ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 1| January 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

WORD FORMATION AND STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF THE WORD

Aysina M.[1]
[1]*Branch of the National University of Science and Technology "MISIS" in the city of Almalyk*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra19829
DOI No: 10.36713/epra19829

ABSTRACT
Word-formation structure exists exclusively in derivatives and compound words. It is important to distinguish between changes in word-formation structure at different stages of language development: The diachronic approach takes into account historical changes, while the synchronic approach studies the current state of the language. The differences between these approaches can be quite significant. The word-formation meaning and its formal indicator (derivative) form two sides of a single linguistic sign, i.e. derivateme, which is the signified and the signifier. Changes occur in language that affect morphemic structure and derivation. This includes such phenomena as etymologization, loss of morpheme productivity, haplology, folk etymology, and the law of analogy.
KEY WORDS: *structure of a word, morpheme, derivative, word-formation meaning, diachronic and synchronic approach.*

INTRODUCTION
The word-formation or derivational structure of a word consists of a derivational base and a derivate, which is a formal indicator of the word-formation meaning. The morphemic structure and formation of words can change in the process of changes occurring in the language. Thus, a derivative base of a word, consisting of individual morphemes, can become a non-derivative, indecomposable base. This process is closely related to the non-etymology of words, that is, the loss of previous semantic connections.

Word-formation or derivational structure of the word is observed in derivative words and compound words. Its identification consists in comparing the words of the motivating and motivated base. In the article, the subject of the description is the word-formation structure, comparison of the motivating and motivated word [6, 174].

MATERIALS AND METHODS
The purpose of the description is to study changes in the derivational structure of a derivative word. In a motivated word, also known as a derivative word, two components can be distinguished: a word-formation base or derivational base, as well as a derivator, which is a formal indicator of the word-formation meaning. For example, the words reader, visitor, builder, caretaker, pilot, gunner, chief, switchman, teacher and mentor contain a derivational base and a formal indicator of the word-formation meaning in the form of suffixes «**-itel'**», «**-chik**» etc.

In some cases, both the derivation base and the derivator may be complex. For example, in words *mashinopisnyi* and *pis'monosets* derivational bases consist of several roots, and derivatives are represented by suffixes **-n** and **-ets.** The word-formation meaning and its formal indicator are united as two sides of a linguistic sign, or derivatives – the signified and the signifier [9]. Derivatives are similar to grammemes, but they differ in that they are not combined into a limited number of contrasting elements. They are not closed and represent a strictly structured set as in a morphological category. Word-forming meanings are expressed in a less standardized way, unlike form-forming meanings, which allow for more diverse meanings. If we present the structure of the word-forming paradigm in a table, for example, for the paradigm of names «producer of action», formed from verbs of active action, we will find many empty cells [3, 29]. When one word is used with different verbal constructions, different meanings and motivations arise. Each motivation has its own unique word-formation structure, which reflects the relationship between the productive base and the suffix. This forms a word-formation model, according to which a certain compound of the derivative word is formed. The structure of a word is a system in which derivational bases, word formation and affixes for morphogenesis are located in time series and semantically [7, 58]. It would be possible to use a noun *bronenosets* for comparison. At first glance it also seems to disintegrate into the same morphemes: two roots *bron'* and *nos*, суффикс **-ets**, connecting vowel **e** and zero inflection. In reality, this noun is formed by a productive base *bron'* and a solid suffixoid *-enosets*, compare: *ordenonosets*, *medalenosets*, and it has a special structure: *bron+enosets.*

RESULTS
So, we should distinguish between the composition of a word and the structure of a word. The common elements in them are affixes, roots that differ from them, on the one hand, and the producing bases, on the other. The composition of a word and the structure of a word are closely related to each other, they cannot be separated from each other, just as they cannot be identified [2, 18]. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between the structure of the word and the word-composition of the structure. Common to both elements are affixes, which are

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 1| January 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2024: 8.402 || ISI Value: 1.188

divided into roots and groups. Therefore, the structure of the word and the word-composition are closely related, cannot be separated from each other, cannot be identified [2, 18]. If a derivative word can have multiple motivations, it can be considered as two or more-word structures rather than as a single word structure. As noted, languages at all levels change over time. These processes also affect morphemic structure and word formation.

It is also necessary to look at such changes in more detail [8, 123]. This change is expressed in the fact that a derived word stem, consisting of individual morphemes, can eventually develop into a non-derivative, non-decomposable stem in which all morphemes are «integrated» into a single root. This process is closely related to the non-etymology of words, that is, the loss of previous semantic connections [10].

