

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 02 Volume: 70

Published: 20.02.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Shahnoza Aybekovna Alieva  
Andijan State University  
dpt. Uzbek linguistics  
Senoir lecturer  
[z\\_eshanova@mail.ru](mailto:z_eshanova@mail.ru)

SECTION 29. Literature.

## COMMENTS ON THE LEXICAL TRANSFORMATION

**Abstract:** The article gives comments on the studying lexical transformations in the Russian and Uzbek linguistics and the factors that make them. It observes methods of formation of the lexical transforms in Uzbek language; the process of creating synthetic and analytical transforms using affixes and auxiliary words is presented based on examples.

**Key words:** derivation, transform, transformation, lexical derivation, language layers, system, nominative, constructive, compressive, expressive, stylistic, some of stylistic adaptation, grammatical form, grammatical meaning, paradigm.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Alieva, S. A. (2019). Comments on the lexical transformation. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 02 (70), 160-162.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-02-70-13> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.02.70.13>

### Introduction

In Russian linguistic the problems of lexical derivation and transformation discussed by Russian scholar E.A.Zemskaya, who commented on the process of words formation in her research. From this point of view, the ideas outlined in her book “Yazyk kak deyatelnost” (Language as an activity) are remarkable [2, p.198]. The author devoted almost sixty years of her life to studying the problems of lexical derivation. It is possible to accept her latest book as a synthesis of this sixty-year scientific work experience. In her opinion, it is not advisable to consider the word formation as a separate level of language. Word formation along with morphology stands on the same level of the language and establishes a small but essential subsystem closely connected with its morphology and lexics [2, p.198].

Although E.A.Zemskaya has extensive experience in the field of derivation, we believe that in many cases, she confuses it with the phenomenon of transformation. Specifically, she distinguishes up to five following derivation types: 1) creating a purely nominative word; 2) constructive word formation; 3) compressive word formation; 4) expressive word formation; 5) stylistic word formation.

### Materials and Methods

Obviously, the fourth and fifth types included in the group of word formation do not meet its requirement. In them, using the specific means does not lead to formation of another lexeme from the particular lexeme, which would be semantically motivated with the latter one. Instead, in the semantic content of the word created addition semes of expressive and stylistic adaptation appears. Therefore, the fourth and fifth types are nothing more than a word change, or in other words, a lexical transformation.

The lexical transformation is the change of the word with its grammatical forms that carry grammatical meanings. Thus, the lexical transformation covers all cases except the word formation process. It includes creating the word forms. In other words, the transformation occurs as a result of the change of the second component of the word forms in the formula W + Mgr. Therefore, it is defined as morphological transformation and can be contrasted with syntactic transformation. However, in the context of the word, taking into account its formation and transformation, in order to generalize the part of the word and to distinguish between lexical formations and changing such terms as derivation and transformation are used.

Academic A.Hadzhiev explains grammatical meanings and grammatical forms, that the

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

grammatical meaning does not change the lexical sense of the word, but serves as an additional meaning to its lexical meaning and is expressed through use of special means [8, p.5]. At the same time, grammatical meaning and grammatical form are used only for words with independent meaning, since only they possess grammatical meanings and grammatical forms [8, p.5]. It is true that every independent word has grammatical meanings and grammatical form. However, this does not mean that auxiliary morphemes are lack of grammatical meaning.

Every grammatical form represents a particular grammatical meaning. As a member of a special grammatical paradigm, along with a general sense of this paradigm, it possesses a unique grammatical sense, which differs it from the members of other paradigms, even before it comes to a syntactic relationship with the leading morpheme of the word. For example, the form of an objective case as a member of the case paradigm has the common sense of "case" - the sense to express syntactic relationship of the word, it is connected to, with another word; at the same time it possesses the special meaning, special grammatical sense, which differs it from the meaning of forms used for parental and dative cases.

In the Turkology, in particular, in Uzbek linguistics, fundamental research on word formation began in the 50s, however, in the textbooks and manuals the issues related to formation and changing words until the 1970s were presented inside of the morphology [3, p.5]. As Academic A.Hadjiev pointed out, the reason for studying the matters of word formation and form creation in the field of morphology is that both of them occur with the help of morphemes. Morpheme and its peculiarities were also discussed in morphology. However, later the study about morpheme has been separated as a special field [8, p.3].

Every independent word, besides a lexical sense, also has a grammatical meaning. The grammatical meaning does not change the lexical sense of the word; it conveys additional meaning to the lexical meaning and is expressed through special means. The form taken by the means expressing grammatical meaning is called the grammatical form of the word or, in short, word form [8, P.5]. Professor Sh.Rahmatullaev uses the term "lexeme form" for the different grammatical forms of a lexeme. [4, P.28]. Every lexeme form is considered to be one of the various transformations of the particular lexeme, occurred on a speech process.

