

Morphological Issues of the English and Uzbek Languages

Usmonova Durдона Fazliddin qizi

Researcher of the National university of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Faculty of Foreign philology

Article Information

Received: March 31, 2023

Accepted: April 30, 2023

Published: May 26, 2023

Keywords

morphology, investigate, morpheme, speech, category, root, prefix, inflexions.

ABSTRACT

This article has presented specific morphological features of English and Uzbek. The morphological systems of the English and Uzbek languages are characterized by a considerable number of isomorphic as well as of several allomorphic features. Due to these linguistic phenomena to investigate is very actual.

Human beings are able to exchange knowledge, beliefs, opinions, wishes, threats, commands, thanks, promises, declarations, feelings and many others, but our system of communication before anything else is language. Language is the forming and storing ideas as reflection of reality and exchanging them in the process of human interaction. Language is social by nature; it is inseparably connected with the people who are its creators and users; it grows and develops together with the development of society and like all events in the world, it is in the process of continuous change. Language contains many types of formation and one of them is affixation. Affixation (prefixation and suffixation) is the formation of words by adding derivational affixes (prefixes and suffixes) to bases. Knowledge of prefixes and suffixes are one part of academic that may increase student achievement.

Compound words are formed by compounding in the fact that two or several originally distinct terms, but are frequently occurring together in the syntax within a sentence, are attached as one unit which is difficult to analyze. They are groups of words which, taken together, have unpredictable semantics. Focusing on the formation process, the morphological compounding is distinguished from the syntactical compounding. Matthews, Corbin, Booij, Haspelmath, and Fradin defined the compounding as a process of combing two lexemes rather in specialized language. They consider that the compounding only belongs to the lexical phenomenon but not

to the syntactical one. In this theoretical framework, complex units composed of non-lexemes, lexicalized, lexicalized syntactic constructions are not considered as compounds. However, Guilbert, Mathieu-Colas, Gross, Apothéloz, Di Sciullo, Riegel, Pellat and Rioul consider any complex lexical unit composed of two or more terms as a compound word.

Morphological compounding and syntactical compounding are generally considered as two different formation process of words. The compound nouns can be divided into morphological ones and syntactical ones. The syntactical compound nouns are formed from the lexicalization of syntactical constructions. For morphological compounding, three types are distinguished: native compounding, neoclassical compounding and concealed compounding. Native compounds are composed of two lexemes of current English lexicon without linking element (*such as smoking wagon, apple-green, frog-man, etc.*) and neoclassical compounds are formed along two bases of Greek or Latin origin, that are not syntactically in English, connected by a linking element (*such as microcephalus, homicide, cynocephalus, etc.*). The compounds formed of at least one truncated English lexeme (*like afro - for african in afro-brésilien, etc.*) are called concealed compounds.. They are also called pseudo-compounds. The other constituent of concealed compounds can be native or neoclassical, but concealed compounds are often grouped into neoclassical or native compounds.

Constituents of Compound Nouns

3.1 Word, Lexeme and Stem

The lexeme is an abstract unit sub-specified for the flexion which corresponds to lexical units in linguistics, for example, manger, mangeait and mangerai are all the instances of lexeme MANGER (Fradin, 2003). The concrete words manger, mangeait, mangerai... are word forms of the lexeme MANGER. The word forms are the elements with syntactically relevant properties, while the lexemes are strictly morphological and have no syntactic realization (Villoing, 2012). The stem of a word is the word form minus its inflectional affixes, for example, porte- is the stem of portais, portant, porta, porte, portons, ... Each of the word forms of lexeme PORTER consists of a stem and a desinence (Booji, 2005). Traditionally, it is considered that lexemes are the compounding units and native compounds are formed of two French lexemes without inflection, while the framework of lexeme-based morphology makes it clear to consider the verb in VN compound nouns as a stem of the lexeme (Corbin, 1992; Villoing, 2009; Fradin, 2009). However, the constituents of many compound nouns are words or even non-autonomous units. For example, in neoclassical compound nouns, the constituents are borrowed from Greek and Latin, which are non-autonomous elements and are not linked to any lexeme in French. They are called archeo-constituents by Corbin and Paul (1999). Montermini (2010) argued

