INTERPRETATION OF GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES OF NOUNS IN THE SOURCES OF UZBEK LINGUISTICS OF THE 1920S

S. AMINOVA NUKUS
DPI Master of Uzbek Language and Literature

ABSTRACT

In the 1920s, the Uzbek language was published in 1919 by Chigotay Gurugi as a work reflecting the rules of the Uzbek language. We can show such works as "Sarf" (Morphology) and "Nahv" (Syntax), "Rules of Uzbek language" written by M.Qori, Q.Ramazon, Sh.Zunnun for primary schools in 1925.

The category of horse (noun) is first mentioned in the "Ways of Agreement" and the term is used in all organized sources. Only Abdurauf Fitratgina used it as a horse in his 1927 work Sarf, which later gave rise to the term. This term has an important place in Uzbek linguistics. The term name is still found in some works.

INTRODUCTION:

In the Ways of Agreement, the name (horse) is abbreviated as "the horse of everything" (Ways of Agreement, p. 23). Abdurauf Fitrat explains the name (horse) in a peculiar way: "When we say sun, cloud, iron, wood, Ahmad, each of these words reminds us of something. In other words, each of these words is the name of something that reminds us. It is a word that is attached to the meaning as a horse "(Abdurauf Fitrat, p. 19). In this explanation, of course, there is a lack of science, and at the same time it has not reached the level of tariffs. In the Linguistics Lesson, it is stated: "Words denoting the name of a person or thing are called nouns" (p. 65). This tariff is repeated in Section IV "Uzbek language lessons".

According to Korina, the horse is approached only as a lexical-semantic category. There is no mention of its morphological and syntactic features, but the notes of Section II "Language Lessons" also state that horses (including nouns) can have and act as a cut ("Language Lessons", p. 75).

GRAMMATICAL NUMBER CATEGORY:

In the works of the period of the organization, along with simple and straightforward explanations of this issue, some theoretical aspects are also covered. In the Ways of Agreement, the notion of "unity and cobility" is discussed, and the affix -s (-lor) is noted as a coplic sign, and is limited to the words horses, sheep, and butterflies (p. 27). Abdurauf Fitrat is also limited to the phrase "unity-coplik" in his side title: "All the primitive, artificial horses we have seen above are unity horses" (Abdurauf Fitrat, p. 20). It is said that the cop is formed by the affix -s (-lor).

The interpretation of the singular and the plural in sections II, III, and IV of the Uzbek Language Lessons can be called the most perfect example of the interpretation of the 1920s. In it, the singular form is explained as follows: "Names denoting the name of a single person or a single thing are called" singular nouns. "Explaining this in more detail, it is said, "Each of the words 'let, quail, and nightingale' means the same thing as a horse and a sage" (p. 68). This comment refers to the singularity of an object, to the representation of objects that are inseparable from solitude. It should be noted that not all current textbooks and manuals provide a unit number tariff. It is often emphasized that it is a zero form.

Section II, The Language Lesson, explains copulation as follows: "Nouns denoting more than one thing are called 'coplic nouns'

(originally written b instead of p-Q.Q)" and show that they are formed with the affix -s (-lor). This tariff correctly shows the main semantic feature and formal formation of copulation. The content mentioned in the above section IV "Uzbek language lesson" is further clarified: "Names are either singular or plural. Nouns denoting the name of a person or a thing are called "singular nouns", nouns denoting more than one person or thing are called "nouns": Uzbek-singular; Uzbeks-Koblik ”(p. 27).

They also tried to shed light on some semantic features of the word, which took the affix. In this regard, their opinion is noteworthy:

"Otaglik, nouns are not koplik / koblik /: Ahmad sozi is a paternal noun. He cannot be called Ahmad, unless the person whose name is understood, and other people with the thing, want to know that things exist, then the paternal names are multiplied: If I say, 'I went to Ahmad's house,' it means that Ahmad has not only a few but also his relatives. " -bet). This idea suggests that the affix -lar expresses the meaning of the plural when added to famous horses.

