



MORPHONOLOGICAL PHENOMENA AS A MEANS OF MANIFESTATION OF THE CONCEPT OF FUSION IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Jakupov G.

PhD student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the place of the Russian language in the general typological classifications of languages. The leading trend in the morphological structure of the Russian language is fusion. It is opposed to agglutination and is defined as a close connection of polysemantic affixes with a changeable root. Morphological characteristics such as alternations of phonemes, alternations of stress, and affix variability are the indicative of fusion.

KEY WORDS: *type of language, fusion, agglutination, morphonology, alternation, affix.*

INTRODUCTION

The question of the typological classification of languages has become the subject of linguistic research since its formation as an independent science. With the development of linguistics, typological classifications of languages also developed. Karl Wilhelm Friedrich von Schlegel, August Wilhelm von Schlegel, Wilhelm von Humboldt, Edward Sapir, Joseph Harold Greenberg, and many others dealt with this problem at different times. Various classifications involve the separation of different types of languages, based on certain essential differential features that form the basis of the classification.

This article considers the place of the Russian language in the classification of languages based on the type of their morphonological structure. We are especially interested in contrasting the morphological characteristics of the Russian language as a fusional language with agglutinative languages. Since the identification of their structural differences is important when teaching the Russian language to native speakers of agglutinative languages, which is a very urgent issue.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Aim

To study the manifestation of the fusional characteristics of the Russian language at the morphonological level.

Objectives

To study the place of fusion in various general typological classifications of languages.

Determine the main features of fusional languages.

Consider how morphological characteristics demonstrate the fusional nature of the Russian language.

RESULTS

W. von Humboldt's general classification

Fusion and agglutination as the leading trends in the morphological structure of languages were first contrasted within the framework of the general typology of languages by W. von Humboldt. The classification of W. von Humboldt can rightfully be considered the first scientific general typology of languages. Despite the fact that the classifications of the brothers F. Schlegel and A. Schlegel chronologically preceded the typology of W. von Humboldt, they were largely pre-scientific in nature [1].

Features of the use of various types of morphemes formed the basis of Humboldt's classification. He divides languages into 4 types: isolating, incorporating, agglutinative and inflected. This classification has 3 levels; on each level one type of languages is opposed to the remaining ones according to some important feature [2; 19]. At the first level, W. von Humboldt contrasts isolating languages that do not have a developed system of morphological affixes with others that have such a system. At the next level, among languages that have a developed system of morphological affixes, W. von Humboldt separates incorporating languages with "sentence-words" from agglutinative and inflected languages. Finally, at the third level, there is a dichotomy between agglutinating languages, in which the combination of affixes occurs mechanically, and inflectional languages, which are characterized by a close combination of morphemes in the lexeme.

Thus, isolating languages are at one extreme, and inflected languages at the opposite. V. von Humboldt considered the Chinese language to be the final destination of isolating languages. The most developed inflected language, in his opinion, is Sanskrit: "...among all the languages known to us, Chinese and Sanskrit form two clear final points, similar to each other not in their adaptation to spiritual development, but only in the internal consistency and perfect logic of their



systems...” [3; 244]. Also, W. von Humboldt refuses the concept of the so-called “pure” types of languages, believing that they all belong to one type or another, based on the predominance of some properties over others. No language has been able to fully implement the inflectional method in itself: “... none of the real languages reached the peak here” [3; 160].

However, V.P. Danilenko believes that Humboldt’s typology has certain shortcomings in the. “The distinction between agglutinative and inflectional languages is a weak point in Humboldt’s typology of languages” [1]. Fusion as the main criterion for distinguishing between inflectional and agglutinative languages is only outlined in his classification, but not clearly defined. “Agglutinative languages differ from inflectional ones not fundamentally, as they reject any indication of grammatical categories through inflection” [3; 125].

The place of fusion in the E. Sapir’s classification

E. Sapir in his works develops a general typological classification of languages. The advantage of his classification is that the concepts of fusion and agglutination are understood more deeply and receive a more important place in it. E. Sapir presented 4 general typological classifications of languages, the concept of “fusion” is most fully explained in the second of them. According to this classification, E. Sapir identifies four types of languages: isolating, agglutinative, fusional and symbolic. Isolating languages are treated here in the Humboldtian tradition. From Humboldt’s inflected languages E. Sapir singles out symbolic languages, which have internal inflection as a central feature, and fusional ones. E. Sapir refuses the term “inflected” in favor of the term “fusional”, as inflection may be characteristic of some agglutinative languages as well. Thus, the presence of inflection in this classification is not a defining typological property. E. Sapir introduces a new concept of “fusion” as the main feature that distinguishes agglutinative and fusional languages.

