

Morphonologie im kreis moderner sprachdisziplinen
Zaynutdinova Makhliyo Bobomurodovna

Doktorandin des grundlegenden Doktoratsstudiums (PhD) im Fachgebiet 10.00.04 - "Sprachen und Literatur der Völker Europas, Amerikas und Australiens" der National University of Uzbekistan benannt nach Mirzo Ulugbek, Taschkent, Usbekistan.

E-mail: zaynutdinovam28@gmail.com

Zusammenfassung: Der Artikel widmet sich der Betrachtung des Verhältnisses zwischen Morphonologie und modernen Sprachwissenschaften. Dieser Artikel beschreibt die Haltung verschiedener Sprachschulen zur Zuordnung der Morphonologie als eigenständige Disziplin in der Sprachwissenschaft.

Schlüsselwörter: Morphonologie, Morphologie, Sprachschulen, vergleichend-historische Linguistik, Morphonem, Submorph.

Morphology in the circle of modern linguistic disciplines
Zaynutdinova Makhliyo Bobomurodovna

Doctoral candidate of basic doctoral studies (PhD) in specialty 10.00.04 - "Languages and literature of the peoples of Europe, America and Australia" of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

E-mail: zaynutdinovam28@gmail.com

Abstract: the article is devoted to the consideration of the relationship between morphonology and modern linguistic disciplines. This article describes the attitude of different linguistic schools to the allocation of morphonology as a separate discipline in linguistic knowledge.

Keywords: morphonology, morphology, linguistic schools, comparative-historical linguistics, morphoneme, submorph.

Introduction

Morphonology is one of the youngest branches of linguistics. The word morphonology itself is a combination of two words: morphology and phonology: linguistic education morphophonology is a result of hapology, i.e. omission of one of two immediately following one after the other identical syllables acquired the form of morphonology.

Morphonology (from morpho-phonology) is a branch of the science of language that studies phonemes as part of morphemes. Problems of morphology have long been included in the introductory sections to morphology, although the term itself is relatively new. The corresponding problems were developed thoroughly in ancient Indian grammar, in the Semitic grammatical tradition and in the Indo-European comparative-historical grammar. Not a single scientific description of languages can do without it, especially languages with a branched morphonological system of the inflectional type.

Morphonology is a branch of linguistics that studies the patterns of structure, phonemic composition and variation of morphemes of a particular language, which are not fully derived from the features of its phonology, as well as a set of phenomena of a morphological nature inherent in a given language [1]. In many works written in English (and sometimes in Russian), morphonology is called morphophonemics.

The existence of morphonology as a special level of the language system, different from phonology, is determined by the fact that some phenomena related to the use and change of the sounds of the language (for example, the change of Russian unstressed *o* into a vowel close to *a*) can be described without referring to information about the morpheme the composition of words (in Russian, an unstressed *o* is generally impossible), while others (for example, the softening of *л* before *ш* in the *генеральша* word - cf. *генерал*) - no (the combination of *лш* in Russian is possible, but only within a morpheme, cf. *волшебный*). The distinction between phenomena of the first and second types (most frequently, rather inconsistent) was presented in one form or another by ancient

Indian grammarians, later, with the emergence of comparative-historical linguistics, in the works of many Indo-Europeanists of the 19th century, as well as representatives of the Kazan linguistic school - I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, N.V. Krushevsky and others.

The outstanding Russian linguist N.S. Trubetsky is rightfully considered the creator of morphonology as an independent linguistic discipline, in whose works of the late 1920s - early 1930s the independence of morphonology was convincingly substantiated, its goals and objectives were formulated, and a description of the morphonological systems of the Polabian and Russian languages. N.S. Trubetsky also owns the term "morphonology" (from "morpho-phonology") [1].

