

FEATURES OF PHONETIC TERMS FOR MORPHONOLOGICAL PROCESSES
RECURSOS DOS TERMOS FONÉTICOS PARA PROCESSOS MORFONOLÓGICOS
CARACTERÍSTICAS DE LOS TÉRMINOS FONÉTICOS PARA PROCESOS
MORFONOLÓGICOS

Konstantin Mihailovich DENISOV¹
Evdokiya Ivanovna LOBANOVA²
Ludmila Vladimirovna ZENINA³
Irina Igorevna YAROSLAVSKAYA⁴
Tatjana Leonidovna GERASIMENKO⁵

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the study is to analyze the features of phonetic terms in the field of phonological processes. Based on a theoretical analysis of scientific and methodological literature, the authors present different perspectives and studies by prominent linguists on the designation and fixation of phonetic terms in the field of morphonology and morphonological phenomena. Such terms as "morphonology", "morphoneme", "morpheme", "morph", and "submorph" are defined as well as the key morphonological phenomena in the Russian language. The systematization and generalization of linguists' views and studies make it possible to define the features of phonetic terms in the field of morphonological processes. It is concluded that there is still no consensus in modern linguistics about the interpretation of morphonological notions. Modern linguists have not agreed on whether some means, in particular, phonetic alternation and stress, are morphonological phenomena in language.

KEYWORDS: Morphonology. Morpheme. Morphoneme. Submorph. Morphonological phenomenon.

RESUMO: O objetivo do estudo é analisar as características dos termos fonéticos no campo dos processos fonológicos. A partir de uma análise teórica da literatura científica e metodológica, os autores apresentam diferentes perspectivas e estudos de linguistas de destaque sobre a designação e fixação de termos fonéticos no campo da morfologia e dos fenômenos morfológicos. Termos como "morfonologia", "morfonema", "morfema", "morfo" e "submorfo" são definidos, bem como os principais fenômenos morfológicos na língua russa. A sistematização e generalização das visões e estudos dos linguistas permitem definir as características dos termos fonéticos no campo dos processos morfológicos. Conclui-se que

¹ Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6637-9629>. E-mail: Denisov.KM@rea.ru

² Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7206-5426>. E-mail: Lobanova.EI@rea.ru

³ Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7194-5912>. E-mail: Zenina.LV@rea.ru

⁴ Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1629-6187>. E-mail: YAroslavskaya.II@rea.ru

⁵ Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8396-8900>. E-mail: Gerasimenko.TV@rea.ru

ainda não há consenso na linguística moderna sobre a interpretação das noções morfológicas. Os linguistas modernos não concordaram se alguns meios, em particular, alternância fonética e acento, são fenômenos morfológicos na linguagem.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Morfonologia. Morfema. Morfonema. Submorph. Fenômeno morfológico.*

RESUMEN: *El propósito del estudio es analizar las características de los términos fonéticos en el campo de los procesos fonológicos. A partir de un análisis teórico de la literatura científica y metodológica, los autores presentan diferentes perspectivas y estudios de destacados lingüistas sobre la designación y fijación de términos fonéticos en el campo de la morfología y los fenómenos morfológicos. Se definen términos como "morfología", "morfonema", "morfema", "morfo" y "submorfo", así como los fenómenos morfológicos clave en el idioma ruso. La sistematización y generalización de los puntos de vista y estudios de los lingüistas permiten definir las características de los términos fonéticos en el campo de los procesos morfológicos. Se concluye que aún no existe consenso en la lingüística moderna sobre la interpretación de las nociones morfológicas. Los lingüistas modernos no se han puesto de acuerdo sobre si algunos medios, en particular, la alternancia fonética y el acento, son fenómenos morfológicos en el lenguaje.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Morfonología. Morfema. Morphoneme. Submorph. Fenómeno morfológico.*

Introduction

Language is one of the principals and fascinating means of human communication, a means of exchanging opinions. Language can perform these variable and complex functions because it is a very flexible and well-organized system (MURATOVA *et al.*, 2021; ALSHYNBAEVA *et al.*, 2021). Language is a natural communication system that includes numerous elements that constantly interact with each other and form a certain unity. Like any system, language can be viewed from two sides. On the one hand, language consists of elements: phonemes, morphemes, words that have a related material basis – sound, and on the other hand, the language has a particular structure. The "structure of speech" is understood as its internal organization, the scheme of connections between numerous elements that ensure the functioning of speech as an act of communication.

