

THE HISTORICAL AND ETYMOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PREFIXATION IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Narzullayeva Muborak Sherzod qizi

Independent Researcher, Gulistan State University, Uzbekistan

E-mail: narzullayevamuboraksherzodovna@gmail.com

Abstract

The article examines the historical and etymological development of prefixation in the Uzbek language. Uzbek belongs to the Turkic family, whose word formation rests almost entirely on suffixation, and therefore every prefixal element of the modern language carries a traceable history of language contact or of internal reanalysis. The study distinguishes five chronological layers: the Old Turkic base, in which productive prefixation is absent; the intensifying reduplicative model of native origin; the Arabic layer that entered after the Islamization of Movarounnahr; the Persian and Tajik layer, which supplied the core of the present prefixal inventory; and the Russian and international layer of the twentieth century, continued after 1991 by elements of English origin. Each prefixal element is described through its source form, its original lexical meaning and the stage at which it became segmentable for Uzbek speakers. The material shows that borrowing alone does not create a prefix. A foreign element acquires prefixal status only when it combines with native Turkic stems and when the resulting complex takes Uzbek inflection as a single unit. On this basis the article proposes a grammaticalization cline for Uzbek prefixal elements that runs from free word through semi-bound component to fully bound prefix, and it shows that the elements of the modern inventory occupy different points on that cline.

Keywords: Prefixation, Uzbek language, etymology, historical word formation, language contact, borrowing, Persian layer, Arabic layer, internationalisms, grammaticalization.

Introduction

The Uzbek language belongs to the Karluk branch of the Turkic family and shares with that family a word formation system built on suffixation. A stem is followed by derivational and then inflectional morphemes in a fixed order, and the boundaries between them remain transparent throughout the paradigm [1]. Against this background prefixation looks like a foreign body in the system. Nevertheless, the modern literary language contains a stable inventory of prefixal elements that includes be-, no-, ser-, ba-, bo-, ham-, kam-, bad-, xush-, g'ayri-, lo- and a large group of international items such as anti-, kontr-, re-, de-, dis-, post-, trans-, super-, ultra-, mikro- and makro-. The presence of this inventory in a consistently suffixing language is a direct product of contact history, and it cannot be explained by internal Turkic development alone.

Descriptive grammars of Uzbek usually present these elements synchronically. They list the prefixes, indicate the word classes they derive and give examples, but they rarely trace the path by which a lexical item of another language became a bound morpheme of Uzbek. The etymological information that does exist is dispersed across dictionaries of different periods and across studies devoted to the Persian and Arabic lexical layers as a whole. As a result, questions of chronology remain open. It is not clear at which stage the Persian privative element became segmentable for Turkic speakers, or whether the Arabic elements ever reached the same degree of integration, or how the international prefixes of the Soviet decades differ structurally from the older layers.

The aim of the present article is to reconstruct the historical and etymological development of prefixation in Uzbek and to establish the chronological layers of the modern inventory. Four tasks follow from this aim. The first is to determine whether Old Turkic possessed any prefixal model at all. The second is to describe the intensifying reduplicative formations of the type qip-qizil as the single native source of prefix-like structures. The third is to trace the Arabic, Persian and Russian layers with their source forms and their approximate dates of entry. The fourth is to establish the criteria by which a borrowed element can be said to have become a prefix of Uzbek rather than an unanalysable part of a loanword.

The material of the study consists of prefixed lexical items recorded in explanatory and etymological dictionaries of Uzbek, in the monuments of the Karakhanid, Khorezm-Turkic and Chagatai periods, and in the terminological vocabulary of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The methods applied are

the comparative historical method, etymological analysis of the source forms, and the contact linguistic approach that distinguishes matter borrowing from pattern borrowing. Structural criteria of segmentability are used throughout as the test of prefixal status.

