



Typology Of Derivational Systems of The Russian and Uzbek Languages

Burkhanova Gulrukh

Researcher of the Samarkand State University

ABSTRACT

One of the basic concepts of linguistic typology is the concept of "type of language". However, it is rather difficult to give its precise and adequate definition. This happens because the very approach of scientists to what should be considered a type of language has not yet been determined, and those criteria that could serve as a reliable basis for determining particular type of language have not been established either. Considering the Russian and Uzbek languages, we can easily make sure that similar features are found in these languages.

Keywords:

Temporal word, independence, syntactic level, sentence, lexical level, word, unit of the syntactic level, grammatical gender

Like any system, language has two sides. It consists, on the one hand, of elements, morphemes, words clothed in material substance, sounds, on the other hand, it has a structure. There are a huge number of languages on the globe, and each of them has both some features in common with other languages, and features that we find only in a separate language.

The word "type" is widespread both in everyday life and in scientific literature. To determine the content of the concept of "type of language", it is necessary to consider some of the features or signs that are present in individual languages and that make up their characteristics.

Let's start with the structure of the word. In the Russian language, it is possible to dismember the vast majority of words into a root, stem, derivational morphemes, inflectional morphemes. At the same time, we are usually faced with the fact that the root (not always) exists independently as a separate word. This also applies to adjectives and verbs: the roots черн- и сид- do not exist as independent words.

Let's see what morphemes a word can take in Russian and Uzbek languages. In the

Russian language, which morphemes make up the word temporal, and neither the form of tense, nor time exist as independent words. To get a whole word that can exist as an independent lexical unit, it must be formalized with an inflectional morpheme, in this case the morpheme - ой, signaling that the temporal word is a masculine adjective, singular, nominative. The morpheme that we will add will not deprive this word of its independence, but will give it a new grammatical meaning: maktab - school; maktab + lar = maktablar - schools; maktablar + imiz = maktablarimiz - our schools; maktablarimiz + da = maktablarimizda - in our schools.

Note one more interesting feature, all lexical changes, as well as grammatical ones, are made by adding prefixes and suffixes. If we turn to the structure of the sentence, we will see that a common feature is observed in the Uzbek language - a firm word order, this subject - addition - predicate S + O + R.

In Russian, we have a relatively free word order with a predominance of the main variant: subject - predicate - addition S + P + O. However, in special stylistic conditions, the Russian language allows other, relatively rarely

used word order options: O + P + S, O + S + PhP + O + S. The above examples, showing the features of the structure of the unit of the lexical level - the word and the unit of the syntactic level - the sentence, clearly indicate that each language has some features peculiar to it and distinguishing it from other languages. And these traits or signs coexist with each other not just mechanically, but constitute a definite and stable system.

The following types of relations exist between the phenomena of language:

1) If there is A, that is, B. That is, if there is a phenomenon A in the language, for example, agreement in gender, as in Russian, German, Swedish, French, then there must be B, in this case, the grammatical gender. In the Uzbek language, A is absent, that is, there is no gender agreement, and B is also absent, that is, these languages do not have a grammatical gender.

2) If there is A, then, probably, there is B. This kind of relation can be expressed in two ways: a) isomorphism, that is, such a relation in which, if problem A is solved in a certain way, then problem B will also be solved. So, if a language has many declination classes, as, for example, in Old English, Old Russian and other Indo-European languages, where there were several declination classes with stems for vowel and consonant, then in these languages there are several classes of conjugation: seven classes of strong verbs and three classes of weak verbs; b) compensation, that is, such an attitude in which, if a language has two means for expressing one grammatical phenomenon, then there is reason to assume that there will be a language that uses only one of these means.

So, if there is a grammatically meaningful word order in a language, as, for example, in Uzbek, Turkic, Mongolian languages, then there will be no need for agreement as in a syntactic method of expressing the connection between the definition and the defined, and it will not appear in the language.

3) If there is A, then there may be B. This kind of relationship, although it is purely random, can still be taken into account when determining the typological properties of a given language.

