
About Grammatical or Morph syntactic Interference

Zokirov Mukhtorali Turdaliyevich

Ferghana State University, Candidate of philological sciences, docent, Fergana, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article deals with the issues of grammatical (morph syntactic) interference. The views of the world's leading linguists on grammatical interference are given. Scientific conclusions are confirmed by numerous examples based on Russian and English languages.

Keywords: grammatical interference, syntactic interference, morphological interference, speech, language, words, morphemes, grammatical models, grammatical relations.

Introduction

Interference has been attracted by many linguists to explain linguistic evolution most directly in the field of vocabulary development, but also to explain phonological and morphological innovations. Interference (from Latin Infer - between themselves, ferio - touching, striking) - in physics interference is considered as mutual amplification or weakening of waves when superposing; In psychology, interference is "an interaction of skills in which previously acquired skills have a wiggle effect on the formation of new skills"; in language the phenomenon of interference is defined as the use of past linguistic experience, i.e. the experience of speech in the native language, regardless of the will of the speaker; language phenomena that appear in speech periodically, do not acquire distribution, do not become the norm, belong to the field of interference; in the methodology interference is considered as a negative result of the transfer of previous linguistic experience, i.e. it is an involuntary assumption in the speech in a non-native language of various inaccuracies under the forking of the native language.

The main part

U. Weinreich says that "grammatical interference occurs when the rules of arrangement, agreement, choice or change of grammatical units that are part of the system of one language are applied to approximately the same chains of elements of another language." (Weinreich, 1979: 36). The researcher proposes to distinguish three types of interference in the field of grammatical relations:

copying the relations of another language, clearly conveying a different meaning than the speaker had in mind;

copying the relations of another language, which violates the relational model existing in that language, so that the statement can either lose its meaning altogether, or its meaning can be found out from the context;

the unnecessary application of a certain type of relation to a language in which no obligatory type of relation is required for that domain [Weinreich, 1979: 71].

The causes of grammatical interference are varied. S.S. Sorokina sees the cause of grammatical interference in the fact that "the dynamic stereotypes of grammatical forms and constructions formed in the native language, especially those that differ from the

corresponding ones in the foreign language, become stiff, difficult to change, so that when mastering the second language it has a significant counteraction to the newly formed foreign-language stereotypes" [Sorokina, 1971: 8].

A. Zhluktenko calls the cause of grammatical interference "the identification of words, morphemes and grammatical models of both languages". In his work "Linguistic Aspects of Bilingualism" he gives the following typology of grammatical interference:

1. changing grammatical relations in one language by analogy with those relations that exist in another:

a) transfer of grammatical relations from language A to language B or vice versa;

b) elimination of grammatical relations existing in one language due to their absence in another.

The change in the grammatical function of a word or morpheme of one language by the pattern of another;

expansion or narrowing of the use of a grammatical form, model or unit of a given language under the influence of the usability of the identifiable phenomenon of another language [Zhluktenko, 1974: 105-107].

Sometimes, speaking of grammatical interference, researchers distinguish two subtypes of it - syntactic and morphological. It is very difficult and sometimes impossible to distinguish between these subtypes, so in the practical part of our study we will use the term "grammatical interference" without dividing it into morphological and syntactic subtypes. But in order to give a more complete description of grammatical interference, we will give a detailed description of each of its subtypes.

Morphological interference is manifested at the level of morphemes and parts of speech. M.V. Dyachkov defined morphological interference as "the borrowing of affix systems and their paradigms from one language to another" [Dyachkov, 1992: 85].

W. Weinreich notes that the speaker usually identifies morphemes on the basis of their formal similarity or similarity of their previous functions. [Weinreich, 1979: 74]. Sometimes a morpheme may be transferred from one language to another in order to replace a null morpheme or a morpheme consisting of a small number of phonemes. [Bagana, Hapilina, 2007: 77]. However, at the level of morphemes interference is relatively rare, it is much more common at the level of parts of speech.

The basis of interference at the level of parts of speech are, above all, categorical differences and other features of parts of speech of different languages. T.V. Korneva says that these differences are found when comparing any part of speech, for example: mismatch of the gender of nouns, verb forms, the presence or absence of articles. The author notes "that to overcome grammatical interference it is necessary to identify similarities and differences and establish interlingual equivalents for successful learning" [Korneva].

T.G. Shishkina, who studied morphological interference in translation (in Russian and English), identifies the following causes of interference errors in the field of grammatical categories:

insufficiently deep penetration of the communicant into the context of the information transmitted;

erroneous identification of grammatical categories existing in both languages;

formal use of direct grammatical correspondences in translation [Shishkina, 1996: 15].

She considers the main cause of errors at the level of function words to be synonymous ways of expressing the same meaning within a given language.

Among the most common errors caused by interference at the level of parts of speech, T.G. Shishkina calls "errors observed in the use of categorical forms of number and case of nouns, adverbial and adjectival forms of adjective; categorical forms of time, species, temporal reference, inclination, temporal and verbal representation. [Shishkina, 1996: 19].

