



## A Contrastive Analysis of Clitic Morphemes in English and Kazakh

Dariga Toluspayeva<sup>1\*</sup>, Aliya Shukan<sup>1</sup>, Aigul Aratayeva<sup>1</sup>, Bakhyt Ayazbayeva<sup>1</sup>, Irina Grigoryeva<sup>1</sup>, Nurgul Issabayeva<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Karaganda Buketov University, Kazakhstan

**Abstract** The present article demonstrates a comparative analysis of clitic morphemes in English and Kazakh languages. Clitics, according to the linguistic phenomenon, have a peculiar specificity as elements that do not have an independent lexical meaning but, at the same time, play a significant role in the construction of words and sentences. The purpose of the study is to determine the main types of clitic elements and their functional meaning in a sentence. The work makes an attempt to identify and classify the main elements of clitics in the linguistic context of two differently structured languages and describe their features. As a result of our research, similarities and differences were identified between the three main types of clitic morphemes (i.e., real clitics, semiclitics, and quasi-clitics) in the languages represented.

**Keywords:** *Clitics, Morphology, Syntax, Word forms, Linguistics*

### 1. Introduction

In the current world of linguistics, the study of the morphology and syntax of the language system plays a significant role in representing the structure and functioning of linguistic units. A characteristic feature of the modern stage of linguistics is its polyparadigmatic nature and versatility. It aims to integrate a variety of methodological approaches and establish communication with other scientific disciplines, aimed at in-depth coverage of the language system and its meaning in life (Beiskhanova & Zhunussova, 2023). One of the key areas of research is the analysis of clitic morphemes, which represent a special class of linguistic elements that significantly influence the formation of word forms and the syntactic structure of sentences. This article provides a comparative analysis of clitic elements in two different languages - English and Kazakh. The area of studying the influence of clitic elements on the formation of word forms in a language is of significant interest to linguists and language researchers. The relevance of the work is due to the need for a deeper study of clitic elements and their influence on the morphology and syntax of the language. This is important for

\*Corresponding Author:

Dariga Toluspayeva

[dnn\\_tm@bk.ru](mailto:dnn_tm@bk.ru)

**Received:** December 2023

**Revised:** February 2024

**Accepted:** March 2024

**Published:** March 2024

© 2024 Toluspayeva, Shukan, Aratayeva, Ayazbayeva, Grigoryeva, and Issabayeva.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

<https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2024.2022461.3382>

the further development of linguistic science, as well as for the application of acquired knowledge in the practice of language teaching, translation, and linguistic research.

Clitics, as a phenomenon, attracts attention due to its specific nature. They are grammatical elements that do not have an independent lexical or grammatical function but significantly influence the structure of words and sentences. The term “clitic” is used in morphology to designate this class of linguistic elements. The main feature by which clitics differ from word forms is related to phonology (or, more precisely, prosody): a clitic is defined as an accentually independent unit that does not coincide with either a morpheme or a word form. In other words, the clitic is always embedded in some prosodic unity (usually joint stress) with another word form of the language, which acts as the basis or carrier of the clitic. This complex is often called a phonetic word (Plungyan, 2000). Clitics represent one of the most frequently discussed linguistic inconsistencies. In particular, clitic is applied to elements that appear word-like on the (morpho)syntactic dimension but behave like bound morphemes on the phonological dimension (Zingler, 2022). Despite this abstract characterization, there is general agreement that clitics are classified as a wide variety of phenomena by different researchers and that the overall concept is subsequently ill-defined (see Atabaeva & Turashbek, 2017; Haspelmath, 2023; Heine & Kuteva, 2007; Melchuk, 1997). By continuing our research, we aim to fill the gaps in existing knowledge about the influence of clitic elements on the formation of word forms, taking into account their importance in different linguistic environments and contexts.

Our proposed study is aimed at identifying and conducting a comparative analysis of the main types of clitic elements of two differently structured and unrelated languages, such as English and Kazakh, as well as the functionality and impact of clitic elements on the construction of word forms, as well as determining the common features and differences between them. This opens up new perspectives for understanding the linguistic features of each language and their relationship with morphological and syntactic characteristics. The practical significance of the study lies in the possibility of applying its results in the field of linguistics and language teaching. Understanding the features of clitic morphemes in different languages allows us to develop effective methods for teaching foreign languages and also deepens the knowledge of translators and linguists about the specifics of linguistic units in the context of their use.

