



ON THE LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION OF THE MORPHEME

Ibragimova Muqaddas Abdullayevna

Teachers of the Department of Uzbek Language and Literature,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8069746>

Abstract. The work contains comments on the linguistic description of the morpheme and the morphematic level. They were treated. New conclusions are presented.

Key words: morpheme, morpheme, linguistic description of morpheme, morphematic level, language units, unity, phonemic and morphematic level.

When considering one of the language units - the phoneme, it was described in detail that it is the smallest and independently meaningless unit. However, it should also be said that we can study the linguistic nature of the phoneme only within the larger units - morpheme or word. This is, of course, one side of the matter. Its second side is reflected in the fact that the description of the linguistic nature of the morpheme and the word is inextricably linked with the phoneme. Linguistic signs require a countable morpheme and a sound complex, the expressive aspect of a word. Therefore, while discussing the morphematic level of the language, we emphasize that the means of expression of a morpheme is a phoneme.

A morpheme is also the smallest unit of our language. However, it differs from a phoneme in that it has not only an expressive but also an expressive aspect. But interestingly, both aspects of the morpheme characteristic of the language sign are realized through the phoneme. This, in turn, indicates the integral relationship of phonemic and morphematic levels. If the elements related to one of them are considered material, the elements related to the second require the form created by means of this material.

The term "morpheme" was first introduced into linguistics by IABoudin de Courtenay. In this regard, VMSolnsev writes the following: "LVShcherba testifies that linguistics owes *the term morpheme* to IABouden de Courtenay, who defined it as the smallest meaningful part of a word. "Connected speech is divided into independent sentences or phrases, sentences into independent words, words into morphological syllables or morphemes, and morphemes into phonemes," wrote IABouden de Courtenay.

The opinion of J. Vandries about morpheme is also unique, he calls morphemes the units that establish a relationship between language elements with independent meaning and includes all auxiliary means of language and formal parts of words.

morpheme is described in a different way in the teaching of L. Bloomfield, one of the founders of descriptive linguistics. Accordingly, a language form that is not similar to another form in phonetic-semantic aspects can be called a simple form or a morpheme. Bird, play, dance, etc. are morphemes [L. Bloomfield 2002:168].

calls simple (uncomplicated) words, independent auxiliary words and meaningful parts of words by this name. In other words, L. Bloomfield uses the concept of *morpheme* more than the language unit-word.

VMSolnsev, in the process of studying the opinions and comments of famous linguists such as IABouden de Courtenay, J. Vandries, L. Bloomfield, which we have considered above, about the morpheme, emphasizes the following:

1. The most important thing for J. Vandries is the independent (auxiliary) character of the morpheme.

2. For L. Bloomfield, the minimal character of the morpheme is important, and its place in the language system and its relation to other units are not of primary importance. Therefore, in the teaching of L. Bloomfield, both simple and independent words and meaningful parts of the word are included in the morpheme sentence.

3. IABoduen de Courtenay also notes the minimal form of the morpheme. However, it is emphasized that its place in the language system and its relation to other units are important. Baudouin of the word minimum meaningful part morpheme that calls

In our opinion, L. Bloomfield's comments about the linguistic nature of the morpheme are comprehensive and close to the truth. Hajman conforms to the definition of a morpheme in that both minimal simple words and independent words do not break down again and convey a specific meaning. In IABoduende Courtene's remarks, it is mentioned about the minimum units of a morpheme, which are mainly related to a word and make up its meaningful part.

J. Vandries also understands the morpheme in a relatively narrow sense. Therefore, it gives feedback on auxiliary words, formal parts of speech, stress and intonation. The root part of the word is not counted as a morpheme.

VMSoln t sev objects to the interpretation of simple words in the style of morphemes in the theory of L. Bloomfield. He says that simple words also have a zero-form morpheme, and therefore it is inappropriate to interpret them as an indivisible unit [VM Soln t sev 1971: 246-247].

