

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 06 Volume: 86

Published: 30.06.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Muhabbat Melieva Allamuratova

Termez State University

Russian language teacher Department
of Russian Linguistics, Faculty of Russian Philology

ACTIVE PROCESSES OF MODERN WORD PRODUCTION

Abstract: In the article the problem of the emergence and use of new words has always been of interest to linguists, especially in our era, the era of economic crisis, the hallmark of which was the liberation of the language, the weakening of the "internal censor" and, as a result, the abundance of all kinds of neologisms.

Key words: modern, word, linguistics.

Language: English

Citation: Allamuratova, M. M. (2020). Active processes of modern word production. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (86), 754-757.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-86-141> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.06.86.141>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Being in constant motion, the language is constantly developing, improving, having its present, past and future. Enrichment of the dictionary is one of the most important factors in the development of a language, evidence of its dynamic nature. Language vocabulary is in a state of continuous change in accordance with language laws. With the development of society, new objects and phenomena appear, they are imprinted in new words and new meanings.

The problem of the emergence and use of new words has always been of interest to linguists, especially in our era, the era of economic crisis, the hallmark of which was the liberation of the language, the weakening of the "internal censor" and, as a result, the abundance of all kinds of neologisms.

One of the main questions of neology is the question of factors contributing to their appearance of new words. In this regard, they speak of the extralinguistic conditionality of lexical changes, that is, a significant role in the development of vocabulary is assigned to the influence of external factors.

Extralinguistic conditions for the development of language include, first of all, socio-political factors. New realities bring their names to the language. This process can be expressed by the formula: "new phenomena - new words." The events of the second half of the 90s, according to E. A. Zemskaya, in their

impact on the language and society "are like a revolution." There are several reasons for this.[1]

Methodology

First, the composition of mass communication participants is expanding sharply: new sections of the population are joining the role of speakers, the role of writing in newspapers and magazines.

Secondly, censorship is sharply weakening, even collapsing. People speak and write freely, "internal censor" is weakened.

Thirdly, the personal principle in speech increases. Faceless and mediocre speech is replaced by personal speech, acquires a specific addressee.

Fourth, the dialogue of communication is increasing. Two equal interlocutors participate in the interview. This is an equal talk.

And finally, situations and genres of communication are changing. The tight framework of official public communication is loosening. The dry official announcer of radio and television is replaced by a presenter who ponders, jokes, expresses his opinion.

Thus, in public communication, the degree of unpreparedness increases and officialness is weakened.[2]

Despite the fact that the influence of external factors plays a significant role in the development of the vocabulary of the language, far from always lexical changes are directly dependent on

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.997	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

extralinguistic reasons. The replenishment of the dictionary is governed by factors not only of the external, but also of the internal order. As B. A. Serebrennikov notes, the very functioning of the language as a tool of communication “is capable of generating impulses of such changes that are not in themselves dependent on the people” [3].

Internal incentives for language development.

Internal transformations are less noticeable. The neoplasms caused by them do not denote new objects and concepts, they are used to name existing realities that were previously designated either descriptively or by a separate word already known in the language. Because of this, they are less noticeable; the expression of novelty in them is not so pronounced; in some cases, their detection is associated with known difficulties. Apparently, this circumstance, as well as the complexity and insufficient development of the general problem of the internal laws of language development explain the fact that intrasystem neoplasms, as a rule, remain outside the field of view of researchers.

Intra-systemic neoplasms are diverse both in nature and in the nature of their functions. Autonomous processes occurring within the lexical subsystem of the language are mediated by external stimuli. The latter activates the linguistic mechanism, which seeks to give the well-known concept a designation that is convenient for a given state of the linguistic system, corresponding to one or another tendency in modern development. Thus, external stimuli seem to “shape” intralinguistic factors.

Let us consider what specific needs of improving the notation system contribute to the appearance of neoplasms.

1. a significant part of the lexical innovations that arose to rename already known concepts is the result of the action of the generative function of the language system, which makes possible the appearance of certain members of the word-formation link that never exists in the language in its entirety. Prior to their appearance, such innovations existed as if potentially, by virtue of which certain realities were indicated for some period of time descriptively. So in the 70s, due to the generative function of the linguistic system, the vocabulary of the Russian language was replenished with a number of derived words from previously known words.

For example: lack of spirituality 'lack of a spiritual, moral, intellectual principle';

veteran 'old honored worker in any field';

transpersonal 'above individual interests'

We'd also: extra-home, insulate, weaning, planetarity, cite, babe, fraternization, unhappiness, winged, etc.

Thus, certain lexical units, having gained independence in due time, become the basis of new word-formation series.

2. One of the powerful intralinguistic incentives that provide the emergence of new vocabulary elements is also a trend called “language economy” (O. Epersen) or “the law of economy of language efforts” (A. Martine).

