

DUNYAMIN YUNUSOV
LEYLA KHANBUTAYEVA

**COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGY OF THE
ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGES**

BAKU – 2008

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OF AZERBAIJAN REPUBLIC
AZERBAIJAN UNIVERSITY OF LANGUAGES

DUNYAMIN YUNUSOV
LEYLA KHANBUTAYEVA

COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGY OF THE
ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGES

*By the order of the Ministry of Education
of Azerbaijan Republic the stamp was
given (order № _____)*

BAKU – “MUTARJIM” – 2008

It was approved by the department of “European Languages and Literature” of “Scientific Methodical Council” of the Ministry of Education of Azerbaijan Republic, December 8, 2007 (record of evidence №16).

REVIEWERS:

Doctor of philology, professor

A.A.Abdullayev

Candidate of philology, assistant professor

A.R.Huseynov

EDITOR:

Candidate of philology, assistant professor

E.I.Hajiyev

COMPUTER DESIGNER:

Sadagat Yusivofa

Copyright

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, transmitted, stored in a retrieval system without the written permission of the authors.

PREFACE

“Comparative Typology of the English and Azerbaijani languages” is a new kind of book in our Republic. In writing it, the authors have assumed that studying comparative typology, for the overseas student, makes most sense if one starts with the question “How can I learn this subject?”

In preparing this book, care has been taken to bring the text of the book up to date and to introduce the reader to some outstanding problems of modern linguistics. One of these concerns the relations between two non-kindred English and Azerbaijani languages, on the one hand and main levels and processes of the development of languages, linguistic differentiation and integration on the other.

Recent discussion of this problem has also immediate connection with the treatment of the notion of “comparativeness”. Much attention has accordingly been given to the typological problems of different levels in the hierarchy of linguistics in the appropriate places.

This textbook is meant to be used as an advanced course by the students of bachelorship and mastership levels of universities specializing in Comparative Typology [HSM – 040009 – English]. The book has been compiled in accordance with the requirements of the programme of comparative typology of foreign and native languages approved and published by the Ministry of Education of Azerbaijan Republic in 2004 (order no. 08, May 22).

The authors of the book has a long teaching experience of English Grammar and Comparative Typology at the Azerbaijan University of Languages.

The book covers the entire material required by the programme and consists of 23 chapters. Its main purpose is to introduce the student to the many linguistic problems connected with typological studies of phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactical characteristics in English and Azerbaijani and to the modern methods applied in dealing with them. The authors have endeavoured, as far as was possible, to point out the essence of the comparative typological problems, and to state the arguments which have been, or may be, put forward in favour of one view or

another. This should enable the reader to form a judgement of his own on the typological problems involved and on the respective merits of the various solutions proposed. The development of linguistics in the last few decades has been so quick and so manifold that a new insight has been gained into practically all the typological problems dealt with here, and into many others as well, for that matter. This of course was found to be reflected in the contents of the book and in its very structure.

A few words may not be out of place here concerning the kind of work students may be expected to do in their class hours. At the end of each chapter different kinds of questions involving the whole part were given. Some of these questions will probably lend themselves more readily than others to such discussion; among them, the following may be suggested: main and functional parts of speech in compared English and Azerbaijani languages, the category of case in nouns and pronouns, types of phrases and sentences, types of predicate, secondary parts of a sentence, asyndetic composite sentences, word order in non-kindred English and Azerbaijani languages.

Of course much will depend in each case on the teacher's own choice and on the particular interests expressed by the students.

What the student is meant to acquire as a result of his studies is an insight into the comparative typology of the English and Azerbaijani languages and an ability to form his own ideas on this or that question. This would appear to be a necessary accomplishment for a teacher of English [at whatever sort of school he may be teaching], who is apt to find differing, and occasionally contradictory, treatment of the typological phenomena he has to mention in his teaching.

In this way the authors hope that you will improve and extend the range of your theoretical skills in the languages.

At the end of the textbook a bibliography is provided not only as a guide to further reading, but also in acknowledgement of works we have consulted and used.

The textbook is intended for the theoretical course on "Comparative Typology of the English and Azerbaijani languages" forming part of the curriculum at our University of Languages and other Teachers Training Colleges in our Republic.

All the chapters including preface of the text book were written by Doctor of philology D.N.Yunusov and “Check yourself tests” at the end of each chapter enriching chapters IV, VIII, XI, XIX, XXIII with additional materials were fulfilled by Candidate of philology, assistant professor L.M.Khanbutayeva.

Our sincere thanks are due to the reviewers doctor of philology, professor A.A.Abdullayev, candidate of philology, assistant professor A.R.Huseynov, to the editor candidate of philology, assistant professor E.I.Hajiyev and to the members of English Grammar Department of Azerbaijan University of Languages and especially to the head of the English Grammar Department, our teacher doctor of philology, professor O.I.Musayev.

Undoubtedly there may be some errors and misprints in the text-book we wish to express our heartfelt gratitude to the readers in advance who will call attention to the possible misprints and errors. The suggestions will be carefully considered in the next edition of the text-book.

The authors are also thankful in advance to those who are eager to give useful advice on this or that part of the text book.

Authors.

CHAPTER I.

TYOLOGY OF FOREIGN AND NATIVE LANGUAGES

Subject and aims of typological studies. Language typology as a branch of linguistics. Typology and other branches of linguistics.

The word typology is derived from Greek word which means (“typos” – form and “logos” – study) “form study”. Typology is the classification of languages by grammatical features. Grammatical systems, while not identical, often show remarkable similarities on a deeper level.

Typology is concerned with outlining the range of variation possible grammatical systems. It involves surveying which patterns exist in the world’s languages, which are common or uncommon, which patterns seem to necessarily cooccur with other patterns. It also involves the classification of languages into groups based on shared characteristics.

Language typology can be defined as the study of differences and similarities in various formal features between languages. Investigating different languages, mainly English, Azerbaijani and Russian, one can easily find out similar features in most of them, though they are non-kindred languages. For instance, in English, in German and in some other Germanic languages we can meet a lot of words of common root. It is explained by the fact that these languages belong to one genetic group, namely Germanic family of languages.

At the same time it should be noted that from the structural point of view languages belonging to one and the same genetic group differ from each other in some certain cases. Genetic structural features are found in most various languages belonging to quite different language groups. For instance, attributive phrases in which the adjective precedes the noun without agreement exist in English, Turkish, Mongolian, Chinese, Japanese.

According to this structural features the above mentioned languages may form a certain group with common structure having the same kind of attributive phrases. So

the branch of linguistics which investigates grouping of main, essential characteristic features and revealing genetic appropriateness is called *typological linguistics*.

Typological linguistics also studies the type of languages and type of language structure.

Being one of the Indo-European languages, the English language is the most important language in the world today. About 75% of all scientific papers are published in English and approximately 70% of the world's mail is written in English. It is also the language of shipping and air travel. English is the first or joint first language in 70 countries, while French is spoken in 23 countries. About 500 million people speak English as a first or joint-first language. This is 14% of the world's population.

English is also spoken as a second language by another 300 million people. There are also many millions of people who have learned English as a foreign language in schools or universities. It is estimated that 25% of China's one billion two hundred million population are studying English at present. The nearest estimate of the number of people in the world today who can speak English is two billion out of a total population of seven billion. Furthermore we'll deal with typological studies of English, Azerbaijani and Russian languages. So comparative typology is the branch of linguistics which investigates grouping of main, essential characteristic features and revealing genetic appropriateness. It also studies the type of languages and type of language structure.

According to its object and aim typology can be divided into general and special.

General typology studies language types, their general problems showing similar and different features of separate languages. In other words general typology investigates general properties, changes, processes in languages belonging to different language groups or families (ex: the phonological system of languages, the general features in the structure of phrase and sentences, the types of morphological structure, etc.). **E.g.** the way of expressing the category of definiteness and indefiniteness in English, Russian and Azerbaijani; the vowel system in English and Azerbaijani; word order in English and Azerbaijani etc.

Special typology investigates the problems which are more limited and restricted. Here belong the investigation of one language or separate languages. Special typology is of great importance from practical point of view. This type of investigation can also be called comparative typology of foreign and native languages. Special typology investigates problems which are more limited or restricted. Here separate language phenomenon may be investigated. **E.g.** the system of personal pronouns in English and Azerbaijani; the adjective forming suffixes in English and Azerbaijani.

As it is mentioned by most scholars special typology is of great importance from practical point of view. This kind of typological investigation may be called comparative typology of foreign and native languages. So the aim of comparative typology is to teach students to determine main typological features of English and Azerbaijani languages, to show the methods of helping to compare the elements of the English language which are absent in the native one and at the same time to find out the means of expressing these meanings in the native language.

Typology as general and special investigates the typological characteristics not only native languages, but also the languages belonging to different systems.

Typological investigations may depend on the following factors:

- 1) the number of languages which are investigated;
- 2) the scope of work;
- 3) the aim of investigation;
- 4) the character of the revealed divergence;
- 5) the level of analysis;
- 6) the direction of investigation.

Linguistics, as an independent science, has some branches. Such as phonetics, lexicology, stylistics and so on. Typology is also a branch of linguistics. Each of these branches has its own method of investigation.

But what is the aim of applied linguistics? It is a new branch of linguistics said of mathematics or science dealing with theory and abstractions rather than practical

applicants. It has different branches: such as graphic arts, orthography, orthoepy, lexicography and linguistic translation.

Comparative typology as a branch of general linguistics is based on theoretical language course. It is closely connected with other branches of linguistics. Such as: the history of language, general linguistics, practical grammar, theoretical grammar, the structure of the native language etc.

Language typology has several types:

- 1) special;
- 2) universal;
- 3) general;
- 4) qualitative and quantitative;
- 5) structural and functional;
- 6) semasiological and onomasiological.

Special typology studies concrete languages. Here can be investigated more than two languages and these languages may be cognate or non-cognate. Our course will deal mostly with special typology comparing English and Azerbaijani belonging to different language families.

Universal typology analyses the languages of the world in order to find out languages universals common to all languages.

General typology investigates language types, the general features of languages structure usually in relation to a definite aspect: sound structure, morphological structure, syntactical structure of sentences. Special comparative typology studies separate aspects and elements of language structure.

Depending on the aim of investigation we may distinguish classifying and characterizing typology.

Classifying typology finds out typological classification of languages, revealing their typological groups and correlation. But the aim of the *characterizing typology* is to find out specific features of the given language, its peculiarities among other languages. Our course will lay a special stress on characterizing typology which

makes it known that one and the same lingual phenomena are represented unequally in different languages.

While comparing the given languages two types of divergences may be found: qualitative divergence, quantitative divergence.

In qualitative divergence some linguistic phenomena don't exist in one of the compared languages (ex: article, gerund, adlink, sequence of tenses, etc. don't exist in Azerbaijani).

In quantitative divergence this or that phenomena may exist in both languages. But the use of their frequency isn't the same in number. **E.g.** the category of cases – there are two cases of English nouns, but six cases in Azerbaijani nouns. The present tense has four forms in English, but only one in Azerbaijani.

According to the object of investigation we may distinguish the following branches of language typology:

- 1) genetic typology;
- 2) structural typology;
- 3) areal typology;
- 4) comparative typology.

Genetic typology compares system of genetic kindred languages in diachrony and synchrony. This type of typology in general linguistics is called “the historical comparative method in linguistics”.

Structural typology considers systems of different languages without any genetic area limitation. It tries to determine type features of languages. It may use the results of other branches of language type. The final aim of structural typology is finding out universal properties of language.

Areal typology compares languages irrespective of their relationship in order to determine common elements formed as a result of mutual influence of languages.

The object of such investigation is borrowed elements in languages; language contact, language union and bilingualism.

Contrastive-comparative typology as a rule compares two languages irrespective of their relationship with the purpose of finding out similarities between them.

Typologic linguistics considers the widest problems. It studies specific features of languages on the background of those common properties which are characteristic to human languages in general.

Comparative typology unites two directions in language study: contrastive-comparative typology. Comparative typology as a branch of general linguistics is based on theoretical language courses. It is closely connected with:

- 1) the history of language;
- 2) general linguistics;
- 3) practical linguistics;
- 4) practical and theoretical grammar;
- 5) the structure of the native language.

As we know, the history of language reflects historical development of language. It gives correct explanations to the present day language.

General linguistics deals with general problems of a language. Theoretical grammar deals with different theories put forward by various scholars. These theories in some cases may coincide, in other cases they may greatly differ from one another. Practical grammar deals with general grammatical rules of a language and has the purpose of teaching grammar. This type of grammar is taught to those who are to learn a language practically etc.

It was mentioned in general linguistics that we can compare the languages of quite different, not depending upon their kinship and historical relations between them. We always find out the same features, the same changes, the same historical processes opposite to one another historically and geographically.

As is seen above mentioned, typological investigations expand the borderline of linguistic investigations. It attracts non-kindred, structural languages and solves a lot of language problems. Typological investigations can be carried out in the sphere of separate systems and subsystems of the languages. For example in the sphere of phonological, morphological, lexical system.

Depending on the level of analyses we may differ structural and functional typology.

Structural typology studies types of language expressions.

Functional typology studies how to use these types in speech.

Depending on the direction of investigation we can differ between semasiological and onomasiological typology.

Semasiological typology studies the compared facts of language from meaning to function. English and Azerbaijani words have different functions. *Onomasiological typology* studies language facts from meaning to form. Here we may compare different language levels which may express one and the same meaning. **E.g.** the ways of expressing modality in English and Azerbaijani.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST I.

1. How do you understand the term “typology”?
2. How many languages are there in the world?
3. Is their number growing or diminishing?
4. In which principles are these languages different from one other?
5. What scholars were the first to develop the idea of language relationship?
6. What is the subject and aim of the typology of foreign and native languages?
7. What can you say about the typology and other branches of linguistics?
8. What kind of divergences do you know?
9. What is the difference between structural and functional typology?
10. What can you say about the main properties of the semasiological and onomasiological typology?
11. When were the relations between the languages of the Indo-European family studied systematically and scientifically?
12. What is the difference between general and special typology?
13. Which factors determines the typological investigation?
14. What does genetic typology compare?
15. What is the difference between genetic and structural typology?
16. What does areal typology learn?
17. Will you show the difference between areal and comparative method?

18. Which directions does comparative typology unite in language study?
19. What does typological linguistics study?
20. What can you say about contrastive-comparative method?

CHAPTER II.

THE HISTORY OF TYPOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Short summary of the History of typological investigation. Methods of typological analysis.

As is known **the history of language** reflects historical development of language and gives correct explanations to the present-day language.

General linguistics deals with general problems of a language. Theoretical grammar deals with different theories put by various scholars. These theories in some cases may coincide, in other cases they may greatly differ from one another. Practical grammar deals with general grammatical rules of a language and has the purpose of teaching grammar practically.

Scholars still long ago observed the fact that some of the languages are similar to one another in their forms, while other dissimilar. They expressed the idea that the languages revealing formal features of similarity have a common origin. Attempts to establish groups of kindred languages were repeatedly made from XVI century on. But a consistently scientific proof and study of the actual relationship between languages became possible only when the Historical Comparative method of language study was created and it was in the first quarter of the XIX century. This method developed in connection with the comparative observation of languages belonging to the Indo-European family and its appearance was stimulated by the discovery of Sanscrit.

No scholar in the world knows the exact number of the languages. The book "Linguistics and guide of language intercourse" which was published in Germany not long ago shows that there are 5651 languages in the world. But some other sources note that there are 3000 languages in the world. It should be noted that 1400 languages out of them didn't gain their independence. Paying a great attention to the quantity of different languages in the world we'd like to drop some words about the

history of typological investigations in compared languages. The scientists think about the types of languages over 150 years.

Friedrich Shlegel (March 10, 1772 – January 12, 1829) the well-known German linguist, poet, critic and scholar was the first who gave the classification of the languages typology. He divided the languages into two groups:

1. Languages with affixes - here belong - Chinese, Bantu (such as: Teke, Sonqo, Indigi, Suaxeli, Konde, Makua, Satko, etc.) and Turkish languages.

2. Flective languages (here belong Sami languages (Arabic, Liviya, Irag, Livan, Tunis, etc.), Georgian, French languages.

Of course the classification of the languages like that concealed approximately distinctive features.

His brother August Shlegel overworking this classification distinguished three language classes:

- 1) the languages without grammatical structure;
- 2) languages with affixes;
- 3) flective languages.

V. Humboldt, the well-known German linguist is considered to be the founder of the linguistic typology. He knew a lot of languages. To know a lot of languages gave him a great opportunity to compare the structure of the languages and to show their typological classification. He divided all the languages he knew into 4 groups:

1. Isolating – no morphology; one-to-one correspondence between words and morphemes (**E.g.** Chinese)

2. Agglutinating – a word may consist of more than one morpheme and the boundaries between morphemes are always clear-cut (Turkish languages). Examples of agglutinative languages are the Altaic languages (mainly Turkish), many Tibeto-Burman languages, Basque, the Dravidian languages, many Uralic languages (such as: Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian), the Northeast, Northwest and South Caucasian languages, some North American languages.

3. Flective languages – he included here Indo-European languages.

4. Incorporating languages – put lexical and grammatical morphemes together to form a word. Here he included the language of American Indians.

There were some scientists who assumed the phonological (Frans Bopp-german linguist), morphological (F.Shlegel, V.Humboldt) and syntactical (C.Shteynal) criteria as a basis in comparing languages.

Nowadays a great interest is increased in the field of typology. In typology exist mainly the following trends:

1. Some typologists are interested in the sturcture of the languages (I.I.Meschaninov, G.P.Melnikov, V.Skalichka, A.Martine, etc.).

2. Some typologists consider that the typology of the languages are unadvesible (V.Z.Panfilov, B.Skalichka).

3. The majority of the linguists consider language universals revealing in typology (S.Ulmann, B.A.Uspensky, R.O.Jacobson and others).

4. In the works of some linguists the quantitative criteria is applied (J.Kubryacova, T.Milevsky, V.Skalichka and others).

Generally all the languages are devided into four different groups:

- 1) root or isolating languages;
- 2) agglutinative languages;
- 3) flective languages;
- 4) incorporating languages.

Languages that tend not to combine morphemes at all except to form compounds are called **isolating languages**. Chinese, Vietnamese, Indonesian and Birmese are the most purely isolating with nearly half their words being monomorphemic and also monosyllabic.

Agglutinative languages. The term agglutination was introduced by Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1836 to classify languages from a morphological point of view. It was derived from the Latin verb “agglutinare” which means “to glue together”. Agglutination is the addition of a large number of affixes one after another. Agglutinating languages are devided into 2 groups:

- 1) synthetic;

2) analytic.

Synthetic type of languages which are not agglutinative are called fusional languages; they sometimes combine affixes by “squeezing” them together, often changing them in the process and joining several meanings in one affix (for example, in the Spanish word “comi” (I ate), the suffix – **i** carries the meanings of indicative mood, active voice, past tense, first person singular subject and perfect aspect) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/the free encyclopedia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/the_free_encyclopedia)). Synthetic type consists of two subgroups:

a) root of the word+suffix (Turkish languages);

b) suffix+root

Analytical type consists of the root of the word+suffix.

Flective languages – the changes of the words are taken into consideration here. Flexion may be: external, internal. **External flexion** is characteristic for the Russian language, but **internal flexion** is characteristic for the Arabic and Azerbaijani languages. Ex: in the word the suffixes are changed. But Azerbaijani, for example the root of the word is changed and this change is called internal flexion.

A definite role takes place in the history of the linguistic typology the Middle Ages period till Renaissance. From the beginning of the XII century till the epoch Renaissance, the scientists began to acquaint with the antique works. These works are said that every language has its own grammatical formation.

The well-known specialist in Turkic philology Mahmud Kashgari lay down the foundation of the comparative method in the study of Turkic languages. By the help of phonetic, lexical and grammatical analyses he defined the kinship of the Turkic languages.

Further development of the comparative study of the Turkic languages are shown in A. Navai’s works. He gave the comparison of the Turkic and Indo-European languages [57, 18].

As is seen above mentioned, typological investigations expand the borderline of linguistic investigations. It attracts non-kindred, structural languages and solves a lot of language problems. Typological investigations can be carried out in the sphere of

separate systems and subsystems of the languages. For example in the sphere of phonological, morphological, lexical systems.

The scientists not only made comparative and historical observations, but they defined the fundamental conception of linguistic “kinship” (“relationship”), and created the historical comparative and typological investigations in linguistics.

It is further developed in the works of such scientists as the representatives of the XIX and XX centuries: F.F.Fortunatov, A.A.Potebnya, H.O.Schelecher, A.Buslayev, Fedinand-de-Saussure, Antuan Meye and others.

The typological investigations are closely connected with the names of E.D.Polyvanov, I.I.Meschaninov, Boduen-de-Courtenay, A.A.Peshkovski, L.V.Sherba, L.R.Zinder, O.I.Musayev and others.

The typological investigation of the sentence is closely connected with the name of academician I.I.Meschaninov. He was the first scholar who paid attention to the typology of sentences of different languages with different morphological structure. As the result of his vast investigation he was able to put forward a new typological classification of languages based on the type of sentences. According to him languages can be divided into two groups:

- 1) languages with nominative construction;
- 2) languages with ergative construction.

Academician I.I.Meschaninov includes all the agglutinative, flective and amorphous languages into the first group. Here belong the Turkic languages, Indo-European languages and the Chinese languages. But the second group embraces Caucasian languages, such as: Kabardin, Dargin, Avar, Lezgin, Chechen and Chukci.

The second scholar who paid attention to the typological investigation of the sentence with different morphological structure is V.Skalichka, check by nationality. He somewhat worked out in detail the classification put forward by I.I.Meschaninov saying that word order in flective languages is free, whereas it can't be considered quite right. This is not the same in all flective languages, for example, the persian language being one of the flective languages, its word order is fixed.

J.Greenberg also investigated the sentence typology in different languages. As the result of his vast investigation he put forward his own classification of languages. J.Greenberg divided all the languages into three groups according to the sentence structure:

- 1) predicate+subject+object (PSO);
- 2) subject+predicate+object (SPO);
- 3) subject+object+ predicate (SOP).

According to J.Greenberg English belongs to the group of languages with the SPO, but Azerbaijani belongs to the languages with the structure SOP.

There are some typological investigations which are based on resemblances of features between different unrelated (non-kindred) languages without any historical consideration being involved. Therefore we can call it *contrastive structure studies*.

Any typological investigation made on this field of comparison helps us to teach and to learn any foreign languages.

The significance of the latter comparison can not only be limited by the above mentioned idea. The comparison of non-kindred languages is necessary for future machine translation too.

O.Musayev was the first scholar in our Republic who compared “word order” in English and Azerbaijani. He was also the author of the book “English Grammar” which was presented contrastively.

He gained a lot of good results in comparing these two non-kindred languages. Besides O.Musayev, different scholars like N.Valiyeva, E.Hajiyev, A.Huseynov, D.Yunusov, J.Akhundov, Z.Verdiyeva, F.Veysalov (Veysally), N.Yusifov, S.Abdullayev investigated different levels of these non-kindred languages typologically.

It should be mentioned that a very few steps are taken in this field of linguistics in different foreign countries.

C.Y.Simpson, an English scientist is the author of the typological investigation “The Turkish language of the Soviet Azerbaijani”. In this research work, the author speaks about the sound system and morphological level of the Azerbaijani language

and tries to compare with the native English language. Here the author's main purpose was to give some brief idea on the phonology and morphology of the Azerbaijani language in comparison with the English language.

W.Fred, G.I.Householder are the authors of the other fundamental book "Basic course in Azerbaijani".

This book took place in a beautiful burgundy volume that befits its contents. This typological investigation was published in Indiana University in America.

Though it deals with the Azerbaijani language, but sometimes there takes place the comparison of these two non-kindred languages: Azerbaijani and English.

It may be called a manual designed to help those who wish to learn spoken Azerbaijani in comparison with English.

The other author Tabrizi presented different kinds of dialogues in that book but that was written very vague.

Linguistic typology, as it is mentioned above studies the types and structures of languages. Typology studies not only the morphological structure of the language, but also phonetic and syntactical structures.

The last few years have seen a rapid development of various new **methods of linguistic investigation**, and there is a great variety of views as to their merits (xidmət).

As is known there are many languages on earth both great and small. According to modern calculation the number of living languages exceeds 2500. Alongside of highly developed languages with ancient writing and literature there are languages having no writing and no recorded history. Here belong the spoken languages of tribes and small nationalities in America, Asia, Africa and Australia. Many of the spoken languages are dying due to measurable condition, they have been reduced to by the "Higher European Civilization"; as in the case with aboriginal Indian tribes in America and Australia. On the other hand the number of known languages is still growing and new languages and dialects come to be recorded and studied by science. Observing the fact that some of the languages are similar to one another in their forms while others are dissimilar.

Scholars still long ago expressed the idea that languages revealing formal features of similarity have a common origin. Attempts to establish groups of kindred languages were repeatedly made from XVI century on. But a consistently scientific proof and study of the actual relationship between languages became possible only when the Historical Comparative Method of language study was created and it was in the first quarter of the XIX century.

Without exaggerating it should be mentioned that the Historical Comparative Method developed in connection with the comparative observation of languages belonging to the Indo-European family and its appearance was stimulated by the discovery of Sanscrit.

Sir William Jones – a prominent British orientalist and Sanscrit scholar who was the first to point out in the form of vigorously grounded scientific hypothesis that Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic and some other languages of Indo-and-Europe had sprung from the same source which no longer existed. He based his views on the observation of verbal forms or roots and certain grammatical forms in the compared languages. The relations between the languages of the Indo-European family were studied systematically and scientifically at the beginning of XIX century by Frans Bopp, Rasmus Rusk, Jakov Grimm, Alexandr Vostokov. These scientists not only made comparative and historical observations of the kindred languages, but also they defined the fundamental conception of linguistic kinship and created the Historical Comparative Method. The rise of this method marks the appearance of linguistics as a science in the widest sense of the world. After that the historical and comparative study of the Indo-European languages became the principal line of the European linguistic schools for many years to come. The Historical Comparative Linguistics was further developed in the works of such scientists as the representatives of the XIX and XX centuries as Fortunatov, Potebnya, Schlecher, Buslayev, Ferdinand-de-Saussure, Antuan Meye and other linguists. The following general conceptions of different aspects of language and its development underline the foundation of the Historical Comparative Method.

Basing on historical comparative method we can compare the native words of Indo-European languages that evidence of their kinship.

In Russian	In English	In German
<i>Брат</i>	<i>brother</i>	<i>bruder</i>
<i>Мать</i>	<i>mother</i>	<i>mutter</i>
<i>Десять</i>	<i>ten</i>	<i>zehn</i>
<i>Два</i>	<i>two</i>	<i>zwei etc.</i>

But the same can also be said about the Altaik languages.

In Azerbaijani	In Turkish	In Tatar
<i>Tüstü</i>	<i>duman, sis</i>	<i>tütün</i>
<i>Yandırmaq</i>	<i>yakmaq</i>	<i>yakmaq</i>
<i>Gənc</i>	<i>genc</i>	<i>yaş</i>
<i>Qoca</i>	<i>yaşlı</i>	<i>qart, etc.</i>

The following general conceptions of different aspects of language and its development underline the foundation of the Historical Comparative Method.

- 1) Families of languages originate due to the historical division of languages.
- 2) Lingual signs are arbitrary in their sense that there is no natural connection between their form and the thing or ideas they signify.

3) The Historical development of language is continual, but not uneven. We are going to consider these fundamental conceptions and their consequences separately:

a) The Historical Comparative method proceeds from the possibility for different languages is brought about by the division of the language speaking community due to political and economic factors. Since language is always changing historically the isolation of daughter community can lead to the growing differences in their language to the rise of dialects which in the process of further change can develop into totally different though related languages.

Such division of languages is characteristic of the tribe epoch in the history of people's. But the actual process of language division is very complex. It is connected

with repeated mixing, crossing and redivision of tribes and nationalities throughout centuries and accompanied by the disappearance of some languages the spread of other languages over vast territories and among originally unrelated communities. When the dialects of a language grow into different languages it means that the parent language has ceased to exist. In this stage a family of languages has arisen thus in the family forming linguistic process we register several stages.

b) The actual kinship or non kinship of different languages is revealed on the basis of systematic comparison of their forms. Since there is no naturally predetermined connection between lingual forms and the things and ideas they signify the resemblance of meaningful forms in different languages can evidence their kinship. Different cases of resemblance must be considered here. Occasional resemblance in meaningful forms is purely coincidental and such cases of resemblance are very rare. Other resemblance may be due to the borrowing of words from one language to another.

Let's compare the native words of Indo European languages that evidence of their kinship.

брат - brother - bruder

мать - mother - mutter

By comparing forms of kindred languages linguists reveal the system of phonological corresponds characterizing one language or a group of languages within the family reference to other language or a group of languages.

десять - ten - zehn

два - two - zwai

Now, let's pay attention to the evidence of their kinship in Turkic languages.

Orxanla mən mağazadan həməizə bir karandaş, beş dəftər aldıq (In Azerbaijani).

Orhanla ben mağazadan birer kuruşunkalem, beşer defter aldık (In Turkish).

Ban bekledim, bekledim klubta kardaşımsa gelmedi (In Gagauz) etc.

c) Language develops unevenly. It concerns all the structural elements of language. It is connected with the fact that different structural elements of language

specifically react to, and reflect the history of the people. It follows from this that elements no longer existing in one language of a family maybe preserved in other kindred language. Thus, comparing different languages and their forms linguists can reconstruct elements of languages and more vigorously formulated the historical changes in languages.

Comparing the word “father” in different Indo-European languages scientists reconstruct the word belonging to the epoch of the parent Indo-European languages.

Some scholars show that historical comparative method has certain limitations. They are the followings:

a) It is limited by the material it can use. The facts that ceased to exist in all compared group or family of languages can hardly be reconstructed.

b) It is difficult and sometimes impossible to define the time and even the relative chronology of lingual changes.

c) It can be chiefly applied to languages with ancient writing.

d) It is applied only to the comparative study of kindred languages

However these limitations of the historical comparative method can't testify that method is antiquated. Alongside of the Indo-European family of languages, other families of related languages have been discovered and are being studied such as Finno-Ugrian family, the Turkic family, the Caucasian family and others. Their study brings new scientific results, widening the horizon of the comparative linguistics and contributing to the development.

Both these methods, distributional analysis and substitution were not new ideas in the history of the English language. The term “distribution” is of recent origin. The difference between the traditional and structural approaches consists that the former did not rely on this method. Modern linguists has given recognition within the theory of comparative typology, to the distributional principle.

Distributional method is widely used in American structutal linguistics. The essence of this method is that linguistic units (phonemes, morphemes, words, etc.) are classified on the basis of their distribution in coherent speech. Under distribution

one understands the combination of this or that element with other elements in speech.

The generally favourite method of linguistic description became that of distribution. The founder of distributional method is Z.S.Harris. He wrote that linguistic procedures were directed at a twice made application of two major steps: the setting up of elements and the statement of the distribution of these elements relative to each other, distribution being defined as the sum of all the different environments or positions of an element relative to the occurrence of other elements. The term distribution is of recent origin. The difference between the traditional and structural approaches consists that the former didn't rely upon this method.

The method developed by N.Chomsky has now become widely known as Transformational Generative Method. According to this method sentences have a surface structure and a deep structure. Of these, the surface structure is more complicated, based on one or more underlying abstract simple structures. Transformational method is based on three parts – the first part is its syntactic component, the second part is the semantic component and the third part is the phonological component.

The syntactic component includes description both of deep and surface structure. The semantic component provides a semantic interpretation of the deep structure, but the phonological component provides a phonetic interpretation of the surface structure of the sentence.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST II.

1. What can you say about the languages with nominative and ergative constructions?
2. Who is considered to be the founder of sentence typology in our republic?
3. Who is the author of the book “The Turkish language of Soviet Azerbaijani” and what does it deal with?
4. What can you say about the publication of the fundamental book “Basic course in Azerbaijani”?

5. Speak about I.I.Meshaninov's classification of languages.
6. What can you say about I.I.Meshaninov's view point about word order in fleective languages?
7. How many groups did J.Greenberg divide into all the languages according to the sentence structure?
8. What are Friedrich Shlegel and August Shlegel?
9. What can you say about Friedrich Shlegel's division of the languages?
10. What can you say about August Shlegel's division of the languages?
11. Which languages are the languages of affixes?
12. What is the difference between isolating and agglutinating languages?
13. Speak about the difference between fleective and incorporating languages?
14. What kind of trends exist in typology?
15. How many groups are all languages divided into?
16. Who was the term "agglutination" introduced by?
17. How many groups are the agglutinating languages divided into?
18. How do we call synthetic languages which are not agglutinative?
19. What kind of flections do you know?
20. Speak about the main characteristic feature of external flection.
21. Who lay down the foundation of the comparative method in the study of Turkic languages?
22. What can you say about the methods of typological analysis?
23. Who was known to be the founder of the distributional method?
24. Who was known to be the founder of the transformational method?
25. What principles is the transformational method based on?
26. What kind of limitations has the historical comparative method?
27. Speak about the distributional method.
28. What method of investigation is developed by Chomsky?
29. What can you say about three basic parts of transformational method?
30. How do the languages develop?

CHAPTER III.

THE LANGUAGE TYPE AND TYPE IN THE LANGUAGE

The notion of language type and type in the language. The levels of typological studies. The notion of isomorphism and allomorphy. Language universals. The notion of pattern language (metalanguage).

One of the main problems in linguistic typology is the notion of language type. Up today there is no unity of opinion on the notion of language type. Here different view points may be distinguished.

We consider V.D.Arakin's opinion on this problem more acceptable. He writes: "Under the type of separate language we understand stable totality of the main features of language which have certain relations between them. Presence or absence of any feature is conditioned by the presence or absence of other features" [56, 13].

Investigating of kindred languages show that there are certain properties characterising different language types in every language. As we know, in English analytical forms dominate. But there are some features of agglutinating type. The morphemes "en", "es" (dresses, children, oxen) may express plurality. The same can be said about the absence of grammatical category of gender and the absence of agreement of nouns, adjectives, possessive pronouns.

E.g. *the new town – the new towns*

In Russian where the features of synthetical structure dominate one can find features of analytical structure. Analytical forms are found in the formation of future tense forms and degrees of comparison of adjectives. The same can be said about the Azerbaijani language. Though it is in synthetical units, we may still distinguish analytical forms in the verb and adjectives.

E.g. *gəlməli idim, lap qırmızı, Sabah çalış daha tez gəl etc.*

The above mentioned facts show that pure language types don't exist in reality. Language typology is determined with the features dominating in it which are observed in all levels of language structure.

Comparing various kindred and non-kindred languages we can find some similar properties in them. In all Turkic languages we find out the same features:

- 1) vowel harmony - is the main feature in the phonological level;
- 2) monosemy of affixes;
- 3) absence of agreement as a type of syntactical relation;
- 4) position of the attribute before the word it modifies;
- 5) unchangeability of root of the word;
- 6) absence of sound alternation and so on.

While speaking about the type in the language we mean special language features existing in the system of this or that language. In some languages stress is free, but in others it is fixed (English, French). Ways of expressing plurality in English may be expressed:

- a) synthetically (book+s);
- b) sound alternation (man-men, foot-feet).

But in Azerbaijani plurality is expressed only synthetically.

So type in the language reveals the presence of these or those types of language expressing of the English verb are the followings:

- a) synthetical - *speaks*;
- b) analytical - *is speaking*;
- c) sound - alternation - *spoke*;
- d) suppletive formation - *went, gone*.

As is known language incorporates the three constituent parts, and each being inherent in it by virtue of its social nature. These parts are the phonological system, the lexical system, the grammatical system. Only the unity of these three elements forms a language without any one of them there is no human language in the above sense.

These systems are closely interconnected and interdependent within these three systems. The following levels may be distinguished:

- 1) phonological level;
- 2) phonetic level;

- 3) morphological level;
- 4) lexical level;
- 5) syntactical level.

According to the level language type compares the units of the above mentioned level. Delimitation of language levels is of great importance while comparing languages. Without such delimitation it is impossible to find out language universals.

So according to the levels of language hierarchy the following language types should be given:

- 1) phonological type;
- 2) phonetic type;
- 3) morphological type;
- 4) lexical type;
- 5) syntactical type.

Phonological typology. This type compares units of phonology, phonemic levels of language. Its aim is to find out phonological differential features in compared languages. Phonological system of different languages are compared according to the interrelations of their consonant and vowel elements considered as distinct phonemes. This sort of classification was the first done by Trubetskoy.

Phonetic typology. This type compares units of phonetic levels of languages. Mainly, phonetic typology studies concrete physiological units.

It may compare units of kindred and non-kindred languages. E.D.Polivanov is considered to be the first of the founders of phonetic typology. At present there are a lot of investigations of phonetic typology.

Morphological typology. According to character of investigation morphological typology may be divided into two types:

1. It studies morphological classification of languages and determines language types. It also studies general problem of classification of languages according to certain types.

2. Morphological typology of the second type studies special problems. Here different morphological, grammatical units may be compared. Besides it, grammatical categories of notional parts of speech, noun forming suffixes in given languages etc. may be compared as well.

Syntactical typology. It compares units of syntactical level. Main units for comparing are phrases and sentences. Depending on the character of investigation syntactical typology may consist of several divisions:

- a) comparing units of phrase level;
- b) comparing units of sentence level;
- c) comparing units of different levels from syntactical functioning point of view.

I.I.Meschaninov was the first to work out problems of syntactical typology systematically.

In his works parts of sentences are treated as universal categories.

But in our republic prof. O.I.Musayev is the first founder of syntactical typology.

His investigation “Word order in English and Azerbaijani” is of great importance from theoretical and practical points of view.

Lexical typology. It compares units of lexical level of languages. It may have several divisions:

- 1) lexical typology of words or typology of words;
- 2) word building typology;
- 3) comparative lexicography;
- 4) lexico-statistic typology;
- 5) lexical typology of borrowings;
- 6) lexical typology of phraseology;
- 7) lexical typology of proverbs and sayings;
- 8) lexical typology of onomastics (name study);
- 9) lexical typology of toponymy (place-name study);
- 10) lexical typology of terminology.

It is very important to establish likeness of given systems for typology as well. Such likeness or parallelism of language structure of separate micro or macrosystem

is called isomorphism. The term “isomorphism” was carried in linguistics by Polish linguist E.Kurilovich from mathematics.

E.A.Makayev determines isomorphism as the uniformity of the structure of language units constituting given level. He supposes that the distributional and the transformational methods will be more effective in description and determination of language levels.

The aim of the typology is to show isomorphism in different languages, that is to determine the resemblance or similarity not only in microsystem, but as well as in subsystems, in macrosystems of the language.

Isomorphism withstands with allomorphy. Allomorphy is the variety of the structure of language units forming the given level, in other words it shows the differences in the structures of the language units.

The term “Grammatika universalis” is used in the XIII century in the science. The problem of language universals has always made the scientists busy for a long time.