It is true that in simple words, non-morpheme is also observed. A single morpheme can never be defined as a morpheme, and it has a grammatical meaning. A simple word-form morpheme expresses a lexical meaning. For example, it is natural that the words *to ш, бoш, кoш, дoш, etc.* also have a singular grammatical meaning. If we imagine these words in the style of *t o sh + l o q, bosh+liq, k o n+ga, d o n +*, then the root and affix morphemes are in *x usus* it will be possible to run. But in this place, let's say that they have three morphs (*tosh- root morph + unitary meaning : no lm orf + affixal morph e ma*) would it be right?

On the other hand, the existence of non-morphism cannot be denied. In our opinion, G. Glis o n's opinion about this is somewhat instructive. G. Gliss does not deny the existence of modern art. But Kin also points out that the widespread use of the concept of allomorph, which does not have its own material meaning, can lead to some confusion. In addition, the scientist realizes that the concept of morphology cannot justify itself logically, and that is why it is impossible to allow abuse in the application of this concept. Hida emphasizes [G.Glis o n 1959:119].

In fact, it is necessary to skillfully use the concept of non-morpheme in the process of linguistic analysis of language material. Otherwise, different meanings stupidity can be allowed. For example, the word *eye* can have singular and plural grammatical meanings at the same time. Based on this, this word is a unit that gives lexical and two grammatical meanings, more precisely, the root morpheme + grammatical meaning. If we interpret it in the form of

non - morpheme + grammatical sense , it is obvious that the concept of non - morpheme has been misused . let's At this point , the following principles of VBKasevich are also relevant : noga the word is made up of two morphemes *that* have a subject and a subject : *nog + a* . The expressive aspect of *a* single morpheme also includes Grammatical meanings such as singularity *and singularity* However , for each of these grammatical meanings , there are no separate expressions (complexes of sounds) . Therefore, at the same time - *a* minimal b e is felt [VB Kasevich 1977 : 53].

Some interesting aspects of morpheme interpretation , as mentioned above , have led some linguists to the conclusion that another term should be used ldi

Y. Stepanov states that the smallest grammatical form is *a morph* . When the scientist says morph, he understands an indivisible unit that preserves the integrity of meaning. In the teaching of Y. Stepanov, it is shown that there are the following types of morphs: 1. The root morph that forms the main part of the word. 2. Affix morphs with categorical meaning.

Since the expressive aspect of a morph is inextricably linked with phonemes, it can be said that it consists of positional variants (or allophones) of phonemes.

Y. Stepanov reminds that the concept of *morpheme is higher than the concept of allomorph* , that morpheme requires a set of morphs. In this place, it is emphasized that morphemes are variant characteristics, while morphemes are invariant characteristics.

VBKasevich interprets the morpheme as a minimally meaningful unit, a minimally meaningful sign. He emphasizes that the analysis of language material should be carried out on the basis of the deductive method, and in this process, as a result of text segmentation, it is possible to have complete information about the smallest meaningful units-morphemes, each of which has its own representation. VBKasevich divides morphemes into two large groups: Independent (lexical) morphemes and auxiliary (grammatical) morphemes. For example, in the word *ruka* , *ruk* is an independent morpheme, and - *a* is an auxiliary morpheme.

VB Kasevich reminds that auxiliary morphemes cannot be used without the root morphemes they are connected to, and this situation is observed both in inflectional affixes and agglutinative affixes. However, agglutinative affixes can be used with one grammatical meaning each time, while inflectional affixes can be used with several grammatical meanings. For example, the suffix *-lar* in Turkish expresses only the plural meaning, and the affix *-i* in *Russian* expresses both the plural meaning and the initial agreement at the same time ... In addition, agglutinative affixes have a standard characteristic , that is, if only this affix is used to express a certain grammatical meaning, inflectional affixes in most cases come in different forms: *golosa, volosy, kolosya* , etc.

VB Kasevich includes preposition, article, auxiliary, conjunction, etc. as auxiliary grammatical morphemes. The members of the first type of these grammatical morphemes differ from the independent elements they depend on according to their positional characteristics, and therefore other elements can be inserted between them. Grammatical morphemes of the second type cannot acquire value without being separated from the stem or base to which they are attached.

