

DERIVATIONAL MORPHEMES AND THEIR VARIATION**Ibatova Amira Shavkatovna**Associate Professor (PhD) of the Department of “Languages”
of Samarkand branch of Tashkent University of Information Technologies

UZBEKISTAN, Samarkand

Email id: amiraibatova1911@gmail.com

Annotation: The article discusses the problems of studying derivational morphemes that form a new lexeme, which is crucial for understanding its very essence. It may be characterized by variation due to the influence of various factors and allowing for quantitative research, and an indispensable condition for morpheme variants is that they have phonetic similarities and research morphological phenomena in close connection with syntactic and lexical phenomena and based on certain linguistic research methods. In addition, the analysis procedure itself contained a significant defect, which consisted in the fact that the use of the morpheme of similarity in substantive bases was interpreted as its distributive feature – compatibility with the bases of certain semantic categories or sub-categories.

Keywords: derivation, word, approached, derivational morphemes, modelling, methods, variation, lexeme, syntaxeme, affixal, formation, abstraction.

1. Introduction

As is well known, the study of al, or formation, morphemes, which is largely associated with great theoretical difficulties. Indicative in this regard are the existing disagreements on the problem of derivation (or affixal word formation), which some researchers associate with lexicology, others with grammar [Lopatin 1977: 3]. L. V. Shcherba word formation differently, distinguishing, on the one hand, "the rules of word formation, i.e. the question of how to make new words," which is what one of the main departments of grammar does, on the other hand, the question of "how finished words are made," is, he believed, "a matter of the dictionary, where the divisibility of a word should be given, if its composition is still felt and can be an effective factor." "speeches" (parole)..." [Shcherba 1958: 17]. In the study of the functional specificity of derivational morphemes to the general problems of linguistic analysis, however, we cannot but keep in mind the close links of the latter with grammar, from which it actually grew.

In one of the articles of the early 80s, derivational morphemes were characterized as elementary functional units of the morphological level of the language, which are represented in

the language by systems of variants, have signs of distributive order and are determined using experimental and modeling methods [Mukhin 1982:172]. Distributive features of such morphemes were associated with their use in the basics the corresponding part of speech and their location. Attempting to solve this problem at that time, in linguistics, the experience of functional analysis of elementary units of different levels of language, in particular, and especially our own experience of functional analysis of elementary syntactic units – syntaxes, which indicates that the sign of external similarity does not play a decisive role in identifying syntaxeme variants.

II. Experimental methods

Accordingly, it is necessary to determine the variant systems of some derivational morphemes, regardless of their external similarity or difference, taking into account only their meaning and distributional features. Thus, the English adjectives have the suffixes -ly, -like, -ish, -u, as well as -form, -oid, -ous, -ine, -ed as morpheme variants with the meaning of similarity (likeness to what is indicated by the base), which sometimes replace each other with some and the same basics (womanly – womanlike – womanish, etc.). All of them are found in the basics of nouns, subdivided according to their belonging to one of three semantic categories, denoting (1) animate objects, (2) specific inanimate objects, (3) substances and natural phenomena. Further, in order to better characterize the compatibility of these various suffixes with substantive bases, the latter were differentiated within each semantic category by sub-categories, and the number of such semantic sub-categories of substantive bases could be very significant and they could overlap.

Aggregates of words formed by identical or unambiguous word-formation suffixes are called word-formation or derivational categories. There are categories of diminution, magnification, collectivity, and abstraction.

III. Development of oral speech skills

The development of comparative word formation became possible only after the problems of word formation became the subject of lively scientific interest and frontal research on the theory and methodology of word formation was created, based on compliance with the principles of system-functional study, operating with a stable conceptual and terminological apparatus, a proven technology of word formation description. The last three decades have been an important stage in the development of word formation science. This period was marked by major achievements in the development of the theory and method of word formation analysis. A word can be considered in its relation to the system of sound means of its expression – the phonological tier; it can be considered in relation to the system of its significant independent parts (repeated in other words) – the morphological tier; finally, in its relation to the system of combinations with other words – the syntactic tier. The distinction between the structural tiers of a language is based not only on

the difference in the units of sections, but also on the quality of the abstraction that defines them. Lexical abstraction a word is not directly related to a thing, but to a whole class of things. Common names and proper names represent different degrees of lexical abstraction. Grammatical abstraction is a different quality: you can attach a morph to any morph in terms of meaning this is an abstraction of features and relationships.

Lexical meaning is the correlation of the sound shell of a word with the corresponding objects or phenomena of objective reality. The lexical meaning consists of features that determine related properties for a number of objects, actions, and phenomena, as well as establish differences that distinguish a given object, action, or phenomenon. Consider a frequently cited example. The lexical meaning of the word "giraffe" is defined as follows: "an African artiodactyl ruminant with a very long neck and long legs," that is, those signs that distinguish a giraffe from other animals are listed. The signs of difference are listed. The lexical analysis of a word is the identity of a word and an object. Semantic analysis (feature analysis) this is the decomposition of morphemes of a word into semantic meanings and signs, and the identity of semantic signs to an object or phenomenon. Semantic analysis (feature analysis) this is the identity of the word and the meanings of morphemes. All words of the Russian language have meaning and signs. A word can have one lexical meaning (these are unambiguous words) or two, three, or more lexical meanings (polysemous). Polysemous words exist in all independent parts of speech, except for numerals.

