

## THE ROLE OF THE OLD RUSSIAN LANGUAGE IN THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MORPHONOLOGY OF WORD FORMATION OF THE PROTO-SLAVIC LANGUAGE

\*Zhakupov G.A.<sup>1</sup>

doctoral student, Uzbek State University of World Languages,  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

[georgejakupov@gmail.com](mailto:georgejakupov@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The main purpose of the scientific article is to consider the status of morphonology and its problems on the basis of the morphonology of the Proto-Slavic language. The goal is also set for further in-depth research of morphonology - a preliminary reconstruction of the vocabulary of the proto-language on the basis of a comparative etymological study of the vocabulary of all languages of this group. The idea is expressed that the morphonological features of the Slavic languages were already laid down in the Proto-Slavic language.

For their reconstruction, a special role is played by the data of the Old Russian language as one of the dialects of the proto-language, and the data of the Old Russian dictionary are of particular importance.

At the same time, some differences are possible in the chronological depth of reconstruction for different cases, since the early Slavic period is distinguished in the history of the Proto-Slavic language, before the tendency to the loss of closed syllables and the period after the loss of closed syllables (Late Pre-Slavic period). The tendency to the loss of closed syllables contributed to the monophthongization of diphthongs, which significantly transformed not only the phonological, but also other systems of the Proto-Slavic language, primarily its morphonology.

On the basis of the study and description of the theoretical ideas of famous linguists of the 20th and 21st centuries, such a scientific problem as the problem of studying the connection between the phonological structure of morphemes and their word-formation functions is determined. Therefore, much attention is paid to the study of the role of alternations functioning in word formation.

The urgency of the problem is that the consideration of the relationship of phonetics and grammar both in synchronicity and in diachrony is not only constantly put forward as a necessary aspect of linguistic research in theoretical works, but also becomes an indispensable part of modern descriptive, historical and comparative grammars. Special studies are devoted to the morphonology of individual languages.

The opinions of various scientists about the place of morphonology in science (part of grammar, phonology, inter-tiered level, etc.) are given. The role of N. Trubetskoy as a representative of the Prague linguistic circle in the formulation of the problem of morphonology is noted.

The article has a certain theoretical significance, since it develops problems related to the study of the historical conditionality of many phenomena in modern Slavic languages. The work is interesting for specialists in the field of Russian linguistics, students studying the history of the language and modern Slavic languages.

**Keywords:** morphonology, alternations, Proto-Slavic language, Old East Slavic language.

### Basic provisions

Morphonological problems, the interest in which arose within the framework of the Prague Linguistic Circle, have recently attracted the attention of many linguists.

Consideration of the relationship between phonetics and grammar, both in synchrony and diachrony, is not only constantly promoted as a necessary aspect of linguistic research in theoretical works, but also becomes an indispensable part of modern descriptive, historical and comparative grammars. Special studies are devoted to the morphonology of individual languages.

## **Introduction**

The term "morphonology", as well as the definition of the boundaries and tasks of this area of linguistic research, were first proposed by Trubetskoy in two articles published in the "Proceedings of the Prague Linguistic Circle": "Sur la morphonologie" (1929) and "Gedanken über Morphonologie" (1931). Morphonology was specified by N.S. Trubetskoy as a part of grammar that studies the morphological use of phonological differences [2].

In the range of objects of study of morphonology, he eventually included the following questions: phonological structure of morphemes; combinatorial sound changes that a morpheme undergoes in conjunction with other morphemes; alternations with morphological function.

“Based on the above definition of the purpose of morphonology as the study of the morphological use of phonological differences, the inclusion of the study of combinatorial changes at the boundaries of morphemes in morphonology seems controversial, since these changes just eliminate the phonological differences of morphemes.

