



Morphological Asymmetry and Relictolinguistic Interpretation

Tursunali JUMAEV,

doctor of philological sciences, associate professor

Abstract: The article compares the synchronic and diachronic cases of the current Uzbek language agreement system. It is explained that the modern appearance of such interpretation agreement forms also provides information about their ancient signs, and to understand it, it is necessary to approach the essence from a relictolinguistic point of view.

Key words: synchrony, dichrony, dialectic, synchronic and diachronic conflict, agreement, grammatical meaning, synharmonism, relict, historical remnant.

INTRODUCTION

The study of languages in a comparative-historical aspect is a way of determining the true state of written monuments or of contemporary living languages. It is characteristic that the modern form of the language provides information not only about its current state, but also about its ancient signs.

A. A. Potebnya (1835–1891) also emphasized this point. The principle of examining some aspects of the modern form of the language in connection with its historical manifestations was the basis for A. Potebnya to determine the reliable diachronic foundation of the language. According to him, it is impossible to study the past and the future of the language separately. This issue does not depend on the desire of the learner. Therefore, defining the synchronic structure of a language through its long past is the basis of dialectical knowledge.

“The two-sided structure of the language (modern and ancient) is changing towards a new basis: in new conditions, new appearances and new meanings continue to be discovered; increasingly changes its form and meaning on a new basis. It is natural for language to form different layers by changing its appearance¹.

This opinion of A. Potebnya is one of the important principles of dialectics, and it is a proof that the historical traces of any development are necessarily preserved in a modern form. According to this opinion, it is possible to recover traces of the past by relying on dialectical logic and the principle of continuity. It is appropriate to distinguish this development into two stages: upper - synchronic and lower - diachronic stages. At a higher level, indeed, a certain limit emerges only when approached with reference to the earlier features of the language. In order to restore the historical development of the language, its condition at that time is taken as a basis. In our opinion, in a dynamic and conflicting system, the synchronous part has a crucial role. It is related to the systematic relationship of language units, that is, to the mutual relationship of grammatical categories.

¹ Потебня А.А. Из записок по русской грамматике, т. I—II. – М., 1958. – С. 86.



The synchronic part in the grammatical construction of the language shows the formation of conflicting grammatical forms and grammatical categories. The basis, the core, and the most characteristic feature of this system, however, is a strict two-sided conflict in the essence of grammatical forms.

The internal division of a specific form in each grammatical unit provides a two-view division of conflict. It is important that these grammatical forms contrast with each other within grammatical categories. In other words, different categories are interrelated, so the grammatical forms included in the system of grammatical categories form a definite and fixed system. The interaction of forms with grammatical categories does not apply; it is characteristic of formality and abstraction.

Let's consider this issue of synchronic and diachronic conflict on the example of the category of Uzbek language agreements.

The agreement systems of ancient Turkish languages and modern Turkish languages differ in terms of quantity and quality. While opinions were expressed about 6-8 conjugations in the ancient Turkish language, there is a debate about the presence of 5-7 conjugations in modern Turkish languages, and 6 conjugations in the Uzbek language. This controversial issue has not yet been resolved.

General agreement. The ancient meaning of the general was opposed to the filler-means and dependency conjugations. The contradiction of this agreement is manifested in the names(variable words), in the naming of things and bodies and in their non-identification. The ancient meaning of the preposition is "general determiner" and has a variety of meanings.

The main conjugation has basic meanings: it reflects the general characteristics of the action within the verb, does not exist in the essence of the possessor and object. For example, the adjective in modern Uzbek "*suv oqqan*", "*suv ichgan*" Such patterns embody these meanings.

A group of researchers include relative clauses in participle relations, when in fact the determining construction belongs to the possessive clause. In fact, the non-participation of the relative person indicator in the combination that we are interpreting prevents us from revealing the essence of the combination. It should be considered that the "possession" meaning of the main agreement is a relict of the past. So, with the appearance and development of the determining adverbial turns, it shows the old features of the sentence.

Dependency conjugation was not used in the early stage of Old Turkish languages. In the old Turkish language, the function of the accusative case was formed by the syntactic connection of two nouns in the main case, the directive and the non-directive. Examples: *Qirg'iz kychyg qag'an yag'imiz bolti* (The mighty Khagan of Kirghiz became our enemy). *Sy engagin ahtimiz* (We opened the battle of Lashkar) [Tunyukuk inscription]. At the next stage, the demonstrative agreement was used as a marker. Example: *Turgash qag'an ancha tamish: baning bodunum anta arir, tamish* ("Turgash Khagan said: *My people will be there*") [Tunyukuk inscription].

