



On the syntactic basis of the study of morphology of a language

Saidova Mukhabbat
Shukrullaevna,

Associate Professor of Nam State University

ABSTRACT

The article retrospectively highlights individual forms of implementing the idea of studying morphology on a syntactic basis and gives considerations on further increasing the effectiveness of this idea when taking a course in the modern Russian literary language, and draws some conclusions from observations of the degree of understanding by students.

Keywords:

Linguodidactics, morphology, syntactic basis, comprehension, semantic content, formal category, syntactic interpretation.

The idea of studying morphology based on syntax has become firmly established in modern linguodidactics. However, with a general recognition of the methodological value of this idea, there is often a different approach to its practical implementation, which is especially reflected in the formulation of teaching the Russian language at the Faculty of Russian Language and Literature in the national school, which trains people of local nationality who have received secondary education in their native language in the majority. cases in rural areas and do not have sufficient training in the Russian language. In this regard, we would like, on the one hand, to elucidate retrospectively some forms of implementation of the idea of studying morphology on a syntactic basis and, on the other hand, to express our thoughts on further increasing the effectiveness of this idea when taking a course in the modern Russian literary language at the named faculty. [1]

The idea of studying morphology on a syntactic basis has deep roots. It arose in connection with the concept of the primacy of syntax over morphology, with the recognition that the elements of morphology can be defined

comprehensively only in the structure of the sentence, in the aspect of syntax. Many outstanding linguists and Methodists have spoken out in defense of this idea, directly or indirectly.

According to E.D. Polivanov, "... the Russian grammatical formal category itself does not have a fundamentally independent and constant semantic characteristics, which is, independent from the context [7.108s]

The semantic content is embedded in a given morphological category by syntax, that is, by the moment of combination with certain other words... ". Speaking about the nature of the relationship between morphology and syntax, V.V. Vinogradov emphasized: "In the grammatical structure of words, morphological and syntactic peculiarities are combined into an organic unity. Morphological forms are settled syntactic forms ... Morphological categories are inextricably linked with syntactic ... Syntax is the organizational center of grammar. " A. V. Mirtov advised starting the study of grammar with syntax: "The study of the elements of syntax begins from the first days of grammatical study of the language ... Parts of speech are studied ... in connection

with their role in the sentence. It is impossible to break the morphology and syntax when learning a language for practical purposes.”[5]

Nevertheless, the idea of studying morphology from syntax did not immediately make its way into teaching practice. But in recent years, many methodologists, compilers of programs, authors of textbooks, teaching aids on the Russian language for secondary schools and universities have begun to show noticeable activity in this area.

As mentioned above, the idea of studying morphology based on syntax has various forms of implementation. Let's consider some of them:

1. When explaining a morphological theme, it is recommended to refer to the syntax as necessary, to indicate the syntactic role of this or that morphological phenomenon. “In all cases,” writes A. V. Tekuchev, “when it is suggested by the material under study from morphology, one should also refer to the syntax along the way” [9.177]. The fact is that “many phenomena (parts of speech, their individual forms, cases, gender, number, etc.) have some features at the same time, and therefore should be considered from a syntactic point of view.” This is perhaps the opinion of the majority of Methodists.

This methodological solution is not devoid of weaknesses. They are inevitably found in the linear passage of grammar (syntax after morphology) and the study of the propaedeutic course of syntax before starting the course in morphology. The volume and content of the propaedeutic course, as a rule, are determined “by eye”. It is no coincidence that this course is presented unequally in different textbooks by different authors, while the course of morphology itself remains unchanged in terms of volume and content as a whole. Moreover, upon preliminary assimilation of the syntax elements, it is difficult to establish which morphological categories are associated with these elements. It is not easy to explain the material of the propaedeutic course of syntax without relying on knowledge of certain information on morphology, those morphological means by

which the syntactic connection between words is carried out. Thus, syntax is studied in terms of morphology, and morphology in terms of syntax. As a result, the same issues are repeatedly considered, which is hardly acceptable with the usual budget of study time

