

Pragmalinguistic aspect of Homogenous voice composites in Turkic languages (the case of Karakalpak and Uzbek languages)

Satullayeva Nargiza Jalgasbayevna¹, Kuldashev Akrom Makhmudovich²

¹Karakalpak State University, senior lecturer, E-mail: nsatullaeva@mail.ru

²Uzbek State World Languages University, associated professor, E-mail: akrom53@yahoo.com

Abstract: *The article deals with the comparative study of English and Turkic, grammatical forms namely Karakalpak and Uzbek voice forms. The category of voice is one of the most complicated categories of verb morphology nearly in all the languages of the world. Traditionally, the English language is typologically classified as an analytic language with the elements of the synthetic structure. This definition is exemplified by the category of voice is expressed by a synthetic form and the passive voice is expressed an analytical form of the word.*

This fact only shows how topical is the research, that is the comparative study of voice forms in different languages.

The subject of the article is the homogeneous voice composites found a lot in Karakalpak and Uzbek languages. Here in one word form we sometimes find two or more voice meanings, which we named as "Homogeneous voice composites" that is simultaneous use of different voice forms.

This phenomenon can be met in very few, namely agglutinative languages of Karakalpak and Uzbek Type.

The author considers that this article will be of certain interest for those who investigates the pragmalinguistics aspect of language functioning, especially on the morphemic level.

Keywords: *voice form, homogeneous, active, passive, reflexive, reciprocal, medial, causative, synthetic forms, analytical forms, agglutination, voice opposition.*

Introduction

The category of voice is one of the most complicated grammatical categories in nearly all language families in the world, beginning with in the European and ending with Altaic family, to which Karakalpak and Uzbek languages belong. These languages are marked by highly developed agglutinative morphology of words as well as a frame-structure in word order. The Karakalpak language is spoken by about half a million people in the Republic of Uzbekistan.

The aim of this article is to investigate the functional-semantic aspect of the voice forms used in the literary discourse. The task of this article is to compare the voice forms in English, Karakalpak and Uzbek from the point of view of the formation of homogeneous complexes with voice meanings in different types of the discourse.

The topicality of the research undertaken in this article is doubtless because English and Turkic languages differ greatly in the sphere of voice forms. This is due to the typology of the languages. Analytical forms of the word which are so typical of English make it

possible to form chains of words in the form of discontinuous morphemes, once were named by American descriptivists.

Methods

Agglutinative morphology observed in modern Karakalpak and Uzbek where each morpheme has only one grammatical meaning and their collocation gives new composites consisting of two or three voice meanings.

The English language is poor in grammatically pure voice forms. There are only two voice forms Active and Passive. But Karakalpak and Uzbek languages have a comparatively rich paradigm of voice forms. Homogeneous voice composites are formed due to the functional activity of voice forming morphemes. The category of boys is one of the oldest grammatical categories of the verb in general and in Turkic languages, in particular.

Active voice form is represented by zero-morpheme of the verb, which corresponds to the lexical base - stem of the verb, which some linguists call it as a leading diathesis. Namely, here the verb potency of functioning as a verb, as any part of speech, implicitly denoting the relation of the representing action to the reality and the doer of the action that functions in the sentence as the syntactic subject of the sentence if the verb is a dynamic one. If the verb is a stative one, the subject represents the bearer of the state expressed by the predicate verb.

The active voice form of the verb is characterized by the indifferent expression of subject-verb relations in the structure of the sentence where the subject is indifferent to the action or the state expressed by the verb-predicate of the sentence, whether it is the doer of the action expressed by the verb or it has the meaning of state expressed by the stative verb which is the predicate of the sentence.

All other voice forms historically represent the transformation and modification of the active voice within the verb-form by means of special affixal forms.

Thus, reciprocal and causative voice forms characterize the strictly determined interrelation of two real subjects in accomplishing the action. The Reflexive voice is characterized by the direction of the action. Towards the doer of the action which is the subject of an action. The same picture is observed in Uzbek, Karakalpak and other languages. Let us consider the case of the Karakalpak language.

N.A. Baskakov distinguished the following voice forms in Karakalpak.

