

DERIVATIONAL FEATURES OF COMPOSITES IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

Mamasoliyeva Dilfuza Do'stmurod qizi

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Shevtsova Olga Vladimirovna

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: mamasoliyevad02@gmail.com

The article examines the derivational features of English and Russian composites in order to identify both typological similarities and systematic differences. The analysis is based on terms from the field of linguistics, which allow us to trace the mechanisms of word formation and the interaction of morphological and semantic characteristics. The study relies on corpus data, dictionaries and linguistic works containing English-Russian correspondences of composites. Particular attention is paid to the differences in the order of components, the nature of the connection and the types of word-formation models.

Keywords: composites, derivation, word formation, linguistic terminology, English-Russian comparison.

Composites, or compound words, are an important object of research in the word-formation system of both English and Russian. In the context of globalization and intensive linguistic interaction, there is an active borrowing of English compound words into Russian, which is due to both technological progress and cultural influence.

The study of these units makes it possible to identify patterns of their adaptation, transformation of meaning and pragmatic use in various discourses. However, despite the universality of the phenomenon of composition, each language implements it by means inherent in its grammatical system. One of the productive ways to identify the specifics of derivational processes is a comparison based on the material of the similar vocabulary.

In this article, the terminology of linguistics, which is distinguished by structural orderliness and stability of use, has been chosen as such vocabulary. This choice was due to the fact that scientific terminology is less subject to stylistic fluctuations and is most often used according to certain word-formation models, which makes it especially convenient for comparative analysis.

Compositeness represents a developing area of linguistic research that has been explored by scholars such as E.S. Kubryakova, R. Lieber, and N.A. Zaliznyak.

According to E.S. Kubryakova, compositeness should be considered as “a method of derivation in which semantic, morphological and syntactic parameters interact.” [5, 193]. R. Lieber also points out that composites function as intermediate units between syntax and lexicon, reflecting the dynamics of the language system. [6, 215] A.A. Zaliznyak emphasizes in his work, that composites should be

considered not only from a formal point of view, but also from the stand point of derivational semantics, since the meaning of a compound word often goes beyond the simple summation of the meanings of its components. [8] This is especially noticeable in cases of metaphorical or idiomatic composites, for example: bookworm, headhunter.

Thus, compositeness as a phenomenon demonstrates a complex interaction of formal and semantic characteristics, which makes it a productive object of analysis within the framework of morphology, lexicology and cognitive linguistics. The study of composites requires taking into account not only their structural features, but also pragmatic, cognitive and cultural factors, which is especially important in comparative analysis in the English-Russian perspective.

The English language is characterized by a high degree of productivity of composites. The main models are: N+N (speech-pattern), Adj+N (phonetic-form), V+N (checklist), Adv+V (overgeneralize), as well as chains of more than two components (whatsoever).

As L. Bauer emphasizes, “composites in English have a high level of flexibility, which is due to the analytical nature of the language.” [2, 199].

Terms from linguistics, such as sound-change, word-order, stem-form, stress-mark demonstrate the high frequency of the N+N model and the ability to create new units through analogy and combination.

As L. Bloomfield notes, “English tends to use compact complex units, where the components retain relative autonomy.” [3, 6]

The Russian language, unlike English, is less inclined to create fused composites. Analytical constructions expressed through phrases prevail: *морфологическое правило* (morphological rule), *синтаксическая конструкция* (syntactical construction), *фразеологический оборот* (phraseological unit). However, in scientific terminology, one can also find complex words: *языковедение* (linguistics), *звукоподражание* (onomatopoeia), *словопроизводство* (word production). As T.V. Zhrebilo writes, “the Russian language uses phrases to a greater extent to express concepts that are formalized as composites in English.” [9]. Nevertheless, there is a tendency to borrow English-language models – this is emphasized by V.N Prokhorova in her studies of terminology systems [7, 29].

The comparative approach allows us to identify the following main differences and similarities:

1) The order of components: English language often places the definition before the defined (birthplace), while in Russian language the norm dictates the opposite order (*месторождение*).

2) Methods of the connection: English composites can be solid compounds (homework), hyphenated compounds (syntax-based) and open compounds (language family), however in Russian, phrases (syntax-based: *основанный на синтаксисе*) and calques predominate (language family: *языковая семья*). As N.D. Arutyunova notes, “The Russian tradition is inclined toward descriptiveness in term formation.” [1, 114].

3) Flexibility of the model: English language allows multi-level derivation (word-formation-based approach), while, in Russian such structures are conveyed descriptively (*подход, основанный на словообразовании*) or through phraseological expressions. This phenomenon is discussed in the works of O. Jespersen. [4]

Thus, the derivational features of composites in English and Russian demonstrate both general universal trends and specific differences dictated by the structure of languages. The terminology of linguistics provides extensive material for analysis, as it combines elements of high systematicity and creativity. Comparing such compounds not only deepens our understanding of word-formation mechanisms but also helps develop strategies for effective translation and scientific communication.

In the future, such research may be expanded by including additional languages, as well as by incorporating methods from corpus linguistics and automated analysis of lexical structures.

References

1. Arutyunova N.D. Language and human world. – Litres, 2022. – 109-115 p.
2. Bauer L. Introducing Linguistic Morphology. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003. – 196-214 p.
3. Bloomfield M. The study of Language. – Deadalus, 102, no. 3, 1973. – 5-13 p.
4. Jespersen O. The philosophy of Grammar: First edition. – Routledge, 1924.
5. Kubryakova E. Language and knowledge. – Litres, 2022. – 190-200 p.
6. Lieber R. Introducing Morphology: Third edition. – Cambridge University Press, 2022. – 214-217, 245 p.
7. Prokhorova V.N. Russian Terminology. – “Рипол Классик”, 1996. – 27-36 p.
8. Zaliznyak A.A. Grammatical dictionary of Russian Language. – Russian Dictionaries, 2003.
9. Zherebilo, T.V. Dictionary of linguistic terminology. – Russia: ООО "Кеп", 2016.