We see that E.S. Kubryakova's comments about the morpheme and its interpretation are very close to VBKasevich's opinion in this regard. In other words, E.S. Kubryakova notes that in order to know the linguistic nature of the morpheme, it is necessary to divide the text into segments, and through this, it is easy to get the necessary information about the meaningful elements in the minimal state. However, VNGolovin emphasized that with the help

of this method, it is only possible to get information about the fact that morphemes consist only of the integration of phonemes, there will be no opportunity to study their functional weight, the subtlety of meaning unique to each of them. emphasizes. He mentions that it is desirable to study a morpheme as a language unit rather than a segment of a text.

Uzbek linguistics has also conducted research on the linguistic nature of the morpheme, and scientific opinions have been given about it. In these comments, it is scientifically defined that a morpheme is an indivisible, smallest meaningful part of a word (M. Mirzayev, S. Usmonov, I. Rasulov. Uzbek language. - Tashkent, 1978; Sh. Shoabdurahmanov, M. Askarova et al. Modern Uzbek literature. - Tashkent, 1980; A. Hojiyev. System of word formation in Uzbek. - Tashkent, 2007; A. Hojiyev. Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms. - Tashkent, 1985; Sh. Rakhmatullayev. Contemporary literary Uzbek language. -Tashkent, 2006.).

It provides excellent information about the appearance of the morpheme in the root position and about the affix morphemes. Also. We will see that the influence of the morpheme in the system of word formation is also covered in detail.

In the textbook "General Linguistics" by NABaskov, ASSodikov, AAAbduazizov, published in 1979, the concept of morpheme is interpreted in a more extensive and scientifically based way. The definition of morpheme is given as follows: "The smallest meaningful unit of language (a stage of morphology) is called a *morpheme*."

This definition, of course, covers all types of morpheme. In addition, A. Abduazizov (the author of the morphology section of the mentioned textbook) states that each appearance of morphemes is called a morph and that it can be represented by a complex of phonemes, and sometimes by a single phoneme, that the sum of morphs constitutes a *morpheme* is also discussed in detail. At the same time, each morph stands in an additional distribution compared to another morph, and the morphs that can be used in one position (surrounding) are *allomorphs*, i.e. variants of the morpheme. The scientist also provides sufficient information about the zero morpheme. However, A. Abduazizov does not comment on morphemes in the form of auxiliary words. In addition, the following remark of the scientist, in our opinion, is explanatory: "... it is not possible to insert other words into one word structure, but one morpheme can be inserted into another morpheme."

A. Abduazizov refers to LS Barkhudarov in this place and cites the word *ishq-i-boz* as an example. In our opinion, it seems that at the moment some madness of thought has been allowed. If we consider the infix *i* as a morpheme, then the rule of step relation is not violated. Bourdieu, if we understand it as a second morpheme being inserted into a morpheme, the rule of gradualness is violated.

Sh. Rakhmatullayev's textbook known as "Current Literary Uzbek Language" also provides excellent information about morphemes. In the textbook, a morpheme is defined as the smallest segmental unit of a language structure that expresses a grammatical meaning. Sh. Rahmatullayev rightly points out that the smallest segment of a morpheme expressing meaning is a unit. But there seems to be something missing here in the definition of the morpheme. In other words, the concept of root morpheme is being neglected at the moment.

Sh.Rakhmatullayev: "It should be included in the definition that the main sign of a morpheme is a unit representing a grammatical meaning. Then the concepts and terms of "lexical morpheme" and "root morpheme" will be abandoned," he writes. There is no doubt that this opinion of the scientist was expressed with the aim of freeing the concept of

morpheme from the current interpretation problems and interpreting it as simply as possible. However, in our view, it seems difficult to abandon the concept of the root morpheme. Sh.Rakhmatullayev himself used the concept of "lexical morpheme" in the textbook. The lexical nature of the morpheme, in our opinion, requires the understanding of root morphemes. In addition, we include words-like connectives and auxiliaries as root morphemes. In addition to the above, the mentioned textbook emphasizes that lexeme is a unit belonging to the vocabulary stage of language construction, and morpheme is a unit belonging to the morpheme stage of language construction. At the same time, one can fully agree with the idea that the lexeme is a unit belonging to the vocabulary stage (composition) of language construction. But in this case, we should consider not only lexemes without morphemes, but also artificial words.

