



THE CONCEPTUAL STRUCTURE OF THE REALITY REPRESENTED BY THE CATEGORY OF THE VOICE IN THE KARAKALPAK LANGUAGE

Satullaeva Nargiza Jalgasbaevna

English Language and Literature Department, Karakalpak State University, Nukus, Uzbekistan, Karakalpakstan

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra9901>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra9901

ABSTRACT

The article describes the question of what is the general direction of research on issues related to the concept, conceptual meaning and conceptual interpretation in cognitive grammar in particular and general linguistics in general. The paper states that in Karakalpak language main voice with a developed new verb terminology has expanded to some extent due to some layer of derived verbs that now the presence of one or another voice affix in the verb has ceased to be a reliable criterion. Furthermore, in the article, different two diatheses are represented by the form of causative voice have been discussed and provided with examples in English, Russian and Karakalpak languages.

KEY WORDS: *conceptual structure, English, Germanic, Karakalpak, typological, Turkic verb, voice.*

INTRODUCTION

We will be going to consider the correlation of the traditional concept of the voice category with the new conceptual development of the voice category and concepts related to the semantics of the ways of expressing the voice in the languages of various systems. There are several directions in cognitive grammar and they all differ from each other depending on what exactly is fighting for the basis in defining the concept, conceptual structure, as well as all other concepts related to the cognitive approach to the study of the basic provisions and categories of grammar. The last word in the cognitive approach to the study of grammatical structure in English, Russian, and other languages can be called a collective monograph edited by N.N.Boldyrev [2]. The main problems raised by the authors of this book are the following:

- voice, return ability, and stative in the aspect of interpretative differences;
- morphological categories in the aspect of linguistic interpretation;
- interpretative potential of morphology from the point of view of the main aspects of the operation of meaning in language;
- secondary interpretation of knowledge in language using morphological forms.
- interpretative - evaluative potential of the level of human cognitive activity.

We might currently assert that cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics and linguoculturology have already reached the second degree of their development. The stage of formation of these sciences, the formation of the conceptual apparatus and the main categories has been completed and scientists are now busy analyzing the material that was collected during the initial period of the existence of sciences.

Therefore, the Cassirer was right when he wrote that “Symbols are known not by cognition, but only by interpretation” [2]. Road signs are necessary not only to know that they are road signs, but also a person should be able to interpret what meaning lies behind this sign, how to understand it, what to prepare for, what should be planned further according to the information received from the newly identified symbol. There are quite a few symbols in this world - continues “The Cassirer is a function, the intersection of symbols of language, the myth of culture”. At the same time, the symbolic universe itself is placed in the significance of a person's consciousness. First - “Symbolic thinking, then “symbolic human behavior” [2].

METHODOLOGY

The absolute majority of forms of compulsory voice have undergone rethinking and now represent a valid voice in its generally accepted understanding. Only the forms with *t*, *tyv*, *qfb* etc have more or less retained their former productivity in the actual voice value. Of all the indirect voices, only the passive is still widely used as a diathesis, in comparison with them the least associated with word formation.

In general, the main voice has undergone the biggest change. In the course of the historical development of indirect voices, especially with the activation and isolation of the word-formation function of their forms beyond the diathesis proper; expressed by them, a lot of lexical units have accumulated, in which voice affixes are distinguished exclusively as derivators, which do not change the original voice characteristics of the generating basis at all and, accordingly, do not in any way interfere with their natural attraction to the main voice, which gradually chose them entirely. Good cognitive linguists have written about these and other problems with a great response of work on this area of



linguistics. The chapters written by N.N. Boldyrev were especially successful. *Language as an interpretive factor of cognition* [3, 174 pp] from 1978; E.G. Belyaevskaya [3, pp.82-157]; O.V.Magirovsky [8 , pp. 158-184]. A.L. Sharandin [10, pp.185-217]; L.A. Panasenko [9, pp. 218-243]; I.A.Besednaya [6, pp. 311-327]; L.A. Furs [11, pp. 328-351]; O.G. Dubrovskaya [7, pp. 371-395] ; I.Yu Bezukladova [5, pp. 422-440].

