

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС
ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ
ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ДАВЛАТ ЖАҲОН ТИЛЛАРИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ**

**АБДУШУКУРОВА НИГИНА АЛИШЕР ҚИЗИ
ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИ 2-ФАКУЛЬТЕТИ, 308 А - ГУРУҲ**

WORDFORMATION AS A BRANCH OF LEXICOLOGY

РЕФЕРАТ

**катта ўқитувчи
М. Полвонова**

Тошкент – 2015

Content

1. Introduction: Word Formation and its basic peculiarities

2. Body: Productivity of Word Building

3. Conclusion

List of used literature

Introduction: Word Formation and its basic peculiarities

Because of new inventions and changes, every language is in need of new words-borrowed, derived or otherwise formed-simply because new things need new words. The human community is steadily growing and developing, just as tool we use to communicate : Language. When new invention and changes enter our lives, we are in the need of naming them and of course to communicate about them. Language is dynamic , it changes constantly. Inter alia because native speakers like to play with their language because there are no “wrong” words. The key here is usage: If a new word, however silly it may be, is used many speakers of a language, it will be probably survive and it can happen that one day, it is an everyday every day word and entered our dictionary.

This paper is devoted to the general description and history of word formation and productivity of word building.

Body: Productivity of Word Building

«Wordformation is the process of creating new words from the material available in the language after certain structural and semantic formulas and patterns (*Ginzburg*). Wordformation is that branch of the science of language which the patterns on which a language forms new lexical units, i.e. words». (*H. Marchand*.) The term «wordformation» is applied to the process by which new words are formed by adding prefixes and suffixes or both to a root — form already in existence. (*J.A. Sheard*). Wordformation is the creation of new words from the elements existing in the language. Every language has its own structural patterns of wordformation. Words like «*writer*», «*worker*», «*teacher*», «*manager*» and many others follow the structural pattern of wordformation «V + er». Word-formation may be studied synchronically and diachronically. «With regard to compounding, prefixing and suffixing wordformation proceeds either on a native or on a foreign basis of coining. The term native basis of coining means that a derivative must be analysable as consisting of two independent morphemes (in the event of a compound as *rainbow*) or of a combination of independent and dependent morpheme (in the case of prefixal and suffixal derivatives as *un-just*, *boy-hood*). By wordformation on a foreign basis of coining we understand derivation on the morphologic basis of another language. In English most learned, scientific or technical words are formed on the morphologic basis of Latin or Greek. (*Marchand*)

Two principal approaches are applied in the science of language: the synchronic and the diachronic one. With regard to wordformation the synchronic linguist would study the present day system of formatting words types while the scholar of the diachronic school would write the history of wordformation .

Marchand points out that mere semantic correlation is not enough to establish a phonological (phonemic), morpho-phonemic opposition. For the

speaker «*dine*» and «*dinner*», «*maintain*» and «*maintenance*» and many others are semantically connected but a derivative connection has not developed out of such pairs, so their opposition is not relevant to wordformation. Thus, synchronically we study those of wordformation which characterize the present-day English linguistic system, while diachronically we investigate the history of wordformation. The synchronic type of wordformation does not always coincide with the historical system of wordformation.

For example. The words *childhood*, *kingdom* were compound words: *hood* OE had (state, rank), *dom* OE dom condemn. But synchronically they are considered as derived words because «*-dom*,» «*-hood*» became affixes. The words «*return*» and «*turn*» historically had semantic relations and «*return*» was considered as a word derived from «*turn*». But synchronically these words have no semantic relations and we can't say that «*return*» is derived from «*turn*».

Synchronically the most important and the most productive ways of wordformation are: affixation, conversion, word-composition. Besides them there are other types of wordformation such as: shortening, soundinterchange, blending, back-formation. In the course of the historical development of a language the productivity of this or that way of wordformation changes.

For example. soundinterchange (blood — bleed, strike — stroke) was a productive way of wordformation in old English and it is an important subject-matter for a diachronic study of the English language. Soundinterchange has lost its productivity in Modern English and no new words can be formed by means of soundinterchange. Affixation on the contrary was productive in Old English and is still one of the most productive ways of wordformation in Modern English.

