

SUFFIXES OF NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES

Navruzova Farida Nazarovna

Teacher of Russian language and literature of the 1st Academic Lyceum of the Tashkent State University of Economics

Abstract: The word-formation semantics of action names is considered. The combination of procedural and objective meanings is considered as a phenomenon due to the polysemy of the suffix. Action names that have objective meanings form a transition zone between syntactic and lexical derivation.

Keywords: syntactic and lexical derivation, action names, word-formation affix, polysemy.

The distinction between homonymy and polysemy of word-formation affixes is one of the most difficult problems of Russian derivatology. The solution of this problem is especially relevant for nouns, in the semantics of which the meaning of action is combined with objective meanings. As is known, E. Kurilovich contrasted lexical and syntactic derivation on a functional basis. He called a syntactic derivative a form "with the same lexical content as the original form, but with a different syntactic function." "While syntactic derivation occurs within the same lexical meaning..., lexical derivation assumes that the original and derived words are identical to each other in primary syntactic function." The concept of transposition is close to the concept of syntactic derivation. M. Dokulil understood transposition as the translation of a word from one part of speech to another without changing the lexical meaning of this word. Here he included relative adjectives and verbal names of action. Transposition was opposed to modification and mutation.

Action names traditionally belong to syntactic derivatives, however, as noted in grammars and explanatory dictionaries of the Russian language, the meaning of action is regularly accompanied by objective meanings. For example, in Russian grammar-80, out of 39 word-formative types of derivatives naming an action, 11 types with secondary objective meanings are noted. For example, highly productive derivatives with the suffixes: -ациj|(a)/-qi|(a)/-and|(a) (degradation, stylization, compilation); -к(a)/-овк(a)/-ежк(a)/-ачк(a)/-анк(a) (melting, cutting, rejection), -ниj|(e)/-ениj|(f)/-аниj|/-тиj|(e)/-анд|(f) (treatment, punishment, capture) have the following objective meanings:

- 1) 'tool, means of action': ventilation, isolation; pointer, tamper, pin; ignition, fastening, fertilizer;
- 2) 'result of action': combination, annotation, organization; embroidery, notching, blank;
- 3) 'object of action': paycheck, chewing gum, snack;
- 4) 'object and result of action': possession, knitting, jam;
- 5) 'the producer of the action': management, command, population;
- 6) 'place of action': inspection, editorial office; washing, buying, wintering.

Action names that do not have objective meanings belong mainly to unproductive word-formation types or to single formations. In addition, many of these derivatives can have objective meanings, although this is not fixed by Russian grammar-80. For example, derivatives with the suffixes -и|ш (winning, losing), -он (vydrinkon, zakuson "space."), -ст(о) (device, guidance), -ур(a): (proofreading), -ч(a) (distribution), -ари (commentary), -ель (snowstorm). Cf.: To take the winnings; The loss amounted to a large amount; Bring a drink; Buy a snack; Regulating device; Report to management; Read the application guide; Submit proofreading; Stand at the distribution; Read the commentary; A blizzard swept the roads. Thus, the meanings of an abstract procedural feature and an object are regularly combined,



however, a number of researchers recognize the relativity of the boundaries between lexical and syntactic derivation. I.G. Miloslavsky argues on this matter: "It seems that syntactic derivation to a certain extent indicates the range of words where there are no formally unexpressed meanings. However, only to a certain extent. ... One and the same polysemous word in one of its meanings can act as a result of syntactic derivation, and in another – as a result of lexical derivation: to guard – protection (of property) and to protect – protection (reports). In the first case, security is "a certain action from the verb to protect, in the second – a circle of persons engaged in what they are protecting".

Z.I. Rezanova, analyzing the zones of transitions between the main spheres of word formation, gives examples of word-formation models that combine syntactic and lexical transformations, for example, "verb stem + Ø suffix": to lose – loss and to grumble – grumbling. However, he notes that "more interesting are the examples of word-formation types, within the framework of which derivatives are created as a result of the simultaneous action of two differently directed transformations." For example, "a combination of syntactic and lexical exchange": printed heels and heels. A.G. Maksapetyan sees in this phenomenon a categorical syncretism of word-formation types. Word-formative types that combine the meanings of 'abstract procedural feature/carrier of a procedural feature' are considered as "archetypes and unmarked members of privative word-formation oppositions by the presence/absence of signaling of the semantic marker 'physical object', and their inherent categorical ambiguity is a consequence of the systemic neutralization of these oppositions, which is marked by the fact that the unmarked term (i.e. word-formative archetype), intended to express the meaning of 'grammatical objectivity', implicitly expresses the meaning of the marked opposite term (these are initially unambiguous, concrete-objective ST2 word-formation types -ak, -al, -ary, -en...) – 'physical objectivity'...". Thus, "the categorical ambiguity of the word-formative type, which makes it a constituent of at least two word-formative categories, is interpreted in the work not as homonymy and not as polysemy, but as hyponymy of intercategory order."

In our opinion, it is possible to speak of the syncretism of the meanings of an abstract action and a concrete object with the proviso that objective meanings, although they regularly accompany the names of an action, are not obligatory for all derivatives within the framework of one word-formative type. As for the neutralization of the semantic opposition 'action' – 'object', the neutralization or non-distinction of meanings is characteristic of all linguistic units of the same name out of context. The most widely represented opinion in Russian derivatology is that the correlation of the verbal derivative with the procedural and objective meanings is associated with the ambiguity (polysemy or homonymy) of suffixes. For example, I.G. Miloslavsky considers polysemy as a special, distinctive property of suffixes with a categorical meaning: "Suffixes with a specific meaning, as a rule, do not create additional meanings... Suffixes that have only a categorical meaning are divided into two groups: some of them do not create an additional meaning, participating only in syntactic derivation, while others create an additional specific meaning... Such, for example, are the suffixes -n/ya/: maznya (process and object), cook (process and object), begotnya (process), kvashnya (object) or -k/a/: жатка (object), shake (process), podcleanka (process and object)."

References

1. Kurilovich E. Derivation of lexical and syntactic derivation. On the Theory of Parts of Speech // Kurilovich E. Essays on Linguistics. Moscow, Foreign Literature Publ., 1962. Pp. 57–70.
2. Dokulil M. Word formation in Czech, 1. Prague, 1962.



3. Russian grammar. T. 1. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1980.
4. Miloslavsky I.G. Voprosy slovoobrazovatel'nogo sinteza [Issues of word-formation synthesis]. Moscow, Moscow University Publ., 1980.
5. Rezanova Z.I. Funktsional'nyy aspekt slovoobrazovanie [Functional aspect of word formation]. Russian derived name. Tomsk, Tomsk University Publ., 1986.