Phonetic terminology is a continuity that combines one-structure components and word combinations-terms denoting the concepts of phonetics as a branch of linguistics (AVERBUKH, 2004). Therefore, one should note that the main feature of any language is the systematization of phonetic terms into groups: 1) terms for designating sections and subsections of phonetics; 2) terms for scientific phonetic terms; 3) peripheral terms (AVERBUKH, 2004).

Each of the classes has a specific center or core. The main core of the phonetic terminology of the language is the phoneme. A phoneme is the smallest, indivisible, structural-semantic sound unit that can perform certain functions in speech: the phoneme creates, separates, and distinguishes morphemes, words, and their forms in the speech.

A feature of phonetic terminology is that the theoretical and practical aspects of research are intertwined therein, its conceptual and terminological apparatus is in active interaction with such subsystems as linguistics (orthoepy, graphemics, spelling, as well as lexicology, grammar [morphology and syntax] and stylistics) and applied spheres – biology (anatomy, physiology, neurophysiology), physics, psychology, logic, aphasiology, and speech and language pathology, physical acoustics and psychoacoustics; communication technology; information theory; cybernetics and information technology; statistics; communication theory; cognitive science; psychology; sociology; history; ethnography; cultural studies; aesthetics (DENISOV, 2012a). Thus, the scheme and structure of the phonetic terminology system are very complex and have several transition zones primarily due to the use of applied aspects of other sciences.

The methodological foundations for studying phonetic terminology as a terminological paradigm are one-word components and terminological phrases that denote the concept of the phonetic subsystem of the language and are used in special scientific-theoretical, popular science, methodological and educational literature, in the professional language of phoneticians, phonologists, intonologists, accentologists, etc. The phonetic terminology system is an ordered set of terms that denote phonetic concepts that are in various connections and relationships (DENISOV, 2012b).

At the same time, linguists-researchers have always found the issue of defining morphonology as a separate field of linguistics debatable and promising. In particular, this refers to the definition of the term morphonology and the attribution of certain phenomena to morphonological processes.

Literature review

The term morphonology was proposed by the philologist N.S. Trubetzkoy in 1929. One of the founders of this field was the linguist J. Baudouin de Courtenay. Morphonological research was carried out by supporters of the Moscow phonological school, for example, R.I. Avanesov (ITKIN, 2007).

Researchers viewed morphonology from various perspectives: 1) as a link between phonology and morphology; 2) as an intermediate level between phonology and morphology;

3) as an independent but not a basic level of the language system; 4) as part of grammar – "pre-morphology", as an introduction to morphology; 5) as part of morphology (ITKIN, 2007).

E. Kurilovich (1962) believes that most problems of morphonology are within the competence of phonology, and only a few refer to morphology. According to A. Martinet, all morphonological problems should be considered within morphology. Thus, to determine the status of morphonology in linguistics, one must evaluate phonology, morphology, and morphonology from a functional (dynamic) point of view (KIPARSKY, 1995).

V.B. Kasevich (1986) defines morphonology as a branch of linguistics that studies the phonological structure of morphemes and the use of phonological differences for morphological purposes.

In modern linguistics, the term morphonology is used with two meanings – narrow and broad. Morphonology in the narrow sense studies the variation of phonemes in the morphs of one morpheme, that is, the alternation of phonemes, *drug – družhestvennyi*, *strakh – strashit*, *den – dnya* [friend – friendly, fear – scare, day – day], etc. Morphonology in a broad sense examines the phonological composition of morphemes and the ways of distinguishing them; modification of morphemes with their compatibility in the processes of inflection and word-formation, that is, junctural changes of morphemes (KUBRYAKOVA; PANKRATS, 1983).

S.M. Tolstaya (1998) defines the term morphonology as a branch of linguistics formed at the intersection of morphology and phonology and studying the patterns of functioning of morphologically determined phonological means. The object of morphonology is the variation of morphemes and the paradigmatics of its allomorphs, in particular: 1) the phonemic structure of morphemes; 2) combinatorial changes of sounds, which morphemes are subject to/in individual morpheme combinations; and 3) sound alternations that perform a morphological function.