Two types of wordformation may be distinguished: word-derivation and word-composition. Words formed by word-derivation have only one stem and one or more derivational affixes (**For example.** *kindness* from *kind*). Some derived words have no affixes because derivation is achieved through conversion (**For example.** *to*

paper from paper). Words formed by wordcomposition have two or more stems (*For example*. bookcase, note-book). Besides there are words created by derivation and composition. Such words are called derivational compounds (*For example*. long-legged). So the subject of study of wordformation is to study the patterns on which the English language builds words.

The English and Uzbek languages differ in the types of wordformation. Their ways of wordformation are also different. Affixation, composition, shortening are very productive ways of wordformation in both languages. In Uzbek conversion, blending, soundinterchange (stressinterchange), backformation are less common type of wordformation. As for as the English language concerned these types of wordformation are very common. We can find a few words which formed by these types of wordformation in the Uzbek language. The Comparative value of the wordformation of English and Uzbek languages demands further investigations.

The nineteenth century, the period of great advances in historical and comparative language study, saw the first claims of linguistics to be a science, comparable in its methods with the natural sciences which were also enjoying a period of exciting discovery. These claims rested on the detailed study, by comparative linguists, of formal correspondences in the Indo-European languages, and their realization that such study depended on the assumption of certain natural 'laws' of sound change. As Robins¹ observes in his discussion of the linguistics of the latter part of the nineteenth century:

The history of a language is traced through recorded variations in the forms and meanings of its words, and languages are proved to be related by reason of their possession of worlds bearing formal and semantic correspondences to each other such as cannot be attributed to mere chance or to recent borrowing. If sound change were not regular, if word-forms were subject to random, inexplicable, and unmotivated variation in the course of time, such arguments would lose their

validity and linguistic relations could only be established historically by extra linguistic evidence such as is provided in the Romance field of languages descended from Latin.

The rise and development in the twentieth century of synchronic descriptive linguistics meant a shift of emphasis from historical studies, but not from the idea of linguistics as a science based on detailed observation and the rigorous exclusion of all explanations depended on extra linguistic factors. As early as 1876, Henry Sweet had written:

Before history must come a knowledge of what exists. We must learn to observe things as they are, without regard to their origin, just as a zoologist must learn to describe accurately a horse or any other animal. Nor would the mere statements that the modern horse is a descendant of a three-toed marsh quadruped be accepted as an exhausted description... Such however is the course being pursued by most antiquarian philologists.²

The most influential scholar concerned with the new linguistics was Ferdinand de Saussure, who emphasized the distinction between external linguistics – the study of the effects on a language of the history and culture of its speakers, and internal linguistics – the study of its system and rules. Language, studied synchronically, as a system of elements definable in relation to one another, must be seen as a fixed state of affairs at a particular point of time. It was internal linguistics, stimulated by de Saussure's works, that was to be the main concern of the twentieth-century scholars, and within it there could be no place for the study of the formation of words, with its close connection with the external world and its implications of constant change. Any discussion of new formations as such means the abandonment of the strict distinction between history and the present moment. As Harris expressed in his influential *Structural Linguistics*³ :

‘The methods of descriptive linguistics cannot treat of the productivity of elements since that is a measure of the difference between our corpus and some future corpus of the language.’ Leonard Bloomfield, whose book *Language*⁴ was the next work of major influence after that of de Saussure, re-emphasized the necessity of a scientific approach, and the consequent difficulties in the way of studying ‘meaning’, and until the middle of the nineteen-fifties, interest was centered on the isolating of minimal segments of speech, the description of their distribution relative to one another, and their organization into larger units. The fundamental unit of grammar was not the word but a smaller unit, the morpheme.

