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Shokhida Abdullayeva, Iroda Khajiyeva, Nilufar Matyazova

Urgench Branch of Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after Muhammad al Khwarizmi, Urgench, Uzbekistan

shohida82@mail.ru

Abstract. The article is devoted to the identification of the interaction of the lexical, morphological and word-formation tiers of the Russian language in the field of verb vocabulary. This article also addresses the problems of intensive isomorphism and structural allomorphism with respect to multisystem languages.
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Introduction

Currently, linguistics is activating both studies of new directions (the linguistic picture of the world, linguoculturology, cognitive and gender linguistics), and the directions and problems put forward and formulated in previous decades. One of the urgent problems of linguistics is the creation of a general theory of the word, combining the achievements of both lexicology proper and grammar and word formation. In relation to the verb vocabulary of the Russian language, the in-depth study of the relationships between the grammatical categories of the type and the voice with the verb action methods (VAM) and derivational categories (DC) is of particular relevance. This direction is relevant both in a comparative aspect and in the study of morphological and word-formation systems of individual languages, including Russian.

Literature review

Slavic linguistics, including Russian studies, and comparative typological linguistics are actively developing areas of linguistics in Uzbekistan (see the works of A. A. Abduazizov, J. Buranov, M. Dzhusupov, M. I. Rasulova, A.G. Sheremetyeva, W.K. Yusupova and many others), however, in a comparative aspect, the word-formation tier is clearly not well understood. Meanwhile, it is word-formation systems of different types of languages that clearly demonstrate both the general, universal features of these systems, and the features of explicit allomorphism associated both with the expression of the language determinant (the leading typological trend) and with the specifics of the "world view" in this language. D. N. Shmelev, considering the systematic problem in vocabulary, in addition to the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes of systematicity, he distinguishes the associativ-derivative axis, which is associated with the phenomenon of ambiguity and word formation [11, p. 125]. From our point of view, the derivational axis of the systemic verb vocabulary is associated with the categories of the type, voice, DC and VAM of the verb, and the interaction of these categories and verb groups is essentially poorly understood.
Word formation, as you know, was one of the actively developed areas in Russian studies (more broadly - in Slavic studies) of the second half of the 20th century; nevertheless, far from all the problems of word formation have been solved so far to give a complete picture of the specifics of the word formation tier, the mechanism of word generation and systemic connections of word formation with other language tiers. From our point of view, the most central concept defining the specifics of the word-formation tier, the derivational meaning (DM), is not sufficiently studied.

It seems extremely valuable the remark of E. S. Kubryakova that derivational meanings are either universal or extremely close to the universal categories of the human mind, which are “considered as universal concepts reflecting a description of the state of affairs” in the world and fundamental to create a picture of the world in a person’s head " [4; 5, p. 39].

With this approach, the forms of implementation of DM - derivational methods, DT, formants - cannot be considered as a decisive factor in determining the essence of DM, on the contrary, they are selected depending on the type of information contained in one or another DM, and in each language in accordance with its grammatical structure. The derivational meaning should be considered as an abstract, generalized meaning, similar in type of information expressed to a grammatical meaning. The DM is based on the same generalized conceptual categories (concepts) as the basis of grammatical meanings: “quantity”, “subject”, “object”, “tool”, “temperament”, “locative”, “gender”, and values reflecting the connection of parts of speech (transpositional meanings). The fundamental difference between word-formation and grammatical meanings is: 1) the optionality of DM for all tokens of a given part of speech; 2) in the field of embodiment (not a word form, but a derivative word); 3) in the method of embodiment (not inflectional, which is characteristic for most of the GM, but formatted).

**Methods:** component analysis method associated with the identification of the seminal composition of verbs of certain VAM; transformational method associated with the analysis of the type of transformations on the line producing - derivative. The work also used the traditional descriptive method associated with the selection, classification and description of the actual material - derivatives of verb tokens.

**Main part**

Derivational meanings within each part of speech reflect, first of all, categorical semantics (verb - process), and are grouped into word-formation categories, which we consider after M. Dokulil and R. S. Manucharyan as a kind of onomasiological categories, as a system of derivational meanings expressed by any formant means [6, p. 195-215].

