MORPHOLOGY AND MORPHEMOLOGY: WORD STRUCTURE AND MORPHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE

ªNATALIIA DZIUBAK, ᵇNELIA PAVLYK,
ᶜVIKTORIA LIPYCH, ᵈSVITLANA SHULIAK,
ᵉANNA OHAR

*ªKamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohiienko National University,
Kamianets-Podilskyi, Ukraine.*
ᵇ,ᶜBerdyansk State Pedagogical University, Berdyansk, Ukraine.
*ᵈPavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, Uman,
Ukraine.*
*ᵉDrohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University,
Drohobych, Ukraine.*

*email: ªdznan@ukr.net, ᵇpavliknelya80@gmail.com,
ᶜlipich.viktoria@gmail.com, ᵈshulyak_svitlana@ukr.net,
ᵉannaogar@ukr.net*

Abstract: The article focuses on analyzing the foundational theoretical tenets of morphemology and morphology within contemporary Ukrainian linguistics, emphasizing their intrinsic interrelation. A comprehensive examination of the morpheme as the fundamental linguistic entity for morphemological studies is undertaken. The primary attributes of a morpheme as a linguistic unit are elucidated, facilitating a more proficient comprehension of the principles underlying the morphemic analysis of words. Furthermore, the research delves into the grammatical meanings embodied by morphemes within specific parts of speech, drawing on Ukrainian language lexemes for illustration. The discourse provides a rationale for considering morphemology as an autonomous branch of linguistics, intricately linked with morphology and derivatology. The article delineates distinctions in the application of terms such as "morphemics" versus "morphemology" and "morpheme" versus "morph." A crucial assertion is advanced, substantiating that a morpheme, functioning as the smallest semantically significant constituent of a word, can simultaneously convey lexical, grammatical, and word-formational meanings. The correlation between morphemology and morphology is substantiated by the integral semantics inherent in words, a phenomenon derived from the amalgamation of lexical and grammatical meanings. The confluence of these meanings establishes a word's classification within a specific grammatical category (part of speech) and its affiliation with a particular word-formational type. Similar to a word form, a morpheme exhibits reproducibility in language, possesses a semiological function, and serves to convey both subject (via the root) and non-subject (via affixes) meanings. As with other linguistic entities, morphemes and word forms can be regarded as historical categories, prompting the differentiation of word formation into historical and synchronic aspects. Throughout the historical evolution of a language, alterations in word structure manifest through phonetic changes, the loss of productive affixes, and modifications in the phonemic boundaries of morphemes. Consequently, the framework for synchronic morphemic analysis must not be indiscriminately applied to other synchronic facets of the language.

Keywords: Linguistics, Morphemics, Morpheme, Morphology, Morphemic analysis of a word, Word-root, Affix, Lexical and grammatical meaning, Word formation meaning, Morphemic composition of a word, Modern Ukrainian language.

1 Introduction

Language functions as a complex multilevel system, characterized by a systematic structure facilitated through the existence of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations among different levels or tiers of language, as well as among various linguistic units. Morphology, one of the earliest branches of linguistics, is dedicated to the examination of the morphological level of language and the exploration of the grammatical semantics inherent in words. In conjunction with syntax, morphology constitutes a foundational component of language grammar.

Given that the subject of morphology encompasses a word or its word form, conceived as a structural and semantic amalgamation of meaningful components, key linguistic challenges at the intersection of morphology and morphemics can be delineated as follows:

1. Typology of morphemes in contemporary Ukrainian language.
2. Investigation into the meanings and functions of morphemes within words and their word forms.
3. Development of the principles governing morphemic analysis of words.
4. Examination of the morphemic composition across diverse parts of speech.

2 Aim and objectives

The primary aim of this article is to examine the interplay between morphology and morphemics, treating them as distinct branches within linguistics. The focus entails elucidating the lexical and grammatical significance of morphemes and their variations, commonly referred to as "morphs," within the framework of classifying parts of speech.

Research Objectives:

- To delineate the semantic boundaries of the concepts "morphemics," "morphemology," and "morphology," along with elucidating the linguistic units "morpheme," "morph," and "word form," establishing their correlation with specific levels of language.
- To expound upon the morphological characteristics of the Ukrainian language, exploring the relationship between morphology and morphemics through the lens of lexico-grammatical groups (parts of speech) and their distinctive derivational indicators.
- To enhance the structural and typological modeling of words classified within specific lexical and grammatical groups in the Ukrainian language.
- To outline the characteristics of the morpheme as the smallest significant unit in language, defining its functions and distinctive features.

