



The Basic Element of Grammatical Structure of the Uzbek Literary Language

Safarov Firuz Sulaymonovich

A doctoral student of Uzbek Linguistics department Bukhara State University

Abstract: *The article deals with the basic elements of the grammatical structure of the Uzbek literary language. The basic element of grammatical construction is the grammatical category, the nature of the grammatical-lexical and functional-semantic field. The number of members of the grammatical category, the relationship of the content of the members, the means to which the language belongs, the national identity of the structure, the relationship with the morphological structure of the language, the structure of the grammatical-lexical and functional-semantic field, the ideas on the means are analyzed.*

Keywords: *basic element of grammatical structure, grammatical category, grammatical form, general grammatical meaning, opposition, nooppositive differentiation, manifestations of general grammatical meaning, grammatical-lexical field, functional-semantic field, field core, field edge.*

Date of Submission: 27-4-2022

Date of Acceptance: 25-5-2022

I. Introduction

Although the grammatical structure of a language is studied in linguistics by different schools and currents, there is no single idea about its basic unity, the basic element [1, 65].

Many proponents of traditional linguistics refer to categories as the basic building blocks of grammatical construction. This view is widespread in Russian and Soviet linguistics. Since Uzbek linguistics has been an integral part of Soviet linguistics until recently, this view is also a priority [1, 66].

The term category entered linguistics from philosophy. It is defined in philosophy as "a general concept that reflects more than a legitimate relationship and relation to the essence of objective being and cognition." In both philosophy and linguistics, a category means the same thing, that is, a category must have a pair and a separation [2, 223]. The unifying basis for the grammatical category is the general grammatical meaning [3, 317]. For example, the general meaning of the category of numbers is to indicate the amount of existence, the category of time is to express the relation of action to the time of speech, and so on. It is possible to recognize that such a grammatical category exists only when a certain general grammatical meaning is expressed in the language by grammatical means [3, 318].

II. Literature review

There is no consensus on most of the issues involved in the work, which is considered to be a basic element of grammatical construction. The number of its members, the relationship of its members, the means to which part of the language it belongs, the national identity of its structure, its

connection with the morphological structure of the language, common to all languages, classification, the boundary is among them. Since these issues are controversial, each requires a separate interpretation. We will briefly comment on some of them.

There are two different views on the number of members of a grammatical category. At first glance, the grammatical category consists of at least two members, and according to the second, it consists of one form.

Two articles on this subject by Turkologists V. G. Guzev and D. M. Nasilov is noteworthy. In the first article, these scholars consider the phrase to be a grammatical form, saying that a grammatical category consists of at least two members, and in the second article, they equate a grammatical category with a grammatical form. In the latter case, the grammatical category is not defined. Interestingly, both views are claimed to reflect the agglutinative nature of Turkic languages as opposed to inflected languages. It should be noted that the Turkic written monuments created in the XI-XII centuries do not have a single grammatical category. G. Zikrillaev writes that we have never encountered such a category in modern Turkic languages.

In distinguishing and describing a grammatical category, an approach should be made based on the internal structure of each language. Because the morphological structure of languages belonging to different families differs sharply from each other.

III. Analysis

It should be noted that this instructive idea was expressed almost two centuries ago by the founder of theoretical linguistics V. Humboldt. According to W. Humboldt, the social nature of language is a national trait in the minds and hearts of people. This spiritual-intellectual-cognitive feature is not universal (logical, logical) or private, but national linguistic thinking: "The language of the people means its spirit (Geist, dux), and the spirit of the people means its language".

Many linguists since Humboldt have paid attention to this issue. For example, Baudouin de Courtenay said, "It is unthinkable to think that a language has a category in another language without thinking". However, during the Soviet era, Uzbek linguistics did not follow this instruction. In particular, the Uzbek language is included in the academic publication as having the same category as in Russian. On the contrary, the meanings of respect and style, which reflect the specificity of the Uzbek language, were not distinguished as grammatical categories.

Available in two languages, the grammatical category of the same name may also differ in its internal structure, content, and usage. For example, in the Russian language, the forms of the number category have two types: formal syntactic and semantic (logical). Therefore, in this language, the root of the horse must be in the form of a formal number (singular or plural), regardless of its relation to the quantitative meaning. Therefore, if a horse is in the form of a singular (or plural) number, it does not necessarily represent a single (or more) being. In Turkic languages, the forms of the number category perform only a substantive function. It is not correct to divide numbers into logical and grammatical (formal) numbers in Uzbek, the first of which cannot be studied in grammar. However, in Uzbek linguistics, this difference between Russian and Uzbek has been interpreted as a grammatical unit, regardless of whether the root noun represents a singular or a plural. A similar variation is given in the category of nouns within the category of nouns, and the category of persons in the category of verbs is given in the category of verbs. However, in the Uzbek language, conjugation is also characteristic of nouns and conjugation verbs.