In the classic work of Vinogradov, “The Russian language (grammatical doctrine of the word)”, much attention is paid to the description of grammatical categories of the form and voice, both in diachronic and synchronous aspects. A huge number of works are devoted to these categories both in Russian studies and in foreign linguistics (works by A. A. Potebni, V. V. Shakhmatov, A. M. Peshkovsky, Yu. S. Maslov, A. V. Bondarko, N. S Avilova, M. A. Shelyakin, A. N. Tikhonov, A. A. Kholodovich, I. G. Miloslavsky, A. V. Isachenko, R. Ruzhichki, and many others).

In the aspect of the theory of morphological categories, categories of a species and voice are considered in the works of T.V. Bulygina and A.V. Bondarko, nevertheless, many aspects of these categories remain insufficiently studied, especially in the light of the interaction of the lexical, derivational and morphological tiers.

A. V. Bondarko chooses a sign of the alternative / derivational nature of the morphology as one of the classification parameters of morphological categories, contrasting the categories of mood, tense, person, number, verb, case of nouns and other parts of speech
(alternative) with the categories of the type, voice of the verb, the number of nouns, the degree of comparison of adjectives and adverbs as derivational, i.e., formed as a result of morphological derivation. “By its very nature, derivation is open to the far-reaching impact of vocabulary, which creates difficulties and obstacles for the correlation of word forms and leads to inconsistent implementation of this correlation” [1, p. 101].

As a result of discussions about the status of members of a species pair and the number of collaterals in the Russian language, and as a result of the intensive development of the theory of word formation in recent decades, from our point of view, it can be argued: categories of type and collateral in Russian, in opposition to categories of mood, time, persons are categories of a word-forming character, replenishing and organizing verb vocabulary. When they are implemented, not morphological, but derivational word-formation is observed.

We are close to the point of view on the category of the species set forth in Grammar-70: “View as a grammatical category is expressed by the opposition of the forms of the same verb, and not of different verbs. This is confirmed, firstly, by the fact that the suffixes and prefixes that form verbs are not formative; these are word-building morphemes ... Secondly, the verbs forming a species pair have different conjugation forms and different infinitives. Thus, the category of the species, formed by the opposition not of different forms of the same word, but of different words, is a grammatical category of special quality: it is a lexical-grammatical (classification) category” [2, p. 339].

According to S. V. Rusanova’s point of view: “The understanding of the category of a species as a word-formation is promoted by the theory of basic suffixes, which, forming a verb stem, not only distinguish it from a nominal stem, but also carry a specific species meaning” [7, p. 5]. However, the term “derivational category” in derivatology has been assigned the designation of one of the complex units of the word-formation system, therefore we prefer to characterize the category of the species, as well as the category of pledge, as the grammatical category of the word-forming character, although this is somewhat paradoxical (but this is not a terminology of paradox, but deep essence of the named categories themselves). As for the special status of the underlying suffixes, from our point of view, it is inexpedient to distinguish this type of affixes in the language of the fusional type, which is the Russian language, since basic formation is a language technique in the service of semantics and function.

So, species-forming suffixes, like species-prefixes, are full-fledged word-forming formants of a syncretic nature, which, along with the function of speciation, perform the function of including a verb in one or another DC, which is correlated with a certain method of verb action.

Methods of verb action is a traditional and well-studied object of aspectology, however, VAM, as a rule, does not at all correlate with DC verbs; the characteristic of verb action methods as derivational categories (DC) of verbs is considered in the dissertation of M. I. Halikova [10].

The grounds for the assertion that most of the VAM correlates with derivational categories lie in the specifics of the significant, including the verb vocabulary of the Russian language: most of the full-valued words in the Russian language (about 90%) are derivative words. However, this does not at all mean the identification of the verbal DC and VAM: these are associations.

**Conclusion.**

The intensive coincidence of DC “causation” and “formation” in two languages does not in any way mean the coincidence of the values of any homogeneous lexemes, on the contrary, it is a testing ground for identifying the specifics of motivation, idioms of many
lexemes, including in the Uzbek language, of the dominance of the language determinant or opposite principles: for example, agglutination is characteristic of the Russian DC “formation”, which is manifested both in the limited formants and in the clarity of the morpheme structure of verbs.

So, derivational categories are the connecting link of vocabulary, word-formation and grammar in languages with a developed word-formation system; the unit of comparative study of multisystem languages should not be derivational methods, not derivational types, but derivational categories.
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