

# Linear Transformations of The Basis of The Motivating Word in Russian Inflection and Word Formation

**Alimardanova Shahlo Ashurmamatovna**  
Teacher of the department of General Linguistics  
Uzbekistan State World Language University

**Annotation.** This article describes linear transformations of the stem of a motivating word, which include stem truncation and interfixation. The specificity of these phenomena of Russian word formation is considered from different points of view.

**Keywords:** linear and nonlinear transformations, stem truncation, interfixation, morph, submorph, formative, interfix, connective morpheme, structure.

## Introduction.

It is well known that the motivating basis, standing out in the structure of a motivated word, can either coincide in phonemic composition with the basis of the motivating word, or differ from it.

In this regard, the basis of the motivating word can undergo various morphonological transformations in the structure of the motivated one – transformations of the phonemic composition, due to compatibility with certain morphemes that are part of the formant. These transformations take place:

1) predominantly - before suffixal morphs with the suffix method of word formation and with mixed methods of word formation with the participation of suffixation (prefix – suffix, suffix – postfix, suffix – complex), including in formations with a zero suffix;

2) before interfixing morphs in compound and suffixally compound words.

In other words, on the morpheme seam, at the junction of the generating stem and the word-forming affix, not all combinations of phonemes are permissible. Often, the addition of word-forming affixes to a generating stem causes various morphonological transformations – alternation of vowel and consonant phonemes, stress shifting, truncation, morpheme imposition, interfixation. As a result of this, there is a mutual adaptation of the generating basis and the word-forming affix. Note that morphonological phenomena do not affect the semantic relations between the producing and derived words. They affect only the formal relations between them, changing their phonemic structure.

## Literature review and methodology.

Among the morphonological transformations of the basis of the motivating word, there are linear and nonlinear transformations. Linear transformations include truncation or augmentation of the stem due to some segment (phoneme or combination of phonemes) at the end of it or – much less often – at its beginning; for example: *широк-ий* – *шир-ота* (truncation of the stem due to the final combination of phonemes |ок|), *не-ть* – *нев-учий* (increasing the stem due to the final consonant |в|), *бездарн-ый* – *бездарь-Ø* (simple) (truncation of the stem due to the final consonant |н|, which is a suffix morph).

In most cases, linear transformations of the stems of the motivating word are found in its final part, i.e. in the part that immediately precedes the inflectional affixes in the motivating word itself (for example, in the verb – the inflections of the present tense, the suffix of the past tense), and in the corresponding motivated word – the suffix or interfixal derivational morph. So, the segment |а| (final) of the infinitive stem of the verb *читать* belongs to the final part: *читать: чита-ть, чита-л, чита-тель* (however, this segment is absent, for example, in the word *чит-ка*). The final part of the verb stem does not include the postfix *-ся/-сь* after inflectional affixes, for example: *боя-ться, бо[ж-у]-сь*.

A.N. Tikhonov notes that “when words are formed at the junction of the generating stem and the word-forming affix, sound combinations arise that are not characteristic of the modern Russian language or for this word-building type, which do not meet the norms of the combination of phonemes on morphemic seams. This leads to the fact that the end of the generating base is simplified, subject to truncation” [5, p. 26].

E.A. Zemskaya in the book *Modern Russian Language. Word formation* "notes that the truncation of the generating stem in affix word formation is one of the types of mutual adaptation of morphemes, standing on a par with alternation and interfixation:" in the derivative stem there is no final phoneme (or group of phonemes) of the generating stem" [3, p. 143]. This phenomenon is exactly the opposite of interfixation. If, during interfixing, the derivative base grows, it increases, then during truncation, it is reduced (the final part of the base is truncated).

In modern Russian, truncation of the stems of nouns, adjectives and verbs is widespread. Usually the suffix (or its matching submorph) or the final vowel of the root is truncated. Moreover, the final vowel of the root is truncated only in non-declining nouns with a vowel ending. Accordingly, E.A. Zemskaya distinguishes between morphological and phonological truncations. The purpose of truncations, she believes, is "to avoid violations of any laws of morphology, namely:

a) to eliminate the accumulation of consonants on the morpheme seam, i.e. make it easier for a suffix beginning with a consonant to join the stem;

b) eliminate the accumulation of vowels on the morpheme seam, i.e. to give a vowel-based basis, which has a structure unusual for the Russian language, a more "familiar" form for word formation" [Ibid, p. 143].