3 Literature Review

A focal issue within contemporary morphology involves the formulation of principles and approaches for the classification of parts of speech, a categorization that is further delineated into traditional and modern perspectives. The traditional approach, as expounded in the collective monograph "Modern Ukrainian Literary Language. Morphology" (1969), classifies all parts of speech into full, partial, and interjection categories. The primary criterion underpinning the traditional approach to part-of-speech classification is the identification of shared formal features and a characteristic syntactic role.

The most recent classification, introduced by linguist I. Vykhovanets in his monograph "The Prepositional System of the Ukrainian Language" (1980), presented a novel semantic and grammatical framework for the categorization of words into parts of speech. According to Vykhovanets, nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs are categorized as full parts of speech, while numerals, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, particles, and interjections fall under the designation of service words. This classification is grounded in the concept of "relational semantics." Notably, Vykhovanets contends that numerals have forfeited their status as an independent part of speech, asserting that their primary function is to specify quantity, a role equated with the indication of the number of nouns expressed through inflection.

In his subsequent monograph, "Parts of Speech in the Semantic and Grammatical Aspect" (Vykhovanets, 1988), the scholar further refined the classification of parts of speech. This classification is characterized as heterogeneous, deviating from the earlier homogeneous categorization, which dichotomized all words into modifiable (with inflections) and those that cannot be modified. I. Vykhovanets' heterogeneous classification was established on semantic, syntactic, morphological, word-formational, and logical criteria. This approach resulted in the creation of an internal hierarchy of parts of speech, wherein the noun and verb held central status, while the adjective and adverb were peripheral—thus forming a four-component system of full-value parts of speech. In her monograph "Conjunctions of the Ukrainian Language" (2010), K. Horodenska substantiated the semantic and formal-syntactic functions of conjunctions and provided insights into their morphemic status. Additionally, the

researcher introduced a novel perspective on the nature of interjections as a distinct part of speech, situating it within the concept of the sentential nature of the interjection.

The most comprehensive depiction of the morphological system of the Ukrainian language is articulated in the scholarly work "Grammar of the Modern Ukrainian Language. Morphology", authored by I. Vykhovanets, K. Horodenska, S. Sokolova, and A. Zahnitko (2017). This study delineates the morphological facets of the language through the lens of functional-categorical grammar. However, language, as a dynamic organism, undergoes constant evolution and change, thereby influencing the trajectory of theoretical morphology in the future. Notwithstanding the merits of the aforementioned works, there exists a notable gap in the examination of the relationship between morphemology and morphology, underscoring the significance of the chosen research topic.

Morphology and morphemology serve as pivotal domains for comparison in the realm of comparative grammar. In their study, Ukrainian scholars N. Hladush and N. Pavliuk (2019) conducted a comparative analysis of the grammatical structures of Ukrainian and English, revealing that nouns share more similarities in both languages than may be apparent initially. Upon scrutinizing the morphological structure of the Ukrainian language, the researchers concluded that the language's morphological system manifests its properties through the morphemic structure of words. Ukrainian, primarily a synthetic language, boasts a well-developed system of affixes. In contrast, English, an analytical language, predominantly employs free morphemes and is comparatively less rich in affixes. A noteworthy challenge in the English language lies in the fact that the same word can often belong to different parts of speech, with certain forms considered functional shifts or conversions, while others are homonyms. In English, the classification into parts of speech primarily relies not on formal characteristics, as in Ukrainian, but rather on the syntactic properties of words.

The scholar O. Zuban (2017) delves into the Ukrainian language corpus from the perspective of applied linguistics, situated at the intersection of morphemics and morphology. According to her assessment, the application of computer modeling at the morpheme level remains inadequately developed within contemporary corpus linguistics. It is noteworthy, however, that the Department of Structural and Mathematical Linguistics at the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine has established a Morpheme and Derivation Database for the Ukrainian language. Additionally, the team at the Computerized Laboratory of Linguistics at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv has designed the Automated System of Morpheme and Derivation Analysis (ASMDA).

