

THE LEVEL OF ADVERBS IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS

Sharipova Mohichehra

Gulistan State University, Faculty of Philology, 2nd year student

Abstract

Arabic grammar, which is recognized today as the most perfect grammar, was also advancing at a rapid pace, as were Indian, Greek, and Chinese linguistics. The emergence and development of linguistics in the Arab Caliphate was also associated with practical needs, i.e. during this period there was a great difference between the ancient monuments and the language of the Qur'an and the living Arabic language. The research carried out by Arab scholars in order to make the Qur'an understandable and to protect the classical Arabic language from the influence of dialects has reached us in some of the scientific works.

Keywords: language, speech, dichotomy, language, word, grammar, system, synchronous, diachronic.

According to academician A.N. Kononov's book "Grammar of the Turkic language" (M.L., 1941, p. 64), this idea is supported by Bang and Nemet. A. Gulamov also quotes J. Denu's opinion that "this affix is in fact a remnant of the word namesake". Commenting on other ideas, A. Gulamov, in support of E.K. Zaleman's opinion that this affix is formed from the combination of two morphemes, defines these morphemes as follows: the first part consists of the affix -la, and the second part consists of believes that there can be unity, and proves this point. A. Gulamov bases his opinion on nine points. However, it leaves as a separate object of study how the suffixes -da and -sh are actually derived.

Apparently, the scientist: 1) determines the possibility of using the affix -dash in the present and in the past; 2) fully shows the variants in Turkish and Uzbek; 3) pays attention to the use of Uzbek dialects; 4) pays attention to the place in live speech; 5) describes the effect of the affix on the sound at the end of the base when it is added to the base, indicates the reasons; 6) defines its semantic relationship with other affixes (pays attention to its synonymous relationship); 7) checks the methodological aspect; 8) reacts to the opinions expressed on the origin of the



affix; 9) expresses and substantiates his views on the etymology of this affix; 10) determines the scope of work to be done (the main problem).

In this way, A. Gulamov chooses to reveal all the aspects and features of this unity. Of course, this leads to a more in-depth study of all the features. In particular, there is an opportunity to continue the study of the properties of the units with the affix -dash, such as the possibility of steadiness and stabilization, and other similar properties (adverbial participle, participle).

A. Gulamov approaches every linguistic phenomenon, the source of research, applying all the principles and general laws of dialectics. In the researches of the scientist it is observed that system-structural, formal-functional (can be formal or functional), substantial research methods are synthesized. It is impossible to determine whether he conducted any research, for example, only in the formal-functional direction. In this regard, A. Gulamov is, in fact, the founder of linguistics in the substantive direction. The point is that substantial linguistics literally includes both the system-structural direction and the formal-functional direction. The principles of dialectical cognition require it.

This is because it is impossible to approach every event (and every unit) of language without taking into account its different relations with other events and units, just as every event in the universe (cognition) is approached. All of these facts and unusual approaches do not give complete results, but lead to one-sided conclusions. Professor H. Nematov, commenting on such cases, makes the following right statement: “Both the structural (including substantial) interpretation of the linguistic unit reveals in its own way - only one aspect of its very multifaceted source of research - the linguistic unit, only. Uncovering the rest is a task facing science. Time and progress, on the other hand, reveal new facets of it. Therefore, in modern Uzbek linguistics one can see different approaches and interpretations in the description of the morphological system of the same language - Uzbek” [11, 24]. Conclusions about each language phenomenon, its features, aspects, depending on the nature of the approach, purpose, goal, scope of the approach, the level of knowledge of the approach, etc., the size of the selected object, other views, level of research, general scientific and practical environment relatively deepening and enriching. Indeed, subsequent work will change, complement, refine, enrich, and clarify them.



The above conclusions of A. Gulamov have their value due to their serious substantiation. As a result of new research, they can be supplemented, improved, developed. For example, in Uzbek, the plural can be expressed both by repeating adjectives and by repeating words in the noun or other category: good-good; car-car; what-what (took), often (many/much), visit, four-four. Each of these differs in its unique plural expression. The plural is also expressed phonetically in speech, that is, the word odam (man) is pronounced as oodam - by emphasizing the accent or by stretching the vowel.

In the book, A. Gulamov puts forward the firm opinion that “the only sign of the plural meaning in nouns in the Uzbek language is” –lar (-s)”. Also, “So –lar (-s) is the grammatical sign of the plural. The designation of its plural sign depends on its main function. If we consider the plurality of nouns as –lar (-s), then it is clear that this is a logical-grammatical phenomenon” [8, 5], in this way the scientist is absolutely right. As early as the 1940’s, the scholar said, “As expressed by the plurals, the unit is known for not taking this suffix, which introduces itself by not having a special formal sign. This is typical of nouns, and unity in verbs can also have its own sign.”