The lexeme is abstract units sub-specified for the flexion which corresponds to lexical units in linguistics, for example, eat, ate and will eat are all the instances of lexeme EAT. The concrete words eat, ate and will eat are word forms of the lexeme. The word forms are the elements with syntactically relevant properties, while the lexemes are strictly morphological and have no syntactic realization. However, the constituents of many compound nouns are words or even non-autonomous units. For example, in neoclassical compound nouns, the constituents are borrowed from Greek and Latin, which are non-autonomous elements and are not linked to any lexeme in English. They are called archeoconstituents. Some constituents of compound nouns are the truncated lexemes of English (such as, euro-, afro-, petro-...). They are non-

autonomous elements, which function as representation of the English lexeme, considered as fracto-constituents. The fracto-constituents are treated as stems of lexemes, one of the forms of English lexemes, since they are linked to English lexemes. Finally, some constituents reveal inflected forms of the lexeme, typically in VerbNoun compounds, such as eggs in egg trays, eyes in eye protectors, hands in hand dryers, etc. The word forms are also frequent in syntactical compounds, since the syntactical compound nouns are formed through the lexicalization of syntactical structures. Thus, most of the constituents of syntactical compounds have a syntactical realization, such as collar beating machine, letter box, lunch box, etc. This makes it interesting to ask: what does the notion “lexeme” used in definition of native compounds indicate exactly: simple lexeme or complex lexeme? If cure-dents is considered as native compound according to the definition of native compounding which combines two English lexemes without inflection, what status should be attributed to toothpick holder?

The morphological systems of the English and Uzbek languages are characterized by a considerable number of isomorphic as well as of several allomorphic features. The isomorphic features are due to the common Indo-European origin of the two languages, while all morphisms have been acquired by English and Uzbek in the course of their historical development and functioning as independent national languages. The main typological constants that make the object of contrasting at the morphological level of English and Uzbek, and not only of these but also of many other languages, are three. These are 1) *the morpheme*; 2) *the parts of speech*; 3) *their morphological categories*.

The principal typological constant of the morphological level is, of course, the morpheme which is endowed in both contrasted languages with some minimal meaning. As to its structure, the morpheme may be a) *simple (one-phoneme)*: *a-, -s, -t (alike, says, burnt) in English and -a, -з, қ-, etc. in Uzbek (оила, қиз, қошиқ) or b) compound (-ment, -hood, -ward) as in management, brotherhood, seaward - (-лик, -воз, -шунос) болалик, масхаравоз, тилишунос*.

The complexity of its nature, structure and meaning makes the morpheme one of the main objects of contrastive study at the morphological level. Moreover, the morpheme in English and Uzbek has some peculiar features, which are characteristic of each of these contrasted languages. Isomorphisms and allomorphisms in the morphemic structure of English and Uzbek words. The morpheme is a minimal meaningful unit and it can be in the contrasted languages either free or bound.

Free or root morphemes are lexically and functionally not dependent on other morphemes. They may be regular words (*for example, boy, day, he, four, кун, олча, ўғил, уч*) or they may constitute the lexical core of a word. *Eg. boyhood, daily, fourth, кундузги, тунги, иккита etc.* In other words, root morphemes in English, Uzbek and other languages are not dependent on other morphemes in a word.

Bound morphemes, on the other hand, cannot function independently: they are bound to the root or to the stem consisting of the root morpheme and of one or more affixal morphemes. *For example, days, spoken, fourteen, overcome, government, ҳаяжонли, ақлан, кунлик, etc.* Bound morphemes like *-s, -en, -teen, over-, -ment, -ли, -ан, -лик*, in either of the two languages cannot exist independently, i.e. they are not free but always dependent on roots or stems of their words.

Root morphemes. Due to its historical development, English has also a much larger number of morphologically unmarked words, i.e. regular root morphemes, than Uzbek.

Consequently, the number of inflexions expressing the morphological categories is much smaller in English than in Uzbek. Moreover, a lot of notionals in English lack even the affixes which can identify their lexico-morphological nature.

Free root-morphemed words, though fewer in Uzbek, are still represented in all lexicomorphological classes as nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. of both contrasted languages. For instance, *arm, pen, boy, work, do, red, he, she, it, five, this, ten, here, far, etc.* Similarly, in Uzbek: *бурун, пешона, ким, беш, кўз, қулоқ, etc.* Free root morphemes in English and Uzbek can also be functionals: *but, till, on, not, through, just (a moment); каби, узоқда, ҳа, эҳтимол, устуда, остуда,* and so on. Root morphemes in English can often form part of the stem, which is especially characteristic of present-day Uzbek, for example: *workers, friendliness, concerning, beautiful; чексиз, ўзгарувчан, иссиқлик, совуқ* and so on.