Here are examples of morphological interference (examples are taken from the work of V. V. Alimov "Interference in translation (on the material of professionally oriented intercultural communication and translation in the field of professional communication)").

Many English words are subject to morphological interference, which differ from Russian words in number form:

sovet, sovety - advice;

novost, novosti - news;

volos, volosy - hair;

znaniya - knowledge;

uspekh, uspekhi - progress.

Prepositions are also subject to morphological interference:

- *preuspet v chem-to- to be good at smth. (not in);*
- *ne prisutstvovat na vstreche - to be absent from the meeting (not on, in, at);*
- *v kredit - on credit (not in);*
- *vskriknut ot boli - to cry out with pain (not from);*
- *otvechat na vopros - to answer a question (not on a question);*
- *pomnit o chem-to - to remember smth. (not to remember about smth.)*

Negative constructions can be subject to interference:

- ✓ *Nikto nichego na znaet ob etom - Nobody knows anything about it (not Nobody knows nothing about it).*

Russian-speaking communicators have a special difficulty with the harmonization of tenses in English, especially the interference associated with the tense forms of verbs:

- ✓ *On skazal, chto ne znaet bu cheloveka - He said that he didn't know that man (not He said that he don't know that man).*

Syntactic interference. Since from the syntactic point of view words appear as members of a sentence, syntactic interference can be defined as the interference of sentence members and sentences of different types [Alimov, 2005: 121-122]. M.V. Dyachkov says that syntactic interference occurs "when models of collocations and sentences, typical for one language, are borrowed into another" [Dyachkov, 1992: 85]. Almost all members of a sentence, the word order in it, and its structure can be subject to syntactic interference [Alimov, 2005: 122].

S.S. Sorokina and L.N. Kovylyina interpret syntactic interference as "deviations from the regularities of the combining properties of the members of a simple or complex sentence" [Sorokina, 1971: 10]. L.N. Kovylin proposes to call syntactic interference "syntagmatic" (respectively, morphological interference "paradigmatic") and distinguishes the following types:

- *plus-segmentation* - an increase in the number of elements in the sequence I2 under the influence of the distributive rules of I1;
- *minus-segmentation* - reduction in the number of elements in the sequence Ya2 under the influence of the corresponding models Ya1;
- *replacing* - a rearrangement of elements of the model Ya2 under the influence of the rules of Ya1 [Kovylyna, 1983: 9-10].

The researcher notes that syntagmatics and paradigmatics in language are an inseparable, interpenetrating unity, so it is often impossible to draw a clear line between morphological and syntactic interference.

Here are examples of syntactic interference

A consequence of syntactic interference is often a violation of word order:

- ✓ *Etu mashinu videli zdes chasto* - *This car was often seen here* (not *This car was seen here often*).

Russian-speaking communicators often interfere syntactically with the formal subject *it*. Thus, they try to translate it into Russian:

- ✓ *It is early morning* - *Ranee utro* (not *Eto ranee utro*).

Secondary members of a sentence, such as complements and circumstances, are often subject to interference:

- ✓ *vesti boy s protivnikom* - *to fight against the enemy* (not *with*);
- ✓ *byt vinovnym v prestuplenii* - *to be guilty of a crime* (not *in*).

Conclusion

So, at the heart of grammatical interference are the differences in the grammatical structure of the two languages, therefore, it is manifested at the level of morphemes, parts of speech and syntactic constructions. Rules of formation, agreement, conjunction of words (word combinations, sentences) are transferred from one language to another. As a result, there are errors in the speech of a bilingual, primarily at the level of morphosyntactic combinability. Morphosyntactic combinability of a word depends on its grammatical characteristics - belonging to a certain part of speech, grammatical category, class, category, etc. As a result of grammatical interference a foreign language word can be endowed with the grammatical characteristics of the word of the native language and be combined with other words under the influence of these characteristics, due to which the rules of combinability of the second language are violated.

As we have already noted in the previous chapter, the grammatical meaning of a word is closely related to its lexical meaning; on this basis, we can say that lexical and semantic compatibility may also be violated as a result of grammatical interference. Although in the practical part of our study we will not distinguish between these subtypes, in order to get a more complete description of lexical-semantic interference, we will give them a detailed characterization.

