Studies of Reciprocality in Linguistics

Sharipov Bobur Salimovich | Teacher at the Department of Languages of the Samarkand State Medical University bs_sharipov89@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the linguistic interpretation of the concept of reciprocity. It examines the human factor, which is central to the social sciences, that reciprocity is also inextricably linked with anthropocentrism, which he finds evidence in his derivational study. Reciprocity is a logical category. This concept is expressed in the language by affixes and words. The article analyzes and comments on the views of a number of linguists.

Keywords: Human factor, anthropocentrism, reciprocity, operator, mutual-joint pledge, object, subject.

At the present stage of development of the social sciences, the human factor has become one of the central ones. This concept has become a major object of study in the fields of philosophy, history, literature, art, psychology, as well as linguistics. It is not in vain, of course, that language is a system that realizes the world of external phenomena in the inner world and speech of man. After all, there is no such thing as a concept that is not reflected in human language. Well-known linguist I.V. Arnold, commenting on the important role of the human factor in the language system, said: The social sciences need to be studied in the context of the concept of anthropocentrism, although they are inherently related to human activity "[1.125-126].

Indeed, since the formation of linguistics as a science, only a handful of linguists have acknowledged that the fact that language is an event or activity is inextricably linked to the human factor. Every element of language, from phonemes to words, is directly related to human thinking. In other words, language is alive with man and man is alive with language [2.66].

The concept of reciprocity that we are analyzing is also inextricably linked to the human factor. Evidence of this can be seen in the derivation of reciprocity and the transfer of language elements to speech in the process. This shows that we must fully recognize that the transfer of every element of language to speech does not take place without the involvement of the human factor, since the need to use the signs of the language system in speech arises in the process of speech.

The term "reciprocal" began to be used in linguistics in the 1950s. The term is derived from Latin and means "together" [3.856]. This concept implies that the action is performed jointly by two or more referents. Russian linguist AM Peshkovsky was one of the first to explain the semantics of reciprocal. However, the idea that an action was performed by several referees, although not called reciprocal in those days, has long been known in linguistics. For example, Mahmud Kashgri writes: "If someone wants to say that someone has helped, the past tense is added to the verb before the letter d. He helped me in watering-he helped me to water the horse "[4.234].

The meaning expressed by this concept corresponds to the meaning that arises in the

Uzbek language through the form of the singular form of the verb. In other words, the conjunctive form of the verb, which belongs to the relative category, is one of the forms that make up the reciprocal. But this does not mean that it is a grammatical category. Reciprocity is a logical category that occurs in languages through affixes or analytic forms.

Reciprocity, which represents a relationship, is based on logical symmetry as a semantic category. But it is not the same thing as logical symmetry. Logical symmetry is a category that represents the process of existence and formation of the same moments under certain conditions and in certain relationships between different and opposite states of world events [5 / electronic source]. In reciprocity, the action of two or more persons in the same situation is observed, and since it is related to semantics, we know that it is based on symmetry. In fact, linguistic symmetry combines paradigms at its disposal. Indeed, although the elements of the paradigm vary in size, they require order (uniformity) [6].

It should be noted that any joint action does not create reciprocity, because reciprocity requires the same relationship between the two referees. In other words, in the case of reciprocity, the participants must be in the same object / subject ← → object / subject status in the performance of a particular action. In particular, although the phrase Athletes Run refers to an action performed by more than one person, it cannot be reciprocated. As Y.G. Testeles rightly points out, in reciprocity, referents are the subject and object of the situation without changing the number of participants in the performance of the same action at the same time, and have a correlated sign of correlation [7.13]. Coreference is a Latin word used to describe the relationship of two or more nominal groups to the same object [8.243].