In the early twentieth century, despite the emergence of ideas such as “there is no need to talk about the category of numbers or unity in the Uzbek language, as long as the unit does not have its own formal index” [23,195-201], A. Gulamov’s ideas remain unique and new. Because the scientist understood the essence of the concept of grammatical form not in appearance, but inwardly. That is, in speech, kitob (book) and kitoblar (books) forms are in a relation of form paradigm to each other. Sensing this deeply, the scientist put forward the idea that the unit introduces itself by not having a special formal sign. A similar opinion was later expressed by Sh. Rakhmatullaev, and A. Gulamov’s opinion was confirmed. Sh.Rahmatullaev writes: “Usually the affix –lar (-s) is called the plural form: accordingly, the state without the affix, which contradicts it in form and meaning, is called the singular form. For example, darah (a tree) is called a singular noun, and darahlar (trees) is called a plural noun [8,5].

In addition, academician A.Khojiev states that “... the form of the noun without any form (formless) is considered to be a singular form, but in the Uzbek language it is really a form that has a singular meaning and can be in opposition to the plural form. (the singular form of numbers) has not been proved ...” [22,26-33], his more



rigorous ideas are not confirmed: a) the thesis “nouns are used in singular and plural forms” is understood by all linguists divided (the question of form must be approached internally, not externally); b) H.G. Nematov proved it in his article “Verb, its forms and categories” [17,49]; c) in the manual “Modern Uzbek language, morphology”; “Therefore, to exclude it from the category is nothing more than to understand the essence of the system... And the linguistic essence is “the opposition of the formless state to the formal state” [12,210].

A. Gulamov draws attention to the idea that the suffix –lar (-s) is a syntactic phenomenon, or a morphological phenomenon, and tries to determine that it is not a word-forming, nor is it one of the variables in linguistics. “Scholars who include the –lar (-s) in the noun as a word-changer (“The word-change takes place with the help of the suffixes and the suffixes: “birds-birds...”) also take it with some considerations” gives a cautious approach. This means that A. Gulamov does not include the affix –lar (-s) in the list of word-formers and word-modifiers. The classification of affixes, in the form of word-makers, in the form of word-modifiers, cites the affix of scholars as word-modifiers, dividing the modifiers themselves into forms that perform syntactic functions and forms that do not perform syntactic functions. In this case, -lar (-s) are included in the list of affixes that do not perform a syntactic function. In the following grammar, which classifies affixes as word-formers and word-modifiers, A. Gulamov himself includes the –lar (-s) affix in the list of form-forming affixes. In both cases, the status of the –lar (-s) affix is correctly defined [20, 82-83]:

In the meantime A. Gulamov draws his attention to the comparison of some aspects of the application of the usage of –lar (-s) in other languages. In particular, the second words of the Russian-language combinations “Птицы поют, сердца детей” (“Birds are singing, hearts of children”, in German “Die Vogel singen Kinderhersen” in this place will not be supported in the singular form (the compatibility of the quantity is always preserved), but in Uzbek, without changing the material of thought, it will be explained seriously by the idea that it will be supported both in the form of “Қушлар сайрадилар, болаларнинг юраклари” (“birds sang, hearts of children”). Comments, such as the above, the goal is that many linguists Professor A. Gulamov in relation to “A. Gulumov applied the rules of the Russian language to the Uzbek language exactly, expressed his thoughts on the basis of the materials of the Russian language, did not originate from the



peculiarities of the Uzbek language” [15, 19-23]. And yet, A. Gulamov observed that his thoughts on the basis of an in-depth analysis of Uzbek language materials. This can be assured by reviewing the same book of the scientist.

The conclusion made by the scientist on the basis of the above comparison also confirms this: “although we use these words in both forms, the plural content gives an understanding. As it shows, it is contextually understood that the combinations form one of the content in all three languages, but in the second examples in the Uzbek language the meaning of the plural”. It follows that the plural in the Uzbek language does not always have its own meaning. In this language, its formal expression is not so strict, it is more powerful to be based on the ideological side. This fact is once again proved by the fact that the turkologist does not have a wide application of the plural form in Turkic languages, his views on the fact that he often does not express himself.

