

МОРФОНОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЯВЛЕНИЙ В РУССКОМ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИИ И МОРФЕМИКИ

Алимова Инобат Ибодуллаевна
Корёгдиева Мохинур Улмас кизи
Кутлиева Гулхайо Бобировнаг.Бухара
Бухарская область
Джондорский район
профессиональный колледж N1
Qutliyevagulhayo@gmail.com
Qoryog'diyevamohinur59@gmail.com

Аннотация:

В статье анализируются чередования при суффиксальном способе словообразования, чередования на границах корня (или основы) и суффикса в морфологии. Изменения наблюдаются изменения при соединении суффикса к основе, вызывающая так называемую регрессивную ассимиляцию по разным признакам. Рассматриваются чередования, обусловленные современными закономерностями звукового строя и орфоэпическими нормами, называются живыми, фонетическими и позиционными.

Ключевые слова: морфология, суффикс, чередования, звук, орфоэпия, корень.

RUS SO'Z SHAKLLANISHI VA MORFEMIKASIDAGI MORFONOLOGIK HODISALAR.

Alimova Inobat Ibodullayevna
Koregdiyeva Mohinur Ulmas qizi
Qutliyeva Gulxayo Bobirovnag.Buxoro
Buxoro viloyati
Jandor tumani
N1 kasb-hunar kolleji
Qutliyevagulhayo@gmail.com
Qoryog'diyevamohinur59@gmail.com

Annotatsiya:

maqolada so'z yasashning suffiks usuli, morfonologiyada ildiz (yoki asos) va suffiks chegaralaridagi almashinuvlar tahlil qilinadi. O'zgarishlar qo'shimchani bazaga



qo'shilishida o'zgarishlar kuzatiladi, bu esa turli xil xususiyatlarga ko'ra regressiv assimilyatsiya deb ataladi. Tovush tizimining zamonaviy qonuniyatlari va orfoepik me'yorlar tufayli almashinuvlar ko'rib chiqiladi, ular tirik, fonetik va pozitsion deb nomlanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: morfonologiya, qo'shimchalar, almashtirishlar, tovush, orfoepiya, ildiz.

MORPHOLOGICAL PHENOMENA IN RUSSIAN WORD FORMATION AND MORPHEMICS.

Alimova Inobat Ibodullayevna
Koregdieva Mohinur Ulmas kizi
Kutlieva Gulhayo Bobirovnag.Bukhara
Bukhara region
Jandor district
Vocational College N1
Qutliyevagulhayo@gmail.com
Qoryog'diyevamohinur59@gmail.com

Abstract:

The article analyzes alternations in the suffix method of word formation, alternation at the boundaries of the root (or base) and suffix in morphology. Changes are observed in the attachment of the suffix to the base, causing the so-called regressive assimilation on various grounds. The alternations caused by modern patterns of the sound system and orthoepic norms are considered, they are called living, phonetic and positional.

Keywords: morphology, suffix, alternation, sound, orthoepy, root.

Alternations in the suffix method of word formation occupy an important place in the study of the structure of the language. For Russian word formation, alternations at the borders of the root (or base) and the suffix are quite indicative of morphology. The changes are observed due to the addition of the suffix to the base, resulting in a combination of consonant sounds, causing the so-called regressive assimilation according to various signs: deafness-sonority (say fairy tale [s//s]), hardness-softness (window sill [n//n']), method of formation (fly pilot [t/h]). The alternations caused



by modern patterns of the sound system and orthoepic norms are called living, phonetic, positional.

When suffixing, it is also very common to find alternations of phonemes that do not depend on the living phonetic laws of the modern language, but once in the history of the language were phonetically determined, for example: hand manual, book book. Such alternations are called historical, traditional, non-positional, morphological. They are only possible in the same morpheme.