LITERATURE REVIEW

A significant role in the development of morphonology was played by L. Bloomfield's article on the Menominee language (1939), dedicated to the memory of N.S. Trubetsky. In subsequent years, a friend and colleague of Trubetsky R.O. Jakobson, as well as S.B. Bernshtein, T.V. Bulygina, N.A. Eskova, A.A. Zaliznyak made an important contribution to the development of the morphological theory and the description of the morphology of specific languages, V.B. Kasevich, A.K. Polivanova, S.M. Tolstaya, V.G. Churganova, R. Lyaskovsky, B. Kreyta, A.V. Isachenko, V. Dressler, H. Andersen, D.S. Worth, B. Darden, T.M. Lightner, E. Stankevich, M. Halle, I. Sh. Morin, V. Wurzel and others.

The most fruitful period in this regard was the period from the 1960s to the first half of the 1970s. It seems appropriate even to talk about the "morphonological boom" that has come over these years. Since the second half of the 1970s, interest in morphonology has largely fallen, and only recently has it begun to revive again [1].

A distinctive feature of morphonology as a science, conditioned, on the one hand, by its relative "youth", and on the other, by the inevitable dependence of the interpretation of morphonological phenomena by representatives of various linguistic schools on the concepts of morphology and phonology adopted in these schools, is the almost complete absence of generally accepted theoretical positions and disagreements even on such key issues as the subject of morphonology, its boundaries, the presence of morphonology's own units of description and their nature, the existence of a special morphonological level of representation of word forms.

The tasks of morphonology undoubtedly include, firstly, the study of the structure of morphemes of various classes, and secondly, the description of the system of morphonological alternations available in the language. It is unclear, however, whether it is possible to obtain truly significant scientific results in the first of these areas.

The main task of morphonology is the description of systems of morphonological alternations. The exact establishment of the range of phenomena corresponding in a particular language to the concept of "morphological alternation" is far from a trivial task and largely depends on the accepted method of description: the same phenomenon can be interpreted as morphonological or as phonological (automatic) alternation, as alternation or as a synonymy of morphemes, etc. So, the alternation of the Russian fluent *o* with *zero sound* can be interpreted both as morphonological, occurring only in some morphemes (compare *зудок* – *зудка*, but *седок* – *седока*, *посол* – *посла*, but *укол* – *укола*), and as phonological, occurring before the combination "consonant + vowel" - but in the latter case, two different units should be included in the number of vowel phonemes of the Russian language: / o₁/ (not fluent) and / o₂/ (fluent) [2].

In the 1970s-1980s, the idea of describing morphonology, put forward by V.G. Churganova and I.A. Mel'chuk, was widespread not in terms of morphemes, but in terms of submorphs - chains of morphemes that formally coincide with morphemes, but not necessarily carry a meaning (cf. submorph - *eu* in *лар-еу*, where it is a suffix, and in a *ченеу*, where it is included in the root). The rationale for such a decision is, firstly, the fact that morphonology deals with signifying morphemes, but not with their signifieds, and secondly, the ability to formulate the rules of alternation in a simpler and more general form (for example, the transition from *у* to *ч* in the *ларчик*, the *ченчик* can be described as a property of the submorph - *eu*, but not the suffix - *eu*) [1].

The range of tasks of morphonology is not limited to the creation of a general morphological theory and the construction of complete morphonological descriptions of individual languages; no less important is the development of such areas as morphological typology and diachronic morphology, which are currently only making their first steps.

In modern linguistics, there are the following scientific directions of the morphological study of languages:

1. The theory of alternations by I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay and N. Krushevsky;
2. Morphonological theory of N.S. Trubetsky and R.O. Jakobson;
3. Theory of morphonemics in American descriptive linguistics (L. Bloomfield);
4. E. Stankevich's theory of morphonemics;
5. The theory of the cyclical nature of the morphonological rules of M. Halle and T. M. Lightner;
6. Morphonological directions of Russian linguists (V.A. Redkin, A.N. Tikhonov, V.G. Churganova);
7. Morphonological concept of V.B. Kasevich;
8. Theory of the morphonological description of the languages of Russian Germanists: E.A. Makaeva, E.S. Kubryakova, Yu.G. Pankrats;
9. Morphonological concepts in the study of Turkic and other languages;
10. Morphonological concepts of A.I. Smirnitsky and O.S. Akhmanova;
11. Morphonological theory of American structuralists and generative linguistics [1].