These two morpheme-derivation databases serve distinct purposes and, correspondingly, are grounded in different methodologies. The Ukrainian morpheme-derivation database functions as a manual within the realm of linguistics, offering a static resource that is not amenable to automated text analysis. In contrast, the Automated System of Morpheme and Derivation Analysis constitutes an electronic linguistic tool designed for the automatic segmentation of morphemes from the initial word form in a given text, operating with dynamic search capabilities. The development of the ASMDA software is geared towards the automated compilation of relevant examples based on the ASMDA lexical list, while also considering factors such as homonymy and root allomorphism. The application of this computer modeling method in constructing ASMDA aligns with both theoretical and applied concepts in modern linguistics, rendering the system an effective and rational tool for future linguistic research (Zuban, 2017).

4 Research Methods

The study employed the following methods:

▪ Analysis Method and Synthesis Method: Utilized in the critical review of scientific literature, this approach

facilitated the differentiation of concepts such as "morph," "morpheme," "word form," "morphemics," and "morphemology."

▪ Comparative and Contrastive Method: Applied to identify similar, partially similar, and distinctive lexical and grammatical meanings associated with individual morphemes.

▪ Historical Method: Employed in the examination of historical word formation, exploration of phonetic alterations in word composition, analysis of affix productivity loss, and investigation of changes in the phonemic boundaries of morphemes.

▪ Method of Generalization: Utilized for synthesizing scientific and theoretical conclusions regarding the relationship between morphology and morphemics, as well as establishing correlations between word structure and the lexical and grammatical categories of words.

5 Results

The term "morpheme" was originally coined by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay in the 1870s, during the nineteenth century. The scholar emphasized that morphemes are dynamic, tangible units of language subject to constant change. Importantly, he asserted that morphemes are not merely theoretical constructs but rather elements of linguistic cognition, functioning as psychological units. Followers of Jan Baudouin de Courtenay's doctrine underscored the significance of clearly distinguishing between the etymological and contemporary meanings of words. For instance, in modern Ukrainian, the terms *"malyna" (raspberry), "smorodyna" (currant), and "ozhyna" (blackberry)* are considered non-derivative, despite the presence of the etymological suffix "-yn-." In contemporary Ukrainian, this suffix is no longer discernible in these words; at the current stage, the root and suffix have amalgamated into a unified root morpheme.

The term "morphemics" emerged relatively recently, just over half a century ago, and its interpretation in linguistic dictionaries encompasses two principal perspectives. First, it is viewed as a system of morphemes within a specific language. Second, it is considered a distinct branch of morphology, tasked with elucidating morphological models in language—entailing the description of morpheme structures and the patterns governing their placement within words. However, the polysemy of the term often introduces confusion in scientific discourse, blurring distinctions between its two connotations: as a linguistic science branch and as a collection of units at the morphemic level of language. This inherent ambiguity significantly complicates the research process within the domain of morphological aspects of language.

The terms "morphemics" and "morphemicons" are often employed interchangeably with the term "morphemology." Their usage varies, sometimes treating them as absolute synonyms, while at other times drawing clear distinctions. Specifically, morphemics is conceptualized as a collection of morphemes and morphemicons, while morphemology is proposed as a linguistic subfield, akin to the nomenclature of sections such as "phraseology," "lexicology," "derivatology," and "phonology."

Given the considerations outlined above, it becomes both natural and imperative to organize and systematize terms within morphological terminology. The lack of organization in this terminology frequently leads to scientific misunderstandings and the conflation of concepts at different levels and categories. Morphology, as a field, is subdivided into three components: morphemology, derivatology, and paradigmology. The terms "morphemics," "word formation," and "paradigmatics" are employed to denote these morphological subsystems. Since the word stands as the fundamental unit in morphology, it is noteworthy that each subdivision emphasizes a different aspect of word structure. In morphemology, the focus is on the morphemic structure of the word as an ordered unity of morphemes. In derivatology, the attention turns to the word-formation structure of the word, encompassing the unity of the

word-formation base and the word-formation formant. In paradigmology, the emphasis lies on systematically ordered word forms, categorized into stems and inflections, thereby highlighting the paradigmatic structure of the word.

