

TYOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LANGUAGE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATURE OF THE SIGNIFICANT FUNCTION OF PHONEMES

*B. Gafurov*¹

Abstract:

This research thesis is aimed at identifying typological characteristics of language through phonetic-morphological analysis of the nature of the significant phonemic function. The validity of this process is associated with the inseparable phono-morphological connection of the phoneme and morpheme, since under certain word-formation circumstances within a lexeme and even a word form, a phoneme can easily induce morphemic manifestations in itself and vice versa. This and some other characteristic features of the functioning of phonemes through the prism of the morphological field are considered in the proposed scientific work.

Key words: morpheme, phoneme, borrowing, vocabulary, root, word formation, assimilation.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.2024/myxorx17>

In each language the number of morphemes is approximately the same and fluctuates between 3 and 5 thousand. All languages, even those with a high degree of cultural development, have borrowings from other languages. Thus, English contains up to 65% of Romanisms, i.e. words of Latin and Old French origin. In Japanese, about 65% are Sinicisms. The adopted borrowings are adapted in their morphophonological structure to the rules for assembling morphemes from phonemes accepted in a given language. In fact, this is what the adoption of a borrowing consists of. Let us consider the word 'seminar', which etymologically comes from the Russian language and entered the Chinese vocabulary, transforming into the word form 'si-min-na-era': The word-formation aspect of this lexeme comes from the fact that the syllables in it are built according to the phonetic and morphological norms that exist in the Chinese language and also acquired a morphemic aspect: si- ('in detail') -min ('to understand') -na ('accepted') -era (noun suffix). The Russian word bread in Chinese is le-ba, etc. When assimilating borrowings from phonetic and morphologically similar languages, their morphemic structure is not modified. The principle of constructing morphemes from phonemes is the most stable and quantitative characteristic of some types of languages. For example, the Chinese language has a morphemic formula IR: 21 (consonants) x 30 (vowels) x 4 (tones) = 2451 syllables and morphemes, of which about 1100 are realized. In the Khinarg language, the formula is as follows: SU - 53 x 17 = 901 syllable-morphemes. The morphemic formula in the Turkic language of the Orkhon inscription is CVCC, that is, 17 x 12 x 17 x 17 x 17 = 58,956. It should be noted that not all consonant phonemes occur at the beginning or end of a syllable. The potential number of morphemes in Tagalog for which the phonological morphemic formula is CVCVC is: 15 x 3 x 15 x 15 x 15 x 3 = 2451. The number of syllables in Japanese is 45. The root and base morphemes here are two- and three-syllable, and their number is comparable to the number of potential Tagil morphemes: 4 5 x 45 = 2025. In Indo-European languages (especially Russian), the number of potential sound combinations of morphemes is not limited. This is due to the fact that in Indo-European languages, the number of syllables in a morpheme can vary greatly. There is a certain balance in the ratio of

¹ *Gafurov Bakhtiyor Zakirovich, Bukhara state medical institute DSc in Philology, professor of the department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Russian and English languages*

vowels and consonants, when languages with a large number of consonants have relatively fewer vowels, and languages with a smaller number of consonants have relatively more vowels, and there is no standard phonetic formula for the number of phonemes in a morpheme. For example, in Arabic, the potential number of morphemes is calculated using the formula: $c o / vCo / vCo / vCo / v - 28 \times 28 \times 28 = 28145$.

These calculations do not take into account imperfective forms of morphemes. For example, the Tagalog perfective root formula is CVCVC, but Tagalog also has the abbreviations CV, V, CVC, and CVCV. The same is true for the Sami languages, which, in addition to the roots «1-letter» C-C-C, «1-letter» C-C-C, «1-letter» C, and «2-letter» C-C, have «3-letter» C-C. In addition, each language has a number of words with roots whose phoneme configuration is larger than that represented by the corresponding formula. For example, Tagalog has a word with the phoneme CVCVCVCVC, and Arabic has a word with the "four-letter" phoneme C-C-C-C. However, such computational subtleties cannot change the numerical order of potential morphemes. The example languages can be arranged numerically as follows. The data on this are given in Table 1 below:

1	2	3	4	5
Khinalug	Tagalog, Japanese	Chinese	Turkic, Arabic	Indo- European
890	2125	2451	28145	-

In the Khinalug languages, the number of syllables representing individual morphemes is significantly less than the number of morphemes necessary for the functioning of the language. Let us call such languages morphophonological inferior. Such a language needs morphosyntactic diversity. Morphological diversity can be achieved in only two ways:

- paradigmatically - by developing morphemic polysemy and synonymy;
- syntactically - by combining morphemes (morphosyntax).