References:

1. Zokirov, M. and Isomiddinov, F., 2020, December. ABOUT THE HOLES OF LANGUAGE LANGUAGE DICTIONARY. In Конференции.
2. Zokirov, M. T., & Isomiddinov, F. (2021). About the problems of synchronous and diachronous sociolinguistics. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 11 (103), 867-871

3. Xojaliyev, I. T., & Jamolov, J. U. M. A. B. O. Y. (2021). About changes in the phonetic structure of words borrowed in Uzbek language from Tajik. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12(104), 478.
4. Axmadjonov, P. M. (2021). Sadridin Ayni" Sample of Tajik literature" and some issues of zullisonayn in it. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12(104), 406.
5. Mahamadzoda, A. P. (2021, April). IMPORTANT FEATURES OF FAZLI NAMANGANI TAZKIRASI AND THE ISSUE OF ZULLISANAIN. In *Archive of Conferences* (Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 5-7).
6. Ibragimova, E. I., Zokirov, M. T., Qurbonova, S. M., & Abbozov, O. Q. "Filologiyaning dolzarb masalalari" mavzusidagi Respublika ilmiy-amaliy internet-konferensiya materiallari: Ilmiy ishlar to'plami.–Farg'ona, 2018.–113 sahifa.
7. Abbozov, O. Q. (2021). General properties of oronyms. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, (12), 389-391.
8. ХАКИМОВ, М. Х. (2001). *Ўзбек тилида матннинг прагматик талқини* (Doctoral dissertation, –Тошкент-2001).
9. Hakimov, M., & Nosirova, U. (2020, December). On pragmapoetic symptoms. In *Конференции*.
10. Hakimov, M. (2001). *Ўзбек тилида матннинг прагматик талқини*: Filolog. fan. d-ridas-si.
11. Mamajonov, M. (2019). ON THE MATTER OF PRAGMATICS OF NAMES IN UZBEK LANGUAGE. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (11), 316-318.
12. Rustamovna, U. N., & Turdalievich, Z. M. (2020). Frame Structure of The Concept "GOLD" in Navoi's Poem "ISKANDER'S WALL". *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 9(16), 346-357.
13. Умарова, Н., & Абдувалиева, Н. (2020). Алишер Навоий ғазалларида мақол ва ибораларнинг маъновий хусусиятлари. *Oriental Art and Culture*, (III), 105-111.
14. Alimova, Z. V. (2021). ABOUT COMMON WORDS IN UZBEK AND TAJIK LANGUAGES, THEIR SEMANTICS. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (5), 101-104.
15. Gulbakhor, R. (2020). Expression of temporality and locality through noun lexemes in Mahmud Kashgari's "devon". *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(11), 1648-1653.
16. Hojaliyev, I., & Shodiyeva, A. EXTRALINGUISTIC SIGNS OF THE OFFICIAL STYLE.
17. O'rinboyeva, E. (2021). On the study of lexoantonyms. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12(104), 410.
18. DADAJONOV, A. (2021). CONCERNING THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF DISCUSSION SPEECH. *THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука*, (12), 378-382.
19. Xojaliyev, I., & Dadajonov, A. (2021). МУНОКАМАНING SO'ZLASHUV USLUBIGA XOSLANISHIGA DOIR. *Студенческий вестник*, (19-11), 15-16.
20. Хожалиев, И. Т. (2021). МУҲОКАМА НУТҚИНИНГ ЎЗИГА ХОС ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ. *Студенческий вестник*, (7-3), 93-95.

21. Шукуров, Р. М., & Жўрабоева, Г. С. (2016). THE MOTIVATION OF HYDRONYMS AND THEIR LEXICAL CLASSIFICATION SEMANTICHESKOE. *Учёный XXI века*, (3-4 (16)), 36-39.
22. Шукуров, Р. М., & Жўрабоева, Г. С. (2016). ВОПРОСЫ МОТИВАЦИИ ГИДРОНИМОВ И ИХ ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКАЯ КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ. *Ученый XXI века*, 38.
23. Ibragimova, E. I., & Sharafutdinova, N. K. (2020). ТИПОЛОГИЯ РЕЧИ ДВУХ ГЕРОЕВ. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 682-686.
24. Ibragimova, E. I. (2020). ЭСТЕТИЧЕСКАЯ ФУНКЦИЯ ОТНОШЕНИЙ АДРЕСАНТА. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (5), 101-104.
25. Dosmatov, H. H., & Ibragimova, E. I. (2021). LINGUISTIC PHENOMENA ASSOCIATED WITH WORD GAMES. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (5), 108-111.
26. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). Actual Problems of Bilingualism in a Multi-Ethnic Environment. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 13, 17-23.
27. Khamrakulova, S., & Zokirov, M. T. (2022). Phraseological units expressing old age of a human being in the English and Russian languages. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 01 (105), 280-283.
28. Zokirov, M. T., & Ibragimova, M. S. N. (2021). Alisher Navoi about style problems. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, (12), 601-604.
29. Omonov, M. (2019). MORPHOLOGICAL FORMS OF PERSIAN IZAFET CONSTRUCTIONS IN “BABURNAMA”. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (11), 260-263.
30. Amonov, M. U. (2019). ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORIGINAL OF ISAFETIC COMBINATIONS IN “BABURNAMA”. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 1(8), 239-244.
31. Umarovich, A. M. (2021). The proportion of arabic isophical compounds in the “baburnoma” with the original. *ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL*, 11(2), 1554-1557.