

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

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: 2023 Issue: 06 Volume: 122

Published: 28.06.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Yulduz Urazimbetovna Matkurbanova

Karakalpak State University

teacher of the interfaculty department of foreign languages

HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF DERIVATION IN STUDYING LANGUAGES

Abstract: The research deals with the significance of derivation of words within one language or languages. This way appears in all languages' lexicology which are close or far away. The given paper tried to show the value of historical and modern derivation in developing languages. Most importantly, the role of relation of derivation was particularly highlighted.

Key words: derivational words, word formation, derivative, modern derivation, comparative-historical method, productivity, the relation of derivativeness.

Language: English

Citation: Matkurbanova, Yu. U. (2023). Historical importance of derivation in studying languages. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (122), 409-411.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-122-65> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.06.122.65>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Derivation is a complex notion which has different contexts but in linguistics the concept "derivation" in linguistics is used in two different meanings. In one meaning, it indicates a historical or diachronic development words either from an earlier form of the word or by adding affix to an existing word, especially the Oxford English Dictionary defines derivation as "Formation of a word from a more primitive word or root in the same or another language; origination as a derivative"[1:3]. As for Webster's Third New International Dictionary, it defines it as "The formation of a word from an earlier word or base usu. by the addition of an affix usu. noninflectional. In a second meaning derivation indicates the formation of a word synchronically from a word which is said to 'underly it'; Webster's defines derivation in this sense: "Relation of a word to its base as expressed usu. in terms of presence of an affix, q . . . vowel alternation J . . . consonant alternation" . . . difference of accent J . . . absense of one or more sounds, . . . or zero difference J . . . (2) : the relation of a word to its base when the two do not belong to the same inflectional paradigm[2:13].

In modern linguistics, derivation is just beginning to take shape. Much is still unclear about it; a system of terminology has not yet been created,

sufficiently reliable research methods have not been developed, not even the whole range of problems to be resolved has been defined. Derivation did not appear in a vacuum. Formation of modern derivation is a well-known summing up, summarizing the results of the development of linguistics. In this regard, we turn to his history.

Already in the ancient world we find separate ideas consonant with the provisions of modern derivation. So, the ancient Indian linguist Panini compiled a grammar that told how the roots of Sanskrit words are formed, what alternations of sounds occur during word formation. It was essentially the world's first derivational grammar. In ancient times, partly independently, partly relying on the Persian and Arabic tradition, scientists made many interesting assumptions about how individual words and their grammatical forms. It is no coincidence that "derivational" linguistic terminology took shape in ancient Greek philology [3:56]. Compare Russian tracing papers: case (indirect cases seemed to fall away from the nominative case), declension (cases deviated from the original, original), etc.

In Russian linguistics, the ideas of this grammar were successfully developed by the so-called logical grammar, the founder which is N.I.Grech. His "Practical Grammar of the Russian Language" had a

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

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

huge impact on the development of not only the scientific grammar of the 19th-20th centuries, which is still found in school textbooks on the Russian language.

Participial and participial phrases, applications, introductory words were interpreted by logical grammar as sentences "abbreviated" adjectives. Although in reality these turnovers historically, nor derivatively, they were not reduced to subordinate clauses in the literal sense, but they are "raised" to the sentence, i.e. replace it: As we approached the village, we heard dogs barking. = When we were approaching...

N.I. Grech and his followers, including Buslaev, talked about many other derivational processes: fusion (animals and birds live without difficulty), substitutions (I live in a city where = where I am very bored), omissions (they say there will be peace soon = people say) [2:65].

F.I. Buslaev for the first time made an attempt to consider such processes from a historical point of view, i.e. treat them as "historical", occurring in the history of the language. Supporters of the comparative-historical method in linguistics ("historical grammar") did a lot in this direction, although they denied the scientific significance both universal and logical grammar. However, they denied - does not mean they rejected everything that was done by them predecessors. On the contrary, many fruitful ideas of logical schools found not only support, but also development in the works of representatives of comparative historical linguistics.

It's typical before only for the early period of its development, when the psychological concept was "combined" with the conviction that language is a deeply social phenomenon. This postulate was proclaimed the basis of linguistics in the works of the brilliant W. von Humboldt, a German encyclopedist of the 19th century.

G. Steintal proceeded from the linguistic concept of Humboldt and A.A. Potebnya. In the latter's book, Thought and Language, an attempt was made concretize and develop the ideas of W. von Humboldt. A.A. Potebnya showed that the historical formation of language is closely connected with mental processes, that the forms of language (words or sentences) are ultimately determined by the need for expression of thought, and that along this path it is necessary to look for laws that govern both languages, as well as thinking.

Language in direct observation is an uninterrupted process, constant activity of communication, expression and formulation of thought in linguistic (material) forms. But every activity has a certain result, a certain product. So the language is activity presupposes language as the product of this activity. Its two sides of the same phenomenon - language: dynamics and statics [3].

