



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.01850.4**

RELATIONSHIP OF REFERING PRONOUNS TO PERSONAL DEIXIS IN UZBEK LANGUAGE

Eshonqulov O.T*

*Researcher of (PhD),

Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navo'I,
UZBEKISTAN

ABSTRACT

The article describes the reference of the personal deixis with the means of pronouns in Uzbek language and deals with the problem of differences paradigm of pronouns in oral speech of syntaxis analysis. On the basis of this feature, all types of pronouns in traditional linguistics (personality, indication, question, identity, designation, indivisibility, suspicion) are united in the paradigm of pronouns.

KEYWORDS: *Deixis Sign, Pronoun Pointing To Person, Pronoun Pointing To Objects, Pronouns Pointing To Sign, Pronouns Pointing To Amount, Pronouns Pointing To Place, Pronouns Pointing To Time, Pronouns Pointing To Action.*

INTRODUCTION

It is known that all types of pronouns have a deictic character, they do not directly name reality and its elements, but only refer to them. On the basis of this feature, all types of pronouns in traditional linguistics (personality, indication, question, identity, designation, indivisibility, suspicion) are united in the paradigm of pronouns. However, these types of pronouns have different characteristics in terms of which object they refer to. For example, if personal pronouns refer to individuals, demonstrative pronouns can refer to individuals as well as objects. Such different signs cause the types of pronouns to contradict each other.

Pronouns in the Uzbek language can be divided into the following types on the basis of the deictic sign elements:

1. Pronouns referring to individuals.¹
2. Pronouns referring to objects.

3. Pronouns referring to sign.
4. Pronouns referring to quantity.
5. Pronouns referring to place.
6. Pronouns referring to time.
7. Pronouns referring movement condition.

In this article, we express our views on the problem of opposition in pronouns of person referring to Uzbek language.

In the Uzbek language, the following pronouns refer to individuals:

- Personal pronouns: *I, you, he, we, you, they*;
- Morphological forms of the personal pronoun, indicating the persons, taking into account the possessive indicators: *myself, yourself, yourselves*;
- types of pronouns which demonstrate the person: *he/she, this, that, it is...*;
- The type of interrogative pronouns referring to unknown persons by interrogation: *who*;
- Types of indefinite pronouns denoting persons: *all, everybody, everything, everyone*;
- Types of suspicious pronouns referring to indefinite persons: *someone, anyone, anybody pronouns*;
- Types of indivisible pronouns that indicate the denial of individuals: *no one, no body*;

Pronouns referring to individuals are differ in the way they refer to the speaker, listener, or other person, their amount, the denial or affirmation of individuals, and they can be in conflict with each other.

The following types of pronouns, which refer to persons in terms of speaker, listener, or other signals, contradict each other:

1. Personal pronouns and possessive pronouns are contradict each other. In this contradict, the personal and possessive pronouns are: a) a reference to the speaker and listener (*I ↔ yourself (yourselves), we ↔ yourself(yourselves)*); b) a reference to the speaker and another *I ↔ himself (themselves), we herself (themselves)*; c) a sign to the listener and the speaker *you myself (ourselves), you ↔ myself(ourselves)*; d) a sign to the listener and the another *you ↔ himself (themselves)*, they are contradicting each other.

2. Interrogation and personal pronouns contradict each other. The interrogation of personal pronouns and they become even clearer when they are used as interdependent passages between parts of speech. The following pronouns are used in this task: *who (whom, whose) ↔ he (him, his, himself, him selves)*.

3. Define and personal pronouns contradict each other. Contradicts between personal pronouns and define pronouns are formed when they are used as conjunctions between parts of speech. Such a contradiction is observed in the relation of the following designations and personal pronouns: *everyone (everybody) ↔ he (him, his, himself)*.

Pronouns referring to individuals also differ in the way they represent the speaker, the listener, or the amount of others, and enter into a contradicting relationship. Such a contradiction is formed between the following types of pronouns:

1. Define pronouns and possessive pronouns contradict each other. Contradictions are also observed in the relationship between personal pronouns denoting persons and their numbers, and personal pronouns denoting persons and their numbers by accepting the possessive suffix. In such a confrontation, *everyone* who refers to more than one person is confronted with the pronouns *I, me, and myself*, which refer to one person. Compare: *all (everybody, everyone) ↔myself, all (everybody, everyone) ↔yourself, all (everybody, everyone) ↔himself*. For instance: **Everybody** has gone. I couldn't notice that I stayed with **myself**

As Iskandarova, Sh said that: "Pointing, if the reference to a person is general, reveals a quantitative contradiction between the expressions singular yourself (*only yourself*) and collective (group, gang) in all pronouns."² It should be noted here that *all* pronouns are opposed to personal pronouns, which only accept possessive suffixes in the unit. Because the personal pronoun that accepts the plural possessive suffixes does not mean singularity. Compare: *myself ↔ ourselves, yourself ↔ yourselves, himself ↔ themselves*.

2. Define pronouns and personal pronouns contradict each other. In this type of contradiction the pointing of more than one person as like *all, everybody* which meaning is directed to singular person *I, you, he* come across in contradict with personal pronouns: *all (everybody, everyone) ↔I, all (everybody, everyone) ↔ you (everybody, everyone) ↔he/she*.