Truncation of the generating stem most often occurs during affixation, for example: *сценар(ий) → сценар-н-ый, дерев(н-я) → дерев-ушк-а, эп(ос) → эп-ическ-ий, близ(к-ий) → близ-ость, уз(к-ий) → уз-еньк-ий*. Less commonly, it is observed in the addition of the foundations. In complex words, the first stem is usually truncated, but the second stem can also be truncated, for example: *инд-о-иранский, морфолог-о-синтаксический, одн-о-пал-Ø-ый, дв-у-пал-Ø-ый*. The end of the producing base is also truncated. One phoneme (vowel or consonant) or various combinations of phonemes are subjected to truncation: *безум(н-ый) → безум-ец, ревн (ова-ть) → ревн-ость*.

As rightly noted by N.S. Ulukhanov in the article "On the types of truncation of the bases of motivating words in Russian word formation", the part of the base that remains after the selection of the word-formation formant is not materially completely identical to the base of the motivating word. He also writes that the phenomena of truncation at the end and at the beginning of the stem are "phenomena of truncation of the stem of the motivating word"; for example, at the end: *летать – лётчик, пускать – пуск, глубокий – глубь, Тбилиси – тбилисский*, или в начале основы мотивирующего слова: *нельзя – лъзя, обогатить – богатить (оказ.)*. And further: "The problem of truncation is closely related to the problem of dividing word forms into minimal significant parts - morphs. The question of whether the cut off segment is a morph is solved in different ways in the literature on word formation" [7, p. 96].

E.A. Zemskaya distinguishes the following types of truncation:

1) truncation of the final vowel stems of non-declining nouns. Non-declining nouns with an outcome in a vowel, as a rule, are of foreign origin and are inactive in Russian word formation. E.A. Zemskaya considers two cases possible in which it is possible to make their basis more common for Russian word formation: to truncate the final vowel or add an interfix to the stem. As you can see, these two morphological means complement each other and are in the relationship of additional distribution, i.e. in the presence of one phenomenon, the other is absent, for example: *жалюзи-(й)-ный* and *жалюз-ный* from *жалюзи*. The author also gives examples of various types of derivatives, in which the vowel stem is truncated:

A) in formations from common nouns: *пальто – пальт-ушко, пальт-ище, пальт-ецо, резюме – резюм-ировать* (examples by E.A. Zemskoy).

B) in formations from their own names: *Франко – франк-ист, Тбилиси – тбилис-ский, тбилис-ец, Сухуми – сухум-ский, сухум-ец*, etc. [3, p. 145].

In Russian, the truncation of final vowels (most often *i* or *e*) in derivatives from geographical names is widely used. Derivatives without truncation of the final vowel stem are also common. In these cases, the interfix appears, for example: *Чили – чили-(й)-ский, Дели – дели-(й)-ский, Америка – америк-(ан)-ский*, etc.

2) truncation of final suffixes or submorphs, including consonants or combinations with consonants. Truncated segments are suffixes or submorphs of nouns.

In formations from common nouns, according to E.A. Zemsky, the segments are truncated: *-к-: девочка – девчон-ский, смекалка – смекал-истый; -ак-, -ок-, -ик-: козырёк – козыр-ять, праздник – праздн-овать; -ец-: туняедец – туняед-ствовать; -ив-: юридив-ый – юрид-ствовать; -ат-: результат – результат-ивный, результат-ный; -ик(а)-: математика – математ-изировать, техника – техн-изация.*

In formations from proper names, in particular those derived from names from settlements, adjectives with the suffix *-ск-* and the names of persons with the suffix *-ец-*, as a rule, suffixes (or submorphs) of the producing stem are truncated: *-к-: Камчатка – камчат-ский; -ок-: Новогрудок – новогруд-ский, новогруд-цы, etc.* [Ibid, p. 145-147].

### Discussion.

Thus, truncation phenomena are many and varied. "Some of them have a purely" technical "meaning, being caused by reasons of a formal nature, others are word-forming means and are accompanied by truncation of the "semantics" of the word (*нелепый – окказ. лепый, etc.*)" [7, p. 113].

