Suffixal Derivation in French and Uzbek Languages

Kavilova Laura-Aquilina and Kavilova Tamara

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Jizzakh, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article delves into the application of argotic suffixes and prefixes as derivational mechanisms for conveying emotional and evaluative sentiments toward the designated object. The authors systematically pinpoint the argotic suffixes that prove to be particularly effective in conveying estimation. Additionally, the article sheds light on the unique trajectories through which these suffixes have been integrated into the current grammatical structures of both French and Uzbek languages. Language, as a powerful medium of communication, not only conveys information but also serves as a rich tapestry of expressions that reflect our emotions and evaluations. One intriguing facet of linguistic evolution involves the use of argotic suffixes and prefixes, which serve as potent derivational tools for articulating our emotional and evaluative relationships towards the designated object. This article delves into the multifaceted realm of argotic linguistic elements, exploring how they enhance our ability to express subjective sentiments.

1 INTRODUCTION

Among the Romance languages, French stands out as having diverged the farthest from its Latin origins, primarily due to the influence of Germanic languages, notably Frankish. The region of Gaul experienced significant impact from the invasions of Germanic tribes around the 5th century, with the Franks emerging as the most dominant among them. Interestingly, unlike the replacement of Gaulish by Latin, the Gallo-Romance language did not yield entirely to the language of the invaders. Instead, Frankish coexisted with Romance before gradually fading away over the subsequent centuries.

Remarkably, despite the gradual disappearance of Frankish, it left a lasting imprint on the French language. Over 600 words, particularly related to rural life (e.g., wheat), parts of the body (e.g., chine), clothing (e.g., scarf), feelings or chivalrous character (e.g., hardi), weaponry (e.g., spear), war (e.g., truce), and colors (e.g., blue), continue to be part of the French vocabulary today[3]. Additionally, beyond individual words, the Franks contributed prefixes such as mé- (e.g., discontent) and suffixes like -aud (e.g., badaud), -an (e.g., peasant), and -ard (e.g., old man) to the French language (Dubois, J., F. 1999).

This article seeks to delve deeper into the examination of suffixes. According to Le Petit Robert, suffixes are described as elements of Germanic origin that impart a pejorative or vulgar nuance to nouns and adjectives (Kurt Glaser. 1910). This prompts several inquiries: Do words ending in certain suffixes indeed carry pejorative connotations based on their origins? In which types of words are these suffixes commonly found? Are there instances where they are not employed in a pejorative sense? Furthermore, how have the meanings of medieval words evolved over time? Our initial hypothesis posits that the suffix inherently carries a pejorative nuance in French, a notion that warrants further exploration.

In this introductory section, we have consulted a range of works, including "History of the French language, T.1 From the Latin era to the Renaissance" (1905) by Ferdinand Brunot, "Evolution and structure of the French language" (1993) by Walther von Wartburg, "History of the French language" (2002) by Mireille Huchon, "Introduction to the history of the French language" (2016) by Michèle Perret, and "Le nouveau Petit Robert" (2007) by Paul Robert.

For the theoretical foundation of this article, our primary references will include "Methodical Grammar of French" (2009) by Martin Riegel, Jean-Christophe Pellat, and René Rioul, "Historical Grammar of the French Language" (1908) by Kristoffer Nyrop, "Elements of Romance Linguistics" (1967) by Édouard Bourciez, "Suffixal

derivation in French" (1999) by Jean Dubois and Françoise Dubois-Charlier.

Additionally, we will draw insights from "History of the French Language" (1930) by Albert Dauzat and "The Adventure of French Words from Elsewhere" (1997) by Henriette Walter. Notably, the research titled "The pejorative meaning of the suffix -ard in French" (1910) by Kurt Glaser, being the sole work exclusively dedicated to this suffix, merits a distinct section within the theoretical framework.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Kurt Glaser's study, "The pejorative meaning of the suffix -ard in French," published in the journal Romanische Forschungen in 1910, stands as the sole comprehensive exploration of the -ard suffix, providing valuable insights. In this research, the Romanist Glaser scrutinizes words ending in -ard, tracing their usage from Old French to the contemporary era, specifically those he deems to carry a pejorative connotation. Addressing the challenges posed by the sometimes unclear etymology of -ard words, we focuse solely on those with well-established etymologies.