The theoretical framework applied here distinguishes two kinds of contact-induced transfer. The transfer of concrete morphological material, that is, of the phonological shape of a morpheme together with its function, is matter borrowing. The transfer of a structural schema that the recipient language then fills with its own material is pattern borrowing. Uzbek prefixation involves both, and the two must be kept apart in the historical account. The Persian and Arabic elements *be-*, *no-*, *ser-* and *g'ayri-* are matter borrowings, since their form as well as their function came from the donor language. The productive left-hand modification of the twentieth century terminology, on the other hand, includes formations built entirely from Uzbek material on a foreign schema, and these are the result of pattern borrowing. The distinction explains why the inventory of prefixal elements and the extent of prefixal word formation in Uzbek do not coincide, and why a purely etymological list of prefixes understates the presence of the phenomenon in the modern language.

2. The Old Turkic base: a language without prefixes

The oldest recorded stage of Turkic shows no productive prefixation. The Orkhon and Yenisei inscriptions of the eighth century, the Old Uyghur manuscripts and the Karakhanid texts derive new words exclusively by suffixation and by composition. Erdal, in the fullest treatment of Old Turkic word formation, organises the entire material by suffix classes and records no prefixal derivation for the period [2]. The same picture emerges from Clauson, whose etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish reconstructs stems and suffixes but has no place for a prefix inventory [3]. This absence is not accidental. It follows from the general structure of the agglutinative type, in which grammatical and derivational information is added to the right of the root, and it is shared by the Mongolic and Tungusic families as well.

The typological consequence is important for the present study. Any prefix now found in Uzbek must have entered the language after the Old Turkic period, or must have arisen through reanalysis of a native structure that was originally not prefixal. There is no third possibility. This gives the historical investigation a clear

starting point: the inventory of the eighth to tenth centuries is empty, and every later item requires a documented source.

A qualification is needed for the elements that appear prefix-like in the earliest texts. Old Turkic possessed a series of intensifying formations of the shape C1V1p plus the full adjective, such as sap sarig for bright yellow. These formations are recorded in the Compendium of the Turkic Dialects compiled by Mahmud Kashgari in the eleventh century, which describes them as a means of strengthening the meaning of colour adjectives [4]. They are structurally similar to prefixation, since a bound element precedes the stem, but their origin is reduplicative rather than prefixal. The next section treats them separately.

3. The intensifying reduplicative model as the native source of prefix-like structures

Modern Uzbek retains the intensifying model in full productivity. The formations qip-qizil for bright red, sap-sariq for bright yellow, ko'm-ko'k for deep blue, yam-yashil for vivid green, oppoq for snow white, tim-qora for pitch black, yap-yangi for brand new, top-toza for spotless, bus-butun for entirely whole and dum-dumaloq for perfectly round all follow one rule. The initial consonant and vowel of the adjective are repeated, an obstruent or nasal of the set p, m, s is added, and the resulting syllable is placed before the full stem. The element that precedes the stem is bound, it never occurs alone, and it modifies the meaning of the stem in a regular way, which are three properties of a prefix.

The historical origin of the model is nevertheless reduplication, not affixation. Menges treats these forms as a shared Turkic intensifying device that developed from full reduplication with subsequent phonological reduction [5]. The inserted consonant is generally explained as an epenthetic segment that blocked the fusion of the two identical syllables. The evidence of the eleventh century supports this explanation, since Kashgari records both the reduced and the fuller variants [4]. The model is therefore a case in which a Turkic language arrived at a prefix-like surface structure without borrowing anything.

Two consequences follow for the later history of Uzbek prefixation. First, speakers of Turkic were not confronted with a structurally unfamiliar pattern when Persian prefixed words began to enter the language. A preposed bound element that intensifies or modifies the stem already existed in their system, even if its source was different. This structural familiarity plausibly facilitated the

segmentation of the borrowed elements at a later stage. This is presented here as an explanatory hypothesis and not as a documented process. Second, the native model remained closed. It applies only to adjectives, mostly to colour adjectives and to a small set of adjectives denoting completeness and cleanliness, and it has produced no new type since the medieval period. All the expansion of Uzbek prefixation is therefore due to contact.

4. The Arabic layer

The Arabic influence on the Turkic languages of Movarounnahr began with the Islamization of the region in the eighth and ninth centuries and intensified in the Karakhanid period, when Arabic became the language of religion, law and scholarship. Most Arabic material entered Uzbek as lexical borrowing, and the great majority of Arabisms in the modern language are nouns and adjectives without any internal structure for Uzbek speakers. A small number of Arabic function words, however, entered as parts of composite expressions and were later reanalysed as prefixal elements.