The use of two nouns in the main agreement with a syntactic connection is common to all stages of development of the Uzbek language. In the language of Alisher Navoi's works, this usage has preserved its character:

Qushiniq nag'masi hijron surudi,

Oqar suv barcha seli ashk rudi. (FSh. 2)



When suffixes are added to personal pronouns in the written monuments of the old Uzbek language *-ning* the addition of a demonstrative suffix does not cause any change in meaning.

Bular ichra bor erdi bir zaif it,

Meniṅdek zoru majruhu nahif it (FSh. 238).

The suffix of the accusative case also historically expressed the meaning of abstract possession. "In the old Uzbek language, the meaning of ownership is expressed by the form of the accusative case. The word in the nominative case used in the sense of perspective comes mainly as participle: *Bu tayaq kishiniṅ* (Tafsir). *Ey ana, sen qayu elniṅ-sen?* (Narrated by Rabguzi)"².

Ani daf' aylasam olam meniṅdur,

Bu mehri olamoro ham meniṅdur (FSh. 274).

The meaning of dependency after the 15th century began to be expressed with an affix *-niki*. This addition is not found in the works of Alisher Navoi. In Babur's works, it is abstract possession *-ning* also with: (a) *Har vilāyatkim musahhar bolsa, chahār dang mirzāning bolg'ay, du dang aniṅ*. (BN); *-niki* is also formed with (b). *Koṅguldə ul edi kim,... Shayx Bāyazidni Tanbaldin ayirib bizniki bolg'ay* (BN. 79).

This affix was actually formed in the form of *-niki (-iṅki)* on the basis of *-niki*, which forms the dependent form, and the adjectival suffix *-ki(-qi/-gi/-g'i)* meaning characteristic, relation.

Later, with the passage of time, the occurrence of the possessive with *-ning* receded, and the form *-niki* became active. In some dialects of modern Uzbek, possessiveness is still made using the affix *-niṅki (-iṅki)*. In the modern Uzbek literary language, *-niki* is used as a literary norm, it has entered our language as a morphological relic based on the combination of *-n* and *-gi* affixes.

Fuller conjugation has two meanings in modern Turkish languages: a) it is attached to the verb group as a concrete thing-body object conflict (in nouns in the concrete object-physical sense), it is attached to the main agreement by means of an indefinite object (that is, in nouns with an abstract object-body meaning);

b) accusative is the only form in the definiteness-uncertainty distinction away from the verb, in which the meaning of the complement is determined by the meaning of the subject, like the possessive. The first of these two meanings is a remnant of the past, while the second is an element of progress: *kelgani aniq – akamni ko'rdim*.

Direction conjugation. The vowel *a* is found in all the suffixes of direction conjugation that are considered to be the form of the past tense in modern Turkish languages for example *-ga, -ka, -qa, -g'a*. Accordingly, it is assumed that the form of the departure agreement in ancient Turkic languages is mainly *-a*, and elements such as *g, k, q, g'* were formed later in the structure of agreement suffixes as means of concretizing the meaning.

Accordingly, the use of *-a//ə* is noticeable in all forms of the dispatch agreement. These adverbs are used in various forms in modern Uzbek, although most of them indicate the direction of the subject to the object, some of them are used in a way that deviates from their main grammatical meaning and function.

² Abdurahmonov G., Shukurov Sh., Mahmudov Q. O'zbek tilining tarixiy grammatikasi. – Toshkent, 2008. – B. 80.



For example, the forms *-gari//kari*, *-garu//qari*, *-ra*, which are considered archaic for the modern Turkic language, are found in some Uzbek words such as *ilgari*, *ichkari*, *tashqari*, *ichra*, *uzra*. But now these suffixes do not mean the meaning of the direction like the current meaning, but are imagined as an inseparable whole together with the base to which they are added, they are no longer an affix of agreement, but have become a morphological element that forms place and time expressions.

In some modern Turkish languages, the affixes *-gari//kari*, *-gari//qari* are still used as indicators of the case of departure, depending on the nature of the stem.

For example: in the Altaic language *eringari* “*kechqurun*”, *tishqari*, *kuskari* “*ko‘zga*”, *ichkari*, *teskeri*; in Gagauz and Turkish languages *dishari*, *ileri*, *icheri*; in Khabarda-Balkar language *ogari* (*yuqori*), *ichkari*, *tishxari*.

The vocabulary of the modern Uzbek language includes the idioms of dawn and dusk. It is not difficult to understand what they mean at the moment. However, the word *eran-qaran* does not correspond to the standards of the modern Uzbek language either in terms of form or semantics. That is why the “Annotated dictionary of the Uzbek language” does not give an explanation or description of the word: because there is no reason to explain.