By "pejorative," we refer to that which degrades meaning, is interpreted negatively, or implies denigration. While cataloging non- derogatory -ard words, he includes those indicating a property (e.g., bécard, "salmon with a long hooked projection of the lower jaw"), a quality (péchard), an augmentative meaning (fauchard, "large scythe"), and diminutive meaning (chevrillard, "small deer"), noting the relative rarity of the latter.

Glaser highlights the widespread usage of the - ard suffix throughout history, contributing numerous innovative words to colloquial language, a phenomenon often overlooked in literature (Glaser 1910: 934). Despite the varied meanings of these words, it raises the question of how to explain the predominantly pejorative sense of this suffix. He aligns with Nyrop's theory suggesting that the pejorative meaning evolved from the augmentative sense, positing that it initially emerged in words with stems already carrying derogatory meanings, such as "drunkard" and "sotard." The derogatory connotation of these stems would have influenced the suffix in these instances, extending to other derivatives in -ard, as seen in "lisard," which could mean someone who knows how to read, likes to read, but also conveys the sense of being clever or adept in business. Glaser draws comparisons between the pejorative nature of the -ard suffix and other pejorative suffixes in French,

including -ald, -asse, -aille, -in, -on, and -âtre. The suffix -ald, considered the closest counterpart to -ard, has been previously discussed in the preceding chapter. Similar to -ard, it initially emerges in Germanic proper nouns before extending to common nouns denoting people and animals, often carrying a pejorative undertone, as seen in terms like clumsy, clumsy, and toad (Kurt Glaser. 1910).

Concerning -asse, derived from the Latin feminine suffix -acea/-acia, it primarily functions as a collective and augmentative suffix, taking on a pejorative sense in words such as bestiasse and paperwork. The idea of greatness, when misinterpreted, generates the concept of disproportionate and consequently deformed greatness. In certain feminine and pejorative words ending in -asse, such as blondasse and fadasse, the feminine form is also applied to masculine entities. Another French suffix derived from Latin (-alia) is

-aille, conveying a collective meaning with an inclination toward the pejorative, words like ferraille ("waste iron", TLFi) and valetaille ("[a] set of valets", TLFi), pointing out that the pejorative sense of these terms has a relatively modern origin.

In the case of the suffixes -in and -on, both derived from Latin, the pejorative connotation is rooted in the diminutive sense, where "the idea of smallness engenders contempt": gallant, joker, braggart, grumpy, among others. The endings stemming from the Latin suffix -attus/-ottus/-ittus follow a similar pattern, conveying a diminutive meaning in words like louvat and îlet, while adopting a pejorative sense in bellot and vielot (Kurt Glaser. 1910).

Highlighting this aspect, let's observe instances where words ending in -ard have fallen out of use, replaced by alternatives deemed more neutral, as seen in the shift from Nicien and Niçois to Niçard. He underscores the fluidity of language, noting that -ard words are susceptible to nuanced shifts in meaning, potentially diluting or entirely eclipsing the originally pejorative sense of a word. Thus, he posits, "the pejorative meaning is not always precisely defined and specified, often making it challenging to grasp"(Kurt Glaser. 1910).

In this research, following Glaser's study we'd like to categorize sixteen groups of pejorative words ending in -ard, encompassing qualities interpreted negatively (esperart, "one who hopes easily"), tendencies towards chatter (languard, "one with a sharp tongue"), lack of courage (coward, fugitive), inclination to cry (cryer, whiner), loud and inappropriate shouting (loud, shouty), individuals with a gloomy and scolding demeanor (grondart, hognart), drunkenness (drunk, thirsty), mockery

(joking), stupidity (sottard), deceit (cheat), physical peculiarities or defects (nasty, one-eyed), morally reprehensible individuals (bawdy, party animal), professional nicknames (snitch, "[police] spy," cumulard, "one who combines several paid public functions"), the executioner (hangman), laziness (straggler, lazy person), and names with specific pejorative meanings (Pierre Fessart, "fessu"). Regarding the latter, Glaser notes that while the pejorative sense is absent in Germanic proper nouns, it emerges later in French proper nouns, often in the form of a noun or adjective expressing a negative quality (Kurt Glaser. 1910).

