

## Expression of Comparatives in the Karakalpak Language in a Morphological Way

Najimov Perdebay Aymanovich

Karakalpak Scientific Research Institute of Humanities Karakalpak Branch of Academy of Sciences of Republic of Uzbekistan , Nukus

**Abstract:** The article considers comparisons in the Karakalpak language as a construction that has its own construction, which consists of four elements: 1) the object being compared - “the object of comparison”; 2) the object with which the other is compared - the “image of comparison”; 3) a common element for both compared objects, that is, a common feature for comparison - “the basis of comparison”; 4) grammatical indicator - "comparison indicator". Comparison is a stylistic means that conveys the figurative, artistic, emotional and expressive impact of identical or different aspects of objects or phenomena by comparing one object with another on the basis of common, similar features.

**Keywords:** linguistic means of figurativeness, methods of forming comparisons, morphological method, morphological-syntactic method, syntactic method, lexical-grammatical method, method of expression with the help of intonations, comparative construction, Turkic languages, tropes.

Human speech is able not only to convey thoughts, but also to evoke figurative representations of reality in all its sensual authenticity [6, 155]. Therefore, any word used in a work to reveal its content, depending on the context, can also perform the function of visual means, vividly and figuratively characterize certain features of an object or phenomenon.

One of the linguistic means of figurativeness is comparison, the essence of which is the comparison of two or more objects, phenomena that have similar or identical features.

The study of the functions of comparisons in a work of art is the task of a literary critic. However, it is also of great interest to the linguist. For a linguist, it is important to study comparative constructions (turnovers) and their structure, the amount of words and phrases used in these constructions. Therefore, recently in some Turkic languages, special studies have been conducted on a comprehensive study of comparisons [1; 2; 3; 4; 5;8; 11; 15]. Despite this, it cannot be said that this problem has acquired a final systematization. In these studies, one can trace different opinions regarding comparisons, which, in our opinion, are due to the structure and internal capabilities of each language. Such a variety of opinions and views does not mean at all that there is no commonality in the transfer of comparisons in the Turkic languages. The disclosure of the general and peculiar in one or another Turkic language, acting as a pattern, is of great scientific importance.

The Karakalpak language has potential possibilities and means that form comparative constructions, the study and theoretical evaluation of which determines the scientific and practical value of the study.

Comparison is the rarest and most precious quality that a person is endowed with by nature and with the help of which he distinguishes and evaluates objects, phenomena, events, signs existing in the world. The systematization of expressive means, the expression and disclosure of the semantic and stylistic features of comparative constructions is one of the cardinal problems of linguistics, its special branch - stylistics. There is still no scientific generalized research on this problem in Karakalpak linguistics.

Comparison is one of the most complex types of expressive means of the language, differing from other figurative and expressive means in its structural, semantic and stylistic features, a comprehensive study of which is due to its relevance in Karakalpak linguistics.

Comparison is a stylistic means that conveys the figurative, artistic, emotional and expressive impact of identical or different aspects of objects or phenomena by comparing one object with another on the basis of common, similar features.

As a construction, comparison has its own construction, which consists of four elements: 1) the object being compared - "the object of comparison"; 2) the object with which the other is compared - the "image of comparison"; 3) a common element for both compared objects, that is, a common feature for comparison - "the basis of comparison"; 4) grammatical indicator - "comparison indicator".

For example: Халқым деген көкиреги

**Аппак еди қардайын** (B. Gengemuratov)

Here «көкирек» (soul)—the object of comparison, «қар» (snow — image of comparison, «аппак» (pure-pure) — the basis of comparison, «-дайын»—" comparison indicator.

On the basis of specific linguistic materials of the Karakalpak language, the following ways of forming comparisons can be distinguished: 1) morphological method; 2) morphological-syntactic method; 3) syntactic way; 4) lexical and grammatical method; 5) intonation method.

1. In the morphological way of forming comparisons in the Karakalpak language, various affixes are used, differing in frequency of use: some are productive, others are unproductive.

a) Affix **-дай/-дей**. There is still no consensus among researchers about the nature of this affix. Some believe that a noun with this affix retains its lexical meaning, semantic originality, continues to denote the objective meaning inherent in nouns, does not form a new lexical content [13,50]. Therefore, it would be more correct to analyze it not as a lexeme-forming unit, but as a form of comparison (form-forming unit) [13, 50].

Exploring this affix, G. Musabaev considers it a word-forming affix, the main semantics of which is comparison [9; 10].

Such dissimilarity of opinions of scientists regarding this affix is apparently explained by the activity of its use: it can follow both directly after the root (*атмай, таўдай*), and after any formative and word-changing affixes (*таўлардай, перзентлеримиздей*); secondly, the derivative stem formed with the help of **-дай/-дей**, implies the presence of semantic proximity with its non-derivative stem. For example; the word «*атмай*», «*таўдай*» convey only the meaning «*атқауқсаған*» (like a horse), «*таўға уқсаған*» (like mountains). Researchers do not deny the

transfer of comparative meaning by this affix. Therefore, in our opinion, it is more expedient to consider the affix *-дай//-дей* as word-forming, with the semantics of comparison. For example, the above examples are not about a mountain, not about a horse, but about other objects similar to them. Compare: *mountains are like mountains, a horse is like a horse*. Such kind of comparison is unthinkable.