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

### **2.1. Introduction to Grammaticalization**

In the modern linguistic world, many changes and innovations are taking place. At the same time, technological research and modernization continue in already established fields. In linguistics, research involves the use of new methods based on different principles through the transformation of already familiar aspects of the main categories and their semantic meaning. The reason for this is that language and its units have become part of corpus science and cognitive systems. Humanity acquires knowledge through language, receives various information, processes it, understands the laws of life, compares and remembers the necessary data, and forms its unique models. The direct involvement of language in these processes evokes disturbing or universal images of the world from the depths of human consciousness and memory (Pansat & Khalikova, 2023). This development is due to various factors, including social, political, and technological advances. It can have both positive and negative consequences for language users. It should be noted that according to (Tulegenova et al., 2022), language changes under the influence of social factors and is associated with diversity in society. Linguistic expressions are distributed and reinforced in different areas of communication and environments, which contributes to linguistic differences. The fact that clitics in modern Germanic languages are subject to certain restrictions and follow certain rules proves that clitics have undergone a process of grammaticalization during their development. Many factors contribute to the process of grammaticalization. One of the approaches dealing with the mechanisms of this process belongs to Lehmann (2004). Grammaticalization can be studied in diachronic and synchronic aspects. If we consider grammaticalization in a diachronic aspect, it represents a process of linguistic development. In the synchronic aspect, it represents the transformation of one structure into another.

It is generally accepted that the processes of grammaticalization represent complex sequences of logically independent changes that affect both the meaning and the form of linguistic elements in particular morphosyntactic structures. Typically, formal and functional changes are reductive, i.e., grammaticalizing elements lose their semantic specificity, syntactic freedom, morphological potential, and sound form. However, it has also been clearly stated that grammaticalisation results from semantic changes and, therefore, should not be considered as a necessary criterion for grammaticalisation; rather, formal changes do not always occur and are therefore not a necessary part of the definition (e.g., Bisang et al., 2020; Narrog & Heine, 2018). However, this approach implies that all items that represent traditional grammatical functions and are formally truncated relative to full words had to pass through grammar at some point. Since the elements discussed here do not exhibit the full range of collocation properties, it is assumed that they are all grammaticalized to some degree (Zingler, 2022). Grammaticalization, usually studied as the process of transformation of non-grammatical elements into grammatical elements or the appearance of more grammatical features in linguistic units, was first considered in Meillet's "Évolution des formes grammaticales" to denote the transformation of autonomous words into a grammatical element, for example, when the Latin word *mente* is used as an adverbial suffix to form an independent word, although the term itself is often used. The study of this phenomenon has been carried out since the time of the French scientist Kondilyak in the 18th century, according to the prediction of Lehmann (Avagyan, 2020). The modern theory of grammaticalization, based mainly on the works of these authors, attempts to explain the evolution of grammatical structures. It should be noted that there are considerable differences in the definition of the term "grammar". Lehman (2004) defines the process of grammaticalization of a linguistic sign as a change in which this sign loses its independence and becomes more dependent on the limitations of the language system. New words in the language, adapted to the needs of the linguistic community, are quickly and simultaneously formed and introduced into everyday speech. The phenomenon of mass word creation immediately enters into the linguistic experience (Yerlanova & Zhunusova, 2019), which is connected with the actualization of a certain concept in everyday speech. However, it should be noted that the approach to the grammar of the Kazakh language presented in linguistic studies is based on an unclear relationship between morphology and semantics. The first morphological analyzer of the Kazakh language was created in 2009 on the basis of the procedural method. This method involves the preliminary systematic organization of morphological knowledge about natural language and the creation of algorithms for analyzing morphological information, correlating it with individual word forms (Bekmanova, 2009). The procedural analysis of the morphology of the Kazakh language included the following stages: identification of the root in the current word form, its recognition, and linking with the list of morphological information corresponding to this word form.

## 2.2. The Concept of Clitics

The concepts of clitics and clitic clusters serve to illustrate word forms, or both word forms and morphemes defined only within a deductively closed theory, where the criteria by which linguistic units are opposed to each other are specified. The key question is what clitics are opposed to - only word forms, i.e., elements of sentences and phrases (Melchuk, 1997), or both word forms and morphemes at the same time (Plungyan, 2000). Melchuk (1997) defines clitics as a form of language that lacks the pronounced prosodic features that are characteristic of almost all other word forms in a given language. A clitic always forms a prosodic unit (accentual or tonal, taking into account the laws of language) with another word form. Clitics are considered to be an important intermediate class of linguistic units of linear and syntagmatic structure. The idea of contrasting word form and morpheme in a universal morphological typology seems simplistic: what is needed is another intermediate class, which can be regarded as a transitional phenomenon, lying in the middle between these two extremes. Clitics are just such a unit: they are less autonomous than word forms, but more autonomous than morphemes. For trivial reasons, a clitic cannot be regarded as an autonomous word form, but within a linear and syntagmatic structure. Clitics can have a high degree of freedom. They are often characterized by the possibility of separation or movement from the core of the sentence (Plungyan, 2000). The detected clitics are characterized by a lack of internal structure, which makes them difficult to study within a strict morphological and syntactic field. However, we also agree that clitics

are closely related to affixes; sometimes, their boundaries with affixes are blurred. Therefore, it seems problematic to study word-form problems without taking clitics into account' (Melchuk, 1997).