However, the difference between the rules for combining phonemes on the border of morphemes from the rules for their intramorphic compounds and the difference in the rules for combining phonemes on the borders of morphemes of different classes may serve as a basis for including this problem in morphonology”[1]. The next work of N.S. Trubetskoy "Das Morphonologische System der russischen Sprache" (Prague, 1934) is a description of the morphonology of the synchronous linguistic state; however, the scientist himself pointed out the importance of morphonological analysis both in statically descriptive (synchronic) and historical (diachronic) language learning [2].

## **Description of materials and methods**

Hence, the purpose of our research is the preliminary reconstruction of the vocabulary of the proto-language on the basis of a comparative etymological study of the vocabulary of all languages of this group. At the same time, special attention is paid to the study of the role of alternations functioning in word formation.

There was also noted the interdependence of the morphological and phonetic systems of the language manifested, on the one hand, in the ability of the morphonological system to both facilitate and hinder the development of phonetic changes, and on the other hand, in the ability of phonetic changes to cause displacements and breaks in the morphological system [2]. Morphonology, according to N.S. Trubetskoy, is central to grammar.

## **Results**

For the Old Russian language itself, questions about the root vocalism of root and suffixal names, as well as about replacing the correlation of root names with verbs by derivation of names from verbs are irrelevant: the identity of the vocalism of names to vocalism of verbs, in connection with the derivation of names from verbs, prevailed as a principle of nominal verbal word formation back in late period of the Proto-Slavic language.

However, the consideration of these issues on Old Russian material with an orientation towards the Proto-Slavic language not only makes it possible to determine some features of the nominal word formation in the Proto-Slavic language; it also has a certain value for studying the prehistory of the Old Russian language as a dialect of the Proto-Slavic language, allowing to raise the question of the degree of isolation of this dialect in the Proto-Slavic language in relation to, for example, the root vocalism of names correlated with verbs, i.e. the question of the presence of their own Proto-Slavic archaisms and innovations in the Old Russian language.

Since when considering the Old Russian material, we constantly take into account the possible projection of the corresponding problems into the Proto-Slavic language, and some questions in general turn out to be relevant only for the Proto-Slavic language, therefore we have to repeatedly turn to the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic state on the basis of the Old Russian dictionary. At the same time, some differences are possible in the chronological depth of reconstruction for different cases: the depth of reconstruction is determined by the nature of the issues under consideration.

The periodization of the history of the Proto-Slavic language is based on the distinction between the period before the loss of closed syllables (early Proto-Slavic period) and the period after the loss of closed syllables (late Pre-Slavic period).

The tendency to the loss of closed syllables, one of the manifestations of which is the monophthongization of diphthongs, has significantly transformed not only the phonological, but also other systems of the Proto-Slavic language, first of all, its morphonology.

This is evidenced by the dependence of the change in the regularities of the root vocalism of root names on the monophthongization of diphthongs: the

opposition of the vocalism of a name to the vocalism of a verb (in quality or quantity) turns out to be relevant for the morphonology of nominal verbal word formation only before the monophthongization of diphthongs. Therefore, the description of the root vocalism of root and suffixal names and the corresponding verbs is best considered at the level of the Early Slavic period, i.e. before monophthongization of diphthongs.

To consider other issues, reconstruction at the Late Pre-Slavic level (after the monophthongization of diphthongs) is sufficient: at this level, for example, the reconstruction of suffixes is given.

Morphological types of nouns are defined as \* -o, \* -jo-, \* -a-, \* -ja-, \* -ĭ-, \* -ŭ-, \* -u-stems, but in the vast majority of cases, when speech refers to the late pre-Slavic period, these names are used conventionally to designate various paradigmatic classes that go back to these types of bases. As an independent paradigmatic class, the names of the neuter gender with the old \* -o- (and \* -jo-) - base are distinguished, since in the derivational relation they differ from the stems on the \* - (and \* -jo-) masculine gender.

The aforementioned randomness and limitedness of the fixed Old Russian dictionary forces us to include in the study, along with formations corresponding to productive word-formation models, also single formations that are related by root to more or less extensive nests, but do not have one-suffix correspondences (that is, according to the generally accepted terminology included in only one, root series).

