

Eurasian
Research Bulletin

Generality of reduplication and its role in the typological classification of languages

**Rakhimova Guzal
Yuldashovna**

Assistant professor of Urgench State University, Uzbekistan

Shakirova Inobat

English teacher of Urgench State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Word formation is characteristic of the systems of all languages, because the word formation process itself is constantly operating and the word formation means themselves are dynamically evolving. On this basis, new lexical units are created and the vocabulary of a particular language is enriched. The existence of word formation in the systems of different languages testifies to the typological commonality of this phenomenon.

Keywords:

word formation, affixation, general linguistics, linguistic description.

Introduction

All languages have word formation, however, the ways or types of word formation may have a different degree of occurrence in languages, i.e. for languages of one type, affixation is more characteristic, for another, composition, for a third, conversion, and so on. The foregoing indicates that the systems of all specific languages of the world need a typological inventory of the word-formation system. At the same time, the goals and purposes of a typological inventory may be different. The maximum task of a typologist in this regard is to study word-building means to determine the types of linguistic structure and to establish word-building universals. The minimum or narrow task of a typologist is to fix the main word-building means in systems of quantitatively limited languages, to establish interlingual correspondence, etc., which is a necessary step for preparing answers to typological questionnaires that are necessary for a uniform description of languages and for creating universal grammars. The solution of such questions undoubtedly enriches our

knowledge of the general problems of linguistics. For, according to individual linguists, "general linguistics does not yet know its subject: linguists can know, to one degree or another, what takes place in a particular language, but they do not properly know what can take place in the totality of languages. Indeed, we know something about languages, but how much do we know about the language itself - about what can and cannot be in it, what phenomena in it is connected, what is natural in it, and what is accidental, etc.

Main part

The above table shows that the global problems of linguistic description and generalization of the facts of a language can be carried out by studying the systems of specific languages in terms of comparison, by compiling specific punch cards according to the structure of each of the compared languages. We find similar thoughts in Ld. Grinberg: "One of the steps that any science must take if it wants to clearly comprehend the potential of its scientific method is to go beyond a simple

description of the objects being studied, to move on to their comparison and classifications". Comparison of a limited number of languages about the minimum task of interlingual description is "ordering" in nature, since this paS-case typology is below the "predictive" typology.

Word-building units are not only peculiar units of the language hierarchy, but also modifying features, with the help of which language types and general structures of languages are determined. Therefore, in all typological classifications of languages, the role and degree of compatibility of affixal morphemes, as well as ways of combining root morphemes with each other, are taken into account. This is evidenced by the classifications of languages by the comparativists of the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries, F. Schlegel, A. Schdegel, W. Humboldt, F. Misteiai, F. Bopp, A. Pott, A. Schleicher, G. Steinthal, F.F. Fortu -NATO, F. Fink and others. Derivational and relational elements played an important role in E. Sapir's classification of languages. He classified languages into the following four groups: 1) simple purely relational languages, 2) complex purely relational languages, 3) simple mixed-relational languages, 4) complex mixed-relational languages. Despite some shortcomings, E. Sapir's classification turned out to be very successful and, according to M.I. Zhurinkaya, E. Sapir "took the first steps in creating a typology based on the relationship between signifier and as elements, but as a system. However, its classification also has certain shortcomings and shortcomings that require their improvements. This issue is reflected in the classifications of modern linguists-typologists. So, for example, the derivation index, the prefix index and the suffix index served as one of the main criteria for determining the types of languages in the quantitative-morpho Sepir E. Language. Introduction to the study of speech. Per. about English., J.-L.: State social and economic publishing house, 1934, o.94-115. about Zhurinskaya N.I. Linguistic typology. General linguistics.

logical classification of J. Greenberg. The role of derivative means in the determinative

classification of languages by G.P. about Melnikov.