In the first case, the identification of clitics is considered a task of syntactic theory, which determines the accentual classification of word forms; see the definitions of a phonetic word, enclitic and proclitic in the textbook by Shaikevich (2005). In the second case, it falls within the competence of morphology, where it is possible to make an accent classification of morphemes. It is also important to determine which criterion for determining clitics - phonetic or syntactic - is considered to be the main one. Phonetic clitics are those elements that, when used in isolation, do not form a phonetic word (in other words, a group of bars; Zaliznyak, 1985). Many linguists distinguish two main categories of words: content and functional, the latter belonging to the semantic types of clitics. Content words such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives form one group, while functional words include most other types of words. However, they are difficult to classify unambiguously. The most important classes of function words are relatives (adjectives, introductory constructions), signifiers (objects, conjunctions), articles, auxiliaries of tense forms, and various types of discourse markers. The main similarity between most function words (including affixes) is that the information they carry is of secondary importance in discourse. In this regard, this article will introduce various types of clitics, most of which relate to function words (Haspelmath, 2023). English modal verbs *may*, *can*, *could*, *must*, and *will*, have a significant place in the formation of clitics in the English language. Most works are treated as auxiliary. The above central modal auxiliary verbs are included in independent classes of verbs and are contrasted, on the one hand, with semi-modal verbs (*should*, *boldly*, *must*) and, on the other hand, not modal auxiliary verbs (Huddleston & Pullum 2002), non-modal auxiliary verbs (*do*, *be*, *have*). The final ones are considered to be completely grammaticalized, that is, to have lost their inherent lexical meaning. In other words, they act as prototypical auxiliary verbs that can form a clitic (Sorokina, 2021). Also, in the presented work there is a large-scale discussion of the meaning of such negative patterns of the Kazakh language as “zhok” (not, no) and “emes” (no). According to Kazembek, (1846), the above words are verbs that refer to a modal word, auxiliary words used for the concept of a predicate, its part, or an independent word that can be attributed to the formative clitic morphemes of the Kazakh language. The national corpus of the Kazakh language, represented by the National Corpus of the Kazakh Language of the Institute of Linguistics named after Baitursynuly, contains a classification of linguistic units related to clitics, such as gerunds, numerals, subjunctive participle, participle, negative verb forms, pronouns, prepositions, functional complements, abbreviations, conventional signs in the Kazakh language (Bekmanova, 2009).

### 2.3. Similarities and Differences between Clitics and Affixes

Affixes are fundamental and effective methods for developing communication. Word formation due to affixes occupies a significant place in the complexity of the Kazakh language, in which the transformation of the lexical meaning of a word is possible only if it is similar to the semantic content of the new word. Consequently, variation in the meaning of a word is a historical-evolutionary phenomenon (Toktarov, 1997). In light of the above, it can be noted that affixation is the procedure of attaching different affixes to the base and roots of a word, which is supposed to be one of the very effective methods of word formation in the Kazakh language (Toluspayeva, et al. 2024). There are several similarities and differences between clitics and affixes. It is also important in distinguishing between free and bound words that there are no generally established criteria for distinguishing affixes from clitics (Carstairs-McCarthy, 1987). Because there are not always clear boundaries between affixes and clitics, it may seem more difficult to distinguish between them than between free and bound words. The main characteristic of clitic elements is that, like affixes, they are always adjacent to another element. For this reason, both clitics and affixes are called bound forms or bound morphemes (Matthews, 1974). This common feature of clitics and affixes - always adjacent to an adjacent element - means that they can never occur in isolation. Typically, clitics form either the end or the beginning of a word, depending on the language. Both clitics and inflections are *lento* forms. Like inflections, they are inseparable from their base by pauses and speech insertions (Mironova, 2015). One of the differences between clitics and affixes is that affixes have a greater degree of coherence and dependence on their base and, therefore, follow stricter restrictions. According to Klawans, the fundamental difference between clitics and affixes is that affixes are only combined with