E. Sapir sees the main difference between fusional and agglutinative languages in the degree and nature of the connection between root morphemes and affixes. “We may designate the two types of affixing as “fusing” and “juxtaposing.” The juxtaposing technique we may call an “agglutinative” one, if we like” [4; 124]. In addition, E. Sapir defined fusion as a tendency of morphological structure, characteristic not only of fusion languages, but also of agglutinative ones. That is why, for example, he regarded Bantu as an agglutinative-synthetic language, and French as a fusional-analytical one [5]. E. Sapir’s classification had significant drawbacks: it did not cover all the existing languages, excluding incorporating ones. However, regarding the understanding of the nature of fusional languages, the work of E. Sapir was an undoubted step forward.

J. Greenberg’s method of distinguishing fusion and agglutination

J. Greenberg, developing the ideas of E. Sapir, offers his own classification using the method of numerical indices: “instead of intuitive definitions based on general impressions,

an attempt is made to characterize each feature used in this classification in terms of the ratio of two units, each of which receives a fairly accurate definition by calculating a numerical index based on the relative frequency of these two units in segments of the text” [6; 60-95].

J. Greenberg sees the method of connection as the main criterion for distinguishing between fusional and agglutinative languages. He contrasts agglutination, which involves the combination of meaningful elements in a word without a significant change in their phonemic composition, and fusion, which involves the mutual modification or merging of elements. As a numerical parameter for distinguishing between these two tendencies, he introduces the agglutination index, which is expressed through the ratio of the number of agglutinative structures to the number of morphemic sutures. The agglutination index is calculated by the formula A/J , where A is the number of agglutinative structures, and J is the number of boundaries between morphemes [6; 60-95].

J. Greenberg, following E. Sapir, understands fusion only as a close connection of morphemes, leading to the blurring of boundaries between them. However, the modern understanding of fusion is different. Therefore, for example, A.A. Reformatskii identifies the following properties of fusional languages: polysemantic and non-standard affixes, indistinct boundaries between morphemes, non-independence of certain stems. In contrast to fusion, agglutination is characterized by monosemantic standard affixes, a clear distinction between morphemes, and the independence of each stem [7; 52-76]. It follows that the definition of fusion and agglutination only through a simple ratio of the number of morphemes to the number of morphemic sutures is incomplete and does not take into account all the features of fusion and agglutination.

Fusional characteristics of the Russian language at the morphological level

The fusional characteristics of the Russian language are manifested in derivation and inflection. Thus, in the word *домá* (‘domá’ – houses) morpheme *-a* expresses the grammatical meaning of the plural. In the Uzbek language, which is agglutinative, a similar meaning is expressed by the affix *-лар* (‘lar’) – *уй* (‘ui’ – house) + *лар* (plural suffix) => *уйлар* (‘uilar’ – houses). The suffix *-лар* (lar) in the Uzbek language expresses only the meaning of the plural, while in the Russian language the morpheme *-a* in the word *домá* (‘domá’) also expresses the meaning of the Nominative case. It should also be noted that in the Uzbek language the meaning of the plural is expressed only by the suffix *-лар* (‘lar’), whereas in the Russian language the meaning of the plural can also be expressed by other morphemes. In the Russian language, derivational meaning is also often expressed by more than one derivational affix. So the meaning of the person performing an action can be expressed by the suffixes *-чик*, *-щик*, *-ник*, *-ец*, *-ист*, *-ант*, *-ент*, *-ер* (*-тер*), *-ор* (*-тор*), *-онер* (*-ионер*), *-ар* (*-яр*) (‘-chik’, ‘-shchik’, ‘-nik’, ‘-ets’, ‘-ist’, ‘-ant’, ‘-ent’, ‘-er (-ter)’, ‘-or (-tor)’, ‘-oner (-ioner)’, ‘-ar (-yar)’) and others. At the same time, the choice



of a derivational affix with this meaning is not random, but depends on the accent and alternational characteristics of the producing word. Affixes are considered as variants in the paradigm of affixes with a given meaning, which, in turn, is their invariant.

DISCUSSION

Thus, fusion is characteristic of the morphonological system of the Russian language. Morphonological units of alternation of stress and alternation of phonemes are traditionally referred to as indicators of fusion. Here we can also include the variability of affixes within the framework of the paradigm of affixes with a certain meaning. Hence, morphological characteristics are an indicator of fusion.

REFERENCES

1. Danilenko V.P. *General Typology of Languages in the Concept of W. von Humboldt*. URL: <http://slovo.isu.ru/danilenko/articles/gumbtipol.htm>
2. Sharafutdinova N.S. *Linguistic Typology and Language Areas*. 2009:128-19.
3. Humboldt W. von. *Selected Works on Linguistics*. 1984:400-125.
4. Sapir E. *Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies*. 1993:656-124.
5. Danilenko V.P. *General Typology of Languages in the Concept of E. Sapir*. URL: <http://slovo.isu.ru/danilenko/articles/sepirtipol.htm>.
6. Greenberg J. *Quantitative Approach to the Morphological Typology of Languages*. *New in Linguistics*. 1963; 3:60-95.
7. Reformatskii A.A. *Linguistics and Poetics*. 1987:52-76.