

DIFFICULTIES OF ASSIMILATION OF MORPHOLOGICAL PHENOMENA AND THEIR ACCOUNT IN TEACHING RUSSIAN WORD FORMATION AND MORPHEMICS

Mukimova Gulandon Akhatovna

Bukhara State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10201261>

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 addition of the suffix to the base, causing the so-called regressive assimilation on various grounds. The alternations caused by the modern laws of the sound system and orthoepic norms are considered, called live, phonetic and positional.*

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

Alternations by suffixal method word formations 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 on various grounds: deafness-sonority (сказать - сказка [З//с]), твердости-мягкости (окно - подоконник [н//н']), способу образования (летать - летчик [т//ч]). Alternations caused by modern laws of the sound system and orthoepic norms are called live, 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 conditioned, for example: hand - manual, book - book. Such alternations are called historical, traditional, non-positional, morphological. They are only possible in the same morpheme.

Suffixation in Russian is characterized by the direction of alternations from the main (or stronger) member of the morphoneme to its weaker representatives, i.e. the generating base usually contains the main (or stronger) member of the morphoneme, and the derivative is weaker: друг - дружить - дружба, сухой - сушь - сушить, волк - волчица - волчонок, медведь - медвежонок.

At the same time, in a series of alternating phonemes that are members of the same morpheme, 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: го-лос- голос-ок, папа ~ пап-очка, прыгать ~ прыг-ун, рыба - рыб-ак, гнездо - гнезд-ышк-о. Such a rule, as V.N. Musatov noted, refers to suffixes beginning with the vowels о, у, о, ы. And here it can be seen that, for example, the suffix -ок in the word голос-ок only attracts the stress from the base to itself, but does not cause any alternations. 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, с.45] The following types of consonant alternation are

most productive : paired hard consonants with soft consonants (н/н', с/с', м/ т', д/д': слон -слон'-онок, лиса -лис'-онок, кот - кот'-ище);back-lingual with hissing (г/ж, к/ч, х/ш: нога -нож-ища, песок - песоч-ек, мох - мил-ист-ый).

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 пила — пил-ка, стена - стенка, но недопустимо рука - *рукка, нога - *ногга and 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. When suffixing in Russian, there are many typical alternations such as: к//ч: рука - ручка, г//ж: нога - ножка, х//ш: сухой - сушить, д//ж: водить - вожак, д//жд: водить - вождение, ц//ч: ли-цо - личико, с//ш: просить - прошение, з//ж: поразить - поражение, с//с': лиса - лисенок, н// н': слон - слониха, р//р': хитрый - хитрец, б//бл': озлобить - озлобление, в//вл': ловить - ловля, м//мл': кормить - кормление, п//пл': осле-пить - ослепление; чередование гласного с нулем звука: лев - львиный (е///-), лоб - лбище(о///-) and ets.

In the Russian language, 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 coincide 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, having the values: a) magnification; b) singularity; c) type of meat. For example:

- a) волк - волч-ина, бульдог - бульдож-ина;
- b) урюк - урюч-ина, горох - го-рош-ина, жемчуг - жемчуж-ина;
- c) белуга - белуж-ина, севрюга - севрюж-ина, собака - собач-ина.

In all formations, regardless of what the value of the derivatives is, the same alternations are found: к/ч, г/ж, х/ш

Thus, the rules of morphological alternations are often explained by phonetic changes in the history of the language, which then lost their phonological conditionality. For example, alternations of к/ч, г/ж, х/ш are observed in the Russian language mainly before the front vowels; historically, it was in this position that the transition of the back-lingual to sibilant took place. Based on such examples, it is often concluded that this is the nature of all morphological phenomena. Hence, the description of morphology can be reduced to the data of historical phonetics.

However, the study of the history of the development of various languages shows that such an interpretation simplifies the real state of affairs. As is known, there are a significant number of segments in the Russian word that are formally well distinguished and similar to affixes, but do not perform the usual inflectional or word-forming function and therefore look abnormal and asemantic against the background of "normal" morphemes. Cf. steamboat, singer, chorus, chitaju, cut, sonja, 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 their selection as full-fledged morphemes, however, attempts to attach them to neighboring morphemes rarely turn out to be successful.

Since the term "internal inflection" is busy, the components in question can be called "interbasic inflections" К this class morpheme not only explicit flexi of type of formants of

numeric -ёх-, -ух-, -и-, but and connoisseurs. Functionally they represent a unified internal flexion. Not only functional, and genetic communication Russian connective vowels with padezhny flexions indicates and evolution that many Russian complex passed words (ср.: землетресение, землитрясение> землетрясение, умонастроение> умонастроение, челобитная> челобитная и пр.). Russian connective vowels, single-tonnes and obey hardness/softness the preceding consonant in the form they are close to unimportant versions of many flexi noun.