The challenges associated with affixation in the formation of abbreviated lexical units pose a nuanced dilemma for researchers. N.N. Lopatnikova (Lopatnikova N.N. 1999) characterizes this phenomenon as not affixation but rather an expansion of existing indifferent words through the addition of elements that create a familiar shortening effect. Additional elements are appended to the end of a word or root. The author highlights the efficacy of general techniques, especially those involving the replacement of the last truncated element of a lexical unit (word or root) with another surrogate element. These surrogate elements, like -anche, -ouse, -o, - oche, - if, and others, are not considered suffixes as they lack a general lexical taxonomic meaning and can generate constructions related to different parts of the word, a characteristic not typical of standard suffixes. N. N. Lopatnikova identifies suffixes such as -o, -ard, and -on as variations of false suffixes, distinct in purpose—creating variations and addressing word formation deficits.

The exploration of the relationship between

lexical origin and register in French takes a distinctive perspective in comparison to other linguists. E.M. Chekalina (Chekalina E.M. 1986) delves into evaluative means within the system of suffixes for French nouns and adjectives, encompassing -ard, -eux, -esque, -asse, -aud, -ache,

-iste, -isme. Additionally, she includes diminutive forms that generate -et (elet), -ot, -on.

In a study focused on emotional connections in the French language, V. I. Nukalova (Nukalova V.I. 1974) places emphasis on suffixes of subjective assessment, such as -ard, -aille, -ouille, - aud, and others. These suffixes form an integral part of the morphological structure of the language, serving specific grammatical functions and imbuing words with emotional connotations like disgust, rejection, or irony.

Meanwhile, V.V. Meteleva (Meteleva V.V. 1977), in her examination of the semantics of reduced

lexical units in French, particularly in colloquial speech, meticulously analyzes the semantics of derivatives shaped by the -ard suffix. All the aforementioned word-formation elements are regarded as suffixes utilized for transforming the root for word-formation purposes.

The utilization of suffixes and prefixes as derivative tools for conveying an emotional-evaluative stance towards the subject being described alleviates the weightiness of the statement. This concise approach allows for the precise depiction of a person, object, or phenomenon in positive or negative terms and seamlessly integrates into everyday conversation, having originated from slang.

An illustrative example is the slang noun "salaud," formed by appending the slang suffix - aud to the French adjective "sale," meaning "dirty" or "nasty." This term was initially documented by the French Academy in 1798 and, in its early usage, denoted "a dishonest and vile person, a hypocrite, and a scoundrel," serving as a harsh condemnation. It gained rapid popularity and recognition, particularly since 1946, thanks to its active inclusion in the works of the French philosopher and journalist J.-P. Sartre. In its current lexical status, "salaud" is classified as "pop" in French dictionaries (ROBERT, Paul. 2007), carrying a clearly negative concept synonymous with "scoundrel" or "rascal."

The examination of texts reveals the frequency of employing suffixes for expressing a relational attitude towards the associated object. Emotional assessments are commonly conveyed through diminutive suffixes, while derogatory implications can be articulated through various affixes. It's crucial to underscore that lexical units with diminutive suffixes may, under specific circumstances, acquire a negative or sarcastic connotation.

When scrutinizing evaluative expressions— both positive and negative—via suffixal derivation, a discernible hierarchy emerges among suffixal parts of speech. Phrases with substantives are deemed the most productive, followed by adjectives, verb forms, and personal pronouns. Demonstrative pronouns rank lower in productivity. The analysis of language documents indicates that the suffix -ard is the most effective means for constructing words expressing gratitude in French slang, with 64 words listed in the argot dictionary. Notably, the suffix -ard predominantly demonstrates a negative attitude towards the subject of evaluation, as exemplified by terms like "demerdard" (shifted) and "queutard" (debaucher, party-goer), among others. Surnames ending in -ard originate from two

distinct sources, either a Germanic name or adescriptor where the suffix -ard imparts either an elevating or derogatory connotation.

Germanic military names often incorporate the word "hard," signifying strength or utility in ancient Germanic language. This term is an integral part of various Germanic names that evoke strength or mythical creatures. For instance, Bernard means "strong bear," and Richard conveys the meaning of "mighty and strong." Some names survive solely in surnames, such as Rocard ("strong crow"), Sicard ("strong victory"), and Guérard ("attentive and strong")...

Conversely, in French, the suffix -ard generally carries a derogatory meaning. Numerous examples, including ringard, connard, fêtard, bâtard, bavard, babillard, banlieusard, bambochard, flemmard, and vantard, underscore this trend. For instance, Ronflard, commonly found in Tours, could describe a loud snorer or a card player, as ronfle, meaning "snore," is associated with a card game where one player was expected to feign sleep, hence snoring (Mireille Huchon.2002)...