The scope of the main voice in the Karakalpak language with a developed new verb terminology has expanded so much due to this numerous layer of derived verbs that now the presence of one or another voice affix in the verb has ceased to be a reliable criterion. The separation of the imperative, reflexive, mutual and partly passive voices, especially since it was previously impossible to distinguish the reflexive and passive voices by one external structure of the verb.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The forms of optative (indirect) voices are generally characterized by polyfunctionality, which is far from fitting within the very category of voice. As part of a more or less wide range of verbs. They really have the proper voice meanings, which in existing linguistic sources are characterized without any reservations as the universal and unchangeable content of this voice form. In very many cases, the forms of the voice, unambiguously expressing the corresponding diathesis, simultaneously forms a qualitatively new or updated lexical unit: karakalpak: кьырџин (бриться) (кьырџ-скоблить, тереть), кьогус (увидеться, встретиться, здороваться, здороваться за руку) (кьр)видеть).

Even more often, the voice-forming affix, losing the meaning of this voice, acts exclusively for word-formation purposes, independently or as part of a complex purely derivational affix such as лаш-, -лат-, -лан-, -лэн – Compare, for example: totun – приступить, (tut-держать, ловить).

This clearly expressed dual (voice and word-forming) nature of voice-forming forms, which can be traced both in ancient written monuments and in modern language¹, is manifested in the fact that indirect voices, especially reciprocal causative and in their generally recognized voice meanings do not differ in uniformity, break up into semantically and functionally very different varieties, some of which tend to word formation, preserving only a distant genetic connection with this voice. As for the forms of mutual voice, in all Turkic languages, including some written monuments, they are divided into the following structural and semantic types, which are clearly defined independent models:

1. With numerous involuntary verbs (such as kul - смеяться) or active (such as йырлапџ) actions are distinguished as an independent lexico-grammatical category expressing an indefinite set of homogeneous actions occurring simultaneously, usually correlated with the same subject in the plural form - кьушалаг сайрашды.

2. With a relatively smaller number of verbs of active action, especially in transitive verbs like кьотер -поднимать - it stands out in the typical meaning of assisting in the implementation of an action, the main performer of which is

not the subject, but another person named in the position of an indirect complement in the form of the dative case.

Ол менга бугъдай йкџышди.(Он помог мне собрать пшеницу)

What is a fundamentally different diathesis than all the other diatheses organized by the form - ш Ol menга bugday ykgyshdi.(He helped me harvest wheat)

3. With a narrow circle of transitive verbs like учра- “встретить”, the form -ш- appears in a reciprocal-reflexive meaning;

4. With a wider composition of transitive and partly intransitive verbs, the same form is distinguished in a joint meaning that does not contain an indication of the direction of the action on its performers themselves, provided in the sentence, as in the previous case, by two separately expressed names of persons, as required by the reciprocal voice itself. Ол менынг бирла йорушџы. Он состязался со мной в ходьбе.

5. In some verbs, such as “sura - расспрашивать”, “bilish – разознавать”, “уурлаш – воровать”, the form -ш- expresses the repeatability and intensification of the action, completely without changing the original - voice characterization of the verb.

Fundamentally different two diatheses are represented by the form of causative voice. Compare:

1. Ол атын семиртти. Он откормил свою лошадь.

2. Ол болани ашатты, ана су ичиртты. Она накормила ребёнка, напоила её водой.

In the second variety, characteristic of the Altaic languages, the causative voice, in turn, reveals a multifaceted semantic variation (compulsion, motivation, assumption, resolution, etc). The content and functions of the form of reflexive and especially passive voices are much less branched. But they do not differ in unambiguity and monofunctionality. There is an obvious semantic stratification in the reflexive voice, the passive voice is essentially two different diatheses. No voice other than the main one, none of its varieties has an absolute character. Each indirect voice covers in general only a small part of the verbal vocabulary. In one of its general and particular meanings, it is formed from one circle of verbs, in another from another, depending entirely on the nature of their lexical meaning.

A large discrepancy is found in indirect voices and their functional and semantic varieties in terms of the scope of the verbal vocabulary, i.e. in terms of the number of verbs from which they can be formed, among other things, from their meanings, as well as in the degree of their use, which ultimately depends on the communicative significance of each voice and its varieties. This distinction is used by the fact that the voices and their varieties received precisely in the sphere of their distribution in the process of their historical development. But the most significant differences are found in the Karakalpak language in the composition of the so-called lexicalized forms of indirect voices, as well as in the composition of verbs, in which the voice form simultaneously plays a voice-forming and word-forming role, shedding light on the historical development of the voice category.

Its identity and sufficient features of stability, which gives the basis for the pratyurk language, form this category.