the roots or stems of words to form a complete word. Clitics are attached to already formed, morphologically complete words (1985). In other words, the base of a clitic is always an independent word, and the root of an inflected word can, in many cases, only form an independent word with inflection, e.g., in verbs. This means that inflections can be added as affixes to bound morphemes, whereas clitics can only be added to free morphemes. Clitics are extractive, i.e., they are characterized by their position concerning the reference word, i.e., they can be attached to the right or left of the reference word (Klavans, 1985). They can also join words that already have clitics. Affixes, on the other hand, can be unrelated to the words to which clitics are attached (Zwicky, 1983). They differ from clitics in that the connection to their stem is morphological and/or lexical (Klavans, 1985). According to Nübling (1992), cliticization, i.e., the combination of a word and a clitic, involves both syntactic and morphological processes. From this crucial difference between clitics and affixes, other tendentious differences follow. Clitics are less selective than affixes in choosing the type of element with which they are associated. In other words, they have more distributional freedom than affixes or a lower degree of category selectivity of their reference word. Affixes have a high degree of selectivity in the choice of their stem. They are subject to stricter distributive rules and are usually assigned to only one category (Zwicky, 1983). According to Carstairs-McCarthy (1987), affixes often have grammatical features corresponding to the category of their base (case indicator, gender, or indicator of the type of verb conjugation). The morphological form of the word on which the clitic is based is, as a rule, preserved. As a result of the addition of an affix to its base, in some cases, the morphological and phonological form of the base and affix may change, and morphonological idiosyncrasies occur, i.e., irregular extra-structural changes (Zwicky, 1983). The meaning of such a connection consists of the meanings of both components. Clitics do not change the semantics of their reference word. Affixes, on the contrary, can sometimes cause a change in the semantics of the word stem. The meaning of the combination of affix and stem does not consist of the meaning of all parts of the word. Inflections, with their basis, always form a semantic unit. Special morphologically distributive clitics form semantically the first step on the path to inflection. The agreement, which is more common in inflections, indicates their minimum Scopus, i.e., minimum semantic radius. Since agreement is less typical for clitics, they are distinguished by greater scopus than clitics. Klavans (1985), in turn, notes another criterion for the difference between affixes and clitics. She points out that clitics can change the direction in which they connect to their anchor word. In contrast, affixes adjoin only in the direction of their stem side.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1. Materials**

A wide selection of language material was used to conduct the study. It is important to note that a detailed review of clitic phenomena in the two languages was carried out. In addition, the available controlled interoperable dictionaries are generally published monolingual; in this regard, the insufficiency of English-Kazakh and Kazakh-English dictionaries in the areas is a significant issue for specialists and translators (Bayekeyeva et al., 2022). At the present time, modern lexicography has the advantage of including dictionaries in one language under consideration, in which word forms are not accompanied by interpretations.

##### *3.1.1. The Kazakh Language*

For the Kazakh language, from the given examples of the classification of clitic morphemes, materials from the linguistic corpus (i.e., “National Corpus of the Kazakh Language” ([www.qazcorpus.kz](http://www.qazcorpus.kz))), as well as materials from well-known lexicographic publications (i.e., “Kazakh Language. Lexicogrammatical Dictionary” (Kubaeva & Karibaeva, 2005)) were used. In addition, data was taken from Internet sources, such as Lugat dictionaries (<https://.lugat.kz/>) and Sozdik dictionaries <http://sozdik.kz/ru/>.

##### *3.1.2. The English Language*

For the English language, materials were used in the form of Internet sources such as the Glossary of Linguistic Terms ([www.glossary.sil.org](http://www.glossary.sil.org)) and Cambridge Dictionary ([www.dictionary.cambridge.org](http://www.dictionary.cambridge.org)).

### 3.2. Procedure

In the article, the following methods of analysis were included: descriptive analysis was used to interpret the semantic features and contextual meanings of clitic elements in sentences of various types. This helped us understand what functions clitics perform in different linguistic contexts. In addition to descriptive analysis, contrastive analysis was used aiming to compare and analyze differences in the use of clitic elements in English and Kazakh languages. This method allowed us to identify the distinctive features of each language in the context of the use of clitics and their impact on sentence structure. We also applied a component method to identify and classify clitic elements in the languages under consideration. This method made it possible to determine the different types of clitics, their frequency of use, and basic morphological patterns. Adaptation and combination of these methods allowed us to analyze clitic elements in the English and Kazakh languages, which made it possible to better understand their role in the formation of word forms and the syntactic structure of sentences in both languages.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Basic Classifications of Clitics

When classifying clitics, it is useful to distinguish between two main types: Real clitics, which have a high degree of separability, and Semiclitics. The latter category includes clitics with limited independence, such as clitics that are difficult to produce (e.g., Russian ‘koe-’ or French ‘ne’) and mobile but inseparable clitics (e.g., Russian ‘zhe’ and ‘by’). Separability is recognized as an important linear property, more important than other parameters of independence in a sentence (Plungyan, 2000). Melchuk’s work identified three main types of clitics: real, semiclitic, and quasi-clitic.

1) **Real (or prototypical) clitics** lack a primary real word form. Representatives of this type function exclusively as clitics. Examples are Russian prepositions or the Latin conjunction ‘queue’.

2) **Semiclitics** have a corresponding primary word form belonging to the same lexeme. These elements can act as both clitics and word forms, depending on the context. Examples are the French clitics ‘je/me/moi’, corresponding to ‘I/me/me’.

3) **Quasi-clitics** are a variant of a real word form, often stylistically emphasized, and can always replace the corresponding clitic. Examples include clitics in English contractions such as “I’ve”, and “you’re” (Mel’chuk, 1997).