With the delineation of morphonological problematics into an independent branch of linguistics in linguistic literature in the early 1920s–1930s, the discussion continues about the feasibility and motivation of identifying special, that is, morphonological units.

Some researchers (AKHMANOVA, 1966; BERNSTEIN, 1974; KUBRYAKOVA, 1983; POPOVA, 1987) defend the idea that morphonology as a study of the patterns of phonological representation of morphemes and their series does not need a special unit, since nothing corresponds to it in language ontology; all cases of formal variation of morphemes can be appropriately described in terms of alternations.

Other researchers of morphology (HARRIS, 1955; LASKOWSKI, 1981; WORTH, 1972; CHURGANOVA, 1973; KASEVICH, 1986; LOPATIN, 1977) substantiate the linguistic

reality of morphological units – morphemes and submorphs (or just submorphs), and their importance for the correct description of the languages characterized by highly active morphonological transformations.

Methods

We used the following research methods in the study:

- Theoretical analysis of scientific and methodological literature to define the conceptual apparatus of the study related to the definition of the terms "morphology", "morpheme", "morpheme", "morph", "submorph".

- Systematization and generalization made it possible to determine the features of phonetic terms in the field of morphonological processes.

At the first stage of the study, we selected the sources of information necessary to achieve the research goal. In total, 26 sources were selected, including 12 monographs, five articles in scientific journals, five articles from collections of articles, three textbooks, and a dissertation abstract.

At the second stage of the study, we processed the collected information, which consisted in the selection of data corresponding to the research topic with the subsequent interpretation of the results obtained to define the terms "morphology", "morpheme", "morpheme", "morph", "submorph", as well as definitions of the main morphonological phenomena in the Russian language and the features of phonetic terms in the field of morphonological processes.

Results

Analysis of academic literature showed that morphology as an independent branch of linguistics studies:

- 1) The phonemic structure of morphs of various types (root, suffix, prefix, inflectional), the methods of their opposition and differences;

- 2) The rules for the compatibility of morphemes, that is, their mutual adaptation, modification of morphemes (variation), the morphemes they are combined into morpheme chains (alternation of phonemes in identical morphs) during inflection and word-formation;

3) Morphological alternation (morphoneme) and various phenomena on the juncture between morphs (truncation, extension, combination, stress transition) when the morphemes are combined as adjacent signals during inflection and word formation.

Today, the concept and the term morphoneme is used by representatives of various linguistic schools and directions that are characterized by different visions of morphonology, different interpretations of its status, subject, and goals. There is still no consensus in modern linguistics about the definition of the term morphoneme.

According to G. Ulashin, a morphoneme is a phoneme in the semasiological-morphological function, that is, an elementary component of a morpheme that undergoes alternation within the morpheme (KUKUSHKINA, 2016). This opinion was shared by V.G. Churganova, who built the concept of a morphoneme as an elementary unit of morphonology, namely: a morphoneme is a unit that reflects the unity of strong and weak phonemes of one class, interpreted as a component of a real morpheme (morph) (CHURGANOVA, 1973).

A morphoneme as interpreted by the proponents of the generative method (WORTH, 1972; LASKOWSKI, 1981; BULYGINA, 1977) is an element of the deep (abstract-vocabulary) form of a morpheme, from which all its surface forms can be formed using appropriate rules.

In the definition of this term by E. Kurilovich (1962), a morphoneme is a redundant morpheme, which can be referred to only in the case of a double phonological characterization of a certain grammatical category.

A.A. Reformatsky (1979), outlining the concept of a morphoneme, made further generalizations that a morpheme is a series of morphonological phenomena determined by accommodation in the morphs of productive words and derivatives which are formed in a certain word-formation position. According to the linguist, a morphoneme consists of morphemes and can belong to one of three classes - root, suffixal, or prefixal morphonemes. The criterion for such a classification is the nature of the basic morpheme.

Discussion

The difference in approaches to interpreting the morphoneme results in divergences in the outlining of the inventory of this class of units. For linguists who are focused on the phonological level of the language in the analysis of morphonological phenomena and consequently on the phonological nature of the morphoneme, the inventory almost coincides with that of phonemes. Thus, V.G. Churganova (1973) identifies 43 morphonemes, and M.B.

Popov (2005) identifies 39. In the works of researchers focusing on the functional essence of morphonemes, the number of the latter is determined by the alternation series available in the language and significantly exceeds the number of phonemes.