For the beginning of the XX century the interest increased to the problem of language universals and it can be considered with the development of the structural linguistics. The problem of universals was the focus of attention of structuralists and the followers of N.Khomiński school. But the problem of universals was developed in N.S.Trubetsky and R.O.Yakobson’s works.

In 1961 was held a conference about language universals. “The memorandum of Language Universals” by J.Greenberg, Ch.Osgood, Dj.Djenkinson played a great role in this sphere. The aim of this work is to show general features in different world languages.

In short, language universals show the characteristic features belonging to all languages.

Language universals have the following types:

- 1) deductive and inductive;
- 2) absolute and stative;
- 3) simple and compound;
- 4) synchronic and diachronic;

5) extralinguistic and linguistic.

But there are also phonological, grammatical and semantic universals.

The founder of semantic universals is N.Trubetsky. The founder of grammatical universals is J.Greenberg. He defined 45 universals in the field of morphology and syntax. The founders of semantic universals are J.Greenberg, Ch.Osgud, Dj.Djenkinson.

As is known universal features exist in all languages of the world.

These universal features which exist in all languages are called language universals.

- a) In all languages of world sounds are divided into vowels and consonants;
- b) In most languages of the world we may find pronouns, especially personal pronouns for the first and second persons.
- c) Each language of the world has proper nouns
- d) Each language of the world has verb systems etc.

The final aim of language typology is to find out language universals.

In order to define isomorphism or allomorphism it is useful to compare these languages with each other.

The typology of the languages as a special section of the science deals with unlimited number of the languages. These can be the languages, having genetic resemblance, for instance Indo-European languages. These can be languages, limited by certain area, for instance Balkan languages.

It is necessary to compare kindred or non-kindred languages in order to determine similar and different features of them. In this comparison one of the compared languages becomes the main language.

However, if we compare the English language with our native language, the latter will conditionally be taken as pattern language or metalanguage.

The notion of “patterns” and of a “pattern language”, comes from the work of Christopher Alexander, a contemporary architect who proposed the use of collections of architectural patterns to address deficiencies in modern building design. In later works, Alexander expanded the scope of his rather fascinating concept of patterns to

a broader design context. In the early 90s, computer scientists began to apply Alexander's work to software development [33, 76].

Pattern language helps us to speak clearly, exactly, accurately and impressively. Each speech obtaining all those characteristics is considered to be good speech and may attract the listener's attention immediately.

Normal pattern language belongs to both written and oral speech. As it is seen oral speech is the main factor on affecting your listener or reader. But what should we do in order to get good pronunciation? Without hesitating we can mention that each of us should control the normative of literary language. So it should be taken into its lexical, grammatical, stylistic, orthographical and orthoepic rules consideration. While speaking in any language we should try to choose the words which can be pronounced correctly, clearly, musically, accurately. While hearing good speech we stop for a moment and try to concentrate our attention to that person. Without exaggerating it should be noted that each language in the world is potentially the source of music. But it may be more or less. We may prove it by saying the following extract by Walter Everett Hawkins:

*“Ask me, why I love you, dear,
And I will ask the rose
Why it loves the dews of Spring
At the winter's close
Why the blossom's nectared sweets
Loved by guesting bee,
I will gladly answer you,
If they answer me”.*

But the structure of native language may be different. In other words the results gained by the comparison of native language will be quite different. And the results taken by the comparison of the English language shouldn't be the same either.

Some scholars consider two kinds of pattern language: a) minimal pattern language and b) maximal pattern language.

Minimum language standard must connect in itself the typological features of all the languages.

Maximum language standard must connect all the characteristic features of comparing languages.

U.I.Shendels dwells on the pattern language of amorphous languages. He considers that amorphous languages have a simple structure and they can be expressed by common features for all languages [82, 137-158].

Taking into account of a great importance of a pattern language for typological investigations and theory of sciences E.A.Makayev put forward the following features coinciding with pattern language:

1) language standard is useful in checking and determination of language universals and influences the criterion of the strictly typological theories, i.e. pattern language influences the organization of typological theory;

2) pattern language is considered to be the language-object for typological theory. It presents all languages of the world in one language;

3) pattern language is usually used by symbols;

4) pattern language is presented as typological metalanguage and it interprets the preceding typological views [69, 31-47].

In other words, metalanguage studies the content of the other language.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST III.

1. How do you understand the notion of language type and type in the language?
2. What can you say about V.D.Arakin's opinion on the notion of language type?
3. What kind of language is the Azerbaijani language according to its type?
4. What kind of language is the English language according to its type?
5. Do the pure language types exist in reality?
6. What kind of features exist in the compared languages?
7. What kind of levels of typological studies do you know?
8. What is of great importance in finding out language universals?
9. What is the difference between phonological and phonetic levels?

10. What can you say about morphological typology?
11. Speak about the types of morphological typology.
12. How many divisions of lexical typology do you know?
13. What is the difference between lexical and syntactical typology?
14. Who was the first to work out the problems of syntactical typology?
15. How do you understand the notion of isomorphizm and allomorphizm?
16. When was the term language universals used in science?
17. What do language universals show?
18. What kind of types have the language universals?
19. What is the difference between isomorphizm and allomorphizm?
20. Who was considered to be the founder of phonological universals?
21. Who is the founder of grammatical universals?
22. How many universals did J.Greenberg define in the field of morphology and syntax?
23. What is the definition of language universals?
24. Who are the founders of semantic universals?
25. When was a conference held about language universals?

CHAPTER IV.

CONTRASTIVE STRUCTURE STUDIES IN FOREIGN AND NATIVE LANGUAGES

Contrastive structure studies means that genetic affinity between languages is not taken into consideration. Thus, in contrastive structure studies of the non-kindred English and Azerbaijani languages we are to speak about the structural similarities and differences, in other words morphs and .allomorphs between these languages. As you know there are different approaches to the nature of the language. At the same time it should be mentioned that there are different definitions of language given by various scholars. Only basing upon theoretical problems we may solve this problem correctly. The social nature of language is based on its being a product of human society. Language is created by higher society and it exists only in human society. There is no language outside society in the world. Language can be understood properly if it is studied in close connection with the history of human society.

That is a short but quite concrete explanation of social nature of language. The question “what is the language?” should be answered only by learning it thoroughly. There are many languages on the globe, both great and small. According to modern calculations the number of living languages exceeds more than three thousands. Every language has its own sound system, basic word stock and grammatical structure. According to their relations and grammatical structure some of the languages are alike. Here we use “alike” relatively. Of course some of these languages greatly differ from one another like English and Azerbaijani. So according to their relations we speak of genetical affinations of languages and according to their grammatical structure we speak on their morphological classification.

According to their genetical classification languages are divided into families, that's related groups. It shows that languages from one and the same family are historically or genetically related. There are the following language groups (families):

- 1) Indo-European languages (Hindu, Romance, Russian, English, etc.);
- 2) Altaic languages (Tatar, Azerbaijani, Turkish, Uzbek, Turkmen, etc.);
- 3) Chino-Tibetan languages (numerous Chinese languages);
- 4) Hamito-Semitic languages (Arabic languages);
- 5) Dravidian languages (tamil, felebu) etc.;
- 6) Malayo-Polynesian languages (languages spoken in Malai peninsula);
- 7) Bantu languages (languages of East Africa);
- 8) Caucasian languages (Georgian and others);
- 9) Language families of North America.

As it is seen from the classification given above the English and the Russian languages belong to Indo-European languages family, but Azerbaijani belongs to Altaic languages. As we have already mentioned according to their grammatical structure languages are classified morphologically as well. The morphological classification considers grammatical forms of languages. The most familiar classifications of languages by their structure contains four groups:

- 1) isolating (Chinese languages);
- 2) flexional (Latin, Russian, to some stem of English);
- 3) agglutinative (Turkish, Tatar, Azerbaijani, etc.);
- 4) incorporating or poly-synthetic (like some American Indian languages).

The flexional languages are divided into synthetic and analytic. In the synthetic languages the grammatical relations between words are expressed by forms of the words themselves. In analytic languages the sentence is of prime importance and the grammatical meanings are expressed by words arranged in a fixed order.

The characteristic feature of agglutinative languages is that a large number of so-called stickers-suffixes are added to the unchangeable root of the words. These suffixes express syntactic relations in the sentence.

In dealing with contrastive structure studies of English, Azerbaijani and Russian languages it should be noted that there are two different kinds of comparison is based on inflecting historical development or relationship among particular related

languages. This type of comparison probably the one best known to the general public is historically oriented comparison.

E.g. Comparing Azerbaijani, Tatar, Turkish, Turkmen, Uzbek and other Altaik languages we can find certain grammatical categories of one and the same meaning historically changed or remaining unchanged.

E.g. *Sən gəlirsən, yoxsa mən gəlim* (in Azerbaijani).

Cin giläsenme, bulmasa min bariymi (in Tatar).

Kafirlarni muminlär öltürdilər, taki kalğanini asir gildilar (in Uzbek).

Kafirləri möminlär öldürtdülər, lakin qalanini əsir aldılar (in Azerbaijani).

Ban bekledim, bekledim klubta kardaşimsa qelmedi (in Gagauz).

Mən klubda hey gözlədim, lakin dostum gəlmədi (in Azerbaijani) etc.

But in comparison of the second type is based on resemblances of features between different unrelated languages without any historical consideration being involved. Therefore we call it contrastive structure studies.

Any research made on this field of comparison helps teaching and learning languages of different systems and families. The significance of the latter comparison can't only be limited by the above mentioned idea. The comparison of unrelated languages is necessary for future machine translating. Excluding some research works written in contrastive structure studies of English, Azerbaijani and Russian languages by R.Gaibova, O.Musayev, Z.Verdiyeva, J.Akhundov, E.Hajiyev, A.Husseyinov, D.Yunusov and others, this field on the whole remains unresearched.

No attempt is taken in this field abroad either. Without going into details it should be noted that only some research works written in abroad. C.Y.Simpson, an English scientist, is the author of the research work "The Turkish language of the Soviet Azerbaijani". This research work speaks about the sound system and morphology of the Azerbaijani language. The author's purpose was to give some brief idea on the phonology and morphology of the Azerbaijani language. W.Fred, Y.I.Householder are the authors of "Basic course in Azerbaijani". This research work was published in Indiana University (in America). Though it deals with Azerbaijani language, but really it is a manual designed to help those who wish to learn spoken Azerbaijani.

Another author Tabrizy presented the dialogue in that book but that was written very vague.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST IV.

1. What is the genetic affinity?
2. How do you understand “contrastive structure studies”?
3. What is the language?
4. Into how many groups are languages divided according to their genetic classification?
5. What kind of language groups do you know?
6. Speak about the most familiar classification of languages by their structure.
7. Speak about the peculiar features of agglutinative and flecive languages.
8. Who were considered to be the researchers of the contrastive structure studies in Azerbaijan?
9. What is the speech?
10. Can any language exist outside society? Why?

CHAPTER V.

CLASSIFICATION OF LANGUAGES: GENEALOGICAL, TYPOLOGICAL (MORPHOLOGICAL) AND AREAL

In linguistics two types of classifications are usually distinguished:

- 1) genealogical;
- 2) typological or morphological.

But some scholars besides upper mentioned types put forward the third classification, that's areal.

The classification of world languages is one of the main problems in linguistics. In the XI century Mahmud Kashgari divided turkic languages according to their features into four groups. This division can be considered as a first step in this field.

The aim and principles of the general linguistics is that to systematize all the languages, to learn their linguistic-grammatic type, to define ties of relationship. In A.Babayev's, J.Maslov's books "Introduction to Linguistics", world languages are classified according to the following principles:

- 1) areal
- 2) functional
- 3) typological
- 4) genealogical

Genealogical classification of languages is closely connected with the historical development of languages. It studies languages in inseparable connection with the history of the people to whom the languages under study belong and who are the creators of language.

The aim of genealogical classification is to determine relationship of languages or cognate languages. In genealogical classification mainly historical comparative method is used. Scholars put forward and distinguished the following language families:

I. The Indo-European language family. This family consists of twelve language groups and each group at the same time consists of several subgroups; here we are interested in the Germanic group. This group has three subgroups:

- a) Scandinavian languages
- b) East Germanic sub-group
- c) West Germanic sub-group

The last sub-group includes the following languages: 1) The English language; 2) the German language; 3) the Dutch language; 4) the Friesian language.

The English language is one of the widely used languages of the world. It is spoken in Great Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and some others. About 75% of all scientific papers are published in English and approximately 70% of the world's mail is written in English.

It is also the language of shipping and air-travel. The English language is the first or joint first language in 70 countries, while French is spoken in 34 countries and Arabic is spoken in 22 countries. The nearest estimate of the number of people in the world today who can speak English is about one billion out of a total population of six billion.

II. The Turkic language family consists of 32 languages. It should be noted that up to nowadays the classification of Turkic languages remains controversial. In different books and investigations one can meet various classifications. We should take into consideration prof. Onullahy's classification. Without going into particulars of these classifications we should like only to drop some words and saying that the Azerbaijani language is included into the Oghuz group of the Turkic language family. Besides, this Oghuz-Saldjuk group, there are two more other subgroups – Oghuz-Turkman and Oghuz-Bulgar in this language family.

Prof. B.Chobanzadeh divides the turkic languages into 4 groups:

- 1) Eastern group: Altay language, Baraba language, North Altay, etc.
- 2) Western group: a) Kirgiz language, Karakirgiz language, Khazakh language, Karakalpak language; b) Irtish dialect; c) Bashgird language; d) Volga or Eastern Russian dialect.

3) Middle Asia dialects and slangs: jigatay, yarkand, Agsu, Uzbek language.

4) South-eastern group: 1. Turkmen language, 2. Azerbaijani language, 3. The language of Anadolu turks, 4. The language of Krim tatars [11, 476].

Generally, there are 23 language-families in the world. All these characteristic features are understudied in genealogical classification.

The second classification of languages is **typological or morphological classification**.

The aim of typological classification is to determine the grammatical structure of the given languages.

The typological classification of languages enables to divide languages into isolating or analytical, agglutinative and fusional or inflecting types.

The English language is in fact barely mixed type of language. Invariable words, such as conjunctions and many adverbs are isolating in type and in many cases they are monomorphemic (since, from) and their grammatical status and class membership are entirely determined by their syntactic relations with the rest of the sentences in which they appear. Sometimes in English the process of agglutination and in Azerbaijan analytism may be observed.

E.g. *He tries to come earlier than usual.*

Sabah çalış daha tez gəl!

English nouns in plurals like “men” are inflexional in structure as against the grammatically equivalent agglutinative forms like “students”. It may be noted that the specifically inflexional structures of English words are in the minority subclasses and often in the irregular forms of the words. Regular morphological structures in English are usually agglutinative.

E.g. *boobs, goes, Jane’s etc.*

Pure examples of any of the free types of word forms structure though out a language are very rare. Some languages make use of one type of word formation as isolating, agglutinative or fusional languages. Chinese and other languages of South-East Asia, Vietnamese are perhaps the purest examples of isolating languages. The Turkic language is the typically purest agglutinative one. Here word-forming and

word-changing monosemantic suffixes are associated with the root of the word. In strict succession the following language types belong to this group: 1) The Turkic languages; 2) Finno-Ugric, Tungus and some – African languages.

As we have already mentioned above agglutinating languages are characterised by the following properties;

- a) the root of the word doesn't change;
- b) there is no sound alternation;
- c) there is vowel harmony;
- d) affixes are as a rule monosemantic;
- e) affixes are associated with the roots directly.

As is known that typological classification is based on typological comparison. It is based on general features of the systems and structures of languages and thus forms part of the wider process of classification of any observed phenomena according to the revealed similarities of form and structure. Its linguistic groups are set up irrespective of historical language families and may in part agree with them or cut across their boundaries. The typological comparison like the descriptive linguistics deals with the present state of language. The main task of it is to study the similarities and differences in structures of two or even more languages. The main task subject of typological comparison is the structurally of at least two languages with their similarities and differences. Naturally this method requires constant and logically right comparison of the sounds of one language with those of the other language, the vocabulary of one language with that of the other, the morphology of one language with the other language. Such comparisons must involve both the single elements as well as parts of language structures, like the verb in English and the verb in Azerbaijani etc. Such approach to language permits us to understand more deeply in nature of a language structure, its peculiarities in different languages to distinguish different language types or their parts. Typological classification of language can be done on the basis of different language principles.

As we know languages are classified according to the interrelations of their consonant and vowel elements considered as distinct phonemes. This sort of

classification was the first done by Trubetsky. One may distinguish languages of vowel system organized in two principal dimensions: open and close, front and back with lip spreading accompanying back vowels (Italian and Spanish) and languages making independent use of the three dimensions: open and close, front and back and lip spreading and lip rounding (French, German, Turkish).

Consonant system may similarly be classified according to the number of articulation places and process characterizing the greater part of each system. English plosive and nasal consonants fall into a three place and three process system bilabial alveolar, velar and voiceless, voiced, nasal.

At the grammatical level languages may be classified according to the predominant characteristics of their grammatical systems: Such as the category of order, concord, government, the category of case, gender and number. As is known the English and Azerbaijani languages belong to different language groups both from genealogical as well as from typological point of view. The English language being included into the Germanic group of Indo-European language family is of analytical type, while the Azerbaijani language being included into the Oghuz group of the Turkic family of languages is of agglutinative type. The fact gives an explanation to the great differences between these languages. In modern English grammatical relations between the words in phrases and sentences are mainly expressed by formal words: prepositions, articles, particles, auxiliary verbs and word order. In the following cases grammatical meaning in Modern English are expressed analytically:

- 1) all the tense forms except “present” and “past simple”;
- 2) the interrogative and negative forms of the present and past simple are formed analytically.

As is known the category of case in Modern English is still problematic. Syntactical relations between nouns are mainly expressed analytically by means of numerous prepositions. The use of the articles as a structural part of speech is analytical means of expressing the category of definiteness and indefiniteness. Word order in modern English phrases and sentences, as is known of great importance. **E.g.** light lamp; lamp light.

In Azerbaijani synthetic flexions dominate in all forms of person, number, case, tense etc. But still one can also meet analytical forms in Azerbaijani. They are comparatively few and they show up themselves, mostly in adjectives and adverbs.

However, it should be noted that the structure of any language is never purely synthetic or purely analytic. In Modern English one can meet synthetic forms in the third person singular of the present simple, in the past simple of irregular verbs, in the genitive case etc.

Comparing synthetism and analytism of non-kindred and kindred languages, let's pay attention to the following sentence patterns:

1. *The soldier's wound was carefully bandaged and in a few days he was again able to fight* (In English).

2. *Петр Данилович от души громко рассмеялся* (In Russian).

3. *Sin giläsenme, bulmasa min barşmi* (*Sən gəlirsən, yoxsa mən gəlim*) (In Tatar).

4. *Kafirlarnı muminlər öltürdilər, tagi kalğanını asir gıldılar* (*Kafirləri möminlər öldürdülər, lakin qalanını əsir aldılar*) (In Uzbek).

5. *Ban bekledim, bekledim klubta kardaşimsa qelmedi* (*Mən klubda hey gözlədim, lakin dostum gəlmədi*) (In Gagauz).

6. *Her gün bu kadının evinin önünden geçen bir delikanlı, kadının sokağa bir tas süt döktüğünü görüyor, merak ediyormuş* (*Hər gün bu qadının evinin önündən keçən bir gənc, qadının küçəyə bir qab süd tökdüyünü görür və maraqlanır*) (In Turkish) etc.

Taking into account the results of above mentioned examples we'd come into conclusion that it is impossible to find out pure synthetic or analytical languages in the world. We can find analytical elements in synthetic languages or synthetic elements in analytical languages.

Areal or geographical classification. The history of this classification is not old. But it began to spread over and determine its principles in XX century. The main objective of this classification is to prepare the linguistic map of world languages and to learn these languages according to this map. Its aim is to study how the given

language is spread over in given country, how it is used by the other nationalities living in this or that area, how many people consider this or that language their own native language etc.

Ex.: 99,1% Azerbaijanis consider the Azerbaijani language their native language, 0,4% consider Russian as a native language and the other rest the other languages.

To the areal typology may be included the following items:

- a) to study dialects and dialectal discrimination;
- b) composition of dialectical map;
- c) to study the main features in the system of kindred and non-kindred languages;
- d) defining of neologisms and archaisms, etc. [57, 54].

Functional classification – this classification is otherwise called a lingosociological or sociological classification. In functional classification of languages three main divisions are taken into consideration:

- 1) relation of the language with ethnic community;
- 2) the functions, that language fulfills in the society;
- 3) prevalence of the language outside of the main ethnic sphere.

There are two points of functional classification:

- a) national languages (English, French, Russian)
- b) family languages (Khinalig (in Guba region), Kilit (in Ordubad) etc.

The aim of linguistics is to classify these languages from the functional point of view.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST V.

1. How many types of classifications are distinguished in linguistics?
2. What can you say about the genealogical classification of languages?
3. What is the aim of the genealogical classification?
4. What method is used in genealogical classification?
5. Speak about the Indo-European language family.
6. Which languages are included into west Germanic sub-group?
7. Which subgroups has the Indo-European language family?

8. Speak about the Turkic language family.
9. What can you say about prof. Onullahy's classification?
10. To which group is the Azerbaijani language included?
11. How many language families are there in the world?
12. What can you say about typological or morphological classification of languages?
13. What is the aim of typological classification?
14. What kind of language is the English language?
15. What are the characteristic properties of the agglutinating languages?
16. What can you say about the areal or geographical classification?
17. What is the main objective and aim of the areal classification?
18. Speak about the functional classification.

CHAPTER VI.

TYPOLOGY OF PHONOLOGICAL SYSTEMS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

The notion of phonological level. Criteria for typological studies of the phonological level.

The most important function of the language is to serve for intercourse. No idea can be expressed without sentences which consist of words. Spoken words in all languages consist of language sounds. Therefore any spoken language is first of all a language of sounds. In order to speak a foreign language one must be able to pronounce words and sentences in that language correctly. At the same time a learner of a foreign language must distinguish similarities and differences existing both in native and foreign languages. As we know, the lowest level of any language is the phonemic level consisting of phonemes.

The phoneme is the smallest sound unit of a language capable to distinguish one word from another form of the same word.

Units of language are divided into segmental and supra-segmental. Segmental units consist of phonemes, they form phonemic strings of various status (syllables, morphemes, words, etc.). To the supra-segmental units belong intonations, accents, pauses, patterns of word-order.

The lowest level of lingual segments is phonemic: it is formed by phonemes as the material elements of the higher level segments. The phoneme has no meaning, its function is purely differential: it differentiates morphemes and words as material bodies. Since the phoneme has no meaning, it is not a sign.

Phonemes are combined into syllables. The syllable, a rhythmic segmental group of phonemes, is not a sign, either; it has a purely formal significance. Due to this fact, it could hardly stand to reason to recognize in language a separate syllabic level; rather, the syllables should be considered in the light of the intra-level combinability properties of phonemes.

Phonemes are represented by letters in writing. Since the letter has a representative status, it is a sign, though different in principle from the level-forming signs of language.

E.g. *bag* [bʌg] - *back* [bʌk]
dark [dɑ:k] - *duck* [dʌk]

Every language has its own way of using the organs of speech, its own type and place of stress in words and sentences, different use of intonation in speech.

On the basis of which we get different languages both oral and written. We can say that phonemes of one language may be absent in another, another may resemble but have difference in some point or points. The following are the most characteristic features of the English articulation basis in comparison with Azerbaijani English consonants [d=, ʒ, =] which sound somewhat soft as they have the second place of obstruction formed by the central part of the tongue and the hard palate have this quality regardless of their position in words. English consonants aren't palatalized before all the vowels of front and back.

E.g. *table*, *little*

But Azerbaijani consonants have a strong tendency for adaptation to vowels. Velar consonants [k, g] with front vowels, mostly after front vowels the sound [ŋ] becomes soft.

Compare: *bell* - *girl* *girl* - *göl*

English voiced consonants [b, v, d, z, ɱ, g, ɱ] are partly devoiced in final position. If we use a voiceless consonants instead of the partly devoiced in this position different words will get mixed up. So it leads to phonological mistakes.

E.g. *cab* - *cap* *bus* - *buzz*
leave - *leaf* *bag* - *back*

In Azerbaijani final consonants are usually devoiced:

E.g. *kitab* - *kitap*; *həsəd* - *həsət*.

Two, three even four English consonants may follow one another both preceding and following vowels in syllables, **E.g.** *spring*, *square*, *stress*, *wrinkled*. But similar things don't happen in Azerbaijani, **E.g.** *üst*, *dörd*.

English fore-lingual consonants except [r] have an apical articulation while corresponding Azerbaijani consonants are dorsal. There is a third nasal sonorant (besides [m and n]) [ŋ] in English which is absent in literary Azerbaijani. There is a constrictive sonorant [w] in English which has a bilabial articulation. No similar phoneme exists in Azerbaijani. Two fore-lingual interdental constrictive consonants are characteristic of English [θ, ð]. No similar phonemes can be found in Azerbaijani. In English there are no medio-lingual plosives like Azerbaijani [b, g]. English words final sonorants [m, n, ŋ] become syllabic when they stand after consonants.

E.g. [ˈgɑːdn̩], [ˈrɪzm̩]; [ˈlɪtl̩]

English vowels are more tense than the Azerbaijani ones in stressed syllables while in unstressed position they may undergo reduction and become neutral or even be dropped.

E.g. [ˈlesn̩], [ˈlesn̩]

But Azerbaijani vowels don't lose their quality in unstressed position. English vowels may differ in their stability. This may be monophthongs and diphthongs. But there is no diphthong in Azerbaijani. English vowels may differ in quantity: long and short [iː-i; ɒː-ɒ; aː-ɒ; uː-u; ɜː-ɜ]. In Azerbaijani the length isn't phonemic. Long vowels may occur in prestressed position in some words of foreign origin: *saat*, *maarif*, *məna*. English vowels are mostly non-labialized, of 20 English vowels only five labialized [uː, u, ɔ-ɒ]. The rounded lips are tense but very little protruded. The lips are tense for the unrounded English vowels. But in Azerbaijani the lip rounding may differ vowel phonemes. The lips are less tense but more protruded. There are two central vowels in English [ɜː, ɜ]. Such sounds are absent in Azerbaijani. In English there is no vowel harmony which is typical of Azerbaijani and other Turkic languages. **E.g.:** *alma*, *gəlmə* etc.

The stress in English usually falls on the first syllable but on last in Azerbaijani. In Russian the stress is free. Intonation in English is of two kinds: the falling and rising intonation. Intonation determines whether the given utterance in the given situation

is a statement, a question of any kind, a request, an order or an exclamatory sentence, that's communicative function of intonation.

Its syntactical function determines whether the utterance is a simple, a complex or a compound sentence.

Its modal function shows that by means of intonation the speaker's attitude to the given utterance is expressed, as well as his or her state of mind and attitude to the listener or audience.

Intonation points out whether the logical centre of the given utterance lies (logical function). It may shift the logical centre from a notional word to any other word, usually insignificant, thus making it weighty as a logical predicate.

All those functions mentioned above are realized by various intonation patterns which may be united into intonation types, or intonemes, if they all form certain communicative types of utterances which differ in modality only.

All intonation patterns which end in the same nuclear tone form certain communicative types.

Intonation is defined as a complex unity of all prosodic, or suprasegmental elements of speech. The main components of intonation are the following: speech melody, sentence stress, speech tempo and voice timber.

Speech melody is the pitch component of intonation. It is the musical arrangement of sounds and words in connected speech.

Sentence stress is the relative degree of prominence with which more significant words in a sentence are uttered at regular intervals. Sentence stress has the function of singling out words in the sentence according to their relative semantic importance.

Tempo of speech is the rate at which a sentence or a part of it is pronounced.

The rhythm is closely connected with the tempo of speech. It is understood as the regular movement of utterance in which stressed syllables occur at definite intervals.

Voice timber is the qualitative component of intonation. It gives emotional colouring to speech in pronouncing different sense-groups and sentences.

Every sense group, as well as every isolated word represents a sequence of sounds which are pronounced with a different degree of energy of articulation. This increase

and diminution of force divides speech into smaller phonetic units called syllables. A rise of prominence is clearly heard in every unit and a fall of prominence marks the end of it.

Syllables are first of all phonetic units, as they may not coincide with morphemes or words which represent semantic units having definite sound forms.

Thus the word “table” [ˈteɪbl] consists of one morpheme, but of two syllables, the word “readable” [ˈriːdəbl] consists of two morphemes “read” and “able”, but of three syllables.

In Azerbaijani the morphological division of the word “saziş” could be “saz-iş”, but the phonetic division is “sa`ziş”.

The word in Azerbaijani “a`bad” consists of one morpheme, but has two syllables: a`bad.

But in many cases the morphological and the phonetic division may coincide:

E.g. `railway [ˈreɪl - weɪ]; `useless [ˈjuːs - ləs] etc.

But it would be wrong to say that a syllable is only a phonetic phenomenon. Syllables not only organize sounds into words but show the boundaries between them. A wrong grouping of sounds into syllables may lead to the change in the meaning of words and phrases.

The phrase “a nice house” may receive a different meaning if we read it as [7n`aɪs `hau:s].

The English sonorants [w] [j] and [r] can't be syllabic. The nasal consonant [m] is seldom syllabic, and [ŋ] is syllabic only in very rare occasions - when it occurs as a result of assimilation, as in “bacon” [ˈbeɪkən] or [ˈbeɪkn] or “I can go” [aɪ kən `gou].

In Azerbaijani lateral and nasal sonants are never syllabic, they seldom occur in word final position after other consonants, and if they do, they are non-syllabic.

Compare:

English	Azerbaijani
---------	-------------

<i>rhythm</i> [rɪθm]	[rəhm]
<i>bottle</i> [ˈbɒtl]	[sədr]
<i>table</i> [ˈteɪbl] and so on	[kɒmmuˈnɪzm] və s.

Language incorporates the three constituent sides, each being inherent in it by virtue of its social nature. These parts are the phonological system, the lexical system and the grammatical system. Only the unity of these three elements forms a language; without any one of them there is no human language.

The phonological system is the subfoundation of language; it determines the material (phonetical) appearance of its significative units. The phonological description of language is effected by the science of phonology.

I.A. Boduen de Courtenay thinks that the phone is psychoequivalent of the sound. The sounds are the courtenay of the syllable.

Accepting Moscow phonological school's conception the Azerbaijan linguist A. Damirchizadeh showed the following morphological characteristics of phonemes. He said:

- 1) phoneme is the independent part of language;
- 2) phonemic system is the meaningful unit of the word;
- 3) phonemic system is defined according to the specific features of every language;
- 4) one phoneme can consist of one, two, even three sounds (monophthong, diphthong, thrifthong).

Every language has its own way of using the organs of speech, its own type and place of stress in words and sentences, different use of intonation in speech and so on. On this bases of which we get different languages: both oral and written.

Typology of consonants.

English consonants are not palatalized before all the vowels, both front and back.

Ex: [ou] – [o].

Azerbaijani consonants have a stronger tendency for adaptation to vowels, consonants [k, q] – [k, g] are used with front vowels mostly. Let us compare.

English: *give, girl, cake, kid*

Azerbaijani: *gil, göl, kəsmik, kin (küdurət).*

English voiced consonants are partly devoiced in final position. If we use a voiceless consonants instead of the partly devoiced one in this position different words will get mixed up. **Ex:** *cap – cab, leaf – leave, bag – back, send – sent.*

But in Azerbaijani (oral speech) consonants are usually devoiced: *kitab – kitap, məktəb – məktəp etc.*

Two, three even four English consonants may follow one another, both preceding and following vowels in syllables. **Ex:** *spring – square, mixed – wrinkle.*

Similar sequences of consonants do not occur in Azerbaijani. Not more than one consonant may occur at the beginning of real Azerbaijani words, but they may occur two consonants at the end. **Ex:** *dörd, üst, dürüst.*

There is no nasal sound [2] in Azerbaijani. But in some dialects it occur. English consonants [m, n, l] become syllabic when they stand after consonants. **Ex:** *garden, cotton.*

Typology of vowels.

English vowels are more tense than the Azerbaijani ones in stressed syllables. While in unstressed position they may undergo reduction and become neutral or even drops. But in Azerbaijani vowels do not lose their quality in unstressed position *[les(7)n], [lesn].*

English vowels may differ in stability. These may be monophthongs and diphthongs. But there are no diphthongs in Azerbaijani pronunciation. But in dialects we may come across such words: “*sourma*”, “*qovurma*”, “*anovun*” etc.

English vowels may differ in quantity [i:-i], [a:-0], [o:-o] etc. In Azerbaijani the length is not phonemic. Long vowels may occur in some words of foreign origin. **Ex:** *maarif, saat, inşaət.*

In English there is no vowel harmony which is typical for Azerbaijani and other turkic languagres. **Ex:** *üzüm, maral, qurğu etc.*

CHECK YOURSELF TEST VI.

1. What is the phoneme?
2. What can you say about the English voiced consonants?
3. What kind of consonants are usually devoiced?
4. What kind of consonants may follow one another both preceding and following vowels in syllables in English?
5. What kind of consonant is [r] in comparing languages?
6. Which articulation is characteristic for a constrictive sonorant [w]?
7. What can you say about the characteristic features of English vowels?
8. Do Azerbaijani vowels lose their quality in unstressed position?
9. Speak about the stresses in English.
10. How many kinds of intonation do you know in English?
11. What does intonation point?
12. What can you say about the speech melody?
13. Speak about language units.
14. Which elements belong to the supra-segmental unit?
15. Is there a vowel harmony in English?

CHAPTER VII.

TYOLOGY OF MORPHOLOGICAL SYSTEMS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

The notion of morphological level. Criteria used for the comparison of morphological levels. Typological characteristics of morphological systems in the compared languages.

It is common knowledge that the grammar of every language is traditionally divided into two parts: morphology and syntax. Each part of grammar has its own subject matter to deal with and method of investigation.

The morphological system of language reveals its properties through the morphemic structure of words. Morphology as a part of grammatical theory faces the two segmental units: the morpheme and the word. The object of morphology is the structure, classification and combinability of words.

The morphological system is one of the difficult levels of the multi-stage structure of language. This system considers the structure of the word forms of word changing, means of grammatical expression as well as the division of words into parts of speech. The basic unit of the morphological level is the morpheme which is the smallest structural unit having double nature. Like any other language units except the phoneme, the morpheme has both form and meaning. Let us take the English word “bags”. This word can be broken into two parts: “bag” and – “s”. Here each of the two parts of the word “bags” has both form and content. But if we break up the word “bags” in some other way, **E.g.** “ba-gs”, the resulting parts will not be morphemes, since they have no meanings. There is an important difference between the morpheme “bag” and the word “bag”. The word “bag” contains the meaning of singular number which the morpheme does not. The meaning of singularity is acquired by the word “bag” because there exists the word “bags” with the morpheme of plurality “s”. So the following types of morphemes may be distinguished the absence of “s” in “bag” is interpreted as singular number.

Thus we may say that the word “*bag*” contains 1) the morpheme “*bag*” plus (+) a zero morpheme, with the meaning of singular number. Zero refers only to the form of the morpheme.

The morpheme “*s*” having a positive form may be called 2) a positive morpheme.

The morphemes like “*bag*” are called 3) “free morphemes” because they can be used separately. The morphemes like “*s*”, “*ed*”, “*er*” are called 4) bound morphemes because they can’t be used separately and depend on the meaning of the free morphemes.

By comparing the relations of “*open-opened*” and “*open-shall open*” we can see that the function of “*shall*” is similar to that of the grammatical morpheme “*ed*”.

As “*shall*” has the properties of both a word and a grammatical morpheme, it may be called 5) a grammatical word morpheme.

Besides lexical and grammatical morphemes there exist some intermediate types having double nature. They are called 6) lexico-grammatical morphemes. Like grammatical morphemes “*de*”, “*for*”, “*er*”, “*less*” are attached only to certain classes of lexical morphemes. Like lexical morphemes they determine the lexical meaning of words “*de-part*”, “*for-give*”, “*home-less*” etc.

Morphemes may be of two kinds: a root morpheme which coincides with the stem of the words and an affixational morpheme which in turn has two variants:

a) words changing morpheme expressing relations between words in a phrase or in a sentence.

E.g. *books; Jane’s, smaller etc.*

b) stem-building morphemes which are used to form new words.

E.g. *work - worker*

iş - işçi (fəhlə)

free - freedom

azad - azadlıq etc.

According to their structure morphemes may be one-morphemic, two-morphemic, multi-morphemic. For instance, in Azerbaijani the phonemes **-a**, **-ə**, **-i**, **-ı** can be used as morphemes (otherwise one-morphemic) when they are in the accusative or dative

cases; examples for two-morphemic are *-və, ki etc.* Multimorphemes consist of some phonemes: *lakin, amma, ancaq, bəlkə, çünki etc.* In English *-‘s*, plural ending *-s* can be taken as morphemes too.

In division of morphemes according to their function the form and the content must be taken into consideration. For instance, sometimes the case category and the category of possession are the same in form. *onun kitab-ı, kitab-ı oxudum.* Here the phoneme *-ı* is the same according to its form, but different in content.

Morphemes on the upper level are divided into root morphemes and affixal morphemes.

The root morphemes express the concrete, «material» part of the meaning of the word, while the affixes express the specificational part of the meaning of the word.

The affixal morphemes include prefixes, suffixes and inflexions. Prefixes and lexical suffixes have word-building functions, together with the root they form the stem of the word. Inflexions (grammatical suffixes) express different morphological categories.

There are some forms of affixal morphemes: derivational, zero, plus and minus, connecting morphemes.

Derivational morphemes – here the morphemes connecting to the words create a new lexical meaning. For instance: in Azerbaijani *qap-ma, sor-aq, kitab-xana*, in English *read-er, friend-ship, etc.*

Zero morpheme. This morpheme is characteristic for Azerbaijani. For instance, sometimes in the third person the subject does not agree with the predicate, in other words the subject is used in the plural, but the predicate is in the singular. *Onlar gəldi(lər), quş(lar) uçdu(lar), Yarpaqlar düşdü.* Here **-lar//-lər** is a zero morpheme.

Plus and minus morpheme. There are some morphemes which express positiveness and negativeness. In Azerbaijani **-li (+)** (in other words positiveness), **-sis (-)** (denotes negation), **-dir (+)**, **-deyil (-)**, in English **-ness (+)**, **-less (-)**, **-im, -in (-)** morphemes. *Duzsus, sevincli, irregular, disorder, impatient.*

Connecting morphemes. In Azerbaijani *üz-bə-üz*, *vur-ha-vur*, *dal-ba-dal*, word-for-word, *side-by-side*, *day by day* shows the connecting morphemes.

The root, according to the positional content of the term is obligatory for any word, while affixes are not obligatory. One and the same morphemic segment of functional status, depending on various morphemic environments, can be used as an affix, and as a root.

-out- a root-word (can be used a prep., adv., verbal postposition, adj., noun, etc.)

-throughout – a composite word, in which – out serves as one of the roots.

-outing – a two-morpheme word, in which out- is a root and –ing is a suffix.