Concerning Melchuk’s classification of clitics, we have also provided examples of the three main types of clitics in the language environment under consideration in the form of a table:

**Table 1**

*Main Types of Clitics in English and Kazakh*

Type of clitic	English	Grammatical description	Kazakh	Grammatical description
Real clitics	's	Suffix for contraction and possessiveness of verbs "is" and "has"	pen	Clitic to define a state or accompanying action
	't	Short form of the negative verb "not"	ben	Clitic to determine a state or accompanying action
	-s	Clitic to form plurals	men	Clitic to determine a state or accompanying action
	'll	Short form of the verb "will"	lar	Clitic for plural formation
	'm	Short form of the verb "am"	ler	Clitic for plural formation
Semiclitics	me	Object form of the pronoun "I"	Men (I)	Objective and subjective form of the pronoun "I"
	you	Object and subject form of the pronoun "you"	Sen (You)	Objective and subject form of the pronoun "you"
	him	Object form of the pronoun "he"	Ol (He or She)	Objective and subjective form of the pronoun "he"

	us	Object form of the pronoun "we"	Biz (We)	Objective and subjective form of the pronoun "We"
	them	Objective form of the pronoun "they"	Olar (They)	Objective and subjective form of the pronoun "they"
<b>Quasi-clitics</b>	I've	Short form of "I have"	menin (my)	Possessive pronoun "men"
	you're	Short form of "you are"	senin (Your)	Possessive pronoun "sen"
	we're	Short form of "we are"	bizdin (Our)	Possessive pronoun "biz"
	they've	Short form of "they have"	olardyn (their)	Possessive pronoun "olar"
	can't	Short form of "cannot"	almait (can't)	Abbreviation of the negative verb "alu" (can)

Table 1 demonstrates the similarities and differences between the three main types of clitics in English and Kazakh.

#### 4.1.1. English Real Clitics

- *'s (is or has)* – in the example presented, *'s* is an abbreviation of *"is"* and *"has"*. In a sentence, it is used as a suffix for contraction and possessiveness of verbs *"is"* and *"has"*. For example, *"This is Medina's carpet"*
- *'t (not)* – here, *"'t"* appears as a contraction of the negative form of the verb *"not"*. It is used to express a prohibition or lack of opportunity. For example, *"She's not sure"*.
- *-s* – in the example we presented, *"-s"*, is a clitic to form the plural of nouns. For example, *"The carpets are red"*
- *'m (I am)* – is a shortened form of the word *"I am"*. The presented type of clitic is used to denote the present tense and the first person singular. For example, *"I'm happy to be your mentor"*.
- *'ll (will)* – here, *"'ll"* is a demonstration of the shortened form *"will"*. For this form of the clitic, it is advisable to use the third person singular or plural to determine the future tense. For example, *"She'll fly in from Turkey tomorrow evening"*.

#### 4.1.2. Kazakh Real Clitics

- *-men (with)* – here, *"men"* is used as a clitic, which denotes joint action or accompaniment. It demonstrates that the action is performed accompanied jointly with a specific person. For example, *"Sen menimen birge merkelelik keshke barasyn"* (You will go with me to a festive event).
- *-ben (with)* – *"-ben"* is a form of clitic, which means accompaniment or joint action. It serves to demonstrate that the action is performed accompanied or jointly with a specific person. For example, *"Zamira bizben muzeige barady"* (Zamira goes to the museum with us).
- *-pen (with)* – here the ending *"-pen"*, is used as a clitic, marking joint action or accompaniment with verbs. It serves to demonstrate that the action is performed accompanied or jointly with a specific person. For example, *"Zhalgaspen Damir seruenge shyqty"* (Zhalgas with Damir went for a walk).
- *-lar (They)* – here, *"lar"* is used as clitics, which is used to form plurals of nouns. For example, *"Oqushylar sabakka zhaqsy katysty"* (Students actively participated in classes).

- *-ler (They)* – in the example we presented, “*ler*” is a form of clitic. This type of clitic is used to form plurals of nouns. For example, “*Osimdikter baqty sandep tur*” (Plants decorate the garden).

#### 4.1.3. English Semiclitics

- “*Me*” – This presented type of clitic is the objective form of the pronoun "I". It is used to define the object of an action. For example, “*Fatima gave the book to me*”.
- “*You*” – This type of clitic represents the subjective and objective form of the pronoun "you". It is used to designate the subject or object of the intended action. For example, “*You are my dear person*”.
- “*Him*” – represents the object form of the pronoun "he". "Him" is also used to identify the object of the action. For example, “*I sent him to the pool*”.
- “*Us*” – object form of the pronoun "we". “*Us*” is used to demonstrate the object of an action. For example, “*Medet invited us to his birthday*”.
- “*Them*” – the represented semiclitic is the objective form of the pronoun "they". It is used to define the object of an action. For example, “*I won't see them this summer*”.