1. Direct voice; 2. Reciprocal voice; 3. Reflexive voice; 4. Causative voice; 5. Passive voice.

Results

The specific feature of the Karakalpak language which distinguishes it from other Turkic and Germanic languages to that Passive voice can be formed only with transitive verbs, but in Karakalpak, passive voice forms can be formed with intransitive verbs too.

1. Direct voice:

1) with intransitive verbs: *bar* (to go), *kül* (to smile), *tur* (to stand), *jur* (to move), *avry* (to be unwell, ill); also composite verbs: *sav bol* (be healthy), *maida-maida bo'l* (to be cut into pieces).

2) with transitive verbs: *al* (to take), *ayt* (to say), *sal* (to lay); also composite verbs: *talap et* (to demand), *sarp et* (to spare) etc.

2. Reciprocal voice: *jugur* (to run) – *juguryus* (to run together), *kyül* (to laugh) – *klülus* (to laugh together). For example:

1) *Barlik balalarim kyizilsha menen avirasti.* (All my children were deceased with measles).

2) *Ayeldin erligini yeltirem degennen kyorkagandigina tan kilisti.* (They were all surprised by the brevity of the woman, when she wasn't afraid of my threat that I would kill her). [p.335]

3. Reflexive voice:

kön (to get used to smth) – *könik* (to get used, to make a habit of smth);

e.g.: *Tyubiri tulpar argimak Madiyar yuyden ketken son, bosanip ketti – av belimnen* (His favorite horse, which is traced back to a good origin ran away when Madiyar died). [p. 338]

juv (to wash) – *juvin* (to get washed)

kiy (to dress) – *kiyin* (to get dressed)

Jerden shikti saylanip, beline naiza baylanip. [Gevil, p.339] (Came out of from the ground and tied a speare to his waist.)

4. Causative voice:

1) *Siz saqal-murtiniyizdi aldirasiz-bi?* (Will you get shaved? Will you let the barber shave you? [p.341]

Other examples: *Men soktirdim.* – I was beaten.

Men tonettim. – I was robbed.

Merey aldirdim. – I lost the game.

5. Passive voice:

Benzindi ot aldi. – The oil got inflamed.

Kolumb ashkan Amerika > Kolumb tarepinnen ashilgan Amerika. America which was discovered by Columbus < America which Columbus discovered. The same picture can be observed in all other Turkic languages. There we could find from 2 to 10 voice meanings, and corresponding means of expressing those categorial meanings. To compare there are two grammatically structured voice forms in English which have no corresponding forms.

Now let us compare semantically explicit or implicit voice forms represented in English and Turkic languages.

Table 1.

№	Voice meanings	English	Karakalpak	Uzbek
1.	Reflexive	+	+	+
2.	Medio reflexive	-	+	+
3.	Generalized reflexive	-	+	+
4.	Passive-reflexive	-	+	+
5.	Reciprocal-reflexive	-	+	-
6.	Direct-reflexive	+	+	+
7.	Optimal-reflexive	-	-	-
8.	Medio passive-reflexive	+	+	+
9.	Objectless passive	+	+	+
10.	Active objectless passive	+	-	+
11.	Extending reflexive additional	-	-	-
12.	Externally adjectivized passive	-	-	-
13.	Directly resulted reflexive	-	-	-

14.	Dynamic reflexive	-	-	-
15.	Impersonal intensive	-	-	-
16.	Causative-causative	-	+	+
17.	Causative-reflexive	-	+	+
18.	Causative-causative passive	-	-	+
19.	Causative-reflexive passive	-	-	+

As it can be seen from their names of the voice forms, we can observe semantic composites of voice forms. Semantic composite is a means of expressing two or three voice forms in one word which can be either a synthetic or an analytical form. Of course, a great majority of these forms realized in Latin, Sanskrit or other synthetically most developed languages like Russian, German. However, in English which has analytic structures more than synthetic structures such clusters are not realized. In Uzbek and Kyrgyz, the semantic composition of voice forms are mostly found.

E.g. 1) *Bugun qurt bostirishimiz esingizdami?* [Q.Kenja, p.5]

Causative + reciprocal (Do you remember that today we should cover the silk worms up?) Here the ending “tir” expresses causation and “ish” – reciprocity.

