SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE OF SPEECH AND TEACHING PARTS OF SPEECH ABOUT THE NEED TO GO TO A PEAK THEORY

J. Abdullaev*; Xonazarova N**

*Senior lecturer,
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Guliston State University, UZBEKISTAN

**1st year Master of the Uzbek Linguistics,
Department of Gulistan State University, UZBEKISTAN

ABSTRACT

The article draws attention to the fact that in the system of continuing education the syntactic structure of speech, the principles of coherence and consistency are violated in the teaching of parts of speech. Thought about the consequences and as a solution to the problem, the need for a decisive transition to a single - point syntax at all stages of the system of continuing education has been put forward, and its advantages have been demonstrated.

KEYWORDS: *Syntactic Structure Of The Sentence, Part Of Speech, "Parts Of Speech" That Are Not Part Of Speech, Subordination, Two-Point Doctrine, Tener's Theory, One-Point Doctrine, Predicative, Cut Category.*

INTRODUCTION

It is known to many experts in the field that not only world or Turkic studies, but also Uzbek linguistics has written volumes of books, many pamphlets, hundreds of articles on the syntactic structure of speech, parts of speech. However, some aspects of this multifaceted issue, including the problem of teaching passages, have not yet been resolved. There are also some questions and doubts about the solutions and so, linguists A. Nurmonov and Sh. As Shahobiddinova rightly points out, "it is too early to say that a complete, universally acceptable solution has been reached"[1].Research is ongoing[2]. Our article is also one of the researches in this regard. We thought about the syntactic structure of the sentence, the two-point interpretation of the parts of speech, its advantages and disadvantages, the one-point doctrine developed as a result of new research to eliminate existing problems and shortcomings, the teaching of parts of speech, reacting to both doctrines-interpretations. We have expressed our views on the need to move from a cross-sectional two-point doctrine to a single-point syntactic theory centered on a cut-off

point, having only all levels of continuing education, not only in higher and secondary special education or a limited level, directions.

It is known that from the second half of the 90s of the last century the syntactic structure of our language was taught in higher education, in particular, in the bachelor's degree in philology and language teaching and in the master's degree in linguistics (Uzbek) on the basis of L. Tenersyntactic concept. By the 2000s, this doctrine had also entered the system of secondary special and, to some extent, general secondary education. There are many reasons for this, of course.

Summarizing, analyzing and editing the work done in Uzbek linguistics since the second half of the 80s, especially in the 90s, especially in connection with the growing sense of national identity and independence, summarizing the achievements and shortcomings, summarizing the results achieved. On the basis of which the movement to raise science to a new level in the spirit of independence was intensified.

Many of the leading linguists, together with their colleagues, have been active in this noble cause, mobilizing many of their students for it. There were serious, responsible tasks ahead, such as shaping, developing, perfecting, streamlining, announcing the results, and defending this complex process. The most interesting and difficult thing is that they interpret it as a single object, a single object, a dialectical unit that separates language from its linguistic and speech state - a system, a whole process, a whole. It can be seen that the goals and objectives set according to the current situation require it.

However, it was not possible to positively solve such a complex theoretical problem with the methodology, principles and methods of practical-analytical linguistics[1]. which prevailed at that time and were based on the rules of formal logic. Because they were "research tools" for analyzing speech units given in direct observation, rather than describing their visible aspects, the way to discover the essence of language units based on the study of their interrelationships was not sufficient for cognitive cognition.

Accordingly, linguists with a new worldview were forced to change the principles and methods of research, which are the main tools of traditional-analytical linguistics. In this regard, they were introduced to linguistics by W. von Humboldt, developed by B. de Courtenay, and in F. de Saussure's work, which rose to the level of a complete linguistic doctrine (language) and speech conflict - a system of views based on differentiation and developed under their influence. Ivanov's morphological[1], L. Tener's syntactic; V. Gak's semantic concept[1] came to the fore and served as an ideological-methodological, scientific-methodological basis. Thus, the whole approach of the creators of the new approach was aimed at developing an interpretation of the system-structure-tour (so-called), which clearly distinguishes between language and speech.