The clearest case is g'ayri-, from the Arabic ghayr with the meaning other than or different from. In Uzbek it forms adjectives of the type g'ayriqonuniy for unlawful, g'ayrioddiy for extraordinary, g'ayriixtiyoriy for involuntary, g'ayrirasmiy for unofficial and g'ayrimilliy for non-national. The element is bound, it precedes the stem, and it produces an open series, which satisfies the structural test. Its combinability, however, is restricted almost entirely to stems of Arabic origin, and this restriction is itself an argument about its degree of integration. The second Arabic element is lo-, from the negative particle la, preserved in loqayd for indifferent, in loaqal for at least and in the theological formula lamakon for placeless. This element is unproductive in the modern language and its analysis is available only to speakers with knowledge of Arabic or of classical texts. A third element, bilo- from the Arabic preposition bi-la with the meaning without, appears in bookish formations of the older literary language and is now archaic.

The Arabic layer therefore contributed one element with limited productivity and two with none. The reason lies in the nature of Arabic morphology and in the channel of transmission. Arabic word formation is based on root and pattern rather than on affixation of the concatenative type, and the material that reached Turkic through written religious and scholarly texts consisted largely of ready-

made nominal forms. Doerfer, in his study of Turkic and Mongolic elements in New Persian, documents the same asymmetry from the opposite direction and shows how strongly the direction of prestige governed which morphological material could travel [6].

One further observation belongs to this layer. The Arabic elements entered a language that had already received, or was in the process of receiving, the Persian ones, since Arabic material reached Central Asian Turkic largely through Persian mediation. The two layers are therefore not independent, and for a number of items the immediate donor cannot be determined from the form alone. This is a general problem of the Arabic stratum in Turkic lexicology, and it affects the prefixal material in the same way as the rest of the vocabulary. In the present study the elements are assigned to the language of ultimate origin, with the qualification that the route of transmission was in most cases Persian.

5. The Persian and Tajik layer as the core of the inventory

The decisive layer for Uzbek prefixation is the Persian one. Turkic and Iranian populations of Movarounnahr lived in prolonged and intimate contact, and in the urban centres of Bukhara, Samarkand and the Fergana valley bilingualism was the normal condition of educated and often of ordinary speakers for many centuries. This is a contact situation that permits the transfer not only of words but of morphological material, and that is precisely what happened.

The privative element *be-*, from the Persian preposition *bi* with the meaning without, is the most productive prefix of modern Uzbek. It appears in *bekor* for idle or void, *behuda* for futile, *beg'am* for carefree, *bebaho* for priceless, *beadab* for impolite, *betob* for unwell and in hundreds of further items. The negative element *no-*, from the Persian *na* with the meaning not, forms *nohaq* for unjust, *noto'g'ri* for incorrect, *nomukammal* for imperfect, *noaniq* for imprecise, *norozi* for dissatisfied, *noqonuniy* for illegal and *noo'rin* for inappropriate. The element *ser-*, from the Persian *ser* with the original meaning satiated or full, expresses abundance in *serhosil* for fruitful, *sersuv* for well watered, *serunum* for productive, *sergap* for talkative and *serquyosh* for sunny. The comitative element *ham-*, from the Persian *ham* with the meaning together or also, forms nouns denoting joint participation: *hamkor* for partner, *hamsuhbat* for interlocutor, *hamfikr* for like-minded person, *hamkasb* for colleague and *hamyurt* for compatriot. The elements *ba-* and *bo-* from the Persian *ba* with the meaning with

give baobro' for respected and boadab for well-mannered. The element kam- from the Persian kam with the meaning little gives kamquvvat for weak, kamqon for anaemic and kamgap for taciturn. The evaluative elements bad- and xush-, from the Persian bad for bad and khush for pleasant, give badbo'y for foul-smelling, badxulq for ill-tempered, badgumon for suspicious, xushbo'y for fragrant, xushmuomala for courteous and xushxabar for good news [7].