Modern linguistics proceeds from the understanding of language as a system in which its individual elements, materially formed units - phonemes, morphemes, words, etc. - are in certain, strictly established relations in a given language. This predetermines the basic proposition that in language, as in a very well-developed system, one phenomenon can be caused by another, or it itself causes another phenomenon. On the other hand, each element of the system, by virtue of the same principle, turns out to be interconnected with many other elements of this system. The examples provided are intended to illustrate what has been shown above. Therefore, it is difficult for us to agree with the definition of the type of language, which was proposed by V. Skalichka and which reads: "We call the totality of such phenomena favorable to each other (that is, if there is A, then there is B. - V.A.) we call a type" we also agree with another definition of the same author, which sounds like this: "The sum of freely coexisting phenomena is called a type"

These two definitions are all the more perplexing because the author constantly emphasizes that individual phenomena of a language are interconnected, and it is precisely this criterion that dropped out of the definition of the type of language.

TP Lomtev defines the type of an individual language as a set of features "common to a certain subset of the general set of languages." However, this definition of the type of language has an abstract character and does little to reveal the concept of "type" as applied to a single language.

Meanwhile, the analysis of the structure of different languages, both related and unrelated, shows that in the structure of each language, features that characterize different types of languages coexist. At the same time, in the Uzbek language, the order of words in a sentence completely coincides with the order of words in a simple sentence in Turkish: S (subject) + O (addition) + P (predicate). In the Russian language, which is dominated by the features of a synthetic system, one can find signs of an analytical system; We see the formation of forms of the future tense and degrees of comparison. From the given examples it

becomes obvious that the so-called "pure" linguistic types do not really exist.

In the structure of each language, you can find signs of various types. But, as happens in such cases, the typology of a language is determined by the characteristics prevailing in it, which, in contrast to the typological views of the nineteenth century linguists. There are drawn from all levels of the structure of the language. All of the above gives us the basis to formulate the understanding of the type of language as follows: the type of a separate language is understood as a stable set of leading features of a language that are in certain connections with each other, and the presence or absence of any one feature determines the presence or absence of another feature or other features.

In connection with this definition, another definition arises. Since, in the structure of a language there may be features that are not leading for a given state of it, but nevertheless form a certain stable set of features. So, in the Uzbek language, we can find features that are survivable in it and are related to a different type of linguistic structure: if there are signs that characterize Uzbek as agglutinative (lack of agreement), we find agreement in it in the number of demonstrative pronouns and nouns to which they relate; bu shahar – bu shaharlar, u shahar – u shaharlar.

The presence of such features is what is called a type in the language. Comparing various related and unrelated languages, we can find in them some similar features. So, in all Turkic languages we find the same signs: 1) singharmonism, - the main feature at the phonological level; 2) uniqueness of affixes; 3) lack of agreement as a type of syntactic link; 4) the position of the definition before the determined; 5) the presence of extended members of the sentence instead of subordinate clauses and some other signs that form a stable set.

Such a stable set of leading features, common to a number of languages, forms a certain linguistic type.

Taking into account all the above data led V. Skalichka to the conclusion that there are five language types in the languages of the world:

inflectional, introflective, agglutinative, isolating and polysynthetic. At the same time, we can emphasize that in each specific language, these different types are implemented simultaneously. This conclusion indicates that a linguistic type is an abstract concept that manifests itself in each specific language or group of languages. At the same time, observations on natural languages show that none of the actually existing languages, in terms of their characteristics, can be recognized as adequate to any of the five types named.

References:

1. Shcherba L.V. Language system and speech activity. L.: 2004.
2. Nemchenko V.N. Modern Russian language. Word formation: Textbook. manual for philol. specialist. un-tov. - M.: Higher. sch., 2009.
3. Berezin F.M., Golovin B.N. General linguistics: Textbook. manual for universities. M.: Prsveshenie, 2019
4. Golovin B.N. Introduction to linguistics: Uch. manual for philol. specialist. universities. M.: Higher school, 2013
5. Golovin B.N. General linguistics. Uch. allowance. M.: Education, 2018
6. Akhrorova, Sh. Жамият ва ижтимоий муносабатларда маънавий омиллар. Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI. - 2020. -23(1).
7. S.U. Akhrorova, (2020) "National interests and their value in social relations", Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, Vol. 9, pp. 235-239
8. S.U. Akhrorova, (2020) "Manifestation of national spiritual features in the subjects of social policy", ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, Vol. 10, pp. 2130-2134
9. Ахророва, Ш. У. Аспект национальных ценностей в социальной политике в Узбекистане / Ш. У. Ахророва // Credo New. – 2013. – № 4. – С. 18.
10. Ahrorova, Sh. U. The meaning of national values for social life in Uzbekistan / Sh. U. Ahrorova // Europäische Fachhochschule. – 2014. – No 3. – P. 128-129.