Some linguists defend the opinion that morphonology has a level structure, and a morphoneme is a unit of its lowest (segmental, phonemic) level (IOSAD, 2020). The unit of the highest level, which is directly linked to the morphological one, is the submorph. The term submorph as a morphonological concept was proposed by E. Kurilovich. The linguist used the term to denote such elements of the word structure as apophony (alternation of phonemes), stress movement, various connecting vowel/consonant phonemes, and their combinations, which do not have an independent morphological function in all Indo-European languages but are determined by suffixes or prefixes (KURILOVICH, 1962).

V.V. Lopatin (1977) defines a submorph as semantically dependent (after all, the derivational meaning is expressed by the morpheme as a whole) part of the morpheme, which reveals only formal (morphonological) significance. For example, words like *konets*, *klinok* [end, blade] isolate the segments *en*, *ets*, *ok*, just as they are isolated by morphonologically dividing lexemes *molodets*, *sapozhok* [good fellow, boot]. It is immaterial for morphonology that such elements have lost their correlation with the content plane. The main thing is that they are formally identical with those elements that have preserved this correlation.

V.V. Lopatin (1977) proposes to classify submorphs based on the following criteria:

a) Functional: submorphs are not present in all morphs of the morpheme, can limit its binding capabilities, and also determine the type of morphonological behavior of the stem during inflection and word-formation;

b) Formal: some submorphs correlate with specific suffixal morphs, others do not correlate (in this case, the submorphs often correspond to borrowed affixes);

c) Criterion of regularity/irregularity.

O.A. Zemskaya (1973) assigns a submorph a much more modest role in the morphological system of the language: these are parts of root morphemes that do not have any meaning in the word, but only coincide with affixal morphemes with their sets of phonemes and different types of alternations.

V.B. Kasevich (1986) approaches this problem differently: the linguist considers the submorph to be a single unit of morphonology. According to the researcher, any variable segment of the morpheme can be subsumed under the concept of the submorph.

Therefore, a morphoneme is a series of phonemes that replace each other within the same morpheme and are represented in its allomorphs. The term morphoneme can be

considered unique as the term is abstract. This is because the morphoneme is specifically realized in the form of phonemes, mutually substituted in morphemes during inflection and word formation. A submorph is a segment of a word that is formally (phonetically) identical to a separate affixal morph but devoid of any meaning. The submorph is involved only in expressing the meaning associated with a particular morph.

Morphonological variation is a kind of linguistic variation that manifests itself in the modification of the formal (phonological) structure of morphemes when the morphemes are combined within a word or word form. Morphonological phenomena are such phonological changes that arise between morphs, serve for their mutual adaptation, compatibility, and delineation, and also mark morphological and semantic differences of morphs.

Morphonological phenomena in the Russian language include: truncation of the stem of the forming word before the forming suffix (*sintaksis – sintaksicheskii, dlinnyi – dlinnee* [syntax – syntactic, long – longer]); adding sounds onto a forming suffix, forming prefix or forming stem (*kino – kinoshnik* [cinema – filmmaker]); combination (overlay) of morphemes (*Omsk – omskii* [Omsk – from Omsk]); morphological alternations (*tech – techet, katit – kachu, kolykhat – kolyshet* [to flow – flows, to roll – I roll, to sway – sways]) and stress movement associated with the processes of inflection and word-formation (*oshibka – oshibki* [error – errors]). However, the issue of morphonological means is the subject of debate (BLEVINS, 1995).

The subject of morphonology is very promising since it draws attention to new problems, primarily to the problems of phonetic alternation as an additional way of expressing a certain grammatical meaning.

The function of morphonological phenomena is to enhance the differentiation of forms at the morphological level. For example, if we analyze the alternation of phonemes in the following words: *pokazat – pokazatel, pech – pech; bereg – na beregu, lug – luzhok, den – dnya, ogon – ognya; krutit – kruchu, vozit – vozhu* [to show – indicator, to bake – stove; shore – on the shore, meadow – small meadow, day – day (Gen. case), fire – fire (Gen. case); to twist – I twist, to drive – I drive], it becomes obvious that the alternation of phonemes is an auxiliary means of expressing such grammatical meanings as the degree of comparison, partially linguistic categorical meaning (action – objectivity), case and person meanings (BEKASOVA, 2005).