A. Hojiyev rightly stated that regardless of whether a morpheme comes in the form of an affix or a word, it can also serve for the syntactic function of a phrase or a sentence : *three legs of the apparatus are sticking out* (S. Ahmad). *...after a couple of days, he realized that there should be a big meeting on the matter of Yozyovan* (S.Ahmad).

In the first of the given examples, the affix *-li* is added to the noun phrase (with a tarpaulin cover) and turns it into an adjective, while in the second one, the device equivalent to the sentence like " *There must be a large group*" is acting as a part of the sentence under the influence of the affix *-li* . However, there are cases where the affix morpheme (morphemes in general) is interpreted as a speech unit. For example, Y. Tojiyev states the following about this: "...in relation to the main morpheme, it is not an affix at all, but it participates as a subordinate morpheme with a specific meaning and function, and has this status. Therefore, it belongs to the language unit as an affix in general, it is also considered a speech unit due to the fact that it forms a verb with such and such a meaning and joins the main morpheme with such and such a meaning."

At the same time, Y. Tojiyev gives an example with the affix *-la* . This affix exists as a linguistic unit - mainly as a verb-forming and form-forming affix. It is also used in a different sense in the word *knife* , but in constructions such as *hug* or *yogurt* . With the manifestation of this possibility, it is also a speech unit.

Y. Tojiyev was able to perfectly explain the linguistic nature of the morpheme, especially the affix morpheme. He correctly noted that the morpheme is a linguistic unit, and at the same time, he emphasized that affix morphemes have the ability to require a speech unit in the formation of some artificial words. Most importantly, despite the fact that there are some controversial points in the scientist's opinions, at the same time, language and speech phenomena are studied separately.

Thus, we see that there are different, sometimes contradictory, opinions about the linguistic nature of morphemes in current linguistics. However, in most of these views, the morpheme is interpreted as an indivisible, smallest meaningful unit of the language.

References:

1. Abduazizov A.A. Phonology and morphonology of the Uzbek language. -Tashkent: Teacher, 1992, 135 p.
2. Baskakov N.A., Sodikov A.S., Abduazizov A.A. General linguistics.-Tashkent: Teacher, 1979, 190 p.

3. Bloomfield L. Yazyk. - M. : URSS , 2002 , 606 p .
4. Gleason G. Introduction to descriptive linguistics. - M.: Izd. inost. Literature, 1959, 485 p.
5. Kasevich V.B. Elementy obshchey linguistics. - M.: Nauka, 1977, 182 p.
6. Mirzaev M., Usmanov S., Rasulov I. Uzbek language. - Tashkent, 1978.
7. Rahmatullayev Sh. Contemporary literary Uzbek language. - Tashkent : University, 2006 , 463 p.
8. Solntsev V.M. Yaz y k kak s i stemno-strukturnoe obrazovanie. - M. : Nauka, 1971 , 292 p.
9. Stepanov Yu.S. V mire semiotiki // Semiotics. - M., 1983.
10. Stepanov Yu.S. Osnovy obshchego yazykoznaniya. - M.: Prosveshchenie, 1975, 271 p.
11. Tojiev Yo. About the word, lexeme, word form, morpheme, morphemics // Uzbek language and literature, 2008, No. 6, pp. 42-45.
12. Hojiev A. Annotated dictionary of linguistic terms. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1985, 144 p.
13. Hojiev A. Morphemics // Current Uzbek literary language. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1980, (159-205), 443 p.
14. Hojiev A. Reflections on the main units of language construction // Uzbek language and literature, 2005, #4. 46-49 p.
15. Hojiev A. Uzbek word formation system. - Tashkent: Teacher, 2007, 165 pages.
16. Shoabdurahmonov Sh., Askarova M., Hojiev A., Rasulov I., Doniyorov Kh. Modern Uzbek literary language. Part 1. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1980, 445 p.