For suffixal in the Russian language characteristic orientation of the characters from the main (or stronger) member morpheme to the weaker its representatives, i.e. producing basis usually contains the main (or more powerful) member of morpheme, and the derivative weaker: each friends friendship, dry drought drying, wolf wolf cub, bear bear. At the same time, in a series of alternating phonemes that are members of the same morphoneme, from a pair of consonants correlated in hardness-softness, the main one is solid. But it is important to note here that, first of all, alternation depends on the productivity of the suffix (i.e., on the type of suffix). This suggests that some suffixes do not cause alternation, but only attach to the root, holding some phonetic changes for example: go-los voice-ok, dad dad-glasses, jump jump-un, fish fish-ak, nest nest-oy. Such a rule, as V.N. Musatov noted, refers to suffixes starting with the vowels o, y, o, y. And here it can be seen that, for example, the suffix –ok in the word voice-ok only attracts the stress from the base to itself, but does not cause any alternation. Moreover, Musatov also emphasizes that "of all the alternations on the morphemic seam, the most common and productive is the alternation of consonants paired in hardness/softness.[7, p.45] The following types of consonant alternation are the most productive: paired hard consonants with soft consonants (n/n', s/s', t/t', d/d': elephant □elephant'-onok, fox fox'-onok, cat cat'-ische); posterior-lingual with hissing (g/w, k/h, x/w: leg knife-searching, sand sand-ek, moss moss-east).

The laws of Russian morphology do not allow the combination of some sounds at the junction of morphemes. Therefore, for example, it is possible to form a type of saw—saw-ka, wall-wall, but it is unacceptable to have a hand, leg, leg etc. To eliminate such concatenations of consonants, alternations, extensions, truncations and overlays are used. Such alternations are not explained by living phonetic rules, they are historical. If suffixal in the Russian language there are many typical alternations as: K//h: hand handle, h//W: foot leg, x//W: dry dry, d//W: led leader, d//railway: led driving, C//h: face face, with//W: to ask request, z//W: wow defeat, with//s': Fox Fox, n//n': elephant elephant, R//R': cunning Dodger, b//BL':



embitter bitterness, in//VL': catch fishing, m//ml': feed feeding, n//PL': donkey to drink blinding; the vowel alternating with zero sound: Leo lion (e//ø), forehead vise (o//ø), etc. In Russian, depending on the context or on parts of speech, there are suffixes-homonyms that do not differ in any way in terms of sound. These suffixes match in form, but differ only in meaning. As a rule, they behave in the same way with respect to alternation, i.e. they cause the same alternations. Cf. derivatives with the suffix -in (a) from the bases to the posterior lingual, having the values of: a) magnification; b) uniqueness; c) type of meat. For example:

- a) wolf wolf-ina, bulldog bulldog-ina;
- b) apricot apricot-ina, peas go-rosh-ina, pearls pearl-ina;
- c) beluga beluga-ina, sevruga sevruzh-ina, dog sobach-ina.

In all formations, regardless of what the value of the derivatives is, the same alternations are found: g/w, k/h, x/w.

Thus, the rules of morphological alternation are often explained by phonetic changes in the history of the language, which later lost their phonological conditionality. For example, the alternations k/h, g/w, x/w are observed in the Russian language mainly before the front vowels; historically, it was in this position that the transition of back-lingual to sibilant took place. Based on such examples, it is often concluded that this is the nature of all morphological phenomena. This means that the description of morphology can be reduced to the data of historical phonetics. However, studying the history of the development of various languages shows that such an interpretation simplifies the real state of affairs.

As is known, the Russian word has a significant number of segments that are formally well distinguished and similar to affixes, but do not perform the usual inflectional or word-formation function and therefore look abnormal and asemantic against the background of "normal" morphemes. Cf. steamer, singer, chorus, reading, cutting, sons, African, two-storey, land, hunting, search, etc. The main part of such incomplete segments is located between ordinary morphemes and therefore is often combined under the common name "interfixes". The "insignificant" components of the Russian word create great problems for its morphemic division, since their "asemanticism" prevents them from being distinguished as full-fledged morphemes, however, attempts to attach them to neighboring morphemes rarely turn out to be successful.

Since the term "internal inflection" is used, the components in question can be called "interbasic inflections".



This class of morphemes includes not only explicit inflections such as the formants of the numerals -ex-, -uh-, -and-, but also connecting vowels. Functionally, they represent a unified internal inflection. Russian Russian compound vowels are not only functionally related, but also genetically related to case inflections, and the evolution that many Russian compound words have undergone (e.g.: earthquake, earthquake > earthquake, mindset > mindset, man-bit > petition, etc.). Russian connecting vowels are unstressed, monophonous and obey the hardness/softness of the preceding consonant, i.e. in form they are close to the unstressed variants of many inflections of nouns. Therefore, replacing the real inflection with a connecting vowel is often a purely orthographic act, since normal and "internal" inflection coincide in pronunciation (cf.: wood processing and woodworking). In some cases, spelling, however, behaves inconsistently, preserving the inflection of the motivating phrase in a complete, non-unified form and thus strengthening the connection with this phrase (cf.: mind-boggling, but insane, crazy, etc.)