2) *Har kuni azonda kolkhoz idorasi oldida to'planishadi.* (Q. Kenja, p.5) – Reflexive + Reciprocal. (Every morning they got together at the building of the Kolkhoz management.) Here -n- expresses Reflexive voice meaning and -ish expresses reciprocity.

3) *Pakhtaning ichiga ekib bo'lmaidi, soyado hosil bitmaydi, tejab ishlatilsa, tut barglarimiz yetadi – deydi.* [Q.Kenja].

Causative + Passive. (It is not recommended to plant within the cotton-crushes the shady land won't do, if we economize we may have enough leaves – he said.) Here “t” expresses causation and “il” expresses Passive voice.

4) *Qiz ulg'ayib turmushga chiqishga loyiq bo'lguncha kelin tomon kelishilgan qalinni olib... yurarkan.* [Said Anvar, 18]

Reciprocal + Passive. (While the girl gets adultery and becomes ready for getting married the bride's parents would receive the contracted sum of money from the bridegroom's family.) Here “ish” expresses Passive voice.

5) *Agar chol va qiz ko'nishsa, shaharga olib ketaman, boboyini do'htirlarga ko'rsattiraman.* [Said Anvar, p.21]

Causative + Causative. (If the old man and the girl agree, I will take them to the city and consult the doctors for the oldman.) Here we have two grammatical morphemes expressing causation “sat” and “tir”. We call them as homogeneous morphemes expressing causation.

It is interesting to note that some scholars regard -sat not as a grammatical meaning, but a lexical morpheme forming a new word from the stem “ko'r” – to see, “ko'rsat” – to show.

The same problem arises here if we regard it as a word-forming means. Because if it is a word-building affix, it should build more than one word, at least two words, two new words. But it forms only one word – *ko'rsat* (to show). In Uzbek “to see and to show are expressed by one root. But in English words of two roots are used to express these meanings, therefore English linguists don't understand the essence of the problem. In Russian the case is close to the English one: *увидеть* (to see) – *показать* (to show). We see no problem in

distincting the categorial forms of the words. Analysis of the Uzbek examples show we see the following types of semantically homogeneous voice forms in Uzbek.

1) Causative-reciprocal; 2) Reflexive-reciprocal; 3) Causative-causative; 4) Passive-causative; 5) Reciprocal-passive.

But this list is not complete yet. Detailed analysis of the homogeneous composites of the Passive voice forms in Karakalpak and Uzbek can demonstrate some other types of homogeneous voice forms.

Here we will try to analyze the influence of the composite formation to the semantic structure of the sentence to the semantics of the homogeneous voice forms. Let us analyze some examples:

1) Uzb. *botirilgan* – (Causative + Passive) the root of the verb is *bot-* (to be drowned) and when it takes the ending “*tir*” it took the form “*bottir*” but later one “*t*” was lost due to the principle of simplifying the syllable structure and pronunciation. And the word obtained the today’s form “*botmoq*”. We know some other forms of the word – *botmoq*, *botirmoq*, *botinmoq*, *botirilmog*, *botishmoq*, *botilmoq*, *botqizmoq*, *botilishmoq* etc. The last marked forms were not registered in written records, and we regard them as semantically and grammatically incorrect forms.

2. Uzb. *to'planishadi* (reflexive, reciprocal). The stem is *to'p* (to get together) – *to'plamoq*, *to'planmoq*, *to'plattirmoq*, *to'platqizmoq*, *to'plashmoq*, *to'platmoq*. All these forms are semantically and grammatically correct homogeneous voice forms. But, if we change the places and order of these endings the meaning of the word is distorted.

3. Uzb. *ishlatilsa* (Causative, Passive). The root is *ish*. Its derivatives are: *ishlamoq* (to work), *ishlatmoq* (to make smb. work), *ishlatilmoq* (to be used), *ishlattirmoq* (to make to be used), *ishlanmoq* (to work on smb), *ishlashmoq* (to help to work) etc.

The same rule is observed here, we cannot change places of the homogeneous markers of voice forms.