2. AB Shapiro proposed a very original form of implementing the idea of studying morphology on a syntactic basis.

In the preface to his Russian language textbook, he noted: “The division of the grammatical part of the book into morphology and syntax has been eliminated. This is due to the fact that syntactic elements are introduced ... into the work as soon as it becomes possible, and in any case long before the morphological material is exhausted ... In essence, the whole book is a syntactic-morphological interpretation of linguistic material, and the main base is the syntactic moments of speech” [11.9s]

The content of the textbook, the methodological orientation of the material presented in it generally correspond to the concepts of the author. The book contains a significant number of examples for observations and independent exercises that serve as a “syntactic-morphological interpretation of linguistic material.” This can be judged by the content of the following, for example, tasks:

“1) Listen to someone else's speech. How is it easier to understand it: by individual words or by connecting words with each other in groups?

2) Put together the individual words from the following passage in small groups as needed for understanding:

The factory is surrounded on both sides of the village. The peasants of these villages are engaged in gardening. Gardeners organized an artel to sell their products”

In the construction of his book, AB Shapiro followed the advice of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay: “... it is desirable to have textbooks containing not a dogmatic presentation of grammar, but only a collection of systematically arranged examples and problems ...” [11.9s]

There are also drawbacks in the solution of A. B. Shapiro. The main one is, first of all, the groundlessness of the accepted order of alternation of morphological and syntactic topics in the textbook. It is also necessary to prove why the verb should be studied before the noun, and the sentence after the noun, etc.

3. We find a peculiar approach to the idea of studying morphology on the basis of syntax in the Program for the practical course of the Russian language for national groups of universities in the Union and autonomous republics (Moscow, "Higher School", 1974). Here is what one of its compilers wrote: "Since the study of grammar is not an end in itself, there is no need for a systematic course in morphology and syntax. The program material is arranged in two parallel planes: 1) syntax and punctuation, morphology and spelling."

In this case, the syntax of a simple sentence plays a dominant role. The order of the study of morphology, the distribution of its material is completely determined by the order of consideration of the elements of the syntax of a simple sentence. So, in one of the textbooks compiled in accordance with the specified program, materials of syntax and morphology are arranged as follows: in connection with the topic "Subject, expressed by a noun", "Gender of nouns" and "The number of nouns" are highlighted, and in connection with the topic "Simple predicate expressed by a verb" - all basic grammatical categories of the verb

Such a presentation of grammar, although it fundamentally destroys the traditional system of its construction, best reflects the functional properties of grammar and most fully meets the tasks of the practical orientation of teaching the Russian language in the national audience.

As practice shows, a different approach to the implementation of the idea of studying morphology on a syntactic basis is usually determined by different goals of teaching a language. That is why none of the existing forms of implementing this idea in its pure form is suitable for working with students at the Faculty of Russian Language and Literature at a national school, which has the task of

equipping future teachers with deep theoretical and practical knowledge. While studying at the institute, students must master the Russian language perfectly; learn to skillfully understand the complex issues of Russian linguistics. This, in fact, dictates a special approach to the study of morphology based on syntax in the course of the modern Russian literary language, which allows the combination of two forms of implementation of the methodological idea under consideration. So, the study of the morphology section is preceded by a small syntactic course. It includes some information related to concepts: a sentence, members of a sentence, a phrase, types of syntactic relations in phrases, ways of expressing syntactic relations between words, etc.

In the aspect of syntax, first of all those phenomena of morphology are explained and assimilated, which AM Peshkovsky called "syntactic categories": case of nouns; gender, number, case of adjectives; gender, number, person, tense, mood of verbs; time of participles and gerunds. [7.108]. Based on syntax, separate "non-syntactic categories" are also studied, but closely related to syntactic ones, for example: parts, speech, voice, kind of verb; the degree of comparison of the adjective; gender and number of nouns, etc. It is taken into account that any word in any of the listed "syntactic" and "non-syntactic" categories receives a full grammatical characteristic only as part of a phrase and a sentence. For example, the question of whether such words as worker, dark, one, etc. belong to one or another part of speech can be reliably solved only in terms of syntax: Worker (noun) goes to the factory. Today is a working (adj.) Day. The sky is dark (adj.) It is dark in the yard (condition category). Try on seven times, cut once (numerically). I go out alone (adj.) On the road... etc.