#### 4.1.4. Kazakh Semiclitics

- *Men (I, Me)* – This type of semiclitic can act in a sentence as both a subjective and an objective form of the pronoun “I”. For example, “*Men Muxammetti kinoga shaqyrdym*” (I invited Mukhammet to the cinema).
- *Sen, Siz (You)* – in the example we presented, “*Sen*” and “*Siz*” are types of semiclitic which are the subjective and objective form of the pronoun "you". For example, “*Siz bizben barasyz*” (You will come with us).
- *Ol (He or She)* – “*Ol*” is a type of semiclitic, which is used in the sentence as a subjective and objective form of the pronoun “He” or “She”. For example, “*Ol kitaphanaga bara tur*” (He is going to the library).
- *Biz (We)* – this type of semiclitic is translated as "We". It is the subjective and objective form of the pronoun "we". For example, “*Biz karta oynadyq*” (We played cards).
- *Olar (They)* – in the example, “*Olar*” is translated as "They". “*Olar*” is a semiclitic that is the subjective and objective form of the pronoun "They". For example, “*Olar universitette oqidy*” (They are studying at the university).

#### 4.1.5. English Quasi-clitics

- *I've (I have)* – in the example presented, “*I've*” is an abbreviation of "I have". It is used instead of the full form in affirmative sentences to demonstrate the present tense and denote the presence of some action or state. For example, “*I've finished my homework*”.
- *You're (you are)* – here, “*you're*” appears as a shortened form of "you are". It is used to demonstrate the present tense in the second person singular. For example, “*You're my best friend*”.
- *We're (we are)* - is a shortened form of the word “we are”. This clitic is used to shorten full verb forms in the present tense. For example, “*We're late again*”.
- *They've (they have)* – takes place as a shortened form of “they have”. "They have" is used to reflect the present tense and the third person plural. For example, “*They've already left the session as if they had finished the film*”.



- *Can't (cannot)* – in this case, "can't" is the short form of "cannot". "Can't" is used to formulate a negative form in relation to the ability to implement any action. For example, "*I can't go to the theatre in the evening*".

#### 4.1.6. Kazakh Quasi-clitics

- *Menin (My)* – the type of quasi-clitic is the possessive form of the pronoun "men". For example, "*Menin akem en zhaqsy adam*" (My dad is the best person).
- *Senin (Your)* – in the example we presented, "Senin" is a clitic that is the possessive form of the pronoun "Sen" (you). For example, "*Senin itin aqyldy*" (Your dog is clever).
- *Bizdin (Our)* – in this case, "Bizdin" is a quasi-clitic that is the possessive form of the pronoun "Biz" (we). For example, "*Bizdin komanda myqty*" (Our team is strong).
- *Olardyn (them, their)* – in the example we presented, "olardyn" is a clitic that denotes belonging. This type of clitic is combined with a noun phrase to indicate that something belongs to or refers to certain people or things. For example, "*Olardyn kitaptary zhana bagdarlamamen bekitilgen*" (Their books are approved by the new program).
- *bolmaidy (not, no)* - here the "bolmaidy" is used as a clitic, marking joint action or accompaniment with verbs. It demonstrates that the action is performed in a negative form in different contexts. For example, "*Bugin concert bolmaidy*" (There will be no concert today).

## 4.2. Similarities between English and Kazakh Languages

### 4.2.1. Real clitics

In the languages we have described, one can note the similarity in the use of real clitics in a sentence, such as the English "s", which has the designation of attraction and contraction of the verbs "is" and "has", and the Kazakh endings such as "-men (with)", "-ben (with)", "-pen (with)" which denote a related action or state.

### 4.2.2. Semiclitics

In both languages, semiclitics are used to determine the subject or object of an action in a sentence. For example, if in English we use I, you, he, we, and they, then in Kazakh we use men, sen, ony, biz, and olar when composing a sentence. Semiclitics in two languages can take the form of either independent words or join other words to form complete expressions. This enables connectivity and allows complex production to be carried out more efficiently.

### 4.2.3. Quasi-clitics

Quasi-clitics in two languages abundantly demonstrate the use of belonging and attractiveness. For example, in the English language, we have "I've" and "they've", and in the Kazakh language "menin", "senin", "Bizdin", and "Olardyn".

## 4.3. Differences between English and Kazakh Languages

### 4.3.1. Real Clitics

Unlike English where a real clitic like "s" has a dual use which has the definition of contraction and attraction of the verbs "has" and "is", in the Kazakh language clitics such as "-ben (with)", "-men (with)", and "-pen (with)" are defined as a related action or state.

### 4.3.2. Semiclitics

Based on the previously given examples, it can be noted that in the two languages, semiclitics are used to establish the subject or object of action in a sentence. However, it can be noted that the differences lie in the forms of their application. As an example, pronouns in English are given as I, you, he, we, and they. These examples appear as separate words, while in the Kazakh language

“men”, “sen”, “ony”, “biz”, and “olar” can be combined with other parts of speech to form single expressions.