Proponents of the idea that a grammatical category has at least two members have different interpretations of the semantic relationship between its members. Representatives of traditional linguistics consider the grammatical category as a unit of grammatical meaning and form. The existence of the Acad.L. V. Sherba grammatical category requires an integral connection between

the grammatical form and the grammatical meaning. There is no grammatical category when form and meaning are separated. I. P. Ivanova writes that forms that express the same type of grammatical meaning form a grammatical category. This view is reflected in Uzbek linguistics, including the Uzbek textbook: "The set of grammatical forms that make up a closely interconnected system is called a grammatical category".

Apparently, the two definitions do not state the content relationship of the grammatical category forms, but the one definition expresses the same type of meaning, showing the commonality between them. One group of scholars emphasizes that members of a grammatical category differ in content. This view is expressed in the following description of the Soviet Germanist D. A. Shteling: "The grammatical category is the opposition of two (only two) rows or groups of forms that deny each other in content". It is well known that in linguistics, opposition is seen as a kind of guru of difference.

This view is related to the privative opposition of S. N. Trubeskoy, which was first applied to grammar by R. O. Jakobson, and further developed by A. V. Isachenko. In Uzbek linguistics, this view is reflected in the work of Y. Saidov.

The view that the semantic relationship between the forms of a grammatical category consists of a single privative opposition has not been accepted by most scholars. For in this case the distinction between the paradigmatic and syntagmatic features of the grammatical form is neglected. However, this feature of the grammatical form plays an important role in distinguishing between central and non-central (peripheral) as well as methodological and neutral meanings. Furthermore, dividing polysyllabic grammatical categories into only two lines is not in keeping with the nature of language, leading to artificiality in the study of grammatical category systems.

Many Soviet linguists believe that there is a second type of S. I. Trubeskoy's opposition, the equipolent opposition, among the members of the grammatical category. Most of the proponents of this view are united by the following two definitions: does".

"A morphological category consists of a system of opposite rows of grammatical forms with the same (homogeneous) meaning". While the first definition emphasizes the distinction between grammatical category forms, the second definition also outlines the general features of these forms.

Prof. H. G. Nematov believes that there is both a privative and equipolent oppositional relationship between members of the grammatical category.

According to Prof. A. Nurmanov, all elements of the language system are in opposition to each other.

By the 1980s, a new perspective on the structure of the grammatical category system had been introduced in Soviet linguistics. From this point of view, there is not only opposition but also nooppositive distinction between the members of the grammatical category. As a result of this interpretation of the semantic relationship between the members of the grammatical category, the grammatical category is defined differently: *A grammatical category is a system of grammatical forms that unite on the basis of common (generic) meaning; general meaning is expressed in the form of categories in the form of specific (species) meaning; there is also a nonoppositive distinction between private meanings along with an oppositional attitude. The structure of grammatical categories may be different depending on the structure of the language.*

This definition takes into account the nature of inflected languages, which is based on the following typological definition: *The structure of the grammatical category is a generalized meaning that is consistently expressed behind a system of grammatical forms that depend on the morphological type of the language.* The structure of the grammatical category, more precisely, the semantic interrelation of forms, depends on the morphological type of the language, from the agglutinative to

the grammatical category. It was understood that the definition should be different from the definition that reflects the nature of flexible languages. In Uzbek linguistics, the following definition of a grammatical category takes into account the following requirement: *A grammatical category is a generalized meaning expressed in different degrees and forms through a system of two or more forms.* Apparently, this definition does not refer to the concept of opposition.

Many scholars who study the grammatical structure of a language based on a functional approach continue to use the term grammatical category. Some researchers, in this case, consider it appropriate to use a term that has a broader meaning than the morphological or grammatical category. In particular, A. V. Bondarko uses the terms functional-semantic category [Bond, 1971, 8] and functional-semantic field.

The idea of space as a cornerstone of grammatical construction began in Germany in the first quarter of the 20th century and requires special comment.

IV. Discussion

In the literature, *field* (Geld, pole) is in fact a physical term, first used in linguistics in 1924 by G. Ipsen. In addition to G. Ipsen, the substantiation of the concept of field is associated with the names of German scientists such as I. Trir, Z. Porsig, L. Weisgerber. These scholars study the vocabulary and syntax of a language based on the concept of field.