These names are not always straightforward to interpret. Brouard, derived from the word "brouet," meaning clear soup, gains an added negative nuance with the suffix -ard. It raises questions about whether it refers to someone who consumed only soup and led a meager life or perhaps an innkeeper who served modestly at the table. The negative perception might be linked to the place of origin rather than the individual. For example, Souchard is derived from the word "souche," meaning a cleared area with tree stumps or a village by that name. The -ard suffix suggests that the place was not particularly pleasant, likely due to the unproductive nature of the land.

The suffix -ard serves various functions, including creating agentive and instrumental forms, and substituting for other suffixes. Agentives, derived from action verbs with a subject, can be formed using intransitive verbs (e.g., brailler, "Joseph est un braillard"), pronominal verbs (e.g., se vanter, "Joseph est un vantard"), or transitive verbs (e.g., cumuler, "Joseph est un cumulard"). Comparing -ard with - eur, it is noted that the former is "sometimes more common when the verb itself has a pejorative meaning" (1999: 61), as seen in pleurnicher → "Joseph est un pleurnichard," not pleurnicheur.

Instrumental forms, considered remnants of an older state, are exemplified by words like fouchard, denoting a double-bladed sickle, and are occasionally employed in professional slang, such as "Il est un mouchard qui traîne de rue en rue." Additionally, the suffix -ard can replace a neutral suffix, imparting a

pejorative sense to words like chauffeur → chauffard, signifying one who drives

poorly. Moreover, it can be appended to basic agent names, as seen in flicard → flic, intensifying the pejorative meaning.

When analyzing the structure of non-derivative and derived words in French and Uzbek, a significant contrast becomes apparent. In the Uzbek language, a non-derivative word stands alone, operating independently as a distinct word with a specific lexical meaning. Any substantial word lacking an affix is a complete and self- contained lexical unit. Examples include "temir" for "iron," "dala" for "field," "non" for "bread," and "kitob" for "book." (Asadov, T. 2022)

Words borrowed from French into Uzbek, such as "avance" becoming "avans," "assemblée" becoming "assembleya," and "bagage" turning into "bagaj," have become indivisible words. Consequently, the concept of a "word stem" present in the French language does not align with the specific structure of Uzbek words. In Uzbek, all morphemes are sequentially attached to a non- derivative word. For instance, in the example "Studentlaringizdanginami?" meaning "Is it only from your students?":

"lar" is a plural suffix.

"ingiz" is a suffix indicating affiliation in the 2nd person, plural.

"dan" is a suffix indicating the ablative case.

"gina" is a suffix of restriction, implying "only" or "just."

"mi" is an interrogative particle. (Hozhiev A. 2022)

This structure makes it challenging to pinpoint the stem and inflectional morpheme in examples like "students," where "student" is the root or non- derivative stem, and "-ov" is the ending indicating the plural genitive case. Acknowledging this distinct feature of Uzbek words, it is recommended to use the term "non-derivative word" (instead of "root" or "non-derivative base") if it lacks formative morphemes (Kononov A.N. 1960).

In the Uzbek language, case and other affixes can be easily separated, whereas in French, this is impossible. For instance, "institutlarga" breaks down as follows: "lar" indicates plurality, and "ga" serves as the affix for the dative case. In French, the dative case is expressed through prepositions, as seen in "aux instituts." In Uzbek, any fully formed word without case or other suffixes constitutes a complete lexical unit, involving the concepts of root, prefix, and suffix.

The French language employs a diverse range of methods and tools for word formation, with suffixes

playing a crucial role in the creation of new words. Suffixation carries the primary lexical meaning of a word, whether it consists of a single root (livre), a root and a prefix (pré-achat), or a combination of root, prefix, and suffix (in- accept-a-tion).

In contrast, the Uzbek language lacks the concept of a "root" in the same sense as in French (Jurayeva Shalola Xusanboyeva,). In Uzbek, any non-derivative word represents a formalized lexical unit with a specific meaning. The predominant method of word formation involves suffixation, where word-forming affixes are added to a non-derivative word. For instance, in the word "yozuvchi," "yoz" serves as a non-derivative word,

"-uv-" functions as an affix forming a new word, and "-chi" is a suffix indicating a person.

In French, the root and word-forming morphemes maintain a close relationship, a contrast observed in the Uzbek language. This distinction poses a challenge for Uzbek students, particularly when attempting to identify the root of most French words, given their unfamiliarity with the Latin origin of words. To overcome these challenges, it is recommended to provide students with translations of words into Uzbek

Table 1: For convenience, the main differences are reflected in the table.