It is especially important to take into account the syntactic aspect when passing the declension and conjugation paradigms. It is often still possible to observe in the classroom how words are bowed or conjugated out of connection with others. And this is done not

because the syntactic basis of morphology is being questioned, but rather because the ingrained pattern in the compilation of a syntactic construction with the word being studied looks pedagogically less attractive. compare, for example: *I. There is a new home (table, city ...); R. There is no new home (table, city ...); D. Approached a new home (table, city ...); Q. I see a new house (table, city ...); T. Satisfied with the new home (table, city ...), P. Thinking about a new home (table, city ...).*

Of course, with serious preparation for classes, it is not difficult to avoid this pattern.

The syntactic interpretation of morphological categories, by the way, found its reflection in the textbook on morphology, created by the team of authors of the Republican Pedagogical Institute of the Russian Language and Literature. The manual, in particular, provides for a preliminary acquaintance of students with some information from the field of syntax, necessary for the study of morphology on a syntactic basis. The theoretical provisions, systematically presented in the manual, are simultaneously supported by practical exercises. The entire course of morphology is divided into separate doses, containing interrelated theoretical and illustrative-practical material.

Presumably, the entire methodological potential inherent in the idea of studying morphology on the basis of syntax has not yet been exhausted. The productivity of the idea will steadily increase as the forms of its implementation are improved and rationalized. In this sense, it seems to us advisable to carry out the following:

a) Before starting the study of morphology, not to enter the propaedeutic course of syntax. Separate elements of syntax should be given in parallel with morphology - in connection with the advent of its themes. For example, studying the topic "Parts of speech", refer to the topic "Concept of a sentence", assimilating "Noun", - to the topics "Subject" and "Complement". A similar correlation can be established between the topics: "Adjective" - "Definition", "Case of nouns" - "Management",

"Gender, number, case of adjectives", "Sequence", etc.;

b) The syntactic material studied in connection with the passage of morphology should not be included in the syntax course. This will allow avoiding repeated consideration of the same issues, which inevitably occurs in the process of studying morphology on a syntactic basis with a linear presentation of sections of grammar.

In conclusion, I would like to express the hope that this article, which touched upon some aspects of the problem of implementing the idea of studying morphology on the basis of syntax, will to a certain extent serve to focus the attention of specialists on the still unused methodological reserves for the intensive development of key issues related to the widespread introduction of this methodological idea into teaching practice of the Russian language in the national audience.

References

1. Azizova A.A. Russian language for national groups of universities. Tashkent, "Ukituvchi", 1974
2. Baudouin de Courtenay. The meaning of language as a subject of study. Fav. works on general linguistics, vol. II. M., ed. Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1963, p. 137.
3. Vinogradov V. V. Russian language. M.-L., Uchpedgiz, 1947, p. 29.
4. Gimatova E.P. Vocabulary and syntax in the lessons of morphology. Journal. "Russian language at school", 1978, No. 1.
5. Mirtov A.V. Essays on the methodology of teaching the Russian language in the Uzbek school. Tashkent, 1972, p. 201 - 202.
6. Ladyzhenskaya T.A., Baranov M. T, Grigoryan L, et al. Russian language. Textbook for IV grade - M., 1974
7. Polivanov E. D. The experience of private methods of teaching the Russian language. Tashkent, "Ukituvchi", 1968, p. 108.
8. Peshkovsky A.M. Russian syntax in scientific coverage. M., Uchpedgiz, 1976, p. 32-33.

9. Tekuchev A. V. Kulibaba I. In search of new opportunities. Journal. "Russian language at school", 1967, No. 3;
10. Tekuchev AT Methodology of the Russian language in secondary school. M., "Education", 1970, p. 177.
11. Shapiro A. B. Russian language. A textbook on grammar, spelling and the development of speech technology. M., 1987, p. 9.
12. Shabanov A.Sh. Content and principles of building a Russian language program for national groups of universities. M., 1973, p. 4.
13. Modern Russian language. Morphology. Textbook for -students of the Faculty of Russian Language and Literature at the National School. General edition of Academician of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences V.V. Reshetov. Tashkent, "Ukituvchi", 1976.