The allocation of a suffix in such formations is theoretically sufficiently substantiated in the works of G.O. Vinokura and A.I. Smirnitsky. The use of single formations is essential not only because they can be representatives of the suffixal models that have not been accidentally fixed by other derivatives, but also to an even greater extent because, even being truly single, "fragmentary" formations, they are sometimes indirect indicators of the direction of development of word-formation processes ... Of course, quantitative differences in the material related to different word-formation models are constantly taken into account.

## **Discussion**

In theoretical works, objects of morphonology and its place in grammar are discussed. It is essential here that the focus of attention is constantly on questions about the phonological structure of morphemes and about alternations [4], [5], [7].

At the moment, the question of the level belonging of morphonology remains open. So, N.S. Trubetskoy, A.A. Reformatsky and R.I. Avanesov classify morphonology as phonology, however, "the recognition of the phonological structure of a morpheme as an object of morphonology does not mean that morphonology is a part of phonology" [3]; E. Stankevich, M. Komarek, M. Haspelmat – refer it to morphology, E.A. Makaev and E.S. Kubryakov - to the inter-tier level, which does not have basic units.

N.S. Trubetskoy identifies morphonology as "a link between morphology and phonology. He substantiated the need for a linguistic description of morphonology as a science of "morphological use of phonological means" [8].

Considering the phonological structure of morphemes, researchers pay attention to the heterogeneity of the structure of morphemes belonging to different classes (roots, prefixes, suffixes, endings; roots, forming different parts of speech, etc.), and therefore the problem of studying the relationship of the phonological structure of morphemes with their derivational functions.

Studying alternations from the point of view of their grammatical role, researchers define alternations as an additional means of expression in morphology and word formation, which usually accompanies suffixation and does not have an independent morphological function (according to Kurilovich's terminology, submorphs) [6].

Kurilovich considers this role of alternations to be associated with polarization, that is, to "establish the maximum difference between the substantiating and substantiated forms" [6].

However, alternations can also be directed at the formation of forms or words as an independent grammatical means, as internal inflection. Such alternations are called grammatical alternations [7].

The study of alternations that function in word formation is often defined as the main object of morphonology.

Undoubtedly, the morphonological and derivational characteristics of the proto-language of a group of related languages (in this case, the Proto-Slavic language) ideally presupposes a preliminary reconstruction of the vocabulary of this proto-language on the basis of a comparative etymological study of the vocabulary of all languages of this group.

In the absence of such a reconstructed dictionary, presented in the form of an etymological dictionary based on the reconstruction of not only bases but words, there can be made an attempt to determine some of the morphonological and morphological features of the word formation of the proto-language based on the analysis of the dictionary of one of the daughter languages, best known as one of the most archaic ones in a number of essential features.

Of course, the corresponding dictionary must be taken in its most ancient fixation, and the morphonological description must operate in terminology of the proto-language.

Of particular interest is the morphonology and morphology of the nominal verbal word formation of the Old Russian language, which is the product of the development of the Russian language as a dialect of the Proto-Slavic language immediately before the disintegration of the Proto-Slavic community and some time after this disintegration.

Therefore, some of the most common characteristics of the Old Russian nominal verbal word formation can be attributed to the Proto-Slavic language of the later period.

On the other hand, in the absence of a reconstructed dictionary of the Proto-Slavic language, it seems quite justified to consider, on Old Russian material, with the necessary orientation to the material of other Slavic languages, some questions concerning the word formation of the Proto-Slavic language itself, namely, the question of the role of root vocalism in the formation of root names and in suffix word formation, the question of the relation of the suffixal nominal verbal word formation to the nominal paradigmatic classes, the question of replacing the correlation of root names with verbs with the derivation of nouns from verbs.