ERAN-QARAN. *elan-qaran*. [Bolaning] *Qadam olishi eran-qaran... zarang tayog‘i chag‘ir toshlarga tegib, yengil sakraydi. E. A‘zamov, Olam yam-yashil. Ular eran-qaran o‘rinlaridan turishdi. Sh. Xolmirzayev, Saylanma. To‘dadan ikki kishi ajralib, eran-qaran uning ortidan yurdilar. N. Norqobilov, Bekatdagi oq uycha.*

Eran-qaran The morphemic analysis of the word can be given as follows:

The first element is the core: *er* – place, site (towards the sun) means³, *-(a)n* in the Old Turkish language, fertile is an affix of the instrumental case suffix; *-qaran* departure agreement suffix *-qaru* and the affix of the instrumental case *-n* is formed by joining and simplifying. That's why the analog of this word in Altai language *eringari* (evening) has been preserved in the old form. So, the word *eran-qaran* can be included in the “Annotated Dictionary of the Uzbek Language” as it expresses the meanings of “late”, “at peace”.

In order to examine the relationship of the place-time agreement to relictivity, it is necessary to turn to the present-day reflection of the Old Turkish language agreement.

In Old Turkic, the instrumental suffix *-in//in* expressed various grammatical meanings. In the modern Uzbek language, these suffixes, denying the function of agreement affixes, have been preserved in some words that are used as adverbs of place and time, and they now perform the function of adverbs of place or time, such as: *qishin-yozin*, *ochin-to‘qin*. Although these affixes have forgotten to indicate the meaning of the previous vehicle, they still retain their place in our language as a morphological rudiment.

Although adverbs are formative, they have historically had word-forming potential. The fact that these suffixes change according to the nature of the root is considered a phenomenon related to the synharmonic potential of Turkish languages.

³Gafero'glu (Gaf. EUS, 96) "sun" and Mahmud Koshgari(D. Vol. 1. - P. 464.) noted that it means "towards the sun" that the earth's core is homogeneous with *I : r~er*.



For example, the classification of the archisemes of the *erta* word can be a proof of our opinion.

Erta - the word er “in the morning” is formed by adding the locative suffix -ta to the base expressing the meaning “morning”. V. Bang notes that the genesis of this word developed from the middle vowel early (Bang. “Turan”, 1-2, 94). S.E. Malov (366) and E.R. Tenishev showed that it is a lexical unit formed by adding a locative suffix to the root of the broad vowel *erta* and expressing the meanings “already”, “before”, “in the morning”.

V.Bang and V.Radlov found that the consonant suffix (*ərdə*) of the word *erta* was used in Yakut and ancient Uyghur languages, *erde*, *erden* “earlier” and form of the old Turkish language, and S.E. Malov in “Oltin Yoriq” in the form of *erta*. It was said that it was used in a non-slang form.

In the modern Uzbek language, there is a sign of artificiality in the *erta* word, but the possibility of dividing it into morphemes has been forgotten.

It is necessary to approach the presented arguments only as a sketch, because restoring the syntactic possibilities of each grammatical form gives the need to take into account the existence of dialectical conflicts in each of them. There is a need to carry out certain research in this regard. For this, it is necessary to analyze the current and ancient grammatical constructions of our language, to take into account the existence of various contradictions in grammatical forms and to reveal its essence. In this study, it is necessary to study the grammatical structure of the language in a comprehensive way, and it should be assumed that each modern form in it provides information not only in the current grammatical sense, but also about the previous - ancient situations⁴.

References

1. Потебня А.А. Из записок по русской грамматике, т. I—II. – М., 1958. – С. 86.
2. Abdurahmonov G., Shukurov Sh., Mahmudov Q. O‘zbek tilining tarixiy grammatikasi. – Toshkent, 2008. – B. 80.
3. Абдурасулов Ё. Туркий тилларнинг қиёсий-тарихий грамматикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 2007. – Б. 92.
4. Малов С.Е. Памятники древнетюркской письменности. Тексты и исследования. –М.; – Л., 1951. – С. 366.
5. Тенишев Э.Р. Хозяйственные записи на древнеуйгурском языке. “Исследования по грамматике и лексике тюркских языков”. – Ташкент, 1965. – С. 136.
6. Радлов В.В. Опыт словаря тюркских наречий, I–IV. – СПб, 1893–1911. I. – С. 194.
7. Гаджиева Х.З., Серебренников Б.А. Сравнительно историческая грамматика тюркских языков. – Москва: Наука, 1986. – С. 31-32.

⁴ Гаджиева Х.З., Серебренников Б.А. Сравнительно историческая грамматика тюркских языков. – Москва: Наука, 1986. – С. 31-32.