In some cases we observe homonymous forms in the sphere of means of expressing voice forms in Turkic languages. For example:

1) *Nodir turnikka osildi.* (Reflexive)

2) *Nodir dorga osildi.* (Passive)

The first sentence can be translated as: *Nodir hang on the Horizontal bar.*

The second sentence can be translated as: *Nodir was hung.*

Nodir oyog'ini osiltirdi. – *Nodirning oyog'i osiltirildi.* As the Passivization transformation is possible, we can take the first sentence as non-passive. (*Nodir made his leg hung.*) But we cannot say “*Nodir oyog'ini osidi.*” or “*Nodirning oyog'i osildi.*” (*Nodir hang his leg. and Nodir's leg was hung.*) However, in Uzbek we can say “*Oyog'idan osildi.*” It is translated into English as “*Nodir was hung by his leg*”.

Discussion

Analysis of the voice forms of the above-mentioned verbs together with the grammatically and semantically relevant forms makes it possible to conclude that not all the forms found grammatically and semantically relevant can be equivalently used in the oral or written discourse. May be it is explained by the fact that the appearance of semantically homogeneous forms in speech makes it semantic structure complicated. Adding one more voice ending demands one more actant to the semantic structure of the sentence. And this presents additional difficulties and energy to the speaker and listener to percept new elements.

For instance, the Uzbek verb “*kelmoq*” (to come) demands an animate subject. *Tom keldi* (Tom came.). But if we change the subject and make it inanimate we'll have: *Do'kongamol keldi* (New goods were brought to the shop.).

Here semantic structure of the sentence will be different. Because goods never come themselves, someone has to bring them. If we want to indicate who namely brought the goods we will have to add one more element to the semantic structure of the sentence. And the sentence structure will become heavy-weighted. As one more example to this case we can illustrate this following sentence:

Radio aytganday, qarilik gashtini surib yotibman. [S. Siyoyev, 5]

It is translated into English as: As the Radio informed I'm enjoying my old age: Here Radio stands for the Reporter or speaker or someone whom the hero heard.

There is one more example of a specific use of voice in Uzbek. *Sharsharalar cholning ko'zi qamashishiga olib keldi.* [S.Siyoyev, 8]

The infinitive of this verb is “*qamashtirmoq*” and it is used with eyes and teeth in plural form. If the morpheme of “*-sh-*” is used to form reciprocal voice. In this case, this verb has no Active noise form. We should state here that in the English language there is no verb, which has no active voice form. All the verbs have active voice form in the binary opposition “Active < > Passive”. But in Uzbek, Karakalpak and other Turkic languages we find some verbs which don't have active voice forms. They are not used in the Active voice. They are the following: *qamashmoq*, *yarashmoq*, *yopishmoq*, *yo'qolmoq*, *qidirmoq*, *silkitmoq*, *berkitmoq*, *sevinmoq*, *urinmoq*, *o'rganmoq*, *surtmoq* etc.

Conclusion

As a conclusion we can state that absence of the initial, primary form in binary opposition in Turkic languages is one of the rarely registered phenomena in the semantics of verb forms in human languages of the world. This case can be explained by the semantic homogeneity of voice forms. When voice forming morphemes are very active there can naturally be the state when we find split-membered paradigms as Active < > passive. This can also be explained by comparatively developed morphology of verbs in these languages, when contextual proximity of grammatical and lexical means of expressing grammatical categories cause the hypercorrection of morphemes in discourse.

References:

1. Taylor John R. Cognitive Grammar. Oxford, OUP, 2003, 621 p.
2. Baskakov V.A. Karakalpakskiy yazyk (fonetika i morfologiya), M. Nauka, 1957, 544 p.
3. Kononov A.A. Sovremenniy uzbekskiy literaturniy yazyk, M. Nauka, 1960, 480 p.
4. Baskakov V.A. (ed.) Sravnitel'naya grammatika tyurkskikh yazykov, Morfologiya, M.Nauka, 1981, 600 p.
5. Gulamov A. Fe'l. T. Fan, 1998, 120 p.
6. Khajiyev A. Fe'l. T. Fan, 1982, 230 p.
7. Meschaninov A.A. Glagol. M.Nauka, 1982, 260 p.
8. Rakhmatullayev Sh. Khozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili, T. Fan, 2008, 312 p.