

THE ROLE OF RECIPROCAL AFFIXES IN TURKIC LANGUAGES: MORPHOLOGICAL, SEMANTIC, AND SYNTACTIC ASPECTS

Sharipov Bobur Salimovich

Teacher of the department of Languages,
Samarkand Zarmed University, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
E-mail: sharipovbobur9689@gmail.com

Abstract. This thesis explores the role of reciprocal affixes in Turkic languages, focusing on their morphological, semantic, and syntactic aspects. Reciprocal affixes, which denote mutual actions between subjects, play a significant role in the word-formation systems of Turkic languages. The study examines the structural features of reciprocal affixes, their semantic functions, and their interaction with other grammatical categories such as transitivity, tense, and aspect. The analysis is based on data from multiple Turkic languages, allowing for the identification of common patterns and variations in the use of these affixes. Furthermore, the research highlights the role of reciprocal constructions in shaping syntactic structures and their impact on semantic relationships within sentences. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the grammatical system of Turkic languages and their typological characteristics.

Key words: reciprocity, Turkic languages, affixes, derivation, semantics, functional grammar.

Introduction. Despite numerous studies on the concept of reciprocity (reciprocal, sociative, and comitative) in Turkic linguistics, several unresolved issues persist. One of the most significant challenges lies in the lack of a unified criterion to determine whether reciprocal affixes should be classified as derivational or inflectional elements. This distinction, critical for understanding the grammatical and semantic properties of reciprocal forms, remains ambiguous. Consequently, this uncertainty hinders a comprehensive interpretation of their functional and structural roles within the language system [3,4,5].

Additionally, the lexical-grammatical content of reciprocal forms and their functional-semantic features have not been sufficiently explored. While many studies focus on morphological and syntactic aspects, the deeper semantic relationships and pragmatic nuances of these constructions often receive inadequate attention. This gap leaves questions about how reciprocity interacts with broader linguistic categories, such as tense, aspect, and modality, largely unanswered.

Moreover, reciprocal derivation, as a distinct linguistic process, has yet to be thoroughly analyzed in Turkic studies. Despite the prevalence of reciprocal constructions in Turkic languages, they have not been the subject of monographic

research. Such a study could provide valuable insights into the evolution of these forms, their cross-linguistic parallels, and their role in typological studies of reciprocity [1,2].

In light of these challenges, further research is essential to address the theoretical and practical questions surrounding reciprocity in Turkic linguistics. A comprehensive approach, integrating morphological, syntactic, semantic, and typological perspectives, could significantly advance our understanding of this complex phenomenon.

Methods. The study critically analyzes key theoretical and empirical contributions in the field of Turkic linguistics. The analysis is conducted using comparative and syntactic-semantic methodologies, with an emphasis on affixes like *-sh* and *-ish*.

Results. The research reveals several critical insights into the nature of reciprocity in Turkic languages:

Reciprocal affixes as dependent elements. The study establishes that reciprocal affixes such as *-sh* and *-ish* do not function as independent derivational morphemes. Instead, they combine with other affixes, like *-la* (e.g., *-lash*), to form verbs. This finding underscores the integrative nature of reciprocal derivation, suggesting that these affixes play a subordinate role within larger morphological structures.

Semantic alignment with comitative and sociative categories. The research confirms the classification of reciprocal semantics as aligned with the comitative and sociative categories. This alignment underscores the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs in reciprocal contexts, providing insight into how reciprocity functions across various syntactic constructions.

Predicate structure in reciprocal constructions. The study supports the assertion that reciprocal constructions inherently involve at least two predicates. For example, the verb *quchoqladi* ("hugged") transforms into *quchoqlashdi* ("hugged each other"), signifying a shift in the semantic relationship between participants. This transformation underscores the bidirectional nature of actions in reciprocal constructions.