Morphosyntax is equally oriented toward the formation of complex morphemes from simple ones and toward the formation of words by combining simple and complex word roots and word stems with auxiliary morphemes (according to uniform morphosyntactic rules). Such languages are called morphologically related. Etymology is difficult to determine due to polysemy and synonymy of word roots. Rows 2 and 3 in the table above are occupied by languages in which spelling has morphological significance (morphological and syllabic boundaries coincide). However, there are exceptions when one morpheme can consist of several syllables. The grammar of such languages is based on the principle of articulation. This means that auxiliary morphemes are added to nominal morphemes without changing the phonemic structure of the root or stem. Word formation occurs according to the principles of morphemic composition and word formation. The process of harmonization is expressed to a lesser extent or is not expressed at all.

Tagalog has relatively few homophones, Japanese often has homophones, and Chinese often has homophonized roots. From Tagalog, which has relatively few homophones, to Japanese, where homophones are common, and Chinese, where there are many homophones: $cvcvcvc \rightarrow cvcvc(cvc) \rightarrow IR$. In Turkic and Semitic languages (4th row), where morphemes are formed from phonemes, the number of potential phoneme combinations is orders of magnitude greater than the number of necessary morphemes. Thus, stem homophony is minimal here, and the nature of the acquisition of morphemes from phonemes strictly determines the order of combination of partitive and pragmatic morphemes and quantitatively limits the potential number of such combinations. In Turkic languages, vowels are included directly in the roots of words. These are suffixal languages, and suffixes are added to the roots of words according to strict rules: from suffixes without a general meaning to suffixes with a more general meaning, denoting the endings of words. The process of assimilation is a common phenomenon here.

In Arabic, the consonants of the root and the grammatical meanings of the "three letters" are transmitted by sound reduction.

In languages where morphosyntactic competence significantly exceeds morphosyntactic requirements, strict morphosyntactic ordering is realized either by suffixation or by transposition. Such languages are called morphologically ordered.

The Indo-European morphologically ordered type (row-5) does not imply an exact formula for the order or number of phonemes in morphemes. The processes of habituation and assimilation are widespread here. Morphemic types are fusional, the phonemic structure of the affix is reflected in the structure of the word stem and vice versa. Stress is generally mobile and can influence the process of redistribution of morphological boundaries within a word. Morphological segmentation of words does not depend on the segmentation of syllables. Such languages are called morphologically free.

References:

[1]. Azizkhodzhaeva N.N. *Pedagogical technologies and pedagogical skills*, Tashkent, 2003. 2. Z.I. Esina, A.S. Ivanova, NI. Soboleva, E.V. Sorokina, GA. Suchkova, T.V. *Educational program in Russian as a foreign language. Elementary level. Basic level. First certification level 1 Auto. coll.: Shustikova, M.M. Nakhbina, V.A.*

[2]. Gafurov B.Z. *Study of advertising texts in Russian on the topic of medical terminology. International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT). – Indonesia. Vol. 26. No. 1, April 2021. – pp. 586-590.*

[3]. Gafurov *Analysis of medical version in texts of advertising of hygiene products in the fight against COVID-19 (on the material of Russian and Uzbek languages). Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning (EJEDL). –Indonesia. Vol. 3, Issue 1, January 2022. – pp. 32-39.*

[4]. Gafurov *The relationship between culture and language in the learning process. Eurasian journal of social sciences, philosophy and culture. Volume 3 Issue 5, May 2023. – Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent. – pp. 55-63.*

[5]. Gafurov B.Z. *The main features of kinesthetic style in the learning process. International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities. Finland Academic Research Science Publishers Solana, Cagayan Valley, Philippines. Volume-11. Issue-5. Published: 05/22/2023. – pp. 61-69.*

[6]. Gafurov B.Z. *Specification of error correction in language learning process. IJSSIR, Vol. 12, No. 05 May 2023 – Burnaby, Canada. – pp. 8-13.*