-outlook, outline, out-talk, etc. In these words out serves as a prefix.

look-out, knock-out, time-out – in these words(nouns) –out serves as a suffix.

On the basis of formal presentation, “overt” (*gizli*) and “covert” (*açıq*) morphemes are distinguished. Overt morphemes are explicit morphemes building up words; the covert morpheme is identified as a contrastive absence of morpheme expressing a certain function. The notion of covert morpheme coincides with the notion of zero morpheme. For instance, the word-form *clocks* consists of two overt morphemes: one lexical (root) and one grammatical expressing the plural. The word-form *clock* expresses the singular, is also considered as consisting of two morphemes, i.e. of the overt root and covert (implicit) grammatical suffix of the singular.

On the basis of segmental relation, “segmental” and “supra-segmental” morphemes are distinguished. Supra-segmental morphemes in distributional terms are intonation, accents, pauses.

On the basis of grammatical alternation “additive” and “replacive” morphemes are distinguished. Interpreted as additive morphemes are outer grammatical suffixes, as a rule, they are opposed to the absence of morphemes in grammatical alternation. **Ex:** *look+ed, small+er etc.* In distinction to this, the root phonemes of grammatical interchange are considered as replacive morphemes, since they replace one another in the paradigmatic forms. **Ex:** *drive-drove-driven.*

American scholar L. Bloomfield recognized the phoneme and the morpheme as the basic categories of linguistic description, because these units are the easiest to be isolated in the continual text due to their “physically” minimal, elementary segmental character: the phoneme being the minimal formal segment of language, the morpheme, the minimal meaningful segment.

Accordingly, only two segmental levels were originally identified in language by descriptive scholars: the phonemic level and the morphemic level; later on a third one was added to these – the level of “constructions”, i.e. the level of morphemic combinations.

Summing up, we may point out some of the properties of the morphological level like that:

-morphological level is located above the phonemic level. The morpheme is the elementary meaningful part of the word. It is built up by phonemes;

-being basic morphological notion- the word is a nominative unit of language; it is formed by morphemes; it enters the lexicon of language as its elementary component. The word is used for the formation of the sentence – a unit of information in the communication process.

All the morphological forms of one lexime are called its paradigms. The totality of paradigms characterizing the given class of words or the given parts of speech in the expression of more general properties or characteristics which the given parts of speech possesses grammatical phenomenon are called grammatical category. The grammatical category, in other words is the unity of grammatical form and grammatical meaning. Each grammatical category is realized only when it has its material expression in the given language. So the grammatical category of case in Azerbaijani is realized because it has corresponding case morphemes in this language. **E.g. -m⁴, -nm⁴, -a², -da², -dən².**

The grammatical category of the degrees of comparison of adjectives in English is realized because it has the morphemes “**er**”, “**est**” and word morphemes “**more**”, “**most**” having corresponding semantics. It means that the grammatical category is two folded:

1. on the one hand it is grammatical notion existing in the given language and expressing the most characteristic indications and properties of the given language as a system.

2. on the other hand it is a separate class of words having these grammatical indications.

The category of case in grammatical notion of expressing relations between substantive words that is noun. The above mentioned shows that the morphological level is formed by the following quantities:

- 1) morphemes expressing concrete relations between words;
- 2) paradigms representing stable totality of relations;
- 3) grammatical categories, grammatical notions acquiring the material expressing in certain class of words.

In order to compare one language with another as regards its micro-systems, it is necessary to find out such quantities which can be compared meanwhile in the composition of the morphological level there are very heterogeneous quantities. So in the English language there is a compound tense system, but it is not found in Azerbaijani. At the same time typological comparison is impossible without identical quantities. But what are the criteria used for typological at the morphological level? Taking into account the fact that typological comparison is carried out not on the basis of material identity or etymological kinship but on the basis of functional identity of separate phenomenon of the compared languages. So the first criterion which can be used for characterizing the unit of typological comparison must be the criterion of functional identity of compared phenomena. According to the identity of functions we can compare the suffix “**er**” of the comparative degrees of adjectives in English and in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *She is younger than me*

- *O məndən kiçikdir.*

And the English morphemes of plurality “**s**”, “**es**”, “**en**” and suffix of plurality in Azerbaijani **-lar**². The unit of comparison must be a combination of common properties typical of the compared phenomena as a whole and special features

characterizing each of the compared phenomena in particular. This criterion of a combination of common and special properties makes it possible to fringe the phenomena of more special character to those of the common character cases existing in different languages having their own separate shades of meanings. But all the case forms have one common feature that is to express relations of one substance to other substances, phenomena.

That is why the second criterion is the correspondence of the common features to special ones and vice-versa.

In the earlier stages English had a more developed system. English has various syntactical functions of the noun or pronoun in a sentence. In old English there were the following four cases:

1. nominative
2. genitive
3. dative (yönlük)
4. accusative (təsirlik)

But in the course of time the original nominative, dative and accusative merged into one uninflected form – the common case.

The old genitive case is represented in modern English by the inflected possessive case of nouns (*boy's, father's*). Thus we see that modern English nouns denoting living beings have two cases – the common and the possessive.

In modern Azerbaijani the noun has six case forms. One uninflected form called the nominative case and five inflected forms called the genitive case, dative case, accusative case, locative case (yerlik) and ablative case (çixışlıq). English case system covers only the noun (only living beings and some lifeless things) and the pronoun. Azerbaijani case system has wider use than English. Azerbaijani case system covers the noun, the participle and the infinitive. Except the noun, the pronoun and the infinitive the rest above mentioned parts of speech can have case inflexion in case they are substantivized.

So the third criterion to which the unit of morphological comparison must correspond is the criterion of wide range of lexical units. These three criteria must be

considered while determining the unit of typological comparison and it is possible to say that grammatical category is that unit which finds its material expression in the totality of paradigms.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST VII.

1. What is the object of morphology?
2. What kind of morphemes do you know according to their structure?
3. What kind of morphemes do we call bound morphemes?
4. What kind of morphemes do we call free morphemes?
5. Into how many groups are the morphemes divided on the upper level?
6. What can you say about affixal morphemes?
7. Speak about the root morphemes in compared languages.?
8. What is the difference between derivational and zero morphemes?
9. How do you understand the term plus and minus morphemes?
10. Speak about connecting morphemes.
11. What can you say about additive and replacive morphemes?
12. What is the difference between grammatical and lexico-grammatical morphemes?
13. How can we sum up the main properties of the morphological level?
14. What kind of morphemes are distinguished on the basis of formal presentation?
15. What kind of morphemes are distinguished on the basis of segmental relation?

CHAPTER VIII.

TYPOLOGY OF PARTS OF SPEECH IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

Different approaches to the definition of “parts of speech”. Typological criteria used to study parts of speech.

According to the lexical meaning, morphological characteristics and syntactical function words fall under certain groups called parts of speech. It should be mentioned that the notion of parts of speech is one of the difficult problems in grammatical theory. It causes greater controversies both in general linguistics and in the analysis of separate languages. Though different scholars have been studying parts of speech for over two thousand years, the criteria used for classifying lexemes are not yet agreed upon. That's why there is a great deal of subjectivity in defining the classes of lexemes. The lexemes of a part of speech are first of all united by their content, that's by their meaning. But this general meaning of a part of speech can't be grammatical because the members of one lexeme have different grammatical meanings.

E.g. compare: *boy's – oğlanın* – singular number, genitive case

boys – oğlanlar – plural number, common case (in English),
nominative case (in Azerbaijani)

The general meaning of a part of speech can't be lexical either. If all the words of a part of speech had the same lexical meaning, they would constitute one lexeme. Thus the general meaning of a part of speech is neither lexical nor grammatical, but it is connected with both. B.Khaimovich and B.Rogovskaya call this meaning lexico-grammatical. Lexemes united by the general lexico-grammatical meaning of substance are called nouns, those having the general lexico-grammatical meaning of action are called verbs, etc. The lexico-grammatical morphemes are one of these properties. The stems of noun-lexemes often include the morphemes **er, ness, ship, ment, ist** in English but **çi, çı, çu, çü, liq, lik, ist, izm** in Azerbaijani. The stems of

verb-lexemes include such morphemes as **ize, ify, en** in English, **maq, mək** in Azerbaijani etc.

A part of speech is characterized by its grammatical oppositions and paradigms of its lexemes. Nouns have the categories of number, case; verbs possess the categories of tense, voice, mood in compared languages etc. Another important feature of a part of speech is its combinability, that's the ability to form certain combinations of words. Parts of speech are also characterized by their function in the sentence in compared languages. Thus a part of speech is a class of lexemes characterized by:

- 1) its lexico-grammatical meaning;
- 2) its lexico-grammatical morphemes (stem-building elements);
- 3) its grammatical categories or its paradigms;
- 4) its combinability;
- 5) its function in a sentence.

Features one, four and five are the most general properties of parts of speech in compared languages. In accordance with these five principles B.Khaimovich and B.Rogovskaya distinguish the following parts of speech in English: nouns, adjectives, pronouns, numerals, verbs, adverbs, adlinks (the category of state), modal words, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, interjections, articles, response words (yes and no) [43, 298].

H.Sweet in his book "A New English Grammar" tried to define some general grammatical categories and notions. In the field of parts of speech he postulates three principles according to which the words are to be classified: meaning, form, function. But in fact in his classification he considers form and function and in accordance with them the parts of speech fall under two main groups:

- 1) declinable
- 2) indeclinable

Declinable parts of speech are:

- a) noun words: noun, noun-pronoun, noun-numeral, infinitive, gerund;
- b) adjective words: adjective, adjective-pronoun, adjective-numeral, participles;
- c) verb: finite verb, verbals (infinitive, gerund, participle).

Indeclinable parts of speech are: adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections.

In his classification Henry Sweet also distinguishes: “full words” and “empty words”, producing the sentence “The earth is round” he writes: “we call such words as “the” and “is” form words, because they are words in form only”.

Our opinion is that both “the” and “is” are words in content as well as in form. The impossibility of changing “an” for “the” in the sentence above is due to the content, not the form of “an”. When replacing “is” by another link verb (seems, looks) we change the content of the sentence.

Charles Fries’s classification occupies a special place in modern linguistics. This classification is based on quite a new approach – the distribution of words and their position in certain models. He falls down all the English words into four classes and fifteen groups. These four classes correspond to traditional nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. But he himself warns against the attempt to translate his classes into traditional terms. The words in his classification belonging to one and the same class are characterized by the similar structural meaning and distribution.

His classes are not mentioned by special terms such as “noun” or “adjective”, instead they are given numbers.

Ch.Fries started with the minimum free utterance “the concert was good” as his first test frame and set out to find in the language materials all the words that could be substituted for the word “concert”. With no change of structural meaning the words of this list he *called class one* words [35].

He includes the words “concert” , “food”, “coffee” into class 1, the words “seem”, “feel” – class 2, “good”, “large”, “foreign” – class 3 and “there”, “here”, “always” – class 4. His four classes contain approximately 67 per cent of the total instances of the English vocabulary items. Without going into details, it is easy to see that the number of such classes is greater than that of the usual parts of speech.

Prof. B.Ilyish’s classification is based on three principles: meaning, form, function. *By meaning* we understand the meaning common to all the words of the given class and constituting its essence.

By form we mean the morphological characteristics of a type of word. But *by function* we mean the syntactical properties of a type of word. He classified the following parts of speech: 1. the noun, 2. the adjective, 3. the pronoun, 4. the numeral, 5. the stative, 6. the verb, 7. the adverb, 8. the preposition, 9. the conjunction, 10. the particle, 11. the modal words, 12. the interjection [38, 366].

G. Curme's classification is based upon semantic criterion. All the pronouns in the functions of attributes he calls adjectives. All the words with indefinite meaning he calls indefinite pronouns.

E.g. *A fellow feels queer in such circumstances.*

Men are blind of their faults.

As to him the words "fellow" and "men" are indefinite pronouns. G. Curme points out 8 parts of speech in English.

C. Baim dwells on 7 classes of words. They are: noun, pronoun, adjective including articles, verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction. He excludes interjection as having no grammatical relation to other words of the sentence, nor does it express a notion or idea.

Dealing with the classification of parts of speech Otto Jespersen distinguishes the following as separate parts of speech:

- 1) substantives (including proper names);
- 2) adjectives;
- 3) pronouns (including numerals and pronominal adverbs);
- 4) verbs (with doubts as to the inclusion of verbids);
- 5) particles (comprising adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections).

J. C. Nesfield dwells on eight classes. His classification is based upon syntactical function. He includes every word used as an attribute into the classes of adjectives. As to him pronouns "my, his, her, its, our" are possessive adjectives. The word "that" is a pronoun in the sentence "that man is my neighbour".

M. Ashton as well as J. Nesfield dwells on eight classes of parts of speech: 1. the noun, 2. the pronoun, 3. the adjective, 4. the verb, 5. the adverb, 6. the preposition, 7. the conjunction and 8. the interjection.

M.Brown named ten parts of speech making “the article” and “the particle” separate classes.

M.A.Ganshina and N.M.Vasilevskaya distinguish between independent parts of speech and form words. Nouns, adjectives, pronouns, numerals, verbs, adverbs and independent parts of speech. They each express a notion or idea of its own, have independent meaning and function in the sentence. Prepositions, conjunctions, articles and particles are form words, they have no independent function in the sentence.

V.N.Zhigadlo, I.P.Ivanova and L.L.Iofik considered that parts of speech are lexico-grammatical groups of words distinguished according to their grammatical meaning, types of form building and function in the sentence, but the semantic place, the leading role. They divide the vocabulary of the English language into 13 parts of speech of which 9 are notional and 4 are structural parts of speech.

Prof. O.I.Musayev in his book “English Grammar” classifies parts of speech in the following way:

- 1) notional parts of speech: the noun, the adjective, the pronoun, the numeral, the verb, the adverb, the adlink;
- 2) free parts of speech: the interjection, the modal words;
- 3) structural parts of speech: the preposition, the conjunction, the article and the particle [18, 392].

Summing up what has been said about the classification of parts of speech we may point out that any classification is based on the following three principles:

- 1) semantical – lexico-grammatical meaning of a part of speech;
- 2) morphological – it comprises two features: a) derivational morphemes, b) grammatical category;
- 3) syntactical – a) combinability, that is the ability of a word to make certain connections; b) syntactical function in a sentence.

The history of parts of speech is old. According to Aflatun (V century before our epoch) the sentence was the unity of nouns (nominals) and verbs. He differentiated two types of words in speech – the nominals (onoma) and verbs (rhema). He

analysed the words from the syntactical point of view. According to Aflatun the nominals are the words which are used in the sentence as a subject, but the verbs denote what is said about the subject. When he spoke about the verb, he meant the predicate.

Aristotel differentiated three parts of speech in the old Greek language: noun (onoma), verb (rhema) and connectives (conjunction, article, pronoun). According to him the nouns are the independent words but the conjunctions and articles are considered to have grammatical functions.

In the period of Iskandariyya the number of parts of speech increased to eight (noun, verb, participle, article, pronoun, adverb, postposition, conjunction).

In the middle of the XIX century the parts of speech are characterized as the logical-grammatical category. In the XIX century linguistics, especially morphology developed.

In all languages the noun is considered to be the main part of speech. After the nouns gradually the pronouns and the numerals are created. That's why they are the notional parts of speech in all languages.

As nouns the verbs also exist in all languages. But some grammatical categories of verbs, such as the participle, the gerund and the infinitive show themselves in different languages in different ways.

Which notional parts of speech created first?

Marks Muller (1823-1900) the prominent linguist of the XIX century considered that the primary, the initial words are the verbs. Because the root of the words in Indo-European languages are closely connected with the verbs.

But the Russian scientist H.Marr (1864-1934) denied this fact. He said that the primary words which were created in the language were the nouns. According to him these words were the words which were closely connected with the human's collective labour.

The number of parts of speech are different in both languages: if we accept the theory according to which adlinks are treated as a separate part of speech then

number of parts of speech is not the same in both languages. In English they are seven, in Azerbaijani six.

If we don't accept the theory according to which adlinks are not treated as a separate notional parts of speech then the number of notional parts of speech are the same.

In the classification of parts of speech the main principles are: lexical, grammatical (morphological) and syntactical. According to these principles the parts of speech are classified into notional, structural and free. In other words notional parts of speech according to prof. A.Babayev are called autosemantic (having independent meaning), structural parts of speech are called sinsemantic [11, 365].

Typology of parts of speech of foreign and native languages comprise words denoting things, their qualities, their actions and states. They have independent meaning and function in the sentence and sometimes form sentences by themselves. Investigating non-kindred English and Azerbaijani parts of speech we should like to drop some words about the classification of these parts of speech. It should be noted that English and Azerbaijani main parts of speech coincide in meaning and number. They are: 1. the noun, 2. the adjective, 3. the pronoun, 4. the numeral, 5. the verb and 6. the adverb.

As is seen above mentioned classification the totality of paradigms characterizing the given class of words or the given parts of speech in the expression of more general properties or characteristics which the given main parts of speech possess. It should be mentioned that these properties and characteristic features form of one grammatical category. The grammatical category, in other words, is the unity of grammatical form and grammatical meaning. Each grammatical category of main parts of speech is realized only when it has its material expression in the native or foreign languages. So the grammatical category of case in Azerbaijani is realized because it has corresponding case morphemes in this language. **E.g. -ın,-in,-un,-ün, -nın,-nin, -nun,- nün, -a, -ə, -da, -də, -dan, -dən.**

The grammatical category of the degrees of comparison of adjectives in English is realized because it has the morphemes “**er**”, “**est**” and word morphemes “**more**”,

“**most**” having corresponding semantics. It means that the grammatical category of those main parts of speech of native and foreign languages is two folded:

1) on the one hand it is a grammatical notion existing in the given language and expressing the most characteristic indications and properties of the given language as a system;

2) in the other hand it is a separate class of words having these grammatical indications.

Functional parts of speech of native and foreign languages differ from each other. At the same time both native and foreign languages express relations between words or sentences or emphasize the meaning of the words or sentences. English functional parts of speech are: 1. The conjunction, 2. The preposition, 3. The article and 4. The particle.

Some linguists consider “modal words”, “interjections” and “words of affirmation and negation” (“yes” and “no”) to be “free parts of speech”. But Azerbaijani functional parts of speech are: 1. the conjunction, 2. the particle, 3. the modal words, 4. the connective and 5. the postposition.

As it is seen English functional parts of speech like the preposition, the article and the words of affirmation and negation do not exist in Azerbaijani classification of functional parts of speech. The point is that pure articles and prepositions are not found in modern Azerbaijani at all. Words of affirmation and negation exist in Azerbaijani too. But they are not treated as a separate part of speech.

In order to compare one language with another as regards its micro-systems, it is necessary to find out such quantities which can be compared meanwhile in the composition of the morphological level. So in the English language there is a compound tense system of the main part of speech – the verb; but it is not found in Azerbaijani. At the same time typological comparison is impossible without identical quantities. Then what are the criteria used for typological comparison at the morphological level? Taking into account the fact that typological comparison of main and functional parts of speech of native and foreign languages is carried out not

on the basis of material identity or etimological kinship but on the basis of functional identity of separate phenomenon of the compared languages.

So the first criterion which can be used for characterizing the unit of typological comparison must be the criterion of functional identity of compared phenomena. According to the identity of functions we can compare the suffix “**er**” of the comparative degrees of English adjectives and **-dan, -dən** in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *She is younger than me.*

O məndən kiçikdir.

The English morphemes of plurality of nouns “**s**”, “**es**”, “**en**” and suffix of plurality of Azerbaijani nouns “**lar, lər**” may be compared too.

E.g. *The table is in the corner of the room.*

Stol otağın küncündədir.

The books are in the middle of the room.

Stollar otağın ortasındadır.

The unit of comparison must be a combination of common properties typical of the compared phenomena as a whole and special features characterizing each of the compared phenomena in particular. This criterion of a combination of common and special properties makes it possible to bring the phenomena of more special character to those of the common character cases existing in native and foreign languages having their own separate shades of meanings. But all the case forms of nouns have one common feature that is to express relations of one substance to other substances, phenomena. That’s why the second criterion is the correspondence of the common features to special ones and vice versa.

In the earlier stages English had a more developed system of cases by means of which various syntactical functions of the noun or pronoun in a sentence were marked. In old English there were the following four cases of nouns: 1. nominative, 2. genitive, 3. dative, 4. accusative. But in the course of time the original nominative, dative and accusative merged into one uninflected form – the common case. The old genitive case is represented in modern English by the inflected possessive case of

nouns. Thus we see that modern English nouns denoting living beings have two cases – the common case and the possessive.

But in modern Azerbaijani the noun has six case forms. One uninflected form called the nominative case and five inflected forms called: 1) genitive case; 2) dative case; 3) accusative case; 4) locative case; 5) ablative case.

English case system covers only the noun (living and some lifeless things) and the pronoun. Azerbaijani case system is wider use than English. Azerbaijani case system covers the noun, the adjective, the numeral, the pronoun, the participle and the infinitive. Except the noun, the pronoun and the infinitive, the rest above mentioned parts of speech can have case inflexion in case they are substantivized. As it is seen the third criterion to which the unit of morphological comparison must correspond is the criterion of wide range of lexical units.

These three criteria must be considered while determining the unit of typological comparison and it's possible to say that grammatical category is that unit which finds its material expression in the totality of paradigms.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST VIII.

1. Speak about the problem of parts of speech.
2. Give the definition of the parts of speech.
3. What can you say about B.Khaimovich and B.Rogovskaya's classification?
4. How are the parts of speech classified in compared languages?
5. What are the main characteristic features of the parts of speech?
6. What principles does H.Sweet postulate in the classification of parts of speech?
7. Speak about the declinable parts of speech.
8. Define the indeclinable parts of speech.
9. What do you understand under the term "full words" and "empty words"?
10. What parts of speech are distinguished according to Ch.Fries?
11. How does A.Babayev classify the parts of speech?
12. What can you say about the history of parts of speech?

13. Speak about Aristotel's classification of parts of speech.
14. What notional parts of speech were created first?
15. What can you say about B.Ilyish's classification?
16. Which principles is G.Curme's classification based upon?
17. How many classes of words does C.Baim dwell on?
18. What parts of speech does O.Jespersen distinguish?
19. Speak about J.Nesfield and M.Ashton's classifications.
20. Speak about M.Ganshina, V.Zhigadlo, I.Ivanova and L.Iofik's classification.
21. How does O.Musayev classify the parts of speech?
22. How can you summarize the classification of parts of speech?

CHAPTER IX.

TYOLOGY OF FUNCTIONAL PARTS OF SPEECH IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

Unlike notional parts of speech, functional parts of speech in compared languages are different. At the same time functional parts of speech in compared languages express relations between words or sentences or emphasize the meaning of the words or connect sentences or words.

Some linguists consider “modal words”, “interjections” and “words of affirmation and negation” (“yes” and “no”) to be free parts of speech.

Functional parts of speech are 4 in number in English: 1) the article; 2) the particle; 3) the preposition; 4) the conjunction.

But Azerbaijani functional parts of speech are: 1) the conjunction, 2) the particle, 3) modal words, 4) the connective, 5) the postposition.

As is seen the English functional parts of speech like the article, the preposition and the words of affirmation and negation don't exist in the classification of Azerbaijani functional parts of speech. The point is that pure articles and prepositions are not found in modern Azerbaijani at all. Words of affirmation and negation exist in Azerbaijani classification. But they are not treated as separate parts of speech.

THE ARTICLE.

The article has no lexical meaning, it has a grammatical meaning. The use of the definite or indefinite articles depends on the functions of the nouns in the sentence. Some scientists consider the article to be form-building morpheme, the others consider it to be a separate word.

The article has the following peculiar features:

- 1) the lexico-grammatical meaning of definiteness and indefiniteness;
- 2) the right-hand combinability with nouns;
- 3) the function of noun specifiers.

As is known there are 2 articles in English: the indefinite and the definite. Some scientists consider that there are three articles in English. They add here the zero article. It should be mentioned that the idea of zero article takes its origin in the notion of zero morpheme.

There is no article in Azerbaijani. That is why the grammatical meanings of the article are given in Azerbaijani in different ways. It means that there are different equivalents of the English article in Azerbaijani.

1) When the indefinite article is used with the concrete nouns it is translated into Azerbaijani either with the word “bir” or is not translated. **Ex:** *Wait a minute, please.* - *Zəhmət olmasa, bir dəqiqə gözləyin.* *A horse is a useful animal.* – *At faydalı heyvandır.*

2) Definite article in English is translated into Azerbaijani sometimes by case forms, with the demonstrative pronouns. But there are some cases it is not translated. *Give me the book.* – *Kitabı mənə ver.* *The book is mine.* – *Bu kitab mənimdir.* *The sun rises in the East.* – *Günəş şərqdən çıxır.*

The article can change the verb into the noun. *To book* – *a book*, *air- to air*, etc.

THE PARTICLE.

The particle is characterized by the following features in both languages:

- 1) its lexico-grammatical meaning of “emphatic specification”;
- 2) its unilateral combinability with words of different classes, groups of words, even clauses;
- 3) its function of a specifier.

They have no grammatical categories, no lexical stem building elements.

In Azerbaijan linguistics the particles are investigated on the 50-th years of the XX –th century. Particles play a great role in lively speech, in prose.

In English the particles have several groups: 1) *intensifying* – (*just, only, yet, still*); 2) *limiting* (*only, just, but*) –; 3) *connecting* – (*also, too*); 4) *negative* – (*not, never*), 5) *specifying* (*right, exactly, just*), 6) *additive* (*else*).

Additive particles combine only with indefinite, interrogative and negative pronouns and interrogative adverbs. It shows that the word it refers denotes something additional to what has already been mentioned (somebody else, who else, what else).

In Azerbaijani generally the particles are divided into the following groups: 1) *demonstrative* – (*budur, elədir*); 2) *specifying* – (*elə, məhz*); 3) *limiting* – (*yalnız, ancaq, tək-cə*); 4) *intensifying* – (*ki, daha, artıq, axı, belə*); 5) *emotional or expressive* – (*kaş, təki, barı, bircə, da//-də*); 6) *interrogative* – (*bəs, necə, məgər, yəni, -mi⁴*); 7) *imperative* – (*bax, gəl, qoy, gör*); 8) *affirmative* – (*bəli, hə, ha, bəli a*); 9) *negative* – (*yox, xeyir, heç, heç də*).

In modern English there is a functional part of speech “the article” which doesn’t exist in Azerbaijani.

In Azerbaijani connectives “*imiş, idi, isə, ikən*” coincide with different parts of speech in English. *O yaxşı adam idi.* – *He was a good man.*

The difference between “*idi*” and “*imiş*” is that the former expresses “*certainty*” but the latter “*probability*”, “*hesitation*”.

E.g. *Bu qız müəllim imiş.*

This girl happened to be a teacher.

The syntactic function of “*idi*” and “*imiş*” and “*was*”, “*were*” in most cases is the same in compared languages - link verb to a predicative expressed by a noun, adjective, numeral, infinitive etc.

“*ikən*” being considered to be the connective and given under the title of “*idi*”, “*imiş*” coincide with English conjunction “*while*”.

E.g. *While we dined the band was playing under an oak tree.*

“*isə*” joining some interrogative pronouns like “*kim*”, “*nə*” and interrogative adverbs “*hara*”, “*haçan*”, “*necə*” form in the first case indefinite pronouns like “*kim isə*” – *somebody*, “*nə isə*” – *something*, in the second case compound pronominal adverbs like “*hara isə*” – *somewhere*, “*necəsə*” – *somehow*.

The postposition doesn’t exist in English. This functional part of speech requires a word in the nominative case which is equal to English prepositions.

“ilə”, “üçün”, “haqqında”, “barəsində” etc. can be examples to the postpositions spoken about them.

E.g. *He was listening to me with great interest.*

O mənə böyük maraqla qulaq asırdı.

In both languages the majority of the particles are used before the modified word and there are some peculiarities between the meanings of the particles (**E.g.** limiting, intensifying, negative and so on). In English the particles are few in number than in Azerbaijani. In Azerbaijani there are interrogative particles, but in English such particles are not found. In Azerbaijani there are borrowed particles, but we can't see such particles in English [13, 106].

In modern English there exist the adlink which is not found in Azerbaijani. Adlinks have a predicative suffix “a”.

E.g. *asleep, afraid, agog, alive.*

English adlinks coincide with Azerbaijani participles.

The wounded is alive. – Yaralı diridir.

Those scientists who don't recognize adlinks as a separate part of speech in modern English usually consider them as a subclass of adjectives. But they are quite different.

1) Their lexico-grammatical meanings of adjectives and adlinks are different. The adjectives denote qualities but the adlinks denote states.

2) The stem-building elements of these parts of speech are different.

3) Adjectives possess the category of the degrees of comparison but the adlinks have no grammatical categories.

4) The combinability of adjectives and adlinks differs greatly

5) The syntactical functions of adjectives and adlinks do not coincide.

THE PREPOSITION.

In English the preposition is usually placed before the word with which it is connected. But in Azerbaijani postpositions always stand after the word which they are connected. As is known the Azerbaijani language has a developed case system,

postpositions serve to differentiate or make precise the meaning expressed by case inflexions.

Unlike Azerbaijani there exists structural part of speech, the preposition in English. It has the following features:

- 1) Its lexico-grammatical meaning of relations (of substances).
- 2) Its bilateral combinability with a right-hand noun and a left-hand word belonging to almost any parts of speech.
- 3) Its function of a linking word.

Many prepositions are homonymous with adverbs, conjunctions, particles and lexico-grammatical word morphemes.

E.g. Let's take the preposition “**off**”. It can be homonymous with the noun, the adjective, the verb, the adverb, the interjection, the postposition.

*There is a bathroom **off** the main bedroom. (prep.)*

*The guests are ready for the **off**. (noun)*

*Take **off** here! Remove! (interj.)*

*The paint of the room wore **off**. (P/p)*

*This fish has gone **off** (adv.)*

*Our day **off** is Sunday. (Adj.).*

Prepositions have no lexical meaning, because they can't be used in the sentence independently. In Azerbaijani the relations of substances are mostly denoted by its case system (*evdə, evə, evdən, evin*).

So the preposition is closely connected with the noun it precedes. It can't be used without the noun. In English the prepositions are much more independent. It can be separated from the noun, as in “*the book I read*”. A preposition may refer not only to a word, but also to word-combination (That is for you to decide) or a clause (It all depends on how he will act).

The prepositions show the relation of one noun to another which reflects the relations of the corresponding substances in the world of reality. They usually have very general abstract meanings. The combinability of the preposition is rather peculiar.

THE CONJUNCTION.

The conjunction is a part of speech characterized by the following features:

- 1) Its lexico-grammatical meaning of “relations between substances, actions, properties, situations”, etc.;
- 2) Its peculiar combinability, as a rule, a conjunction connects two similar units: words of a similar type or clauses;
- 3) Its function of a linking word.

In compared languages the conjunctions are divided into simple, derivative, compound and composite according to their stem- structure.

In both languages conjunctions are usually divided into coordinating and subordinating.

In English coordinating conjunctions are divided:

- 1) *copulative (and, both... and, neither... nor, not only);*
- 2) *adversative (but, still, yet);*
- 3) *disjunctive (or, either... or);*
- 4) *causative-consequetive (so, for).*

In Azerbaijani coordinating conjunctions are divided:

- 1) *copulative – və, ilə, -la//-lə*
- 2) *denoting participation – həm, həm də, habelə, həmçinin*
- 3) *denoting negation – nə, nə də ki*
- 4) *adversative – amma, ancaq, lakin, fəqət, halbuki, bəlkə*
- 5) *denoting division – ya, istərsə də*
- 6) *explanatory – yəni, yəni ki, məsələn.*

The combinability of subordinating conjunctions is somewhat different from that of coordinating ones.

In both languages subordinating conjunctions connect mostly clauses, not words. The division of conjunctions into coordinating and subordinating ones is chiefly based on their lexical meanings and the types of units they connect.

According to their morphological characteristics the conjunctions in English are 4 in number, but in Azerbaijani they are 2. In English the composite conjunctions “as well as, in case”, etc. in Azerbaijani are considered to be compound conjunctions. Coordinating conjunctions according to their meaning are 4 in number, but in Azerbaijani they are 6 [13, 81].

CHECK YOURSELF TEST IX.

1. How many functional parts of speech are there in English?
2. Is there any difference between the structural and functional parts of speech?
3. How many functional parts of speech are there in Azerbaijani?
4. Are the words of affirmation and negation treated as a separate part of speech?
5. What are the main features of the article in English?
6. What are the characteristic features of particles in compared languages?
7. What can you say about the peculiar features of particles in compared languages?
8. Have the functional parts of speech grammatical categories and stem-building elements?
9. What kind of particles do you know in compared languages as to their meaning?
10. Speak about the connectives in Azerbaijani.
11. What can you say about the position of prepositions in English?
12. What is the difference between prepositions and postpositions in compared languages?
13. What can you say about the similarities and differences between particles and conjunctions in both languages?
14. How many coordinating conjunctions exist in Azerbaijani?
15. Are there interrogative particles in Azerbaijani?
16. What can you say about the scientists’ points of view about the article in English?
17. Which functional part of speech can change one part of speech into another?

18. What can you say about “the free parts of speech”?
19. How many case forms of nouns were there in old English?
20. What are the criteria used for typological comparison at the morphological level?

CHAPTER X.

TYPOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NOMINAL GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES IN COMPARED LANGUAGES: CASE, NUMBER, GENDER, DEFINITENESS-INDEFINITENESS, DEGREES OF COMPARISON

The dialectical unity of the grammatical meaning and grammatical form is called the grammatical category. Any grammatical meaning is expressed by a certain grammatical form. Ways of expressing grammatical meaning are different. One and the same grammatical meaning may be expressed by different grammatical forms and vice-versa.

Nominal grammatical categories in compared languages belong to the nouns and adjectives. They are: the category of number, case, the category of definiteness and indefiniteness and the category of degrees of comparison of adjectives.

THE CATEGORY OF NUMBER.

English and Azerbaijani as most other languages distinguish between two numbers: singular and plural. The category of number shows whether the noun stands for one object or more than one. Analysing the category of number in both languages we can say that the singular form of the nouns is a bare system with a zero inflexion.

E.g. *a student, a man, a doctor, a tree*

adam, tələbə, kişi, ağac.

The plural of the English nouns is formed by the help of the suffix **-s (-es)** adding to the end or to the stem of the nouns. But there are some exceptions of the English plural forms which don't take that rule. The formation of plural nouns in Azerbaijani is not complicated either. There are two suffixes for formation the plural of the nouns “**lar, lər**”.

E.g. *A girl – girls*

Qız - qızlar

Картина - картины

Kibrit – kibritlər etc.

A noun comprising a back level vowel in the last syllable (Simpson calls them broad vowels) requires the suffix “**lar**”. But a noun comprising a front level vowel in the last syllable (Simpson calls them narrowed vowels) requires the suffix “**lər**”. As a matter of fact not all the nouns form their plural by adding **-s (-es)** in English:

1) there are several nouns which form the plural by changing the root vowel: *man-men, woman-women, foot-feet, tooth-teeth, goose-geese, mouse-mice, louse-lice*;

2) there are few nouns which form the plural in “**-en**”: *ox-oxen, child-children*.

3) some words borrowed from Latin or Greek keep their Latin or Greek plural forms:

phenomenon – phenomena *index – indices*

datum – data *formulas - formula*

crisis - crises

In Azerbaijani we don't observe similar rules.

formula – formulalar

indeks – indekslər

memorandum – memorandumlar

4) in English the plural of compound nouns is formed in different ways, whereas in Azerbaijani the plural of compound nouns is formed according to the general rule, that's “**-lar, -lər**” which is added to the end of the last part of a compound noun.

E.g. *editor-in-chief – editors-in-chief*

looker on – lookers on

merry go round – merry go rounds

hacələklər – hacələklər

taxıldöyən – taxıldöyənlər

5) with regard to the category of number English nouns fall into two subclasses, countables and uncountables.

Uncountable nouns are again subdivided into those having no plural opposites and those having no singular opposites. Nouns like “*milk*”, “*geometry*”, “*self-possession*” having no plural opposites are usually called by a Latin name - *singularia tantum*. Nouns like “*clothes*”, “*goods*” having no singular opposites are known as “*pluralia tantum*”. These are for the most part names of things which imply plurality or consist of two or more parts. Such nouns don't have their analogy in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *scissors* - *qayçı*

scales - *tərəzi*

glasses - *eynək*

fetters – *qandal*

tongs – *maşa, kəlbətin*

scales – *tərəzi, etc.*

In Azerbaijani unlike English and Russian such kind of nouns are used both in singular and plural.

E.g. *qayçı* – *qayçılar*; *maşa* – *maşalar*, *kəlbətin* – *kəlbətinlər*, *şalvar* – *şalvarlar* etc.

6) The English nouns “*sheep*”, “*deer*”, “*swine*” and some others have only singular form.

But in Azerbaijani they have both singular and plural forms. **E.g.** *qoyun-qoyunlar*, *maral-marallar*. Collective nouns of English and Azerbaijani denote a number or collection of similar individuals or things regarded as a single unit but there is difference in their use. English collective nouns (names of multitude) such as “*cattle*”, “*poultry*”, “*police*” are always used as plurals, without “-s” inflexion.

E.g. 1) *The poultry of this farm are increased twice.*

2) *The cattle are in good condition.*

Unlike English, those nouns can be used both in singular and in plural form in Azerbaijani.

E.g. 1) *Bu toyuq-cücelər kimindir?*

2) *Həyatlarımızda toyuq-cücanin sayı ildən-ilə azalır.*

7) The English noun “*people*” in the meaning of “*adamlar*” is always plural (a name of multitude).

E.g. *The weather was warm and the people were sitting at their doors.*

In this case we can't say “*peoples*”. The same noun “*people*” in the meaning of “*xalq*” has both numbers as in Azerbaijani: *xalq-xalqlar, people-xalq, peoples - xalqlar*.

8) Some English collective nouns “*money*”, “*machinery*”, “*use*”, “*linen*” are always used in singular which is not observed in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *pul-pullar, kətan – kətanlar*.

9) English collective nouns “*family*”, “*crew*”, “*crowd*”, “*nation*” have both singular and plural numbers as in Azerbaijani. It should also be noted that if a noun of such kind in English is taken as a whole unit, the verb is in singular. But the verb is plural if it is considered separately which is not characterized for Azerbaijani.

E.g. *My family is small (A whole unit is meant).*

My family are early risers (considered separately).

10) English common nouns such as “*fruit*”, “*fish*”, “*hair*” (*saç*) can't be used in plural if they denote one and the same kind of things. But Azerbaijani “*fish*” – “*balıq*” and “*hair*” – “*saç*” have not the character mentioned above.

E.g. *These fish are fresh – Bu balıqlar təzədir.*

These fishes are not fresh – Bu balıqlar təzə deyildir.

In both cases we have the same translation in the Azerbaijani language. In case English countable nouns are used with numerals they take the plural ending “-s”. But in Azerbaijani such nouns are used only in singular.