Part II, The Language Lesson, also notes that adjectives cannot take the affix -s when adjectives are fired (in their opinion, when a noun is dropped) (p. 76).

OWNERSHIP CATEGORY:

Possessive affixes are traditionally interpreted in all works in the category of rhymes, because in the 20s there was no idea that a separate category of Turkic languages was a linguistic phenomenon. For this reason, in Abdurauf Fitrat's work, this category is not specifically explained, not even its affixes are mentioned.

In Part II, The Language Lesson, possessive affixes are referred to as "sticky rhymes." Although they call possessive affixes "sticky rhymes," they are well aware that it is not an independent word, and say: "Sticky rhymes" mean nouns, adjectives, and adjectives only when they are added after a few. (Language Lesson, p. 87). So there is also a hint from these ideas to understand them as affixes. They also divided 'sticky rhymes' into two groups and called one possessive rhyme and the other verb rhyme. Hence, they thus created the now-reinforced term of affixes, which expresses that the concept of subject and objectivity refers to one of the three persons in speech. Possessive affixes (possessive possessive pronouns) are defined as follows: “Nouns, adjectives, adverbs attached to the end of certain pronouns are called possessive pronouns” (p. 88) and, conversely, possessive pronouns added after verbs are possessed in possessive pronouns an attempt was made to contrast the affixes with the affixes that make up the affixes.

Examples include -m (-im), -ng (-ing), -i (-si) (the -si affix is given by the letter s (sin)), -miz, (-imiz), -ngiz (-ingiz), The change in possessive affixes -i (-si) is shown. It is also noteworthy that the plural affix -s is not used, as until recently in school grammars the -s affix was used as a third person affix. In Section IV of the Uzbek Language Lesson, possessive affixes are explained not in rhymes, but in a bunch of 'signs'. But it is called diamond marks. It is described as follows: "The characters that join the end of the Coz types and replace the personal pronouns are called 'diamond symbols'" (Uzbek Language Lesson, p. 62).

The term pronouns is used not only for possessive affixes, but also for possessives. Hence possessive affixes have been suggested as affixes to nouns, as well as conditional, definite, and future tense verbs. Also, the grammatical meaning of each person, that is, the first person tuner, the second person listener, the third person is called another. Such affixes are: -m, -ng, -i: -miz (k, q), -ngiz, - (i).

Part II, "Language Lessons," also shows the writing of possessive affixes within the graphics and spelling of that period, i.e., the

addition of words that are not long letters. It is also said that the suffix -si is written in this play, and the consonant s is written before -i if the next letter of the word ends with a vowel. It is obvious that the authors of Part II "Language Lessons" did not take into account that the affix -si is a variant of the third person singular.

Agreement category. There was no concept in the 1920s about the specific system of this category. Due to this, this category is not specifically covered. Conjunctive affixes are also listed in the "Symbols" category.

Shorasul Zunnun gives the affixes of -ing, -ni, -da, -dan, -ga / -ka / -qa / in the series of "Symbols" ("Language Lesson", p. 25) and separates the affixes of and and ni explains. In his view, the sign of possession, privacy, means that one thing belongs to another: Ahmad's book, Oybek's lion. He explains that the book belongs to Ahmad, the lion, to Oybek. Hence, Shorasul Zunnun was able to correctly understand the semantics of the future tense. But he takes a completely different approach to interpreting the affix. "Who are you kidding?" If the question is answered as Ahmad, it is understood that the task of feeding came to Ahmad. This is what is added to the word that indicates what has happened "(Language Lesson, p. 27). It is clear that there is a tendency to call such an affixal word tushum. Shorasul Zunnun also gives examples of the decline of the accusative and the future tense, but does not mention the grammatical, semantic, and methodological reasons for the decline of these affixes. Abdurauf Fitrat also tried to explain the affixes of the conjunction in the series "Symbols": he calls the affix of as a sign of looking, and explains that "it shows to whom and to what something belongs". -ga // -ka // -qa // - ga, -don // - dan, -do // - da, -ni. These indicate to whom and to what the verb refers, other than the operators: -ni is a sign of income; -ga, -ka, -qa, is a sign of going; -don, is a sign of

exit from; -do, -da is a placemark (A. Fitrat, pp. 61-62).