As you can see, the structure of morphology is much more complex and broader than the range of issues and phenomena that N.S. Trubetsky included in morphology.

The brightest era in the development of morphonology was the period from the late 60s to the early 80s. of XX century. Since of all linguistic disciplines, morphology is most closely related to morphology, there is no doubt that this "morphological boom" was a direct consequence of the "morphological boom" of the 60s. [1]. It was in the 60s - 70s that such important works on the theory and history of morphonology were published (Guard 1965; Churganova 1967, 1980; Tolstaya 1971; Kilbury 1974; Bulygina 1975, 1977; Bybee, Brewer 1980) and others.

The milestone that marked the end of this stage in the development of theoretical morphonology was the almost simultaneous publication in the mid-1980s of three monographs, the very titles of which are "Morphonology in the Description of Languages" by E.S. Kubryakova and Yu.G. Pankrats (1983) and "Morphonology " V.B. Kasevich (1986) - testified to the final, generalizing nature of their work.

Nevertheless, even during this period, morphonology continued to remain on the periphery of the main paths of development of linguistics of the 20th century and, in particular, was ignored by a number of large scientific schools (primarily Western European). Therefore, it is not surprising that from the mid-1980s the situation in this area began to rapidly change for the worse: the number of works on the general theory of morphonology all over the world began to decline, and the study of Russian morphonology generally found itself in a deep crisis. It is indicative that almost all of the above linguists by the beginning of the 80s for various reasons moved away from active work in this area, and the influx of new names into it completely stopped even earlier - by the beginning of the 90s.

It could be assumed that such a deep and, as it is now clear, rather prolonged decline in interest in morphonology in general and in Russian morphonology in particular, was objective in nature and was simply caused by the exhaustion of the relevant problematics (as happened, for example, with classical phonology). Meanwhile, let us recall such statements that have already become textbooks such as "although the lack of general acceptance of certain theoretical concepts is by no means an exception for any other area of linguistic research, morphonology occupies almost the first place in this respect" [2] and is still not there is not a single complete, synthetic description of Russian morphonology [5]. All this may indicate the urgent need to resume morphonological studies at a new, higher level. As for the morphological typology, in the absence of any holistic morphonological theories and an acute shortage of properly ordered factual data (it should be noted

that the Russian language is perhaps the most studied language in the world from the point of view of morphonology) to talk about it seriously, in fact affairs is impossible.

Taking into account the morphonological factors proper made it possible to create a new, more rigorous and systematic description of morphonological phenomena not only of inflection, but also of word formation. So, in the section "Morphonological phenomena in word formation" of "Russian grammar", the author of the main part of which is VV Lopatin [4], morphonological alternations are described as a natural synchronous phenomenon due to the properties of the connected parts of the word - the stem and the formant. For this, a preliminary morphonological classification of Russian bases and derivational formants is made, which are divided into vocal and consonant.

CONCLUSION

The morphonological aspect turned out to be very important for the Russian accentuation. The study of the relationship between the stress and the morphemic composition of the Russian, Old Russian and Proto-Slavic words are devoted to the works of such famous linguists as V.A. Dybo and A.A. Zaliznyak [3]. It was found, for example, that the place of stress in a Russian derivative word depends primarily on the properties of the suffix - it is it which, in the general, determines the stress / unstressedness of the stem and the place of stress in it.

At present, interest in morphonological problems is growing again, as there is a growing need to comprehend the results obtained and to solve a still unresolved problem - the problem of a single systemic and functional description of Russian morphonology for word formation and inflection. This is evidenced, in particular, by the separation of morphonology as a separate discipline in some educational programs in the Russian language and the release of new works on Russian morphonology, describing the phenomena of word formation and inflection as a whole.

REFERENCES

1. Abduazizov A. A. General linguistics, - T., 2012.
2. Bulygina T.V. Problems of the theory of morphological models. M., 1977.
3. Tolstaya S.M. Morphonology. Morphemics // Review of works on modern Russian literary language for 1974-1977. / Word formation. - M., 1982.
4. Lopatin V.V. Russian derivational morphemics. - M., 1977.
5. Zaliznyak A.A. Russian nominal inflection. - M., 1967.