Grammatical status of reciprocity. A functional-semantic analysis confirms that reciprocity does not constitute an independent grammatical category. Instead, it functions as a grammatical means to convey specific relational meanings, emphasizing the dynamic interplay between participants rather than introducing a new grammatical domain.

These findings collectively provide a nuanced understanding of the morphological and semantic dimensions of reciprocity, paving the way for further research on its typological and functional aspects.

Discussion. The findings of the study challenge the perspective that situates reciprocal affixes as integral components of the word-formation system in Turkic languages. Instead, the research positions these affixes primarily as markers of functional and semantic relationships between subjects, highlighting their role in

encoding relational meanings rather than serving as independent derivational elements. This reinterpretation shifts the focus from morphology to the functional dynamics of reciprocity, suggesting that these affixes function as tools for expressing intersubjective actions and interactions.

Additionally, the distant and contactive characteristics of reciprocity offer valuable insights into its syntactic and semantic dimensions. These characteristics emphasize the dual nature of reciprocal constructions: the capacity to convey interactions that are both spatially and semantically proximate (e.g., physical contact) and those involving conceptual or temporal distance. For example, verbs in reciprocal contexts often encode actions requiring mutual engagement, whether directly (as in *quchoqlashdi*—"hugged each other") or indirectly (as in *yordamlashdi*—"helped each other").

This nuanced view reveals that reciprocal affixes operate not merely as grammatical tools but as vehicles for representing complex interrelations between participants. By integrating functional, semantic, and syntactic perspectives, these findings expand the theoretical framework of reciprocity in Turkic studies, inviting further investigation into its typological and cross-linguistic applications.

Conclusion. Reciprocal constructions in Turkic languages represent a sophisticated intersection of morphology, semantics, and syntax. Although they do not form a distinct grammatical category, their function in expressing relational semantics between participants highlights their significance in the structure of the language. These constructions allow for nuanced expressions of mutual actions or interactions, which are pivotal in reflecting the dynamics of subject relationships.

The study's findings suggest that reciprocal affixes, when combined with other morphemes, encode not just reciprocal actions but also the intricate connections between the involved participants. These affixes facilitate the conveyance of both direct and indirect interactions, emphasizing the need for a more integrated approach to understanding their role in language.

To fully grasp the extent and variability of reciprocal constructions, future research should prioritize the development of a unified framework for analyzing reciprocal affixes within Turkic linguistics. This framework should take into account their interaction with other grammatical systems, such as aspect, voice, and modality. Moreover, cross-linguistic comparisons could enrich our understanding of reciprocal constructions, potentially revealing typological patterns and further distinguishing Turkic languages in terms of their treatment of relational meanings. By synthesizing these diverse perspectives, linguists can achieve a comprehensive understanding of reciprocity in Turkic languages, contributing to broader linguistic theories and offering deeper insights into language structure and meaning[6;94-96].

References

1. Emerson S. N., Limia V. D., Özçalışkan Ş. Cross-linguistic transfer in Turkish–English bilinguals’ descriptions of motion events //Lingua. – 2021. – T. 264. – C. 103153.
2. Ergün A. L. P. Cross-linguistic influence in L1 language attrition and simultaneous acquisition: Evidence from Italian/Turkish bilinguals //RLA. Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada. – 2021. – T. 59. – №. 2. – C. 63-80.
3. Key G., Kovács E. Ó. The Pluractional Marker in Turkish : дис. – Ithaca, NY, USA : Cornell University, 2022.
4. Kuular K. B. Reciprocals, sociatives, comitatives, and assistives in Tuvan //Reciprocal constructions. – John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008. – C. 1163-1229.
5. Nedyalkov V. P. Reciprocal constructions in Turkic languages: typological characteristics //Syntactic Relations and Structure of Arguments. Symposium proc. Ser.: Languages of Europe, North and Central Asia.(Kazan. – 2004. – C. 20-23.
6. D.M.Kholikova. Translation of an international dictionary.// Web of Semantics: Journal of Interdisciplinary Science, 2024. 94-96.