Another type of linear transformations occurring on the border of morphemes is interfixation. Many scientists have addressed the problem of separating interfixes in a word, asking themselves the questions into which parts the word is divided; whether all the parts into which a word is divided have a meaning. In answering these questions, they occupy two opposing positions:

1) not all parts into which a word is divided have meanings. Among them there are significant units and units devoid of meaning;

2) all the parts into which the word is divided have a meaning; in the word there are not and cannot be insignificant parts.

From this it can be seen that the supporters of the first point of view adhere to the idea of isolating insignificant connecting elements in the word, which belongs to N.S. Trubetskoy. He called such elements *Verbindungsmorphemen* ("connecting morphemes" [6, p. 2]) and attributed to them, for example, *-j-* in verb forms (*чита-(j)-ут, дела-(j)-ут etc.*).

G.O. Vinokur, in an article published in 1959, proposed to introduce the concept of formatives. By formatives he understood such elements of the word "which in themselves have no meaning and serve as purely mechanical means of connecting meaningful unities with each other" [1, p. 398]. Moreover, among the formatives, the scientist distinguished two varieties: a) connecting formatives in complex words (*пар(о)ход, пол(у)пальто*); b) thematic formats, which serve "to give the base the kind that it needs so that an ending can be attached to it, for example, *писать, летать, пишешь, любишь*" [Ibid, p. 403].

Interfixes are "morphological means that facilitate the conditions for the compatibility of word-forming affixes with productive stems and thereby contribute to the expansion of the word-formation base of the Russian language, involving in the process of word-production words, the bases of which are based on combinations of phonemes that make it difficult to attach suffixes or greatly limit their combination possibilities" [5, p. 23].

As A.N. Tikhonov, "the emergence of interfixes is associated with the need to overcome certain morphological obstacles in word formation, eliminate unwanted phonemic combinations on the morpheme seam, with the need to create favorable morphological conditions for the combination of generating stems and word-forming affixes" [Ibid, p. 23].

A.N. Tikhonov singles out in the composition of the word marching elements that serve "to connect the generating basis and word-forming affixes, but have neither word-formation, nor grammatical meaning" [4, p. 370], and suggests calling them by the term structure. In his opinion, these elements include: parts of a word used as a "spacer" between the generating base and the word-forming suffix: *купе-й/н-ый, американ/ец, спа-ль/н-я.*

However, E.A. Zemskaya considers the term "interfix" to be the most successful, since it "has a transparent inner form - cf. the terms "prefix", "suffix", "postfix", etc., including the term-element *-fix* and Latin prefixes with spatial meaning [2, p. 75], and also, in relation to other terms with *-fix*, the term "interfix" indicates that it denotes a part of a word. However, it is on a par with terms that name the parts of a word that have meaning. This is the name of the types of morphemes: "suffix", "prefix", "affix", etc., while the interfix, without meaning, does not belong to the number of morphemes. From the point of view of E.A.

Zemskoy, it is more important that this term clearly means: "I name a part of a word, and not something else" [Ibid., P. 75]. As for Tikhonov's term "structure", it does not in any way correlate with the morpheme, does not oppose it. The term "structure" expresses too general a meaning. He's not specialized enough.

Comparing the terms "interfix" and "structure", E.A. Zemskaya notes that the ability to generate derivatives is an important feature of the term. From the term "interfix", for example, one can easily form the adjective "interfix" and the noun "interfix". And from the term "structure" the adjective is formed easily ("structured"), and the noun is difficult, and so on.

We, in turn, agree with E.A. Zemskoy is that the term "interfix" is more apt to denote this phenomenon of morphonology. The essence of interfixing, in her opinion, lies in the fact that an asemantic (insignificant) spacer is inserted between two morphemes, eliminating combinations of phonemes that are prohibited by the laws of morphonology or are not typical for the structure of the Russian word. Such spacers can also appear in a word by analogy. "Intermorphemic spacers playing a purely connecting function in the structure of the word", E.A. Zemskaya calls interfixes [3, p. 117]. A number of examples can be given: *суди-(л)-ище, жи-(л)-ец, пе-(в)-ец, пе-(в)-уч-ий, настоящ-(н)-ость, шоссе-(j)-н-ый, кофе-(j)-н-ый, америк-(ан)-ск-ий*, etc.