Sometimes a change in the meaning of a non-derivative word, but a derivative one, can lead to a change in the base. For example, the verb *chesat'* over time this verb lost its meaning as *comb* (hair). This loss led to the destruction of the connection between words, and the derived noun became non-derivative [1, 58]. Etymologization and distortion of morphemic composition contribute to phonetic changes in language. Thanks to them, even related lexemes can outwardly differ from each other so much that their original semantic and genetic connections are not simply lost in the consciousness of native speakers: they can be difficult to identify even with the help of scientific etymological analysis [5, 65].

Change can also occur when a morpheme loses its productivity because it is no longer used to form new words. For example, a noun *pir* was formed in the Proto-Slavic era from a verb *piti* using a suffix **-r-:** *piti> *pirъ. In the modern Russian language it is non-derivative.

This diffusion is called applique, and very often it is caused by haplology (the loss of one of two identical or similar-sounding adjacent syllables in a word). Thanks to simplification, new root morphemes appear in the language. For example: *tomskii* (overlaying the final part of the city name *Tomsk* and adjective suffix **-sk-)** etc.

Diffusion is not always manifested in written speech; it can only be manifested in living speech. Thus, the last consonant of the root in adjectives *bratskij*, *deti* etc. merges with the first consonant of the suffix in the sound **[c].** A similar fusion of sounds is also observed in some forms of verbs with a postfix **-sja**: *umyvat'sja*, *odevat'sja*, *prjatat'sja*. [4, 43]. Sometimes in words one morpheme is replaced by another. The main factor in this phenomenon is folk etymology. For example, thanks to it, the Old Russian word *sъvѣdѣtel'* («the one who knows », from the verb *vѣdati*) turned into *svidetel'* («the one who saw»). This word has undergone a root change.

Changes can often occur by analogy. Thus, under the influence of nouns with **- nica** a modern word *lestnica* appeared from an Old Russian noun *lѣstvica.* In this case, the suffix was replaced. Different types of structural changes can be combined in the same word.

DISCUSSION

It is necessary to distinguish between the word-formation structure of a word at past stages of development and at the current stage (synchrony): the differences can be very large. Data from the past is restored in the course of etymological analysis, while in the analysis of morphemes and word-formations the same word is considered as an element of the modern, contemporary language system. Simply put, as a result of etymological research, it can be established that the word *vozduh* once had the root *duh*. But in the word-formation and morphemic analysis in the same word we will choose a non-derivative base consisting of the root *vozduh* [1, 43], since this noun is already present in the modern language, it has no semantic relationship with the word *duh* [8, 78].

CONCLUSION

Thus, it is necessary to distinguish between the word-formation structure of a word at the diachronic and synchronic stages of development. The word-formation structure of a word can change as a result of the action of various phenomena in the language, which can influence the morphemic structure and the formation of words. Such phenomena include etymologization, loss of productivity of a morpheme, the phenomena of haplology, folk etymology, and the law of analogy.

REFERENCES

1. *Zemskaya E.A. (2011) Modern Russian Language: Word Formation. Moscow, Prosveshchenie Publishing House, 323 p.*
2. *Lopatin V.V. (1977) Russian Word-Formation Morphemics: Problems and Principles of Description. Moscow, Nauka Publishing House, 140 p.*
3. *Maslov Yu.S. (1987) Introduction to Linguistics. Moscow, Vysshaya Shkola Publishing House, 272 p.*
4. *Rosenthal D.E. et al. (2017) Modern Russian Language. Moscow, Prosveshchenie Publishing House, 213 p.*
5. *Shansky N.M., Tikhonov A.N. (1987) Modern Russian Language: Part 2. Word Formation, Morphology. Moscow, 254 p.*
6. *P.V. Tsarev. (1984) Productive Nominal Word Formation in Modern Language. Moscow, 225 p.*
7. *Charykova O.N., Popova Z.D., Sternin I.A. (2010) Fundamentals of the theory of language and communication. Study guide. Moscow, Flinta Publishing House, 149 p.*
8. *Shansky N.M., Ivanov V.V., Shanskaya T.V. (1971) Brief etymological dictionary of the Russian language: A manual for teachers. Moscow, 544 p.*
9. *http://psihdocs.ru/susov-i-p-vvedenie-v-teoreticheskoe-yazikoznanie.html?page=15*
10. *http://new.gramota.ru/biblio/readingroom/textbooks/author/litnevskaya/par*