### **Conclusion**

Thus, for the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic state, the data of the Old Russian dictionary are of particular importance. At the same time, some differences are possible in the chronological depth of reconstruction for different cases, since the early Proto-Slavic period is distinguished in the history of the Proto-Slavic language, before the tendency to the loss of closed syllables and the period after the loss of closed syllables (Late Proto-Slavic period). The tendency to the loss of closed syllables contributed to the monophthongization of diphthongs, which significantly transformed not only the phonological, but also other systems of the Proto-Slavic language, first of all, its morphonology.

### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Trubetzkoy N.S. Gedanken über Morphonologie. – TCLP, v.4, 1931. – C. 161-162.
- [2] Trubetzkoy N.S. Sur la «morphologie». – TCLP, v.1, 1929. – P. 85.
- [3] Abduazizov A.A. On the relationship between word formation and morphonology // U'zbekistonda khorizhij tillar. – 2015. – № 5(0). – P. 42.
- [4] Bernshtejn S.B. On some questions of the theory of alternations. "Soviet Slavic Studies". –1965. – № 5. – P 45-52.
- [5] Gvozdev A.N. About the sound composition of morphemes. - Questions of linguistics. – № 3. – 1960. – P 24-41.
- [6] Kurilovich E. Allophones and allomorphs // E. Kurilovich. Essays on linguistics.-M., 1962. – P. 38-42.
- [7] Reformat'skij A.A. On the relationship between phonetics and grammar (morphology). // "Questions of grammatical structure". - M., 1955. – P. 108-111.
- [8] Trubetzkoy N.S. Some considerations regarding morphonology. // Prague linguistic circle. – M., 1967. – P. 116.

## **ПРАСЛАВЯН ТІЛІНІҢ СӨЗЖАСАМЫНЫҢ МОРФОНОЛОГИЯСЫН ҚАЛПЫНА КЕЛТІРУДЕ ЕСКІ ОРЫС ТІЛІНІҢ РӨЛІ**

**\*Жакупов Г.А.<sup>1</sup>,**

докторант, Ўзбек мемлекеттік әлем тілдері университеті,

Ташкент, Ўзбекстан

[georgejakupov@gmail.com](mailto:georgejakupov@gmail.com)

**Андатпа.** Ғылыми мақаланың негізгі мақсаты-морфонологияның мәртебесі мен оның мәселелерін праславян тілінің морфонологиясы негізінде қарастыру. Сонымен қатар, морфонологияны одан әрі терең зерттеу мақсатымен бұл топтың барлық тілдерінің лексикасын салыстырмалы этимологиялық зерттеу негізінде праславян сөздік қорын қайта құру міндеті қойылған. Қазіргі славян тілдерінің морфонологиялық ерекшеліктері протославян тілінде бұрыннан қалыптасқан деген ой айтылады.

Оларды қайта құру үшін прототілінің диалектілерінің бірі ретінде ескі орыс тілінің деректері ерекше рөл атқарады, ал ескі орыс сөздігінің деректері ерекше маңызға ие.

Сонымен қатар, әр түрлі жағдайларда реконструкцияның хронологиялық тереңдігінде кейбір айырмашылықтар болуы мүмкін, өйткені протославян тілінің тарихында славян тілінің алғашқы, тұйық буындардың жоғалу үрдісіне дейін, кезеңі белгіленеді және одан кейінгі, тұйық буындардың жоғалуы, кезеңі ерекшеленеді (кеш славянға дейінгі кезең). Тұйық буындардың жоғалу үрдісі дифтонгтардың монофтонгизациясына ықпал етті, бұл тек фонологиялық ғана емес, сонымен қатар протославян тілінің басқа жүйелерін, ең алдымен оның морфонологиясын өзгертті.

Мақала авторы 20-21 ғасырдағы белгілі лингвистердің теориялық идеяларын зерттеу мен сипаттау негізінде морфемалардың фонологиялық құрылымы мен олардың сөзжасамдық қызметтерінің байланысын зерттеу мәселесі сияқты ғылыми мәселе анықтайды. Сондықтан сөзжасамда қызмет ететін ауыспалылардың рөлін зерттеуге көп көңіл бөлінеді.