E.g. *five pens – beş qələm*

ten maps – on xəritə

It should be mentioned that “*beş qələmlər*” or “*on xəritələr*” is not correct in Azerbaijani.

11) There are some nouns which lost their plurality and remained singular.

E.g. *barracks – kazarma*

news – xəbər, xəbərlər

works – zavod etc.

12) But there are some nouns in Russian which are used in plural. Those nouns are singular in English.

E.g. *выборы - election*

похороны - funeral

обой - wallpaper

чернила - ink

дрова - wood etc.

Studying the typology of English and Azerbaijani nominal grammatical categories, especially, the category of number we may come into the following conclusion:

1) the category of number has limited character in English. But it has more useful character in Azerbaijani;

2) in Russian sequence of tenses of the category of number is widely used. But it is less in English and in Azerbaijani.

THE CATEGORY OF CASE.

Case is the morphological category of the noun showing the relations of the noun to other objects and phenomena. The problem of case is one of the complicated problems of English grammar. Four special views advanced at various times by different scholars in the analysis of this problem. The first view may be called “the theory of positional cases”. This theory was formulated by J.C.Nesfield, M.Deutschbein, M.Bryant and other scholars. The second view is called “The theory of prepositional cases”. According to this theory the prepositions *to, for, from, in, at* can denote case. The third view is “the limited case theory”. This theory was formulated by such scholars as H.Sweet, O.Jespersen and developed by A.I.Smirnitsky, L.S.Barkhudarov. The fourth view is “the postpositional theory” that is advanced by G.N.Vorontsova.

Case is the form of the noun built up by means of inflexion which indicates the relations of the noun to the other words in the sentence in compared English and Azerbaijani languages. Case is usually defined as the form the noun showing the

relations of forms of one and the same noun. It's expressed by the opposition of noun with the zero inflection and 's.

English has two cases because it has distinctive forms. The category of case is built by common and genitive case. Common case is represented by the zero-morphemes. In plural nouns the case and number morpheme are often expressed in one and the same morpheme and signed by an apostrophy in writing. The case morphemes are expressed separately by -'s which follows the morpheme of number. The meaning of common case shows that a noun is non-genitive. The use of nouns in common case is more frequent than in genitive case.

The genitive case is characterized by a number of points which limit its use in modern English:

1) it's mainly applied to names of human-beings. Animate nouns can be replaced by "*he, she, who*". The genitive case is commonly used with nouns denoting measures of time and space (a month's leave). It's used with names of countries, animals, ships, vehicles;

2) it's mainly used as an attribute to other nouns and occurs in preposition to them (*Jim's hat*). It can be replaced by "*he, she*". These nouns regularly occur in genitive case. They are not animate and can be replaced by "it" and have features of inanimate nouns which denote a group of people and form genitive case (the party's meeting). The genitive case falls under dependent and absolute genitive. Occasionally other nouns can be used in genitive case. The meaning of genitive case expressed by -'s is difficult to define. -'s is polysemantic in modern English. Its different meaning is easily disclosed if the method of transformational analysis is applied to genitive construction. -'s expresses typical constructions (*Jane's book*). They transformed by a verb "*to have*". It's possessive genitive.

3) subjective genitive (the doctor's advice). This construction can be transformed into "The doctor advised";

4) objective genitive (the John's surprised – John was surprised);

5) adverbial genitive (two-hour's work – somebody worked for two hours);

6) equational genitive- genitive of quantity (a mile's distance – the distance is a mile);

7) genitive of destination (children's books – the books for children);

8) qualitative genitive (a cat's hand – the hand belongs to a cat).

It should be noted that in earlier stages the English language had a more developed system of cases by means of which various syntactical functions of the noun or pronoun in a sentence were marked. In old English there were the following four cases: 1) nominative case, 2) genitive case, 3) dative case, 4) accusative case.

But in the course of time the original nominative, dative and accusative cases merged into one uninflected form, the common case.

E.g. *a man, a doctor, a girl etc.*

The old genitive case is represented in modern English by the inflected possessive case of nouns.

E.g. *a boy's, a doctor's, a girl's etc.*

Thus we can see that English nouns denoting living beings (and some nouns denoting lifeless things) have two cases: an uninflected form called the common case, and an inflected form called the possessive case.

Case system of the Azerbaijani nouns differ from those of English in number and use. In modern Azerbaijani and Russian the nouns have six case forms. One uninflected form called “the nominative case” and five inflected forms called “the genitive case”, “dative case”, “accusative case”, “locative case” and “ablative case”. English case systems cover only the noun (only living beings and some lifeless things) and the pronoun. Azerbaijani case system has wider use than English. Azerbaijani case system covers the noun, the adjective, the numeral, the pronoun, the participle and the infinitive. Except the noun, the pronoun and the infinitive the rest above mentioned parts of speech can have case inflexion in case they are substantivized.

The English common case like Azerbaijani and Russian nominative case is characterized by the zero inflexion. The English common case has a very general and indefinite meaning. When a noun in the common case precedes the predicate verb, it

is the subject of the sentence. When a noun in the common case follows the predicate verb, it is usually a direct object.

E.g. *The student reads the text well.*

Tələbə kitabı oxuyur. Tələbə kitab oxuyur.

Placed after a link verb it is a predicative.

E.g. *It is an interesting book.*

Placed between the transitive verb and its direct object, it is the indirect object.

E.g. *He gave Pete (indirect) the book (direct) yesterday.*

O, Gülnaza dünən kitab verdi.

Preceded by the preposition to the noun may be:

a) a prepositional indirect object. **E.g.** *He gave the book to Pete yesterday.*

b) in an adverbial modifier indicating the place towards which the action of the verb is directed. **E.g.** *Every Sunday Pete goes to the park.*

When the noun is used in the common case with the preposition “by”, it is a prepositional object indicating the agent of the action expressed by the possessive predicate verb.

E.g. *The way to the space was opened by Y.A.Gagarin.*

With the preposition “of” it may be an attribute to another noun.

E.g. *At last they reached the outskirts of the forest.*

Thus English nouns in the common case can have the following syntactical functions: subject, predicative, direct and indirect prepositional objects, attribute and adverbial modifier. The main syntactical function of the Azerbaijani nouns case is the subject. A noun in the nominative case can be the subject of the sentence expressed by verb – predicate or a compound – nominal predicate (as in English).

E.g. *Əhməd universitetdə oxuyur.*

Ahmad studies at the University.

The noun in the nominative case can also have the syntactical function of an attribute in compared languages.

E.g. *The silver spoon is under the table.*

Gümüş qaşığı stolun altındadır.

When the noun is in the indefinite accusative it coincides with the nominative case, but its syntactical function is not a subject but a direct object.

E.g. *Kitab bilik mənbəyidir.*

In this sentence “*kitab*” is in the nominative case and its syntactical function is the subject. But in the sentence “*Əli kitab oxuyur*”, the word “*kitab*” – coincides with the nominative case as *Ali* and its syntactical function is a direct object.

The possessive case represents in modern English, the genitive case of English nouns. But it is much narrower, in its meaning, use and function. In old English the genitive case had a very wide range of meaning and function and it was freely used with old nouns denoting living beings as well as lifeless things as Azerbaijani genitive case.

In Modern English the use of possessive case is restricted chiefly to nouns denoting living beings and its syntactical function is exclusively that of an attribute.

E.g. *Jack's brother knows five foreign languages.*

With nouns denoting inanimate things and abstract notions the possessive case relations is rendered by the “of phrase” (which is an equivalent of the possessive case).

E.g. *The colour of the wall is not white.*

The “of-phrase” may be used with nouns denoting living beings too.

E.g. *The father of Kate had been a very braveman.*

Different from English all the nouns denoting living beings and lifeless things in Azerbaijani and Russian can have the genitive case.

E.g. *Şagirdin çantası stolun üstündədir.*

Almanın rəngi qırmızıdır.

Дверь комнаты белый etc.

The possessive case in English is formed by the apostrophe “s” (‘s), the genitive case in Azerbaijani is formed by the suffixes “-m, -in, -un, -ün” for the nouns ending in a consonant and by the suffixes “-nın, -nin, -nun, -nün” for the nouns ending in a vowel.

E.g. *Qalanın hündürlüyü, bülbülün cəh-cəhi, çarpayının dəmiri etc.*

As it is seen from the examples the suffixes of the genitive case are added to the stem of the noun. As in English the noun in the genitive case in Azerbaijani requires the word that it modifies. In compared languages the noun in the possessive (genitive) case precedes the noun it modifies.

E.g. *the girl's name – qızın adı, the student's book – tələbənin kitabı etc.*

The difference is that a noun in the possessive case in English has always the syntactical function of an attribute which rarely happens in Azerbaijani. It should also be mentioned that a noun in the genitive case in Azerbaijani with the word it modifies forms a complex part of the sentence.

E.g. *Almazın bacısı beş xarici dil bilir.*

To separate “Almazın” from “bacısı” in this case is impossible. As a word combination they are one member of the sentence – complex subject.

E.g. *Almaz's sister knows five foreign languages.*

In some cases a noun in the possessive case in Azerbaijani can serve as an inner attribute to the word it precedes.

E.g. *“Almaz Səriyyə xalanın dizinə söykənmişdi”.*

If we say “Almaz dizinə söykənmişdi” one can't understand over whose knees Almaz was leaning. “Səriyyə xalanın” which is the inner attribute to “dizinə” involves this character.

THE CATEGORY OF GENDER.

There is a contradiction in the presentation of gender in English from the theoretical and practical point of view. From theoretical point of view gender of nouns are purely lexical or semantic, from practical point of view the description of gender is included in its subject matter.

A.I.Smirnitsky proved the non-existence of gender in English either in the grammatical or lexico-grammatical sense. M.A.Ganshina and N.M.Vasilevskaya deny the existence of grammatical gender in English.

The category of gender is oppositional. As a result of the opposition arises three genders: the neuter, the masculine, the feminine. The strong member of the upper opposition is the human subclass of nouns and its semantic mark is person. The weak member of the opposition comprises both inanimate and animate non-person nouns.

E.g. *tree, crowd, love, cock, mare etc.*

A great many nouns denoting person in English are capable of expressing both feminine and masculine person genders by way of pronominal correlation. These are referred to as nouns of the “common gender”.

E.g. *person, parent, cousin, doctor, etc.*

English nouns can show the sex either lexically or by suffixal derivation and sometimes by certain notional words.

E.g. *girl-friend, landlord, cock-sparrow, she-bear, lion, lioness, etc.*

All these facts show that gender is a lexical category, not a grammatical category.

Gender is expressed in English by the obligatory correlation of nouns with the personal pronouns of the third person. Gender is strictly oppositional nouns are divided into personal nouns and non-personal nouns. Personal and non-personal nouns is a traditional classification. At the same time a great number of personal nouns may be masculine and feminine genders. These are the nouns of common gender. The first opposition (personal, non-personal) may be regarded as the upper opposition while the second opposition (feminine and masculine) the lower opposition. The strong member of the upper opposition is the human subclasses of nouns. Its semantic mark being “person” or “personality”. The strong member of lower opposition is the feminine subclasses of person nouns, its semantic mark being “female sex”.

A great many person nouns in English are capable of expressing both feminine and masculine person genders by way of the pronominal correlation. These are referred to as nouns of the “common gender”. Here belong such words as *person, friend, doctor, teacher, president.*

E.g. *The doctor entered the room. He examined the patient.*

Sex distinctions can be shown lexically with the help of notional noun or with the help of suffixes or with the help of pronouns. This point of view doesn't seem to be correct. It is based only on substitution. Meaning of gender of pronouns is lexical and not grammatical ("he, she, it" are different words).

Noun denotes inanimate thing is not a grammatical nature. It can be explained by historico-cultural traditions. **E.g.** "sun" is correlated to "he", "moon" is correlated to "she", names of countries are correlated to "it" when the geographical position is meant.

Some English nouns can show the sex of their reference lexically or by suffixal derivation.

E.g. *boy-friend - girl-friend*

man-producer - woman-producer

actor - actress

lion - lioness

When the pronominal relation of the non-personal animate nouns is turned: respectively into "he" and "she". We can speak of a grammatical personifying transposition, very typical of English. This kind of transposition effects not only animate nouns, but also a wide range of inanimate nouns, being regulated in every day language by cultural-historical tradition. Compare the reference of "she" with the names of countries, vehicles, weaker animals etc. The reference of "he" with the names of stronger animals the names of phenomena suggesting "crude", "strength", "fierceness" etc.

So we may conclude that gender in English is only meaningful and as such it is represented in the nominal system as a whole. But in Azerbaijani we don't distinguish the category of gender at all.

There is no gender category in Azerbaijani, as well as, in all Turkic languages. But there are some words which show the masculine and the feminine meanings.

E.g. *qoç-qoyun, xoruz-toyuq, öküs-camiş etc.*

We shall summarize the category of gender like that:

1) there is no gender in Azerbaijani;

- 2) there are three genders in English, Russian and German languages;
- 3) there are two genders in French.

THE CATEGORY OF DEFINITENESS AND INDEFINITENESS.

It is one of the universal categories. Irrespective of its structure each language possesses certain means of expressing this category. There are formal means of expressing definiteness // indefiniteness. This, that, my, his, each, every, etc. also refer to that group. Means of expressing this category within a language may be shown in the following way: 1) grammatical means; 2) lexico-syntactical means; 3) lexico-semantic means.

In English the articles are the main grammatical means.

E.g. *Give me a book.*

Give me the book.

In Azerbaijani genitive and accusative case inflexions but in Russian word order are the main grammatical means.

E.g. *Появился мальчик.*

Мальчик появился.

Lexico-grammatical means: demonstrative pronouns *this* book, *that* book; *bu* kitab, *o* kitab. They denote definiteness. But indefiniteness is expressed by means of “*one*”, “*bir*”, “*один*”, “*какой-то*”.

Lexico-semantic means are proper nouns which always denote definiteness. Ways of expressing definiteness and indefiniteness in different languages have been investigated by E.Hajiyev and A.Huseynov.

In English there are only two material articles: definite and indefinite. The absence of the article is also meaningful. Omission of the article can be applied in two cases stylistically justified (telegrams, newspaper headlines).

Absence of the article is a special kind of the article (zero article).

The indefinite article has the following meanings: 1) nominating; 2) classifying; 3) numerical; 4) generalizing; 5) aspective with uncountable nouns.

The definite article has the meanings of: 1) individualizing; 2) generic; 3) restrictive (with uncountable nouns and names of material).

Absence of the article has the nominating, classifying, generalizing meaning.

There are the following functions of the article: morphological, syntactical and communicating.

The morphological function consists of serving as indicating form of a noun.

The article has two syntactic functions: the article separates the noun phrase from the other parts of the sentence; the article may connect sentences with the text by corolating a noun. It modifies with some words in the previous context (connecting function). The article has also the communicating function: a noun with the indefinite article may introduce new information in the sentence. It's a focus of communication (the rheme). A noun with the definite article in the initial position usually indicates given information (the theme).

In Azerbaijani there is no article to denote definiteness or indefiniteness. That is why the word "*bir*" is widely used to express this phenonena.

E.g. *Qapıda bir qadın dayanmışdı. Qapıda qadın dayanmışdı.*

THE CATEGORY OF DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

In modern English we distinguish three degrees: positive, comparative, superlative.

As is known, the comparative and superlative degrees are built up either synthetically or analytically. The choice of these formations depends on the morphological structure of the adjective.

In Azerbaijani the number of degrees of adjectives has not been determined yet. Some Azerbaijani grammarians think that adjectives have five degrees: 1) positive; 2) diminutive; 3) comparative; 4) superlative; 5) augmentative.

Some others think that Azerbaijani adjectives have three degrees: 1) positive; 2) diminutive and 3) augmentative.

The category of the degrees of comparison of adjectives is the system of opposemes (*like long-longer-longest*) showing quantitative distinctions of qualities.

Accordingly we speak of positive, comparative and superlative degrees. The positive degree is not marked. In both languages the comparative and superlative degrees are built up either synthetically or analytically.

E.g. *qəşəng-daha qəşəng-lap qəşəng.*

Suppletive opposemes are few in number.

E.g. *good-better-best; little-less-least; bad-worse-worst.*

E.g. *Bu otaq o otaqdan böyükdür.*

Bu otaq o otağa nisbətən böyükdür.

The superlative degree can be formed analytically.

E.g. *Bu ən böyük otaqdır.*

The diminutive degree is formed by the suffix “-mtıl”.

E.g. *sarımtıl - yellowish*

göyümtül - blueish

But augmentatives are usually reduplicated forms:

E.g. *qupquru, dümdüs, yamyaşıl, qıpqırmızı etc.*

CHECK YOURSELF TEST X.

1. What is the definition of the grammatical category?
2. How will you differentiate grammatical meaning and grammatical form?
3. What can you say about ways of expressing grammatical meaning?
4. What are the main nominal grammatical categories?
5. Speak about the category of number in compared languages.
6. How can the plurality be expressed in English?
7. What kind of typological similarities between two languages may be distinguished?
8. What is the difference between “singularia tantum” and “pluralia tantum”?
9. What can you say about case relations in compared languages?
10. Can you differentiate the common and nominative cases in the compared languages?
11. How can the genitive case be rendered in Azerbaijani?

12. What can you say about the category of definiteness and indefiniteness in both languages?
13. Speak about the degrees of comparison of adjectives in compared languages.
14. What kind of category is gender?
15. Do we distinguish the category of gender in Azerbaijani?
16. How many degrees of adjectives in Azerbaijani do you know?
17. How is the diminutive degree formed in Azerbaijani?
18. How is the comparative degree formed in Azerbaijani?
19. Does there exist augmentative degree in English?
20. Which degree of the adjectives is not marked?

CHAPTER XI.

TYOLOGY OF THE VERBAL GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

Analysing the verb in modern Russian academician V.V.Vinogradov characterizes this part of speech as “the most complex and capacious part of speech” [59, 422].

The verb in compared languages has got different grammatical categories. They are: **voice, tense, mood, aspect** etc. B.Khaimovich and B.Rogovskaya include to these grammatical categories, i.e. the category of order and the category of posteriority.

THE CATEGORY OF VOICE.

The category of voice is the system of two member opposemes which shows whether the action is represented as issuing from its subject or as experienced by its object.

Voice is one of those categories in compared languages which show the close connection between language and speech. The main problem concerning the voice system in ME is the number of voices . Some scholars speak about reflexive, reciprocal and middle voices.

E.g. *He showed himself (reflexive).*

They greeted each other (reciprocal).

The door opened (middle).

We must mention that the last three forms are not accepted by all grammarians. This classification is based on semantic principles.

There are two voices of the verb in modern English: active and passive. But unlike the English language, the Azerbaijani verb has five voice forms: active, passive, reflexive, reciprocal and causative-pressing (*icbar*).

Now, let's explain and compare this grammatical category.

As you know the active voice shows that the action is performed by its subject and the subject is the doer of the action. The active voice of the verb in compared languages is characterized by having no special suffixes. Unlike the active voice, the passive voice shows that the subject is acted upon that it is the recipient of the action. In English the passive voice is performed analytically but in Azerbaijani synthetically by means of the following suffixes: **ıl⁴, ıl², ın⁴, n, ыл²**.

E.g. *aparıldı – aparıldı, bildi-bilindi, dedi-deyindi, sürdü – süründü, soydu – soyuldu, gözlədi – gözlənildi, aldı-alındı, oxudu-oxundu etc.*

Unlike English some intransitive verbs in Azerbaijani after being them made transitive by adding special suffixes can also be used in the passive voice as well.

E.g. “to sleep” is an intransitive verb.

It can't be used in the passive voice. But in Azerbaijani “yatmaq”, “qaçmaq” can have the form “qaçırmaq”, “yatırmaq” which as a verb form is lacking in English. As we see “yatırmaq”, “qaçırmaq” are transitive verbs now and they can have the passive voice.

E.g. *Uşaq yatırıldı.*

Canı qaçırıldı etc.

Comparative typology of the English and Russian category of voice differs quietly from each other. Sometimes the English passive sentence rears Russian active one.

E.g. *This long bridge was built by the workers of our factory last year.*

Этот длинный мост построили рабочие нашего завода.

We were told a good news.

Нам сообщили приятную новостью.

John was given a good-mark.

Джону поставили хорошую оценку.

THE CATEGORIES OF TENSE AND ASPECT.

Tense is a grammatical category of the verb which shows the type of an action and event. The grammatical meaning of tense is relative and expressed by different affixes and form words. But lexically a period of time is directly and expressed by

using words and word combinations “*today*”, “*yesterday*”, “*in a year*”, “*last year*” etc.

It's necessary to mention that there is no unity of opinion concerning the category of tense in ME.

According to B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya the category of tense is a system of three member opposemes such as “*write*”- “*wrote*”- “*will write*” – “*is writing*”- “*was writing*”- “*will be writing*”.

In both languages there are three tenses: past, present, future. In English all tenses have four groups and each of them have four forms.

The problem of aspect is controversial in English grammar. Aspect can be briefly summarised as follows:

- 1) aspect is interpreted as a category of semantics rather than that of grammar;
- 2) aspect is not recognised at all as a category of ME grammar;
- 3) aspect is blended with tense and regarded as an inalienable part of the tense-aspect system;
- 4) aspect and tense are recognised as two distinct grammatical categories.

The categories of tense and aspect characterise an action from different points of view. The tense of a verb shows the time of the action, while the aspect of a verb deals with the development of the action.

As a rule in Azerbaijan grammar the category of aspect is not accepted as the grammatical category of the verb. But there are two dissertations (Z.Budagova, R.Rajabova) which prove the existence of aspect in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *baxıb qalmaq, gəzinmək (continual action),*
susub durmaq, gəlib qalmaq (stability),
yazıb qurtarmaq, gəlib çatmaq (completeness).

The basic features of the category of tense appear to be the same in English and Azerbaijani. They are: past, future and present. All three tense forms of the English language are expressed in two aspect forms: the common and the continuous.

The present tense of the common aspect of the English language represents an action as simply occurring without concretizing it, actions of more general, more

abstract character referring to the present. In this case the present tense of the common aspect of the English verb coincides with the present tense which is called “indiki zaman” in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *They live in this house.*

Onlar bu binada yaşayırlar.

The present tense of the common aspect in English is formed without inflexion. But this form in Azerbaijani is formed by inflexion. As we know the present of the common aspect in English is also used to express an action in the future when the action is planned or anticipated. The present tense has this function with verbs expressing motion such as: “to go”, “to come”, “to leave”, “to start” etc.

The present tense of the Azerbaijani language can also have the same function but here we don't observe any limitation in the choice of the verb.

E.g. 1. *Qonaqlar sabah yola düşür.*

2. Sabahdan ot biçimi başlayır etc.

The continuous aspect of the English verb can be expressed either by present tense or by present continuous.

E.g. *He is writing a letter.*

O, məktub yazır.

The past tense of the common aspect refers an action to the past. We don't find one and the same way of expressing the English past tense in Azerbaijani. It depends on the situation, that English past tense is used. The past simple in English used with indefinite adverbs “sometimes”, “occasionally”, “rarely”, “always”, “often”, “seldom” is usually expressed by the past tense with the indefinite future in Azerbaijani as in the examples.

E.g. *O, kənddə olanda saatlarla kitab oxuyardı.*

Nənəm tez-tez nağıl söyləyərdi etc.

The past indefinite of the English common aspect used by the adverbs like “yesterday”, “ago”, “in 1997” is expressed by uncompleted past tense or by the past tense called “şühudi keçmiş” in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *I saw him yesterday. – Mən onu dünən gördüm.*

In 1995 he lived in London. – 1995-ci ildə o Londonda yaşayırdı.

But if a past tense verb denotes a repeated action in the past, it is rendered by means of “ar²”+“dı²”.

E.g. *We went to the forest every day.*

Biz hər gün meşəyə gedərdik.

Depending on the context Future tense may be rendered by means of “acaq²”, “ar²”.

E.g. *Tom will write a letter to you.*

Tom sizə məktub yazacaq (yazar).

Anyhow the following tense forms are mentioned by Azerbaijani grammarians.

E.g.

I Past tense simple forms:

a) şühudi keçmiş “dı⁴”:

It is interesting to note here that in this form there are certain personal endings

Singular	Plural
-----------------	---------------

I – m	q-k
-------	-----

II – n	niz ⁴
--------	------------------

III –	lər ²
-------	------------------

b) nəqli keçmiş “miş⁴”, “ib⁴”:

I – m	ik ²
-------	-----------------

II – n	sınız ²
--------	--------------------

III –	lar ²
-------	------------------

c) compound forms of the past tense:

1) *usaq keçmiş – yatmışdı, almış idi, keçmiş imiş, alibmiş.*

2) *qəti gələcəkli keçmiş – həll edəcəkdi, söyləyəcəkdi.*

3) *qeyri-qəti gələcəkli keçmiş – şənlik edirdilər.*

4) *davamlı keçmiş – yazmaqda idim.*

II. Present tense simple forms:

a) by adding suffixes ır⁴;

E.g. *Qatar yaxınlaşır.*

b) *davamlı indiki saman – yazmaqdayam, oxumaqdayam.*

III. Future tense from:

a) *qəti gələcək – gələcəyəm.*

b) *qeyri-qəti gələcək – gedər.*

Now we'll take all the possible tense forms in English and find corresponding forms or equivalents in Azerbaijani.

I. 1) The present Indefinite is rendered in Azerbaijani firstly by means of “**ır⁴**”.

2) *She goes to school every day (gedir).*

2) Secondly if the present tense is used in conditional sentences it is rendered by means of “**sa²**”.

If he comes, we'll see him.

3) Thirdly by means of “feli bağlama” or “feli sifət+qoşma”.

I'll tell him everything as soon as he comes.

II. 1) Past Tense is mostly rendered in Azerbaijani by means of “**şühudi keçmiş**”.

E.g. *I wrote a letter (yazdım).*

2) But if a past tense verb denotes a repeated action in the past it is rendered by means of “**ar²+dı²**”.

E.g. *We went to the forest every day (gedərdik).*

III. Future Tense. Depending on the content it may be rendered by means of “**acaq**” or “**ar²**” (**güman ki**).

Tom will write a letter to you (yazacaq, yazar).

IV. 1) **The Present Continuous** is rendered by means of – “**ı**”+personal case endings.

E.g. *I am going to the cinema now (gedirəm).*

2) But in sentence like “*We are going to Moscow tomorrow*” (gedəcəyik, gedirik).

V. The Past Continuous.

We were going on an excursion at that time yesterday (gedirdik, getməkdə idik).

VI. The Future Continuous.

They will be working at 2 o'clock tomorrow (işləyəcəklər, işləməkdə olacaqlar).

VII. 1) The Present Perfect; If we speak about actions completed before the moment of speech it is rendered by means of - “miş²”.

E.g. *I have prepared my lessons (hasırlamışam).*

2) If we speak about actions began in the past and still going on, the present perfect is rendered by means of present tense.

I have known this man for 20 years.

VIII. The Past Prefect is rendered by “*uzaq keçmiş*” (miş²,+di²).

We had finished our work before the rain began yesterday (qurtarmışdıq).

IX. The Future Perfect - by means of “miş²+olacaq”.

They will have built the house by the end of the year (tikmiş olacaqlar).

X. The Present Perfect Continuous:

a) inclusive by means of present tense:

E.g. *I have been waiting for you for 20 minutes.*

b) exclusive by means of “*nəqli keçmiş*” or by the present tense.

E.g. *You look very tired. You have been working hard, I think (çox işləyirsən, işləmişsinis).*

XI. The Past Prefect Continuous.

a) inclusive – by means of “*şühudi keçmiş*”.

E.g. *We had been working for two hours when the storm began (işləyirdik).*

b) exclusive – by means of “*nəqli keçmiş*”.

E.g. *He was very tired because he had been working very hard (işləmişdi).*

XII. The Future Prefect Continuous is rendered by means of “miş²+olacaq”.

E.g. *We shall have been working (işləmiş olacağıq).*

Of course, there may be other ways of interpretation of English tense forms in Azerbaijani and vice-versa. One must be very careful in translating these forms from one language into another, especially in literary language.

THE CATEGORY OF VOICE.

The main problem concerning the voice system is the number of voices in ME. Some scholars speak about reflexive, reciprocal and middle voices. Ex: 1. *He showed*

himself (reflexive); 2. They greeted each other (reciprocal); 3. The door opens (middle).

We must mention that the last three forms are not accepted by all grammarians. This classification is based on semantic principles. Traditionally two voices are distinguished: active and passive. There are six voices in Azerbaijani: *məlum, məchul, şəxssiz, qayıdış, qarşılıqlı-birgəlik, icbar.*

THE CATEGORY OF MOOD.

The category of mood of the verb reflects the relation of the action denoted by the verb to reality from the speaker's point of view. In general the number of English moods in different theories is given from two to seventeen.

The Indicative mood serves to present an action as a fact of reality. It conveys minimum personal attitude to the fact.

The Imperative mood represents an action as a command, urgent, request to one's interlocutor in compared languages.

The various shades of meaning subjunctive mood grammemes may acquire in certain environments, and the types of sentences and clauses they are used in, are not part of the morphological system of moods and need not be treated here. Subjunctive mood expresses an action as a non-fact, as something imaginary, desirable, problematic, contrary to reality.

But in Azerbaijani mood has six forms: imperative, indicative, obligatory, desiderative, optative and conditional.

In Russian we can find indicative, imperative and subjunctive which has two types: conditional and suppositional. Russian subjunctive mood can be expressed by the suffix “**бы**”.

E.g. *Что бы он не говорил ни слова.*

Чтоб он не называл меня...

In order to understand the category of mood in Azerbaijani one should learn the following.

Forms of the verb	Personal suffixes	Tense suffixes	Special suffixes
--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

1. imperative	+ (besides II p.s.)	–	–
2. indicative	+	+	–
3. obligatory	+	–	+malı ²
4. desiderative	+	–	+ası ²
5. optative	+	–	+a ² , gərək
6. conditional	+	–	+sa ²

VALENCY.

The number of arguments that a verb takes is called its valency or valence. According to valency, a verb can be classified as one of:

Intransitive (valency = 1); the verb only has a subject.

E.g. *She reads. It rains.*

Transitive (valency = 2); the verb has a subject and a direct object.

E.g. *The child eats cakes.*

Ditransitive (valency = 3); the verb has a subject, a direct object and an indirect or secondary object.

E.g. *I gave her a book. She sent me a present.*

It is possible to have verbs with valency = 0. A few of these appear in Spanish, Portuguese and other null subject languages and may be termed “impersonal verbs”.

E.g. *Llueve = It rains.*

English verbs are often flexible with regard to valency. A transitive verb can often drop its object and become intransitive; or an intransitive verb can be added an object and become transitive.

Compare. *I gave. (intransitive).*

I gave flowers. (transitive).

I gave John flowers. (ditransitive).

In the first example the verb “give” describes the idea of giving, in the abstract; in the second, what was given is specified; in the third, both the gift and the recipient are set forth. In many languages other than English, such valency changes aren’t

possible like this; the verb must be inflected for voice in order to change the valency. (www. En.Wikipedia.org)

Valency of the verbs in Azerbaijani linguistics is investigated by Vugar Sultanov .

Agreement also plays a great role in English. In languages where the verb is inflected, it often agrees with its primary argument in person, number and gender. English only shows distinctive agreement in the third person singular, present tense form of verbs; the rest of verbs (which is marked by adding “-s”); the rest of the persons are not distinguished in the verb.

Spanish inflects verbs for tense/mood/aspect and they agree in person and number (but not gender) with the subject. Japanese, in turn, inflects verbs for many more categories, but shows absolutely no agreement with the subject. Georgian and some other languages have polypersonal agreement: the verb agrees with the subject, the direct object and even the secondary object if present. (www. En. Wikipedia.org)

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XI.

1. How does the academician V.Vinogradov characterize the verb?
2. What can you say about the grammatical categories in compared languages?
3. What is the definition of the category of voice?
4. How many voices are there in English?
5. Speak about the forms of voice in Azerbaijani.
6. What are the basic features of the category of tense?
7. How can we summarize the category of aspect?
8. What does the category of mood denote?
9. What is the difference between the indicative and the imperative mood ?
10. What does the imperative mood represent?
11. What can you say about the number of moods in Azerbaijani?
12. How many grammatical categories has the verb according to B.Khaimovich and B.Rogovskaya?
13. What does the subjunctive mood express?
14. How many forms has the the subjunctive mood?

15. How can the subjunctive mood be expressed in Russian?

16. How can you characterize the valency of the verb?

CHAPTER XII.

TYPOLOGY OF WORD CLASSES AND MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

As we have already mentioned the English and Azerbaijani languages belong to different language families, namely the English language is a language of Indo-European, but the Azerbaijani is a language of Altac group. It means that these languages genetically are not related, in other words, they are non-kindred languages. So German, Dutch, Frisian languages, as well as the English language are called a Germanic one. Germanic languages comprise three sub-groups:

1) North Germanic or Scandinavian which includes Danish, Swedish, Norwegian and Icelandic.

2) West Germanic which includes English spoken today, approximately six hundred million people in Great Britain and abroad (the USA, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, etc.) Frisian-Netherlands, Germans, Dutch, Jewish- spoken by Jewish population in Israel, Poland, Germany, Roumania, Hungary and Russia.

3) East Germanic subgroup which has left no trace nowadays.

Being a language of Altaic group the Azerbaijani with some other below mentioned languages forms Oghuz group including several sub-groups such as:

a) Oghuz-Turkmen which includes mainly modern Turkmen;

b) Oghuz-Bulgar which includes mainly Gagauz and Bulgarian-Turkish;

c) Oghuz-Saldjug-Turkish, Crimea-Tatar languages, Azerbaijani etc.

Azerbaijani is spoken by about more than fifty million people in the world (see: prof. Onullahi's research works about the Azerbaijan and its population statistics).

More than eight million people live in Azerbaijan Republic and speak Azerbaijani. But the rest of them live in Iran, Irak, the former republics of the USSR and in other countries of the world.

According to the morphological classifications English, Russian and Azerbaijani belong to different language systems. The formers being analytic but the latter agglutinative.

Suffice it to compare some sentences in order to understand what those different language systems mean. Azerbaijani *Məktub yazılmışdır* – “Письмо написана” is translated into English as “the letter has been written”. In “*yazılmışdır*” (*написана*) the suffix “*ıl*” expresses the voice, “*mış*” – tense, “*dır*” – signifies person. But in the English sentence the same syntactic relations between words are expressed analytically and no suffixes are used. The matter is that in some cases to find agglutination in English and analytism in Azerbaijani is also possible.

E.g. *Я иду в школу* and “*She speaks English better*” are examples from Russian and English of agglutinative word structures. But in Azerbaijani “*Sabah çalış daha tez gəl!*” we can’t find any suffixes in formation syntactic relations between words. Even English word “*earlier*” is expressed by two separate Azerbaijani words – “*daha tez*”. Therefore it is impossible to say that English is purely agglutinative. While including English into analytic type and Azerbaijani into agglutinative we mean that former is richer in analytism than the latter. And the latter is richer in agglutination than the former. In English analytical forms are mostly proper to verbs. To express some analytical forms connected with the English word in Azerbaijani we use agglutinative word structures.

As we know morphology is that part of grammar which deals with the parts of speech and their inflexions, that’s the forms of number and case of nouns and pronouns; the forms of tense, mood etc., of the verb, the forms of degrees of comparison of adjectives. Though grammarians have been studying parts of speech for over two thousand years, the criteria used for classifying words are not yet agreed upon. In our book we are to fix our observation on some difficulties of parts of speech in compared languages.

In compared languages parts of speech are divided into two groups:

- 1) notional parts of speech;
- 2) semi-notional (structural) parts of speech.

But some grammarians put forward the third classification “free parts of speech” either too.

Notional parts of speech are: the noun, the adjective, the pronoun, the numeral, the verb and the adverb. These parts of speech coincide in compared languages. But semi-notional parts of speech are: the conjunction, the preposition, the article, the particle. Some scientists consider modal words, interjections and words of affirmation and negation to be free parts of speech. But in Azerbaijani they are: the conjunction, the particle, the connective (bağlama), the postposition (qoşma) and modal words. We shall try to compare those parts of speech which don't coincide in this or that language.

Connectives “*imiş*”, “*idi*”, “*isə*”, “*ikən*” coincide with different parts of speech in English.

E.g. *O, yaxşı adam idi.* – Он **был** хорошим человеком. – He **was** a good man.

The difference between “*idi*” and “*imiş*” is that the former expresses “certainty” but the latter “probability”, “hesitation”.

E.g. *Bu qız müəllim imiş.* – This girl happened to be a teacher.

The syntactic function of “*idi*” and “*imiş*” and “*was, were*” (*был*) in most cases is the same in compared languages – link verb to a predicative expressed by a noun, adjective, numeral, infinitive etc. “*ikən*” being considered the connective and given under the title with “*idi*”, “*imiş*” coincide with English conjunction “*while*” and with Russian “*в то время*”, “*пока*” etc.

E.g. *While we dined the band was playing.*

“*isə*” joining some interrogative pronouns like “*kim*”, “*nə*” and interrogative adverbs “*hara, haçan, necə*” form in the first case indefinite pronouns as “*kim isə*” – *somebody* (*кмо-мо*), “*nə isə*” – *something* (*чмо-мо*), in the second case compound pronominal adverbs as “*hara isə*” – *somewhere* (*куда-мо, где-мо*), “*necəsə*” – *somehow* (*чмо-мо*).

The postpositions which require a word in the nominative case are equal to English pre-positions.

“ilə”, “üçün”, “haqqıda”, “barəsində” etc. can be examples to postpositions spoken about them.

E.g. *He was listening to me **with** great interest.*

Он слушал меня с большим интересом.

O mənə böyük maraqla qulaq asırdı.

In English the preposition is usually placed immediately before the word with which it is connected. But in Azerbaijani postpositions always stand after the word which they are connected. As Azerbaijani has a developed case system postpositions serve to differentiate or make precise the meanings expressed by case inflexions.

Besides those parts of speech mentioned above there is another part of speech called the adlink. In Azerbaijani we don't have such kind of part of speech. Some grammarians don't recognize adlinks as a separate part of speech. B.Ilyish, B.Khaimovich and B.Rogovskaya consider them to be a separate part of speech. Adlinks have a productive suffix “**a**”.

E.g. *sleep – asleep, wake – awake.*

English adlink coincides with Azerbaijani participle.

E.g. *The wounded is alive. – Yaralı diridir.*

Those scientists who don't recognize adlinks as a separate part of speech in modern English usually consider them as a subclass of adjectives. Let us compare adjectives and adlinks on the basis of the criteria we use to distinguish parts of speech.

1) The lexico-grammatical meanings of adjectives and adlinks. The adjectives denote qualities but the adlinks denote states.

2) The stem-building elements of the two parts of speech are quite different. The characteristic prefix of adlinks is “a”. Adjectives have other affixes: **-ful, -less, -ive, -ous, -un, -pre, etc.**

3) Adjectives possess the category of the degrees of comparison. But adlinks have no grammatical categories.