The affix *-дай//-дей* can be attached to both a noun and a participle in the form of *-зан//-зен* and expresses a comparative meaning. There are no structural differences between them, but only stylistic features. “Combining with participles, in the form *-дай/-дей*, it further concretizes, supplements the comparative semantics of the image of comparison with the meanings of person, tense, mood and modal shades. As a result, the most diverse and most abstract, subtlest movements of the human soul acquire a concrete and individual character” [4, 49].

The Karakalpak language also uses a phonetic variant of the considered affix *--дак//-дек*, which is most often found in the works of classical poets, folklore creations. The function of the affix *-дак//-дек* is similar to the function *-дай//-дей*. Therefore, they can be considered genetically the same affix. However, the affix *-дай//-дей* is used more productively in the modern Karakalpak language.

In the formation of comparative constructions of the Karakalpak language, the affix *-дайын//-дейин* can also be used. Some researchers consider it a phonetic variant of the affix *-дай/-дей* [14, 198.]. This affix is mainly used in poetic works and is less common than the *-дай/-дей* affix, although it has some expressive character;

b) affix *-ша -ше*. According to scientists, this affix has long been used both to form an adverb and to convey a comparative meaning. In most cases, this affix acts as a synonym for the affix *-дай/-дей*.

For example: *Бәдхасылга хамал жетсе,  
Пухарасын талар ийтше*. (I. Yusupov).

In this example, if the word «*ийтше*» is replaced by the word «*ийтмей*», the general content of the statement does not change, although there may be differences in stylistic terms. At the same time, affixes do not always act as synonyms. For example, in the sentence «*Олар қарақалпақша сөйлесті*», the affix *-ша* cannot be replaced by the affix *-дай/-дей*;

c) for the formation of comparative constructions, the affix *-шылап//-шилеп* is used, the scope of which is not very wide. Some scholars associate its origin with the verb *чыла*, which exists in the Tofalar language, expressing the meaning of assimilation, comparison [12, 260]. For example: *Дастықтықолтыққақысып, бирқолдыбүйиргетаяп, байшылап жамбаслап көрди* (Sh. Seytov);

d) the affixes *-рақ//-рек* and *-лаў//-леў* are also actively used to form comparative constructions. They denote an insufficient, incomplete degree of quality, a sign of one object in comparison with the qualities, a sign of another object, without changing the main lexical meaning of the word to which they are attached. Consequently, these affixes create comparative constructions by comparing the features of the compared objects;

e) in the Karakalpak language, the affix of the original case also serves to form a comparative construction. The name of the object, before which another object is given priority, is put in the

original case when compared. An adjective can, with such turns, not take the endings of the comparative degree [7, 22].

Thus, the article provides an overview of some affixes expressing comparative meaning in the Karakalpak language. The analysis of materials on the Karakalpak language makes it possible to conclude that some of them are used productively, while others are unproductive.

Of the above affixes, some of them compare, liken objects, phenomena or movements, while other affixes compare the meanings of objects or phenomena. Therefore, comparative constructions are divided by meaning into: 1) comparative constructions in the meaning of comparison; 2) comparative constructions in the meaning of collation.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdullayev I.N. Methods of comparison in the Azerbaijani language. Dissertation abstract. Baku, 1974.
2. Zufarova N. 3. Degrees of comparison and comparative constructions in modern English and Uzbek languages. Dissertation abstract. Tashkent, 1971.
3. Konirov T. Kazakh equations, Almaty, 1978
4. Konirov T. Structural and semantic activity in Kazakhstan, Alma-Ata, 1985.
5. Kungurov R. Visual aids of the Uzbek language. Tashkent, 1977.
6. Mamonov V.A., Rosenthal D.E. Practical style of modern Russian writing. M., 1957.
7. Melioransky P.M. Brief grammatical Kazakh-oblique inscription. Phonetics and Etymology, Ch. I, St. Petersburg, 1884.
8. Mukarramov M. Comparisons and methods in modern Uzbek literary writing. Dissertation abstract. Tashkent. 1973.
9. Musabaev F., - about applications -tai, -tai//Izvestia of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. Series philology and art. V. 3-4, 1955.
10. Musabaev F., Words of criticism in the Kazakh language. Almaty, 1951.
11. Povarisov S. Sh. Comparisons in the Tatar language. Dissertation abstract. Ufa, 1965.
12. Rassadin V.I. Morphology of the Tofalar language in comparative lighting. M.: Science, 1978.
13. Rakhmatullaev Sh. -dek the format //Uzbek language and literature. Tashkent, 1977. № 1. P. 50.
14. Tomanov M. Historical letter of the Kazakh language. Almaty, 1988. 198 p.
15. Khudaiberganova D.S. Semantic and stylistic analysis of new constructions in Uzbek paganism. Dissertation abstract. Tashkent, 1989.