The large-scale research process, systematically organized on the basis of research principles developed in consistent compliance with the laws of dialectics, has yielded good results. In a relatively short period of time, new system-structural (theoretical-synthetic[1]) interpretations[1] were developed based on the results of the current traditional-analytical analysis of the modern Uzbek language, and from the second half of the 90s onwards. Applied to the secondary education system;

Such radical changes in our linguistics were also reflected in the interpretation of the syntactic structure of the Uzbek language, of course, and this was done, first of all, on the syntactic

structure of the sentence. The point is that by this time the weaknesses of the current two-point doctrine, developed on the basis of the rules of formal logic, had become apparent, but it was not possible to overcome them by the doctrine itself. After all, the main problem was at the very top of the two peaks, when it was time to radically change itself. At the same time, it became clear that

Tener's theory of the apex was widespread in Europe, and that the cut was considered the sole grammatical basis, the center of the sentence, and was given the status of an absolute authority - a purposeful way to solve the problem. The point was that even in the Uzbek language, the cut is a multifaceted semantic-syntactic element with a system of grammatical meanings and forms that express the main grammatical feature of the sentence - predicative. For this reason, the semantic-syntactic structure of the sentence - the ability to provide information about the parts of speech, including the possessive, in accordance with the meaning of the person-number[1]. For this reason, if necessary, the possessor is not used in the sentence, but the judgment is still expressed - the idea is understood. The section of the sentence, the category of the section that is embodied in the grammar and semantics of the language unit that comes in the function of the section[1], gives it such an opportunity. Therefore, in the speech, a single sentence can be expressed in agreement with the sentence itself, and it is, without exception, a complete sentence[1]. So, the main and important for the grammatical-semantic-intonational formation of the sentence is the existence of the cut, the performance of this or that language unit as a cut, the existence of a lexical-grammatical unit in the cut function, if it is the opposite, that is, if there is no cut, there is no speech, no expression, no completeness of tone, regardless of whether it is possessed or not. Interestingly, in such cases, the absence or absence of the owner of the main part, which is the absolute ruler in the two-pronged syntactic doctrine, does not adversely affect the grammatical or semantic aspects of the sentences, they are considered perfect sentences in all respects. For example: Allah is approached through the Qur'an. Read, read and read again! We will build our great future together with our brave and noble people. He must fight against ignorance through enlightenment.and h.

In this sense, L., who was known in Europe as a peak theory and made a radical turn in the interpretation of speech syntax. It can be said that the successful application of Tener's doctrine to the syntax of Uzbek speech was also an event in Uzbek linguistics. After all, the two-pronged syntactic structure of the sentence, the part of speech, their types, levels, which has ruled so far, has been enriched with serious innovations, changes, and has risen to a new level. We believe that the following provides a good basis for such a conclusion:

It is known that the sentence is an absolute dominant fragment with two vertex interpretations developed in accordance with the logical sentence structure, forming a predicative minimum[1] and forming a sentence, while changing the cut. For example, Spring has come. Everything is blue. The flowers are open. People are happy. At a glance, there is no need for a climax here: both the sentence and the predicative are expressed in a proper-proportional possessive-cut relation. But most of the utterances in the speech do not form an isomorphic-proportionality as above with logical judgment. Here logical judgment, thought, and grammatical expression are two different phenomena that show their power.

The point is that one of the manifestations of objective reality is a linguistic reality in which the sentence given in direct observation is closely related to the logical judgment, although it is a speech unit that expresses it, but also has its own characteristics that are radically different from

it. Speech, which is composed of a sequence of different sentences, can be expressed in the texts, in addition to the sentence, elements that are not related to it, or even contradict it, cited as part of the sentence or sentence, embodied as a semantic-methodological element. In such statements, possession may or may not be used. But the cut will definitely be expressed, applied. Even sentences that are not expressed in some cut form are actually cut. Its function is assumed by the previous logically stressed part, which means that the implicit expression of the cut has taken place. Or the cut expressed in the first sentence will also apply to the second or remaining sentences - it will be common to both or all of them. For example: Happy New Year! It will rain in time, it will snow in time. One whip for a good horse, a thousand whips for a bad horse. Birniki – mingga, mingniki – tumanga. To the horses! And etc.