In Uzbek language, the lexical transformations are created by means of affixes and auxiliary words. We create synthetic transforms using affixation and analytical transforms using auxiliary words. For example, such lexeme forms as **далага** (to the field), **дала томон** (in the direction of the field) are different transforms of the word **дала** (field), the

first one made by affixation and the second one – by composition, for this reason the first transform is synthetic, and the second one is the analytic lexic transform. A.Hadjiev discussing word forms, divides them in accordance with their ability or disability to create a grammatical category into categorical and non-categorical forms. For example, the case, possession, time, and voice are the categorical forms. The reason is that these forms demonstrate that the transform peculiar to the particular category. Diminutive and petting forms of nouns, participle forms of verbs, and names of actions are non-categorical forms [9, P.338; 10, P.226].

In addition, there are forms of words called "modal form" and "subjective forms", which some authors interpret as derivatives, and other authors – as transformants [8, p.25].

A.Hodzhiev criticized the attempt to distinguish except of categorical and non-categorical types separated forms of transforms, such as "the form of subjective evaluation" and "modal form". In his opinion, dividing word forms into the categorical and non-categorical types of words based on the certain principles. Here the relation of the word form to the grammatical category is considered as a basis. In distinguishing modal forms and forms of subjective evaluation, there is not such a principle. In fact, the forms described as "modal form" and "subjective evaluation" are the phenomena, which are related neither to word formation nor to grammatical categories [8, p.27]. The debate on the above forms, as he suggests, based on the fact that the general theoretical problems related to form creating were not properly studied [8, p.29].

Some scholars unite all operators that oppose to the lexical derivation operators in the group of the form makers, and, in accordance with their ability or disability to express syntactic relations, divide them into vocabulary form makers and syntactic form makers [6, P.97]. In this confrontation, the first of the opposing members does not have the basic sign of the conflict, and it is weak, the second one has that sign, and considered as the strong member of that confrontation.

The vocabulary form makers and the syntactic form makers, in accordance with their ability or disability to effect the meaning of the main part, they are connected to, appear in the relation of privative confrontation. In this respect, the vocabulary form makers possess the sign of the confrontation basics and they are strong, while syntaxes form makers, in contrary, do not possess it, so they are weak.

Azim Hodzhiev says that since in the Uzbek language morphology mainly categorical forms have so far been studied, a number of additions, such as **-даги**, **-дек**, **-ники**, **-нинг**, were observed as word makers. In his view, any form of word (i.e. transform) expresses a grammatical meaning. This is

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	ПИИЦ (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

a common feature for all grammatical forms. They represent different grammatical meanings. Word forms, without any regard to their meaning, in accordance with their relation to grammatical category, are divided into two major categories: categorical and non-categorical forms. Every word form belongs to one of these types. The forms defined up to now as “modal forms”, “forms of subjective evaluation” and “diminutive-petting forms”, such as кизча, кўзичок, акажон belong to non-categorical forms [8, P.28].

The form -гина is connected to not only nouns and adjectives. It can be added to almost all independent words. For example, шугина, келсагина, анчагина, секингина, иккитагина and others. This is a general form expressing two types of meaning, two types of essence, and both of those forms differ from each other by the ability to carry or not to carry the stress.

In short, the words creation and formation of the word forms opposed to each other, and the first one is considered as derivation, and the second – as a transformation. It is possible to accept the method of forming partial new lexemes by incorporating lexema as a lexical derivation, and the method, which does not create new lexemes, as morphological transformation.

### Conclusion

Comparing to lexis derivation, the result, appeared after adding formation mean to the lexeme form, can be called lexical. Although, it can be named as a transformation. However, since the transformation is related to the word form, it is more preferable to use the term of morphological transformation for the word change presented above to provide more accurate definition for this phenomenon.

### References:

1. Abdurahmonov, G. A. (1960). *Osnovy sintaksisa slojnogo predlozheniya sovremennogo uzbekskoro yazyka*. (p.87). Toshkent.
2. Zemskaya, E. A. (2004). *Yazyk kak deyatelnost. Morfema. Slovo, Rech.* Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury.
3. Gulyamov, A. G. (1955). *Problemy istoricheskogo slovoobrazovaniya uzbekskogo yazyka*. Ch. 1. Affiksatsiya. Diss. Doktora filol. Nauk. Moscow.
4. Rahmatullayev, S. (2002). *Til qurilishining asosiy birliklari*. (p.28). T.: Universitet.
5. Turmiyozov, N., et al. (2002). *Struktur sintaktik asoslari*. Toshkent: Fan.
6. Shahobiddinova, S. (2011). *O`zbek tili morfologiyasi*. (p.97). Andijon.
7. Gaffarov, A. A. (2007). *Hozirgi Uzbek tilidagi partselyativ va ilovali qurilmalarning syntactic derivatsiyasi. Filol, fan. Nomzodi ilmiy darajasini olish uchun taqdim etilgan nomzodlik dissertatsiya avtorefer.* Samarqand.
8. Hojiev, A. (1979). *Hozirgi o`zbek tilida forma yasalishi*. (p.5). Toshkent.
9. (1957). *Hozirgi zamon o`zbek tili*. (p.338). Toshkent.
10. (1966). *Hozirgi o`zbek adabiy tili. Fonetika, leksikologiya, morfologiya*. (p.226). Toshkent.