Only the inflections of numerals resist reduction and replacement with connecting vowels in between the main position. This is probably due to their constant stress and closeness – even in the composition of complex words, the stress (secondary) falls not on their basis, but on inflection. [6, c. 93]. Nevertheless, here, too, the process of weakening, reducing inflections in between the main position is presented: it affects the final consonant, cf. two-sense > ambiguous; two-term > binomial, etc.

Thus, the presence of "interbasic inflection" in the word performs an important semantic function: it conveys information about the grammatical relations linking the components of the motivating phrase. At the same time, the components connecting the basics carry another type of information: they serve as a signal that the first component of the word is grammatically formed, which means that it appears in full, not abbreviated form.

Thus, connecting vowels help to distinguish different ways of word formation – the generation of a new nominative unit based on a phrase and a simple compression of the finished phrase (cf., for example, the difference between forest (o) who and forest || farm).

The independence of the components under consideration is so obvious that sometimes attempts to attach them to the root are not supported. Connecting vowels are considered by most linguists as a separate type of morpheme and are not included in any of the connected components. [3, c. 87]



From a functional point of view, however, they can be included, as an independent grammatical element, in the first base, which they form grammatically. In this case, we will get the following division, which is quite appropriate to the linguistic sense: par-o+move ||0, nov-o+astro(j)||k|a.

It is impossible to ignore the "insignificant" components, not to distinguish them in the composition of the Russian word, since a native speaker sees them and their submorphic independence does not cause any doubt. There are sufficient grounds for maintaining their independent morphemic status for the types considered. This in no way means that there are "empty" morphemes in the Russian word. "Voids" are formed in it only in one case – when we limit the functions of Russian affixes to two main ones – word-formation and inflection. If we admit that the Russian word has auxiliary morphemic units that directly serve the base and formant, then there are no "redundant" morphemic components.

Such auxiliary units include consonizers – means of connecting an open base with non-consonant formants; interbasic inflections - means of grammatical connection of the bases in a complex word, grammatical categorizers of non-derivative bases (primarily verbal themes), as well as the initial parts of composite formants that contribute to the expression of word-formation meaning.

Morphology is also relevant for the written form of the language. The morphological principle is recognized as the leading one in Russian writing, since it preserves the uniform spelling of the morpheme, regardless of its pronunciation in specific word forms.

Hence the problem of the ratio of the sounding and written appearance of morphemes.

Russian morphemes have obvious difficulties for foreign students in mastering the written and oral forms of Russian morphemes, as well as difficulties for Russian schoolchildren in spelling.

Russian as a foreign language should therefore be taken into account in the teaching of Russian and Russian as a foreign language in different types of speech activity: reading, speaking, listening and writing.

REFERENCE

1. Диуф Алиу. Морфонология русских префиксов и суффиксов: автореф. - М., 2011. - 22 с.
2. Диуф Алиу. Морфонологические чередования при суффиксальном словообразовании в обучении РКИ.- М., РУДН.Русский язык№1, 2011.



3. Земская Е.А. Современный русский язык. Словообразование: учеб.пособие. - 3-е изд., испр. и доп. - М. : Флинта: Наука, 2016. - 328 с.
4. Козиева И. К. ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ СВОЙСТВА АНТРОПОНИМОВ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ //TADQIQOTLAR. UZ. – 2024. – Т. 33. – №. 1. – С. 167-171.
5. Ikbol K. Aesthetic onomastics and its functions in artistic and intertext //International Journal on Integrated Education. – 2021. – Т. 4. – №. 4. – С. 132-136.
6. Komiljonovna K. I. ANTHROPONYMY AS A BRANCH OF ONOMASTICS //Open Access Repository. – 2023. – Т. 9. – №. 9. – С. 84-87.
7. Koziyeva I. ISSUES OF ANTHROPONYMY IN UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LINGUISTICS //Science and innovation. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. B1. – С. 121-123.
8. Kozieva I. ANTHROPONYMY STUDIES //Science and innovation. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. C10. – С. 63-65.