The chronology of this layer can be established only approximately, but its outline is clear. In the Karakhanid and Khorezm-Turkic periods the prefixed Persian items entered as whole words and were unanalysable for Turkic speakers. In the Chagatai period, when the literary language of Central Asia developed under intense Persian influence and when authors such as Alisher Navoi wrote in both languages, the quantity of such items reached the point at which the recurring initial elements could be isolated. Bodrogligeti records numerous formations of this type in the Chagatai literary language and describes the elements as productive components of its word formation [8]. The critical evidence for segmentation is the appearance of hybrid formations, that is, of a Persian element attached to a Turkic stem. Modern Uzbek has many such items: noto'g'ri with the Turkic to'g'ri for straight and correct, noo'rin with the Turkic o'rin for place, notinch with the Turkic tinch for calm, beto'xtov with the Turkic to'xta for stop, sersuv with the Turkic suv for water and seryomg'ir with the Turkic yomg'ir for rain. A hybrid of this kind cannot be a borrowed word, because it does not exist in the source language. It can only be a native formation made with a borrowed morpheme, and it therefore proves that segmentation had occurred.

The Persian layer also explains a structural peculiarity of Uzbek prefixation that will be relevant to any synchronic description. Persian is a language with prepositions and with left-headed structures of a type that Turkic does not have, and the prefixes taken from it did not adapt to Turkic phonology. They do not participate in vowel harmony, they do not undergo the consonant alternations found at Turkic morpheme boundaries, and they retain an invariant shape. The suffixes of Uzbek historically varied according to the vowel of the stem, and although modern literary Uzbek has largely lost harmony, the contrast in behaviour is diagnostic of the different origin of the two sets of morphemes [9].

6. The Russian and international layer

The fourth layer entered from the second half of the nineteenth century, after the incorporation of the Central Asian khanates into the Russian Empire, and expanded enormously in the Soviet decades. Russian served as the channel through which the international vocabulary of Greek and Latin origin reached Uzbek, and the prefixal elements of that vocabulary came with it. The list includes anti- in antivirus and antisiklon, kontr- in kontrataka, re- in rekonstruksiya and reeksport, de- in demontaj and devalvatsiya, dis- in diskvalifikatsiya, sub- in subtropik, super- in supermarket, ultra- in ultratovush and ultrabinafsha, ekstra- in ekstraklass, trans- in transmilliy, post- in postsovet, pro- in prorektor, mikro- in mikroiklim and mikrokredit, and makro- in makroiqtisodiyot.

Two circumstances distinguish this layer from the older ones. The first is its channel. The Persian elements entered through spoken bilingualism over many centuries, whereas the international elements entered through written texts, education, administration and terminology within a few decades. Kononov, describing the literary language of the middle of the twentieth century, treats them as a terminological resource rather than as part of general word formation [10]. The second circumstance is the writing system. The Uzbek alphabet changed from Arabic script to Latin in 1929, from Latin to Cyrillic in 1940, and back to a Latin-based alphabet after 1993. Each change affected the graphic shape of the borrowed elements and, in the last case, brought the question of their spelling and hyphenation back onto the agenda of normative work.

The degree of integration of the international layer is uneven and is still increasing. Most items of this group combine only with stems of the same origin, which keeps them at the periphery of the system. A growing number, however, now attach to Turkic stems and thereby pass the same hybridity test that the Persian elements passed in the Chagatai period. The clearest examples are infratuzilma for infrastructure, built on the Turkic tuzilma for structure, avtoyo'l for motorway, built on the Turkic yo'l for road, and teleko'rsatuv for television programme, built on the Turkic ko'rsatuv for showing. These formations show that the international elements are not confined to the transfer of ready-made terms and that they have begun to function as word-forming means of Uzbek itself.

The period after 1991 continues the same process with a new source language. English has replaced Russian as the principal donor of international vocabulary,

and elements such as kiber- in kiberxavfsizlik for cybersecurity, veb- in veb-sayt for website, onlayn- and elektron- in the vocabulary of digital administration entered directly rather than through Russian mediation. The structural mechanism is unchanged. What is new is the speed of entry and the fact that normative codification now lags behind usage, which produces the orthographic variation observed in the press and in official documents.