Thus, word-building means and the principle of compatibility play a role in typological classification, and therefore they can be called "typologically active means." In this regard, we are in solidarity with V.D. Arakin, when he writes that each of the ways of word formation has its own typology. The foregoing also indicates that in the typological inventory of language systems, a certain place is allocated to the typological comparison of the types of word formation in different languages. This, in turn, is due to the fact that word formation and the typological (morphological) classification of languages are interdependent.

When determining the place of word formation in the typological classification of languages, it is necessary to take into account not only affixation, but it is necessary to proceed from all types of word production, since in languages of various genetic groups and morphological types, individual word-formation properties that are characteristic only for their type or group can be developed. In addition, in the system of these languages, a mutual relationship between word-formation types may arise, for example, similarities in the field of derivation may be reflected in the similarity of composition, etc. An example is the fact that the formation of agentive words by attaching the stem of the present tense of verbs to nominal stems in the group with at te and Indo-European languages. These include words like winemaker, field grower, etc. in Russian, and binokor "builder", oshpaz "cook", etc. in Tajik, which are borrowed into the Uzbek language.

It should be noted that this derivational type can go beyond the limits of genetic relationship and be repeated in other languages belonging to other language types. It is found in Chinese and some other languages. For example, a Chinese word like m y y - fu "water carrier" is formed from shu y - "water" + fu - "carry" . These examples testify to the coincidence of the word-formation type, although in the morphological classification of

languages, the Slavic and Iranian languages are inflectional, and Chinese is isolating.

The formation of words by reduplication is a productive type of word formation in almost all languages of the world. This is evidenced by the numerous inventory of reduplicative words found in languages of various systems. The foregoing evidence is also that the formation of words by repetition constitutes an independent subtype of word formation and is included in the rest of the composition as its constituent. With the help of reduplication, new lexical units, grammatical forms and stylistic variants are very productively formed. It is necessary to emphasize the typological commonality or omnipresence of this phenomenon. As can be seen from the materials studied in various languages, repetitions are characteristic of all languages of the world, regardless of their structure or system. Without referring to the reason for the generality, we can show that in some languages this type of tin and shaping is very widely developed, while in others it is less common. The presence of this method is common to all, although repetitions perform very diverse functions in different languages, not limited to one or two levels of the language hierarchy. The typological universality of this phenomenon lies in the fact that with the help of reduplication a certain categorical meaning is transmitted.

The presence of this method of word formation in the systems of many languages at the same time indicates the universality of the existence of reduplication from a typological point of view, which gives us a basis for studying the reduplicative type of word formation in a typological plan, i.e. in such diverse languages as English and Uzbek.

It is known that English and Uzbek languages are unrelated both from the genealogical and typological points of view.

From a genetic point of view, English is an Indo-European language, and Uzbek belongs to the Turkic group of Altaic languages. Therefore, there are almost no direct material correspondences between the systems of these languages. The existing interlingual equivalents

are not identical in terms of ethical correspondence.

Genetic divergence accompanies morphological or formal divergences, since English historically belongs to inflectional languages, and Uzbek - to agglutinative ones. From the point of view of analyticity and syntheticity, the English language is defined as synthetic-analytical or inflectional-analytical or "analytical in general", and the Uzbek language modi Ilyish B.A. The structure of modern English. L.: Education, 1971, p. 10.

is classified as agglutinative-aalitic, or suffixal-agglutinative analytical.

The discrepancy between the compared languages from a genetic and morphological point of view does not in any way indicate the absence of a certain similarity in the field of word formation, which includes word formation by reduplication, because, as evidenced by the facts of typological studies of recent years in the field of linguistic typology, certain linguistic features can be characteristic of systems of a number of languages and on this basis it is possible to classify languages into certain groups.