The members of the pronoun paradigm are also opposed to the denial or affirmation of individuals. Such a contradiction is formed between the following pronouns:

1. Indivisibility pronouns and possessive pronouns contradict each other. Such contradictions are formed in the case of indivisible pronouns denoting the denial of persons and personal pronouns denoting the speaker, the listener, or the affirmative: *nobody (anybody) ↔ I, nobody (anybody) ↔ you, nobody (no-one) ↔ he, nobody (no-one) ↔ we, nobody (no-one) ↔ you, nobody (no-one) ↔ they*.

2. Indivisibility pronouns and designation pronouns contradict each other. Such contradiction is formed in the case of the indefinite pronouns denoting the denial of persons and the definite pronouns denoting the persons in the plural as well as the persons singled out from the plural: *Nobody(no-one) ↔ all (everyone, everybody), no-one (no-body) ↔everyone (everybody)*.

3. Indivisibility pronouns and demonstrative pronouns contradict each other. Such a contradiction is formed in the case of indivisible pronouns denoting the denial of persons and demonstrative pronouns denoting by affirmation of persons at a distance or near. Compare: *No-one it(this, those, it is, that is...), no-body ↔this(it, those, this is, that is..)*

4. Indivisibility pronouns and pronouns of suspicion contradict each other. Such contradiction is observed in the case of the following pronouns, which refer to persons who do not exist but who are presumed: *No One ↔someone(anybody, somebody), nobody anybody (someone, somebody)*.

The following table shows the deictic nature of pronouns referring to persons:

| № | Types of pronouns' meaning | Differentiation of pronouns on the basis of a person's dexterity |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Personal pronouns: <i>I, you, we, you,</i> <i>she/he, they</i> | + + |
| 2. | Demonstrative pronouns: <i>a) she/he, this, that, those, these...;</i> <i>b) as/like that, as like this, so, such, such as this..;</i> <i>c) as much, as many...</i> | + - - |
| 3. | Interrogative pronouns: <i>a) who;</i> <i>b) what;</i> <i>c) how, which;</i> <i>d) how much, how many, which number;</i> <i>e) where;</i> <i>f) what is wrong, what happened...;</i> <i>g) when...</i> | + - - - - - - |
| 4. | Possessive pronouns: <i>a) my;</i> <i>b) myself, yourself, our self, yourselves, himself/herself, them self</i> | - + |
| 5. | Pointing pronouns: <i>a) everybody (everyone);</i> <i>b) everything (anything);</i> <i>c) any, any kind of...;</i> <i>d) any amount;</i> <i>e) anywhere...;</i> <i>f) anytime..;</i> <i>g) all, everybody, everything, total...</i> | + - - - - - + |
| 6. | Indivisibility pronouns: <i>a) no one (anyone);</i> <i>b) anything (nothing);</i> <i>c) anyway, no-way...;</i> <i>d) none;</i> <i>e) never;</i> <i>f) nowhere...</i> | + - - - - - |
| 7. | Suspicious pronouns: <i>a) somebody, someone, anyone;</i> <i>b) anything, something;</i> <i>c) someway, anyway...;</i> <i>d) somehow, any amount...;</i> <i>e) anytime, sometime...;</i> <i>f) somewhere, anywhere...</i> | + - - - - - |

Thus, in the Uzbek language, pronouns have the property of referring to the deixis of a person, but this feature is not observed in different members of the paradigm of pronouns. However, the sign of pronouns in the personal dexterity is found in almost all of their internal forms.

REFERENCES

1. Абдуазизов А. Phonology and morphology of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1992. - B. 35-44.
2. Акрамов Т. On stylistic features of personal pronouns // Vocabulary, stylistics and speech culture. - Tashkent, 1980. - B. 85-91.
3. Alekhina M.I. On the classifications and mestoimienii // Russian language at school. 1982. - No. 1. - S. 63-68.
4. Askarova M. Some comments on pronouns // Uzbek language and literature. 1969. - №4. - Б. 27-30.
5. Askarova M. Compound sentences in modern Uzbek. - Tashkent: UzFA Publishing House, 1960. - 132 p.
6. Askarova M., Abdulagatova R., Doniyorova N. Here are some suggestions on how to look or get an appointment for acne treatment. - Tashkent ped. ins scientific works. 87, 1972.
7. Askarova M., Yunusov R., Yuldashev M., Mukhamedova D. Uzbek language practicum. - Tashkent: Economics and Finance, 2006. - B. 144- 146.
8. Belousova A.S. On the question of semantic classification of local words // Philological collection. - M., 1995. -- S. 47-52.
9. Beldiyan V.M. Sound system of the modern Russian language and questions of neutralization and phonemes: Avtoref. dis. ... Cand. philological sciences. - M., 1968.
10. Bogoraz-Bukhman L.I. Phonological neutralization at the level of differences and phonemes in Russian: Authors. dis. ... Cand. philological sciences. - M., 1963.
11. Vinogradov V.A. Some questions of the theory of phonological oppositions and neutralization // Problems of linguistic analysis. Phonology. Grammar. Lexicology. - M., 1966. -- S. 13-21.
12. Volkov N.N. Semantics of personal places // Semantics and typology of diverse languages: Sat. works of the Tashkent University. - Issue. 709. - Tashkent, 1983. - S. 51–55.
13. Volkov N.N. Semantics and action functions of personal places in modern English: Authors. dis. ... Candidate of Philological Sciences. - M.: MGPIIYa, 1984. -- 23 p.
14. Vorotnikov Yu.L. Places as "linguistic categories" // Philological sciences. - M., 2001. - No. 5. - S. 43-49.