#### 4.3.3. *Quasi-clitics*

Quasi-clitics in English, such as “I’ve”, “you’re”, and “they’re”, are shortened forms of pronouns and verbs in order to simplify or speed up speech. In the Kazakh language, such clitics as “menin”, “senin”, “Bizdin”, and “Olardyn” act as forms of possessiveness and have a significantly direct relation to the object or subject of the action.

## 5. Discussion

The purpose of this scientific article is to conduct a relative analysis of clitic morphemes in the English and Kazakh languages, taking into account their impact on the formation of word forms and the syntactic construction of sentences. The fundamental tasks were to identify the main types of clitic elements in each of the languages presented, as well as to compare their characteristic features to identify similarities and differences. The research we carried out successfully achieved our objectives by identifying the main characteristics of clitics in the English and Kazakh languages. In light of the stated goal, the study made it possible to expand knowledge about the mechanisms of functioning of clitic morphemes in language systems.

The idea of the picture of the world is a key component of a person’s understanding of the surrounding reality, and ideas about this reality can vary significantly depending on the national culture and the formation of consciousness (Language Picture of the World in Grammar, 2014) Grammar structures embodied in language reflect the specific features of the mentality of each society, therefore, play a key role in the formation of the linguistic model of the world and have a significant impact on the national perception of reality (Atabaeva & Turashbek, 2017). As a result of the modern use of Kazakh linguistic units, clitic word forms are updated from the point of view of historical knowledge, and linguistic information of an archetypal nature is preserved in the construction of the phraseological system (Bekeyeva et al., 2021).

According to Hudson (2001), it can be noted that clitics combine syntax with morphology as linguistic units with ordinary syntactic communications depending on other words, but in addition, clitics act as components of the (rigidly ordered) morphological structure of a much more significant word. A special feature of clitics that has attracted specific interest from syntax theorists is that “they do not appear where we expect them” (Riemsdijk, 1995). As Aikhenvald (2003) suggested, clitics are often defined as elements that focus exclusively on stress, which is misleading because elements with indiscriminate distribution and some prosodic dependence may also be in a state of stress.

The differences between the clitics of English and Kazakh languages are demonstrated in various aspects, which include constructive application, grammatical basis, and their significance in the sentence. In English, clitics are repeatedly subjected to the contraction of perfect forms of verbs and auxiliaries, making conversation more conversational and natural. For example, it can be noted that clitics in English, such as n’t (not), ’s (is/has) and ’ll (will) are used to express conditions, negation, and other grammatical categories. Kazakh clitics also have other functions, which include the formulation of negation and placement, but it is also possible to note that their structure and use are reminiscent of English clitics. For example, in the Kazakh language, clitics have the ability to be very multifunctional and complex, and can also contain endings such as “men”, “pen”, and “ben”, which are used to express an accompanying action or state. In connection with the above, it can be noted that both languages resort to clitics to shorten and simplify the expression of the structure of words; the constructive application and distinctive features of clitics in English and Kazakh languages can differ significantly.

The results obtained from a comparative analysis of clitic morphemes in English and Kazakh languages represent a significant contribution to linguistic research and shed light on the syntactic structure and formation of word forms, providing valuable information for linguists and language teachers. They highlight similarities and differences in the use of clitic elements in both languages, which can be useful for comparative analysis of the morphology and syntax of different languages.

These results are important for linguists, allowing them to better understand the structure and function of clitic morphemes, as well as for language teachers, enriching the material for studying and understanding the features of the English and Kazakh languages. This research has high implications for the development of linguistic knowledge and language teaching. The results obtained from the analysis of clitic morphemes not only help linguists better understand the structure and function of these elements in languages but are also an important resource for teaching and learning English and Kazakh languages. Understanding the characteristics of clitic elements will help develop effective teaching and translation techniques, enriching students' language skills and improving the quality of learning in general.

### Disclosure Statement

The authors claim no conflict of interest.

### Funding

The research did not receive any specific grants from funding agencies.