It is noteworthy that there is no unanimous agreement among scholars regarding the status of morphemology as an independent branch of linguistics. While some scholars view it as an auxiliary component of morphology, others position morphemology within the framework of word formation, considering it a derivative aspect of derivatology. We assert our stance that morphemology is justified in being regarded as a distinct and independent branch of linguistics, closely intertwined with both morphology and derivatology. Several factors substantiate the autonomy of morphemology:

1. Morphemes and morphs, the foundational units of morphemology, exhibit distinctions in terms of content, function, and structure when compared to morphological, morphophonemic, and word-formation units.
2. Morphemology operates with its own distinct conceptual and terminological framework, featuring a well-established system of methods and techniques specific to morphemological research.

One of the contemporary directions within modern morphemics aims to precisely delineate the semantic boundaries of key concepts such as morpheme, morpheme (allomorph), and their interplay within the word-word-form relationship. The morphological system of the Ukrainian language exhibits both isomorphic and allomorphic features. Isomorphic features are shared across a set of related languages, while allomorphic features have been acquired through historical development. A morpheme serves as an invariant realized through variants, referred to as morphs—specific manifestations of a morpheme. An allomorph, on the other hand, is a phonetically modified morpheme influenced by the sound composition of neighboring morphemes. For instance, in the cognates of two forms of the word *"leg" (noha and nizhechka)*, the allomorphs are *"noh" and "nizh,"* respectively.

Undoubtedly, the morpheme stands as the fundamental linguistic unit within the purview of morphemology. However, the delineation of functional boundaries for morphemes remains a subject of contention. Our standpoint is that both word-forming and grammatical (formative and inflectional) morphemes should be encompassed as subjects of morphemics. Both categories contribute to shaping the external, structural framework of the word, conveying either the fundamental (via the root) or ancillary (via the prefix, suffix, postfix) lexical meaning, or the grammatical meaning of the word. This perspective underscores the evident correlation between morphemics and morphology in contemporary linguistics.

The morphemic distinctiveness of the Ukrainian language is manifested through lexical and grammatical categories, including those of independent parts of speech. Examining the lexical and grammatical categories associated with nouns reveals specific derivational indicators. Notably, the suffix "-yvo" is employed in verbal substantives that signify the outcome or result of an action. Examples include *"varyvo" (indicating something that has been boiled), "morozyvo" (ice cream), "pechyvo" (biscuits), "merezhyvo" (lace), and "priadyvo" (hemp).*

The correlation between morphemology and morphology is affirmed by the comprehensive semantics of the word, shaped by the integration of its lexical and grammatical meanings. The amalgamation of lexical and grammatical senses determines the classification of the word within a specific lexical and grammatical class (part of speech) and its affiliation with a particular word-formation type. An illustrative instance is found in the category of nouns derived through prefix-suffix word formation, conveying the meaning of *"an object below the one named by the motivating noun."* In this context, the formal indicators contributing to their lexical meaning, aside from the

root, encompass the prefix "pid-" and the suffix "-nyk-": *"pidvikonnyk" (windowsill), "pidlokitnyk" (armrest), "pidsvichnyk" (candle holder), "pidsnizhnyk" (snowdrop), "pidbereznyk" (birch bolete), "pidhuznyk" (diaper), among others.* The word-forming suffix "-nyk-" concurrently signifies grammatical association with the noun category, while the masculine null ending serves as a word-shifting morpheme indicating the use of these words in the singular form of the nominative and accusative cases.

Within the category of adjectives formed through the prefix-suffix method, denoting *"located directly close to the one named by the derived noun,"* consistent indicators of lexical meaning include the root, the prefix "pry-," and the suffix "-n-": *"prydvornyi" (near the household), "pryberezhnyi" (near the shore), "prysadybnyi" (near the homestead), "pryozernyi" (near the lake), "pryshkilnyi" (near the school), and "prydorozhnii" (near the road).* The suffix "-n-" concurrently signifies the grammatical classification of these words as adjectives, while the ending "-yi" serves as a word-shifting morpheme indicating the masculine singular form in the nominative and accusative cases of this part of speech.