The effect of this pattern is manifested in the fact that in the process of using the language, the speakers select the most rational language means for communication. This corresponds to the cultural desire of modern society to increase the information content of the text due to its reduction, as well as certain pragmatic aspirations - to save the area of printed materials and the time of oral communications. The indicated internal incentive finds its expression in the replacement of phrases, which, as a rule, have the character of a stable language nomination, single-word names, as more economical in form.

The most striking illustration of this process is the intensive replenishment of the dictionary of the modern Russian literary language with new words that allow you to express a particular concept in the form of a single sign corresponding to a synonymous descriptive structure:

television channel = television genre;

television series = television series;

firstlander = first resident;

air show = air show;

TV show = television show;

brigade officer = police facilitation team;

people's deputy = people's deputy;

bookshelf = bookstore selling books, etc.

these words are compact in form, and at the same time their semantics are easily perceived, the internal form is transparent, which determines their advantage over phrases.

Another phenomenon of the word-formation order, which serves as a source of a significant number of intrasystemic neoplasms, is abbreviation, which is also associated with the rationalization of the language. Despite certain shortcomings, abbreviated words are really economical, because they significantly reduce the “area” of verbal signs.

Over the past thirty years, the study of Russian word formation has intensified significantly. A large number of monographs devoted to the problems of derivatology have appeared. Beginning in the 70s, the works of Zemskoy E.A. (“Modern Russian Language. Word Formation” [4]), Shansky N. M. (“Essays on Russian Word Formation” [5]), Yantsenetskaya M. N. (“Semantic questions of the theory of word formation” [6]), Ermakova O. P. (“Lexical meanings of derivative words in Russian” [7]) and others. In 1985, the “Word-formation dictionary of the Russian language” by A. N. Tikhonov and his team of authors appeared [8], later - monographs by E. A. Zemsky “Word-formation as an activity” [9] and I. S. Ulukhanov “Units of the word-formation system of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHII (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.997	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

the Russian language and their lexical implementation” [10].

The first classification of the methods of Russian word formation was presented by V.V. Vinogradov in the works of the early 50s. He identified the following morphological word formation methods:

1) phonetic and morphological, non-suffix method, 2) suffix, 3) prefix, 4) mixed, suffix - prefix, as well as the following methods - syntactic: morphological-syntactic, lexical-syntactic, lexical-semantic [11]. With the beginning of active replenishment of research in the field of word formation, a traditional classification of word formation methods in the Russian language is taking shape. It is presented, first of all, in the “Russian Grammar” of 1980 and in the article by A. N. Tikhonov “Basic concepts of Russian word formation”.

So, according to the traditional classification of word-formation methods, the following methods apply in modern Russian:

Ways to form words that have one motivating basis.

1). Suffix.

The formant includes a derivational suffix, as well as (in nominal words) a system of derivational affixes of a motivated word. The suffix can be material or null.

2). Prefix The formant is the prefix.

3). Postfixation

The formant is the postfix. The prefix and postfix are attached to the whole word, and not to the base, like a suffix. With prefixation and postfixation, the part-membership does not change.

4). The prefix - suffix method.

Prefixation in combination with the suffixation of material - pronounced and zero.

5). Prefix - postfix method.

6). Suffixely - postfixal way.

7). Prefixing combined with suffix and postfix.

The last four methods are mixed, as it includes several formats.

Ways to form words with more than one motivating basis.

pure addition.

The reference (last) component is equal to the whole word, and the component (s) preceding it is a clean foundation.

Addition of producing bases.

Mixed addition - suffix - a complex way, or addition in combination with suffix.

Fusion.

This method differs from addition in that the words formed in this way, in all word forms in morphemic composition, are completely identical to the phrase on the basis of which they are formed.

Abbreviation is the addition of truncated stems or truncated and complete stems. These methods are traditionally distinguished by most derivatologists. In

addition to the main ones, some researchers give additional, less frequent methods of Russian word formation. So, WG-80 additionally presents the following:

prefixal - complex, prefixal - suffixial - complex, fusion in combination with suffixation, and also a type of abbreviation is mentioned - truncation of the producing base according to the abbreviation principle (term E. A. Zemsky).

So, all the mentioned word-formation methods are presented in the established traditional classification. It should be noted one feature of Russian word-formation, noticed by A. N. Tikhonov and N. D. Arutyunova. As you know, motivating and motivational words make up word-building pairs, chains. N. D. Arutyunova notes that “a real word-formation chain does not necessarily include all the intermediate links. Between any two components of a series, direct semantic and then derivational relations are easily established. Word formation can be carried out with the passage of any number of mediating elements” [12,142]. A. N. Tikhonov calls such word formation “intermittent” [13, p. 146].