The next major change of emphasis in linguistics was marked by the publication in 1957 of Noam Chomsky’s *Syntactic Structures*⁵. As Chomsky stated it, the aim of linguistics was now seen to be ‘to make grammatical explanations parallel in achievement to the behavior of the speaker who, on the basis of a finite and accidental experience with language can produce and understand an indefinite number of new sentences’. The idea of productivity, or creativity, previously excluded from linguistics, or discussed in terms of probabilities in the effort to maintain the view of language as existing in a static state, was seen to be of central importance. But still word-formation remained a topic neglected by linguists, and for several good reasons. Chomsky made explicit the distinction, fundamental to linguistics today (and comparable to that made by de Saussure between *langue*, the system of a language, and *parole*, the set of utterances of the language), between linguistic competence, ‘the speaker-hearer’s knowledge of his language’ and performance, ‘the actual use of language in concrete situations’. Linked with this distinction are the notions of ‘grammaticalness’ and ‘acceptability’; in Chomsky’s words, ‘Acceptability is a concept that belongs to the study of competence’. A ‘grammatical’ utterance is one which may be generated and interpreted by the rules of the grammar; an ‘acceptable’ utterance is one which is ‘perfectly natural and immediately

comprehensible... and in no way bizarre or outlandish'⁶. It is easy to show, as Chomsky does, that a grammatical sentence may not be acceptable. For instance, *this is the cheese the rat the cat caught stole* appears 'bizarre' and unacceptable because we have difficulty in working it out, not because it breaks any grammatical rules. Generally, however, it is to be expected that grammaticalness and acceptability will go hand in hand where sentences are concerned.

The ability to make and understand new words is obviously as much a part of our linguistic competence as the ability to make and understand new sentences, and so, as Pennanen⁷ points out, 'it is an obvious gap in transformational grammars not to have made provision for treating word-formation.' But, as we have already noticed, we may readily think of words, like *to piano* and *to violin*, against which we can invoke no rule, but which are definitely 'unacceptable' for no obvious reason. The incongruence of grammaticality and acceptability that is, is far greater where words are concerned than where sentences are concerned. It is so great, in fact, that the exercise of setting out the 'rules' for forming words has so far seemed to many linguists to be out of questionable usefulness. The occasions on which we would have to describe the output of such rules as 'grammatical but non-occurring'⁸ are just too numerous. And there are further difficulties in treating new words like new sentences. A novel word (like *handbook* or *partial*) may attract unwelcome attention to itself and appear to be the result of the breaking of rules rather than of their application. And besides, the more accustomed to the word we become, the more likely we are to find it acceptable, whether it is 'grammatical' or not – or perhaps we should say, whether or not it was 'grammatical' *at the time it was first formed*, since a new word once formed, often becomes merely a member

of an inventory; its formation is a historical event, and the 'rule' behind it may then appear irrelevant.

Some of the ways of forming words in present-day English can be restored to for the creation of new words whenever the occasion demands – these are called **productive ways of forming words**, other ways of forming words cannot now produce new words, and these are commonly termed **non-productive** or **unproductive**. R. S. Ginzburg gives the example of affixation having been a productive way of forming new words ever since the Old English period; on the other hand, sound-interchange must have been at one time a word-building means but in Modern English (as we have mentioned above) its function is actually only to distinguish between different classes and forms of words.

It follows that productivity of word-building ways, individual derivational patterns and derivational affixes is understood as their ability of making new words which all who speak English find no difficulty in understanding, in particular their ability to create what are called **occasional words** or **nonce-words**⁹ (e.g. *lungful* (of smoke), *Dickensish* (office), *collarless* (appearance)). The term suggests that a speaker coins such words when he needs them; if on another occasion the same word is needed again, he coins it afresh. Nonce-words are built from familiar language material after familiar patterns. Dictionaries, as a rule, do not list occasional words.

The delimitation between productive and non-productive ways and means of word-formation as stated above is not, however, accepted by all linguists without reserve. Some linguists consider it necessary to define the term productivity of a word-building means more accurately. They hold the view that productive ways and means of word-formation are only those that can be used for the formation of an unlimited number of new words in the modern language, i.e. such means that “know no bounds” and easily form occasional words. This divergence of opinion is

responsible for the difference in the lists of derivational affixes considered productive in various books on English lexicology.