While YG Testeles' view is correct, we do not agree with his view that the number of participants in the formation of reciprocity does not change. This is because correlation involves the participation of two or more individuals. For example, if Anvar, Sabir, and Otabek become friends, then in this reciprocity

all three persons will have the status of object ← → subject and will have the same position in the performance of the action. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that reciprocity exists only in the actions of two people. In addition, a third party may be involved in the interaction between the two parties. For example, when Sabir and Anwar were performing hashar, they were joined by several helpers and worked together. According to AM Peshkovsky, "Reciprocity refers to situations in which there are two or more participants. Each of the participants is both an active object and an active subject in action, "[9.115].

In general, an action performed by several persons together often refers to the category of the relative pronouns of the verbs. But in reciprocity, not only the verb itself, but also the operators that are attached to it or start distributing with it are important. Therefore, a verb that takes the form of a relative pronoun can only be called a form of reciprocity. However, when thinking about the singular form of the verb, Sh. As an example, they say hugged - hugged. Examples show that two words are reciprocal. Only in the first case does the reciprocal form of the relation occur with the -sh operator, and in the second with the -s operator, which produces the plural form. The previous -sh operator has fallen to a passive level. The fact that these operators are reciprocal does not require explanation. After all, there is a sign of correlation, and it is clear that the relationship between two people, the meaning of which is performed by more than one person. It is not clear on what basis Rakhmatullayev came to this conclusion.

In this regard, the opinion of A. Hodzhiev is noteworthy: "The form of the joint degree is formed with the affix - (i) sh and means that the action is performed by more than one person: wrote, watered, quoted. The form of this degree is also called "joint" because it means that more than one person is involved in the action. The following cases can be considered: 1) to perform together; 2) assistance in the movement of another person; 3) the meaning of the plural in general "[11.101].

Apparently, although the meanings mentioned by A. Hodzhiev are not called by the term "reciprocal", he explains the concept we are studying. It should be noted that the semantics, morphological formation of the reciprocal, the occurrence of syntactic devices associated with it have been studied by a number of linguists. In addition, the study of the derivation of recirculated devices is not yet on the agenda. We are clarifying the solution to this problem in our research. However, of the means of expressing reciprocity, the notion of the relation of the verb in general, the notion of proportion in general, has been extensively studied in linguistics and has been studied in the context of the notion of reciprocal diathesis. The term "diathesis" is derived from the Greek word meaning ratio. Ancient Indian and Greek linguists interpreted ratio as a grammatical category, noting that it had definite, indefinite, and general forms. This is one of the first studies in linguistics to study the concept of relativity. Later, in the early 17th century, Melenty Smotritsky was one of the first to express his views on the use of the category of relativity in the Slavic languages [13.128]. M.Smotritsky interprets the category of ratio in the same way as it is studied in Greek linguistics. In our opinion, the scholar's views on this mean that the Greek grammatical traditions were mechanically transferred to Slavic grammar. Nevertheless, Smotritsky's research served as a starting point for later scholars in the study of relativity. In particular, MV Lomonosov, based on the teachings of M. Smotritsky, made significant changes in the linguistic views copied from Greek grammar. More precisely, he studied proportions and reciprocity in accordance with the peculiarities of the Russian language. MV Lomonosov described ratios and studied them in six types: definite, ambiguous, self, singular, singular, middle and general. He rejected some of the concepts used by M. Smotritsky and introduced ratios based on new reflexive and reciprocal meanings ending in the -sya affix [14].

It should be noted that MV Lomonosov, paying attention to the syntactic connection of verbs with relative forms, for the first time explained in detail the meaning of verbs with the affix -sya, their syntactic connection. This was of great importance and led to the study of the semantics of reciprocity.

A.Kh. Vostokov studies ratios as well as M.V. Lomonosov, but he considers the exact ratio as the main one and emphasizes that the remaining ratios are formed on this basis. In his view, ratios should be distinguished not by their affixes, but by their meaning and syntactic relationship. In our opinion, the meaning and syntactic relationship of a verb with a relative pronoun depends on which suffix it takes. Indeed, derivatively, the affix serves as both a syntactic and a semantic operator. For example, performed - semantically causatema; performed – semantically reciprocity. In other words, both are related to semantics because they are a means of expressing grammatical meaning. The syntactic connection of these verbs also depends on the operators to which they are attached. More precisely, they can form a valence with transitive verbs and enter into a derivative relationship.