4) The combinability of adjectives and adlinks differs greatly. As we have seen, the most typical combinative model of adjectives is its right-hand connection with

nouns. Now this model is alien to adlinks. Linguists who regard adlinks as adjectives try to explain the strong opposition of these adjectives to combination like “*an asleep man*”.

5) The syntactical functions of adjectives and adlinks don't coincide.

Summing up, we can say that adjectives and adlinks are different classes of words, i.e. adlinks form a separate part of speech.

CHECH YOURSELF TEST XII.

1. What languages comprise Germanic languages?
2. Which language group does English belong to ?
3. Has any trace of East Germanic sub-groups?
4. What languages are included into the Oghuz group?
5. How many people speak Azerbaijani in the different corners of world?
6. Do connectives coincide with different parts of speech?
7. Are the postpositions in Azerbaijani equal to English prepositions?
8. What part of speech in English coincides with Azerbaijani participle?
9. How do the scientists recognize adlinks in modern English?
10. What are the main differences between adjectives and adlinks?

CHAPTER XIII.

TYPOLOGY OF LEXICAL SYSTEMS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

The word as a main vocabulary unit. Morphological structure of a word.

In the segmental lingual – hierarchy the lexemic level is the third one. It names things and their relations.

Word is a semantic, grammatical and phonological unit. The definition of a word is one of the most difficult in linguistics, because the simplest word has many different aspects. It has a sound, because it is a certain arrangement of phonemes; it has its morphological structure, being also a certain fragment of morphemes, it may occur in different word forms, different syntactic functions.

The word has also grammatical and lexical meaning. Grammatical meaning of a word is more abstract, lexical meaning is more generalized. The lexical meaning of every word depends upon the part of speech to which the word belongs.

Some linguists take the lexical and semantical typology together. They show the following parts of lexical typology:

- 1) lexical typology of words or typology of words;
- 2) lexical typology of word-building;
- 3) comparative lexicography;
- 4) lexico-statistical typology;
- 5) lexical typology of phraseology;
- 6) lexical typology of proverbs and sayings;
- 7) lexical typology of onomasiology;
- 8) lexical typology of toponymy;
- 9) lexical typology of semasiology;
- 10) lexical typology of terminology;
- 11) diachronical lexical typology;
- 12) synchronical lexical typology and some others [57, 71].

As we have already mentioned the word is a nominative unit of a language. Here we'll try to study the morphological structure of a word from the typological point of view. There are the following types of words (or word-form derivations): **1) synthetic types; 2) analytical types; 3) sound alternations; 4) suppletive forms.**

1) Synthetic types.

The number of morphemes used for deriving word forms is very small.

-“s” (es) - plural;

-“en” and “ren” - oxen, children, brethren;

-“s” - genitive case;

-“er” and “est” - the degrees of comparison.

All the above-mentioned features belong to the nouns and adjectives.

But the verb has “s” in the present simple, in the third person singular.

-“ed” - past simple of the regular verbs;

-“ing” - the ending of the present participle and the gerund, etc.

Thus the total number of morphemes used to derive forms of words is eleven or twelve. It should be noted that most of these endings are monosemantic.

E.g. a book - books

a map - maps etc.

But they denote only one grammatical category and not two or three at a time. But this is not the case with “-s” (-es) of the third person singular. It expresses at least three grammatical categories: person, number and mood. In certain verbs it also expresses the category of tense, thus in the case “puts” only the “s” shows that it is a simple present tense form.

2) Analytical types.

These consist in using a word (devoiced of any lexical meaning of its own) to express some grammatical category of another word. There can be no doubt in modern English about the analytical character of such formations as “has invited”, “is invited”, “is inviting”, “does not invite”, “shall invite” etc.

The verbs “have”, “be” and “do” have no lexical meaning of their own in these cases. The lexical meaning of the formation resides in the participle or in the

infinitive following the verb “**have**”, “**be**” or “**do**”. These verbs are called auxiliary verbs and they constitute a typical feature of the analytical structure.

3) Sound alternation.

By this form we mean a way of expressing grammatical categories which consists in changing a sound inside the root.

Nouns: *man - men, foot - feet, goose - geese, woman - women* etc.

This form is much more extensively used in verbs.

write - wrote - written

sing - sang - sung

meet - met - met etc.

On the whole vowel alternation does play some part among the means of expressing grammatical categories. Though its role has been much reduced as compared to old English.

4) Suppletive forms.

By a suppletive formation we mean building a form of a word from all together different stems.

to go - went

I - me

good – better, etc.

We consider “**go**” and “**went**” as, in a way, two forms of one word. In the morphological system of modern English suppletive formations are very insignificant element. They only concern a few very widely used words among adjectives, pronouns and verbs.

The word has also grammatical and lexical meaning. Grammatical meaning of a word is more abstract, lexical meaning is more generalized. The lexical meaning of every word depends upon the part of speech to which the word belongs.

Morpheme is a meaningful part of a word. Morphemes are divided into root-morphemes (roots) and affixal morphemes. The roots morphemes express the concrete, “material” part of the meaning of the word and coincides with the stem of

the word. While affixes express the specificational part of the meaning of the word.

The affixational morpheme has two variants:

a) word-changing morphemes expressing relations between words in a phrase or in a sentence: *book-books, Jane-Jane's, worked, smaller*.

b) stem-building morphemes which are used to form new words: *work - worker, free-freedom, beauty-beautiful*

The root of notional words are classical lexical morphemes. In other words, each word has at least one lexical morpheme. It may also have grammatical and lexico-grammatical morphemes.

The affixal morphemes include prefixes, suffixes and inflexions. Prefixes and lexical suffixes have word-building functions, together with the root they form the stem of the word.

Being an adaptive system, the vocabulary is constantly adjusting itself to the changing requirements and conditions of human communications and cultural and other needs. The process of self-regulation of the lexical system is a result of overcoming contradictions between the state of the system and the demands it has to meet. The speaker chooses from the existing stock of words, such words that in his opinion can adequately express his thought and feeling. It is important to stress that the development is not confined to coining new words on the existing patterns but in adapting the very structure of the system to its changing functions.

It is also interesting to mention the new meaning of word formation patterns in composition in compared languages. The very means of word-formation change their status. This is for instance manifest in the set of combining forms. In the past these were only found forms borrowings from Latin and Greek mostly used to form technical terms. Now some of them turn into free standing words.

When some word becomes a very frequent element in compounds the discrimination of compounds and derivatives, the difference between affix and semi-affix is blurred.

On the morphological level words are divided into four groups according to their morphological structure, namely the number and type of morphemes which compose them. They are:

1) root or morpheme words. Their stem contains one free morpheme.

E.g. *dog, hand.*

2) derivatives contain no less than two morphemes of which at least one is bound.

E.g. *dogged, handful.*

3) compound words consist of most less than two free morphemes, the presence of bound morphemes is possible but not necessary.

E.g. *dog cheap (very cheap)*

dog-days (hottest part of the year)

handball, handbook.

4) compound derivatives consist of not less than two free morphemes and one bound morpheme referring to the whole combination. The pattern is stem+stem+suffix.

E.g. *dog-legged (crooked)*

left-handed

We can show the analysis on the word-formation level showing not only the morphemic constituents of the word but also the structural pattern on which it is built, this may be carried out in terms of proportional oppositions.

The pattern un+adjective stem: *uncertain, unconscious, uneasy, unfortunate, unnatural.*

Noun stem+ly: *womanly, masterly, scholarly, soldierly.*

Adjective stem+man: *gentleman (businessman).*

We can make a conclusion that in comparative typology of the analysis of words may be grouped not only according to their root morphemes but according to affixes as well.

The next step is classifying words not in isolation but taking them within actual utterances. Here the first contrast to consider is the contrast between notional words and form or functional words. Actually the definition of the word as a minimum free

form holds good for notional words only. It is only notional words that can stand alone and yet have meaning and form a complete utterance. They can name different objects of reality, the qualities of these objects and actions or the process in which they take part. In sentences they function syntactically as some primary or secondary members. Even extended sentences are possible which consist of notional words only. They can also express the attitude of the speaker towards reality.

Form words, also called functional words, empty words or auxiliaries (the latter term is coined by H.Sweet), are lexical units which are called words, although they do not conform to the definition of the word, because they are used only in combination with notional words or in reference to them. This group comprises auxiliary verbs, prepositions, conjunctions and relative adverbs. Primarily they express grammatical relationships between words. This does not, however, imply that they have no lexical meaning of their own.

The borderline between notional and functional words is not always very clear and does not correspond to that between various parts of speech. Thus, most verbs are notional words, but the auxiliary verbs are classified as form words. It is open to discussion whether link verbs should be treated as form words or not. The situation is very complicated if we consider pronouns. Personal, demonstrative and interrogative pronouns, as their syntactical functions testify, are notional words; reflexive pronouns seem to be form words building up such analytical verb forms as "I warmed myself", but this is open to discussion. As to propwords (one, those, etc.), some authors think that they should be considered as a separate, third group.

It is typical of the English language that the boundary between notional and functional words sometimes lies within the semantic structure of one and the same word, so that in some contexts they appear as notional words in other contexts as form words.

The systematic use of form words is one of the main devices of English grammatical structure, surpassed in importance only by fixed word order. Form words are therefore studied in grammar rather than typology which concentrates its attention upon notional words.

Very interesting treatment of form words is given by Charles Fries. The classes suggested by Ch.Fries are based on distribution, in other words, they are syntactic positional classes bulk of words in the utterances he investigated is constituted by four main classes. He gives them no names except numbers.

Class I: *water, time, summer, history;*

Class II: *felt, arranged, sees, forgot, know;*

Class III: *general, good, better, wide, young;*

Class IV: *there, here, now, usually, first.*

The percentage of the total vocabulary in these four classes in English is over 93%. The remaining 7% are constituted by 154 form words. These, though few in number, occur very frequently.

Observing the semantic structure of words belonging to this group we find a great deal of semantic likeness within it, not only in the denotative meanings as such but also in the way various meanings are combined.

Typology of word building means a new way of forming words. One of the most useful ways is the type:

N → V: *word - to word; dream - to dream*

A.A.Ufimtsev shows one more productive way of forming new words.

A → N: *round (dairəvi) - round (yumru, dairə)*

V → N: *to try - a try; to drive - a drive*

However in Azerbaijani one can find the following types:

V → N (*gəzmək - gəzinti, baxmaq - baxış*)

N → V (*çağırış - çağırmaq*)

A+(N) → N (*soyunma otağı, yemək otağı*)

The meaning of every word forms part of the semantic system of each particular language and is always determined by the peculiarities of its vocabulary, namely the existence of synonyms, or words near in meaning, by the typological usage, set expressions.

Vocabulary is the system formed by the sum total of all the words and word equivalents that the language possesses.

In both languages the lexical meanings of the words “*invite*”, “*invited*” and the combination “*shall invite*” (*dāvāt edir, dāvāt etdi, dāvāt edəcək*) are the same. The main difference is in content (the word “*invite*” is used in the present, past, future tenses). These meanings are grammatical.

Let us compare two units: “*reads*” and “*shall read*”. They contain the same lexical morpheme “*read*” and different grammatical morphemes “-s” and “*shall*”. The grammatical morpheme “-s” is a bound morpheme: it is connected with the lexical morpheme. The grammatical morpheme “*shall*” is a free morpheme or a word-morpheme. It is connected with the lexical morpheme. The word “*reads*” with bound grammatical morphemes is called synthetic word, “*shall read*” analytical word, because they are (*shall and read*) words in content only, in form they are combinations of words.

Lexical meanings can be found in a bunch only in a dictionary or in the memory of a man, or scientifically in the lexical system of a language.

In both languages typologically the morphological structure of words are divided into the following types:

1) the first type comprises the words consisting of a morpheme. Here belong functional words in both languages; the preposition, the conjunction, some pronouns;

2) the second type comprises the words which consist of a root morpheme. In English the majority of the notional parts of speech – the noun, the adjective, the verb, the numeral belong here.

Being an adaptive system, the vocabulary is constantly adjusting itself to show changing requirements and conditions of human communications and cultural and other needs. The process of self-regulation of the lexical system is a result of overcoming contradictions between the state of the system and the demands it has to meet. The speaker in both compared languages chooses from the existing stock of words, such words that in his opinion can adequately express his thought and feeling. It is important to stress that the development is not confined to coining new words on the existing patterns but in adapting the very structure of the system to its changing functions.

It is also interesting to mention the new meaning of word formation patterns in composition in compared languages. The very means of word-formation change their status. This is for instance manifest in the set of combining forms.

In the past these were only bound forms borrowings from Latin and Greek mostly used to form technical terms. Now some of them turn into free standing words.

So investigating the typology of lexical systems in English and Azerbaijani languages we can come into the following conclusion that there exists morphs and allomorphs between these compared languages.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XIII.

1. Which level is the third one in the segmental lingual hierarchy?
2. What kind of unit is the word?
3. What kind of morphemes do you know?
4. What does the root morpheme express?
5. What types of words do you know?
6. What can you say about synthetic types?
7. What is the difference between analytical and synthetic types?
8. What is the main peculiarity of the sound alternation?
9. What is the difference between sound alternation and suppletive forms of words?
10. What can you say about the typology of word-building means?
11. Into how many groups are the words divided according to their morphological structure?
12. What can you say about compound derivatives?
13. What can you say about Ch.Fries's definition about form words?
14. What kind of types of the morphological structure of words do you know?
15. Speak about the types of lexical typology.
16. How many variants has the affixational morpheme?

CHAPTER XIV.

TYOLOGY OF SYNTACTIC SYSTEMS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

The notion of syntactic level. Typology of syntactic units: phrases. Criteria used in distinguishing types of phrases.

As is known there are some levels of language. One of them is the proposemic level. Proposemic level is a sentence level. The peculiar character of this level is that expressing predication.

The basic unit of syntax is the sentence. There exist many definitions of the sentence. According to J.Greenwood syntax is that part of grammar which treats of the right placing and joining words in a sentence. B.Khaimovich and B.Rogovskaya say that “syntax deals with the structure, classification and combination of sentences” [43]. But B.Ilyish thinks that syntax is the part of grammar which treats of phrases and sentences [38].

The syntax of every language is that part of grammar which deals with the phrase and sentence. Accordingly the first task of syntactical typology is to study the phrase and sentence in the compared languages. In other words syntactical typology must find out isomorphs (similarities) and allomorphs (differences) existing in English and Azerbaijani. It should be noted that the aim of typological study is to learn phrases and sentences, their peculiarities in these languages. We'll divide syntactical typology into two parts:

- 1) phrases in English and Azerbaijani, similarities and differences between them;
- 2) sentences in both languages, similarities and differences between them.

First of all it is necessary to say that in compared languages the phrase is a combination of two or more notional parts of speech. There is similarity between the phrases of these English and Azerbaijani languages. As we know, the words form certain groups in a sentence which are called phrases. Phrases can occupy different position in a sentence.

E.g. *This is my book. I gave my book to him.*

Mən kitabımı ona verdim.

So the phrase can be studied apart the sentence in which it occurs.

Russian as well as Azerbaijani linguistics is that the word combination (phrase) should contain at least two notional words, this view seems to have become traditional.

Unlike these scholars, western scholars hold a different view of the problem. They consider that every combination of two or more words constitutes a unit which they term “phrase”. They do not draw a sharp distinction between two types of word groups such as “wise men” and “to the lighthouse” (mayak). It should be noted that academician V.M. Zhirmunsky and prof. B.A. Ilyish share this opinion. They think that the constituents of phrase may belong to any part of speech. It follows that the first and probably the most important difference of opinion on the question among scholars concerns the constituents of phrase forming grammatical units.

Another debatable problem in linguistics is whether a predicative combination of words form a word combination.

It is generally known that a sentence is based on predication and predication, in its shortest definition consists in saying something about something, so that its purpose is communication. But a phrase has no such aim. Phrases are more like words because they are used for naming, action, qualities and so on. Thus, most Russian and Azerbaijani linguists seem justified in postulating the separate existence of the two entities which bear the names of phrase and sentence respectively.

In contrast with these linguists, Western scholars make no difference between subject-predicate combinations of words and other combinations. In general the western approach to the study of the phrase is different.

Some theories of Western linguists carry numerous fruitful ideas which are useful for modern linguists. It is evident that the conception which has become a tradition in linguistics of that matter is more acceptable, that is “a phrase is a word combination which contains at least two notional words”, because in the combination of “form word+notional word” the components can’t be considered equal in rank, as

the first element has almost lost its lexical meaning. So the combinations “preposition+noun (pronoun)”, “article+noun” can’t be considered phrases. Comparing these two non kindred languages we can see some difference between the phrases of English and Azerbaijani languages.

I. The first difference is observed in the classification of the phrases in both languages. As it is known in Azerbaijani linguistic literature it has become a tradition to classify phrases into three major groups called attributive word combinations or phrases:

- a) **the first group:** *daş divar, yaxşı adam,*
- b) **the second group:** *fil dişi, palıd ağacı,*
- c) **the third group:** *məktəbin direktoru, mənim adım.*

It is evident from the given examples this classification is based on the morphological form of the constituent parts of phrases.

In the first group the components have no suffix; in the second group the second element has one of the suffixes **r⁴**, in the third group both constituent parts take suffixes. But English phrases don’t admit of such classification.

II. The second difference is observed in the position kernel (head word) and the adjunct (subordinate word). In English there can be the model A+K (adjunct+kernel).

E.g. *beautiful park; five books.*

But sometimes we can meet the model K+A (kernel+adjunct).

E.g. *a man alive, something interesting.*

In Azerbaijani only the model A+K is possible – *maraqlı kitab, ağıllı uşaq, dəcəl körpə, isti gün etc.*

III. The third difference is observed in the syntactical relation combining the constituent parts of phrases. The major syntactical relation between the components of English phrases is adjoining that is in most cases English words stand side by side without agreeing with the head word or governed by it. The other syntactical relations that is agreement and government are insignificant in English.

IV. The fourth difference is observed in enclosure, that’s also important in English.

E.g. *high house (adjoining)*

A high house (enclosure)

In modern Azerbaijani adjoining is one of the syntactical relations between the components of a phrase is also of great importance because words can stand side by side without agreement and government. But in some cases especially in the third type, the major syntactical relation is agreement. In Azerbaijani we observe agreement in person and number.

E.g. *mənim kitabım, onun atası, onun qardaşları etc.*

As it is seen in the last phrase there is no agreement in number. The kernel is in the plural, but the adjunct is in the singular. Such syntactic relation between the components of phrases in modern English is not observed. As we know agreement in English is found only between the components of the phrase consisting of “numeral+noun” or “demonstrative pronoun+noun”.

E.g. *a cup – five cups*

But agreement as a syntactical relation in the phrases consisting of a “demonstrative pronoun+noun” is not observed in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *we never say – bunlar kitablar, onlar evlər*

But we say “bu kitablar”, “o evlər” etc.

Besides the above shown difference we can also find similarities between English and Azerbaijani phrases. They are observed in the following cases:

- 1) the phrase in compared languages is a matter of syntax;
- 2) in both languages the phrase can be formed on the same syntactical connection:
 - a) an attributive connection: *London theatre – London teatri*
 - b) an objective construction: *to write a letter – məktub yazmaq*
 - c) an adverbial connection: *very hard – çox çətin*
- 3) in both languages the phrases may be of two components or more components such as “little child – nice little child – newly born nice little child” etc.;

Summing up the above mentioned we can say that English and Azerbaijani differ in the sphere of phrases though in some cases we can see certain similarities between

the phrase of these languages. Let's pay attention to different types of phrases in compared languages:

Accordingly the following types of phrases may be distinguished. Here semantical principle is followed:

1) noun+noun: *speech sound, silver watch, army unit* – *nitq səsi, gümüş saat, daş divar.*

2) noun in the genitive case+noun: *a boy's friend, a woman's doctor* – *oğlanın dostu, qadının həkimi.*

3) Adjective+noun: *a red pen, a young man* – *qırmızı qələm, cavan adam.*

4) verb+noun: *wait a minute, walk a mile*

5) verb+adverb: *go fast, speak slowly*

6) adverb +adjective: *very nice, pretty bad, complete empty* – *çox gözəl, tamamilə pis.*

7) adverb+adverb: *very carefully, fairly easily* – *çox qayğıkeşliklə, lap asanlıqla.*

8) noun +preposition+noun: *the door of the room.*

9) verb+preposition+noun: *know by heart etc.*

Features four, five, eight and nine have got difference in compared languages.

Analysing the phrases in compared languages we find out some likeness and difference in syntactical relations between the components of a phrase. In both languages there exist coordination and subordination. Subordination comprises agreement (concord), government and adjoining. But in Azerbaijani there is no enclosure which is widely used in English.

E.g. *the then government.*

Here the adverb “then” is enclosed.

In the phrase “an - on the spot - investigation” the phrase “on the spot” is enclosed between the article and the noun to which the article belongs, and this characterizes the syntactic connections of the phrase in modern English.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XIV

1. What is syntax?

2. Which level is the proposemic level?
3. What is syntax according to J.Greenwood?
4. What can you say about B.Khaimovich, B.Rogovskaya and B.Ilyish's view points about syntax?
5. What are the main components of syntax?
6. What is the aim of typological study?
7. What can you say about the divisions of syntactical typology?
8. What can you say about the similarity between the phrases of English and Azerbaijani languages?
9. What is the definition of a phrase?
10. What are the main differences between the phrases of English and Azerbaijani languages?
11. How are the phrases classified in Azerbaijani linguistic literature?
12. How do you understand the terms "kernel" and "adjunct"?
13. What kind of syntactical relations are observed in combining the constituent parts of phrases?
14. What is the difference between "agreement" and "government"?
15. What types of phrases may be distinguished in the compared languages?
16. How do you understand the terms "adjoining" and "enclosure"?
17. Is there enclosure in Azerbaijani?
18. Speak about agreement in compared languages.
19. Which syntactic relations are insignificant in English?
20. Speak about adjoining and government in both languages.

CHAPTER XV.

TYPOLOGY OF SENTENCE MEMBERS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

Typology of sentence members: subject, predicate, object, attribute, adverbial modifier. Typology of simple and composite sentences.

Investigating the typology of sentence members of foreign and native languages we find out that the problem of the parts of the sentence is closely connected with the problem of the parts of speech. If the parts of speech are defined according to the combination of different criteria (semantical, morphological, syntactical), the members of the sentence being devoid of formal features are distinguished only in accordance with their function in the sentence and represent functional categories. Each word as a certain part of speech gets its main syntactical function. So the words that form a sentence are called sentence members. It is common in grammatical theory to distinguish between main (primary) and secondary parts of the sentence. Traditionally the subject and the predicate are regarded as the primary or principal parts of the sentence. The attribute, the object and the adverbial modifier are regarded as the secondary parts of the sentence. This opposition “primary – secondary” is justified the difference in function. The subject and the predicate in compared languages make the predication and thus constitute the sentence, the secondary parts serve to expand it by being added to the words of the predication.

Depending on the way *the subject* is expressed all two-member sentences fall into personal and impersonal sentences. There are two types of subjects in English. The first type of the subject is expressed by a notional word. But the second type may be expressed by a whole phrase and even a whole sentence if it is substantivized.

From the point of view of its content the subject in English may be either personal or impersonal.

Unlike the Azerbaijani the personal subject may have the following classes:

- 1) the personal subject proper;

- 2) the indefinite personal subject;
- 3) the demonstrative subject;
- 4) the negative subject;
- 5) the interrogative subject.

When the subject expressed by “it” which is devoid of lexical meaning and is purely formal as it does not refer to any person, or thing or abstract notion, the impersonal subject is used.

The impersonal subject does not exist in Azerbaijani. In Azerbaijani different suffixes show that this action refers either to the first, to the second or to the third persons. Sometimes the subject lacks but it can be understood from the context easily.

Compare:

- 1) *It is necessary to go there early.*
- 2) *It was five o'clock.*
- 3) *It was ten miles.*
- 4) *Gəlmişdilər ki, bizə kömək etsinlər.*
- 5) *İki gündən sonra şəhərdən qayıdır.*
- 6) *Kitabxanaya gedirəm. etc.*

In both compared languages the subject must take some definite forms. The nouns are used in the common case but they don't differ in form from nouns in other functions. And yet we can see that the subject is marked in its fixed place in the sentence. Thus in both languages in declarative sentences it is generally placed before the predicate.

The predicate is the second sentence-member in compared languages. The predicate is that word or group of words that expresses predication, i.e., the most important element of a communication. Predication is marked in compared English and Azerbaijani languages by intonation, it is a universal means of predication.

Unlike the Azerbaijani language, in English predication is generally expressed in two member sentences by the finite form of the verb. In compared languages the predicate may be simple and compound, nominal and verbal. But unlike the

Azerbaijani, in English we can meet compound verbal aspect, compound verbal modal and double predicates.

E.g. *She arrived at the inn early in the morning.*

She seemed quite old.

They began copying out all the exercises without permission.

You must fulfil this plan.

The sun rose red.

Sizin qardaşınız gəldi.

Onlar bu məktəbdə müəllim idilər.

O bizim müdirin oğlu imiş.

Nəhayət tələbələr bir-bir gəlməyə başladılar.

One of the sentence members is the object. The object refers to the words denoting action or qualities and completes or restricts their meaning in both languages. In both compared languages the objects can be of two kinds: direct and indirect. But in English indirect objects can be used with prepositions and without them. Besides, in English there exists so-called the cognate object which we don't observe in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *Mr.Black sent his son a message.*

Mr.Black sent a message to his son.

Mr.Black lived a dreadful life.

Onun xalası ərizəni müdirə verdi.

Onun xalası müdirə ərisəni verdi.

The attribute in both languages denotes the quality or the quality of a person or thing. The attribute can either precede or follow the word it modifies in English. But in English the attribute may be used in pre-positive and post-positive, but in Azerbaijani it can only be in pre positive.

E.g. *She had black eyes, a round face and a slender figure.*

An extract below was given on this page.

Onun ağ sifəti, qara gözləri və uca boyu onu daha yaraşılıq göstərirdi etc.

Attributes in compared languages have a special form apposition. But in Azerbaijani it doesn't include the attribute.

The adverbial modifier is one of the sentence members in compared languages. It modifies a part of the sentence expressed by a verb, a verbal noun, an adjective or an adverb and serving to characterize an action or a property or to state the way an action is done. Semantically adverbials denote place, time, manner, cause, purpose, result, condition, concession, comparison, degree and measure in compared languages. Unlike the Azerbaijani, in English there is also the adverbial modifier of attendant circumstances. In compared languages the semantic class of an adverbial may be identified directly (absolutely) or indirectly (relatively).

It is identified directly by lexical meaning of the word or phrase used as an adverbial.

E.g. *I saw him yesterday.* – *Mən onu **dünən** gördüm.*

*She spoke **in a loud voice**.* – *O **yüksək səslə** (ucadan) danışdı.*

In other cases the semantic type is identified relatively, that's only through the relationship of the adverbial to the modified part of the sentence, as is often the case with participles, infinitives and some prepositional phrases.

As you know the syntax of every language is that part of grammar which deals with the phrase and sentence. Accordingly the first task of syntactical typology is to study the phrase and sentence in compared languages. Before starting to analyse the sentence structure in compared languages typologically we think it is necessary to drop some words about the history of typological investigation of the sentence in general. The typological investigation of the sentence is closely connected with the name of academician I.I.Meschaninov. He was the first scholar who paid a great attention to the typology of sentences of different languages with different morphological structure. As the result of his vast investigation he was able to put forward a new typological classification of languages based on the type of sentences. According to academician I.I.Meschaninov, languages can be divided into two groups:

a) languages with nominative construction

b) languages with ergative construction [70, 96].

Academician I.I. Meschaninov includes all the agglutinative, flective, and amorphous languages into the first group. Here belong the Turkic languages, Indo-European languages and the Chinese languages. But the second group comprises all the Caucasian languages, such as: Adigey, Kabardin, Dargin, Avar, Lezgin, Chechen and Chukci. The second scholar who paid attention to the typological investigation of the sentence in the languages with different morphological structure is V. Skalichka, Chech by nationality. He somewhat worked out in detail the classification put forward by I.I. Meschaninov saying that word order in flective languages is free, whereas it can't be considered quite right. It is not so in all the flective languages, for example Persian language being one of the flective languages, its word order is fixed.

J. Greenberg also investigated the sentence typology in different languages. As the result of his investigation he put forward his own classification of languages. He divided languages into three groups according to the sentence structure. Such as:

- 1) predicate+subject+object (PSO);
- 2) subject+predicate+object (SPO);
- 3) subject+object+predicate (SOP).

According to J. Greenberg English and Russian languages belong to the group of languages with the SPO, but Azerbaijani to languages with the structure SOP.

There are languages in which object comes at the beginning of the sentence. Such kind of sentences are found in Amazonian languages.

E.g. *A dragon he killed.* = O+S+P

O+S+P kind of word order can be found in English, too, in stylistic variants.

E.g. *What fools these mortals be (Shakespeare).* In the movie "Star Wars" the character Yoda spoke English with the order O+S+P.

E.g. *A sign you shall see. Your father he is.*

It is common knowledge that the sentence is the unit of speech which is formed according to the syntactical rules of the given language and indicates a more or less

complete thought having its definite grammatical structure and intonation. Sentences are classified according to types of communication and according to the structure.

According to the first principle sentences are divided into a) declarative; b) interrogative; c) imperative; d) exclamatory.

In compared languages the sentence has nominative construction, as it has been determined by acad. I.I.Meschaninov. Together with such similarities there exist some differences between English and Azerbaijani sentences. The first major difference lies in the use of the subject in sentences in compared languages. As a matter of fact the subject is a constant member of the sentence in English, even impersonal sentences should have their own subject, which is expressed by the impersonal “it”. It should be mentioned that it is no mere chance but is closely connected with the morphological structure of Modern English where there is almost no inflection to indicate the categories of person and number. As the result of it in English every sentence should have its own subject which at the same time is as the means of expressing of the categories of person and number. But as the Azerbaijani language has rich morphological means for expressing the categories of person and number, the sentence may not need a special subject of its own expressed by a separate word, as it is in English.

E.g. *Sabah gedirəm. Sabah gedirsən.*

Sabah gedir. Sabah gedirik.

In the first sentence the suffix “-əm” shows that the speaker is the first person singular, in the second sentence, the ending - “-sən” indicates that the speaker is the second person singular. That’s the reason why in Azerbaijani especially in spoken speech very often we don’t need the subject to be expressed by a separate word.

E.g. *Sabah gedəcəyəm - I’ll go tomorrow.*

Sabah gedəcəksən - You’ll go tomorrow.

Sabah gedəcəyik - We’ll go tomorrow, etc.

In Azerbaijani impersonal sentences have no subject at all. Such as: *Soyuqdur. Qışdır. Saat 5-dir. Axşamdır. Günortadır, etc.* But in English this type of sentences, i.e. impersonal sentences have an obligatory subject. Such as:

E.g. *Bu gün soyuqdur.* – *It is cold to day.*

Saat beşdir. – *It is five o'clock.*

It should be noted that this is the main typological difference between the sentences structure of the compared languages.

The second fundamental typological difference is observed in the order of the words in the sentence. First of all it should be noted that in English every type of the sentence - declarative, interrogative etc. has its syntactical structure.

A declarative sentence has the structure “subject+predicate+object” (SPO). An interrogative sentence has the structure “auxiliary verb+subject+the main verb+the secondary parts” ($V_{aux}+S+V_{main}+II_{ps}$) or “semi-auxiliary verb+subject+notional verb+secondary parts of sentences” ($V_{semi-aux}+S+V_{notional}+II_{ps}$).

An imperative sentence has the following structure “predicate+secondary parts of speech”.

E.g. *Take the book. Go home.*

But some exclamatory sentences have the structure: “exclamatory word+emphasized word+subject”+predicate.

E.g. *What a beautiful picture it is!*

Azerbaijani sentences have not got their own syntactical structure having the same syntactical structure. Sentences may be declarative or interrogative depending upon the intonation. Such as:

E.g. *Sən tələbəsən?* / *interrogative sentence* /

Sən tələbəsən. / *declarative sentence* /

An imperative sentence in Azerbaijani has the following syntactical structure: “II p.s.+predicate”.

E.g. *Kitabı götürün.*

The above-mentioned facts show that English, Russian and Azerbaijani sentences are quite contrary to each other which show that there exists a great typological difference between the sentence structure of these languages. As to the composite sentence here we can also observe some typological similarities and differences between the compared languages. Investigating different types of composite

sentences the linguists gained good results. First of all it must be mentioned that in compared languages composite sentences are divided into two main groups, namely “compound”, “tabesiz”, “сложносочиненное” and “complex”, “tabeli”, “сложноподчиненное”. A brief survey shows that there is no great difference between the compound sentences in compared languages: in all of them compound sentences consist of two or more independent simple sentences coordinated to each other either syndetically or asyndetically.

E.g. *Müəllim gəldi və dərs başlandı.*

Учитель пришёл и урок начался.

The teacher came and the lesson began. (syndetical coordination)

Müəllim gəldi, dərs başlandı.

Учитель пришёл, урок начался.

The teacher came, the lesson began. (asyndetical coordination)

In regard to the complex sentences we can say that there is some likeness between the compared languages. In all of them a complex sentence consists of one principal clause and one or more subordinate clauses such as:

E.g. *Mən bilirdim ki, o tənə məktub yazacaq.*

Я знал, что он напишет мне письмо.

I knew that he would write me a letter.

Aydın oldu ki, bütün qonaqlar vaxtında gələcəklər.

Было ясно, что гости придут во время.

It was clear that all the guests would come in time.

At the same time one can easily observe some essential differences between compared languages. In English complex sentences with the adverbial clauses of time and condition may precede or follow the principal clause. Such as:

E.g. *If the weather is fine tomorrow, we'll go to the country.*

We'll go to the country if the weather is fine tomorrow.

I'll do it when I return.

When I return I'll do it.

It is the same in the Russian language but only adverbial clauses of time introducing “when” is rendered “тогда, когда”.

E.g. *Я это сделаю тогда, когда я вернусь.*

Если завтра будет хорошая погода, мы поедем за город.

Мы поедем за город, если завтра будет хорошая погода, etc.

It is impossible to use the adverbial clauses of time and condition after the principal clause in Modern Azerbaijani.

Possible: *O gəlsə, mən onu görəcəyəm.*

Impossible: *Mən onu görəcəyəm, o gəlsə.*

The fact can be considered as a typological difference the complex sentences of the compared languages.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XV.

1. What parts of the sentence do you know?
2. What are the primary parts of the sentence?
3. Speak about the secondary parts of the sentence.
4. What parts of the sentence make the predication?
5. What is the difference between personal and impersonal sentences?
6. What can you say about divisions of personal subject?
7. Does the impersonal subject exist in Azerbaijani?
8. What can you say about the predicate in compared languages?
9. What is the universal means of predication in compared languages?
10. Speak about the types of predicate in both languages.
11. What is the main peculiarity of the object in English and Azerbaijani?
12. What can you say about the kinds of object?
13. Speak about the peculiar features of the attribute in both languages.
14. What can you say about the special form of attributes in compared languages?
15. What do adverbials semantically denote in compared languages?
16. Speak about the history of typological investigation of the sentence .

17. Who paid a great attention to the typology of sentences in languages with different morphological structure?
18. Into how many groups can the languages be divided according to academician I.I.Meschaninov and what are they?
19. What can you say I.I.Meschaninov's view point about languages with nominative construction?
20. Speak about languages with ergative construction.
21. Who worked out in detail the classification put forward by I.I.Meschaninov?
22. What can you say about J.Greenberg's division?
23. What does the sentence indicate?
24. What can you say about the similarities between Azerbaijani and English sentences?
25. Do you see any differences between Azerbaijani and English sentences?
26. What can you say about the structure of sentences in compared languages?
27. Share your view points on simple and composite sentences in compared languages.

CHAPTER XVI.

SOME PROBLEMS OF SEMANTICO-STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF COMPLEX SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI

As different kinds of investigations are increasing in linguistics, new materials of this field of science appear in the light of new innovations. And it gives the basis of approaching, opposition and comparison methods to those problems and by virtue of it more logical results are gained.

It is clear that the most changeable part of the language is its word stock. These changes are widely affected by the words which are closely linked with the objective world. But it is difficult to say it about the syntactic structure of the language, especially its sentence structure. Without going into details it should be mentioned that it is closely connected with the stable character of the syntactic structure.

Though the chance of changeable character of the syntactic structure is weak, on the whole, the syntactic structure, especially its intonation and semantic sides is undergone by different factors and it causes to the polyvariants. This changing happens to be seen for the first sight that the syntactic structure is dynamic. Though there are a lot of investigations of kindred and non kindred languages, the problem of semantical-structural features of the complex syntactic units remain one of the unsolved cardinal problems till nowadays.

Comparative analysis of the English and Azerbaijani complex syntactic units proves that there are a lot of things in the grammatical structure of both languages remain unsettled. Complex syntactic units, their boundary lines, classifications, the process of evolution the meaning and grammatical relations of components, the investigation of intonative structure, the usage of the verbs in the principal clause and a lot of other problems should be specified profoundly, scientifically and systematically. It needs new scientific analysis of the above mentioned problems no matter how they have been investigated.

Beginning of the second half of the XX century the complex syntactic units began to be investigated from the structural, semantic and intonative etc. sides. For a long time both the English and Azerbaijani languages have been closely investigated by their grammatical structure. The scholars satisfied with the studying of the words and main and functional parts of the sentence on the simple sentence structure level and separate components of the composite-complex sentences, their grammatical structure and sometimes they satisfied with the functional analysis of them.

Seeing the disadvantages of the syntactic investigations A.M.Mukhin wrote: “while investigating the most elementar syntactic units the main attention, furthermore, was given to the sentence structure notion – to the constructive unit of syntactic level of language” [72, 3].

But “each grammatical form has its own content and this content is closely connected with the form” [70, 307]. In other words, the aspects of semantic (content), grammatical (formal) and intonative never exist separately and can't be in isolated forms from one another. On this account some scholars treat and defend this conception that “syntax and semantics are important parts of grammar” [62, 409].

While investigating complex syntactic units like double-sided construction from the point of its grammatical side it seems inadequate. In order to determine this notion, its real place in language system the role of investigations of the syntactic, semantic and intonative structures is of great importance.

While investigating the complex syntactic units in languages of different systems we'd like to show their variety and constancy and the factors affecting on these problems. We'd try to investigate different variants of complex syntactic units in different non-kindred languages and find out the isomorphic and allomorphic properties of them.

In order to reach our aim we'd like to solve the following objectives:

- determining the varieties of complex syntactic units;
- determining the factors affecting on this variety;
- finding out the varieties of the components in complex syntactic units;

-considering the functional – semantic relation and grammatical – intonative relation of the components – principal and subordinate clauses of the complex syntactic units in a closed way;

-determining the role of conjunctions and connectives in formalizing the varieties of complex syntactic units;

-investigating the closely relations between relyative and correlyative connections in complex syntactic units;

-exacting the degree of varieties of the position of components within the complex syntactic units;

-determining the role of the syntactic structure and its affecting on the varieties of complex syntactic units;

-finding out the degree of affecting of the verbs used in principal clauses on the varieties of complex syntactic units.

