

ON METHODS OF RESEARCH OF UZBEK LANGUAGE SYNTAX

Yuldosheva Nilufar Ergashevna,

The Republic of Uzbekistan Karshi State University

Docent of Uzbek Linguistics, Candidate of Philological Sciences

(nilu.75@mail.ru)

ANNOTATION

The article discusses the research methods of Uzbek language syntax.

In Uzbek linguistics, syntactic phenomena have been studied in detail since the 1930s, and several syntactic theories have emerged in this regard. Each of these independent theories has its own source of research and has been approached on the basis of specific research methods and methodological bases. As a result, the scientific advances they have made have in many cases contradicted each other.

Keywords: language, language, speech, contemplation, ideology, literary language, grammatical structure, syntactic unit, subject, predicate, attribute, cut, syntactic pattern.

INTRODUCTION

Language as a social phenomenon is always developed in harmony with society, in accordance with the laws of its development. At the same time, society also affects the development of social consciousness, national thinking. The development of society, on the other hand, meets the requirements of the times for the science that studies it. «Each period has its own goals and specific requirements,» he said. The development of the sciences is inextricably linked with the advanced philosophical thought of the period, the achievements of the leading fields of science for the period. Since the sources of different sciences are multifaceted, the leading philosophical thought of the period determines which aspects of the source of learning from the sciences should be given special attention, and how to reflect the existing laws of existence in logical categories. This is the methodological significance of philosophy, as well as its direct impact on other disciplines[11;12].

Founded in the 1930s, Uzbek linguistics has made great strides in the simultaneous study of language. Its units - the founders of the internal system - have been identified, extensively planned work has been carried out in a descriptive way, and as a result, our science has been formed as a relatively independent science. However, as in any field, Uzbek linguistics still has a single policy, and linguistic evidence is studied mainly in a single descriptive way, which would prevent the inevitable diversity of views on it. The changes that began to take place in social life at the end of the century were also reflected in linguistics, and a number of his research methods became richer. In particular, the influx of systemology into Uzbek linguistics, which for many years was denounced as a «bourgeois method of study» as an idealistic branch of science, has radically changed many existing views. As a result, in linguistics there is an opportunity and conditions to study the phenomenon of a language from different angles, to study its various aspects on different methodological and methodological bases. In Uzbek linguistics, too, there is a difference of opinion, «linguistic pluralism». This, in turn, paved the

way for its development in sync with the times. Today, Uzbek linguistics has several independent directions, and in many cases, contradictory opinions and scientific interpretations are determined by different linguistic currents. In particular, the fact that the views obtained as a result of different approaches to a single argument in the interpretation of syntactic phenomena are immediately, even the content of education, is constantly introduced into the system shows that there is a choice in language learning. There are many ways and means to study language from different angles. At present, there are two directions in computer linguistics: 1) computer-assisted language teaching; 2) Great work is being done in the field of computer-assisted text research and machine translation, new research methods and tools are being discovered. Pragmalinguistic studies that study the speech phenomenon of language, cognitive linguistics that studies language as a source of knowledge, and linguoculturology that studies the problems of language and culture are emerging.

Traditional study of syntactic units. This method of analysis has been reflected in modern Uzbek linguistics since the 1930s. Its foundations are the teachings of the Moscow (formal) school of linguistics (F. Fortunatov, A. Shakhmatov, A. Peshkovsky, V. Vinogradov), formed in the late XIX and early XX centuries. N. Dmitriev, N. Baskakov, E. Polivanov, A. Borovkov, A. Kononov and others introduced this method to Uzbek linguistics. However, earlier this descriptive method was used in the «Grammar of the Altai language» written in the middle of the XIX century[12,70].

In the syntactic field of Uzbek linguistics, this direction was formed by A.Gulamov, G.Abdurahmanov, M.Askarova, M.Mirzaev, F.Abdullaev. In their work, the syntactic unit, the basis of its expression, structure and formation, the formal syntactic relationship were studied [19;20;15;22;26;27].