Nevertheless, recent investigations seem to prove that productivity of derivational means is relative in many respects. Moreover there are no absolutely productive means; derivational patterns and derivational affixes possess different degrees of productivity. Therefore it is important that conditions favouring productivity and the degree of productivity of a particular pattern or affix should be established. All derivational patterns experience both structural and semantic constraints. The fewer are the constraints, the higher is the degree of productivity, the greater is the number of new words built on it. The two general constraints imposed on all derivational patterns are: the part of speech in which the pattern functions and the meaning attached to it which conveys the regular semantic correlation between the two classes of words. It follows that each part of speech is characterized by a set of productive derivational patterns peculiar to it. Three degrees of productivity are distinguished for derivational patterns and individual derivational affixes: (1) highly productive, (2) productive or semi-productive and (3) non-productive.

R. S. Ginzburg¹⁰ says that productivity of derivational patterns and affixes should not be identified with the frequency of occurrence in speech, although there may be some interrelation between them. Frequency of occurrence is characterized by the fact that a great number of words containing a given derivational affix are often used in speech, in particular in various texts. Productivity is characterized by the ability of a given suffix to make new words.

In linguistic literature there is another interpretation of derivational productivity based on a quantitative approach. A derivational pattern or a derivational affix are qualified as productive provided there are in the word-stock dozens and hundreds of derived words built on the pattern or with the help of the suffix in question. Thus interpreted, derivational productivity is distinguished from word-formation activity by which is meant the ability of an affix to produce new words, in

particular occasional words or nonce-words. For instance, the agent suffix –er is to be qualified both as a productive and as an active suffix: on the one hand, the English word-stock possesses hundreds of nouns containing this suffix (e.g. writer, reaper, lover, runner , etc.), on the other hand, the suffix –er in the pattern v + –er - N is freely used to coin an unlimited number of nonce-words denoting active agents (e.g. interrupter, respecter, laugher, breakfaster , etc.).

The adjective suffix –ful is described as a productive but not as an active one, for there are hundreds of adjectives with this suffix (e.g. beautiful, hopeful, useful , etc.), but no new words seem to be built with its help.

For obvious reasons, the noun-suffix –th in terms of this approach is to be regarded both as a non-productive and a non-active one.

Conclusion

So, we are done with the comparative and classificational analysis. In this work we, first, managed to study different sources making new words. We found out that all ways can be distinguished into two types: major and minor. These two types were very useful in the further classificational analyses.

As we have seen before, there are many ways to create new words: Borrowing from other languages, blending together from several words or deriving from words we already have. Of course there even more possibilities than mentioned before. There is the possibility to convert words from one grammatical category to another, for example from verb to noun (to flow-the flow) or from noun to verb (the e-mail-to e-mail) . Other examples for other word formation processes include clippings, with which the word is shortened (influenza-flu; advertising-ad; motorbike-bike), or folk etymology, where words from other languages are taken and then, overtime, people try to make sense of them. So gradually the word is changed to a more familiar form that usually keeps its original meaning, e.g. the Spanish word *cucaracha* was borrowed and then gradually transformed to *cockroach*. Even the creative respelling, where the spelling of words is changed for products (e.g. Kleen, Krunch), is considered to be one of these processes.

So finally, if we take a look around, we will see amass of new words surrounding us, brought to us both consciously by language trends or advertising and unconsciously through language change over time. For example, if you read any Shakespeare's work, it is obvious that language is dynamic, because both the grammar and the words are different to ours now. Language changes constantly. And who knows if the people will understand the language we are using now in a few decades?

List of used literature

1. M.L Burns Scope English Writing and Language skill Level three – Scholastic Inc., 1982.
2. Л.Л. Касаткин, Е.В. Клобуков, П.А. Лекант Краткий справочник по современному русскому языку. – М.: Высшая школа, 1995. – 382 с.
3. Noam Avram Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* . Berlin, 1957.
4. Jukka Pennanen, *Aspects of Finnish Grammar* . Pohjoinen, 1972. P. 293.