A suffix is a sequence of letters added to the end of a word, which is referred to as the radical or root word. This addition results in a new word within the same word family, known as a derived word. The stem of the word encapsulates the primary idea, while the suffix alters the meaning of the radical.	New words are formed from root words or derived stem mainly by adding word-forming (stem-forming) suffixes to them. For example: ish - work, business, ish-chi - worker employee, ish-siz - unemployed, ish- siz-lik unemployment, ish-chan - businesslike, ish-la
Suffixes play a role in modifying the grammatical nature of the original word, enabling the transformation of an adjective into a noun, an adverb, and vice versa.	- work (the basis of the verb ishlamoq - work) etc. Prefixa word formation is very rare, for example: to'g'ri - correct noto'g'ri - incorrect.
Ex: *grand* (qualifying adjective) *grand-eur* (common noun) *grand-ir* (verb) Here, we added *-eur* and *-ir* to find other words of a different nature.	The word formation system is much simpler than in the French language (there are many productive word-forming suffixes, most of them are unambiguous).
The word formation system is very complex (many rules and exceptions to them, many prefixes and suffixes with very different meanings). A large number of words can be formed from one root morpheme (sometimes up to 150-200 words). Set of words that have the same root, the same radical. Ex : Forêt, forest-ier, dé-forest-a-tion, forest-erie.	One root word usually produces 5-10 (sometimes 10-20 words of the same root. To denote various actions, stable phrases (so-called "complex verbs") are often used, fo example: olib kelmoq - bring, (lit. "taking to come") oli ketmoq - take away, carry away (lit., "taking to leave") yaxshi ko'rmoq .—to love (lit., "to see well"), tamon qilmoq—to finish (lit., "to do the end"), etc.
The radical does not always have exactly the same form from one word to another in the same family. Ex: Le radical « cheval » a donné les mots « chevalerie », « chevalier », mais aussi « chevaucher».	In the Uzbek language, the method of compounding word in word formation is used relatively rarely.
Prefixes, suffixes and endings in the French language, as a rule, have multiple meanings. The affixal derivation can be, depending on the nature of the affix added to the base (one or more), prefixal, suffixal or parasynthetic. Prefixal and suffixal derivations consist of adding a prefix and a suffix to a base respectively. Thus, re-peindre is a derivative by prefixation of the verb peindre and pauvre-té is a derivative by suffixation of the adjective pauvre.	Suffixes in the Uzbek language are in most case unambiguous. So, for example, the suffix -dan expresse only the meaning of the original case of names, the suffix ning - only the meaning of the genitive case of names, th suffix -lar - only the meaning of the plural, the suffix -ni only the meaning of the accusative case of names, etc.
The parasynthetic formation results from a simultaneous addition to a base, a prefix and a suffix. For example, the word neckline is formed both by prefixation and by suffixation: we add to the base constituted by the noun col, the prefix en- and the suffix –ure. Likewise, *indécorable* is formed by the addition of the prefix *in-* and the suffix –able.	There are both polysemantic and homonymous suffixes (fo example: -cha, -siz, -(i)ng, etc.), but there are very few o them.
	The rules and paradigms for declension of names an conjugation of verbs are very simple and uniform. There ar almost no exceptions to these rules. So, for example, al nouns, substantivized adjectives, participles, pronomina adjectives, ordinal numbers and, in general, al substantivized parts of speech, as well as noun pronoun (for example, personal pronouns), cardinal numbers ar declined according to the same rule, and to them to expres the meanings of number, case, belonging, etc. the sam suffixes (endings) are added.
We speak of production when a lexical unit produces derivatives. Lexical units are more or less productive depending on the number of derivatives they produce. Chrome, for example, is very productive since it gives rise to a large number of derivatives: *chromer, chromage, chromé(e), chromatage, chromate, chromeur, chromeux, chromifère, chromique, chromisation.*	One suffix (ending) usually expresses only on grammatical meaning. Therefore, in order to express

Certain lexical units do not produce any morphological derivative, they are said to be blocked, this is the case of the nouns keyboard and mouse, for example.	several grammatical meanings at the same time, several suffixes (endings) must be added to the base of the word. For example: for your children - bola+lar+ing-iz+ga [-lar- — plural, -ing- - 2 p. (owner), -iz- —:pl. , (owner), -ga – dative case].