The main principles of the modern formal direction of Uzbek linguistics in the study of the syntactic structure of the Uzbek language are:

- joint description of the phenomenon of language and speech in syntax;
- explain the synchronous state of syntactic construction;
- to describe the formal, semantic and functional aspects of the syntactic unit as a speech phenomenon.

The methodological basis of the direction is formal logic, at which stage the syntactic phenomena are put into a system in an empirical way, that is, on the basis of apparent features. Logical-grammatical study of syntactic phenomena. The study of syntax in relation to logic, the explanation of syntactic phenomena on the basis of logical concepts and categories, has its roots in the period of formation of philosophy, the science of logic. Hegel acknowledges the connection between grammar and logic «and emphasizes the need to study these sciences in at least two stages - first to master the methods and concepts of analysis specific to this area, and then move on to the analysis of underlying phenomena, revealing new aspects of the object of study»[12; 6]. Most of the syntactic terms used in research in this area are actually logical categories: subject, predicate, attribute, object, causative, active, passive, coordination, conjugation. Errors in the synthesis of syntactic and logical concepts are still present in Uzbek linguistics. This situation, as one of the age-old shortcomings in science, still hinders the solution of many problems.

The main principles of this research method in checking the syntactic structure of language were:

- Equalization of sentence and sentence, parts of speech and parts of sentence;
- Search for syntactic similarities between languages;
- Identification of grammatical and logical categories that form the basis of syntactic construction;
- Pay more attention to solving all linguistic problems on the basis of syntactic factors[12].

In research based on the principles of logical grammar, logical and grammatical concepts can be used together. Note: “With the formation of the accusative form, the object of action, not the executor (grammatical subject), increases, and if there is no such object, it occurs: dressed, came, brought.

When an accusative affix is added to some object verbs, there is no change in the relation of the action to the object and the subject.

We have seen that the self-degree form transforms an object verb into an objectless verb. When an incremental level is created from the self level, another objective verb appears: yuv-yuvin - yuvintir”[21, 451].

“Judgment consists of a combination of subject and predicate. Speech, on the other hand, is usually formed from the possessive and the cut relation. It has secondary pieces and defines the cut in some way.

At the heart of everything lies reality. The speech derives its content from this reality and reflects its features through predicativeness. The predicative compound serves as the material of the sentence. Predicative includes three different grammatical categories (person-number, tense, modality) ...”[1,24].

“It is said that the sentence has an absolute ruling part in the form of a general agreement, in which the judgment is directed, the thought goes on about itself, and the sign is determined by the cut. The possessive is the dominant part of a two-syllable sentence. The owner forms a composition with subordinate parts ...

The participle, which is expressed in verb sentences, often indicates the executor - the logical subject. But the opposite is also true. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that the owner uses in real turnover (active construction) and passive turnover (passive construction). In definite pronouns, the part of speech is often in the definite (sometimes conditional) form of the verb. The owner shows the executor of the action: Karima wrote a letter. Indicates a logical object, not a logical subject that has a passive circulation: The letter was written by Karima [1, 45]. In this case, the executor of the action - the logical subject - is a complement, and the logical object is a grammatical possessor. It seems that the scientific directional categorical apparatus based on this research method is in many respects compatible with the logical categorical system.

Typological study of syntactic units. “The internal structure of languages, whether related or distant, inextricably linked, is a method based on the method of comparing similarities (commonalities) and features (differences) in the expression of certain meanings and functions, with which comparative, logical the concepts of grammar, comparative-historical method and glossematics are mixed”[12,71]. The foundation of its basic principles was laid in Alisher

Navoi's Muhokamatul-lug'atayn, as well as in F. de Saussure's General Linguistics Course on the concept of linguistic value. "Its main categories are *t i l u s t i l i k* (metatyl, metalanguage) and linguistic *u m u m i y l i k*. Linguistic generality partially correspond to the categories of consciousness (thinking) of other directions. Tilusticity (metatyl) is a set of concepts, relationships and tasks that are superior to natural language and must be expressed in the social activity of speech. Each of these concepts, relationships and tasks is considered linguistic when taken separately[12,71].