### References

- Aikhenvald, A. (2003). Typological parameters for the study of clitics, with special reference to Tariana. In R. M. W. Dixon, & A. Aikhenvald (Eds.), *Word* (pp. 42-78). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511486241.003>
- Atabaeva, M. S., & Turashbek, E. (2017). Case forms in the Kazakh language (functional classification). *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Sciences*, 1(3), 31-34.
- Avagyan, A. A. (2020). Morphological reduction as a mechanism of grammaticalization in English and German. *Philology. Theory & Practice. Questions of Theory and Practice*, 13(1), 303-307. <https://doi.org/10.30853/filnauki.2020.1.60>
- Bayekeyeva, A., Tazhibayeva, S., Shaheen, A., Beisenova, Z., & Mamayeva, G. (2022). Developing an online Kazakh-English-Russian thesaurus of industry-specific terminology. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 10(1), 83-98. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscsl.2022.543082.2465>
- Beiskhanova, S., & Zhunussova, Z. (2023). Verbalization of the binary opposition man–woman in paroemias: A cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 11(3), 312-321. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscsl.2023.2010532.3151>
- Bekeyeva, N., Bissengali, A., Mankeyeva, Z., & Nurdauletova, B. (2021). Phraseological expressions in the Turkic language: Comparative analysis. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 9(2), 29-40.
- Bekmanova, G. T. (2009). Some approaches to the problems of automatic inflection and morphological analysis in the Kazakh language. *The Newsletter of D. Serikbayev East Kazakhstan State Technical University*, 2, 192-197.
- Bisang, W., Malchukov, A., Rieder, I., Sun, L., Martiny, M., & Luell, S. (2020). Position paper: Universal and areal patterns in grammaticalization. In W. Bisang & A. Malchukov (Eds.), *Grammaticalization scenarios* (pp. 1–88). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110563146-001>
- Carstairs-McCarthy, A. (1987). *Allomorphy in inflection*. Croom Helm.
- Haspelmath, M. (2023). Types of clitics in the world's languages. *Linguistic Typology at the Crossroads*, 3(2), 1–59. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2785-0943/16057>
- Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2007). *The genesis of grammar: A reconstruction*. Oxford University Press.
- Huddleston R. D., & Pullum, G. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, R. (2001). Clitics in word grammar. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 13, 243-297.
- Klavans, J. L. (1985). The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language*, 61(1), 95–120.
- Kubaeva, I., & Karibaeva, B. (2005). *Kazakh language: Lexico-grammatical dictionary*. Publishing Market.

- Kazembek, M. (1846). *General grammar of Turkish-Tatar language*. Kazan.
- Lehmann, C. (2004). Theory and method in grammaticalization. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik*, 32(2), 152-178. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zfgl.2004.32.2.152>
- Matthews, P. H. (1974). *Morphology: An introduction to the theory of word-structure*. Cambridge University Press.
- Meillet, A. (1912). L'évolution des formes grammaticales [The evolution of grammatical forms]. *Scientia (Rivista di scienza)*, 12(26), 130-148.
- Melchuk, I. A. (1997). *Course of general morphology*. Progress.
- Mironova, O. V. (2015). The conterminal status of clitics in the language system. *MSLU Bulletin*, 20(731), 301-311.
- Narrog, H., & Heine, B. (2018). *Grammaticalization from a typological perspective*. Oxford Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198795841.001.0001>
- National Corpus of the Kazakh Language. (2023). *TBI.KZ*. <https://qazcorpus.kz/>
- Nübling, D. (1997). *Klitika im Deutschen. Schriftsprache, umgangssprache, alemannische dialekte* [Clitics in German. Written language, colloquial language, Alemannic dialects]. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Pansat, Z., & Khalikova, N. (2023). Semantic features of color in emotional, expressive words: The concept of “blue” in the Kazakh Language. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 11(2), 85-93. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2023.556420.2676>
- Plungyan, V. A. (2000). *General morphology. Introduction to the problem*. Editorial URSS.
- Riemsdijk, H. (1995). *Clitics: A state of the art report*. Tilburg University.
- Shaikevich, A. Y. (2005). *Introduction to linguistics*. Academy Publishing Center.
- Sorokina, T. S. (2021). Grammaticalization of English modal verbs in diachrony. *Bulletin of MSLU*, 850(8), 155-164. [https://doi.org/10.52070/2542-2197\\_2021\\_8\\_850\\_155](https://doi.org/10.52070/2542-2197_2021_8_850_155)
- Tulegenova, M. K., Zhunussova, Z. N., Bekasova, E. N., & Balmagambetova, Z. T. (2022). Functional and stylistic differentiation of language within an integrative paradigm. *XLinguae*, 15(3), 200-217. <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2022.15.03.17>
- Toluspayeva, D., Shubina, O., Apshe, K., Shukan, A., Nurguzhina, G., & Mirambaevna, A. (2024). Affixation in morphological word formation and construction of lexemes in the English and Kazakh languages. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 12(1), 326-336. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2024.2019058.3318>
- Yerlanova, M., & Zhunussova, Z. (2019). Word-forming potential of non-usual vocabulary in modern Russian. *Bulletin of the Eurasian National University Named After L.N. Gumilev. Philological Series*, 127(2), 147–156. <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-678X-2019-127-2-147-156>
- Zaliznyak, A. A. (1985). *From proto-Slavic accentuation to Russian*. Nauka.
- Zingler, T. (2022). Clitics, anti-clitics, and weak words: Towards a typology of prosodic and syntagmatic dependence. *Language & Linguistics Compass*, 16(5-6), e12453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12453>
- Zwicky, A. M., & Pullum, G. K. (1983). Cliticization vs. inflection: English language. *Linguistic Society of America*, 59(3), 502–513.