Мәселенің өзектілігі мынада: фонетика мен грамматиканың өзара байланысын синхронияда, диахронияда да қарастыру теориялық еңбектерде лингвистикалық зерттеулердің қажетті аспектісі ретінде үнемі қойылып қоймайды, сонымен қатар қазіргі заманғы сипаттамалық, тарихи, салыстырмалы грамматикалардың ажырамас бөлігіне айналады. Жеке тілдердің морфонологияларына арнайы зерттеулер арналған.

Морфонологияның ғылымдағы орны туралы әр түрлі ғалымдардың пікірлері келтірілген (грамматика, фонология, деңгейаралық деңгей және т.б.) Н.Трубецкойдың морфонология мәселені тұжырымдаудағы Прага лингвистикалық шеңберінің өкілі ретіндегі рөлі атап көрсетілген.

Мақаланың белгілі бір теориялық маңызы бар, өйткені ол қазіргі славян тілдеріндегі көптеген құбылыстардың тарихи негізінде қалыптасқанын зерттейді. Жұмыс орыс тіл білімі саласындағы мамандарға, тілдің тарихы мен қазіргі славян тілдерін зерттейтін студенттерге қызықты.

**Тірек сөздер:** морфонология, кезектестіру, протославян тілі, ескі орыс тілі.

## **РОЛЬ ДРЕВНЕРУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА В РЕКОНСТРУКЦИИ МОРФОНОЛОГИИ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЯ ПРАСЛАВЯНСКОГО ЯЗЫКА**

**\*Жакупов Г.А.<sup>1</sup>**

докторант, Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков,  
Ташкент, Узбекистан

[georgejakupov@gmail.com](mailto:georgejakupov@gmail.com)

**Аннотация.** Основной целью научной статьи является рассмотрение вопроса о статусе морфонологии и её проблематики на материале морфонологии праславянского языка. Ставится также цель для дальнейшего углубленного исследования морфонологии - предварительная реконструкция словаря праязыка на основании сравнительно-этимологического исследования лексики всех языков данной группы. Высказывается идея, что морфонологические особенности славянских языков были заложены уже в праславянском языке. Для их реконструкции особую роль играют данные древнерусского языка как одного из диалектов праязыка и особую важность представляют данные

древнерусского словаря. При этом возможны и некоторые различия в хронологической глубине реконструкции для разных случаев, так как в истории праславянского языка выделяется раннепраславянский период, до тенденции к утрате закрытых слогов и периода после утраты закрытых слогов (позднепраславянский период). Тенденция к утрате закрытых слогов способствовала монофтонгизации дифтонгов, которая существенным образом преобразовала не только фонологическую, но и другие системы праславянского языка, прежде всего – его морфонологию.

На материале изучения и описания теоретических идей известных лингвистов 20-21 веков определяется такая научная проблема, как проблема изучения связи фонологической структуры морфем с их словообразовательными функциями. Поэтому большое внимание уделяется изучению роли чередований, функционирующих в словообразовании.

Актуальность проблемы в том, что рассмотрение взаимосвязи фонетики и грамматики как в синхронии, так и в диахронии не только постоянно выдвигается как необходимый аспект лингвистического исследования в теоретических работах, но и становится неременной частью современных описательных, исторических и сравнительных грамматик. Специальные исследования посвящаются морфонологии отдельных языков.

Приводятся мнения различных ученых о месте морфонологии в науке ( часть грамматики, фонологии, межъязычный уровень и др.) Отмечается роль Н.Трубецкого как представителя Пражского лингвистического кружка в постановке проблемы морфонологии..

Статья имеет определенную теоретическую значимость, так как разрабатывает проблематику, связанную с изучением исторической обусловленности многих явлений современных славянских языков. Работа интересна для специалистов в области русского языкознания, студентов, изучающих историю языка и современные славянские языки.

**Ключевые слова:** морфонология, чередования, праславянский язык, древнерусский язык.

*Статья поступила 20.06.2021*