In this regard, we can talk about the existence of a common phenomenon in the systems of compared languages. The existence of reduplication in different levels of frequency and in different ways indicates the need to study this phenomenon in a comparative (i.e., comparative) plan. As we said above, reduplication is typical for each of the compared languages, however, simply fixing only the presence of this type of word formation is not enough from the point of view of both theory and practice. We need a thorough intralingual inventory of the system of each language, followed by the identification of interlingual similarities and divergences. Only on this basis, it is possible to determine the general pattern of development and distribution of one or another word-formation type, both intralinguistically and interlingually. In a binary study of the structure and semantics of reductive words, we proceed from their unity.

In the linguistic literature, a variety of terms are used to refer to this process:

doubling, with 1 about x Polivanov E.D. Grammar of the Russian language in comparison with the Uzbek language. Tashkent: State Publishing House of the UzSSR, 1934. Same: Experience of a private method of teaching the Russian language. Tashkent: publishing house "Secondary and Higher School" UzSSR, 1961, p. 47 et seq. doubling, repetition, repetition, combine and e, pair combination, gem and -nation, reduplication, duplication and many others. English linguistic literature also uses terms of the following type: reduplication, repetition, reiteration, 2 gemination, rime words, ablaut words, and many others.

As A. Khadzhev rightly pointed out, the same terminological disagreement is also characteristic of the system of redushkativny words in modern Uzbek and other Turkic languages. So, for example, the Uzbek scientific literature on reduplication has terms like: kusha suz, zhuft ouz, takrori suz, etc.

Some linguists use these terms without differentiation of meaning and function, while others differentiate them. For example, following Gony, B.A. Makarenko singles out complete doubling (duplication) and incomplete doubling (reduplication) as means of word formation, and repetitions, which act as syntactic means and are not associated with the formation of new words. This division is primarily based on the study of reduplication in word-formation and stylistic aspects. As for the grammatical use of this phenomenon, it is not considered at all. It is not taken into account that along with affixation, internal inflection, additions, auxiliary words, word order and many others, reduplication can be used as grammatical means when conveying one or another grammatical meaning. Without going into the details of the terminological vagueness of this issue, we note that we use the term "redushsh-kaniya" in relation to the formation of words and word forms. In relation to stylistic devices, we use the term repetition. The reason for the terminological ambiguity is, firstly, the lack of a typological generalizing study of this phenomenon in the systems of various languages of the world, and secondly,

the lack of study of the morphemic nature of reduplicated words in general.

The range of use of reduplication is very wide. It is typical for all genres and styles of speech. Reduplication is used both in literary and bookish and colloquial speech; it is typical for the speech of both adults and children.

Conclusion

In some languages, reduplication performs mainly a word-formation role, while in some others it permeates all levels of linguistic stratification and expresses various categories. As we said above, reduplication is characteristic of all languages of the world. It appears in ancient and modern Hindi, in classical Latin and in modern Romance languages, in the dead Gothic language of Ulfshsh and in all Germanic, Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages, in widespread Slavic, as well as in the languages of the far North, Africa, North America and in many others. Despite the many varieties of languages and their genetic and typological non-identity, reduplication can only express certain linguistic categories. These categories can be lexical, grammatical and stylistic.

References:

1. Vezhbitskaya A. Reduplication in the Italian language: cross-cultural pragmatics and illocutionary semantics // Semantic universals and description of languages. – M., 1999.
2. Vezhbitskaya A. Language. Culture. Cognition. –M., 1996.
3. Venerova S.A. Compound words as a way to create figurativeness in works of art // collection of scientific works of the Moscow State Pedagogical Institute named after M. Torez. -Linguistic aspects of imagery. –M., 1981.
4. Vinokur T.G. Patterns of stylistic use of language units. –M.: Nauka, 1980.
5. Gak V.G. To the problem of correlation of language and reality// Questions of linguistics. - 1972. -№5- p. 12-22.
6. Galperin I.R. Text as an object of linguistic research. –M., 1981.

7. Golovin V.G. Essays on Russian morphemics and word formation. - Voronezh, Publishing House of VSU, 1990.
8. Gulyamov A. Problems of historical word formation of the Uzbek language. Dis. doc. philol. Sciences. -Tashkent, 1955