It is known that complex syntactic units have been investigated according to different principles. It has been investigated due to the structure, the connectives of the components within the complex syntactic units, interrelationship of the functional relations between dependent and independent components and of course, the intonation. But it should be mentioned that in different scientific works one of the above mentioned principles has been taken as the leading one. As a communicative and expressive act in organizing the complex syntactic unit, the semantics of the language unit is of great importance. Though the semantics and function are closely connected with each other, it is impossible to identify them. So the meaning and function of complex syntactic units and their interrelationship in syntax are studied as the interrelationship of the semantics and syntax in different languages. The function being one of the grammatical factors is impossible to consider without the notion of semantics. There is no function without semantics. But it should be mentioned one more touch here, that the semantics of language units either interrelated or isolated, shows itself more differently and enlargely. Semantics of complex syntactic units, on the one hand is studied in syntagmatic plan in interrelationship with other components, on the other hand in highly relative

independence. Meaning being the content of sign in language units functions the inner character of them. The meaning of grammatical forms concerns to the content side and it includes the notion of language structure. So if the meaning comprises the notion of “language”, the function joins the aim of meaning and communication outer the language. Unlike the meaning, the function can take part in the structural field of language. At this time the function doesn’t mean content or thought. The usage of “semantic function” and “structural function” is closely connected with it. At first sight it is spoken about the semantic function of the language unit in the process of communication. But structural function is the giving of inner language information about the organizing of structural point of language units. The relation of the structural function with the meaning is indirect.

Besides the upper mentioned kind of structural-semantic function, its intermediate character was determined as well.

Semantics of complex syntactic units should be studied in different aspects. Firstly, every component, syntagm has got its own semantics. Naturally this semantics is not an independent information. This character is known of the dependence of each component from the point of view of grammar as well. Secondly, it is the semantics having expressed by the components of the whole construction which has got the character of information. It is impossible to isolate these relations from each other. So the semantics of complex syntactic units is the part of semantics of the whole construction. The semantics of complex syntactic units is formalized by the relationship of the components, syntagms etc. The relationship of the semantics of the components in complex syntactic unit is manifested by the relationship of grammar and this formalizes the construction from the point of its structural side. It should be mentioned that sometimes the grammatical and semantic relation of the components in complex syntactic units are alike.

On this account A.Abdullayev writes: “Due to the grammatical position the principal clause, usually being free, brings into subjection to the subordinate clause.

The subordinate clause is dependent upon the principal clause by its grammatical points, but by the semantic point such dependence might not be... As the principal and subordinate clauses serve the content of one whole thought, the center of meaning weight should be either on the principal or on the subordinate clauses; or it may be delivered among them relatively proportionally” [3, 103]. It is clear that in determining the types of complex syntactic units, it should be taken into consideration either pure functional or pure content (semantical) relation. But in linguistics this principle unique is not taken into account and some scholars took the functional relation but not the content relation uppermost in classifying the types of complex syntactic units.

While speaking about the structure of complex syntactic units, it should be mentioned that each content demands equal structure of its own and in different structures, we can't be able to speak of the same absolute content. That's why each content has its own corresponding structure. The formation of this structure is realized by means of phonetic, lexical and grammatical devices taken all together. So in studying semantical-structure, there is a direction from the content to structure.

But unlike semantical structure, structural-semantics is more concrete. Here, there is a way of revealing from abstractness to concreteness. In semantic-structure, the semantic weight of complex syntactic unit is taken mainly, putting forward the first plan its affecting on structure. But in structural semantics the structure, scheme are taken mainly and the ability of such abstract scheme reveals the chance of wide semantic information. In structural semantics the laws of grammatical structure is put forward on the first plan and in this law frame the general scenery of the informative weight is revealed.

We'll base on structural semantics in our investigation. Structural semantics of complex syntactic units does not only mean the revealing of the information in every isolated construction, it is not the information expressed by a definite structure but that's the investigating of the information weight if expressing of a definite structure. On this account if incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units and their components are studied contrastively, we hope, it'll have a great importance not only

for those compared English and Azerbaijani languages but also for the whole general linguistics as well.

It is clear that the language fulfilling its own communicative and expressive meaning, in most cases depends on the speakers who use it in different situation.

Depending on the situation and the aim in most cases, the necessary language material is not used to express any thought. In some cases these are substituted by other means. This case happens in complex syntactic units as well and incomplete forms of complex syntactic units appear to be used in both compared languages largely. We came across the incomplete forms in simple sentences by the terms of elliptic, incomplete, the part of one member sentences etc. This case, with its structural points happens in complex syntactic units as well.

The difference between the complex syntactic units and the simple sentences is not only in its expressing of a complex thought, and polycomponents but in its structural complexity.

The ellipsis of the components of the complex syntactic units is manifested in different situations. We'd like to subdivide them in the following ways: A. Elliptic forms; B. Incomplete forms; and C. Abridged forms.

It should be mentioned that though those three forms are intended the whole types of complex syntactic units, they can't be able to embrace all of them. This subdivision is not categorical and there is a reality in it sometimes it is too difficult to put a demarcation line between them. On the other hand, those terms don't take absolute character either, because the inner content of those forms is close to each other.

A. Elliptic forms. The elliptic forms of complex syntactic units are those complexes which the missing of either principal or the subordinate clause – in transform – construction doesn't seem to be incomplete either structurally or semantically.

Like the simple sentences, here the component undergone by ellipsis is not needed to be restored. It should be mentioned that not in all cases the ellipsis of any component of complex syntactic units happens. On this account A.M.Mukhin

writes: “Incomplete sentences are not only those sentences one of which components is missed (usually the previous and the following parts of the text can be reconstructed) but also are those which have no in reality the missing of the component but have the colouring of outer content in them” [73, 178].

The elliptic forms of different complex syntactic units happen in different situation. This difference of form, furthermore, is closely connected with those constructions and out of which structural forms they have been sourced. The initial semantic-grammatical characters of structural forms and their ways of expressing lexically affect on their later development of the transformation process. In some complex syntactic units the subordinate clause of the first component is parallel to the predicate of different mood, tense and person paradigms of the second component. The predicates of these parallel components are expressed by the same lexical unit. In these constructions the predicate of the principal clause in first component is usually expressed by the verbs “say” (“tell”) in English but “demək” in Azerbaijani. Sometimes they may be expressed by the verbs close in meaning to them. Two elliptic forms are possible in such kind of complex syntactic units in compared English and Azerbaijani languages.

I. In the first case consisting of a subordinate clause of object, the first component, i.e. the principal clause undergoes the ellipsis.

In English

E.g. *We are obeyed the order; pull down this building, we pull down, ruin this street, we ruin, build a new building, we build a new one.*

In Azerbaijani

E.g. *Biz əmrə tabeyik; bu binanı sök, biz də sökürük, bu küçəni dağıt, biz də dağıdırıq, yeni bina ucalt, yenisini ucaldırıq.*

In the above mentioned examples the predicate of the principal clause can be expressed by the verbs “say” (tell), “order”, “command”, “ask” etc. in English and “demək”, “əmr etmək”, “sərəncam vermək”, “tapşiriq vermək” etc. in Azerbaijani. But potentially the content of these structural units exist in elliptic constructions themselves and they are thought to be easily reconstructed.

E.g. 1. *We are obeyed the order, they say (order, command, ask) pull down this building, we pull down, they say ruin this street, we ruin, they say build a new building, we build a new one.*

2. Biz əmrə tabeyik, deyirlər (əmr edirlər, sərəncam verirlər, tapşırıq verirlər), bu binanı sök, biz də sökürük, deyirlər bu küçəni dağıt, biz də dağıdırıq, deyirlər, yeni bina ucalt, yenisini ucaldırıq.

II. In the second case the subordinate clause of the first component which is parallel to the second component is not used. It should be mentioned that this case is not found in the English language.

E.g. Balaş: *Ortadan qapını bağla, bu yana çıxma.*

Sevil: Yaxşı, Balaş, deyirsən, çıxmamam. (C.Cabbarlı)

Analysing the above mentioned complex syntactic unit, we can see that in the second component the subordinate object clause “*çixma*” isn’t used here. This complex syntactic unit should be sounded like this.

E.g. Sevil: *Yaxşı, Balaş, deyirsən, çixma, çixmamam.*

It should be mentioned that though there is informatic likeness between complete and incomplete forms, we can’t find the semantic identity between them. So the semantic shade of colouring in incomplete forms, especially emotional-expressive shades of colouring shows definite semantic separation. In such kind of complex syntactic units there are some puzzled types which exist not only two parallel components but more than two and in this case the previous components remain wholly but the last component undergoes the ellipsis.

E.g. At dedin, verdik, ata arpa dedin, verdik, atın yəhər-əsbabı yoxdur, onu da aldıq. (S.Kərimov).

There are three parallel constructions in the above mentioned complex syntactic unit. While comparing them in paradigmatic line, we may observe that the principal clause of the third parallel construction undergoes ellipsis. In comparison with two previous parallel construction, that component must be reconstructed, like this: “*atın yəhər – əsbabı yoxdur, dedin, onu da aldıq*”.

The ellipsis of the principal clauses happens to be widely used in direct speech. So using the proverbs and sayings in our speech we usually use before them the author's words: *“there is such a saying / proverb”, “belə məsəl var”, “fathers said” “atalar deyiblər”, “they say so” “belə deyirlər” etc.* and according to those expressions the sentence constructions are used like this.

E.g. 1. *There is such a proverb – “A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush”*

2. *Atalar deyib ki, “soğan olsun, nəğd olsun”.*

3. *They say so “don’t look a gift horse in the mouth”.*

4. *Belə deyirlər “bəy verən atın dişinə baxmazlar” etc.*

Unlike the English language, in Azerbaijani even both of these stable constructions *“məsəl var, deyirlər”* are used simultaneously and they perform the function of homogenous principal clause.

E.g. *Bizlərdə belə bir atalar məsəli var, deyirlər: Gözdən uzaq, könüldən iraq.*

There is a proverb in our language, they say “out of sight, out of mind”.

Proverbs and sayings are widely used among the creators of that language and there is no any additional information of showing the source of the expression and there is no need of using separate sentence structure (the principal clause). On this account M.Adilov writes: *“The effect of proverbs is stronger than the above mentioned principal clauses. It should be mentioned that the quantity of words used in sentences and the effective feeling of words are non proportionate”* [12, p.49]. In reality the missing of that mentioned standard sentence gives the lightness to the complex syntactic unit and increases its effective force, emotional shades of colouring.

E.g. 1. *Hey, men, a good beginning makes a good ending.*

2. *A kişilər, könlü balıq istəyənin suya girsən gərək.*

3. *It is your fault, don’t halloo till you are out of the wood.*

4. *İndi cəzandır çək, özgəyə quyu qazan özü düşər etc.*

The predicate of the ellipsis of the principal clause expressed by the verbs *“say”, “demək”* is not only connected with the proverbs and sayings, but also the other constructions are observed in languages of different system.

E.g. 1. *Cliff – She’s hurt. Are you all right?*

Alison – Well, does it look it?

Cliff – She’s burnt her arm on the iron.

Jimmy – Darling, I am sorry

Alison – Get out!

Jimmy – I’m sorry, believe me.

You think, I did it on pur...

Alison – Clear out of my sight (Modern English plays)

2. *Kişi yazığı gözlərindən o yana qoydular bəyəm.*

Getmə gözümdən, gedərik özümdən (Ş. Qurbanov)

Analysing the semantic interrelationship of the above mentioned complex syntactic units it is proved that in English sentence the component “*You say*” is abridged: Though they have structural completeness, that’s the outer case. Their wholly informative thought reveals the incompleteness. It is the same about the Azerbaijani complex syntactic unit. Here in the second sentence the predicate of the principal clause which is expressed by the verb “*deyirlər*” is abridged.

The fact of ellipsis happens in such complex syntactic units the predicate of which is expressed by the verb “*to see*” in English and “*görmək*” in Azerbaijani principal clauses. Without going into details it should be mentioned that such kind of principal clauses demands the object subordinate clauses in both compared languages. The results of investigation prove that in these complex syntactic units the verbs “*see*” and “*görmək*” are used in “**wh**” questions. And these sentences express community and abstractness. In such type of complex syntactic units the content of the question “*what*” “*nə*” should be revealed. Here “*what*” “*nə*” perform the function of direct object in the sentence: “*what did we see?*”, “*nə gördük?*”.

The following sentence of this question may be either a simple sentence or a complex syntactic unit. In the second case the object subordinate clause is used.

E.g. 1. *Going what did we see? We saw that she was sitting with her hands on her knees and thinking*

2. *Gedib nə gördük? Gördük ki, Cahangir oturub əli çənəsində dərin xəyala dalıb.*

In answering to the verb “*saw*” “*gördük*” that is used in the principal clause and repeated twice. The usage and repetition of the verb “*saw*”, “*gördük*” not only hinders the speed speech but also restricts the effective and emotional force of the expression.

The frequent usage of the verb “*to look*”, “*baxmaq*” is a lot. In such kind of complex syntactic units the ellipsis of the verbal predicate “*saw*” “*gördü*” happen and in the relationship of the semantical-grammatical relations of the components behave strangely. Here the usage of the conjunction “*that*” “*ki*” is not proved itself. Here the semantic relation of the components is not on the surface but on the deep structure of the complex syntactic units.

E.g. 1. *He looked that the younger guests immediately had put one their skates.*

2. *Şahzadə Əbülfəz baxdı ki, Rəna xanımın rəngi-ruhu qaçıb.*

3. *Mr.Winkle looked that he was very pleased, but looked rather uncomfortable.*

4. *Baxdı ki, üç atlı toz-torpağın içində çaparaq ona doğru gəlir.*

In reality double situation happens in such kind of complex syntactic units.

The first one is that the question “*to what?*” “*nəyə?*” was borne out of the principal clause and it has more determining character. If we take this item into consideration, then these complex syntactic units are considered to be the object subordinate clauses. But we can't agree with this view point. In the second case the interrelationship of the semantic and grammatical relations is one sided and it is in outer frame, by means of it the corresponding relationship potentially seems to be in the principal clause. On this account, it seems to us that those complex syntactic units should be approached from the second position and they should be presented as elliptic constructions. The verbs “*say*” “*demək*” and “*see*” “*görmək*” are widely used in compared English and Azerbaijani languages and they can easily pass their semantic weight to the other language units which are linked. By the result of it the

predicates expressed by those verbs in the principal clause, they sometimes miss these verbs and they don't give any harm to the complex syntactic units.

E.g. 1. *Hearing this, one of Mr.Winkles' friends immediately lay on the ground, I'm dying.*

2. *Vurulanda tır uzanıb yerə, əl-ayağını uzadıb ki, ölürəm.*

3. *One fine winter day Mr.Wardle entered the house that his friends were staying and waiting for him.*

4. *Zaman həyatə girdi ki, atası mühəccərə söykənib fikirli halda siqaret çəkir.*

Analysing the above mentioned complex syntactic units we can observe that the first two complexes embraced potentially the meaning of the verb “says” “deyir” but in the last two complex syntactic units potentially the verbs “saw” “gördü” existed. From this point of view those complex syntactic units are considered to be object subordinate clauses. Some scholars don't pay attention to the ellipsis here and treat these complex syntactic units as adverbial clauses of time. Though these complex syntactic units are not of the same structure but close in meaning to them. This view point is widely spread in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *Gəldik ki, məclis qurulub.*

(When we came the party was organized)

While investigating this complex syntactic unit it is clear that there is no semantic interrelationship of the components due to the time.

It happens when the expression “o zaman” “at that time” is used within that complex syntactic unit.

E.g. *O zaman gəldi ki, məclis qurulub.*

But in the above complex syntactic unit it is impossible to add the expression “o zaman”. Here the object relation seems and it is realized with the homogeneous predicate “gördük” which underwent the ellipsis.

E.g. *Gəldik gördük ki, məclis qurulub.*

(We came and saw that the party was organized)

Unfortunately the fact of ellipsis not always reconstructed resultatively but also there are some elliptic complex syntactic units which are changed the types of subordinate clauses by reconstructing them.

E.g. 1. *Pilkins slowly stood up: who was that coming at this time?*

2. *Asta-asta divana oturdu bu vaxt gələn kim ola?*

Analysing the above mentioned complex syntactic units it has been proved that “*who was that coming at this time?*” “*bu vaxt gələn kim ola?*” are not connected with the principal clauses directly by the semantical-grammatical points wholly. The reason is that in those complex constructions the subordinate clause, in reality, is closely connected with the abridged expression in the principal clause. This may be reconstructed by different ways. In the first case we may use the verb “*thought*” “*fikirləşdi*” in the principal clause and we may be aware of the completing subordinate clauses. In this case the type of subordinate clauses will be the object subordinate clauses.

E.g. 1. *Pilkins slowly stood up and thought who was that coming at this time.*

2. *Asta-asta divana oturdu və fikirləşdi ki, bu vaxt gələn kim ola.*

But in the second case not only the homogeneous predicate, but also the whole principal clause which is interrelated with the subordinate clause is reconstructed.

E.g. 1. *Pilkins slowly stood up and was in such a mind who was that coming at this time.*

2. *Divana oturdu və onu belə bir fikir apardı ki, bu vaxt gələn kim ola.*

By the result of this reconstruction the other relation between the components may appear. Here the thought – logical relation is the same but the grammatical relation is quite different. So, in the second reconstruction the attributive subordinate clauses are formalized.

There are some kinds of elliptic forms which depend upon the components of the text within and without the previous and following constructions it'll be difficult to make the thought wholly. Such complex syntactic units are widely used in Azerbaijani.

E.g. *Soba, ay Soba, de görüş qazlar hara uçdu?*

Soba, hey Soba, tell me where the geese flew?

Çovdar kökəmdən ye, deyim.

Eat my rye cookey, I'll tell.

Qiz boyun qaçırdı

The girl rejected

Atamın evində buğda unundan bişmiş kökəmi yemirəm.

At my father's I don't eat wheat floured cookey.

In the above mentioned dialogue the last complex syntactic unit seems to be complete but it is in external form. But in reality this complex syntactic unit has got the elliptic form. If that sentence is used out of the text it'll express quite other meaning.

E.g. *Atamın evində buğda unundan bişmiş kökəmi yemirəm, deyirsən, sənün çovdar kökəndən yeyim?*

I don't eat wheat floured cookey at my father's, you say, I'll eat your rye cookey

This is the construction of concession having the relation in composite – compound sentence but the second component of which is wholly the object subordinate clause. The ellipsis of that component causes the formation of an incomplete form. So not going into the deep structure of this complex syntactic unit it is difficult to show its semantic weight and reconstruct the whole structure by approaching only the outer point.

B. Incomplete forms. One of the forms of complex syntactic units is incomplete form. Before investigating this form profoundly we should naturally consider the analysis of a word incomplete without its combinability. But for some reason the combinability of sentences is not regarded important.

One might think that each sentence is an absolutely independent unit, the forms and meanings of which do not depend on its neighbours in speech. But it is not so. Investigating different kind of research papers shows that in a very real sense very few groups of words which we would unanimously punctuate as sentences can really be called complete or capable of standing alone. Most of the sentences that we speak

are dependent on what has been said before. It goes without saying that in a book of this kind the uninvestigated problem of the combinability of sentences cannot get adequate treatment. We can only point out some lines of approach. As we know the demarcation line between a sentence and a combination of sentences is very vague. Some part of a simple or complex syntactic unit may become detached from the rest and pronounced after a pause with the intonation of a separate sentence. In writing this is often marked by punctuation. Here are some examples from “A cup of Tea” by Mansfield.

She'd only to cross the pavement But still she waited
Give me four bunches of those And that far of roses
Give me those stumpy little to lips Those red and white ones

The connection between such sentences is quite evident. The word-combination those red and white ones can make a communication only when combined with some sentence whose predication is understood to refer to the word-combination as well.

But even in case a sentence has its own predication, it may depend on some other sentence, or be coordinated with it, or otherwise connected, so that they form a combination of sentences. In the first of the examples above this connection is expressed by the conjunction “but”. The following sentences are connected by the pronominal subjects.

E.g. *Rosemary had been married two years.*

She had a duck of a boy...

They were rich (Mansfield).

Speaking of the “definite restrictions on order” found in sequences longer than sentences H.Gleason writes that such kind of examples, “*John came*” “*he went away*” might imply that John did both. But “*he came*”, “*John went away*” certainly could not have that meaning.

The sentences below are connected by what we might be tempted to call “pronominal predicates”, and by the implicit repetition of the notional predicate group of the first sentence.

E.g. *Come home to tea with me.*

Why won't you? Do. (Mansfield)

The second sentence might be extended at the expense of the first into “*why won't you come?*” or even “*why won't you come home to tea with me?*” Similarly, the third sentence is understood by the listener as “*Do come*” or “*Do come home to tea with me*”. We find no predication in the second sentence of the following dialogue.

E.g. *How is the little chap feeling?*

Very sorry for himself (Galsworthy).

But this is not a sentence of the “*Rain*” type, with a zero predication. Here we know the subject. It is the “*chap*” of the first sentence. And we know the structural predicate “*is*”. So the person who asked the question perceived the answer as if it had the predication fully expressed:

E.g. *The little chap is very sorry for himself.*

Traditionally sentences like “*very sorry for himself*”, with some part (or parts) left out are called incomplete. But as a matter of fact they are quite complete in their proper places in speech. They would become incomplete only if isolated from the sentences with which they are combined in speech, i.e. when regarded as language units with only paradigmatic relations, without syntagmatic ones.

When a speaker combines a sentence with a previous sentence in speech, he often leaves out some redundant parts that are clear from the foregoing sentence, otherwise speech would be cumbersome. A sentence is thus often reduced to one word only.

E.g. *-Where are you going, old man*

-Jericho (Galsworthy)

-What have you got there, daddiest?

-Dynamite (Shaw).

Theoretically, one and the same sentence may be represented differently in speech, depending on the sentence it is combined with.

Suppose, we take the sentence “*John returned from Moscow yesterday*”. If this sentence is to be the answer to “*who returned from Moscow yesterday?*” it may be reduced to “*John*”. As an answer to “*when did John return from Moscow?*” it may be reduced to “*yesterday*”. In answer to “*where did John return yesterday from?*” it

may take the form of “*Moscow*”. Thus, “*John*” “*yesterday*” “*Moscow*” may be regarded as positionally conditioned speech variants of a regular two-member sentence.

As is seen above mentioned incomplete forms of simple sentence structures were profoundly investigated. But it wasn't searched out on the complex syntactic units. A.Karnaukhova investigated incomplete subordinate clauses but he paid a great attention to the incompleteness of the components within the types of subordinate clauses [69, 1982]. Incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units are widely used in dialogues. On this account F.Agayeva writes: “the unit of dialogue is always used as a complex speech unit. The components of the dialogue speech looks like the parts of complex syntactic units due to the syntactic character” [8, 15-16].

Incomplete sentences differ from the elliptic sentences quietly. In elliptic sentences the incompleteness is felt but it is too difficult to reconstruct them; the component of the undergone ellipsis is difficult to determine.

But incomplete sentences the missed component can be reconstructed by the help of the previous sentences. That's why incomplete sentences concern to the dialogical speech. If incomplete sentences concern to the dialogical speech, the elliptic sentences are widely used in usual speech. On the other hand, if in elliptic forms the postpositive subordinate clauses undergo the ellipsis, in incomplete forms usually postpositive principal clauses are missing. If elliptic forms happen in some types of subordinate clauses, incomplete forms may be seen in all types of subordinate clauses. Incomplete form doesn't consist of only subordinate clauses. Sometimes the principal clauses perform as an incomplete form. Such constructions mostly happen in answers to interlocutor's questions.

E.g. 1. *Well, tell me, when did you come back?*

-Three days.

2. *Yaxşı, bir de görək, nə vaxt gəlmisən?*

-Üç gündür.

It should be mentioned that to answer this question the time is needed. As is seen, the given answer shows the time of the action. But that complex construction is a subordinate clause of subject.

E.g. 1. *It is three days that I came*

2. *Üç gündür ki, gəlmişəm.*

One of the characteristic features of the dialogue is that the speech patterns concerning to different interlocutors are not closely related. As is seen they are not related in consecutive order. It is the same of the incomplete form of the complex syntactic units.

E.g. 1. *Who was invited, let him wait*

-Is there any news?

-Surprise has been prepared for them

2. *Kim dəvət olunubsa, gözləsin*

-Təsə xəbər var?

-Onlar üçün sürpriz hazırlanıb.

In the above mentioned examples the first sentences are complex syntactic units. If after them there wasn't used a question, it wouldn't be incomplete form of the complex syntactic unit. As is seen above mentioned patterns the third constructions are incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units. These constructions depend not on the interrogative sentences but on the first sentences as well. As they are related with the whole sentences, they may be related with the postpositive principal clause.

E.g. I. a) *Who was invited, let him wait because surprise had been prepared for them.*

b) *Who was invited, surprise had been prepared for them.*

II. a) *Kim dəvət olunubsa, gözləsin, çünki onlar üçün sürpriz hazırlanıb.*

b) *Kim dəvət olunubsa, onlar üçün sürpriz hazırlanıb.*

As is seen on both complex syntactic units the principal clauses with different semantical-grammatical relations are connected with the subordinate clauses. In other words the second pole is connected with the first pole. If in a) complex

syntactic units we meet the adverbial clauses of cause, in b) complex syntactic units the object subordinate clauses are formalized. But it seems to us that the first reconstruction is more correct than the second one.

Let us compare another incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units.

E.g. I. *I'm asking you to marry me, Irene.*

It's impossible!

“No”, it isn't. I love you, Irene, I've always loved you. And I know right now that you....

Stop it! It's absolutely impossible!

He stared. What do you mean? Are you.... are you married now?

(D.Carter, Fatherless Sons).

II. *İren, mən səndən xahiş edirəm mənimlə ailə qurasan.*

Bu mümkün deyildir!

Xeyir, mümkün deyildir. Mən səni sevirəm, İren.

Mən həmişə səni sevmişəm. Və mən elə indicə anlayıram ki...

Dayanın! Bu həqiqətən qeyri-mümkündür.

O gözünü zillədi. Sən nəyi nəzərdə tutursan?

Sən... sən indi ailə qurmaq istəyirsən?

While investigating the above mentioned part taken out of the novel “Fatherless Sons” by D.Carter, we observe that these sentences are related with each other strongly. But in the incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units “*And I knew right now that you*”... “*Və mən elə indicə anlayıram ki,*” require the completeness of the thought. But its completeness was given in the last sentence. It shows that “*and I know right now that you are going to marry now*” “*Və mən elə indicə anlayıram ki, sən elə bu saat ailə qurmaq fikrindəsən*” are the object subordinate clauses.

III. Abridged forms. The third incomplete form of the complex syntactic units is the abridged form. The abridged forms of the complex syntactic units are not investigated properly on both compared languages. Both elliptic and incomplete forms have been searched out profoundly and systematically, so these terms are

familiar to us. But “abridged sentence”, “abridged form” are firstly used by us. Unlike the elliptic and incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units, the missing of one of the components of complex syntactic units carries out a situative character. The reconstruction of the undergone components of elliptic and incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units is not so necessary. It isn’t needed that the missing components are reconstructed. Even this form is more acceptable than the whole form of the complex syntactic units. In this case the required information is rightly given in incomplete forms. On the other hand the fact of ellipsis carries out a situative character in elliptic and incomplete forms of the complex syntactic units. In this case much shouldn’t be spoken about the usage of the ellipsis of the component in complex syntactic units.

In abridged form, one of the components of complex syntactic units isn’t used. On the other hand the incompleteness of the structure, meaning and information is strictly felt on them. Finally, the missing of one of the components concretely is not the language fact, but it is closely connected with extralinguistic factors. On this account the abridged form differs from those two forms in its stylistic and situative existence. This form has more structural-semantic points.

It is important to mention that unlike the elliptic and incomplete forms, the abridged form loses the second component because here the fact of ellipsis is not a thinkable act in advance. Here, not using either principal or subordinate clauses placed in the prepositional situation is not so important. That’s why after using the first component, the second component in serving the writer’s aim has the stylistic device and may be omitted. On this account the second component of the complex syntactic unit may be omitted either by the speaker himself or by the result of other hindrances depending on the situation. By the help of this hinder the speech is stopped and is not said. As the abridged forms of complex syntactic units are related with the extralinguistic factors, it is too difficult to determine their linguistic appointment. It is difficult to explain their potential information weight, structural-semantics and grammatical-functional features. On this account the role of principal and subordinate clauses ellipsis is of great importance. In abridged forms of some

complex syntactic units, the principal clause precedes the subordinate clause which is omitted. In this case it is too difficult to determine the types of subordinate clause within complex syntactic units. The structural basis of the abridged form of the complex syntactic units consisting of the prepositive principal clause should be determined by this cause. Let us pay attention to the following abridged forms of the complex syntactic units:

E.g. I. *Jimmy – I said do the papers make you feel you're not so brilliant after all?*

Alison – Oh, I haven't read them yet

Jimmy – I didn't ask you that. I said...

Cliff – Leave the poor girl alone she's busy.

Jimmy – Well, she can talk, can't she?

You can talk, can't you? You can express an opinion. Or does the white women's. Burden make it impossible to think. (Modern English plays)

II. *Özünüzdə dediniz ki... deyə Qəvim üzünü sildi. (O.Salamzadə)*

III. *Cliff (leaning forward) – Listen....*

I'm trying to better myself, let me get on with it, you big, horrible man.

Give it me. (Look back in anger by John Osborne).

IV. *Eh həkim, məni bağışla ki...*

-O yenidən huşunu itirib çarpayıya yıxıldı.

Analysing the above mentioned complex syntactic units, we can observe that in English variants “*I said...*” and “*Listen...*”, in Azerbaijani variants “*özünüzdə dediniz ki...*” and “*Eh, həkim, məni bağışla ki...*” are incomplete forms. The characteristic features of those incomplete forms of complex syntactic units are that all of them are incomplete forms of their structural and informative sides. But the attitude of the determining principal and subordinate clauses by structurally and informatively differs from the first elliptical and incomplete forms. If semantical-grammatical determination of the elliptical and incomplete constructions were cleared out in themselves, here, in abridged forms of the complex syntactic units though grammatico-structural determination were possible, to achieve the semantical determination would be impossible. If in elliptic and incomplete forms of the

complex syntactic units, the ellipsis happened in less important component semantically, here, on the contrary, the component having the meaning and information wouldn't be used.

E.g. I. *Somebody said... what was it... we get out our cooking from Paris, our politics from Moscow, and our morals from Port said. (Look back in anger by John Osborne).*

II. *Geoffrey – I don't see. Why couldn't you have told us....? Your mother and me.*

Billy – I've said... I was meaning to. (Look back in anger by John Osborne)

III. *Well, I am going to see your rotten mother...*

...I'll tell you that (Look back in anger by John Osborne).

IV. *Səndən əvvəl açana demişdi ki...*

Elə səs demişdi ki, sənin sözün də ona qüvvət oldu.

V. *Sonra tale belə gətirdi ki...*

Sonrasını bilirəm.

As is seen above mentioned complex syntactic units the abridged forms "somebody said", "why couldn't you have told us...?", "I've said...", "Well, I am going to see your rotten mother...", "Səndən əvvəl açana demişdi ki...", "Sonra tale belə gətirdi ki..." have got the situative character. The information given by these forms is hidden in them, that's in closed unrevealed case.

The thought expressed by the missing component is given indirectly. In this case new information being clear to the interlocutor, the thought sometimes stops and abridged form appears.

E.g. I. *Then the fortune happened so...*

I know the ending...

II. *Sonra tale belə gətirdi ki...*

Sonrasını bilirəm (F.KərimSadə).

Like the other incomplete of the complex syntactic units, repetitions have a great role in formalizing the abridged form. Using the repetitions in compared English and

Azerbaijani languages is not in need of informatic-communicative demand but it is mostly in need of expressive-emotional demand.

E.g. I. *I promise that I'll think first and step from now on.*

I promise that I'll do nothing to do harm to your name.

II. *Söz verirəm ki, bundan sonra hər addımımı düşünüb atacağam.*

Sös verirəm ki, sənin adına xələl gətirəcək bir iş görməyəcəyəm.

In the above mentioned patterns, mostly the repetition component is abridged and the rest component of the second parallel construction is related with the corresponding component of the first construction.

E.g. I *promise from now on that I'll think first and step and do nothing to do harm to your name.*

Söz verirəm ki, bundan sonra hər addımımı düşünüb atacağam, sənin adına xələl gətirəcək bir iş görməyəcəyəm.

It should be mentioned that the interrelationship of form and content, the quantity of language units has got a great role. On this account the factor of language units homonymous reduce its activity on the syntactic level. This is closely connected with the complicated structure of the complex syntactic units and it tends to the concreteness of them. No matter of what happened, the units of syntactic level like the units of the other levels have got the homonymous character. There are some cases in compared languages that the subordinate clauses are connected with the principal clauses of one meaning, but at the same time the principal clauses are connected with the subordinate clauses of quite other meaning. Sometimes we may meet joint types of complex syntactic units in compared languages.

E.g. I. *Who was sitting on a bench hidden behind the bushes in Hyde park, they could hardly make out the faces of the people who were walking past him and hear the sound of their voices.*

II. *Kim bu müqəddəs yolda həlak olubsa, onlar xalqın qəlbində əbədi məkan salmışlar, onları xalqımız yaşadıqca unutmayacaq.*

While analyzing the above mentioned complex syntactic units we can observe an interesting scene. If in the English complex syntactic unit, the first type of

subordinate clause is the subject subordinate clause, but the second one is the attributive subordinate clause, unlike the English language, in Azerbaijani complex syntactic unit the first type of subordinate clause is the subject subordinate clause but the second one is the object subordinate clause. As is seen above mentioned explanation we can observe two different kinds of subordinate clauses.

In formalizing the joint types of complex syntactic units the verbs of speech get a great role. In the predicate of the principal clauses mostly the verb “to say” “demək” is used. In using this verb we can meet two functional attitudes in correlation of this verb with the subordinate clause: object and purpose.

E.g. I. *Crying Norman Gortsby was saying that the newcomer should not be allowed to be sad.*

II. *Qışqıra-qışqıra deyirdi ki, heç kim çıxmasın.*

We can think above mentioned complex syntactic units either the object subordinate clauses or the adverbial clauses of purpose.

In the first case if we think that said complex syntactic units are the types of object clauses, the component of subordinate clause is connected with the predicate of the component of principal clause indirectly, and it is related with it more semantical shade. In other words here “was saying” “deyirdi” get the meaning of the verb “inform” “xəbərdarlıq edirdi”. In the second case in English complex syntactic unit we think “what was Norman Gortsby saying crying?” but in Azerbaijani complex syntactic unit “Nəyi qışqıra-qışqıra deyirdi?”.

While investigating the complex syntactic units in non-kindred English and Azerbaijani languages we observed that one of the components of the complex syntactic units may be expressed by phraseologisms. As is known phraseologism expresses emotional attitude and this attitude tends to any kind of real fact. On this account either the first component or the second component, even both of the components of complex syntactic units may have the phraseological character. The complex syntactic units having phraseological may be subdivided into two large groups:

1. One of the components of complex syntactic units having the phraseological character.

2. The complex syntactic units both of which components joint phraseological character.

While investigating the first item, we can say that either the components of principal clause or of subordinate clause may become the phraseological character. If the constructions of the principal clause is phraseological, the lining up of the components may have either stylistic factor or the factor of suitable time.

E.g. I. 1) *Simpson says never put off till tomorrow what you can do today.*

2) *Oh, God, I also want to say a happy heart is better than a full purse.*

II. 1) *Kor şeytan deyir, bu pulların bir qismini aradan çıxart.*

2) *Vallahi, mənim də ürəyim istəyir səni görəyim, oturub söhbət edim.*

Grammatically the above mentioned complex syntactic units are object subordinate clauses but semantically those complex syntactic units express emotional attitude and are related with the corresponding subordinate clauses unrealy. These types of complex syntactic units are used asyndetically and it shows that the modality overcomes them.

In reality the principal clauses expressing modal attitude have the functions of parenthesis. But the semantical-grammatical character of the words in these components and the character of interrelationship of the components give us the opportunity of learning them as principal clauses. In determining of the grammatical units, the structural character is taken the leading one and in this case the semantics itself serves to it. On the other hands being given any thought and content figuratively doesn't mean that there is no sentence-semantics and the main thought there. Depending upon the aim of any sentence there may be more or less modal attitude or subjective.

Summing up all above mentioned we may come into conclusion that in non-kindred English and Azerbaijani languages elliptic, incomplete and abridged forms are widely used in complex syntactic units as they are used in simple, two member sentences.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XVI.

1. Does the problem of complex sentence need new scientific analysis?
2. Should semantics of complex syntactic units in compared languages be studied in different aspects?
3. Do the principal and subordinate clauses serve the context of one whole thought?
4. Which one is more concrete: semantical structure or structural-semantics of the sentence?
5. In what situations is the ellipsis of the components of complex sentences manifested?
6. What can you say about elliptic forms of complex syntactic units?
7. Speak about the incomplete forms of complex sentences.
8. Speak about the abridged forms of complex sentences.
9. What is the main difference between the incomplete and elliptic forms of complex syntactic units?
10. What is the main difference between the abridged and incomplete forms of complex syntactic units?

CHAPTER XVII.

MAIN LEVELS AND PROCESSES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGES. LINGUISTIC DIFFERENTIATION AND INTEGRATION

No scholar in the world knows the exact number of the languages. The book “Linguistics and guide of language intercourse” which was published in Germany shows that there are 5651 languages in the world. But some sources note that there are 3000 languages in the world. It should be noted that 1400 languages out of them couldn't have obtained their independence.

Paying a great attention to the quantity of languages in the world we'd like to concentrate our view points to the aim of different languages, processes and levels of their development.

On the one hand it is connected with their different development, process, but on the other hand it is connected with its studying. The question arises which language should be considered independent? Unfortunately there are some languages in the world which quite differ from their dialects.

/Compare: Beijing and Shankhay dialects of China/.

Certainly, the population of those two dialects don't understand each other.

All these testimony that everything will be vague until all the languages are studied profoundly. We can't say that all the languages have the same development process. Moreover we should mention that development process of languages must pass through two specific ways. One of them is differentiation, the other is integration.

Differentiation is the initial stage of language development. In feudalism the tribes began separating and of course these separated tribes could carry out their own dialects. Settling on a new place there appeared some differences between the tribes' dialects. Time passes and those differences begin developing in all levels and systems of dialects. So, increasing these different points influences the independence

of languages. But the origin of these languages remain unchanged. Certainly, independent languages help to organize kindred languages.

Summing up all above mentioned we may come into conclusion that:

- a) differentiation is the main reason of formalizing kindred languages;
- b) differentiation serves the languages to be increasing rapidly.

Integration process - is contrary to differentiation. Integration is the reason of decreasing the languages. It organizes one language out of dialects and different languages. There are two kinds of integration:

- a) integration between languages;
- b) integration within languages.