In the work done in this direction, the expression of typicality in syntactic units, taken as a typical phenomenon, their semantic and functional values are compared, information about the peculiarities of the syntactic system of these languages is given[5;18;16;25].

Transformational study of syntactic units is formed within the framework of "distributive analysis method" and is designed to study and analyze the ways and means of creating more complex than simple syntactic devices, from one type of syntactic device to another on the basis of certain rules. In this method of analysis, a central (basic, first simple) unit (usually precision, general tense, common person-numerical form and meaning, or, for example, a precisely proportional device, etc.) is selected and other semantic and functional devices are selected from this device. generation diagrams (e.g., creation of self-contained speech devices from portable speech devices) are clearly defined, coded, and modeled. It is determined by the ability to correctly create from one device to another on the basis of a certain program by means of an effective automation (machine, computer)[12,74]. In the transformational method of syntactic units, the problem of converting speech syntactic units into other syntactic units is studied.

Linguist S.Mahmatkulov defended his doctoral dissertation on the transformational analysis of syntactic units. The following is an excerpt from Professor S. Mahmatkulov's work based on this method of analysis: "Predicative syntagm is usually a sentence (predicative basis of a sentence). For such a syntagm to act directly as a syntactic unit in a sentence, there must be a certain grammatical change in the predicative syntagm. Such grammatical changes occur differently depending on which part of the predicate syntagm comes in the function. Below we discuss the predicate syntagma represented by the participle as an adjective.

One of the functions that a predicative syntagma can perform in a sentence structure is to become an adjective. The most appropriate predicative syntagmatic section to come to such a task is a qualitatively expressed syntagma, the possessive part of which is usually represented by a noun or a noun compound: 1. The position of the possessor is higher than his. - A warehouseman higher than him ... 2. A person's eyes are sharp and quick. - ... he was a sharp-sighted and quick-witted man in his forties ...

For a predicative syntagm to become an adjective, such a syntagm must move from the predicative form to the attributive form. Originally such a change occurs as a whole in the syntagm, but in practice the cut piece itself changes. Therefore, the main focus is on the cut.

Only one change occurs when the predicative syntagm represented by the participle adjective becomes an adjective (here the simple participle represented by the adjective is meant): the preposition is discarded. As a result, the predicative syntagm becomes an attributive form, the quality is equal to the word[7, 65].

Syntactic derivation is a well-formed trend today, which is being developed in our linguistics by Doctor of Philology, Professor N. Turniyozov and his students.

Syntactic derivation is at first glance similar to the direction of transformational analysis. But it differs in both basic concepts and a subtle aspect. The terms transformation, transformation, transformer, transformant in the transformation direction seem to correspond to the terms derivation, operator, operand, derivative (derivative) actively used in the method of derivation analysis. But the main difference is that transformational analysis analyzes what derivative patterns emerge from a speech syntactic event pattern, static genetic connections in them, while derivational analysis analyzes what syntactic event emerges from a speech syntactic event, the dynamic genetic relationship between them is analyzed on the basis of a single text.

The theory of syntactic derivation was scientifically substantiated by E. Kurilovich, one of the great representatives of the Prague School of Linguistics. The term syntactic derivation was first used in his 1936 article, Lexical Derivation and Syntactic Derivation[8,12].

Lexical and syntactic derivation differ. Syntactic derivation refers to phrases, sentences, and text, and is characterized by a focus on the role of morphological factors in the formation of derivatives and the focus of dynamic events. Lexical derivation, on the other hand, analyzes the basic-productive relations in the formation of new lexemes and words.

In syntactic derivation, the operator is the main element that forms the syntactic operation. "Without its participation, derivation does not occur, and therefore it is called the absolute dominant element of derivation in derivatology" [18,12].

Operand is the material basis of derivation, the raw material that creates the product structure. A derivative is a product of a derivation.

Although a lot of work has been done in the field of derivation in Uzbek linguistics, there is enough evidence to show that it was formed as a separate direction.