In modern linguistics, the concept of reciprocity has been specifically studied by linguists. In particular, the Grammar of Modern Russian Literary Language, published in 1970, explores various aspects of the semantics of interaction. In addition to the suffixes -pere, -yva (-iva), words such as vzaimno, mejdu soboy also serve as reciprocal expressions [16].

In 1981, L.L. Iomdin, a representative of the Moscow School of Semantics, published an article entitled "Symmetric Predicates in Russian" on the problem of expression of interactions based on Russian material [17.89-104].

As mentioned above, although the interpretation of reciprocal devices in linguistics is based on the material of some Turkic languages, there is no monographic research in Uzbek linguistics that explains this concept. With this in mind, we are studying reciprocity in the Uzbek language for the first time. In Uzbek, the affixes -sh, -ish, -lar are used interchangeably with the words we, together, plural, all, with, each other. These elements are the tools that create reciprocity, forming a semantic paradigm that represents interactions. Paradigm elements act as

operators in the derivation of reciprocal devices. Operators, in turn, are the main elements that make operands appear in speech:

1. –We saw you and started arguing with the girls (Said Ahmad. What I lost and what I found).

2. Aliaskar Askarov traveled from Andijan to Namangan and staged the tragedy "Old Turkey" and the comedy "Hungry Letters" with local youth (Sh. Rizayev. Jadid drama).

In the first of the given examples, with the derivation of the reciprocating device, the means of connection, and the second, the analogous means, act as the operator. The operator is included in the derivation process from the outside. This means that a person has free access to language elements in a speech situation.

References:

1. Arnold I.V. Modern linguistic theories of interaction between the system and the environment // Questions of linguistics, No. 3, 1991.

2. Turniyazov B.N Derivations of complex syntactic devices with equal components in modern Uzbek. - Samarkand: SamDCHTI, 2008.

3. Dvoretsky I.Kh. Latin-Russian dictionary. -M.: Russian language, 1976.

4. Makhmud Koshgariy. Devon is favored by a Turk. II vol. -Toshkent: Uzbekiston SSR Fanlar Academy and Nashriyoti, 1963.

5. Gott V.S., Pereturin A.F. Categories of symmetry and asymmetry and physics of the microworld. www.winstein.org (The page was accessed on 10.05 2022).

6. Glinka E.V. General system categories of symmetry and asymmetry in language learning. -St. Petersburg//Notes of the Mining Institute. T.193.

7. Testelets Ya.G. Introduction to General Syntax. -M.: RGGU, 2001.

8. Big encyclopedic dictionary. -M.: Great Russian Encyclopedia, 1998.

9. Peshkovsky A.M. Russian syntax in scientific coverage. -M.: State. textbook ped. publishing house of the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR, 1956.

10. Rahmatullayev Sh. Modern literary Uzbek.-Tashkent: University, 2006.

11. Khozhiev A. Fe'l. -Toshkent: Fan, 1973.

12. Desnitskaya A.V., Katsnelson S.D. History of linguistic teachings / Ancient world. -L.: Nauka, 1980.

13. Smotritsky M.G. Grammar Slavonic correct syntagma. -Evie (Vevis): printing house of Bogdan Oginsky, 1619.

14. Lomonosov M.V. Russian grammar. - St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1755.

15. Vostokov A.Kh. Russian grammar. - St. Petersburg: in the Printing house of I. Glazunov, 1831

16. Grammar of the modern Russian literary language / Ed. N.Yu. Shvedova. -M.: Nauka, 1970.

17. Iomdin LL Symmetric predicates in Russian//Problems of structural linguistics. -M.: Nauka, 1981..