

## **The Role of Morpheme Resources of the Russian Language in the Creation of Neologisms**

**Akmedova Aziza Khusenovna**

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Lecturer, Department of Russian Philology*

**Abstract.** *Implementation of the potential capabilities of the Russian word-formation system is impossible without the use of morphemic resources and word-formation methods inherent in the Russian language. The modern state of Russian is characterized by extremely active borrowing processes of extensive layers of vocabulary related to various spheres of life: economics, politics, sports, art, etc. Sometimes entire lexical series with uniform structure are borrowed (for example: hamburger, cheeseburger, kopburger; yogurt, frugurt, apigurt, emigurt; clipmaker, imagemaker, newsmaker, hitmaker, playmaker). This abundance of borrowed words inevitably leads to a qualitative shift: certain structural elements begin to stand out within these series, developing more or less concrete meanings. Thus, foreign structural elements begin to form as independent morphemes in Russian—i.e., the process of morphemization occurs.*

If a language borrows a set of words that are morphologically segmentable in the source language and belong to one word-formation type there, then—given typological proximity—it is likely that speakers of the borrowing language will also perceive these words not as monoliths but as segmentable lexical units. This is a long, gradual process involving several stages of acquiring morphemic features by a foreign structural element in Russian.

At the initial stage, foreign elements are recognized only as regularly repeating segments in groups of words. For example, in recent years Russian has borrowed many English words with the suffix -ing (marketing, kidnapping, holding, casting, bowling, leasing, etc.). O. P. Sologub argues that this segment has not yet fully developed into an independent Russian suffix. She notes that Russian lacks the base forms from which such words would be derived—an essential condition for recognizing a structural element as an independent morpheme. She insists that a borrowed affix cannot be isolated unless a derivational base is identifiable formally and semantically. To activate a borrowed affix, not isolated words but full derivational families must enter the language.

A factor encouraging segmentation of some -ing-words in Russian is borrowing correlated word pairs: surf – surfing. According to the “Dictionary of New Foreign Words,” there are three words with the root surf-: surf, surfing, surfer. The meanings of these words are provided in detail. However, in words like kickboxing – kickboxer or bodybuilding – bodybuilder, no derivational base (\*kickbox, \*bodybuild) exists in Russian, so -ing cannot be considered a suffix here; it is only an “-ing-element.”

Sologub noted back in 2002 that in isolated cases some foreign-element words begin to develop derivational structure within Russian itself—for example, training, perceived as derived from тренировать(ся). Although this is rare, it demonstrates the initial stage of the foreign element’s integration: the emergence of a meaningful, reproducible pattern.

Our research shows a different trend: the component -ing is now actively used as a full suffix. Many Russian words serve as bases for -ing-derivatives: ресёрч – ресёрчинг, бренд – брендинг, сноуборд

– сноубординг, лонгборд – лонгбординг. These words clearly show derivational structure, and their bases are recognized by speakers.

Regarding the suffix -аж, Sologub previously described it as a relatively regular but unproductive suffix (дубляж, зондаж, инструктаж, массаж, монтаж, пилотаж, саботаж, фиксаж). Today this suffix no longer displays notable productivity.

At the same time, many new borrowed words contain elements such as арт-, бейс-, брейк-, гейт-, дайв-, крио-, медиа-, онлайн-, офлайн-. Numerous examples are provided (арт-базар, бейс-прыжок, брейк-данс, онлайн-конференция, офлайн-браузер, etc.). Dictionaries define these as first or second components of compound words with specific semantic contributions.

The structural element -мейкер- (“maker”) is acquiring clear semantic value (“creator”) and occurs in many words (news-maker, hit-maker, clip-maker, image-maker, etc.), sometimes with Russian bases (слухмейкер). Words like имидж, клип, тату, хит serve as derivational bases.

The element -гейт- already functions as an independent morpheme with the meaning “scandal”: Уотергейт, Ирангейт, Кремлегейт, Панамагейт, etc.

Words with the element -мания (“mania”) also form frequently (битломания, селфимания, покемономания), though still mostly with foreign bases.

Later stages of assimilation involve greater semantic breadth and ability to attach to Russian bases, as seen with elements like -дром (велодром → смеходром, стиходром) and -бельн- (комфортабельный → решабельный, смотрительный).

Based on the analysis, the most productive suffixal morphemes today are -ing and -er. Not all -ing-words contain the true suffix, but many now do. The component -инг has changed status: it behaves as a reproducible, meaningful, structurally fixed morpheme—i.e., a genuine Russian suffix.

## REFERENCES:

(Translated list preserved structurally.)

1. Akhmedova A. Kh. Productive and unproductive models of forming new words // Polish Science Journal. 2020. p.318.
2. Akhmedova A. Kh. The state of research on neological processes in modern Russian // International Conference on Linguistics, Literature and Translation (London). 2024. Vol.3. pp.51–53.
3. Zhuravleva E. A. Word-creation during the COVID-19 pandemic // Izvestia of Volgograd State Pedagogical University. 2021. №9 (162). pp.136–143.
4. Kasatkina R. F. Changes in the prosodic system of modern literary Russian // Modern Russian Language: Active Processes at the Turn of the 20th–21st Centuries. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures, 2008. pp.375–398.
5. Kuzmina N. A., Abrosimova E. A. Active processes in Russian and communication of recent times. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, 2015. 256 p.
6. Sharifullin B. Ya. General characteristics of the speech situation in a Russian city at the beginning of the 21st century // Ecology of Language and Communicative Practice. 2014. №1. pp.67–85.