Therefore, the alternations are not due to the phonetic environment. The alternations caused by the phonological environment do not refer to morphonology. In modern languages, morphonological phenomena are revealed when comparing the forms of one paradigmatic or derivational series: *khochu, khochesh, khochet, khotim, khotite, khotyat; selo – selskii, veselyi*

– *vesele, strakh – strashnyi – strashit, son – sonnyi – snitsya, zhat – zhnetsy – zhnets* [I want, you want, wants, we want, you want, they want; village – rural, cheerful – cheer, fright – frightful – frighten, sleep – sleepy – dream, reap – reapers – reaper].

The study of linguistic literature indicates that not all types of alternations that perform a morphological function belong to morphonology. Thus, in particular, there is no consensus regarding those alternations that represent internal inflection, for example, in English: foot – feet, tooth – teeth, etc. Therefore, according to researchers, this type of alternation is the only means of expressing the grammatical meaning of number (BERMÚDEZ-Otero, 2018).

Some linguists (LOPATIN, 1977; BEKASOVA, 2005) believe that morphonology studies all types of alternations with a morphological load (that is when the alternations are the only means of grammatical differentiation of forms, and those that function together with other grammatical means – suffixes, endings, etc.). Other linguists (WORTH, 1972; BERMÚDEZ-OTERO, 2018) consider only those alternations that serve as auxiliary means. Since in the latter case, alternation is the main and only way of expressing the grammatical meaning of number, then, according to the supporters of the second perspective, alternations cannot be attributed to morphonological phenomena.

The question of whether stress belongs to morphonological means remains controversial (in languages with non-fixed and mobile stress, a change in the grammatical form of a word with the help of an affix or inflection is often accompanied by a change in stress): *zemlya – zemli, selo – selskii, professor – professora* [land – lands, village – rural, professor – professors], and the like.

Conclusion

The phonetic terminology of a language is a complex system of one-component terms and terminological phrases, which has been continuously developing for a long time, caused by the constant attention of scholars and researchers to the issue of the sound structure of speech and the features of its functional modification. This system has a clear structure, common and distinctive features at each of its levels.

The analysis of phonetic terms in the field of morphonological processes makes it possible to conclude that there is still no consensus in modern linguistics regarding the interpretation of morphonological concepts. Modern linguists have not agreed whether some means, in particular, phonetic alternations and stress belong to the morphonological phenomena of the language.

The limitations of the study include a rather narrow area of the study of phonetic terms – morphonological processes. Features of phonetic terminology in the field of differences between vocalism and consonantism may become a prospect for further research.

REFERENCES

- AKHMANOVA, O. S. **Fonologiya, morfonologiya, morfologiya: Ucheb. posobie** [Phonology, morphonology, morphology: a textbook]. Moscow: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta, 1966.
- ALSHYNBAEVA, M. A.; MAZHITAYEVA, S.; KALIYEV, B.; NYGMETOVA, N.; KHAMZINA, G. S. Linguocultural Anatomical Code: Concept of Sacredness. **Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities**, v. 13, n. 1, 2021.
- AVERBUKH, K. YA. **Obshchaya teoriya termina** [The general term theory]. Ivanovo: Izd-vo "Ivanovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet", 2004.
- BEKASOVA, E. N. Ob izuchenii morfonologicheskikh cheredovaniy [On studying morphonological alternations]. **Russkaya slovesnost**, n. 5, p. 44-47, 2005.
- BERMÚDEZ-OTERO, R. **Stratal phonology**, in: S.J. Hannahs, A.R.K. Bosch (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Phonological Theory*. London, 2018.
- BERNSTEIN, S. B. **Ocherk sravnitelnoi grammatiki slavyanskikh yazykov** [Essay on the comparative grammar of Slavic languages]. Moscow: Nauka, 1974.
- BLEVINS, J. **The syllable in phonological theory**, in: J.A. Goldsmith (ed.) *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Blackwell: Cambridge, 1995.
- BULYGINA, T. V. **Problemy teorii morfologicheskikh modelei** [The problems of the theory of morphological models]. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.
- CHURGANOVA, V. G. **Ocherk russkoi morfonologii** [An Essay on Russian Morphonology]. Moscow, 1973.
- DENISOV, K. M. Populyarizatsiya foneticheskoi terminologii kak lingvodidakticheskaya zadacha [Popularization of phonetic terminology as a linguodidactic task]. **Izvestiya Smolenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta**, v. 4, n. 20, p. 115-125, 2012a.
- DENISOV, K. M. Teoreticheskie osnovy opisaniya foneticheskikh terminosistem [Theoretical framework for describing phonetic terminological systems]. **Lichnost. Kultura. Obshchestvo. Mezhdunarodnyi zhurnal sotsialnykh i gumanitarnykh nauk** [Personality. Culture. Society. International journal of social sciences and humanities], v. XIV, n. 1, p. 69-70, 2012b.
- HARRIS, Z. S. From phoneme to morpheme. **Language**, v. 31, n. 2, p. 190-222, 1955.
- IOSAD, P. V. Morfonologicheskaya stratifikatsiya v russkom yazyke [Morphonological stratification in the Russian language]. **Rhema**, n. 1, p. 36-55, 2020.