The intimate relationship between morphemology and morphology is further underscored by the systematic arrangement of morphemes based on parts of speech. For instance, specific suffixes such as "-ets," "-tel-," "-izm-," and "-anyn-" are operative in nouns *(e.g., "vchytel" - teacher, "feminizm" - feminism, "khlopets" - boy, "selianyn" - peasant);* suffixes like "-ov-" (-ev-, -iev-), "-uvat-" (-iuvat-), "-n-," and "-sk-" are found in adjectives *(e.g., "chorniavyi" - black-haired, "syniuvatyi" - blue, "bilenkyi" - white, "kazkovyi" - fabulous);* and the suffix "-ero-" is present in collective numerals *(e.g., "shestero" - a group of six people, "semero" - a group of seven, "vosmero" - a group of eight).*

The word-formation characteristics associated with degrees of quality contribute to the emotional and expressive potential of adjectives. The evaluation of the described attribute is frequently conveyed through the suffixal method, notably employing suffixes such as "-enk-" *(e.g., "bilenkyi" - white, "solodenkyi" - sweet, "malenkyi" - small),* "-esenk-" *(e.g., "bilesenkyi" - very white, "solodesenkyi" - very sweet, "malesenkyi" - very small),* and "-iusink-" *(e.g., "maliusinkyi" - very small, "harniusinkyi" - very beautiful).* When examining the mechanisms for expressing the category of manner within the verb category, specific suffixes emerge, particularly in the process of imperfectivation. Notably, suffixes like "-i-," "-uva-," "-iuva-," "-yzuva-," and "-izuva-" are observed, as seen in words like *"dobryty" (to get better), "zatsepenity" (to get stuck), "hostiuvaty" (to stay at one's place), "vymoshchuvaty" (to pave), "pasteryzuvaty" (to pasteurize), and "vitaminizuvaty" (to vitaminize).*

A distinct issue within the morphology of the Ukrainian language involves the categorization of interjections as a separate part of speech, considering their unique syntactic role within a sentence. This part of speech is inherently tied to specific communicative situations and their connection with adjacent sentences, leading some scholars to refer to them as exclamatory clauses. Examining the morphemic structure of interjections reveals that, on one hand, they consist of unchanged words. On the other hand, interjections encompass sound imitations that may be created through sound compounding or word compounding, exemplified by formations like *"dzen-dzelen" (jingle-jangle), "b-r-r-r-r!" (brrrr), and "ku-ku-riku" (crowing sound).* Consequently, it is logically justified that interjections hold a distinct status apart from both full-meaning and service parts of speech. Additionally, grammarians often seek to classify interjections, alongside particles and modal words, as a unique lexical and grammatical group of words that function at the boundary between independent and service parts of speech.

In discussing the word as the fundamental unit of morphology, it is essential to acknowledge that within morphology, the word is, to some extent, abstracted from its lexical meaning and features.

This abstraction allows for a focus on formal semantic structures. Simultaneously, morphological (grammatical) meanings of words are investigated concerning the lexical and semantic meanings of words. For instance, the semantics of parts of speech, such as quantitative characteristics *(e.g., group of four, seven, six hundred, eight hundred)*, procedural actions *(e.g., think, wait, calm down)*, and abstract concepts *(e.g., pride, tenderness, joy)*, contribute to determining the grammatical peculiarities of different lexical and grammatical groups of words—numerals, verbs, and nouns, respectively.

A morpheme, functioning as a constituent of a word, consistently represents a reproducible unit of language. In contrast, a word is not solely replicated but also constructed by the speaker during the communication process, following specific word-formation models. A morpheme serves a semasiological function, capable of expressing concepts—object concepts through word roots and non-object concepts through affixes. For instance, the suffixes *"-chyk-," "-nyk-," and "-tel-"* in nouns convey the concept of the performer of an action, as seen in examples like *"myslytel" (thinker), "uchytel" (teacher), "budivelnyk" (constructor), and "kranivnyk" (crane operator)*. Despite the reproducibility inherent in morphemes, certain affixes are unique and are found exclusively in one word, termed unifixes. Examples include the suffix "-ampt-" *(in "poshtampt" - post-office)* or the suffix "-och-" *("svitoch" - luminary)*.

A morpheme can be regarded as a historical category susceptible to changes throughout the development of a language, a phenomenon inherent in various linguistic categories. Throughout the historical evolution of a language, phonetic alterations may occur within the word structure, productive affixes may be lost, and the phonemic boundaries of morphemes may undergo modifications. Therefore, the framework of synchronic morpheme analysis should not be extrapolated to other synchronic sections of the language.