### Result.

Note that after a stem ending with a vowel phoneme, an interfix consisting of a consonant phoneme is usually used before a suffix that begins with a vowel. This type of interfixation appears mainly in formations from borrowed bases, since vowel stems are not typical for the structure of the Russian word (for example: *арго – арго-(т)-изм, кабаре – кабаре-(т)-ист*) or in Russian by origin stems (only for verb stems): *жить – жи-(л)-ец, кормить – корми-(л)-ец, петь – пе-(в)-учий*, etc. Consonant interfixes usually appear after vowel stems if the suffix begins with a consonant, because vowel stems are not typical for the structure of the Russian word. Here the interfixes -j-, -ш-, -в-, -н-: *кофе – кофе-(й)-ный, шоссе – шоссе-(й)-ный; кино – кино-(ш)-ник; интервью – интервью-(в)-щик*, etc.

E.A. Zemskaya writes: "Being, like the alternation of phonemes, one of the types of mutual adaptation of morphs on the morpheme seam, interfixation has a number of differences from alternations" [Ibid, p. 125]:

1. The alternation of phonemes is a regular phenomenon. It is found in morphemes of a certain structure in strictly defined positions, therefore it is predictable.

Unlike alternations, which operate in strictly defined positions, interfixation is not distinguished by strictness and inevitability. Interfixing is typed, but not always a regular occurrence. If we take a number of generating stems that are semantically and structurally similar, we cannot say with certainty which interfix the derived word will contain. For example, adjectives from place names with the suffix -sk- can be formed with and without interfixes, cf.: *Чита – чит-(ин)-ский, Ялта – ялт-(ин)-ский*, but: *Тула – туль-ский, Рига – риж-ский*.

2. Interfixing allows a choice of several interfixes, with alternation it is impossible. For example, you can compare the names of minerals that contain different interfixes: *куба-(н)-ит*, but *ангара-(л)-ит*; names of cubs: *гну-(н)-онок* and *гну-(ч')-онок*, *кабарга-(н')-онок* and *кабарга-(ч)-онок*.

3. Interfixing usually works by analogy. A similar effect can be exerted by a word or a group of words that are close in some respect to the formed one (in meaning, stylistic coloring, the nature of the generating basis). Sr: *авиа-(н)-изация* and *телефон-изация, витамин-изация; чили-(н)-изм* and *аргент-изм; лис-(ен')-онок, олен'-онок, слон'-онок*.

A similar effect of interfixing is found in the fact that derivatives from a certain lexical-semantic class of words usually use the same interfix, which gives the derived stems a uniform look. For example, in adjectives in -ский, the interfix -ин is widely used from the names, which was first encountered before the suffix -ск- in order to eliminate the accumulation of consonants on the morphemic seam. The interfix -ин- under the influence of analogy has also become widely used in stems that do not have an accumulation of consonants: *Алма-Ата – алма-ат-(ин)-ский, Махачкала – махачкал-(ин)-ский, Воркута – воркути-(ин)-ский*, etc.

---

### Conclusion.

Thus, observations on the structure of the Russian derivative word show that interfixes have no meaning in the composition of the word. They are used not only to change the form that is not characteristic of the Russian nominal basis - to have an outcome on a vowel, but also generally serve to adapt the generating stems and derivational affixes.

### References:

1. Vinokur G.O. Zametki po russkomu slovoobrazovaniyu // Izbrannye raboty po russkomu yazyku. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1959.
2. Zemskaya E.A. K probleme mnozhestvennosti morfonologicheskikh interpretacij (spornye sluchai chleneniya proizvodnyh osnov v sovremennom russkom yazyke) // Razvitie sovremennogo russkogo yazyka. Pod red. S.I. Ozhegova i M.V. Panova. – M., 1963.
3. Zemskaya E.A. Sovremennyy russkij yazyk. Slovoobrazovanie. – M.: Flinta-Nauka, 2008. – 328 s.
4. Tihonov A.N. Problemy sostavleniya gnezdovogo slovoobrazovatel'nogo slovarya sovremennogo russkogo yazyka. – Samarkand, 1972. – 388 s.
5. Tihonov A.N. Slovoobrazovatel'nyj slovar' russkogo yazyka. V 2 t. T.1. – M.: Russkij yazyk, 1990. – 854 s.
6. Trubeckoj N.S. Das morphonologishe System der russischen Sprache // Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague. T. 5., 1934.
7. Uluhanov N.S. O vidah usecheniya osnov motiviruyushchih slov v russkom slovoobrazovanii // Razvitie sovremennogo russkogo yazyka. Pod red. S.I. Ozhegova i M.V. Panova. – M., 1963.