System-structural analysis is a field of theoretical study of language, which is known as a method of advanced rational research in world linguistics. In linguistics, it has become customary to distinguish the following views of this direction, which are recognized by all linguists:

- 1) Descriptive direction;
- 2) Glossematic direction;
- 3) Functional direction;
- 4) Generative direction.

"The main common features of these areas, which are completely different from each other and differ in their goals and objectives, intersect on the following issues:

- understanding language as a socio-psychological phenomenon;
- Consistent differentiation of language, language and speech;
- Search for the essence of linguistic units in their systematic relations, as well as the predominance of opposition and paradigmatic analysis and descriptions in the language;
 - Approach to language as a semiotic, ie a system of conditional signs (signs, symbols);
 - To focus on the semantic-functional side of linguistic units, not the material side "[12, 82].

In Uzbek linguistics, the structural direction based on these principles is recognized as an independent direction that analyzes the evidence of the Uzbek language. Linguists such as

Sh.Rahmatullaev, I.Abdurahmonov, I.Kuchkartoev, R.Yunusov should be recognized as the founders of this direction in our science. A.Nurmonov, N.Mahmudov, R.Sayfullaeva, M.Kurbanova and others can be considered as representatives of developing the structural syntax of the Uzbek language. R.Sayfullaeva, M.Kurbanova and N.Yuldosheva contributed to the formation of substantial syntax on the basis of methods of structural syntax analysis.

In our science, substantial syntax, which has grown on the basis of structural analysis of syntactic units, is rapidly evolving. In this regard, the doctoral and candidate dissertations of R.Sayfullaeva[17], M.Kurbanova[23], M.Abuzalova[2], Sh.Akramov[3], R.Bobokalonov[4], N.Yuldosheva[25], S.Muhammadjanova[10] can be considered as important researches created in this direction. This direction was established in the «Theses of formal-functional syntax», published in 1984[13,3] and 1988[14,9] in the journal «Soviet Turkology».

- The specificity of the direction of formal-functional analysis is to fill the concepts of licon-speech, liconian unit-speech unit in Prague structuralism (functional linguistics) with the categories of dialectics generality, essence, possibility, cause (UMIC) and individuality, measure, reality, consequence (YHVO). reaches Therefore, the main principle of the direction of formal-functional analysis is the conscious and consistent use of the tips of dialectical analysis in the research process. As in other linguistic units, the basic concepts of analysis are the principles of «cubtancy», «internal contradiction», «multiplicity», «absolute of the intermediate third» in revealing the linguistic essence of syntactic units. These principles are stated in the research of linguists H. Nematov, B. Mengliev and M. Kurbanova[12; 9; 24].

In syntax, the main types of linguistic units are divided into patterns (models), morphological (lexical forms, syntactic forms), derivational (simple and compound word formation), syntactic (nominative units - word formation models, communicative units - sentence formation). models) types differ.

In general, the syntactic theories formed in Uzbek linguistics have studied and continue to do great work on the basis of their own research methodologies and methods to study the grammatical structure of the Uzbek language from different angles and reveal its essence. The scientific findings obtained, although contradictory, are invaluable as complements to each other in terms of illuminating different aspects of syntactic construction that have an objective multifaceted and contradictory nature. Understanding the essence of the syntactic structure of the Uzbek language is based only on the generalization of conclusions specific to different syntactic directions.

REFERENCES

1. Абдурахмонов Ф., Сулаймонов А., Холиёров Х., Омонтурдиев Ж. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. Олий ўқув юрғларининг филология факультетлари сиртқи бўлим студентлари учун қўлланма. -Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1979. – Б. 45-46.
2. Абузалова М. Ўзбек тилида содда гапнинг энг кичик қурилиш қолипи ва унинг нутқда воқеланиши: Филол. фан. номз. ...дисс. – Бухоро, 1994. – 128 б.
3. Акрамов Ш. Ўзбек тилининг гап қурилишида тўлдирувчи ва ҳол. [WPm] валентлиги асосида: Филол. фан. номз. ...дисс. – Тошкент, 1997.
4. Бобокалонов Р. Ўзбек тилида гап синтаксиси ва сўз-гапларнинг систем-структур талқини: Филол. фан. номз. ...дисс. – Тошкент, 2003.