Abdurauf Fitrat noticed that the affix of the accusative case is functionally different from other affixes of the accusative case. In addition, although there is no fiber, consonant affixes have had their first name. It is known that these names, given by Abdurauf Fitrat, are still used today.

In Section IV, The Uzbek Language Lesson, the consonant affixes are listed only as "true followers" in the group of "distinctions" of the "series" of characters. These include the affixes -da, -dan, -ga / -ka / -qa / -ga / (dialectal -a / -na), -ni,-, but their explanations are not given.

It should be noted that although the term agreements was not used, the concept of this was present in Central Asian linguistics. Mulla Muhammadamin ibn Mahmud Karimhoja was able to show a system of agreements in the Uzbek language on the basis of the terminology of Arabic linguistics. He called the affix affixes 'custom mafoils' and cites 8 consonant forms and names. With the exception of the forms mafulu mahu (by whom, by what) mafulu mahu (for whom, why) mafulu alayhu (by whom, by what) in his system of agreements, the form of the terms he cites is much closer to current views. It's not just the future that is at stake. So there was a pineapple to distinguish agreements, but it's hard to understand why this pineapple wasn't used. Even in the grammars of the Tatar language, written under the influence of Arabic grammars, the suffixes bolush and the conjunctions were referred to by the terms of the signs of being.

Forms of grooming and grooming in horses. It is known that such forms are interpreted in the Uzbek language as non-categorical forms.

There is also information in the organized works about the formation of the meanings of diminutive and caressing in horses. Initially, ideas about this can be found in

Abdurauf Fitrat. He called horses with such meanings "small horses" and explained it as follows: "A horse given to a person to honor something or to show his smallness is called a small name (horse)" (Sarf, pp. 19-20). , and shows that it is formed by the affixes -cha (-cho), -gina / -kina / -qina / -gina. It also cites the affixes -chik, -choq, -chak, -loq and emphasizes their low use. Analyzing the examples given to it, there is an independence of morphemes and affix in the words booklet, baby, girl, bride, bag. Until then, bridal words may have a dialectical character rather than a literary norm. However, the citation of infant sozi is controversial, as they cannot be divided into morphemes in the form of chaka / lok without the use of chaka in child soz. It is also incorrect to consider the female, bird forms as a 'minimized horse', but the fact that they form the separation-isolation forms of horses is recorded in the scientific literature. According to Korina, when Abdurauf Fitrat said "a diminutive name (horse)," he understood the forms associated with the making of uniforms in horses.

Part II, "Language Lessons," under the heading "Names of Decline and Pampering," states that the addition of the affixes -cha (-cho), -choq / -chak, -gina / -gina signifies diminution, love, or caress (p. 74).), but it is not based on examples of where it comes in the sense of diminishing, where it means to love or caress. Hence, the forms denoting diminutive, masculine meanings are interpreted together by the authors of this period. This is also in line with current views, as the miniature forms of horses have always been used together.

The works of this period also mention the syntactic features of horses. Part III, The Uzbek Language Lesson, states that a noun (noun) has a possessive and a participle (p. 46). The corresponding examples are also valid. At the same time, they used the word "darak gap" with the part of speech, and we hope that their scientific analysis will be reflected in the scientific works covering the history of syntactic teachings.

REFERENCES:

1) Abdurahmonov G., Shukurov Sh. Historical grammar of the Uzbek language. T .: Teacher. 1973. 320 p
2) Collective. Uzbek grammar. T .: Fan, 1975. I. B. 125.
3) Borovkov AK and others. Uzbek language textbook. T .: Teacher, 1969. p. 55.
4) Shavqi Bektura. Tatar sarv, nahv. Tutay Kuy, 1923. b. 9.
5) Hojiev A. Form making in modern Uzbek language. T .: Teacher, 1979. 80 p.
6) Ikromova R. Synthetic-analytical and functional forms of horses in the Uzbek language. T.: Fan, 1985. b. 70.