HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF COMPOUND WORSD IN ENGLISH

Ergashev Farrukhbek
First year master's
student of the Faculty of Philology and History,
Renaissance Educational University (REU),
Uzbekistan, Tashkent
E-mail: **ergashevfarruxbek555@gmail.com**
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24051878

Abstract: This article provides feedback on the nature and essence of compound words in English. The term joint word is analyzed more broadly. Feedback on how joint words are structured in English, how they integrate into the grammatical model, and what problems they pose within the framework of modern linguistic approaches are explored in groups.

Keywords: compound word, language unit, tariff. In theoretical and practical research carried out in various areas of modern linguistics, interest in joint words is growing significantly. In this article, first of all, an attempt is made to illuminate the existing contradictory opinions and considerations related to the study of joint words. It also analyzes not only the scientific interest of the hypotheses put forward regarding the structure of joint words, but also their role in the grammatical system and the fact that joint words still remain one of the pressing problems among different linguistic units. The role of joint words in the process of understanding the internal structure of language is emphasized by Greenberg.

The researcher believes that, perhaps, there is no language in the world that does not have such phenomena as joint word formation and affixation, that is, the formation of a new word using suffixes. Otherwise in other words, the existence of completely isolated, isolated languages is practically impossible. According to Greenberg, in some languages there may not be a flexion-grammatical formation, but it is incredibly difficult to find a language without the processes of joint word formation and derivation [1; B.92]. Although in recent years the view has been put forward that there are no joint words in some languages, joint words still remain one of the most basic and active methods of word formation. Even in some languages, it is a single word formation method. We will try to illuminate the above issues below. In particular, the structure of compound words, how they integrate into the grammatical model, and what problems they pose within the framework of modern linguistic approaches are explored in groups: (a) why they receive so much attention in theoretical linguistics; (b) at what stage of the grammatical system they are formed; (c) a clear definition of the joint word; Compound words are linguistic units of particular interest in linguistics for a number of reasons. First of all, they constitute a peculiar exception among grammatical structures: they manifest themselves as "words", but at the same time they also have elements of "internal syntax". In the meantime, this syntactic structure becomes invisible, that is, "hidden". For example: taxi driver, hard ball, poet painter. To properly interpret these compound words, it is necessary to "add" the syntactic relationship between the two elements they contain (e.g., a person who drives a taxi, a ball that is solid, a person who is both a poet and an artist).

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

However, this "internal syntax" is not expressed at a superficial level, i.e., in a grammatically clear way [2; P.105-128]. In addition, joint words are also studied in linguistics into the following sections, taking into account their own and figurative meaning: a. syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations; b. syntax and morphology; c. Linguistic knowledge and pragmatic knowledge. Turning to the clause of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations, for example, in a joint word such as taxi driver, there is not only a relation between two elements, but it is a special kind of relationship: where the word taxi serves as an internal argument of the verb. That is, this verb "chooses" its semantically coherent argument – in this case, it is a syntagmatic relationship. Elements within a compound wordThe connection between them arises not only on the basis of semantic correspondence, but also on the basis of grammatical selection – this is a phenomenon at the syntagmatic level of the language. In addition to the syntagmatic relations that are conspicuous in joint words, it is also possible to observe cases among them that in some cases are characteristic of a paradigmatic class (or "family of compound words"). That is, a particular basic element (i.e., the "dominant word") acts as a center that "attracts" other elements to itself, and as a result, a number of new compound words are formed on the basis of that headword. Such a situation can be observed in the example of the English word head ('leader', 'chief'). The following examples are evidence of this: 'head of the class' – 'captain of the class', 'head of the group' – 'head of the group', 'head of school', 'head of the line' – 'person standing at the head of the queue' / 'leader'. It is clear from these examples that the word head is actively used as a paradigmatic framework and acts as a 'base point' for the formation of new compound words in various semantic contexts. Now, let us turn to the relationship between syntax and morphology: as has been pointed out many times in the scientific literature, compound words are among the most closely related to syntactic constructions among morphological structures. As a result, the question of which part (morphology or syntax) of a particular grammatical system they are formed within the framework of a particular grammatical system continues to be debated interlinguistically and theoretically [3; pp. 21-36]. In relation to linguistic knowledge and pragmatic knowledge, even a simple example alone will suffice. As Jackendoff points out, "In some joint words there is evidence of the existence of an internal syntactic structure" [2; B.105-128], for example, the presence of a linker in a compound such as the Health and Welfare Fund (Health and Social Security Fund) is an example of this. To explain the essence of the issue, we consider the example given by a linguist on the compound bicycle girl. To understand that this compound means "the girl who left a bicycle in the vestibule", not only linguistic knowledge is needed, but also contextual (situational) knowledge. Otherwise, we can also interpret it differently: for example, in the sense of "a girl who always rides a bicycle to work". Compound wording most scholars have expressed differing opinions on the subject. In which section of the language system do compound words form? The question is complicated, and the approaches put forward in this regard vary. The following is a list of the main – but not exhaustive – points in this regard: "Compound words are formed by assimilation and subtraction [4; 236 b]; Compound words are formed on the basis of morphological rules, in a special morphological component of the grammatical system [5; 237 b]; Compound words are formed entirely by syntactic rules [6; b.3–9]; Compound words are formed in an independent morphological submodule [7; 306 b].

In view of the above views, we would like to emphasize that there is evidence to support the approach that morphological phenomena are governed by a morphological module or submodule within a grammatical system. These arguments rely on the following areas: Psycholinguistics experiments show that joint words are stored in the lexicon of human memory, which means that they

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

are governed by a lexical system, not a syntactic system; neurolinguistics studies related to aphasia (speech disorders) show how joint word-forming rules are applied by the brain; Theoretical linguistics has many similarities with the derivation (word formation) of joint words – for example, alloforms, connective elements, and stresses, which distinguish them from syntactic units. The conclusion of our article is that the general conclusion from the above definitions is that in most propositions, the concept of a "joint word" is interpreted in the same way as the units that make it up. However, this situation raises new problems. First, there is no consensus about the basic units that make up joint words, since different scholars propose different units: roots, bases, lexemes, or words. In addition, the concept of "foundation" is defined differently in different languages (e.g., in English, stems are usually free forms, while in Greek they are connected forms – Ralli, 2007). Also, in some languages, words often consist of one morpheme, while in others they may consist of two or more morphemes. The English vocabulary system is incredibly rich and its expressive power is incredibly powerful. The same richness and

From the lexicologic tools that contribute to power and constantly manifest it in communication, joint words require a broader and more scientific study, and will never be of great benefit to those who are interested in the language, which is coming to the world stage with bold and bold steps.

List of references

1. Joseph H. Greenberg. Universals of Language. – London: MIT Press, 1963. – P.73-113.
2. Jackendoff Ray. Compounding in the Parallel Architecture and Conceptual Semantics. – Lieber & Štekauer, 2009. – P.105-128.
3. Ackema Peter., Ad Neeleman. The Role of Syntax and Morphology in Compounding. Cross-Disciplinary Issues in Compounding. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010. – 311 p.
4. Lees Robert. The Grammar of English Nominalizations. – Bloomington: Indiana University, 1960.
5. Scalise Sergio. Generative Morphology. – Dordrecht: Foris, 1984.
6. Harley Heidi., Rolf Noyer. Distributed Morphology. Glot International. 1999.
7. Ackema Peter., Ad Neeleman. Beyond Morphology: Interface conditions on word formation. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.