

Analysis of The Morphemic Structure of One-Word Phonetic Terminology

Kamalova Dilovar Azatkhanovna

senior teacher English language department of applied disciplines-3
 English language faculty-3, Uzbekistan state world languages university,
 Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

E-mail: dilyakamalova1@gmail.com

tel: +998 909785608

Abstract. This article considers about the question of what parts of speech the terms should be represented, whether the terminology of the area under study is limited to nouns or it also includes adjectives, verbs and other parts of speech, still remains relevant and extremely significant for modern terminology both in theoretical and in the applied aspect.

Key words: concepts of science, morphemic structure, one-word phonetic terminology, parts of speech, modern terminology.

It should be noted that today this problem still remains unresolved due to the existence of a large number of opposing points of view. According to A.V. Ivanov, “the search for an answer to the question of what part of speech can fully implement terminological functions and be a term should be carried out taking into account the whole range of problems solved within the terminological nomination” [Ivanov, 2007: 592-608]. So, in relation to noun terms as universal language units, disagreements practically do not arise among terminologists and linguists, since it is this part of speech that implements the main function of the term, the nominative one, to the maximum extent. As M.V. Kosov, “this function is characteristic, first of all, for the noun and the substantive subordinate phrase. Most scientific concepts have a fairly high degree of abstractness, and the rich semantics of the noun allows them to serve as a means of designating the main composition of the concepts of science” [Kosova, 2000: 228].

The point of view of O.S. Akhmanova, who states that “first of all, attention should be paid to the fact that in European languages the noun system is so developed, there are so unlimited possibilities to form verbal nouns and abstract nouns formed from adjectival stems that the main composition of the terminological list for these languages is quite can be exhausted by nouns” [Akhmanova, 1966:11].

In numerous definitions of the term, nominativity is the main characteristic and feature that distinguishes the term from the commonly used word. Nominal general scientific vocabulary is the basis for defining terms. Nominal units of a general scientific nature can also act as part of a complex term or serve as the basis for the formation of derivative terms.

So, A.V. Superanskaya, N.V. Podolskaya and N.V. Vasilyeva note that “the main unit on which the nomination (i.e., the fixation of selected phenomena of reality with the help of language names) is based in the general consciousness is the word. The nominative parts of speech include nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs ... Nouns can transpose the content of the words of all other nominative parts of speech and have the appropriate morphological means for this. Nouns are characterized by absolute nominative significance, somewhat weakened in other nominative parts of speech, which have

a reduced ability to convey the content of other parts of speech” [Superanskaya, Podolskaya, Vasilyeva, 1989: 97].

Taking as a basis the position that terminology should be considered in two areas, namely in the area of fixation and the area of functioning [Averbukh, 2004; Danilenko, 1971], it is advisable to trace whether all significant parts of speech capable of expressing concepts [Goder, 1961:50] can represent terms in the two above-mentioned areas.

In the sphere of fixation, the terms are sustained in relation to the forms of nominativity. Here the terminology is not the sum of the names of real things and actions, but a certain system of names of concepts about things and actions. Thus, the main lexical and grammatical means of expressing scientific and technical concepts about objects, qualities, actions in terminology are nouns and, naturally, phrases formed on their basis.

The situation is different when it comes to analyzing the structure of a derived word. According to a number of researchers [Marchand, 1969: 4-5; Meshkov, 1976: 27], the analysis of the structure of a derived word is complicated by two factors: a large number of allomorphic forms of word-forming affixes, mainly suffixes, which implies knowledge of a number of allomorphs of a particular suffix, and, secondly, difficulties associated with the separability of a word-forming affix, and, consequently, the assignment of the word to the category of derivatives. This is due to the fact that in English there is a significant number of lexical units borrowed together with word-formation affixes, but the roots of these words do not have independent use in this language. These words function in parallel with words in which, after subtracting the affix, a part equal to the full word remains (for example, document and government). This problem is logically solved in relation to the word formation of a common language, for example, by G. Marchand, who believes that such words as stupor, stupid, stupefy, receive, conceive, retain, detain are not derivatives [Marchand, 1969: 4-5]. He sees the reason for this in the fact that the suffixes and prefixes in these words do not have a semantic relationship with those parts of the word that remain after subtracting what is taken for a suffix or prefix.