We know that in attributive logic, which is the ideological basis of two peaks, judgment always consists of a subject and a predicate, one interdependent in the dominant-subordinate relation. Because it is a logical essence consisting of a dialectical unity of these elements, but it is not always necessary to express this logical essence in full in the sentence - it is possible to express or not to express. The types of sentences called monosyllabic sentences[1], verbs[2], and vocative sentences[1] are determined by observing the direct speech, the syntactic structure of the various sentences in it, most of which do not have, but have a cut, all of which are cut-based and the sentence will be expressed.

The results of the syntactic analysis of the mentioned types of speech and other types of speech in the speech showed that most of the sentences in the Uzbek speech have both possessive and participle, but the possessive case is not observed in all of them. The peculiarity of almost all forms of simple speech in our speech is that they all have a cut and its other parts of speech, including the possessive, forming a whole, unified semantic-syntactic structure, or without any of them. one to form a complete sentence on one's own. In the latter case the possessive is not expressed differently from the possessive participle, and may even be formed entirely without the possessive, possessive compound. It is impossible to identify, find, or even make assumptions about the meaning of such statements[3] (M.: Why do you cry? Don't cry! You can't cover the moon with a skirt. These thoughts need to be considered.). But all of them, without exception, are a definite opinion, a statement of judgment.

It is clear that, as the theorists of a clause state[2], the most important thing for the origin of a sentence and the expression of a sentence is the presence of a predicative base, a grammatical center, a clause, represented by a noun unit formed by a grammatically or semantically cut category. Without a cut, neither a sentence nor a sentence is formed. Both the fact that the sentence has a complete thought tone and the formation of a complete syntactic integrity are due to the cut. Without a cut, none of them acquire a predicative. For this, all of them need a cut, there must be a cut. Because the content in our minds requires a predicate, a unit that acts as a predicate, for the thought to be born as a speech and the cut is the same unit - the equivalent of the predicate in the sentence, the predicate. Just as there is no sentence without a predicate, there is no sentence without a cut (but there can be a sentence without an owner). The place of the cut in the speech is a very important; the decisive "sound" belongs to the cut. What he points out, what he points to, what he means, and what he follows, constitutes the explicit or implicit content of the sentence. The task entrusted to him is so important, so multifaceted, that when it comes down to it, he represents the sentence alone, without any other part, it is a collective

statement. This is the case when the cut is usually expressed in a prepositional verb. Therefore, any personal verb spoken in a complete tone of speech becomes a syntactic whole-sentence expressing an idea and one of the founders of the Uzbek speech syntax A. This definition of Fitrat confirms once again that the grammatical basis of a sentence is the central part, and this status belongs to him, to the part itself: It is a word that comes at the end of words in a sentence and turns a word into a sentence "(Fitrat, Nahv "1930, p. 6).

Thus, in real speech, the analysis of the sentences in it shows that the basic rule of attributive logic is that a sentence always consists of a subject + predicate structure. Their existence, and their particularly active use in their interaction, also demonstrated the truth that the two main divisions are not an absolute priority reality. In particular, among the one-sentence sentences there are sentences in which not only the owner is not expressed, but the person (owner) is clear or hidden, but impersonal - the owner is completely absent, even unpredictable, the owner can't be found, and the speech situation requires more active use both the peaks and the main factor that gave rise to it - the sign of the absolute authority of the owner - were greatly questioned. He questioned the correctness of the theory. It caused scientific problems, around which the debate became heated, and the idea arose to reconsider it and, if necessary, to create a new theory.

In our view, these and the above-mentioned circumstances are the main objective factors that led to the need to move from a two-peak theory to a one-peak theory. At this point, it is worth noting that words without an owner or without an owner are present in all languages and are widely and actively used in speech, especially in the simple colloquial style, in the language of the living people. This shows that the formation, occurrence, birth and functioning of a sentence is conditioned by a cut, not by the possessor (was not the universe also created by a compound sentence meaning "Wound" in the form of a verb in the cut function ?!). So without a cut, there is no speech, no judgment and no thought. It is more important to have a cut than to have a cut. Because speech is a predicative unit, regardless of its structure or form, the fact that it is called such a unit is due to the fact that it expresses the pre-sentence of the sentence. The owner is often a known subject to both the speaker and the listener. The most important thing for the listener, the reader, the reader is the news, news and information, the sentence is represented by this esapre-dikat - grammatical cut, cut composition.