IV. Activity monitoring

In this regard, it should be noted that combining seemingly different suffixes as variants of the same morpheme of similarity led to an excessive complication of their analysis, which also hardly allowed us to single out the main variant of the morpheme. This alone could raise doubts about the legitimacy of their identification as variants of the same linguistic unit. In addition, the analysis procedure itself contained a significant defect, which consisted in the fact that the use of the morpheme of similarity in substantive bases was interpreted as its distributive feature – compatibility with the bases of certain semantic categories or sub-categories, although the substantive base, unlike the morpheme, does not belong to the number of elementary (non-separable) units and itself it can convey some lexical meaning by itself. Compatibility as a distributive feature presupposes the presence of homogeneous linguistic units (cf. compatibility of syntaxes with syntaxes or phonemes with phonemes, rather than syntaxes with syntagmas or phonemes with syllables).

The language system is an inventory of its units, grouped into categories and tiers according to typical relationships; the structure of the language is formed by the relationships between the tiers and parts of the units; therefore, the structure of the language is only one of the features of

the language system. The unit of a language, the category of a language, the tier of a language, language relations — these concepts do not coincide, although they are all important for revealing the concept of a language system. Language units are its permanent elements that differ from each other in their purpose, structure, and place in the language system. According to their purpose, the units of the language are divided into nominative, communicative and structural. The main nominative unit is the word (lexeme), the communicative unit is the sentence. The structural units of a language serve as a means of constructing and formatting nominative and communicative units; structural units are phonemes and morphemes, as well as word forms and word combinations. The units of the language are divided into categories and tiers of the language. Language categories are groups of homogeneous units of a language; categories are combined based on a common, categorical feature, usually semantic. So, in the Russian language there are such categories as tense and type of verb, case and gender of the name (noun and adjective), the category of collectivity. A language tier is a collection of the same type of units and categories of a language. The main levels are phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical. Both units within a category and categories within a tier are related to each other based on model relationships. Linguistic relations are those relationships that are found between tiers and categories, units and their parts. The main types of relationships are paradigmatic and syntagmatic, associative and hyponymic (hierarchical).

A morpheme is the minimum significant part of a word. As we already know, the phoneme (in speech, sound) is the absolutely minimum structural unit of a language. But the phoneme is not a significant unit of the language. Sounds taken in isolation have no meaning. The main significant unit of the language is the word. It is a nominative unit, that is, it names a concept. A morpheme, like a word, is a two-sided unit of a language. And what is its difference from the word? The word acts as a lexically and grammatically formed unit, is freely reproduced in speech and is part of larger units (phrases and sentences). The morpheme is reproduced in a connected way, only as part of a word. Unlike a sound, a morpheme has a meaning, but unlike a word, it does not name a concept. For example, we can formulate the meaning (more precisely, the values) of the prefix. Note: it can mean moving towards something, being near something, incompleteness of an action, or, conversely, its completeness, and these meanings are realized only as part of specific words, for example, to arrive, to run, to cover up, to finish off. Moreover, in order to formulate the meaning of a morpheme, we must first recall the words in which it is contained (single-structured words), and calculate, by comparing these words, which particular fragment of meaning falls on it.

V. Conclusion and Recommendation

However, combining various suffixes as morpheme variants with the meaning of similarity allowed us to realize and emphasize that the role of the ambiguity factor in functional analysis is limited and in each case needs to be clarified. The comparison of the suffix -u, considered as a variant of the morpheme of similarity, with the suffix -u as a variant of another morpheme having the meaning of completeness (completeness of what is indicated by the substantive basis), for example, in the adjectives crasty, greedy, spleeny, gossipy [ibid.: 140-141], may be indicative in this regard.

The fact that a derivational morpheme forms a new lexeme is crucial for understanding its very essence. It may be characterized by variation due to the influence of various factors and allowing for quantitative research, and an indispensable condition for morpheme variants is that they have phonetic similarities and research morphological phenomena in close connection with syntactic and lexical phenomena and based on certain linguistic research methods.

REFERENCES

1.Galperin I.R. On the problem of differentiation of speech styles // Problems of modern philology, Moscow: Nauka, 1965. pp. 70-84.

2.Mukhin A.M. Appositive connection in the structure of sentences. – In: Studies in Slavic Philology (posv. in memory of Academician V.V. Vinogradov). Moscow time. State University, Moscow: 1974. pp. 240-246.

3.JSGW – John Steinbeck.The Grapes of Wrath. – Moscow, Progress, 1978. – 530 p.