Affixal morphemes in the contrasted languages split into a) Derivational morphemes which are in English and Uzbek mainly suffixes and sometimes also prefixes. The number of suffixes in the contrasted languages considerably exceeds the number of prefixes. So is, naturally, the significance of the former as word-forming means, the latter (prefixes) performing only in a few cases a word-building function in Uzbek. The number of suffixes in English does not exceed 100, there being 60 noun-forming, 26 adjective-forming, 5 verb-forming and 3 adverb-forming suffixes. Among the noun-indicating/forming suffixes in English are *-acy, -ance, -ion, -dom, -er, -ess, -hood, -ics, -ism, -ity, -ment, -ness, -ship, -ty* and others. Cf. *democracy, alliance, delegation, freedom, writer, falsehood, politics, feudalism, government, management, fitness, likeness, penmanship, friendship, loyalty, etc.*

The adjective-indicating suffixes are: *-able, -al, -ial, -fold, -ful, -ic, -ile, -ish, -less, -ous, -some, -ward, -y* and some others. For instance, *capable, formal, presidential, manifold, grateful, laconic, futile, selfish, meaningless, dangerous, tiresome, eastward, happy, silly, etc.*

The verb-indicating suffixes are *-ate, -en, -esce, -ify, -ise*. For instance, *negotiate, facilitate, blacken, shorten, acquiesce, beautify, purify, demobilise, organise.*

The adverb-indicating suffixes are *-ly, -wards, -ward, -ways*: *quickly, slowly, southward/southwards, sideways, etc.*

Inflexional morphemes in the contrasted languages express different morphological categories. The number of genuine English inflexions today is only 14 to 16. They are noun inflexions, for example: *-s (-es), -en, -ren (boys, watches, oxen, children)*; inflexions of the comparative and the superlative degrees of qualitative adjectives: *-er, -est (bigger, biggest)*; inflexions of degrees of qualitative adverbs: *-er/-ier, -est/ -iest (oftener, oftenest; slower; slowliest)*; the verbal inflexions: *-s/-es, -d/-ed, -t, -n/-en; he puts/he watches; she learned the rule (burnt the candle); a broken pencil.* The inflexions of absolute possessive pronouns: *-s, -e: (hers, ours, yours, mine, thine).* There are also some genuinely English plural form inflexions of nouns with restricted use.

Agglutination at the morphological level represents a mechanical adding of one or more affixal morphemes in pre-position, post-position or in interposition to the root morpheme. Somewhat different, however, is the quantitative representation of the parts of speech that are formed in the contrasted languages by means of preposed agglutinating morphemes.

Suppletivity is observed in words, word-forms and morphemes of all Indo-European languages as a means of grammatical expression. At the lexical level it helps express, both in English and Uzbek, sex distinctions, eg: *boy - girl, bull - cow, man - woman, cock - hen, ўғил -*

қиз, эркак - аёл, хўроз - товуқ, etc. Suppletivity nature are most of nouns forming the Lexical semantic group denoting kinship. For example, father - mother, brother - sister, son - daughter, aunt - uncle; ота - она, ака - сингил, ўғил - қиз, амаки - хола, куёв - келин, бува - буви, etc.

REFERENCES

1. Yule G. The Study of Language. Cambridge University Press. -2010. -P.640.
2. Collins English Dictionary & Thesaurus. 21st centuredition. Glasgow, 2002.
3. Picht H. Lexicography-LSP Lexicography-Terminography ПТФ. Vol. 6. №1. 1995.
4. Менглиев Б., Холиёров Ў., Баҳриддинова Б. Ўзбек тилининг сўз ясашиши ўқув луғати. – Тошкент, 2007. – 142 б.
5. Ғуломов А. Ўзбек тилининг морфем луғати. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1977. – Б.140.
6. Ҳожиёв А. Ўзбек тилида кўшма, жуфт ва такрорий сўзлар. –Тошкент: Фан, 1963. – 95 б.
7. Ҳожиёв А. Ўзбек тилида сўз ясашиш тизими. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 2007. – 168 б