The Soviet period also introduced a mechanism that had not operated before, namely loan translation of morphological structure. Alongside the direct transfer of items such as antivirus, Uzbek produced formations in which a Russian or international prefixed model was reproduced with Uzbek material. Terms of the type yarimo'tkazgich for semiconductor, umumxalq for nationwide and ko'pburchak for polygon follow the structure of formations with polu-, obshche- and mnogo-, but every morpheme in them belongs to Uzbek. The prefixal element in such words is a free word of the language and not a bound morpheme, so these formations are not prefixation in the strict sense. Their significance for the history of the phenomenon is nevertheless considerable, because they show that left-hand modification had become an available word-forming pattern of Uzbek independently of the borrowed material that introduced it.

7. The grammaticalization cline of Uzbek prefixal elements

The material surveyed above allows the modern inventory to be arranged on a cline that reflects both the origin of each element and the degree of its integration. Four positions can be distinguished, and the assignment of an element to a position is based on three tests: whether the element also exists as a free word, whether it combines with native Turkic stems, and whether it forms an open series.

The first position holds elements that are still free words in Uzbek and function as prefixes only in fixed formations. The clearest case is ham, which is an ordinary particle meaning also in the sentence men ham bordim for I also went, and at the same time a bound element in hamkor for partner. The element kam is likewise a free adjective meaning few or insufficient and a bound element in kamquvvat for weak. These items are prefixes only in part of their occurrences, and their prefixal use is the endpoint of a grammaticalization path that is not yet complete.

The second position holds fully bound elements of foreign origin that combine freely with Turkic stems and form open series. This is the position of *be-*, *no-* and *ser-*. They have no independent use in Uzbek, they attach to stems of any origin, and they participate in further derivation, since *noaniq* yields *noaniqlik* for imprecision and *hamkor* yields *hamkorlik* and *hamkorlashmoq*. These are prefixes of Uzbek in the full sense, whatever their etymology.

The third position holds bound elements that form series but remain restricted to stems of a particular origin. *G'ayri-* belongs here, and so do most of the international elements. The fourth position holds elements that are historically prefixal but are no longer segmentable, such as *lo-* in *loqayd* and *bilo-* in the archaic formations. Their prefixal status is a fact of etymology and not of the modern grammar. The same position is occupied by the initial syllables of words such as *bemor* for ill person, *nozik* for delicate and *notiq* for orator, in which *be-*, *no-* and *no-* are not prefixes of Uzbek at all but parts of unanalysable Persian and Arabic stems [11]. The distinction matters for lexicography and for automatic morphological analysis, where over-segmentation of such stems is a recurrent source of error.

The cline also predicts the direction of future change, and the prediction is testable. Elements at the third position are expected to move towards the second as the number of their hybrid formations grows, and the recent items *infratuzilma*, *avtoyo'l*, *teleko'rsatuv* and *kiberxavfsizlik* are the first evidence of that movement for the international layer. Elements at the first position are expected to move in the opposite direction only if the free word disappears, which is what happened to *ser-*: it has no independent use in modern Uzbek, whereas its Persian source was an ordinary adjective. Movement between the third and the fourth positions is not a change in the language but a change in the knowledge of speakers, since an item becomes non-segmentable when the stem it contains falls out of use. The history of *lo-* illustrates this: the element was analysable for speakers educated in Arabic and ceased to be analysable when that education ceased to be general.

8. Uzbek prefixation in a comparative Turkic perspective

The layers described above are not equally represented in the other Turkic languages, and the differences are informative because they can be correlated with differences in contact history. The Karluk languages that shared the Central Asian urban environment with Iranian populations show the richest prefixal

inventory. Modern Uyghur, the closest relative of Uzbek, uses the same Persian elements in the same functions, with be- and na- in privative and negative formations, ser- in formations of abundance and hem- in comitative nouns. The parallelism is close enough to indicate that the segmentation of these elements had already occurred in the common Karluk literary tradition of the Chagatai period rather than separately in each language [8].

Azerbaijani occupies a similar position for a similar reason. Centuries of Turkic and Iranian bilingualism in the southern Caucasus and in northern Iran produced a comparable set, including bi- and na- in privative and negative adjectives and ham- in nouns of joint participation, so that the Azerbaijani hamkar corresponds directly to the Uzbek hamkor. Turkmen shows the same elements with a slightly narrower distribution.