3 CONCLUSION

Our task involved constructing a model that depicts semantic derivation, as outlined in the Meaning-Text theory, among morphological derivatives within computer vocabulary terms. To achieve this, we gathered terms from a general public computing corpus using a concordancer. We applied specific criteria to identify terms unique to the field and to distinguish between various meanings of polysemous terms. Our objective was to illustrate semantic derivation links among morphological derivatives, and we encoded these links using lexical functions that model semantic derivation.

However, certain semantic relationships between two terms were not prevalent enough in the language to align with standard lexical functions. Consequently, we devised non-standard lexical functions. Only terms genuinely lexicalized in the spoken language were included, and criteria were employed to determine the lexicalization status of a term.

We propose the utilization of lexical functions in terminography from this standpoint, as they comprehensively and systematically elucidate the semantic relationships among diverse morphological derivatives of terms. The preliminary effort required to disambiguate different meanings of terms proves advantageous, compelling terminographers to adopt a rigorous approach that inherently enhances the quality of definitions. We believe that conducting a reflection based on a broader spectrum of terms could be beneficial, leading to the identification of additional derivatives not found in the corpus. This study could encompass complex terms such as "power on" or "write protection," which were excluded in our initial research. Expanding the scope of the work would facilitate a more profound examination of how to structure the model, specifically regarding the selection of terms to serve as inputs.

Moreover, we have demonstrated the validity of this model in terminology and posit its potential adaptability to other specialized languages with their unique linguistic characteristics.

These could serve as a robust tool for comparing linguistic phenomena in general language with those in specialized languages. Indeed, they effectively bring attention to facts such as derivation and collocations in a formal and easily manipulable manner.

REFERENCES

Asadov, T. (2022). On the study and development of word formation in the Uzbek language. CENTER FOR Scientific Publications (buxdu.Uz), 18(18).

Azizov A.A. Comparative grammar of Russian and Uzbek languages. Tashkent, 1990.

Bujanova L. Ju. Terminologicheskaja derivacija v jazyke nauki: kognitivnost', semiotichnost', funkcional'nost' (Terminological Derivation in the Language of Science: Cognition, Semiotics, Functionality), Moscow: Flinta, 2016, 390 p.

Chekalina E.M. On the problem of the formation of the evaluative meaning of the affix // Bulletin of the Leningrad University. - Ser. 2. – History, linguistics, literary criticism. – L., 1986. – Issue. 4. – pp. 73-78.

Dehqonov Islom Teshaevich. (2021) L'interculturel en francais langue etrengere. International scientific and practical conference. 3 (3) 135-137.

Dubois, J., F. Dubois-Charlier: La dérivation suffixale en français – Paris, Nathan, 1999

Hozhiev A. Uzbek tili suz jasalishi (Word Production in the Uzbek Language), Tashkent: Uqituvchi, 2007, 168 p.

Jurayeva Shalola Xusanboyeva, "On the expression of words from french lanuage to uzbek language". American journal of social and humanitarian research vol 2 no 9,119,120,121

Kononov A.N. "Grammar of the modern Uzbek literary language" 1960.

Kurt Glaser. «Le sens péjoratif du suffixe -ard en français», Romanische Forschungen –T. 27, 1910.,p. 932-983.

Lopatnikova N.N. Colloquially reduced pseudo-word-formation variants of stylistically neutral words in modern French// Unity of systemic and functional analysis of linguistic units. Vol. III. – Belgorod, 1999. – P. 240-245.

Madvaliev A. Uzbek tilining izohli lugati (1-5 zhildlar) (Annotated Dictionary of the Uzbek Language), Volumes 1-5, Tashkent: Davlat ilmii nashrieti, 2020. Mireille Huchon. Histoire de la langue française, – Paris: LGF, 2002

Myakshin, K.A. Diversity of approaches to defining the concept of "term" / K.A. Myakshin // Almanac of modern science and education. – Tambov, 2009. – p.109–111.

N. A. Structural linguistics: origins and directions. - Moscow, 2006.

Reshetova, L. Rod vazhins category sining lexicon-grammar hususiyatlari / L. Reshetova, K. Umurov // Ozbek tili va adabiyoti. 1965. No. 6. pp. 31–35.

Saidov, Zh. R. On the word formation of adjectives in the modern Uzbek language / Zh. R. Saidov. — Text: immediate // Young scientist. — 2015. — No. 8 (88). — P. 1160-1163.

Yusupov U.K. Theoretical foundations of comparative linguistics. – Tashkent: Fan. 2007. – 125 p.