At the same time, among the so called lexicalized forms, in a fairly large layer of verb vocabulary, many have a character of generally Turkic.

For example, *jan* –(гореть) ;*йакъ* (сжечь, развести огонь); *йалкын*; (пламя); *сынъ* (сломаться); *уйрен* (научиться); *уйрет* (научить), *окун* (каяться, сожалеть), *дүшүн* (понять, постичь); *түшъ* (ниспадать. опуститься,-валиться вниз); *йүв*-(мытья ,умываться); *йуу* (мыть стирать); *болуш* -помочь принять участие в осуществлении чужого действия (исполняемого другим лицом), *танъышъ*-(познакомиться, ознакомиться) от *таны* –(знать ,узнать распознать, признать); *тырыл* –(ожить); *тырык* (живой); *сүртъ* (втирать); *кырышъ* (приступить); от *кыр*-(войти) ; *келтырь* (доставить (сюда); от *kel* – (прийти, явиться) ; *күгынъ*-(показаться) от *көр* (видеть) and others.

The word-formation function of voice forms, which left deep and indelible traces in all Turkic languages and nevertheless escaped the attention of researchers, has its roots in antiquity, organically intertwining with the very category of voice and illuminating the most distant origins such as *йүкъат* ->*йүкъадъ* (Baskakov N.A. 387)

The numerous examples provided and similar to them samples clearly indicate that the word - formation function of voice forms is by no means a side spontaneous phenomenon, derived from their main original purposes. If this seems controversial, it is for the reason that not only grammarians, but also lexicographers and lexicologists have not sufficiently studied and revealed the actual dimensions of the so-called lexicalization of voice forms.

Lexicographers usually limit themselves to showing in dictionaries mainly the most striking semantic shifts that occur when the lexical basis of the verb is rejuvenated by voice affixes, and grammarians, describing the voice, as a rule, do not attract dictionary materials, do not use these selective illustrative examples of the use of voice forms for word-formation purposes.

The activeness of the word - formation function of voice forms began to develop on the basis of most of these languages in intra - verbal word formation in two main directions:

1. The forms with *-т* , *-тир* , *-кар* and others are much wider than before they began to serve to transform the nameless verbs of the state into verbs of active action:

For example: *күбейтъ*-(умножить) and *күбей* (увеличиться численно) *күп* (много) *англат* (объяснить) от *англа* (понимать)

And the forms with *-л*- ,*-н*,-*и*-, *-ш*- on the contrary, have firmly established themselves as a regular means of transforming the derivatives of active verbs created by the highly productive affix *-ла-* ,*-ле-*, (*лә*) from names into ordinary verbs of state, completely depriving the voice meaning, or maintaining a distant semantic connection with it: *үтъкърлен*-(сделаться острым, сделаться бойким, шустрым, от *үтъкърле* - (точить) – “*үтъкърь* - острый:

2. On the basis of these two structural types of intra-verbal word formation, complex forms of nameless word formation with *-лан-*,*-лен-* , *лән-*, *-лаш*-*леш*-*лэш*- и на *-лат-*,*-лет-*, *-лэт*, have arisen and are now developing their activity, of which the first two produce verbs of active action: For

example: *къралланъ* (вооружаться), from *къралъ* (оружие); *файдалан* (пользоваться); from *файда* (польза); *кискенлеш* (обостряться) from *кискен* (внезапно).

If in a similar way, we consistently eliminate all historical strata of word-formation processes associated with voice forms from the voice formation itself, then the derivational function of voice forms within their use as indicators of the actual diathesis really appears as an anomalous spontaneous phenomenon, as it separates from antiquity to modernity, increasingly narrowing with a clearly expressed tendency of demarcation and isolation from the very category of voice as a result of its increasing stabilization as such. Nevertheless, the category of voice, even in the modern and most developed state, is not free from word formation. Having arisen mainly on the basis of derivational forms, leaving clear traces of its original dual nature in them, it has never been able to completely break away from the former word-formation traces.

On the one hand, even in the composition of the clearly late highly productive and unproductive word-forming forms operating in the word-formation system outside the voice category, many formations can be noted such as *тугъанлаш* (породниться) from *тугъан* (роственник); *берлене* (объединиться) from *бер* (один); *теллееш* – (перекататься) from *tel* (язык); *судлаш* (судиться) from *суд* (суд); *Тугъанләштир* (породнить); *тынышландъыриш* (успокоить) from *тынышлән* (успокоится), *шатлән* (радоваться) from *шат* (радостный) etc., which fall within the scope of the corresponding voice, or at least gravitate towards it, although at the same time they represent an unconditional derivation or lexical modification.