From the 1960s onwards, the term field began to be used in Soviet linguistics to refer to the grammatical structure of a language. In particular, M. M. Guxman calls the field a grammatical field, believing that it includes a grammatical category, which is a morphological phenomenon, as well as phrases that have a common content and function with it. Y. V. Guliga and Y. I. Shendel's uses the term grammatical-lexical field based on the commonality and connection of grammatical events with lexical means.

Russian linguist A. V. Bondarko uses the term functional-semantic field. He interprets the concept of field based on the grammatical structure of the language. Grammatical structure includes not only systems belonging to one level, but also inter-level, semantically and functionally integrated grammatical and related lexical elements of different levels. Functional-semantic field is a system of means belonging to different levels (morphological, syntactic, word-forming, lexical, as well as mixed - lexical-syntactic, etc.), which unite on the basis of the generality and interaction of semantic functions of a particular language. According to him, the main features of the functional-semantic field in its linguistic means are:

- 1) the presence of a common invariant semantic function,
- 2) the interaction of different (grammatical, lexical) elements,
- 3) structural division into the center (core) and the peripheral part,
- 4) organic transitions between the area and the elements belonging to different areas, the presence of partial points of intersection.

Through the center of the field, the characteristics of this group are concentrated, highly organized, and more specific and regularly used to perform a specific semantic task. In peripheral media, on the other hand, field-specific characters are disorganized, scattered, play a secondary role in the content of the task, and do not have the ability to be used consistently.

Depending on which part of the language the center (core) tool belongs to, the field structure can be of two types: a single-centered (strongly centered) field based on a grammatical category and a set of different linguistic (morphological, syntactic, lexical-grammatical) tools. multi-centered (weakly centralized) area. For example, in Russian, such areas as aspectuality, temporality, modality,

personality are centered, while areas such as situation, certainty, uncertainty, quality, quantity, cause, condition are multi-centered.

There is a specific distribution of the semantic function between the core of the functional-semantic field and the peripheral part. Part of this task is taken over by the nucleus, which is assigned to the peripheral means of refinement. Peripheral tools also serve to represent the non-core part of the content function. Accordingly, the performance of a given task saves language resources.

A. V. Bondarko, theoretically studying the functional-semantic field, believes that its main feature - grouping, basic structure, method of communication is the same in different languages. The commonality of the main feature of the field system for different languages is reflected in the commonality of the underlying categories of thinking. Differences in the functional-semantic field in different languages are due to the peculiarities of the structure of individual languages. In one language, the field, which is distinguished as an independent, grammatically strong unit, may be weakly centered, not based on a system of grammatical forms in another language. Therefore, the study of the functional-semantic field of a particular language should be based on the grammatical structure of the language.

The study of grammatical phenomena in Uzbek linguistics based on the concept of field dates back to the 80s. It can be said that M. Abduvaliev was the first to enter this field. This scientist studied the area of barriers in the Uzbek language. More precisely, the structure of the barrier field, the role and interaction of the means of its representation in the field are studied. Based on the material of the Uzbek language, the numerical meanings of respect and horse are also studied as a grammatical-lexical field.

V. Conclusion

In short, the concept of grammatical category is used in many works, and the concept of grammatical-lexical, functional-semantic field in some works as a basic element of the grammatical structure of the Uzbek literary language. It is advisable to use the concept of grammatical-lexical or functional-semantic field in the study of words and adjectives in the Uzbek literary language, because semantic words and adjectives belong to different levels of language.

References:

1. Зикриллаев Ғ. Рух ва тил. Монография. Тошкент, Фан, 2018.
2. Sayfullayeva R. R., Mengliyev B. R., Voqiyeva G. H., Qurbonova M. M., Yunusov Z. Q., Abuzalova M. Q. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent, Fan va texnologiyalar, 2010.
3. Реформатский А. А. Введение в языковедение. Москва, "Просвещение", 1967, 544 с.
4. Гухман М. М. Грамматическая категория и структура парадигм. Исследование по общей теории грамматики (тўплам). Москва, 1968.
5. Гузев В. Г., Насилов Д. М. Словоизменительные категории в тюркских языках и понятие "грамматическая категория". Журн. "Советская тюркология". 1981. №3. С. 22 – 35.
6. Нигматов Х. Г. Функциональная морфология тюркоязычных памятников XI – XII веков. Ташкент, "Фан", 1989. 192 с.
7. Кодухов В. И. Общее языкознание. Москва, "Высшая школа", 1974. 303 с.
8. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. Москва, "Прогресс", 1984. 400 с.
9. Бодуэн де Куртене. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. Т. 1. Изд-во Академии наук СССР, Москва, 1963. 384 с.

10. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тили. Тошкент, Ўзбекистон ССР Фанлар академияси нашриёти, 1957. 527 б.
11. Милославский И. Г. Морфологические категории современного русского языка. Москва, «Просвещение», 1981. 246 с.
12. Гузев В. Г., Насилов Д. М. К интерпретации категории числа имён существительных в тюркских языках. Журн. “Вопросы языкознания”. 1975, № 3.
13. Истиклол ва она тили таълими (тўплам). Тошкент, Фан, 2000. 112 б.
14. Нигматов Х. Г. Функциональная морфология тюркоязычных памятников XI – XII веков. Ташкент, “Фан”, 1989. 192 с.
15. Никитевич В. М. Грамматические категории в современном русском языке. Москва, Гос. учебно-педагог. изд-во Министерства просвещения РСФСР, 1963. 245 с.
16. Мирзаев М., Усмонов С., Расулов И. Ўзбек тили. Тошкент, 1978.
17. Штелинг Д. А. О неоднородности грамматических категорий. Журн. “Вопросы языкознания”, 1959, № 1. С. 55 – 64.
18. Исаченко А. В. Бинарность, привативные оппозиции и грамматические значения. Журн. “Вопросы языкознания”, 1963, №2. С. 39 – 57.
19. Булыгина Т. В. Грамматические оппозиции. Исследования по общей теории грамматики (сборник). Москва, 1968.
20. Трубецкой С. Н. Основы фонологии. Москва, Издательство иностранной литературы, 1960. 372 с.
21. Саидов Ю. Формы глагола, выражающие нереальность в современном узбекском языке. Журн. “Советская тюркология”. 1971, № 1. С. 49 – 59.
22. Шендельс Е. И. О грамматической полисемии. Журн. “Вопросы языкознания”, 1962, № 3. С. 47 – 55.
23. Бондарко А. В. Грамматическая категория и контекст. Ленинград, Наука, 1971. 115 с.
24. Ҳожиев А. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида форма ясалиши. Тошкент, 1979.
25. Шоабдурахмонов Ш. ва б. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1980.
26. Нигматов Х. Г. Морфология языка восточно-тюркских памятников XI – XII веков. Автореф. дисс. докт. фил. наук. Баку, 1978. 48 с.
27. Нурманов А. Н. Проблемы системного исследования синтаксиса узбекского языка. Ташкент, 1982.
28. Бондарко А. В. О структуре грамматических категорий (Отношения оппозиции и неоппозитивного различия). Журн. “Вопросы языкознания”, 1981, № 6. С. 17 – 28.
29. Ярцева В. Н. Иерархия грамматических и типологическая характеристика языков. Типология грамматических категорий (сборник). Москва, 1975.
30. Зикриллаев Ф. Н. Фейлнинг шахс, сон ва хурмат категориялари системаси. Тошкент, Фан, 1990. 112 б.
31. Бондарко А. В. Теория морфологических категорий. Ленинград, Наука. 1976. 256 с.
32. Бондарко А. В. Принципы функциональной грамматики и вопросы аспектологии. Ленинград, “Наука”, 1983. 208 с.

33. Бондарко А. В. Функциональная грамматика. Ленинград, “Наука”, 1984. 134 с.
34. Щур Г. С. Теории поля в лингвистике. Москва, “Наука”, 1974. 255 с.
35. Гулыга Е. В., Шендельс Е. И. Грамматико-лексические поля в современном немецком языке. Москва, “Просвещение”, 1969. 184 с.
36. Абдувалиев М. Тўсиқсизлик майдони ва уни ташкил этувчи синтактик бирликлар. Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти журнали. 1980, 4-сон.
37. Абдувалиев М. А. Сложноподчинённые предложения с придаточным уступительным в разносистемных языках. Дисс. канд. филол. наук. Ташкент, 1989.
38. Ҳожиёва Ҳ. Я. Ўзбек тилида ҳурмат майдони ва унинг лисоний-нутқий хусусияти. Фил. фан. номз. дисс. Самарқанд. 2001. 130 бет.
39. Сафаров Ф. С. Ўзбек тилида сон-миқдор микромайдони ва унинг лисоний-нутқий хусусияти. Фил. фан. номз. дисс. Самарқанд. 2004. 135 бет.