Turkish presents the opposite case, and it is instructive because the reduction there was deliberate. Persian prefixed items entered Ottoman Turkish in large numbers, and they are still present in frozen formations. The language reform of the twentieth century, however, replaced a substantial part of the Arabic and Persian vocabulary with items built from Turkic roots, and since the prefixed words belonged to that vocabulary, the prefixal model lost most of its lexical support. What remains is a set of inherited items rather than a productive pattern, whereas the international prefixes of the terminological layer are as well represented in Turkish as in Uzbek [1].

The Kipchak languages show the weakest development of the Persian layer. Kazakh possesses a privative element of the same Iranian origin in a limited series that includes formations for peaceful, neutral and unofficial, but the series is small and the element is not productive. Kyrgyz and Tatar are comparable. The explanation lies in the different character of the contact: the Kipchak-speaking populations of the steppe were not part of the Persian-speaking urban culture of Movarounnahr to the same degree and for the same length of time, and the Iranian material that reached them arrived largely through the mediation of the Karluk literary languages rather than through daily bilingualism [5].

The comparison supports a general statement about the mechanism. The density of the Persian prefixal layer in a Turkic language correlates with the intensity and the duration of Turkic and Iranian bilingualism in its historical area, and it is reduced where deliberate language planning removed the lexical base on which the model rested. This is a probable correlation rather than a demonstrated causal

law, since the available data are lexicographic and not sociolinguistic, but the distribution of the material is consistent across all the languages surveyed. The international layer, by contrast, is distributed evenly, because it entered all these languages through the same channels of education and terminology within the same period [10].

9. Conclusion

The history of prefixation in Uzbek is a history of contact operating on a system that had no prefixes of its own. The Old Turkic stage shows no prefixal derivation, and the only native structure of prefix-like shape, the intensifying formation of the type qip-qizil, arose from reduplication and has remained closed to expansion since the medieval period. Everything else in the modern inventory came from outside.

The layers can be ordered chronologically and evaluated by their yield. The Arabic layer, entering after the eighth century through written religious and scholarly texts, produced one element of limited productivity, g'ayri-, and two that are now archaic. The Persian layer, entering through centuries of urban bilingualism, produced the core of the inventory, including the three most productive elements be-, no- and ser-, together with ham-, kam-, ba-, bo-, bad- and xush-. The Russian and international layer of the twentieth century added a large terminological set, and the period after 1991 continues it with elements of English origin.

The decisive criterion of prefixal status is not etymology but hybridity. An element becomes a prefix of Uzbek when it attaches to native Turkic stems and when the whole complex takes Uzbek suffixes as a single unit. By this criterion be-, no- and ser- became prefixes of Uzbek at the latest in the Chagatai period, whereas several international elements are passing the same threshold at present, as infratuzilma, avtoyo'l and teleko'rsatuv demonstrate. The proposed four-position cline, from free word through fully integrated bound prefix and origin-restricted bound element to non-segmentable relic, provides a framework in which each item of the inventory can be placed and in which future changes can be measured. The framework also identifies the practical point at which historical knowledge is required in synchronic work: the boundary between the third and fourth positions, where the difference between a real prefix and a false initial syllable determines whether a segmentation is correct.

References

1. Johanson L., Csato E. A. (eds.). The Turkic Languages. London: Routledge, 1998. 474 p.
2. Erdal M. Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991. 874 p.
3. Clauson G. An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972. 989 p.
4. Kashgari M. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Diwan Lughat at-Turk) / Transl. by R. Dankoff and J. Kelly. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1982-1985.
5. Menges K. H. The Turkic Languages and Peoples: An Introduction to Turkic Studies. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995. 288 p.
6. Doerfer G. Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1963-1975.
7. Rahmatullayev Sh. O'zbek tilining etimologik lug'ati. Toshkent: Universitet, 2000.
8. Bodrogligeti A. J. E. A Grammar of Chagatay. Munich: LINCOM Europa, 2001. 465 p.
9. Hojiyev A. O'zbek tilida so'z yasalihi. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1989.
10. Kononov A. N. Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka. Moscow, Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR, 1960. 446 p.
11. Sjoberg A. F. Uzbek Structural Grammar. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963. 158 p.