They constitute a unity, but a dialectical, contradictory unity. Statics deals with a list of units (it does not matter in what form they are presented, in the form of a simple aggregate or in the form of a strict system) with some given, ready-made material for research and use; she states facts (linguistic data) and captures some relationship between them. On the contrary, dynamics deals with linguistic processes, with the rules for the formation of units, with the functioning of language as a means of communication. It is clear that statics is a moment of dynamics. Figuratively speaking, static is a frame in a film, and dynamics is a film. True, any comparison is lame: a certain sequence of film frames is a film, meanwhile, the sequence of "statics" - static relations of the language - is not its dynamics. Rather, on the contrary, statics, as it were, is extracted from dynamics, statics is always the result of our research, abstraction from the actual state of affairs.

As for the other meaning of this term - the relation of derivativeness - it no longer refers to the dynamics, but to the statics of the language. Indeed, any relation is a relation between given units. We establish the derivative relations after how the process of unit formation took place, we kind of compare coexisting two units and find some difference in them, which allows us to qualify one of them as a derivative from another, i.e. to assume that one was produced (formed) from the other.

For example: in the dictionary of the Russian language, we record two words: tea and teapot. Comparison of these words shows that one of them is more complex and, as it were, "includes" another: a teapot consists of tea + nick. The same is observed in the field of syntax: Snow began to melt - The snow began to melt rapidly. Here the word violently fulfills essentially the same function as the nickname in the teapot. Such an inclusion relation is called a derivative relation. It would seem that we should consider this relationship as a dynamic phenomenon, especially since other relationships that are not directly related to derivation can be established between the units of the language, for example, the relationship of opposition (opposition), which were subjected to a comprehensive analysis in classical structural linguistics, or relations of embodiment, when some abstract postulated unit (linguistic) is put in correspondence with a specific unit (speech); phoneme - the sound of speech, etc.

Derivation as a process of formation of language units is unobservable. It takes place in the minds of the speakers, and how the derivation proceeds can only be judged by some of its results, by indirect data, by some external traces left in the text, in sentence or word structure. In this respect, derivation resembles physics, which also studies unobservable microparticles of atoms, or chemistry, analyzing a chemical reaction based on composition starting materials and end products [3:8].

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

The fundamental non-observation of the subject of research is one of the distinguishing features of derivation. However, this feature is also characteristic of structural linguistics, which studied not the sounds of speech, but phonemes, i.e. relations between sounds, not words as such in the text, but relations between *measchu t sh* and *- lexemes*, etc. Relationships are also an unobservable object, pLdda, of a different kind. One might get the impression that between the theory of derivational relations and derivation there are no fundamental differences, that they investigate, in essence, the same thing, only in different aspects, hence the different terms, we seem to depict in different ways, represent the same phenomenon: to count is a counter, but count the counter. In reality it's not. Theory of derivational relations and derivation have significantly different starting positions - the statics and dynamics of the language, which cannot but affect the entire system of concepts and methodological techniques of either discipline. Derivation — science is functional, and the theory of derivational relations (TAR).

Otherwise, this issue is considered in derivation. Word formation occurs in several stages. At the first stage, some expansion of the object designation is observed, due to which the most general name (generic concept) is specified, limited to the specific concept. For example, the concept of an agent in general can be limited to an indication of what he is reading. As a result, a semantic construction of the type arises in the mind of the speaker: The doer reads = the one who reads. At the second stage, this construction is collapsed, i.e. the process by which a derivative word is obtained. In this case, the figure = the one who is replaced by the affix *-tel*, the word reads - its basis is *reader-*. what and gives the reader [4:43].

In conclusion, derivation is important to do some search which requires the exact meaning and a different context. Even some languages are linked to each other by derivate words and they might be a tool which make languages closer.

References:

1. Dearmond, R.C. (1969). The concept of word derivation. *Lingua* 22 (1969) 329-36 1, 0 North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam.
2. Murzin, L.N. (1964). *Osnovy derivatologii*. Peril.
3. Kubrjakova, E.S. (1974). Derivacija, transpozicija, konversija, *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 1974, '№5.
4. Purilovich, E. (1959). *Derivacija leksicheskaia i derivacija sintaksicheskaia* V kn.: Ocherki po lingvistika. G..
5. (n.d.). *Derivational Types of Words*. Retrieved from www.studfile.net
6. Bauer, L. (2003). *Introducing linguistic morphology*. 2d ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
7. Booij, G. (2007). *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
8. Haspelmath, M., & Sims, A. (2010). *Understanding morphology*. 2d ed. London: Hodder Education.
9. Katamba, F., & Stonham, J. (2006). *Morphology*. 2d ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.