It is noteworthy that certain morphemes exhibit specificity within a lexico-grammatical category, while others encompass a broader lexico-grammatical meaning. For instance, the suffix "-ynn-" is exclusive to the lexical and grammatical category of neuter nouns that solely possess a singular form, sharing the semantic feature of *"aggregate, collectivity."* This is evident in words such as *"kartoplynnia" (potatoes), "kvasolynnia" (beans), and "buriachynnia" (beetroots)*. In contrast, the suffix "-chyk-" is versatile, being employed for both animate and inanimate entities, as seen in examples like *"khlopchyk" (a boy), "horobchyk" (a sparrow)*, as well as *"stilchyk" (a chair) and "palchyk" (a finger)*. Occasionally, to mitigate polysemy, distinct word-formation means are employed for animate and inanimate entities, as illustrated by *"vantazhnyk" (a loader - animate) versus "navantazhuvach" (handler - inanimate), or "oblikovets" (accountant - animate) versus "lichylnyk" (counter - inanimate)*. However, the suffix "-ach-" in the word *"navantazhuvach"* does not necessarily denote belonging to the lexico-grammatical group of inanimate entities. This is because the suffix is regularly used in the formation of masculine nouns, indicating their field of activity or profession, as exemplified by *"zdobuvach" (applicant), "zaviduvach" (head), "vykladach" (educator), "dopovidach" (lecturer), "perekladach" (interpreter), and so forth*.

6 Discussion

The interconnection between morphemics and morphology is discernible in the modifications introduced in the revised edition of Ukrainian spelling (2019). In adherence to historical word formation and linguistic usage, the genitive case of singular nouns in the III declension was reinstated with the normative inflection "-y." Consequently, variants such as *"hordosti" and "hordosty" (two ways to write the word "pride"), "radosti" and "radosty" (two ways to write the word "joy"), as well as "nizhnosti" and "nizhnosty" (two ways to write the word "tenderness")* were officially recognized as correct forms.

The grammatical category of degrees of comparison for adjectives and adverbs presents a complex linguistic nature. Ukrainian linguists engaged in prolonged discussions about whether these entities constitute new words or merely different word forms. This category relies on morphological, word-formation, and syntactic attributes inherent in the aforementioned parts of speech. Additionally, certain adjectives and adverbs exhibit irregular word formation *(e.g., "velykyi - bilshyi - naibilshyi" for "big - bigger - the biggest" or "pohanyi - hirshyi - naihirshyi" for "bad - worse - the worst")*, deviating from the typical creation of word forms. The word-forming affixes such as "-sh-", "-ish-", "nai-", and the components *"bilsh" or "mensh" (more or less), "naibilsh" or "naimensh" (the most - the least)* alter the qualitative characteristics of the adjective and adverb, signifying a more intense or weakened quality (feature). Consequently, due to the lack of lexical identity with the original forms of qualitative adjectives and qualifying adverbs, it is reasonable to categorize them as separate words rather than traditional word forms.

7 Conclusions

In the endeavor to systematize linguistic terminology, we propose a differentiation between the concepts of "morphemics" and "morphemology." The term "morphemics" is aligned with the set of morphemes found in the Ukrainian language, while "morphemology" pertains to the branch of linguistics dedicated to the study of these linguistic units, closely intertwined with morphology and derivatology. Morphemology exhibits all the characteristics of an autonomous branch of linguistics. Its research domain encompasses morphemes as the smallest significant units of language, incorporating lexical, grammatical, and word-formation meanings. Furthermore, morphemology employs its own conceptual and terminological framework and boasts a sophisticated system of methods and techniques for morphemological research.

The inherent characteristics of morphemic structures, marked by their regularity, systemic recurrence, and reproducibility within words, designate them as a distinct category of linguistic units. Specifically, they emerge as ontological entities with a structural nature operating at the morphemic level of the language system. Morphemes possess a reproductive property within language and serve a semasiological function, allowing them to convey both object concepts (via the word-root) and non-object concepts (through affixes).