In general, the meaning of the plurality is expressed not with the help of a special suffix, but by other means, since the meaning is only understood, the noun denoting the subject in the same plural is used in the singular form. Also, the name of subjects that are not related to the number imagination is also used in units” [8,15]. A. Gulamov continues with the idea of the cases of the application of nouns in the Uzbek language in unity, that if these words take the form of a plural, then these nouns can no longer represent a plural, but represent a different meaning, perform a different task. After that, what types of nouns can be used in the unit will pass one by one in 19 points, explaining their causes, their internal appearance [8,15-21]. A. Gulamov with a detailed stop to the features of the application of –lar (-s), it can be said that at that time grammatic form provided for the issue of valence. The opinions expressed by him are the source of thoughts about the next moment (at the beginning of the XXI century) or the valence of the grammatic form, which was expressed slightly earlier. In Particular, A. Gulomov’s think about the fact that before the plural suffix can not be included in words with an integer, if it is added, It can perform another function. This will show that affix will demonstrate one of such opportunities in each joining position.

Apparently, it is a pity that these interpretations, which correspond exactly to the views of scientists, are said to be innovations today in a particular way to the opinion of the scientist, and even to the example, he cited before the views that “the valence of the grammatical form is not completely raised in Uzbek



linguistics.” We read: “-lar (-s) is defined as the general grammatic meaning of the form of the plural number, the divisible indefinite quantitative plural, as seen in the previous chapter, -lar (-s) is understood by itself that the form of the word form does not coincide with the determinant, which expresses a certain amount. And when it is attached, of course, occlusionality – fervent normality occurs. Therefore, hundred book, tenth year can not come in the plural form, which is defined in such a combination” [3, 100]. Similar sentence A. Gulamov we read the following quot: nouns with a definite denominator, expressed in words denoting a number or quantity, are used in units (the plural meaning of this genitive - the exact plural amount is understood by the same predicate). - A hundred tar, a lot of people... If we give both in this place, it will certainly be an expression of a different meaning (usually the meaning of respect. - My grandmother has ten children.” .. A. Gulamov did not use the terms “valence” or “grammatic form valence”, but simply. It is possible to see that the scientist is the founder of substantive linguistics in Uzbek linguistics.

A. Gulamov’s such a method of analysis can only be an example for other scientists, researchers. Because as the scientist approaches the phenomenon, he does not neglect any aspect of it, tries to deeply base each individual case, finds its causes, expresses a scientific attitude to what other scientists say. It is possible to be sure of this, if you pay attention to the analysis of the words of the scientist, such as yonib o’chgan otlarin (my burned grass), bo’y laringdan (from your height), allaqachonlar (from along times), uyqularim keldi (I want to sleep), o’zingga bandalar qilding (you made bandages yourself), shunchalari (so those), yirtqichlarcha (so cruel). It means that it is very difficult to say that any of the thoughts in this book, written in 40’s, are indecent, excessive or erroneous, but also to add to them one thought, to supplement it with another thought. In this case in the Uzbek language (plural category), the same pseudonym is not created perfect research. On the contrary, this work serves as a scientific and methodological source for many studies.

In his research, the scientist first tries to study as thoroughly as possible the thoughts, opinions expressed about this phenomenon, unity, if he sincerely, deeply scientific attitude to them, and secondly, to base his thoughts, he draws examples from the material of live conversations (especially folk materials), from the literature of the same period, from the scientific style, from the publicist, from



official documents. He notices the specific aspects in each of them, interprets them. Similar aspects also serve as a scientific and methodological resource for further researchers.

VI part of the book “Category of the plural in Uzbek” is devoted to the analysis of words entered from other languages (mainly Arabic, Persian), units that take the form of a plural, the state of these forms in the second language, the events that occur as a result of the addition of their-es.

A. Gulamov in the second paragraph of this part, asserts that “when a word in the plural form, which is in the language of one people, moves to a second language, it usually loses its plural meaning, its recognition as a plural, is read as a unit, and takes the sign of that language for the plural”, and this opinion is expressed by profesoor N.V. Yushmanov. The very idea itself is a solution to many theoretical conclusions, views, especially in the matter of language attitudes, such as the assimilation of words, the attitude of another language to assimilation, the determination of the position of assimilation in this language. That is, the word borrowed from other languages into the Uzbek language in the plural form: a) in the Uzbek language is not recognized as a plural - it loses its value; b) these units are therefore recognized as a unit in the plural form only when they accept a specific form of the Uzbek language. The conclusion is reasonable, of course. The scientist continues and gives a solution to another theoretical problem, namely: “Arabic is a very small number of the words Persian entered to us (Uzbek) in the plural, because usually the words of one language pass into another language without unity” (p. 33). “The amount of words entered with the plural form is small” - this is one conclusion, the reason for which the scientist found his own code in the second theoretical view: “because the words of one language pass without units to another language” (p. 33). The scientist also noted that “in the Uzbek language there are more Arabic plural words than in the Persian plural (only the plural is considered)”.

