American Journal Of Social Sciences And Humanity Research

On the Study of Abstract Nouns in Turkic Languages

Eshberdiev Fayzulla Atagullaevich

Lecturer at the Department of Karakalpak Linguistics, Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh, Republic of Karakalpakstan, Nukus, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article examines the views of scholars on the study of abstract nouns in Turkic languages. It discusses the formation of nouns, the affixes used to form abstract nouns, the classification of nouns according to their meanings, and the study of abstract nouns in general.

Keywords: Abstract nouns, concrete and abstract, suffixes.

Introduction: One of the tasks of modern linguistics is the study of all layers of vocabulary, including abstract vocabulary, and the question of its functioning in language is becoming increasingly relevant.

The study of abstract nouns includes an examination of the history of their research in Turkology. However, there are no special studies devoted exclusively to this issue; abstract nouns are mentioned only within grammars and works on word formation and morphology of Turkic languages. The semantics of abstract nouns has been studied rather insufficiently; there are only attempts to classify suffixes with abstract meanings.

The study of nominal word formation and the semantics of noun suffixes in Turkic languages has a long history. These issues were first considered in the earliest Turkic grammars of the nineteenth century: in The Grammar of the Tatar Language by I. Giganov (1801), The Grammar of the Turkish-Tatar Language by M. Kazem-Bek (1846), and The Grammar of the Altai Language (1869). In these works, noun-forming suffixes were identified, but they were not classified.

The issues of noun formation were further explored in the works of several scholars. N. I. Ashmarin identified 13 noun-forming suffixes in the Chuvash language, three of which form abstract nouns. N. F. Katanov identified 12 suffixes in the Tuvan language, three of which form abstract nouns. N. K. Dmitriev identified 13 noun-forming suffixes in the Bashkir language, three of which form abstract nouns. Zh. I. Kharitonova identified 14 suffixes in the Yakut language, four of which form abstract nouns. N. P. Dyrenkova identified 49 suffixes in the Khakas language, four of which form abstract nouns.

Special attention in Turkology is given to the classification of nouns according to their meanings, and in almost all Turkic languages a group of abstract nouns is distinguished. For example, among the fifteen semantic groups of nouns in the Kyrgyz language, one of the groups consists of abstract nouns. [3. 120].

Abstract nouns arise as a result of isolating some feature common to a number of objects, or some action (state), as an independent concept. Unlike adjectives and verbs with the same lexical meaning, in these nouns qualities and actions are presented independently of objects, as something autonomous and substantive. For example, tazalyk "health" (in contrast to the adjective taza "healthy, of strong constitution") cannot function as an attribute of an object; similarly, the word њсеш "growth, development" (in contrast to the verb њсњ "to grow, to develop") cannot denote the action of a specific object.

In her work, A. R. Nurgatina, studying abstract nouns in Turkic languages (in particular in Tatar), distinguishes them from concrete nouns in the following way: Abstract nouns express meanings that are not perceived by the senses but are understood only through thinking. They often represent uncountable concepts [4. 30].

B. O. Oruzbaeva [5. 25] and A. M. Sherbak [8. 106] believe that the original meaning of the forms with the

suffix -lyg was the meaning of possession, and that all other meanings developed from it. Undoubtedly, the determination of the primary meaning is directly related to the etymology of this suffix.

They convincingly demonstrate that the primary meaning of the affix -lyg was the meaning of multiplicity, concentration, or a collective set of concrete objects expressed by the base word. The meaning of abstractness probably arose directly from the meaning of collectivity and concentration.

Nouns with this meaning are mainly formed from bases denoting a state, a quality, a property, or a phenomenon characterized by a particular feature expressed by the base [6. 26]. E. V. Sevortyan states that "Derived nouns with the model N + lyg and abstract meaning have become widely used in Turkic languages, both ancient and modern" [7. 142].