The morphemic specificity of the Ukrainian language is articulated through lexical and grammatical categories, organizing a systematic totality within independent parts of speech based on the principle of categorization. In morphology, a word (or morphological word) is, to a certain extent, detached from lexical meaning and features, enabling a focused exploration of formal and semantic structures. This abstraction facilitates a comprehensive realization of the principle of categorization in language structures. The ongoing investigation of lexico-grammatical and morphemic features within parts of speech remains a promising avenue for the exploration of the morphological aspect of language.

Literature:

1. Arpolenko, H. P., Horodenska, K. H., Shcherbatiuk, H. Kh.: *Numerator of the Ukrainian language*. Kyiv, 1980.
2. Bezpoiasko, O. K., Horodenska, K. H., Rusanivskyi, V. M.: *Grammar of the Ukrainian language. Morphology*. Kyiv, 1993.
3. Bybyk, S.: From the historiography of the language of artistic prose to codification of the terms of linguistical stylistics. *Ukrainian language*, 2018, 4(68), 22-33.
4. Gladush, N. F., Pavlyuk, N. V.: *Contrastive Grammar: Theory and Practice*. Kyiv. Univ. named after B. Hrinchenko; National Kyiv-Mohyla Academic University. Kyiv, 2019, 296 p.
5. Demeshko, I. M.: Morphonological classes of word-forming units with inarticulate verbs in the Ukrainian language. *Proceedings*. Series: Philol. Science, 2020, 187, 30-33.

6.   Demeshko, I. M.: Morphonology of word-forming units of recruiters with a membership vertex to the consonant group. Linguistic Bulletin. *Filolohichnyi chasopys*. Uman, 2020, 61-77.

7.   Diak, O. V.: *Structural and semantic organization of word-forming units with roots for metal designation*. Kyiv: National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, 2006.

8.   Fedurko, M. Y.: *Morphology of noun word formation in the modern Ukrainian language.* Kyiv: O.O. Potebnia Institute of Linguistics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2005.

9.   Greshchuk, V. V.: Fundamentally centric derivatology: history, state, prospects. *Studies in Ukrainian linguistics*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Misto NV, 2009, pp. 93-103.

10. Horodenska, K.: Morphology in the context of the academic Ukrainian language studies. *Ukrainian language*, 2018, 4(68), 3-21.

11. Horodenska, K.: The problem of the status and volume of the category of the state of the verb. *Humanitarian Bulletin of Pereyaslav-Khmelnytsky State Pedagogical University named after Grigory Skovorody*. Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi, 2003, 10–16.

12. Horodenska, K.: *Conjunctions of Ukrainian Language*. Kyiv, 2010.

13. Horodenska, K.H.: Grammar standard of the Ukrainian literary language and modern practice. *Hramatychni studii*, 2017, 3, 17–21.

14. Karamysheva, I.: *Contrastive Grammar of English and Ukrainian Languages*. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha Publishers, 2017, 336 p.

15. Leech, G. N.: *Principles of Pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman, 1983, 250 p.

16. Morokhovskaya, E. J.: *Fundamentals of Theoretical Grammar*. Kiev: Vysca Skola, 1984, 387 p.

17. Nelyuba, A., & Redko, Ye.: *Lexical and verbal innovations (2015-2016).* Dictionary. Kharkiv: Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society, 2017.

18. Vykhovanets, I., Horodens'ka, K.: *Theoretical morphology of the Ukrainian language.* Kyiv, 2004.

19. Vykhovanets, I. R.: *Pronunciation system of the Ukrainian language*. Kyiv, 1980.

20. Vykhovanets, I. R.: *System of cases of Ukrainian language*. Kyiv, 1987.

21. Vykhovanets, I. R.: *Parts of speech in the semantic-grammatical aspect*. Kyiv, 1988.

22. Vykhovanets, I. R.: Morphological categories? Word building? Or grammatical inter-level? *Actual problems of Ukrainian vocabulary*. Ivano-Frankivsk, 2002, 13-18.

23. Vykhovanets, I. R., Horodenska, K. H., Zahnitko, A. P., Sokolova, S. O.: *Grammar of modern Ukrainian literary language*. Morphology. Kyiv, 2017.

24. Yule, G.: *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1996, 152 p.

25. Zuban, O.: Automatic Morphemic Analysis in the Corpus of the Ukrainian Language: Results and Prospects. *Journal of Linguistics*, 2017, 68(2), 415–425.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI