

Investigating Productive Word Formation Patterns in Verbs Across Russian and Uzbek Languages

I. T. Babakulov¹ and K. N. Kadirov²

¹Samarkand State University, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

²Navoi Innovations University, Navoi, Uzbekistan

Keywords: System, Word-Formation Category, Russian Language, Uzbek Language, Causation, Derivation, Suffixation, Suffixal-Postfixal Method.

Abstract: The article characterises the general system of word-formation categories of verbs of Russian and Uzbek languages. The analysis of the most productive word-forming categories included in it is given, with the verbs of motion and movement, movement effectiveness, movement restriction, intensity and causation serving as their derivational bases. It is substantiated that verb word-formation in Russian is more agglutinative, despite the presence of a number of morphological transformations at suffixation and suffixal- postfixal method. The groups predetermining the allocated semantic seme have been established. The verbs of causation in the Uzbek language are considered and on the basis of examples of their word-formation derivation the meanings of causation are conveyed.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the study of Russian word-formation, it is observed that verbal word-formation is more agglutinative compared to nominal word-formation. This is evident despite the presence of various morphonological transformations that occur during suffixation and the suffixal-postfixal method. Notably, specific verb formants such as prefixes and postfixes are characterized by a lack of accompanying morphonological transformations. This distinction highlights the unique structural aspects of Russian verbs in their formation and modification processes.

The analysis of the links between grammatical categories, such as kind (aspect) and pledge (voice), and the lexico-grammatical categories of verbs is particularly significant. These connections reveal intricate interactions between the morphological tier, encompassing categories like kind and pledge, and lexical elements, which include different ways of verbal action. Furthermore, understanding these relationships provides deeper insights into the nature of verb word-formation categories in the Russian language, emphasizing the complexity and richness of its verbal system.

In-depth study of these interactions offers a comprehensive perspective on how morphological,

lexical, and word-formation elements integrate within the Russian language. It is crucial to identify the interplay between these tiers to fully grasp the mechanisms underlying verbal word-formation. This holistic approach not only sheds light on the structural intricacies of Russian verbs but also enhances our understanding of their functional and semantic roles within the language.

2 ANALYSIS

The vast zone of content isomorphism of the two languages being compared - Uzbek and Russian - is manifested in the generalisation and universality of the word-formation meaning (WN), in its ability to convey the general concepts of human thinking. In Russian, the general system of the most productive word-forming categories (WFC) of the verb includes the following: SC "spatial modification of action" (fly in, fly up, fly out, fly in, fly in,

fly around, fly away, fly over, fly under, fly in, fly over, fly over, fly down, fly away, etc.). In this category, the verbs of motion and movement serve as the producing base. Almost all productive verb prefixes are used as formant means in lexical realisations of this category.

SC "effectiveness of action" (to grow up, to mature, to sleep out, to run out, to finish reading, to finish reading, to wake up, to wait for, to salt, to talk out, etc.).

SC "temporally limited action" (to flirt, to laugh, to shriek, to rejoice, to talk, to sit, etc.).

SC "multiplicity of action" (scare, scold, shug, jump, dare; hobble, shiban, chuban, rub, quilt, tell, cut, push; try, etc.).

SC "intensity of action" (to amuse, to press on, to lay on, to push on, to read, to forget; to smoke, to read, to dance, to brood, to cheer up, etc.).

SC "behaviour, occupation" (naive, sassy, monkeying around, frank, pajasnicki, etc.).

SC "becoming a sign" (to orphan, to grow old, to grow rusty, to grow glassy, to grow dilapidated, to grow strong, to grow wild, to grow expensive; to grow deaf, to grow blind, to grow dry, etc.).

SC "manifestation of a feature" (whiteness, blackness, redness, etc.); SC "causation of action" (salt, pepper, sugar, mothball, wax, ochre, powder, etc.).

SC "turning the action towards the subject" (to make up, to comb, to whiten, to blush, to defend, to anger, to restrain, etc.).

SC "reciprocity" ("comitativity") of action (to scold, to shoot, to get acquainted, to shake hands, etc.).

It is shown that only two SCs coincide in the verb subsystems of the Russian and Uzbek languages: "becoming a feature" (derevenet, firm, shallow

- kizarmok, kuyuklamok) and "giving a feature (causation)" (yellow, dirty, reveal, exhaust, orphan - yangilamok, yakhishlamok). At the same time, morphological transformations of derivatives in Uzbek can be no less significant than in Russian: cf. sariq - sargaimok. It is significant that in Russian the technique of attaching verbal suffixes to the bases is close to agglutinative: dirty-i-t, bel-i-t. Verbal suffixes are more easily distinguished than most nominal suffixes, however, we cannot speak of the full agglutinativity of such suffixes, since they express not only derivational but also species meaning.

In Russian, the SC "becoming of a feature" is an integral, compact, and largely agglutinative category, while the SC "causation" is a more complicated complex phenomenon. As A. A. Azizov notes, "in Russian there are only vestigial phenomena of causative (to drink - to drink, to fester - to fester), so this collateral meaning is dead in Russian and is not expressed by grammatical means" [2. P. 164]. [2. C. 164]. In this case, indeed, we can see that there is no such a regular grammatical category in Russian as the propositional voice in Uzbek. Meanwhile, one can by

no means agree that the meaning of causation is a relic phenomenon.

From the author's point of view, the productivity of the verb SC "causation of a feature", which is paradigmatically related to SC "becoming of a feature" and at the same time opposed to it, in Russian partially compensates for the weak "drawing" of the grammatical category of pledge.

The correlation of verb grammatical categories (GC) proper (kind, pledge, inflection, tense, person) is complex and is determined by their contribution to the category of meanings (CM) of proceduralism, the general meaning of all words belonging to the class of verbs. According to A. M. Peshkovsky, the kind of a verb generalises the time of a process or its distribution in time. In contrast to the category of verb tense, species is not related to the deictic temporal (time) localisation of an action, but to its internal "temporal structure", to the way it is interpreted by the speaker. In different languages, the category of kind differs both in the variety of its forms of expression (synthetic or analytic) and in its content.

The numerous oppositions of reaching / not reaching the inner limit of the state and the achieved state, with the notions of repetition, ordinariness, etc., noted in the languages of the world, are characteristic as a kind, acquiring the status of GC in the language. As I. I. Meshchaninov notes, otherwise it will act as a semantic (conceptual) category, i.e., as an opposition of "aspectual classes" (dynamic/static, limit/non-limit verbs) and their subclasses, the so-called modes of action within the functional-semantic field of aspectuality. This means a set of grammatical, word-formation, lexical and many other means serving to convey their meanings.

It is not unknown that the categories of kind and pledge in Russian, relative to the categories of inclination, time, and person, are word-forming categories that contribute to the replenishment of the verb lexicon. Their realisation ensures word-formation derivation rather than morphological derivation. Due to this, the form and pledge status of grammatical categories do not disappear, but their specificity as categories of classifying character is emphasised. For example, A. N. Tikhonov, one of the most convinced supporters of representing the members of the species pair as forms of one verb and the presence of pure species prefixes in the Russian language, held the opposite point of view. In his Dictionary of the Russian Language, each prefixal verb takes the place of a full-fledged member of word-formation chains and paradigms.

These verbs in comparison with the verbs of becoming in Uzbek are described by I. R. Hakimova,

who identified the essential features of isomorphism of the organisation of verbs of this mode of action in the two different languages under consideration. In turn, this substantiates the correctness of E. S. Kubryakova's statement about the proximity of word-formation meanings to universal meanings.

In particular, according to I. R. Hakimova, the specificity of verbs of becoming is determined, first of all, by the fact that in most cases they fulfil the role of derivative adjectives verbs, which are characterised by the inheritance of semantic features of their derivatives. Meanwhile, from our point of view, this interpretation requires clarification. It is well known that verbs of becoming, like all transpositional classes of derivatives, do not so much inherit as transform the semantics of the deriving adjectives (less often nouns) by eliminating the grammatical categories of genus, case, fullness-shortness, and by introducing the derived word fully into the sphere of verb categories. Meanwhile, the generalised lexical semantics of derivational adjectives will undoubtedly be reflected in the semantics of derivational verbs and their functioning.

As we can see, verbs of becoming convey a dialectical unity of motivational semantics, word-formation meaning and grammatical categories of the "resultant" verb grammatical class, the functioning of which is restricted by the semantics of the producing class. For example, I. S. Ulukhanov classifies them as a mutational semantic type of word formation.

In Russian, some causative verbs are paradigmatically connected with verbs of becoming as regular correlates of verbal word-formation paradigms (SP), cf.: to whiten - to whiten, to blacken - to blacken, to blue - to blue, to dirty, to dirty, to young - to young, to old - to old, etc.

According to I. S. Ulukhanov, private realisations of the selected semantic seme are the following groups:

verbs with the meaning "to endow with something (general meaning)":

finance, subsidise, etc.

verbs with the meaning of "to cover an object with something": vaxit, ochre, powder, sandalise, antimony, etc.

verbs with the meaning "to impregnate an object with something": to

spirit, to grease, to alum, etc.

verbs with the meaning "to saturate an object with something":

ammonise, iodise, nitrogenise, etc.

verbs with the meaning "to sprinkle something on or put something in an object": salt, pepper, sugar, etc.

verbs with the meaning "to equip an object with something": to lock, to telephonise, to cable, etc.

In our opinion, all the differences in the above groups and shades of verb meanings reflect the specificity of their lexical meanings or even those actions, chemical reactions, etc. (i.e., extra-linguistic factors, etc.) that are reflected in the semantics of individual verbs. (i.e., extra-linguistic factors) that are reflected in the semantics of individual verbs.

These distinctions have nothing to do with generalised word-formation semantics. Even from the lexicological point of view, the groups singled out by S. Ulukhanov are very narrow: the distinction between the definitions "to impregnate an object with something" and "to saturate an object with something" is not quite clear; it seems reasonable to unite the 3-, 4- and 5-th groups into one.

Only the formulation of Group 1, which refers to verbs of the most abstract semantics "to endow with something", is close to the formulation of word-formation meaning (WF) as a categorical meaning. From our point of view, it represents a working definition of one of the word-formative meanings of "causation".

The verbs characterised in the aspect of causative semantics, i.e., SC "causation", are distinguished by the fact that they acquire this meaning because of word-formation derivation.

We assume that a derivational verb formed in one act of derivation may combine two word-formative meanings, just as a single word-form of fusional Russian combines two or more grammatical meanings. This situation arises in prefixal-suffixal word-formation, the use of confixes in derivational processes, in which one of the components of the formant complex expresses the resultative semantics of prefixes, and the other - the more abstract suffixal semantics.

In Uzbek, the verbs of causation are:

Substantive: ish - ishlamok, arra - arralamok, suz - suzlamok, auz - auzlamok, pichok - pichoklamok, tish - tishlamok, moi - moilamok;

otadjective: tayyor - tayelamok, ok - oklamok, kora - koraymok, yangi yangilamok.

Uzbek also has verbs of causation formed from verbs, for example:

bukmok - buklamok, gazhimok - gazhilamok.

3 CONCLUSIONS

In our opinion, the subtle shades in the semantics of lexical realisations of the above word-forming types

(WF) are explained rather by the specific semantics of the derivatives. Undoubtedly, the semantics of prefixes modifies the semantics of this subtype of SC "causation", however, already in relation to SC "efficiency". Numerous verb SCs in Russian are semantically connected, first of all, with the category of form and the category of pledge, and formally - with prefixal, prefixal-suffixal and postfixal modes of expression (e.g., to come, to fly in, to divorce, to run away, to beat, to go bankrupt). Therefore, they do not find correspondence in Uzbek.

REFERENCES

- Abdullaeva, Sh. D. (2011). Word-forming categories as a factor of systematicity of verb lexicon in the modern Russian language (Candidate of Philological Sciences dissertation). Tashkent.
- Azizov, A. A. (1983). Comparative morphology of Russian and Uzbek languages. Tashkent: Ukituvchi.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1978). History of Russian linguistic doctrines. Moscow: Higher School.
- Kubryakova, E. S. (1988). The role of word formation in the formation of the linguistic picture of the world. In The role of the human factor in language. Language and the picture of the world (pp. 141-172). Moscow: Nauka.
- Nurmukhamedova, D. F. (1997). Borrowed word-forming elements in the modern Uzbek language. In Actual problems of Russian word-formation. Materials of the VII Republican Conference. Samarkand: SamSU.
- Tikhonov, A. N. (1985). Word-formation dictionary of the Russian language (Vols. 1-2). Moscow: Russian language.
- Ulukhanov, I. S. (1999). Units of the word-formation system of the Russian language and their lexical realisation. Moscow: RAN.