So, all the mystery-industry, the reason is that the necessary, distinguishing feature of the sentence - it does not have a predicative sign; it is conditioned by a cut. In other words, the possessor, the representative, the representative of the predicative sign is not a possessive, but a participle. The possessor is the equivalent of the subject, the functional unit in the function of the subject of judgment. Accordingly, possessive is a non-predicative participle, not a predicative. Can a non-predicative part without a predicative sign bet he grammatical basis of a sentence, the predicative center? Absolutely not, for this, the part is, of course, a substitute for the predicate of the sentence in the sentence, an alternative, and a condition. Such a feature occurs only in the part representing the predicate of the logical sentence. Such a piece is definitely a cut.

Accordingly, the predicative sign belongs only to him, to the cut, to the cut. Because, "The most basic grammatical feature of a sentence is predicative, the ability to form a sentence, to express an idea. In this regard, the participle is very important in the sentence: it plays a key role in communication (communication, communication), (A. Gulomov, 1965. p. 95). It is obvious that the main feature of a sentence is predicative, and it is realized in the sentence through the cut, on the basis of the cut. This is determined by the fact that it is the grammatical equivalent of the

predicate in the logical subject + predicate structure in the sentence, and therefore the predicative sign belongs to the cut. Only a syntactic unit with such a meaning and function can be the grammatical basis of a sentence, the semantic-syntactic center. None of the other parts, including the possessor, are provided with such a status-function in the sentence. The owner indicates who, what person, what, where the talk is about. When what is said is known to the listener, the expression of the possessor is not necessary, and the thought finds expression without the possessor. Accordingly, the owner cannot be given the status of a grammatical basis (an important component of) under any circumstances. In fact, the very fact that the sentence expresses the subject, that the subject has meaning, is an indication that it cannot be the grammatical basis of the possessor. The task of the owner is to express the subject, to express the subject, when it is necessary to apply. This is the meaning and task assigned to him in the sentence. Therefore, it is superfluous to look for the predicate sign from the owner, and to "glue" this sign to it. So far, there is no new two-point theory capable of denying this. Some of the statements in this regard do not have the power to take the existing two-peak theory to a qualitatively new level[2]. Because for this it is necessary to deny the methodological bases, the ideological foundations of a peak theory and therefore, whether we like it or not, L, We consider it expedient to adopt a cut-based syntactic doctrine developed on the basis of Tener's one-point theory and to organize the teaching of parts of speech on this basis.

The quality and effectiveness of syntactic education, its membership, depends on this today. However, unfortunately, at some stages of continuing education, including primary education and undergraduate education, the modern Uzbek literary language, the syntactic structure of speech, especially parts of speech, is still taught on the basis of two-point theory. In this case, it is clear that the goal will not be achieved, the principle of membership, consistency will be violated, and the long-standing negative consequences will continue. It is, of course, difficult to give up the practical-analytical linguistics that has permeated our consciousness, especially its two-pronged syntactic doctrine. But if the leader of the two-peak doctrine himself has begun to move to a one-peak theory, and his subsequent views are almost indistinguishable from the two-peak and one-peak of the stone, our syntactic doctrine will be left in the middle if we do not want to change it! Well-known linguist A. for proof of opinion and we would like to quote Nurmanov's comments: "Ayyub Ghulam Emphasizing that predicative is the main distinguishing feature of a sentence, in the second edition of the book predicative is expressed by adding words (section with owner) (p. 42), in the third edition it is expressed by cut, predicative forms are added to the cut (p. 37), the concept of speech is closely related to the concept of cut (p. 84).In this scholar's syntactic doctrine, the transition from two-peak theory (possessive and cut) to one-peak theory (Emphasis added-A.J.)"[3]. We understand the sentence that the core of a sentence is a cut, and that if the other parts are its extensions, the cut itself retains the sign of the sentence, even if the extensions are removed. Such a judgment is that the idea that the cut still leads to the possessive in the syntax has not spread among the scientific community, and that the verbs of the type I read by A. Gulom are the smallest sentences; he argued that the cut was equal to the smallest sentence"[4].