It should be noted that there are many definitions of a derivative word. In many of them, the derivation of a word from a generating stem with the help of affixes is distinguished as a sign of a compound word. For example, P.M. Karashchuk, highlighting, among other things, linear and non-linear types of derivatives, gives them the following definition: “affixal formations resulting from the addition of words (stems) with affixes (suffixes or prefixes)” [Karashchuk, 1977: 13]. P.V. Tsarev defines derived words as “words consisting of a stem (root) and a suffix(s) or prefix(s)” [Tsarev, 1977: 7]. L.V. Bankevich defines a derived word as “a word that consists of a stem (stem) and a suffix or prefix”. At the same time, the basis is understood as any word or one of its forms, “which participates in the word-formation process and serves as the core (kernel) of a new word with a more complex structure” [Bankevitch, 1961: 3]. O.D. Meshkov notes that the word “is a derivative if it can be produced from a generating basis by members of a given language community.” In the event that a word appears in speech only as a “ready reproduced unit”, it cannot be classified as a derivative [Meshkov, 1976: 27].

Despite the apparent unanimity in the definition of a derivative word, its identification can still present certain difficulties. This seems to be due to the fact that the issue of the inventory of English affixes remains extremely complex and unresolved to this day, since the inclusion or non-inclusion of certain affixal morphemes in the list of elements capable of performing a word-formation function depends largely on the position of the authors.

The most productive way of word formation after affixation is compounding [Vasilevskaya, 1962: 37; Meshkov, 1976: 172; Plag, 2002: 164; Lieber, 2004: 46; Stepanova, 1979: 530]. The fundamental difference between affixation and compounding is that during affixation, only one component has an independent semantic meaning, while the other (or others) play an auxiliary role, while compound words are formed by combining two or more significant (nominal) bases into one lexical unit.) words.

Taking the word-formation approach as a basis, it is important to determine whether the dibasic word is the result of addition or whether it is the product of another word-formation process. The criteria for identifying the composition of a compound word, as a rule, are given in its definition, which is difficult to formulate, firstly, because of the complexity of the defined object itself, secondly, due to the existence in the language of objects adjacent to the defined one, and thirdly, due to different linguistic views and approaches to the compound word as a defined phenomenon. Almost all researchers admit that a compound word must contain at least two stems [Jespersen, 1954: 134; Smirnitsky, 1956: 57-58; Arnold 1966: 85; Marchand, 1969: 11; Quirk, 1973:1019; Plag, 2002: 173; Hickey, 2008:16]. At the same time, I.V. Arnold and G. Marchand believe that these stems can occur in the language in the form of free forms, which in a compound word acquire integrity and structural unity. G. Marchand at the same time reveals the subordinating nature of the connection between these free forms, noting that this connection is built on the basis of the relations defining / defined. O. Jespersen translates such qualities of a compound word as fusion and whole-formation into a functional plane, noting that the stems that make up a compound word should function as one word. Whole-formation, in turn, is the main criterion for distinguishing a compound word from a phrase.

Having considered the approaches implemented in linguistics in relation to the methods of word formation in a common language, it is advisable to turn to the analysis of similar problems in the field of terminology. In term formation, the application of the criteria of word-formation analysis and the division of terms into non-derivatives, derivatives and complex ones, as is customary in the general language vocabulary, turns out to be extremely difficult, since the status of the constituent elements of the term (term elements), most of which are of Greek-Latin origin, has not yet been finally determined. and is formed both from significant (nominal) parts of speech of the Greek and Latin languages, and from non-significant (service) classes of words.

The status of Greek-Latin term elements, as we see, is still a subject of disagreement among linguists, lexicographers and terminologists. Attempts to establish it are implemented in general within the framework of the following approaches: the semantics of terminological elements of Greek-Latin origin, perceived by the English language (as well as other modern European languages), "often not derived directly from the semantics of equivalent lexical units of the source language", therefore, these terminological components, depending on their position in the word, acquire the status of prefixes and suffixes in the interpretation of a number of linguists [Ivanov, 2004: 150-152]. In other words, conclusions regarding the morphemic status of Greek-Latin term elements are made on the basis of a functional criterion. The compilers of modern explanatory dictionaries of the English language support this point of view. [New Webster, 1989: XXVII-XXIX; OED, 2004].

Reference:

1. Averbukh K.Ya. General theory of the term text. / K.Ya. Averbukh. Ivanovo: IvGU, 2004. - 252 p.
2. Ivanov A.V. Metalanguage of phonetics and metrics: Monograph text. / A.V. Ivanov. Arkhangelsk: Pomor State University, 2004. - 342 p.