



N.S. TRUBETSKOI AND THE PRAGUE LINGUISTIC SCHOOL

Im S.

*Doctor of Science in Philology, Professor of the Department of Modern Russian Language,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University*

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra11318>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra11318

ABSTRACT

The paper considers those positive moments that were achieved in the works of N.S. Trubetskoi in morphonology, as well as the disadvantages that did not allow morphonology to be distinguished as an independent linguistic discipline. The views of N.S. Trubetskoi were further developed by the Prague Linguistic School. However, they failed to resolve the issue of the independent status of morphonology as a linguistic discipline, although they tried to single out independent morphonological units – morphoneme and alternant.

KEY WORDS: *mophonology, alternant, alternation, morphoneme.*

INTRODUCTION

In the world linguistics, the study of morphonological phenomena is considered to be an essential part of modern descriptive, historical and comparative grammars. N.S. Trubetskoi was the first to declare morphonology as a special linguistic discipline. The first period in the development and formation of morphonology as a science is associated with his name. “The doctrine of ancient Indian grammarians about alternation” by V. Pisani (1) served as an impetus for the emergence of the famous work by N.S. Trubetskoi “Some Considerations Regarding Morphology”. In this work, he first introduced the concept of “morphology” into science. It marked the first period in the history of morphonology.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Aim

To highlight those positive moments that were achieved in the works by N.S. Trubetskoi on morphonology, as well as point out the disadvantages that did not allow morphonology to be singled out as an independent linguistic discipline.

Objectives

To highlight those positive moments that were achieved in the works of N.S. Trubetskoy on morphonology.

Point out the shortcomings that did not allow to single out morphonology as an independent linguistic discipline.

Show how N.S. Trubetskoi's ideas were developed by members of the Prague Linguistic School.

To highlight the reasons why morphonology could not obtain the status of an independent language level within the framework of the Prague Linguistic School.

RESULTS

The term “morphology” is one of the most controversial in modern linguistics. Different meanings are invested in it, hence the different scope of tasks and problems of morphology. Inconsistency has been characteristic of it since its origin. This is apparently due to the fact that the status of morphology as an independent linguistic discipline was not determined. The second period is associated with the name of R.O. Jakobson, whose ideas were developed by American linguists. The issues of morphology as a special linguistic tier are being resolved, its boundaries and terminological apparatus are determined, morphological descriptions appear on a specific linguistic material. The question of the position of morphology among linguistic disciplines is still the subject of controversy. The review proposed below will aim to point out the positive points that were achieved in the works of N.S. Trubetskoi.



The idea of morphonology as a special linguistic discipline, which should take its rightful place, was expressed by N.S. Trubetskoi. The object of morphonology, according to N.S. Trubetskoi are phoneme alternations, i.e. alternations not determined by phonetic position, compare: *лечу* - *летишь* ч//т (*lechu* - *letish'* ch//t). In this case, the consonant alternates with the consonant. In the example *мять* - *мну* а//м' (*myat'* - *mnu* a//m') consonant alternating with vowel *a*, and also the vowel can alternate with zero sound *воробей* - *воробья* е//о (*vorobei* - *vorob'ya* e//o), as well as a vowel with a vowel *сохнуть* - *сушить* о//у (*sokhnut'* - *sushit'* o//u).

N.S. Trubetskoi called the morphoneme the general idea of alternation. This refers to the alternation characteristics of the entire set of the class of word forms. A member of the alternation is named alternant by N.S. Trubetskoi.

N.S. Trubetskoi considered the phenomenon of sandhi to be another object of morphonology. Sandhi are phonetic changes that occur at the junction of morphemes, composites, words. In fact, N.S. Trubetskoi singled out the paradigmatic phenomena of morphonology – morphonemes and syntagmatic – sandhi. Subsequently, the ideas of N.S. Trubetskoi were developed in “Projet de terminologie phonologique standaritsee” (2), as well as in the works of a number of American linguists who were followers of L. Bloomfield (3).

At present, the question of whether morphonology belongs to one or another language level is still the subject of controversy. So, N.S. Trubetskoi, A.A. Reformatsky, and R.I. Avanesov include morphonology in phonology.

However, the recognition of the phonological structure of the morpheme as an object of morphonology does not mean that morphonology is part of phonology. A number of American researchers refer morphonology to morphology. E.A. Makaev and E.S. Kubryakov refer morphonology to an intermediate level, as it does not have its own basic units (4).