The above-mentioned theoretical views are perfectly based on the work, the exact legality of their thoughts is that “in English words such as rels, escimos, papuas with plural ending -s, have entered into the Russian language as a unit and have received Russian “I” for plural (relsy (rails), papuasy (papuasi), eskimosy (Eskimos)), have received Uzbek: papuaslar (papuas), eskimoslar (Eskimos)” etc. The scientist explain in detail the cases of the use of such words in the Uzbek



language **луғатайн (dictionary); тарафайн (айн) (side); хабар (message), ахборот – хабарлар (information)**. Opinions, comments are relevant. In the same way A. Gulamov found the Persian language with the plural words such as Shakhonshohi (My lord), Mardon (brave person), Childukhtaron (forty girls), sipokhon (modest), hukmdoron (ruler), pirsiyon (persian), musurmon (moslem) words express thoughts about their part of speech, as well as during which he expressed his views on the words of his o'g'lon (son), yoron (companion), Eron (Iran), Boyon (rich man), davron (happy period), jonon (lovely) and on each of them. From our point of view, A. Gulamov recorded in dictionaries on these words, his attitude to the opinions expressed by other scientists, his conclusions on their basis are reliable and enrich the views of Uzbek linguistics on these words. In the later parts of the book (Part 7), the expression of the plural in verbs is analyzed. It practically proves and propagates the necessity of relying on the common language in revealing its specific features of the Uzbek language based on its own materials. In places where the scientist thought about the connection of word-building with morphology, he says: "according to the old grammatic teaching, word-forming and word-changing were considered in morphology. In reality, these are just similar in formal terms, in functional terms, another-a different phenomenon: the first is a lexical phenomenon, the second is a syntactic phenomenon. It is understood that the view of word-building in the morphological plan is based on the Indo-European language knowledge; Indo-European language knowledge works with a formal method and, giving its attention to phonetics and morphology, transfers the issue of speech to a secondary place, completely ignoring the semantics phenomena - the doctrine of the meanings of words, legally arising from the

REFERENCES

1. Scientific heritage of A.Gulamov. Book 5. Tashkent. (2009).
2. Scientific heritage of A.Gulamov. Book 1. Tashkent: University. (2005).
3. Modern Uzbek language. Morphology. Tashkent. (2008).
4. Gulomov A. Ways of making words in the Uzbek language. Tashkent. (1949).
5. Gulomov A. Verb. Tashkent: Science.(1954).
6. Gulomov A. Uzbek language grammatics. Tashkent. (1975).



7. Gulomov A. Agreements in the Uzbek language. Tashkent: Uzfa. II. (1940).
8. Gulomov A. Category of the plural in the Uzbek language. Tashkent. (1944).
9. Guloyamov A.G'.. "About the suffix -dash in the Uzbek language".
10. Juraboeva M., Gulomov A. Bibliographic index. Tashkent. (2004).
11. Modern Uzbek language. Morphology. 1-volume. Tashkent: the classic word.(2008).
12. Modern Uzbek language. Morphology. Tashkent. (2007).
13. Zikrillaev G. Language of independence and literature. Tashkent. Science.(2004).
14. Kononov A.N. Grammar of the Turkish language. (Moscow-Leningrad).(1941)
15. Mirtajiev M. Language and culture. Tashkent: Uzbekistan. (1992).
16. Nematov H. Verb, its forms and categories. UTA.1. (1972). 49-B.
17. Sh.Rakhmatullaev-the famous linguist. Tashkent. (2006).
18. Astraumav N. Etymology of the Sartov language. Tashkent. (1910).
19. Tajiev Y. A look at the current Uzbek linguistics. UTA.(2008).
20. Uzbek language grammatics. Tashkent. (1975).
21. Usmanov S. Morphological structure of the word in the Uzbek language. Tashkent. 2010.
22. Hajiev A. Actual problems of Uzbek linguistics. UTA.5, (2007). 26-33-b.
23. Hajiev A. Uzbek language morphology, morphemics and theoretical issues of word-building. Tashkent: Science.(2010).