In this regard, we believe that the following opinion of academician G. Abdurahmanov also helps us to understand the issue: "While conducting an in-depth analysis of the owner and the cut (Simply put, pp. 24-28, 1948), he said", the owner. Is the name of the element (p. 24)? However, in the section of the work, the most basic grammatical feature of a sentence is predicative. In this sense, the cut is the main part of the sentence (p. 29)[5].

In our opinion, the quality and effectiveness of any education is ensured only when it is taught on the basis of a single ideological concept, a specific language unit, and a phenomenon of the same basic scientific and theoretical point of view. Otherwise, just as polytheism or dualism leads society to disintegration, teaching on the basis of two different syntactic doctrines makes it difficult for millions of learners to understand speech as a multi-syntagmatic-syntactic structure expressing thought. However, speech is just such a unit of speech. So, not only the development of science, but also the syntactic essence of speech requires that it be taught on the basis of a cutting-edge doctrine. We believe that the bureaucrats will take steps to positively address this pressing issue.

REFERENCES

1. A. Nurmonov, Sh.Shahobiddinova. On the category of parts of speech and its constituents // OTA, 2006, No. 1, p.
2. Tener L.Osnovy strukturnogo syntaksisa - M .: Progress, 1988. - 656 p.
3. See: Bozorov O., Bozorov O. The relationship of traditional and systematic linguistics // OTA, 2009, No. 3, pp. 44-51.
4. Ivanov S. Pedigree tree tyurok Abul Gazi xana. T .: Fan, 1969, 20-p.
5. G a k V. G. Vyskazivanie i situatsiya. - Problems of structural linguistics. M., 1973, p. 35-s.
6. See: Bozorov O., Bozorov O. Specified source.
7. See bibliography.
8. Sayfullaeva R and b. Modern Uzbek literary language.T., 2010, 316-317- p.
9. Sayfullaeva R and b. Modern Uzbek literary language.T., 2010, pp. 159-160; 200- b.
10. Nurmonov A. Comments on speech and its parts // OTA, 2009, No.26, p
11. Gulomov A., Askarova M. Modern Uzbek literary language. T., 1987
12. Rasulov I. Contemporary Uzbek language.-Tashkent: Science. 1974. -234 p .; Abuzalova M. On one- and two-syllable sentences // Jumh. traditional scientific-theoretical conference of young philologists. mater.-Toshkent, 1991. –B. 135; Shodmonov E. The syntactic nature of yes. -Against, 1967, -14 p.
13. Bobokalonov R. Functionally-semantically formed words in the Uzbek language.ND.-Tashkent, 2000.-136 p.
14. Gulomov A., Askarova M. Modern Uzbek literary language. Syntax.T., 1987. 76-p.
15. See: Gulomov A., Askarova M. Modern Uzbek literary language. Syntax.T., 1987. 76-87-p.
16. Sayfullaeva R and b. Modern Uzbek literary language.T., 2010; A. Nurmonov, Sh.Shahobiddinova. About the category of parts of speech and its organizers // OTA, 2006, issue 1, p. 50; .Nurmonov A. Comments on speech and its parts // OTA, 2009, No.26, p.
17. Tojiev Yo. On some problems in Uzbek linguistics.//OTA. 2004, No. 2, pp. 35-39; On the issue of the status of speech and parts of speech in the Uzbek language.//OTA.2005.4-issue.53-p.
18. Nurmonov A. Syntactic views of Ayub Gulyamov // OTA. 2005 y. No. 1, p.45.
19. Nurmonov A. Comments on the speech and its parts.//OTA.2009 y. Son-2, 36-b.
20. G. Abdurahmonov. A. Gulamov and some issues of Uzbek linguistics.// A.Gulamov and issues of Uzbek linguistics. (Collection of scientific articles) .T., 2007, 6-p.