

Morphological Classification of Languages



Sevara Farkhadovna Alimova

Lecturer, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT: This article describes the morphological classification of languages in general linguistics, as well as the division of all languages in the world into 4 groups: isolation or amorphous languages, agglutinative, inflectional and polysynthetic languages, the views of linguists. Of these, Chinese, which is close to the amorphous category, is illustrated with examples.

KEYWORDS: Isolating, amorphous, Chinese, vocabulary, morphology, grammar "Science is the driving force behind the development of society".

INTRODUCTION

After gaining independence, our country attaches great importance to the development of education and science. In recent years, our country's relations with the People's Republic of China have expanded, and mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries has continued. In particular, various district measures are being taken to strengthen mutually beneficial cooperation between science, culture and art. This, in turn, requires the study of the Chinese language, scientific research.

THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

It is known that in order to directly study the world languages, including Chinese, the process of grouping them on the basis of various criteria had begun. One of these criteria is whether a genetic or genealogical classification has been made in terms of their mutual brotherhood and origin. At the same time, of course, based on the appearance of the language system, that is, the structure of word forms, the morphological criterion was initially recognized as the leader. After the efforts of this order, the most common classification to this day is the classification developed by A. Schlegel as early as the beginning of the XIX century, and then supplemented and modified by W. Humboldt (with some clarifications and changes in turn). According to this classification, all languages in the world are primarily divided into four groups: isolating (separating, isolating) or amorphous (formless, words are not variable) languages; agglutinative (the term is now widely used in relation to the agglutinator; words whose words are formed and changed by agglutination), inflective (languages that form a word by inflection), and polysynthetic (the term is now more common than the word insert). Inflected languages are divided into inflective-synthetic and inflective-analytical types.[1]

An isolating (separating-isolating) or amorphous group (i.e., 'formless', from the Greek negation + form) is characterized by the immutability of words, as well as the relationship between words, characterized by the order of their sentences. The concepts of isolation and amorphous are only partially mutually exclusive. The reason for the so-called isolating languages is that the shape of the words does not indicate the relationship between the words in the sentence, not all words (forms) are related, they are as if "isolated" (separated) from each other in the sentence. However, words themselves in the same language consist only of the stem, and in other languages, they may have word-forming affixes. Some linguists do not include word formation in grammar (and, of course, morphology), but consider it to be related to lexicology, since word-formation tools are used to form new words. However, the tools used to express the relationship between words in a sentence are used to form new words, and even often the same structural tools are used at the same time: both to form new words and to express relationships in different forms; for, in the morphological classification of languages based primarily on the morphological interrelationships in the word, the means of word formation must also be taken into account.

The term amorphous can be strictly included only in the category of core isolating languages; because they are literally deprived of the word form, they do not have not only a word-changing form, but also a word-forming form; while the sentence represents a sequence of invariant stems, the boundaries of which correspond to the boundaries of the word. New concepts in these languages can be expressed in terms of the proportionality of existing cores.[2]

In particular, for the connection of words, in addition to the word order, can be used words that lose their main meaning in the relevant context and take the form of a servant word - auxiliary or connective. There are no word groups in these languages.

Morphological Classification of Languages

Words denoting objects, properties, realities, etc., do not differ from each other in terms of structure (because they are represented by invariant stems), and even a single word can express an object, a property, or a reality, regardless of the context.

According to M.A. Zhurinskaya, amorphous languages are characterized by the absence of word change (slovoizmenenie), the grammatical significance of the word order in the sentence, and the weakness of the opposition of the auxiliary words with the pronoun.[3]

However, none of the languages of the world, known through ancient written monuments and living today, fully correspond to the amorphous category, its above-mentioned features. But there are also languages that are close enough to the amorphous. As evidence, we can cite Chinese sentences based on the norms of the amorphous group: 茶我不喝。Cha wo bu he. I don't drink tea (I don't drink tea) in which case it has no significance for us). This sentence consists of four words, each of which is considered to be the core in pure form, without any additional elements. It is translated into Uzbek as "I do not drink tea", but literally translated "I do not drink tea", because 茶 Cha simply means "tea" and does not express the attitude to other words at all. 我 Wo means 'I' and there is no official command for person and time again. For example, Chinese (i.e., the ancient Chinese language of classical literature; because modern Chinese is far from this case, although it also contains elements close to the amorphous category), to a lesser extent the Indo-Chinese Vietnamese (annam) language, settled in West Africa. Some languages of the living population.

In Chinese, a word itself (as is the case in amorphous languages, as mentioned above) can mean both an object and a reality. For example, the word 磨 Mo, depending on the context, means both "crushing" and "grinding stone" (i.e., a grinding object). The expression of new concepts through the equilibrium of cores is widely developed. For example: 水负 Shui fu - «water carrier», 水 Shui «water» + 负 Fu «carrier».

However, not all sentences in Chinese are structured as above, and not all words have a pure core. Many independent words have lost their basic lexical significance and become 'dry' words (the term is used in Chinese grammar), partly as word-forming adjectives, partly as a formal indicator of the relationship between words, partly to our coherent endings, partly to adjectives denoting the verb of time, and e.t.c. is applied in an adaptive manner. For example, 的 de is sometimes used in conjunction with different words to denote an object, a device, a place, and also has other meanings: 我 wo- "I", 我的 wo de - "mine" (which belongs to me), 工人 gong ren- "worker" (a separate word 人 means "man"), 工人的 gong ren de- "belonging to the worker", 来 lai - "coming", 来的 lai de- "that (man) coming and (people) the place (place) to come "; for example, 来的人 lai de ren- "the coming man", 来的地方 lai de di fang- "the place where people come". If the present tense is denoted by the pure name of this reality (as in the example above), then the past tense

CONCLUSION

Some linguists consider the term amorphous to be unsuccessful in applying the considered category of language on the grounds that there are no languages deprived of form at all. In this case, the word is not about the absence of a form at all (zero, it can be a combination of words and sentences), but about the absence of a separate word form. Linguists who deny the validity of the concept of amorphous languages believe that such languages, which do not have a separate word form, do not exist. These linguists believe that there is a word form that is not expressed at all by the outside; of course, it is impossible not to agree with this. In fact, we have the right to say that there are languages whose words do not have formal (external) grammatical forms, and as a result, "amorphous languages" are legitimate.[4]

Chinese is not only ancient, classical, but also modern, with many facets typical of the amorphous category. But modern Chinese cannot be said to be amorphous, as mentioned above. We find in it so many signs that this aspect brings it closer to agglutinative languages.

REFERENCES

- 1) Gorelov VI "Lexicology of the Chinese language", Moscow, "Enlightenment", 1984
- 2) Dragunov AA "Grammatical system of the modern Chinese language", Leningrad, 1962.
- 3) Jurinskaya M.A. Tipologicheskaya klassifikatsiya yazykov lingvisticheskiy entsklopedicheskiy slovar, M. 2002 (LES)
- 4) Kuznetsov P.S. Morphological classification yazykov. M.1954
- 5) 刘月华, 翻文古"实用汉语语法"北京 2007
- 6) 何世达"现代汉语"北京出版社 1986
- 7) <http://www.bfsu.edu.cn>
- 8) <http://www.chinaviev.org>
- 9) <http://www.bku.edu.cn>