ITKIN, I. B. **Russkaya morfonologiya** [Russian morphonology]. Moscow: Gnozis, 2007.

KASEVICH, V. B. **Morfonologiya** [Morphonology]. Leningard: Izd-vo LGU, 1986.

KIPARSKY, P. **The phonological basis of sound change**, in: J.A. Goldsmith (ed.) *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Blackwell: Cambridge, 1995.

KUBRYAKOVA, E. S.; PANKRATS, YU. G. **Morfonologiya v opisaniii yazykov** [Morphonology in language description]. Moscow: Nauka, 1983.

KUKUSHKINA, O. V. **Morfonologiya sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka** [The morphonology of the modern Russian literary language]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 2016.

KURILOVICH, E. **Ocherki po lingvistike: Sbornik statei** [Essays on linguistics: Collected articles]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo inostrannoi literatury, 1962.

LASKOWSKI, R. **Kakuyu morfonologiyu vybrat?** [Which morphonology to choose?], in: *Slavyanskoe i balkanskoe yazykoznanie: Problemy morfonologii* [Slavic and Balkan linguistics: Morphological problems]. Moscow, 1981.

LOPATIN, V. V. **Russkaya slovoobrazovatel'naya morfemika: Problemy i printsipy opisaniya** [Russian derivational morphology: Problems and description principles]. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.

MURATOVA, A. A.; MAZHITAYEVA, S.; SARYBAYEVA, B. ZH.; KELMAGANBETOVA, A.; KULIBEKOVA, ZH. Non-Verbal Signs and Secret Communication as Universal Signs of Intercultural Communication. **Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities**, v. 13, n. 1, 2021. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v13n1.35>

POPOV, M. B. **Fonologicheskie problemy russkogo yazyka (sinkhronicheskii i diakhronicheskii aspekty)** [Phonological problems of the Russian language (synchronous and diachronous aspects)]: Abstract of Dissertation by the Doctor of Philological Sciences. Saint Petersburg, 2005.

POPOVA, T. V. **Slavyanskaya morfonologiya. Substantivnoe slovoizmenenie** [Slavic morphonology. Substantive inflection]. Moscow: Nauka, 1987.

REFORMATSKY, A. A. **Ocherki fonologii, morfonologii, morfologii** [Essays on phonology, morphonology, morphology]. Moscow: Nauka, 1979.

TOLSTAYA, S. M. **Morfonologiya v strukture slavyanskikh yazykov** [Morphonology in the structure of Slavic languages]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo "Indrik", 1998.

WORTH, D. S. O roli abstraktnykh edinits v russkoi morfonologii [On the role of abstract units in Russian morphonology]. **Razvitie sovremennogo russkogo yazyka**, p. 53-68, 1972.

ZEMSKAYA, E. A. **Sovremennyi russkii yazyk. Slovoobrazovanie** [The modern Russian language. Word formation]. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1973.

How to reference this article

DENISOV, K. M.; LOBANOVA, E. I.; ZENINA, L. V.; YAROSLAVSKAYA, I. I.; GERASIMENKO, T. L. Features of phonetic terms for morphonological processes. **Rev. EntreLínguas**, Araraquara, v. 7, n. esp. 4, e021071, Nov. 2021. e-ISSN: 2447-3529. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v7iesp.4.15607>

Submitted: 09/02/2022

Required revisions: 20/05/2022

Approved: 05/09/2022

Published: 10/11/2022