If independent languages formalize one language, that's the integration between languages. But if there formalizes one language by joining common points of dialects, it is the integration within languages.

The development of languages has historical stages like historical processes. It is impossible to say that all the languages of the world have the same historical processes and stages. First of all, it is connected with their historical development and local condition of languages. Different social formation influences and sometimes changes the structure of existing languages. Of course feudalism society didn't look like the previous and the following societies. But how to understand this postulation? To explain it, let's suppose that our country – Azerbaijan lives in feudalism society. There are different tribes here and there is not any close connections among those tribes. So we can notice different dialects and each of them has its own language. One and the same notion is expressed by different words by those tribes. **E.g.** In order to show “bigness, largeness” one of those tribes uses the word “*böyük*”, another – “*yekə*” and the other “*iri*” but another one “*nəhəng*” etc. But time passes and historical development of these tribes is eager to have social, political and economical relations with each other. So different tribes of this area join and this factor makes it be appearing one language. That language continually develops and because of some special historical-conditional science, one of those dialects mentioned above becomes the most highly developed from that view point.

In case of the English language such dialect was the dialect used in London and the country near it.

Already in the XIV century London became the centre of English administrative, political and cultural life. The importance of London dialect had so much increased by the XVI century that all the business papers, political pamphlets were written in that dialect. The pronunciation standard of London was used at schools and universities and at theatre and what is the most important in church. It was introduced at English Grammar schools and already in XVII century, it became literary standard of English. It has got of the received language.

The variants of the English language spoken in Africa, in Egypt, in Australia, in Canada, in India and so on have very much in common, but they differ from standard English in pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. The variants of a national language should not be confused with its regional types.

J.Kenyon distinguishes four principal styles of good spoken English:

- a) familiar colloquial;
- b) formal colloquial;
- c) public-speaking style;
- d) public-reading style.

He notes that there is a tendency nowadays among public speakers toward a formal colloquial style, the difference from colloquial style being more in subject matter and vocabulary than in pronunciation.

D.Crystal and D.Davy consider that the term “the English language” is not a single homogeneous phenomena at all, but rather a complex of many different “varieties” of language in use in all kinds of situation. They consider that the differences between these varieties are due to the kind of social situation the speaker is in, including the social position of the speaker and the person spoken to. It should be mentioned that informality of conversational English is also created by unexpected introduction of dialect forms, elements of very formal language, slips of the tongue, hesitant draws, uneven tempo, significant variants in loudness, paralinguistic features, such as laugh, giggle, etc.

Summing up all above mentioned we may say that this process continue and will never stop.

However, we are not concerned here with the historical aspect of dialectical words. For our purpose it will suffice to note that there is a definite similarity of functions in the use of slang, cockney and any other form of non-literary English and that of dialectical words. All these groups when used in emotive prose are meant to characterize the speaker as a person of a certain locality, breeding, education, etc.

There is sometimes a difficulty in distinguishing dialectical words from colloquial words. Some dialectical words have become so familiar in good colloquial or standard colloquial English that they are universally accepted as recognized units of the standard colloquial English. To these words belong “*lass*”, meaning “*a girl or a beloved girl*”; “*lad*” – corresponding “*a boy or a young man*”, “*daft*” from the Scottish and the northern dialect, meaning of “*silly*”, “*fash*” – meaning of “*trouble*”, “*cares*” etc. Still they have not lost their dialectical associations and therefore are used in literary English with the above-mentioned stylistic function of characterization.

Most of the examples so far quoted come from the Scottish and the Northern dialect. This is explained by the fact that Scotland has struggled to retain the peculiarities of her language, claiming it to be independent. Therefore many of the words fixed in dictionaries as dialectical are of Scottish origin.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XVII.

1. What is the differentiation?
2. How do you understand the process of integration?
3. What can you say about the kinds of integration?
4. When did London become the centre of English administrative, political and cultural life?
5. What can you say J.Kenyon’s view point about “good spoken English”?
6. What can you say about the terms “literary and non-literary English”?
7. What is the difference between slang and cockney language?

8. What kind of words are fixed in dictionaries of Scottish origin?
9. Which stages of differentiation or integration is more important in linguistics?
10. How does any language develop?
11. What do D.Crystal and D.Davy understand under the term “the English language?”
12. Why does any language embrace a lot of varieties?
13. What do you understand under the term “variety”?
14. Is there any difference between variety and invariety?
15. Which one of variety or invariety is constant and stable? Why?

CHAPTER XVIII.

TYOLOGY OF GRAPHIC ARTS, ORTHOEPY AND ORTHOGRAPHY IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

Different linguistic branches in English and Azerbaijani. Graphic arts, orthography, orthoepy, lexicography and linguistic translation.

Different linguistic branches exist in many languages. Main branches of foreign and native languages are: graphic arts, orthography, orthoepy, lexicography and linguistic translation.

Graphic arts is a wide notion. We can meet this notion not only in linguistics but also in other spheres of the arts. This word comes from Greek word “graphicos” – which means “drawing of something”.

In Chambers 21st century Dictionary by Mairi Robinson and George Davidson, this word is characterized as follows: “the art or science of drawing according to mathematical principles, especially the drawing of three dimensional objects on a two dimensional surface”. Besides upper meaning it can also be characterized as shown below:

- 1) the photographs and illustrations used in a magazine;
- 2) the non-acted visual parts of a film or television programme;
- 3) the use of computers to display and manipulate information in graphical or pictorial form, either on a visual-display unit or plotter;
- 4) the images that are produced by this” [50, 584].

Graphic in arts is one of the kinds of this subject. The works applying to this sphere have been drawn by lines. But graphic arts in linguistics is one of the parts which shows the forms of writing, the pronunciation of this or that sound, showing the sound of any letters, etc.

The history of graphic arts in linguistics began spreading at the first half of XIX century. In this century scholars observed the differences between the letters and sounds, their forms and structure and put forward different conceptions concerning

it. And by virtue of it graphic arts in linguistics as a branch formed and defined its aim and object. Graphic arts consists of two parts:

- a) the characteristic feature of the sum of lines in writing;
- b) the interrelationship between letters and sounds.

The main problem of graphic arts is to define the quantity of lines in the usage of writing and interpret characteristic features of them. By mentioning the quantity of lines, the total of letters we understand apostrophy, stress, the forms of punctuation marks, their totality and structure.

A.A.Reformatsky put forward that all the signs of writing (pictogramme, idiogramme and the retains of sillograms) should belong to graphic arts. In each national graphic system, the letters occupy a special place by their line characters and other means. We should mention beforehand that these lines of graphic means have relative character. Here, no point even the close phonetic features of the sounds should be taken into consideration.

E.g. In English the close phonetics features of the sounds **[b]** and **[p]**; **[v]** and **[f]**; in Azerbaijani **[b]** and **[p]**; in Russian **[н]** - **[б]**- **[т]** - **[д]** - **[в]** - **[ф]** etc. are used differently.

Consequently we should mention that the sounds which are not close phonetically, may be reflected by the repetition of the same sign.

E.g. In English **[n]** and **[m]**; **[u]** and **[w]**; in Azerbaijani **[n]** and **[m]** but in Russian **[н]** and **[м]**; **[у]** and **[м]** are repeated either two or three times.

According to their form, size and structure the letters differ from the phonographic writings.

The size of the letters. In ancient phonographic writings the letters had only one writing forms. But the history of the writing developed and in some writings the letters were used in two forms and now they are formed in this aspect.

Greek, Latin and Russian writing systems should be shown for this. According to this graphic writings they are divided into two letters based on this system: capital letters and small letters.

Without going into details we should mention that there are also some languages in the world having one writing forms of letters. **E.g.** the Georgian language. The letters of the Georgian language don't differ and they are used only in one form.

Capital letters. These letters were especially used in ancient phonographic writings, therefore Latin graphic system obtained this. But by the development of languages the usage of capital letters were limited. So Latin graphic system was used with capital letters till the III century of our era. But since that time the capital letters have been used only at the beginning of the sentence like the first sound of the first word. At present in all languages the position, usage and object of capital letters are defined. Capital letters are used at the beginning of the sentence, in slogans, in columns, in abrevations, etc.

E.g. In English: USA, UN, NATO;

In Azerbaijani: BDU, ADU, ATƏT;

In Russian: PΦ, CHΓ, OOH, etc.

But it should be noted that the object and usage of capital letters are not the same. If we remind the writings of nouns in Azerbaijani and in German, our aim should be clear. So, in Azerbaijani the first letters of proper nouns are always used with capital letters, but in German, all the letters of proper nouns are used with capital letters.

Small letters. These letters are formed from the capital letters. This process is shown in Latin writing systems clearly. The process of appearing small letters in Latin graphic continued from the beginning of the IV century up to the VIII century. The question arises: Why should we need these small letters? Writing small letters affects reading and writing rapidly. The formation of small letters depends on the physiology of reading process and the features of human's eyes. So, while reading capital letters the eyes are tired quickly, because the quantity of letters is less seen. According to different scholars' opinions, the human's eyes can catch ten letters normally. Small letters have also an advantage of their connective character with each other. That's why small letters are widely used in writing.

The structure of letters. According to their structure the letters in phonographic writings are divided into simple and compound letters. If the letters are usually formed by simple signs, they are called simple structural letters.

E.g. In English: **c, o, l, e, n**; in Azerbaijani: **o, e, l, u, ı**; in Russian: **o, c, n, л** etc. are simple according to their appearance and sign writings. Such kind of simple letters exist in many world alphabets.

Compound letters are divided into: a) ligatur and b) diacretik signed letters.

Ligatur letters. This comes from Latin word “ligare” which means “connect”, “link”. But in linguistics under “ligatur” we understand joining two or three letters having one and the same sound. Ligatur letters have two forms: a) joining ligatures, b) approaching ligatures. If the root of a letter should be joined with another letter, they are called joining ligatures. We can meet such kind of letters in English. Reflecting the sounds [ʃ]; [tʃ]; [ʒ], letter combinations “ch”, “sh”, “zh” etc. are used.

But approaching ligatures are used when two or more letters approach each other and have one sound.

In German letter combinations “sch” approaching with one another formalize the sound [ʃ]. But in English letter combinations “tch”, “ck”, “sh”, “ch”, “ght” etc. are the signs of phonemes [tʃ]; [k]; [ʃ]; [tʃ] and [t].

E.g. *match, black, sheet, chess, light etc.*

But in Russian and Azerbaijani only some borrowings have such character like “Шмудм, unпуc”, etc.

Diacretikal signed letters. There are some letters in the world languages which take some signs upper or below and form new phonemes. These signs are called diacretik signs in linguistics. We can come across such letters in Azerbaijani and in Russian.

In Azerbaijani: **ı [i]; ı [ı]; o [6]; ö [ö]; u [u]; ü [ü]; ç [tʃ]; ş [ʃ]; ğ [ğ]** etc.

In Russian: **й [y]** etc.

The formation of letters. Letters have two forms: manuscript and graphic. The difference between manuscript and graphic writing forms depends upon the technique of the writing.

One of the main objects of graphic arts is to define the formation of letters and determine the stability of the history of letters.

Comparing the alphabets of kindred languages we may see the letters of the same origin and their grapheme resemblance. Alphabets are almost formed by two lines: 1) straight; 2) circle.

According to this classification English, Azerbaijani and Russian letters are divided into three main groups:

a) by using different forms of straight lines;

In English: H, J, M, N, T, E, Y, X;

In Azerbaijani: H, N, M, U, T, E, Y, X;

In Russian: А, Г, Д, Е, Ж, К, Л, М, Н, Т, У, Х, Ч, Ш, Щ etc.

b) by using different circle forms of lines; in English O, A, C; in Azerbaijani O, Ö, A, C; in Russian: O, 3, C:

b) by using both straight and circle lines; in English: B, D, G, P, Q, R; in Azerbaijani: B, D, G, Ğ, P, R, Ə; in Russian: Б, В, Ё, П, Ф etc.

Capital letters differ from their small letters in writing. As we are interested in two alphabet systems Latin and Cyrillic, let's show them as shown below:

Differences:			
<i>Latin letters</i>		<i>Russian letters</i>	
Capital	small	Capital	small
D	d	Б	б
Q	q	Е	е
T	t	А	а
F	f		
Resemblances:			
<i>Capital</i>	<i>small</i>	<i>Capital</i>	<i>small</i>
S	s	С	с
M	m	Г	г
P	p	Д	д

N	n		
---	---	--	--

So, the capital and small letters differ from their writing systems too. One of the forms of letters is their manuscript forms. These forms differ from their graphic forms. The capital letters of manuscript differ sufficiently from the small letters. But it should be noted that some of them differ only from their size.

E.g. In English: **A, E, G, X**; in Azerbaijani: **с, ә**; in Russian: **ж, х, л, y**, etc.

Modern alphabets have changed several times since they appeared. Those times the monks wrote down different documents, copied out different records and in this way they wrote letters in different position. But in 1445 the first book was printed in Minets, Germany by Johann Guttenberg and since that time the forms of letters have become stabilized and it influenced the disappearing of different variants of alphabets.

Another main problem is to point out the relations between letters and sounds. In some alphabets of the world languages, the letters have the same sounds. But in some languages we can see the opposite situation, i.e. the letters don't have the same sounds.

Russian alphabets		Latin alphabets	
<i>Letters</i>	<i>Sounds</i>	<i>Letters</i>	<i>Sounds</i>
B	[b]	B	[b]
P	[p]	P	[p]
T	[t]	M	[m]

By comparing the quantity of letters with its sound we can observe proportionally not the same situation. 26 existing English letters have 44 sounds etc.

Summing up all above mentioned we may come into conclusion that studying one of the main branches of applied linguistics “graphic arts” remains actual problem in spelling and alphabet.

The word “orthoepy” is of Greek origin. “Orphos” - correct and “epos” – speech. It means “the study of correct pronunciation, especially the connection between pronunciation and spelling.

Like other branches of linguistics, orthoepy has great role in foreign and native languages of the world. Without going into details it should be mentioned that orthoepy differs from dialects in any language. As you know, pattern language lays the foundation of literary language. It is impossible to imagine literary language without it.

Pattern language helps us to speak clearly, exactly, accurately and impressively. Each speech obtaining all those characteristics is considered to be good speech and may attract the listener’s attention immediately.

Normal pattern language belongs to both written and oral speech. As it is seen oral speech is the main factor on affecting your listener or reader. But what should we do in order to get good pronunciation? Without hesitating we can mention that each of us should control the normative of literary language. So it should be taken into its lexical, grammatical, stylistic, orthographical and orthoepic rules consideration. While speaking in any language we should try to choose the words which can be pronounced correctly, clearly, musically, accurately. While hearing good speech we stop for a moment and try to concentrate our attention to that person – Without exaggerating it should be noted that each language in the world is potentially the source of music. But it may be more or less. We may prove it by saying the following extract by Walter Everett Hawkins:

*“Ask me, why I love you, dear,
And I will ask the rose
Why it loves the dews of Spring
At the winter’s close
Why the blossom’s nectared sweets
Loved by guesting bee,
I will gladly answer you,
If they answer me”.*

Orthoepic system of each modern literary language in the world has the following parts:

- 1) rules concerning the pronunciation of the vowels;
- 2) rules concerning the pronunciation of the consonants;
- 3) rules concerning the pronunciation of grammatical forms;
- 4) rules concerning the pronunciation of the borrowings.

But some scholars, especially Russian linguist A.A.Reformatsky considered orthoepy in the widest plan, including reading rules as secondary part of it. It should be mentioned that the orthoepic rules developed and formed as a system for a long period: While dealing with orthoepy of any language including English, Azerbaijani and Russian, it should be noted the expressiveness of speech without saying. But what is expressive speech? Is this speech usual speech? No, it is not. It is an expressive speech and not usual. Such speech influences the readers' (or listeners') feelings and attracts their attention. They begin to interest in it, think and admire it while listening to such kind of speech, their inner secret, their expressiveness. Probably, any of us didn't pay attention to this or that item but abruptly we change our attitude and listen to such kind of speech till the end attentively as well as profoundly.

In order to assert our view-point we can give an extract from "Khosrov and Shirin" by great Azerbaijani poet N.Ganjavi which we listened and heard several times.

In Azerbaijani:

*"Az danışsan əgər, sözün sayılar,
Çox sözü dinləyənlər çox nöqsan tutar.
Səninçün çox demək bəlkə asandır,
"Çox oldu!" desələr böyük nöqsandır.
Söz ruhdur. Can üçün ruh bir dərmandır,
Cantək əzizliyi bəlkə bundadır".*

In English:

The contest between Khosrov and Farhad:

“Khosrov asked once: “Where do you come from, say?”

Farhad replied: “From regions far away.”

Khosrov: “In what crafts does your land excell?”

Farhad: “We purchase grief and souls we sell.”

Khosrov: “By selling souls what do you gain?”

Farhad: “Our bards this custom don’t disdain.”

Khosrov: “Your soul from love is well nigh fleeting?”

Farhad: “My soul? I love with all my being.”

The history of orthoepy in linguistics is old. So the Indian linguists dwelt on orthoepic problems in ancient times.

Those scholars considered a special place for orthoepic study together with phonetics. But this branch of applied linguistics has become its apogee in XIX and XX centuries.

In those centuries different scholars closely searched out orthoepic problems of different languages. Consequently it should be noted that orthoepy like other branches of applied linguistics, has great role in oral speech.

One of the main branches of native and foreign linguistics is *orthography*. This word is of Greek origin which means “orthos” – correct and “grapho” – writing. It is correct and standard spelling. Besides it, it has also the meaning of particular system of spelling or the study of spelling.

As it is mentioned above orthographic rules are formed simultaneously with the formation of language writing. So while forming writing system of any language, the basis of orthography begins to formalize. In ancient Eastern languages the scholars paid great attention to the formation of orthography (while appearing) in its writing system. Those scholars defined different rules, put forward different conceptions and notes according to orthography. But without exaggerating it should be noted that there wasn’t any complete or proper orthographical theory at that time. Theoretical researches in orthography have become since the recent centuries.

Exact orthographical rules have great importance in development of every literary language. Orthography, as we know, makes a great chance in stabilizing written

literary language, and hinders difficulties in writing. Orthography is wide notion. It embraces some branches. Orthographical rules of some languages are divided into several parts:

- 1) rules about root and affixation;
- 2) rules of writing compound words together, separately and with hyphen;
- 3) rules of writing the capital letters of the words;
- 4) rules of writing parts of the words in a new line;
- 5) rules of writing abbreviation and shortened words.

All those rules mentioned above base on definite orthographical principles. There are a lot of orthographical principles in phonographic writings but the majority of them is not considered as orthographic principle.

Let's pay attention to the writing of omitted words. The following principles should be taken into consideration according to the writing of such words:

- 1) initial principle writing of the first letter is called initial principle;

E.g. in English: *i.e. (idiest), n (noun), c (committee), v (verb) etc.*

in Azerbaijani: *q (qəpik), m (manat), c (cild), h (hissə) etc.*

in Russian: *ВЯ (Вопросы языкознания), М (Москва), К (Казань), с (страница), р (рубль), etc.*

- 2) suspensory principle. If the part of the word is written, that's called suspensory principle;

E.g. in English: *prof (professor), adj (adjective), adv (adverb), conj (conjunction) etc.*

in Azerbaijani: *səh (səhifə), yol (yoldaş), akad (akademik), dos (dosent) etc.*

in Russian: *сб (сборник), кн (книга), Рус. яз. в нац. школе (Русский язык в национальной школе) etc.*

- 3) contracted or shortened principle. Omitting the letters in the middle of the words is called contracted or shortened principle;

E.g. in English: *pr-r (proper), ms (mises) etc.*

in Azerbaijani: *f-ka (fabrika), z-d (zavod), d-r (doktor) etc.*

in Russian: *сб-ник (сборник), ст-а (структура) etc.*

This principle was widely used in ancient Latin writings.

All the principles mentioned above aren't considered to be main orthographical principles. The main principle in the orthography must be wide and embrace some languages and as well as it should be affected on some language writings.

Without going into details it should be noted that phonetic principle is used in a great number of writings. That's why this principle is considered to be one of the main orthographical principles. There are different view points about the quantity of orthographical principles in linguistics.

A.A.Reformatsky put forward six main principles (phonetic and phonematic, etimological and historical-traditional, morphological and symbolic [49, 373]. But other scholars dwelled on three main orthographical principles (phonetic, morphological and traditional) [64, 88]. A great number of scientists agree with this latter view point. Each of these main orthographical principles – phonetic, morphological and traditional – has definite factors.

Phonetic principle. Writing according to modern literary pronunciation is called phonetic principle. According to this principle the word is written as it is sounded.

E.g. in English: *bag [b5g], man [m5n], map [m5p], bat [b5t], dog [dog] etc.*

in Azerbaijani: *yer, ay, gün, qar, baş, daş, boş, qoz, nar etc.*

in Russian: *вид, время, систем, метод, анализ, подход etc.*

So, in phonetic principle the pronunciation of words is considered to be the main essence of writing of words.

Morphological principle. Here one and the same morpheme may be pronounced in different ways in different dialects. That's why it should be taken only one of these morphemes in writing on the contrary it should make the writing of the language confused. Writing with one form of different pronounced morphemes in linguistics is called morphological principle. In Azerbaijani the suffixes of plural nouns “**lar**” and “**lər**” is based on morphological principle.

E.g. *qızlar – qızdar etc.*

Morphological principle has a great role in forming single rules in orthography.

Traditional principle. In some languages the pronunciation of the words greatly differs from its writing. In English we can see a lot of words having different pronunciation and writings:

E.g. *August* [ˈ6:g7st], *light* [la9t], *honorary* [ˈ6n7r7nd] – (someone who receives an award), *neigh* [na9] etc.

Investigating different principles we may come into conclusion that the Azerbaijani language belongs to the phonetic principle and partly to the morphological principle. But the other compared English language belongs to the traditional principle.

So summing up typology of orthoepy and orthography in foreign and native languages we should note that these branches have great role in both compared languages and the development process of each branch is increasing day by day.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XVIII.

1. What are the main branches of foreign and native languages?
2. How do you understand the term “graphic arts”?
3. How is the term “graphic arts” characterized by G.Davidson?
4. What can you say about the history of graphic arts?
5. Speak about A.A.Reformatsky’s view point on graphic arts.
6. According to which principles the letters differ from the phonographic writings?
7. Are there any languages in the world having the same writing forms of letters?
8. In which cases are capital letters used?
9. What can you say about the process of appearing small letters?
10. Why should we need the capital and the small letters?
11. Speak about the structure of letters.
12. What do we mean under the term “ligatur letters”?
13. What is the difference between joining and approaching ligatures?
14. What are the diacritical signed letters?
15. How many forms have letters?

16. What is the main object of graphic arts?
17. What do we see comparing the alphabets of kindred languages?
18. How are the alphabets formed?
19. Speak about main groups of English, Azerbaijani and Russian letters.
20. How do we differentiate capital letters?
21. When were the forms of the letters stabilized?

CHAPTER XIX.

TYPOLOGY OF LEXICOGRAPHY IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

Lexicography is a Greek word: “lexis” –means word, “graphy” means writing. It is “the writing”, compiling and editing of dictionaries”. Being one of the most used branches of linguistics lexicography deals with practical and theoretical problems of writing dictionaries in foreign and native languages. While searching out the scholar’s linguistic view points we came across that “applied lexicography” and used of the same meaning. But it does not embrace the branch as the former does. Being a separate branch, lexicography has its own aim and objects. Sometimes the scholars identify and even oppose lexicography with lexicology, etymology and semasiology [44, 27; 42; 62].

By virtue of this opposition the relations between those branches (lexicography, lexicology, etymology and semasiology) as well as their cut line may be defined. By saying lexicography we understand the profession of writing, compiling and editing of dictionaries as well as the linguistic study of dictionary work. Both of these branches are blended under this part. While dealing with the theoretical problems of lexicography, it should be interpreted the types of dictionaries, kinds, structure, the compiling of method and principles scientifically. Generally, all the theoretical problems of lexicographic work are explained here.

Lexicography is one of the ancient branches of linguistics. In ancient times Indian scholars dealt with the compiling and explaining of words. In VI century of BC (before Christianity) the Indian linguist Amara (but in some books this linguist’s name was written Amarucipkha) compiled Sanscrit language dictionary. The Indians called this dictionary “Amarakosha” which means “Amara’s dictionary”. Besides, in V century of BC in India, the scholar Yaska carried out lexicographic works successfully. At the beginning of our era, dictionary works were spread over different countries. In II century of our era the Chinese scholar Lue Si laid the

foundation of complete Chinese dictionary. In VIII century for the first time Arabic dictionary “Kitab-Al-Ain” was compiled.

At the beginning of the XVI century lexicographic works were attracted great interest and a lot of new dictionaries began to be compiled in different languages. If in XVI and XVIII centuries the dictionaries of different languages were attracted attention, in XIX century the theoretical problems of dictionary compiling works occupied an important place in linguistics.

A great many dictionaries of different languages have been edited nowadays. All these dictionaries are divided into two main types: encyclopedic and philologic dictionaries.

Encyclopedic dictionaries explain the thing, notion in a broad sense; here scientific information of great people’s personality is written and their activity is revealed. In encyclopedic dictionaries we should meet different pictures of this or that matter which are characterized of such type of dictionary.

Encyclopedic dictionaries have two kinds: general encyclopedic dictionary and areal encyclopedic dictionary. We can show “Literature Encyclopaedia”, “Medical Encyclopaedia”, “Child Encyclopaedia” as general encyclopedic dictionaries in English, in Azerbaijani and in Russian.

Philologic dictionaries explain the words, the origin of words and expressions, their historical development, grammatical points, the usage in speech which are explained profoundly in such kinds of dictionaries. Here the meaning of words, its semantics, pronunciation and correct written form are also explained.

Philologic dictionaries are of two kinds:

- a) monolingual – philologic dictionaries;
- b) polylingual – philologic dictionaries.

The aim of monolingual philologic dictionary is to help scientifically and profoundly learning this or that language. We can show “Modern Russian Dictionary” which was published from 1950 up 1965, as a monolingual philologic dictionary. This monolingual dictionary consists of 17 volumes and embraces one hundred and twenty thousand four hundred and eighty words (120480).

Here also we can show English Oxford, Webster's standard and Chambers 21st Century dictionaries too.

Not long ago in Azerbaijani by the head of professor Orudje Musayev new "Azerbaijani-English Dictionary" was published. Its second edition with latin graphics was published in Turkey. This dictionary explains approximately fifty thousand words in both languages. But "English-Azerbaijani Dictionary" headed by professor O.Musayev embraced more than one hundred thousand words, expressions and sentences.

But the aim of polylingual dictionaries is to help linguistic translating and other translating works and to serve learning other foreign languages.

Unlike monolingual dictionaries, polylingual dictionaries may embrace two, three or more languages.

One of the richest polylingual dictionaries in the world was published in Germany in 1806. It was printed by the editors E.K.Adelung and E.C.Faterin from 1806 – up 1817. It was called "Mithridates oder allgemein Sprachkunde" (Mitridat or General linguistics) and was given examples of 500 languages and dialects. That dictionary consists of four volumes.

Language facts are explained in different aspects in philologic dictionaries. That's why, up nowadays different kinds of philologic dictionaries are spread over in the world languages.

E.g. phraseological, historical, orthoepic, orthographical, dialectical, terminological, homonymous, synonymous dictionaries and so on.

At present a lot of polylingual dictionaries appeared in English, Azerbaijani and Russian languages.

In 20-th and 40-th of XX century the scholars paid a great attention to the semantical-ideological and sociological study of words.(Research works by Abayev B.E., Budagov R.A., Marr N.Y., Filin F., Shor R.O. , etc.).

But in 50-th and 60-th years of XX century the first plan was put forward the investigation interrelated connections. These scholars paid a great attention to the

problem of synonyms, homonyms, polysemy, lexico-semantic variation of words, etc. (Research works by N.D.Andreyeva, Golovin B.N., Kholodovich A.A., etc.)

Summing up all above mentioned we may come into conclusion that lexicography being one of the main branches of applied linguistics has a great role in linguistics.

However, being one of the richest Altaik languages the Azerbaijani language was also compiled in different dictionaries by different scholars. At different times of the XX century A.Orudjov, M.T.Tagiyev and other scholars compiled bilingual dictionaries.

Not long ago professor Orudje Musayev published the first Azerbaijani-English dictionary. This dictionary is the result of more than 25 years of work. The second volume consists of 648 pages, 45000 terms. It is beautifully bound in burgundy red and sponsored by Exxon. On the occasion of Orudje Musayev's 70-th jubilee editor of Azerbaijan International Betty Blair mentioned:

“Professor O.Musayev initiated this project when it was not prestigious to learn English. In fact such an undertaking was looked upon with suspicion because Russian, not English, was the most prestigious language in Azerbaijan at that time. The dictionary enables students to move directly between Azerbaijani and English, and eliminate that long tedious, laborious stage of learning Russian as the mediating language. Musayev also must be credited in that he never had the chance to travel or study outside the Soviet Union nor visit a native English speaking-country”.

Furthermore Betty Blair continued:

“One must never forget the incredibly primitive technology used to create this volume two type writers – one Azerbaijan (Cyrillic typeface) and the other English. Today computer technology facilitates such efforts.

Nevertheless, with a tremendous effort and stamina, the job was completed. And generations of Azerbaijanis will reap the rewards of professor O.Musayev's great dream and untiring persistence”.

Betty Blair mentioned that she was impressed professor O.Musayev deserved enormous respect for his efforts and though she didn't know Azerbaijani, she had a great desire to learn the language just as she had when she lived in Greece and Iran

years earlier where language learning materials were readily available. In Azerbaijan such materials are still scarce. And so she made no promises about funding except that she would try to see what he could do.

The actual printing of this dictionary first took place in Cyrillic (1996) and then in Latin (1998) in a beautiful burgundy volume that befits its contents. Exxon immediately saw the significance of this project when Betty Blair broached the project with them. Her link at Exxon should be mentioned for it is only people, not corporations, that really catch the vision for projects and nudge them along.

B. Blair told Jonelle Glosch who was working with Exxon in Nouston at the time but who has since moved to Baki and set up a Business School to facilitate young people so they can learn modern office practices. Back in Texas, Jonelle had opened her home to foreign exchange students from Azerbaijan. She knew first hand the significance of such a dictionary project.

B. Blair mentions that the great legacy of this work of love goes beyond the Republic. Already, numerous world class university libraries have included this volume in their collections, including the Universities of Oxford (UK), Harvard, UCLA, Berkeley, Stanford, Fairleigh Dickinson, Indiana, Texas, as well as the British Library. This dictionary is now being used in the United States, Australia, Finland, Germany, the United Kingdom, Iran, Sweden, Canada, New Zealand, Turkey and other countries. At the end B. Blair, editor of the English language magazine, Azerbaijan International (published 1993) mentions that the legacy of O. Musayev not only in tremendous today, but his efforts are felt by many throughout the world.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XIX.

1. What is the definition of lexicography?
2. What is the aim of lexicography?
3. What is the difference between applied lexicography and lexicography?
4. Who compiled Sanscrit language dictionary?
5. When was “Kitab-al-ain” compiled?

6. How many types are the dictionaries divided into?
7. What is the essence of encyclopedic dictionaries?
8. What can you say about the kinds of encyclopedic dictionaries?
9. What kind of items are explained in philologic dictionaries?
10. Who is the author of the “Azerbaijani-English” and “English-Azerbaijani” dictionaries?
11. What can you say about the philologic dictionaries?
12. What is the aim of monolingual philologic dictionaries?
13. Where was the richest polylingual dictionary published?
14. What is the aim of polylingual dictionaries?
15. What can you say about Betty Blair’s view point about the “Azerbaijani-English dictionary”?

CHAPTER XX.

TYPOLOGY OF LINGUISTIC TRANSLATION IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

“Linguistic translation” is one of the branches of linguistics. In Chambers 21st Century Dictionary this word is explained as follows: 1) to express a word, speech, written text, etc. in another language, closely preserving the meaning of the original; 2) to put or express an idea in other terms, especially terms that are plainer or simpler than the original; 3) to interpret the significance or meaning of an action, behaviour, etc.; 4) to change or move from one state, condition, person, place etc. to another.

But in scientific researches this branch is called in different ways. Some scholars treat it as “translatology” which means “to carry across” (from Latin word “transferre”).

At the same time some other linguists call it linguistic translation which is more convincing and is closer to our view point. A great attention is paid to linguistic translation in linguistics. So the aim of linguistic translation comprises the problems of translation activity, the general law of translation process and others. But without going into details it should be noted that this notion is wide and more expanded. According to the form and content of translation materials, this branch has two kinds: 1) literary translation which has its own content and investigating methods; 2) informative translation which embraces scientific, official, social, publicistic and other translation materials. This branch of translation is closely connected with linguistics. Translation as a separate branch of linguistics is not arbitrary because it has some reasons. One of the main reasons is that linguistic translation is a special kind of speech activity. That’s why linguistics can’t be far away from this. It deals with speech activity problems. It is clear that transferring from this language into another one, forms a new text. This new text must be exact to its origin. This exactness demands that the language details, their variants and colouring should be translated by not distorting language norms. So the exactness of translation becomes not so

easy. A translator whose job is to translate texts, speeches etc. from one language to another should be professionally qualified to do this. While translating, no matter written or orally, a word, speech, text etc. should be put into another language exactly, all kinds of acting or instance or the processes of translation can't be forgotten and they must be taken into consideration.

So, we may come into conclusion that the exactness of translation should be obtained only by knowing linguistic requirements profoundly.

Linguistic translation is a new and young branch of linguistics. It appeared as independent branch in the second half of the XX century. Since that time it has been formalized. Linguistic translation is one of the ancient kinds of human activity. If there didn't have such activity, without hesitating we should say that spreading out the sciences, the development of culture, the connection between peoples would not be possible. That's why the peoples dealt with translation activity for ancient times. During different kinds of travelling, voyages, trips and commercial trades, the people needed the translation and it began spreading all over the world. Though the history of translation goes back (especially linguistic bases) have been done recently.

Since the translation activity has become the object of research works, there appeared a lot of scientific works and the principle of translation process was found out.

But without going into details we can mention that there are a lot of complicated translation problems [74, 200].

As we know at the end of XX century and at the beginning of XXI century the international relations between countries and different organizations, societies, international conferences, congresses etc. put forward such a question that we might pay great attention to the linguistic translation problems. Now some main objectives are put forward to linguistic translation. One of these main objectives is to generalize the achievements of this linguistic sphere. Linguistic translation must play a great role in solving current and actual problems of translation and it should rich the linguistic theory with its achievements.

The aspect of applied linguistics which appeared in linguistics in the middle of XX century and it was connected with machine translation. The first machine translation happened in America in 1954 by the help of IBM-701.

Machine translation, sometimes referred to by the acronym MT, that investigates the use of computer software to translate text or speech in between natural languages.

MT performs simple substitution of atomic words in one natural language for words in another. Using corpus techniques, more complex translations can be performed, allowing for better handling of differences in linguistic typology, phrase recognition, and translation of idioms, as well as the isolation of anomalies. Current systems are unable to produce output of the same quality as a human translator, particularly where the text to be translated uses casual language.

Modern machine translation software, such as that produced by SYSTRAN or IBM, allows for customization by domain or profession (such as weather reports) – improving output by limiting the scope of allowable substitutions. This technique is particularly effective in domains where formal or formulaic language is used. Improved output quality can also be achieved by human intervention: for example, some systems are able to translate more accurately if the user has unambiguously identified which words in the text are names. With the assistance of these techniques, MT has proven useful as a tool to assist human translators, and in some cases can even produce output that can be used “as is”.

“Machine translation” (MT) is the application of computers to the task of translating texts from one natural language to another. The translation process for translation can be stated simply as:

- 1) decoding the meaning of the source text;
- 2) re-encoding this meaning in the target language.

Behind this simple procedure there lies a complex cognitive operation. For example, to decode the meaning of the source text in its entirety, the translator must interpret and analyse all the features of the text, a process which requires in-depth knowledge of both the grammar, semantics, syntax, idioms and the like of the source

language, as well as the culture of its speakers. The translator needs the same in-depth knowledge to re-encode the meaning in the target language.

Therein lies the challenge in machine translation: how to program a computer to “understand” a text as a human being does and also to “create” a new text in the source language that “sounds” as if it has been written by a human.

Machine translation can use a method based on linguistic rules, which means that words will be translated in a linguistic way – the most suitable (orally speaking) words of the target language will replace the ones in the source language.

The first attempts at machine translation were conducted after World War II. It was assumed at this time that the newly invented computers would have no trouble in translating texts. The reason was that computers were able to do complex mathematics quickly, something that humans did with more difficulty. On the other hand, even young children were able to learn to understand human language; therefore, computers could do the same. In actual fact, this belief was soon shown to be incorrect.

On 7 January 1954, the Georgetown-IBM experiment, the first public demonstration of a MT system, was held in New York at the head office of IBM. The demonstration was widely reported in the newspapers and received much public interest. The system itself, however, was no more than what today would be called a “toy” system, having just 250 words and translating just 49 carefully selected Russian sentences into English – mainly in the field of chemistry. Nevertheless it encouraged the view that MT was imminent – and in particular stimulated the financing of MT research, not just in the US but worldwide.

The first serious MT systems were used during the Cold War to parse texts in Russian scientific journals. The rough translations produced were sufficient to understand the “gist” (the essence) of the articles.

Limited field of use systems have also been successful in a number of specialized applications, for instance the METEO System has been used in Canada since 1977 to translate weather forecasts from English to French and now translates close to 80,000 words a day or 30 million words a year.

The advent of low-cost and more powerful computers towards the end of the 20th century brought MT to the masses, as did the availability of sites on the Internet.

In machine translation the translator supports the machine, that is to say that the computer or program translates the text, which is then edited by the translator, whereas in computer-assisted translation the computer program supports the translator who translates the text himself, making all the essential decisions involved.

Despite their inherent limitations, MT programs are currently used by various organizations around the world. Probably the largest institutional user is the European Commission, which uses a highly customised version of the commercial MT system SYSTRAN to handle the automatic translation of a large volume of preliminary drafts of documents for internal use.

In April 2003 Microsoft began using a hybrid MT system for the translation of a database of technical support documents from English to Spanish. The system was developed internally by Microsoft's Natural language research group. The group is currently testing an English-Japanese system as well as bringing English-French and English-German systems online. The latter two systems use a learned language generation component, whereas the first two have manually developed generation components. The systems were developed and trained using translation memory databases with over a million sentences each.

P.Garvin, L.Dostert and P.Sheridan translated into English 60 sentences compiled 250 advanced chosen Russian words. But in 1955 by the help BGSM in former USSR was done the translation from English into Russian. (E.K.Belsky, L.N.Korolyov, E.C.Mukhin, D.U.Panov and C.N.Razumovsky's research works) Since that time many scholars have dealt with machine translation all over the world.

Appearing electronical machines (GVM computers of different kinds) brought some changes in practical scientific works. In linguistics such problems began to be studied by the help of automatic machine, machine compiling and adaptation of the text.