5. Бўронов Ж., Юсупов У., Ирискулов М., Содиқов А. Инглиз, ўзбек ва рус тиллари грамматик структураси: (Олий ўқув юртлари учун). – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1986. – 312 б.
6. Гегель Г. В.Ф. Наука логики. Том 1. – М.: Мысль, 1970. – С. 111-112.
7. Кулмаматов Д.С., Панжиев Н.П., Махматкулов С. Проблемы языковых контактов и трансформационного анализа. – Ташкент: БИ, 2001. – С. 65-66.
8. Kurilovich J. Derivation lexicale et derivation syntaxique. – BSI., 1936. - P. 72-92.
9. Менглиев Б.Р. Лисоний тизим яхлитлиги ва унда сатҳлараро муносабатлар: Филол. фан. докт. ... дисс. автореф. – Тошкент, 2002. – 22 б.;
10. Муҳаммаджонова С. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тилида уюшган гаплар: Филол. фан. номз. ...дисс. – Самарқанд, 1999
11. Неъматов Ҳ., Бозоров О. Тил ва нутқ. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1993. – Б. 5
12. Неъматов Ҳ. Лингвистик тадқиқот методикаси, методологияси ва методлари. – Бухоро: НС, 2005. – Б. 70-103
13. Нигматов Х.Г., Абдуллаев К.М., Банару В.И. и др. Структура предложения и актуальные вопросы синтаксиса тюркских языков. (Тезисы формально-функционального исследования) // Советская тюркология. – 1984. – № 5. – С. 3-10..
14. Нигматов Х.Г., Абдуллаев К.М., Банару В.И. и др. Способы синтаксической связи и актуальные вопросы тюркского синтаксиса. (Тезисы формально-функционального исследования) // Советская тюркология. – 1988. – № 4. – С. 3-9.
15. Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тилшунослиги тарихи. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 2002. – 231 б.
16. Саидова М.Р. Сравнительно-типологическое исследование односоставных предложений в русском и узбекском языках: Автореф. дисс. ...канд. филол. наук. – ТашГУ, 1996. – 24 стр.
17. Сайфуллаева Р. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида қўшма гапларнинг формал-функционал талқини: Филол. фан. докт. ... дисс. – Тошкент, 1993.
18. Турниёзов Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик қурилмалар деривацияси: Филол. фан. номз. ... дисс. автореф. – Самарқанд, 2006. – Б. 12.
19. Узоқов Ҳ. Ўзбек тилшунослари. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1972.
20. Шуқуров Ш., Бозорова Д. Узбекское советское языкознание. – Тошкент: Фан, 1984.
21. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. Т.І. – Тошкент: Фан, 1975. – Б. 450-451.
22. Ўринбоев Б., Турсунов У. Ўзбек адабий тили. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1982. – 174 б.
23. Қурбонова М. Ўзбек тилшунослигида формал-функционал йўналиш ва содда гап қурилишининг талқини: Филол. фан. докт. ... дисс. – Тошкент, 2001.
24. Қурбонова М. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тили: содда гап синтаксиси учун материаллар. – Тошкент, 2002. – Б. 8-9.
25. Юлдошева Н. Йиғиқ гапнинг формал-функционал талқини: Филол. фан. номз. дисс. – Тошкент, 2009. –Б. 17.
26. [http://www.google.com.webhp?as_q=&hewww.bukshu.uzsci.net/ziyofi-lologiya/...](http://www.google.com.webhp?as_q=&hewww.bukshu.uzsci.net/ziyofi-lologiya/) Тилнинг белгилар системаси эканлиги. – Бухоро, 2009;
27. http://www.fdu.uz/fdutz/uzbek_tili/ed_uzb/2-mavzu.htm... Системавий тадқиқотлар тарихи. – Фарғона ДУ, 2008.