Nominal word formation in Turkic languages has been studied in the works of G. Sadvakasov, T. M. Garipov, A. Kh. Sottaev, and A. Yu. Boziev. The systems of word formation in the Azerbaijani, Kyrgyz, and Karachay-Balkar languages have been described in the works of S. Jafarov, B. O. Oruzbaeva, and M. A. Khabichev. Turkologists V. A. Gordlevsky, V. M. Nasilov, P. A. Azimov, S. N. Muratov, and A. Iskakov have also investigated noun word formation in Turkic languages and addressed various issues related to it.

As noted by F. A. Ganiev, noun word formation is studied in considerable detail in the grammar of the Karakalpak language by N. A. Baskakov, who provides a description of twenty-eight noun-forming suffixes. A. N. Kononov, in his grammar of the Uzbek language, identifies forty-four suffixes. One of the most significant works in this field is the fundamental study by E. V. Sevortyan, in which the «suffixal nominal word formation of the Azerbaijani language is systematically examined, and the meanings of suffixes are analyzed in connection with the meanings of their base forms» [2. 64].

The study of abstract nouns in the Karakalpak language is aimed at identifying the semantic groups of these nouns and the methods of their formation. As indicated by the author of the study, the formation of abstract nouns is closely related to the meanings of derivational suffixes. Among the most productive suffixes are -лыкъ/ -лик [1. 181].

The psychological aspect of the problem of "abstractness and concreteness" is discussed in the works of L. S. Vygotsky, A. R. Luria, and S. L. Rubinstein, as well as in the studies of A. N. Leontiev, where such thinking processes as analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization, and abstraction are examined. Despite different approaches to the characterization of language and consciousness, the study of concept formation remains central, including processes of abstraction, comparison, and generalization.

V. V. Vinogradov provided one of the most comprehensive descriptions of abstract nouns in the Russian language. Linguist L. L. Kasatkin identified integral and differential semantic components in the structure of abstract nouns, representing the highest level of abstraction.

As it has been established, semantic classes of nouns have been considered in most Tatar grammars; however, the first explicit opposition between abstract and concrete nouns can be observed in the grammars of K. Nasyri, Sh. Imanaev, and G. Kurbangaliev.

Modern scholars (V. N. Khangildin, D. G. Tumasheva, F. A. Ganiev, and F. S. Faseev) identify a group of abstract nouns and describe their grammatical features and methods of word formation.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that it is necessary to study the semantic groups of abstract nouns, the models of word formation, the meanings of various suffixes, and their role in the formation of nouns. In general, as evidenced by the literature reviewed, abstract nouns should become the subject of a special study based on the material of Turkic languages. The important characteristics of this lexical group require not only the study and description of their meanings but also an investigation of the methods of their formation and the lexical-semantic groups of abstract nouns.

REFERENCES

1. Baskakov, N. A. Karakalpak Language: Phonetics and Morphology. Moscow: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1952. 181 p.

2. Ganiev, F. A. Suffixal Word Formation in the Modern Tatar Literary Language. Kazan: Tatar Book Publishing House, 1974. 64 p.

3. Grammar of the Kyrgyz Literary Language. Frunze: Ilim Publishing House, 1987. p. 120.

4. Nurgatina, A. R. Abstract Nouns in the Tatar Language. Abstract of PhD dissertation (Philology). Kazan, 2012. 30 p.

5. Oruzbaeva, B. O. Word Formation in the Kyrgyz Language. Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation (Philology). Frunze: Ilim Publishing House, 1964. p. 25.

6. Sevortyan, E. V. Affixes of Nominal Word Formation in the Azerbaijani Language: An Attempt at a Comparative Study. Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 1966. p. 26.

7. Comparative-Historical Grammar of the Turkic

Languages. Morphology. Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, 1988. p. 142.

8. Shcherbak, A. M. Essays on the Comparative Morphology of Turkic Languages. Leningrad: Nauka Publishing House, 1977. p. 106.