"Machine translation" is a complicated scientific problem which requires some linguistic logical mathematic and engineering tasks. Using any procedure involving a

series of steps that is used to find the solution to a specific problem, computing the sequence of operations often represented visually by means of a flow chart that are to be performed by and from the basis of a computer program, i.e. algorithm in linguistics is considered its usage for writing the language itself and compiling the programme.

Algorithmic interpretation of the language as (process) translation process considers analysis and synthesis of the texts. In “International Conference” in Paris algorithmic language was accepted in 1960. This aspect of investigation demands the knowledge of technical logics which bases on Boolean algebra and Boolean operation.

Solving all the levels of these analyses should be polyvariants which take into consideration the polysemantical points of languages.

But what is the essence of translation? In translation we always have two texts. The first is the original text which is created irrespectively the other, the second text is created on the basis of the first with the help of certain operations – interlinguistic transformations. The first text is called the text of the original, the second- the text of translation. The language in which the original text is written is called the source language, the language into which the translation is done is called the transliterated or transferred or target language.

What are bases of calling the text of translation equivalent to the text of the original? Why do we say that “*My brother lives in London*” – is equivalent to “*Мой брат живет в Лондоне*” (*Mənim qardaşım Londonda yaşayır*) but not to “*Я учусь в университете*” (*Mən universitetdə oxuyuram*). We understand that the interlinguistic transformation is not carried out at will. In order to regard anything as translation the text of the target language must contain something of the text of the source language. In other words in the process of transformation of the text of the source language to the text of the translated language a certain invariant must be retained and the degree of retaining of this invariety defines the degree of equivalency of the text of the source language to the text of the translated language. In order to know what remains as an invariant in the process of translation one must understand the semiotics – that’s a science on the system of signs. Each sign is

characterized by the plane of expression (form) and the plane of content (meaning). We know that language itself is a system of signs and different languages being different in the plane of expression are identical in the plane of content. Therefore the word “*brother*” in the above mentioned sentence differs from the Russian word “*брат*” and from the Azerbaijani word “*qardaş*” in the plane of expression, but coincides in the plane of content. And if we change (transform) not only these two words, but the whole sentences we may then define translation as a process of transformation of the text of the source language into the text of the translated language under the circumstances if the planes of content are kept unaltered.

In semiotics we distinguish three types meanings: In order to understand these meanings one must proceed from words for words are bearers of meanings. For example, the word “*stol*” (*table*) refers to certain piece of furniture; the word “*it*” (*dog*) to a certain type of animal etc. It is clear that not all the language signs (words) are things or living beings, but they may refer also to actions and processes (as “*getmək*” – *ходит*, “*danışmaq*” – *говорить*) to qualities as “*böyük*” – *большой*, *uzun* – *длинный*”, to such notions as “*səbəb* – *причина*”, “*əlaqə*” – *связь*” as well subjects, processes, qualities, the phenomena of objective reality expressed by language signs are called the referents of the signs, the relation between the sign and its referent is called referential meaning. One must know that the referent of the sign is not a separately taken, single, individual subject, thing, quality, process, but the whole class of them. If a concrete thing, process, quality is meant, in this case we deal with denotation. For example, we may compare: “*Table is a piece of furniture*” and “*Stoldan aralı dur*” – “*Отойди от стола*”.

In the first sentence “the table is a word with referential meaning, in the second it is the “*denotat*” of the word “*table*”.

We use language which is a system of signs and we are not indifferent to these signs in the process of communication. We express our subjective attitude to these referents expressed by the signs. We may compare Azerbaijani words “*oğurlamaq*” and “*çirpışdırmaq*”, “*çıxartmaq*” and “*soyunmaq*”, “*sığallamaq*” and “*tumarlamaq*” etc. Here the words express one and the same referents, but different

subjective relations. These subjective (emotional, expressive, stylistic) relations are called pragmatic relations and the meaning – pragmatic meaning.

One must not forget that not any sign exists in isolation, but function as a component part of a certain sign system. Therefore, any sign is in complicated and multifarious relations with other signs of the sign system. For example, the Azerbaijani word “stol” is in definite relation with the words “*mebel*”, “*şərait*”, “*stul*”, “*kreslo*” etc., in different types of relations with the words “*taxtadan*”, “*dairəvi*”, “*örtmək*”, etc., in a third type of relation words “*mətbəx*”, “*stol ətrafı*” and others. The relation of a sign to other signs of the same sign system is called intralinguistic relations and the meaning intralinguistic meaning.

The semantic structure of the sign is composed of three components: referential, pragmatic and intralinguistic meanings and they are all interconnected and interdependent.

The transformation of these three meanings mainly depend on the type of the text, in the texts where we deal mainly with factual information the main attention is paid to the transformation of referential meanings, but intexts with conceptual information pragmatic meanings take the advantage.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XX.

1. What is the definition of “linguistic translation”?
2. How is linguistic translation explained in Chambers 21st Century Dictionary?
3. How is linguistic translation called in scientific researches?
4. What is the aim of linguistic translation?
5. How should the exactness of translation be obtained?
6. What can you say about the history of linguistic translation?
7. What is the difference between applied and linguistic translation?
8. What can you say about algorithmic interpretation?
9. What is the difference between a translator and an interpreter?
10. When and where was algorithmic interpretation accepted?
11. How do you understand the terms “the source and the target languages”?

12. What are the bases of calling the text of translation equivalent to the text of the original?
13. How many types of meanings do we distinguish in semiotics?
14. What is the difference between the denotational and connotational meanings?
15. How is the semantic structure of the sign composed and what are they?

CHAPTER XXI.

TYOLOGY OF WORD ORDER IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

The arrangement of words in the sentence is called word order. It is a regularity in every language and is a historical category. Word order in Modern English is one of the supra-segmental units. It doesn't exist by itself and realized together with segmental units and expresses different functions.

Word order in English is of much greater importance than in Azerbaijani. Due to the wealth of inflexions word order in Azerbaijani is rather free as the inflexions show the function of each word in a sentence. As English words have hardly any inflexions and their relation to each other is shown by their place in the sentence and not by their form, word order in English is fixed. We can not change the position of different parts of the sentence at will, especially that of the subject and the object.

To illustrate this we shall try to change the order of words in the following sentence.

E.g. *Mr. Brown sent the little boy with a message to the city.*

If we put the direct object "*the little boy*" in the first place and the subject "*Mr. Brown*" in the third, the meaning of the sentence will change, altogether because the object, being placed at the head of the sentence, becomes the subject and the subject being placed after the predicate, becomes the object.

E.g. *The little boy sent Mr. Brown with a message to the city.*

In Azerbaijani such changes of word order are in most cases possible.

E.g. *Mənim bacım dünən teatra getmişdi.*

Dünən mənim bacım teatra getmişdi.

Teatra mənim bacım dünən getmişdi. etc.

Any deviation from the rigid order of words is termed inversion or the inverted order of words. Inversion is widely used when a word or a group of words is put in a prominent position, i.e., when it either opens the sentence or is withdrawn to the end

of the sentence so as to produce a greater effect. So word order often becomes a means of emphasis, thus acquiring a stylistic function. In this case inversion is not due to the structure of the sentence but to the author's wish to produce a certain stylistic effect.

Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik in their book "A Communicative Grammar of English" [45, 160] show that there are two types of inversion in modern English.

1) *subject - verb inversion*

verb – subject

E.g. *The rain came down in torrents.*

Down came the rain in torrents.

2) *subject – operator inversion*

operator subject

E.g. *I have never seen him so angry.*

Never have I seen him so angry.

I never saw him so angry.

Never did I see him so angry.

Subject - verb inversion is normally limited as follows:

- a) the verb phrase consists of a single verb word;
- b) the verb is an intransitive verb of position (be, stand, lie, etc.) or a verb of motion (come, go, fall, etc.);
- c) the topic element is an adverbial modifier of place or direction.

E.g. *Here is the milkman.*

Here comes the bus.

Informal speech

Formal - Away went the car like a whirlwind.

Literary - Slowly out of its hanger rolled the gigantic aircraft.

The interrogative subject "there" in English can bring about subject-verb inversion with some verbs.

E.g. *There rose in his imagination visions of a world empire.*

There may come a time when we are less fortunate.

On the following day, there was held a splendid banquet.

Occasionally subject-verb inversion occurs with a complement as topic when the complement expresses a comparison:

*E.g. For a long time, he refused to talk to his wife, and kept her in ignorance of his troubles. Equally **strange was his behaviour** to his son.*

Some linguists take the view according to which the normal order in declarative sentences in compared languages is “**subject+predicate**”, but the normal order in interrogative sentences is “**predicate+subject**”. According to them there is no inversion in interrogative sentences.

B.Ilyish writes: “*For one thing, there is a type of declarative sentence in which the order “predicate+subject” is normal*”.

M.B.Lazarkevich also sustains this view point. But we don't share this view point because the order “predicate+subject” is essential for the interrogative character of the sentence.

Grammarians usually speak of two kinds of inversion in Modern English: grammatical and stylistic. Unlike stylistic inversion grammatical inversion is not accepted by all grammarians. When stylistic inversion takes place, it changes neither the sense of the sentence nor the syntactic functions of the words, but it changes only the style of the sentence.

E.g. She will never forget you. – Never will she forget you.

In Azerbaijani, grammatical relations between words are mostly expressed by inflexions, and we know that word order in Azerbaijani is not as rigid as in English. However, it would be wrong to believe that Azerbaijani word order is absolutely free. Combined with intonation, it serves as a means of indicating the logical centre of the communication.

E.g. Siz nümayəndə heyətinin tərkibində Avropa Şurasının iclasından dünən qayıtdınız?

If we pronounce this sentence with the rising intonation, it'll be changed into interrogative sentence. But if we pronounce it with the falling intonation, it'll be a declarative sentence. In unemphatic speech the most significant word or word group tends to be placed at the end of the sentence. But as known the direct word order of the English sentence is determined by the rules of grammar requiring that the subject should be placed before the predicate.

Very often, however the logical centre of the sentence doesn't coincide with its subject. It may be any other part of the sentence.

E.g. *A few MP's demanded cuts in military expenditure to ensure the release of money to pay for trade union rights.*

To choose the right word order in translation, we should find out in what way this sentence is connected with the preceding one. If the sentence has been said to answer the question "What did they demand?" the translation will be sounded as follows: "Həmkarlar ittifaqı üzvlərinin hüququnu təmin etməkdən ötrü lazımi vəsaitin tapılmasında parlamentin bir neçə üzvü hərbi xərclərin azaldılmasını tələb edirdilər".

If the sentence is the answer to the question "For what did the MP's demand cuts in military expenditure?" – the translation will be: "Parlamentin bir neçə üzvü tələb edirdi ki, həmkarlar ittifaqı üzvlərinin hüququnu təmin etməkdən ötrü lazımi vəsaitin tapılmasında hərbi sahəyə sərf olunan xərclər azaldılsın".

Inversion emphasizes a certain part of the sentence. The stressed word in Azerbaijani emphatic speech may be placed either in the middle or at the end of the sentence.

E.g. *Mo`ney he had none.*

Onun pu`lu yox idi.

Never shall I forget this scene.

Bu səhnəni heç `vaxt unutmayacağam.

Sometimes punctuation marks have the greater role in compared languages.

E.g. *To free, not to kill ?*

Azad etmək, öldürmək olmaz?

On the whole, the problem of word order proves to be a highly complex one, requiring great care. As far as we can see now, different factors have something to do with determining, the place of one part of a sentence or another.

It is scholar's task to unravel this complex by weighing the influences exercised by each factor and their mutual relations. It is possible, for instance, that two factors work in the same direction – and then the result can only be one. It is also possible

that different factors work in different directions, and then one of them will take the upper hand in compared English, Azerbaijani and Russian languages.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XXI.

1. What is the definition of word order?
2. What kind of category is word order?
3. What can you say about word order in compared languages?
4. What can you say B.Lazarkevich's view point about word order?
5. How do you understand the term "inversion"?
6. How many kinds of inversion do you know?
7. What kind of inversion is accepted by all grammarians?
8. Is the word order in Azerbaijani as rigid as in English?
9. Is Azerbaijani word order free?
10. What does the inversion emphasize?

CHAPTER XXII.

DEVELOPMENT OF MATHEMATIC LINGUISTICS AND ENGINEERING LANGUAGE

Development of linguistic theory increases interest to structural and mathematic methods of studying languages.

On the one hand, the structural linguistic view points began to be criticized, on the other hand it is closely approached to logical-mathematic linguistics and semiotics. Semiotics, as you know, is the study of human communication, especially the relationship between words and the objects or concepts they represent. In 1960 for the first time compiled articles were published in “News in Linguistics”. It was full of popular ideas and methods of structuralism. Structuralism is an approach to various areas of study, literary criticism and linguistics which seeks to identify underlying patterns or structures, especially as they might reflect patterns of behaviour or thought in society as a whole.

It should be noted that since that time, the problems of semiotics, language structure and its stratification began to be discussed in those articles. Stratification means the formation of layers of sedimentary matter on the Earth’s crust, the way in which these layers are arranged and an act of stratifying or stratified condition. But what is a sedimentary matter? It denotes any of a group of rocks, clay, limestone or sandstone, that have formed as a result of the accumulation and compaction of layers of sediment.

The question status of mathematic linguistics is put forward as a science. Three main approaches might be noted here:

- 1) mathematic linguistics is considered to be lingua-mathematic subject developing on the basis of interest to the problem of linguistics. It is also the science which deals with measurements, numbers, quantities and shapes usually expressed as symbols in linguistics. This is not a part of linguistics, because the latter deals with

concrete languages but the former deals with abstract notions particularly used in linguistics as models of different aspects of the language;

Linguamathematics deals with metalanguage and metatheory. Metalanguage is a language or system of symbols used to discuss another language or symbolic system. In other word it is a language described by means of another language. This language is also a language into which a program is translated by a compiler. Naturally, all those works take interest from the point of such mathematic discipline, as mathematic logics, the theory of algorithm, typology and the theory of graph. Graph is an instrument for writing or recording information. It should be noted that their linguistic meaning needs to be proved;

2) mathematic linguistics is understood as connecting some mathematic ideas and methods with linguistic ideas and methods. On the one hand this is the relation of mathematics, structural and semiotic ideas and applying of investigations, on the other hand it is the relation of mathematic ideas and methods with theory information and objectives of machine translating and engineering linguistics [71, 77-89; 75, 46].

In this sense “mathematic linguistics” can exactly be used here.

3) finally, those research works belong to mathematic linguistics which are used symbols and mathematic logics, as well as statistic ideas and methods. First of all, it is traditional linguistics which is used models and statistics. In the middle of XX century engineering linguistics began to be developing rapidly. This is the application of scientific knowledge, especially that concerned with matter and energy, to the practical problems of design, construction, operation and maintenance of devices encountered in everyday life. Engineering linguistics began to be appeared as experimental phonetics. This part of linguistics tries out new styles and techniques or is used in experiments. It was founded by B.A.Bogoroditsky in Russia and P.Ruslo in France. B.A.Bogoroditsky laid the foundation of laboratory of experimental phonetics in Kazan University. In 1899 C.K.Bulich organized such kind of laboratory in Petersburg University and then L.B.Sherba headed it. In Azerbaijani, at our University of Foreign Languages such kind of laboratory was organized for the first time by professor Z.Kh.Tagizadeh in 1968. Then after his

death, professor F.Y.Veysalov (Veysally) headed this laboratory and a lot of experimental research works have been made comparatively in this laboratory. We can note some scholars who are closely connected with this laboratory and have made a lot of useful experimental works. They are: F.Aslanov, F.Zeynalov, E.Mirzayev, M.Safarov, N.Mammadov, D.Yunusov, S.Najafova, J.Mammadguliyev and others.

Experimental phonetics embraces three main devices: 1) somatics; 2) pnevmatics; 3) electro-acoustics.

Somatic device refers or relates to the body, rather than the mind. It refers or relates to the body as opposed to reproduction. Main phonetic devices here are: palatography, photography of organs of speech-articulation, X-ray of speech apparatus and so on, and so forth. In pnevmatic device we understand that the curved lines which are registered the pronunciation of the action of speech organs and their changes in main tone in the mouth and nasal cavities.

Electro-acoustic device is the technology of converting sound into electrical energy and electrical energy into sound. It is also used both acoustic and computer generated sound.

Experimental-phonetic devices give tight and exact articulatory and acoustic characteristic features of speech sounds, formant structure etc. Formant structure is the dominant component or components which determine the particular sound quality of all vowels and some consonants being peaks of acoustic energy which reflect the principal points of resonance in the vocal tract.

Linguistic translating plays a great role in solving modern and actual problems of machine translating. Without exaggerating we should mention that it should rich the linguistic theory with its achievements.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XXII.

1. What does semiotics study?
2. What does stratification mean?
3. How do you understand the term “mathematic linguistics” ?

4. What is graph?
5. When did engineering linguistics begin to be developing rapidly?
6. Who was experimental phonetics founded in Russia by?
7. Who was the organizer of the experimental phonetics laboratory in Azerbaijan?
8. How many devices does experimental phonetics embrace?
9. How do you understand the terms “somatics, pnevmatics, electro-acoustics”?
10. What is the essence of experimental phonetics?
11. What kind of translating plays a great role in solving modern and actual problems of machine translating?
12. Could you tell us the names of some apparatus in experimental phonetics laboratory?
13. What can you say about ossilography?
14. Do you know the function of intonography?

CHAPTER XXIII.

COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGY AND METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH

Taking into account the comparative typology of Azerbaijani and English languages, we should clear out the importance of typology of foreign languages for its learning and influence on methods applying of teaching it in different sides and aspects. The teachers of any foreign language, under their pedagogical activity, face mistakes made by students in pronouncing and structure of foreign language, especially oral and written language. The students often use wrong words and violate combination of words in the language, taking into account combinations in the native language. The analysis on mistakes show that these mistakes can be divided into two groups:

1) accidental mistakes, emerged under insufficient elaboration of current and passed lesson. They don't usually carry principal character and may disappear through application of special methods and exercises to learn lesson. Besides, they usually carry individual character and are different;

2) solid mistakes, which are typical and rife to all and overwhelming native-language speakers.

So, Azerbaijani speaking students, as a rule, even after intensive phonetic training make mistakes in pronouncing by replacing some phoneme or they miss indefinite and definite article since there is no such notion in the Azerbaijani language.

The Azerbaijani students make mistakes in phonological system of the English language, especially in pronouncing the vowels [i:, i, u, u:, a:, ʊ, ɒ:, o]. Besides, they can't pronounce the phonemes [θ, ʒ, ɹ] properly. Meanwhile, those students, owing to so-called locative case – dative, original and local, indicating different space relations among subjects of reality through affixes added to end of noun, take off English prepositions since there lack prepositions in their native language. So they use “*I school go*”, “*My sister lives Moscow*” etc. Instead of “*I go to school*”

and “*My sister lives in Moscow*”. Above mentioned mistakes are characterized by their permanent character and represent a complicated object. Such mistakes can be called as sound or typical mistake. To eliminate such mistakes any foreign language teacher should understand the sources of these mistakes and think and find the most efficient methods of preventing them. If such mistakes emerge, teachers should work out preventing methods. Teachers should create such textbooks, stipulating all the problems, concerning a language learning. These textbooks should promote creation of necessary right skills to use a foreign language. Moreover, a teacher should conduct scientifically based selection of language and speaking material and do it with respect to real opportunities of students. Let’s consider the above mentioned points learning a foreign language, in this case English, proposes that students learn all the peculiarities of the given language. Meanwhile, two systems face – system of native and system of foreign language. The learnt language lies on native language of students with its consistent patterns. There appears mutual inter-entrance of two structures: on the one hand, a foreign language calls for reconstruction of common stereotypes from native language by each student. For this time, there will run reconstruction and a student will put in consistent patterns under all levels of language to foreign language. Naturally, native-language speakers will make one and the same mistakes, which can be called typical or typologically. It will be firstly evident in those components of foreign language, which are absent in native language although they bear some resemblance to analogue facts of native language. On the other hand, native language of students will assign its norms on students and it will be a permanent source for sound mistakes under all levels of structure of foreign language. So, there emerges event known as interference of languages.

The analysis of typological peculiarities of English and Azerbaijani languages under all levels of their structures enabled to set up some structural and functional-similar (isomorphism) and some structural and functional-different (allomorphism) signs, characterizing systems of both languages. The structural and functional-isomorphic features can’t be source for sound mistakes since factor of functional similarity of corresponding events in both languages assures such mistakes can’t

appear. There may emerge just mistakes of the first type, caused by sound learning of materially different but functionally similar events.

Consequently, there remain allomorphic features. The observance over character of sound mistakes made by speakers of different languages and studies on their sources show mistakes of such type emerge under transfer of norms from native language to the foreign language. So typological sign of English vocalism – two types of vowels – narrow and wide, under all three levels – and lack of this sign in Azerbaijan phonology is source for many sound mistakes made by Azerbaijani students under the first stage of learning English and even further. So there are a lot of problems to pronounce some vowels and it is related to right sounding of words and their right understanding.

Another typological sign of English vocalism-division of vowels into common and non-common types brings to mistakes among Azerbaijanis in language of which such sign is absent. The presence of two types of consonant phonemes in Azerbaijani language – soft and hard- and lack of this typological sign in English brings too many mistakes for Azerbaijani students to pronounce English words where vowel of first line comes after consonant.

Phonological typology systems of foreign and native languages, allowing to take into account typological differences between these languages, enable to theoretically define problems, faced by students under learning of phonological system of foreign language, select phonetic and phonological barriers and work out consistence to study sounds and necessary exercises.

The phonological and phonetic minimum of English for other language speakers won't be similar. It will differ depending upon phoneme composition of these languages. So, tatars, bashkir, kazakhz, uzbeks, turkmen and other Turkic language speaking students won't have back tongue sound in their phonological minimum. Meanwhile, other phonemes will be included to phonological minimum of Bashkir-language speaking students.

Morphological typology systems of foreign and native languages also stand as source for sound mistakes of students in foreign language. The teachers know sound

mistakes of students under all stages of teaching to use article since determination category in many languages has only vocabulary expression.

The lack of affixes “**lar**”, “**lər**” for many nouns, its phonetic variants stand as permanent source for sound mistakes of students.

The typological differences of “perfectness” and “non-perfectness” also bring many mistakes by Azerbaijani students in speech. But though it gives difficulties, that is easily mastered by Azerbaijani students, since the Azerbaijani language consists of some verbs “identifying relation of action to different moments of the given time plan”. Among these forms, we find real long time, past long time as “*yaşadım*”, “*yaşayırdım*”, “*yaşamaqdayam*”, “*yaşamaqdaydım*”, etc. which correspond to English “past perfect” and “past perfect continuous” forms.

It is important in speech to use right placement of words in the sentence, i.e., to have right order of words with respect to syntax of the given language.

The analytical order of English calls for tightly fixed order of words in the sentence – subject (s)+predicate (p)+direct object (o)+indirect object (o)+adverbial modifier of place (A_{mod})+adverbial modifier of time (A_{mod}).

The functional-synthetic structure of the Azerbaijani language admits varying of components of sentence since case morphemes fixes relation of the given word to other words in the sentence, irrelevant of its place in the sentence.

Meanwhile, languages of agglutinative structure, for example Turkic languages, have free order of words in the sentence but it differs from English order of words and runs as follows. Adverbial modifier of time+adverbial modifier of place+subject+indirect object+direct object+predicate.

E.g. *Dünən bu ağacın altında mən təkərsız qara bir maşın gördüm.*

The above mentioned schemes of the English and Azerbaijani languages, showing system difference in these languages, give object ground to forecast problems, faced by students and expressed in the sound mistakes. So, Azerbaijani students make mistakes by placing different sentence-members in compliance with norms of the Azerbaijani language. The Turkish language speaking students, including

Azerbaijanis are seeking to place predicate last in the sentence, what corresponds to their native language.

So, we can state that comparative typology of foreign and native languages consider not separate elements of language but its system or structure, as a whole. It creates theoretical ground for surveys on the following problems:

- 1) possibility and impossibility of emergence of some elements in the language;
- 2) compulsory emergence of elements under presence of another elements in the language system: for example, lack of case category brings fixed order of words and wide usage of prepositions in the grammar function; lack of category of type brings to developed system of times as in English and in French.

Comparative typology of language structure allows comparing and finding out typological properties in the compared languages, having no genetic affinity. It should be mentioned that there pointed problem of similar (isomorphism) and different (allomorphism) peculiarities, rife to systems of some languages and sometimes groups of languages, for example position of depending components in preposition in English but position of depending components under attributive word combinations in Turkish, including Azerbaijani or German languages.

The identification of comparative typology of the compared languages allows to remove common methodical problems:

- 1) problems concerning different levels of the languages; phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactical problems faced by students under learning process;
- 2) problems to select necessary language and speech material;
- 3) problems to ensure methodical forecast and develop efficient system of methodical appliances for clear explaining of materials so that to create rational exercises;
- 4) problems to create scientifically-based system of text-books for practical courses on foreign languages.

Besides the above mentioned methodical problems, typological approach allows to remove many problems of private methods applied to teach a foreign language under

certain national audience such as ground and development of methods and appliances to teach concrete sounds and their variants, separate grammar forms or phraseological units of foreign language, depending upon peculiarities of native language of students.

CHECK YOURSELF TEST XXIII.

1. What kind of groups of mistakes do you know?
2. What is the essence of accidental mistakes?
3. What is the difference between accidental and solid mistakes?
4. What are the sources of sound or typical mistakes?
5. Speak about the phonological typology systems of foreign and native languages.
6. Which tense forms bring many grammatical mistakes for the learners?
7. What can you say about the flectional-synthetic structure of the Azerbaijani language?
8. What kind of methodical problems do comparative typology allow to remove?
9. Can word order of any language be one of the devices of making mistakes faced by the students?
10. How could you prevent from making any mistakes by learning any foreign language?
11. What can you say about the “interference” of any language?
12. Where do we come across a lot of mistakes: oral or written speech most?
13. Can the structural and functional-isomorphic features be source for sound mistakes?
14. Will the phonological and phonetic minimum of any foreign language for other language speakers be similar?
15. What does the functional-synthetic structure of the Azerbaijani language admit?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a) In Azerbaijani

1. Abdullayev Ə.Ə. Aktual üzvlənmə və mətn. Bakı: Xəzər universitetinin nəşriyyatı, 1998.
2. Abdullayev Ə.Ə. Mətn, məna və anlama (komunikativ – koqnitiv təhlil): Fil. elm. dok. ... dis. avtoref. Bakı, 2001.
3. Abdullayev Ə.Z. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində tabeli mürəkkəb cümlələr. Bakı: Maarif, 1974.
4. Abdullayev K.M. Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri. Bakı: Maarif, 1998.
5. Abdullayeva N. Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin morfoloqiyası. Bakı: N.Tusi adına APU, 1999.
6. Abdullayev S.Ə. Müasir Alman və Azərbaycan dillərində inkarlıq kateqoriyası. Bakı: Maarif, 1998.
7. Adilov M. Qəzet dili. Bakı: ADU nəşriyyatı, 1973.
8. Axundov A. Ümumi dilçilik. Dilçiliyin tarixi, nəzəriyyəsi və metodları. Bakı: Maarif, 1979.
9. Ağayeva F. Şifahi nitqin sintaksisi. Bakı: Maarif, 1975.
10. Azərbaycan dilinin qrammatikası. I hissə, morfoloqiya. Bakı: Azərb. SSR EA-nın nəşriyyatı, 1960, 327 s.
11. Babayev A.M. Dilçiliyə giriş. Bakı: Nurlan, 2004.
12. Cəfərov B. İngilis və Azərbaycan dillərində felin zamanlar sistemi. Bakı: Nurlan, 2004.
13. Hacıyev E.İ. Müasir ingilis və Azərbaycan dillərində köməkçi nitq hissələrinin funksional-semantik xüsusiyyətləri. Bakı: Mütərcim, 2006.
14. Hüseynzadə M. Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Morfoloqiya. III hissə. Bakı: Maarif, 1983.
15. Qurbanov A. Azərbaycan dilçiliyi problemləri, I c., Bakı: Nurlan, 2004.
16. Məmmədov A.Y. Mətn yaranmasında formal əlaqə vasitələrinin sistemi. Bakı: Elm, 2001.

17. Mirzəzadə H. Azərbaycan dilinin tarixi morfoloqiyası. Bakı: Azərtədrisnəşr, 1962.
18. Musayev O.İ. İngilis dilinin qrammatikası. Bakı: Maarif, 1996.
19. Rəcəbov Ə.Ə. Dilçilik tarixi. Bakı: Maarif, 1987.
20. Rəfibəyli G.L. İngilis və Azərbaycan dillərində feli tərkiblər. Filol. elm. nam. ... dis. avtoref. Bakı: AMEA Nəsimi adına Dilçilik İnstitutu, 2004.
21. Seyidov Y. Azərbaycan dilinin qrammatikası. Morfoloqiya. Bakı: BDU, 2000.
22. Şiriyev F.A. Müəyyənlilik və qeyri-müəyyənlilik (definitivlik) kateqoriyası. Filol. elm. nam. ... dis. avtoref. Bakı: BDU, 2001.
23. Vəliyeva N.Ç. Frazoloji birləşmələrin müqayisəli linqvistik təhlili (ingilis, Azərbaycan və rus dillərinin materialları əsasında). DDA. Bakı: AMEA Nəsimi adına Dilçilik İnstitutu, 2004.
24. Verdiyeva Z.N., Ağayeva F.M., Adilov M.İ. Azərbaycan dilinin semasiologiyası. Bakı, 1979.
25. Veysəlli F.Y. German dilçiliyinə giriş. Bakı: Mütərcim, 2001.
26. Veysəlli F.Y. Struktur dilçiliyin əsasları. Bakı: Təhsil NPM, 2005.
27. Veysəlli F.Y. Fonetika və fonologiya məsələləri. Bakı: Mütərcim, 1993.
28. Veysəlli F.Y. Fonologiyanın əsasları. Bakı, 2000.
29. Yunusov D.N. Müxtəlif sistemli dillərdə mürəkkəb sintaktik vahidlərin variativliyi. Bakı: Mütərcim, 2005.
30. Zeynalov F.R. Müasir türk dillərində ədat və modal sözlər. Bakı: ADU, 1965.

In English

31. Arnold I.V. The English word. M.: Vyşsaya şkola, Prosvescheniye, 1973.
32. Bazell C.E. Syntactic relations and linguistic typology. Cahiers. Ferdinand de Saussure, 1949.
33. Betty Sch. A. Fundamentals of English Grammar. Prentice Hall, 1992-VB.
34. English Usage. London: Harper Collins publishers, 1993.
35. Fries Ch. The structure of English. New York, 1956 (Photo copy).

36. Greenberg J.H. A quantitative approach to the morphology of language – International Journal of American Linguistics, V. XXVI, №3, 1960.
37. Hockett C.E. Syntactic relation and linguistic typology. A manual of phonology. International Journal of American Linguistics. W., 1955.
38. Ilyish B. The structure of modern English. Leningrad: Prosvescheniye, 1971.
39. Jakobson R. Typological studies and their contribution to historical comparative linguistics. Proceedings of the English International Congress of Linguistics, Oslo, 1958.
40. Jakobson R. Implications of language universals for linguistics. Universals of Language, Cambridge, 1966.
41. Jespersen O. The philosophy of Grammar. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1963.
42. Kaushanskaya V.L., Kovner R.L., Kozhevnikova O.N. etc. A Grammar of the English Language. L.: Prosvescheniye, 1967.
43. Khaimovich B.S., Rogovskaya B.I. A course in English Grammar. Moscow: Vysshaya škola, 1967.
44. Kasares X. Introduction to Modern lexicography. M., 1958.
45. Leech G., Svartvik J. A communicative grammar of English. M.: Prosvescheniye, 1983.
46. Maclin A. Reference Guide to English: A Handbook of English as a second language. Washington, DC. USIA, 1996.
47. Palmer H.E. A Grammar of Spoken English. London, New York, 1976.
48. Potter S. Our language. London, 1990.
49. Reformatsky A.A. Introduction to Linguistics. M., 1967
50. Robinson M., Davidson G. Chambers XXI Century Dictionary. Chambers, 1998.
51. Swan M. Practical English Usage. Second edition London: Oxford University Press, 1998.
52. Thomson A., Martinet A. Practical English Grammar. Oxford, 1987.
53. Yunusov D.N. A Guide to English Grammar. Baku: Mutarjim, 2006.

54. Yunusov D.N. Constancy and variety of complex syntactic units in languages of different systems. Istanbul: Ekizler Printing House, 2007.

In Russian

55. Алпатов В.М. Из истории изучения частей речи // Части речи. Теория и типология. М.: Наука, 1990.

56. Аракин В.Д. Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков. Л.: Просвещение, 1979.

57. Буранов Дж. Сравнительная типология английского и тюркских языков. Учебное пособие, М.: Высшая школа, 1983.

58. Вейхман Г.А. Новое в английской грамматике. М.: Высшая школа, 1990.

59. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. М.-Л.: Учпедгиз, 1947.

60. Вопросы теории частей речи на материале языков различных типов. Л.: Наука, 1968.

61. Гаджиев Э.И. Функционально-семантические особенности слов “one” и “bir” в современном английском и азербайджанском языках. Баку, Мутарджим, 2006.

62. Гусейнов А.Р. Проблема однозначности категории определенности как коммуникативной единицы. АКД, Киев, 1979.

63. Дресслер В. К вопросу от реконструкции индоевропейского синтаксиса. «Новое в зарубежной лингвистики», Т. XXI, Москва: Прогресс, 1988.

64. Иванова И.Т., Бурлакова В.В., Почепцов Г.Г. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1981.

65. Иванова В.Ф. Современный русский язык. Графика и орфография. М., 1966.

66. Ильиш Б.А. Современный английский язык. М.: Изд-во литературы на иностранных языках, 1948.

67. Историко-типологические исследования морфологического строя германских языков. М.: Наука, 1972.

68. Кацнельсон С.Д. Основные задачи лингвистической типологии. В сб.: Лингвистическая типология и восточные языки. М.: Наука, 1965.
69. Карнаухова А. Непольные придаточные предложения в современном английском языке. АКД., Москва, 1982.
70. Макаев Э.А. Сравнительная, сопоставительная и типологическая грамматика // Вопросы языкознания №1, 1964.
71. Мещанинов Н.И. Проблема развития языка. Ленинград: Наука, 1975.
72. Мельчук И.А. Проблемы математической лингвистики. «Вестник АН СССР №8, М., 1959.
73. Мухин А.М. Синтаксемный анализ и проблема уровней языка. Ленинград: Наука, 1980.
74. Мухин А.М. Структура предложения и их модели. Ленинград: Наука, 1968.
75. Проблемы лингвистического анализа. М., 1966.
76. Пиотровский Р.Г. Математическое языкознание и его перспективы // Вестник высшей школы №6, М., 1964.
77. Рождественский Ю.В. Типология слова. М., 1969.
78. Семерный О. Введение в сравнительное языкознание. М., 1980.
79. Суник О.П. Общая теория частей речи. М.-Л., 1966.
80. Сравнительно историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Морфология. М.: Наука, 1988.
81. Холодович А.А. Проблемы грамматической теории. Л.: Наука, Ленинградское отделение, 1979.
82. Шендельс У.И. О сопоставительно-типологическом анализе в морфологии. В сб.: Структурно-типологическое описание современных германских языков. М., 1966.
83. Юнусов Д.Н. Сопоставительный анализ структурно-интонационного варьирования сложноподчиненных предложений с АДП и СДП с “that” в современном английском языке // Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета. Серия Лингвистика.

Межкультурная Коммуникация. Лексикология. Москва, вып. 522, 2007, стр. 232-239.

84. Юнусов Д.Н. Трактовка интонационного варьирования сложных синтаксических конструкций в современном английском языке / Научная мысль Кавказа. Северо-Кавказский научный центр высшей школы. Ростов-на-Дону, Приложение 5, 2006, с. 281-285.
85. Ярцева В.Н. Историческая морфология английского языка. М.-Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, Ленинградское отделение, 1960.
86. Ярцева В.Н. Принципы типологического исследования родственных и неродственных языков // В сб.: Проблемы языкознания. М.: Наука, 1967, стр. 203-207.
87. Ярцева В.Н. Контрастивная грамматика. М.: Наука, 1981.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

CHAPTER I. TYPOLOGY OF FOREIGN AND NATIVE
LANGUAGES

CHAPTER II. THE HISTORY OF TYPOLOGICAL
INVESTIGATIONS

CHAPTER III. THE LANGUAGE TYPE AND TYPE IN THE
LANGUAGE

CHAPTER IV. CONTRASTIVE STRUCTURE STUDIES IN
FOREIGN AND NATIVE LANGUAGES

CHAPTER V. CLASSIFICATION OF LANGUAGES:
GENEALOGICAL, TYPOLOGICAL
(MORPHOLOGICAL) AND AREAL

CHAPTER VI. TYPOLOGY OF PHONOLOGICAL SYSTEMS IN
COMPARED LANGUAGES

CHAPTER VII. TYPOLOGY OF MORPHOLOGICAL SYSTEMS IN
COMPARED LANGUAGES

CHAPTER VIII. TYPOLOGY OF PARTS OF SPEECH IN COMPA-
RED LANGUAGES

CHAPTER IX. TYPOLOGY OF FUNCTIONAL PARTS OF
SPEECH IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

- CHAPTER X.** TYPOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NOMINAL GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES IN COMPARED LANGUAGES: CASE, NUMBER, GENDER, DEFINITENESS-INDEFINITENESS, DEGREES OF COMPARISON
- CHAPTER XI.** TYPOLOGY OF THE VERBAL GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES IN COMPARED LANGUAGES
- CHAPTER XII.** TYPOLOGY OF WORD CLASSES AND MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES
- CHAPTER XIII.** TYPOLOGY OF LEXICAL SYSTEMS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES
- CHAPTER XIV.** TYPOLOGY OF SYNTACTIC SYSTEMS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES
- CHAPTER XV.** TYPOLOGY OF SENTENCE MEMBERS IN COMPARED LANGUAGES
- CHAPTER XVI.** SOME PROBLEMS OF SEMANTICO-STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF COMPLEX SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI
- CHAPTER XVII.** MAIN LEVELS AND PROCESSES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGES. LINGUISTIC DIFFERENTIATION AND INTEGRATION.

CHAPTER XVIII. TYPOLOGY OF GRAPHIC ARTS, ORTHOEPY AND ORTHOGRAPHY IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

CHAPTER XIX. TYPOLOGY OF LEXICOGRAPHY IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

CHAPTER XX. TYPOLOGY OF LINGUISTIC TRANSLATION IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

CHAPTER XXI. TYPOLOGY OF WORD ORDER IN COMPARED LANGUAGES

CHAPTER XXII. DEVELOPMENT OF MATHEMATIC LINGUISTICS AND ENGINEERING LANGUAGE

CHAPTER XXIII. COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGY AND METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH

BIBLIOGRAPHY

4) problems to create scientifically-based system of text-books for practical courses on foreign languages.