Therefore, replacing real flexion on the connecting vowel is often purely spelling act, as at pronunciation normal and "internal" flexion coincide (ср.: дерева обработка и деревообработка). In individual cases of spelling, however, behaves inconsistently, keeping the flexion of motivating words in full, not standardized and strengthening, thus, communication with this phrase (ср.: умопомрачительный, но умалишенный, сумасшедший and etc.) Resist from reductions and replacement to connecting vowels В Inter-core positions only flexion numeric. Probably this is due to their constant impact and closed-down - even in complex words the impact(secondary) falls not on their basis, but on flexion. [6, P. 93]. However, the process of weakening here, the reductions of flexions in the Inter-core position are presented: it affects the final consonant, ср. двухсмысленный> двусмысленный; двухчленный> двучленный and etc.

Thus, the presence in the word "Inter-core flexion" performs important semantic function: it transmits information about grammatical relations linking components of motivating word-text. Simultaneously connecting basics components carry information yet one type: they serve as a signal that the first component words grammatically decorated, and therefore acts in full, not cut. Thus, the connective vowels help distinguish different ways of word formation - the creation of a new nominative unit based on the phrase and simple compression of the finished word-text (ср., например, разницу между лес(о)воз и лес||хоз).

Independence considered components it is clear that sometimes attempts are made join their root do not find support. Connoisseurs are considered by most linguists as a separate type of morpheme and are not included in the composition of none of the components connected. [3, S. 87)

A functional point of view, however, they can be including, on the rights of independent grammatical elements, first of the basis they grammatically register. In this case, we will receive the following quite corresponding language instinct: пар-о+ход||0, нов-о†стро(j)||к|а.

Ignore "minor" components, do not highlight them it is impossible as a carrier their language sees and their sub-morph independence not it is no doubt. There are enough grounds and for preservation for considered their type

self-morpheme status. It's not in any way means that in Russian word there is "empty" morphemes.

"Emptiness" in it is formed only in one case - when we limit the functions of Russian affixes two main - word-forming and word-changing. If so admit that in Russian word there are auxiliary morphemous units that serve directly the basis and formant, the "redundant" morphemous components no remains. Such auxiliary units can be attributed consonizers - open base connection tools with pokonsonant forms; Inter-core flexions grammatical communication of the foundations in the complex words, grammatical categorizers of non-performance basics (first of all verb topics), as well as initial parts of Composite formants contributing to their contribution expression of word-forming value.

Conclusion

Morphology is relevant for the written form of language. Morphological principle is recognized as leading in Russian letter, as saves a single writing of morpheme, regardless of her pronunciation in specific words. Hence, the problem of the ratio of sound and written the shape of morpheme. Difficulties of foreign students in assimilation of written and oral form of Russian morpheme is obvious as difficulties Russian schoolchildren in spelling. Thus, morphology phenomena should be taking into account in teaching Russian language and Russian as foreign in different types of speech activity: reading, speaking, auditing and writing.

REFERENCES

1. Туйлиева Л. СОСТАВ СЛОВА В РУССКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ //ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz). – 2022. – Т. 15. – №. 15.
2. Chorakulova D. Z. Linguistic Problems of Translation: Text as an Object of Translation //European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 5. – С. 156-157.
3. Komiljonovna K. I., Almasovna S. N., Axatovna M. G. Problems of Anthroponymy in Uzbek Linguistics //Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture. – 2022. – Т. 3. – №. 2. – С. 27-29
4. Avezova D. SPEAKING SURNAMES AND THEIR ROLE IN THE STYLISTIC IMAGE OF A WORK OF ART //Science and innovation. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. C10. – С. 59-62.
5. Diuf Aliu. Morphological alternations at suffixal Slovenia in the study of the RCA. - M., RUDN.Russian languageN°1, 2011.
6. Zemstvo E. A. Modern Russian language. Slovenia: study guide - 3rd edition, M.: Flinta: Science, 2016. - 328 p.
7. Zemska E. A. Language as activity. Morpheme. Word. Speech. M. YASK, 2004.
8. Shermuxamedova , N. . (2023). ALLYUZIYA VA UNING MATN ROLI. Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры, 3(4 Part 2), 167–171.
9. Lithuanian E. I., Bagryantseva V. A. Methodology of teaching Russian language in high school: teaching aid. -M.: Academic project, 2006. - 590 С.