Often during the formation of nouns and adjectives the verb step is passed:

compartment - docked,

diphthong - diphthongization. The mechanism of intermittent formation is governed by the law of analogy. The existence of certain types of word formation in a language makes it possible to create the necessary words based on their model. In modern Russian, the types of cross-word derivation are diverse and numerous. When studying language material, we will pay attention to such cases. For a graphic representation of the missing link in the word-formation chain, we will take it in brackets, for example:

diphthong ® (diphthong) ® diphthongized.

All of the noted methods are characteristic of normal word formation. Legs and language change, new words are born, often created according to their own laws, and not according to generally accepted ones. That's what Er says about it. Khanpira: “If we assume that word formation (as a process) occurs only in speech, that words are created only in speech, then all word formation should be divided into potential and occasional” [14, p. 157]

Recently, researchers often turn to the study of occasional word formation and the creation of occasionalisms. A. Zemskaya thus described the main trends of occasional word formation in the language of the late 20th century:

In modern word production, the same features are found that are characteristic of the modern Russian language as a whole: the growth of personality, the high role of evaluative and quantitative values, the active movement of related vocabulary into the central spheres of communication. Freedom from restrictions, the flourishing of individual word formation.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Particularly active as the basic foundations of word formation of keywords. Socially oriented sub-substantive production of nouns. Anthropocentric character of modern word formation. High activity of noun prefixation. Abbreviation is involved in the fund of expressive speech. Active production of substantive relative adjectives. Verbs are in third place after word frequency nouns). [15].

In grammar courses and textbooks on word formation, methods typical of normal vocabulary are now highlighted. In rg-80, 15 usual word-formation methods and 2 occasional ones are described. Such a number of word-formation methods (hereinafter referred to as CO) could not fully cover the lexical layer, including occasionalisms. Therefore, a significant step in the development of Russian derivatology was the work of I. S. Ulukhanov, who compiled a very detailed, harmonious and logically verified classification of CO methods. He considers 79 conventional and occasional CO methods [16]

A complete description of the system of CO methods should be considered a description of not only the types of word-formation structures of the word existing in the usual vocabulary, but also the identification of all the word-formation abilities of the

Russian language, which are theoretically predictable but not implemented in the usual vocabulary, but may or may already be implemented casually and are potential source of replenishment of the usual vocabulary. Pure and mixed methods of JI are divided into methods presented in normal vocabulary (most of them are presented in occasional ones), and methods presented only in occasional vocabulary.

In the Russian language, there are 7 pure methods of CO.

Pure normal methods: 1) suffixation, 2) prefixation, 3) postfixation, 4) substantivation, 5) addition, 6) union, 7) non-morphemic truncation (or truncation according to the abbreviation principle).

Pure occasional methods.

Conclusion

Thus, word formation is a dynamic aspect of the language, its lexical composition. The vocabulary of the language is constantly updated and, above all, due to the processes of word formation. In different periods of the history of the Russian language, certain trends drove word production. The study of these trends is of great interest, since they are a generalization of various word-formation processes.

References:

1. Averyanova, A. D. (1979). *How words are born*. (p.71). Moscow: Science.
2. Humboldt, V.O. (1984). *About the difference in the structure of human languages and its influence on the spiritual development of the human race*. Selected works on linguistics. (p.371). Moscow: Nauka.
3. Ermakova, O. G. (1984). *The lexical meaning of derivative words in Russian*. (p.151). Moscow: Knowledge.
4. Aleksandrova, O. I. (1974). Poetic neologisms of the beginning of the 20th century. *Russian Speech*, № 1, pp. 42–46.
5. Batsevich, F.S. (1981). The process of neologization and its influence on systemic relations in vocabulary. *RYASH*, № 1.
6. Bakina, M. L. (1977). *Word-making. Linguistic processes of modern Russian literature*. Poetry. (pp.78-127). Moscow: Nauka.
7. Vinogradov, V.V. (1975). *Word formation in its relation to grammar and lexicology. Studies in Russian grammar*. (p.371). Moscow.
8. Gabinskaya, O. A. (1981). *Typology of the causes of word creation*. (p.152). Voronezh: Publishing house of the University of Voronezh.
9. Hack, V. G. (1983). *New words and dictionaries of new words*. (pp.15-29). L.: Nauka.
10. Gorshkov, A.I. (1979). *Neologism. Russian Language: Encyclopedia*. (p.159). Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia.
11. Dahl, V. (1956). *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Language*. T. 1–4. Moscow.
12. Zemskaya, E. A. (1996). *Active processes of modern word production. Russian language of the end of the 20th century*. Moscow: Science.
13. Karaulov, Yu.N. (1991). *On the state of the Russian language of our time*. (p.57). Moscow: Nauka.
14. Krysin, L.P. (1980). *Life of the word*. (p.176). Moscow: Knowledge.
15. Leichik, V. M. (1982). *People and words*. (p.177). Moscow: Knowledge.
16. Panov, M.V. (1988). *From observations of the style of today's periodicals. The Language of Modern Journalism*. (p.399). Moscow: Nauka.