N.S. Trubetskoi sees in morphonology “a link between morphology and phonology” (5). He substantiated the need for a linguistic description of morphonology as a science of “the morphological use of phonological means”. In the same work, he

defined the tasks of morphonology. “The complete morphonological theory consists of the following sections:

- 1) Theory of phonological structure of morphemes;
- 2) Theories of combinatorial sound changes to which individual morphemes undergo in morphemic combinations;
- 3) Sound alternations that perform a morphological function” (5).

The views of N.S. Trubetskoi were further developed by the compilers of “Projeta de terminologie phonologique standaritsee”. They try to single out independent morphonological units, considering the morphoneme and the alternant to be the object of the study.

“Morphonological alternation is the alternation of a phoneme with a) a correlative phoneme, or b) with a disjunctive phoneme, or c) with a group of phonemes, or d) with a zero phoneme within the same morpheme, depending on the morphological structure of the word. Alternants are members of the same alternation. A morphoneme is the general idea of a combination of two or more members of an alternation” (5).

However, members of the Prague linguistic school cannot be distracted from a specific type of phoneme. Therefore, they cannot solve the problem of identifying alternations with a different composition of phonemes (5). Differences like *лечу* - *летишь* и *люблю* - *любишь* (‘*lechú* - *letish'* and ‘*lyublyú* - *lyúbish'*’) considered as different alternations. Morphonological theory of N.S. Trubetskoi remained a phonological theory, since the units of morphonology were determined by the phoneme and the morpheme.

The concept of “morphoneme” has been criticized many times. A.A. Reformatskii does not accept the idea of N.S. Trubetskoi to reduce such facts of a language as alternations like <к-ч>, <з-ж> (<k-ch>, <g-zh>) to «idees complexes». He criticizes the psychologism of the definition, although in many ways his views on morphonology are similar to those of members of the Prague Linguistic Circle. T.V. Bulygina agrees more: “The search for an objective invariant of alternating phonemes led N.S. Trubetskoi to the promotion of the concept of morphoneme” (6). But she sees the impossibility of



isolating such a unit in the fact that the morphoneme cannot be defined in terms of differential features.

Within the framework of the Prague School, morphonology did not receive the status of an independent discipline, since the units of morphonology were determined through the phoneme and morpheme. Practically morphonology of N.S. Trubetskoi remained a phonological theory. This was its main disadvantage.

From the definition of the Prague school follows the current concept, according to which morphonology is an intermediate, non-basic level, included in the basic (morphological), and "non-basic levels do not have their own units".

DISCUSSION

Thus, the Prague School of Morphonology denies the status of morphonology as an independent linguistic discipline. The object of study of morphonology are alternations, morphonological changes that occur with affixes, which are explained as a result of the compatibility of affixes. But the question of the choice of affixes and the principles of their compatibility is not raised.

The further development of morphonology led to the separation of morphonology into an independent linguistic discipline, to the separation of from phonology and morphology. O.S. Akhmanova said that "The functioning of linguistic matter is more complex and flexible than can be depicted using only the concepts of proper phonology or morphology. Therefore, it is necessary to study some intermediate area in which a real connection and interaction of two principles is found – phonological and morphological" (7).

Recognition of the status of morphonology gives the right to single out autonomous morphonological units that do not belong to either the level of phonology or the level of morphology. This problem was solved within the framework of the Moscow Phonological School.

The formation of the concept of a morphonological unit is based on the idea of the identity of the morpheme of the Moscow Phonological School. The meaning of this idea is that morphemes are considered identical if their differences are expressed in some rule. But the rule

defining the identity of a morpheme is morphonological. If the identity of the morpheme expresses the unity of the word, then the morphonological rule is a means of expressing and defining the unity of the word. This is the meaning of the further evolution of morphonological views. The initial premise of the Moscow School of Morphology in explaining morphonological means creates a tendency to isolate morphonology into a special level of language with its own units.

REFERENCES

1. *Pisani V. General and Indo-European linguistics. Literature review. 1956:83-199.*
2. *Projet de terminologie phonologique standardisee. TCLP. 1931; 4:309-326.*
3. *Bloomfield L. Minomini morphonemics. TCLP. 1935; 8:105-3.*
4. *Makaev E.A., Kubryakova E.S. On the status of morphonology and units of its description. Units of different levels of the grammatical structure of the language and their interaction. 1969:87-119.*
5. *Trubetskoi N.S. Some considerations regarding morphonology. The Prague Linguistic Circle. 1967:115-119.*
6. *Bulygina T.V. Theses of the Prague Linguistic Circle. 1967:80-84.*
7. *Akhmanova O.S. Phonology, morphonology, morphology. 1966:108.*