In other way, with the voice formation itself carried out in isolation from the organized word formation characteristic of the previous case, it is also not excluded. Spontaneous derivation or modification of the lexical content of individual generating bases.

However, in similar cases, updating the lexical meaning of the original basis or its transformation occurs most often because of calque from other languages. But voice forms are involved in it one way or another.

Thus, the voice in the Karakalpak language, neither in its current state, nor even in the historical past, can be distinguished in any consistent way from word formation and qualified as a purely grammatical category of voice [4, 5]

CONCLUSION

Thus, Many Turkologists, following Betlingk, Dmitriev, Konov, interpret the category of voice as a grammatical category. This direction is essentially adjoined by the traditional interpretation of it, coming from Ramstedt and which has received the widest distribution, especially in foreign Turkology; supporters of this firmly established tradition attribute the voice without any justification to the intra-verbal word formation, but consider it not as a derivation proper, but as a category of voice in its generally accepted understanding under the unambiguous terms and terms *factive* or *causative passive reciprocal* and *reflexive* or under their Russian correspondences *compulsive voice passive voice mutual voice* and *refundable voice*. If grammarians up to the



50s were often limited to describing on the material of this language what their predecessors had noted in the field of other languages, starting with Betlingka, then some researchers later, especially from the mid 50s, began to find previously unnoticed typical private or even general meanings of voice forms, but sought to link them with generally recognized voice meanings. Gradually, the list of voice values, especially the list of values of mutual, compulsory and refundable voices, was filled with their more specific meanings and shades, qualified by individual scientists as the actual voice content, after which the very concept of voice became extremely vague.

REFERENCES

1. Baskakov. V.A. *Introduction to the study of Turkic languages. M.V.M, M.: Higher School, 1972. pp. 132.*
2. Boldyrev N.N. *Theoretical and methodological aspects of linguistic interpretation». Tambov, 2018. pp. 448.*
3. Boldyrev N.N. *Language as an interpretive factor of cognition. from 1978.// scientific editor N.N. Boldyrev. Tambov: Publishing House of TSU named after G.R. Derzhavin, 2017. pp. 19-81.*
4. Belyaevskaya E.G. *Interpretation of knowledge about the world in language: methods of study. Tambov: Publishing House of TSU named after G.R. Derzhavin 2016. pp. 82-157.*
5. Bezukladova I.Yu. *Egocentric categorization of space in language as a way of interpreting the world. Tambov State University named after G.R. Derzhavin, 392000, Tambov, Internatsionalnaya str., 33 2017. pp. 422-440.*
6. Besednaya I.A. *Morphological categories in the aspect of linguistic interpretation. Belgorod State National Research University, 85 Pobedy Str., Belgorod, 308015. Type: chapter in the book Language: Russian Year of publication: 2017. pp. 311-327.*
7. Dubrovskaya O.G. *Interpreter of the world. Tyumen State University, 6 Volodarsky str., Tyumen, 625003, 2017. pp. 371-395.*
8. Magirovsky O.V. *Anthropocentric nature of linguistic interpretation. Tambov State University named after G.R. Derzhavin. 2017. pp. 158-184.*
9. Panasenko L.A. *Cognitive foundations of the interpretive potential of lexical categories. Tambov State University named after G.R. Derzhavin, 392000, Tambov, 33 Internatsionalnaya str. Type: chapter in the book Language: Russian Year of publication: 2017. pp. 218-243.*
10. Sharandin A.L. *The word and its forms in the aspect of the theory of interpretation. Interpretation of the world in language: Col. monograph / scientific ed. N.N. Boldyrev. Tambov, 2017. pp. 185-217.*
11. Furs L.A. *Interpretation of mip in syntax. Collective monograph. Tambov: Publishing House of TSU named after G.R. Derzhavin, 2016. pp. 328-351.*
12. Utebaev T., Sarsenbaeva Z. *LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF PROVERBS //Berlin Studies Transnational Journal of Science and Humanities. – 2021. – T. 1. – №. 1.5 Pedagogical sciences.*
13. Sarsenbaeva, Z.J., Utebaev, T.T. *Role of phraseology in developing communicative competence. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal Volume: 6 | Issue: 9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra5111>*