



STUDY OF "INTERMEDIATE WORDS" IN THE NOUN AND ADJECTIVE WORD CLASS

Asadov Tulqin Hamroyevich

Candidate of Philological Science, Associate Professor of the
Department of Uzbek Linguistics and Journalism, Bukhara State University

Abstract

This article highlights scientists who have conducted research on categories of words, and comments on the functional and semantic nature of intermediate words studied in two or more categories of words, including the expression of these words in the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language, on the relationship of words between nouns and adjectives to the category. done. The given theoretical information is explained by examples from the dictionary.

Keywords: Part of speech, semantic, morphological, syntactic criterion, intermediate word, noun-adjective, subjectivity and attribute-property, ambiguity, polyfunctionality, homonymy.

Introduction

All languages are divided into different groups (categories) depending on their grammatical nature and semantic characteristics. The main thing is that there is no single rule that is common to all languages when it comes to categorizing words. Word categorization in a particular language should be developed on the basis of the specific meaning, grammatical feature, word-making system and the ability of words to combine, so that even in a family of sister languages, some kind of differentiation in word categorization can be noticed in the case counted [1,5].

During the 20th century, Uzbek linguistics studied word classes and related phenomena. Research of the A. Fitrat, U. Tursunov, F. Kamol, A. Gülomov, S. Fuzailov, G'. Abdurahmanov, Sh. Shoabdurahmanov, R. Gangurov, A. Mukhtorov, M. Mirtozhiev, M. Sadykova, A. Hojiyev, H. Ne'matov, A. Nurmonov, N. Mahmudov, G'. Zikrillayev, O. Bozorov, R. Rasulovs; and at the end of the 20th century at the beginning of the 19th century I. Madrahimov, J. Eltazarov, B. Mengliyev, Sh. Shahobiddinova, Z. Isakov, The research of A. Pardayev and

other scientists can be highlighted. In addition, the followers of the scientists whose names are mentioned today, representatives of the new generation, continue to conduct scientific research on the study of word classes and related theoretical issues.

Uzbek linguistics has made great strides in describing word classes and their constituents, and in identifying logical and linguistic criteria for distinguishing word classes. Reasonable solutions were reached regarding the Turkish linguistic interpretation of each word category, as well as their semantic-functional similarities and differences with other lexical and grammatical categories.

In linguistics, the relationship between the meanings of nouns (subject) and adjectives (sign-feature) has been extensively studied from the perspective of substantivation, adjectivation, pronominalization, and adverbialization. It is known that in being and nature, in language and thought, subjectivity and sign-characteristics always live in harmony (syncretism), always reminding each other. According to the views of eastern and Western philosophers, subject and character-trait always exist side by side, and it is emphasized that there has never been an ayro-ayro study (i.e.: subject-“complex asmo and sifot”, adjective – “one side of existence, edge, sign – trait”). Carried out under the scientific guidance of the linguistic scientist H. G. Ne'matov.Shirinova's study,” means of distinguishing the meanings of subject and character-trait in Uzbek”, reflected on the same issue. The work explores the concepts of subject and character-trait in being and language, mind and thought, and the lexical, lexical-semantic, lexical-derivational, morphological, syntactic methods of the concepts of subject and character-trait, and the means of distinguishing between subject and character-trait[14]. The researcher writes about this, that is, about the meaning of subject and character-trait, which come syncretically in word categories: “in modern Uzbek linguistics, a number of discussions in the classifications and descriptions of word categories and synthetic methods of word/form making are the result of analyzing them as a result of not taking into account that the differentiation of options of word categories and synthetic methods of word/form making are the result of analyzing them as a result of not taking into account that the differentiation of” [14,18].

It is known that in linguistic theory, in the categorization (categorization) of words, it is popular to follow the semantic, morphological, syntactic criterion, worth noting that in ancient linguistics, when defining parts of speech, the main

criterion was semantic. Morphological and syntactic features are considered additional - secondary, that is, a sign that arises from the semantic characteristics of the word[3;5;6].

Professor J. Eltazarov who arose under the leadership. In A.Botirova's dissertation "functional-syntactic analysis of the primary and secondary function of word categories in Uzbek", the right opinion is observed that the ability of certain words in the dictionary layer to occupy a place in both paradigms (word categories) (being an intermediate word) overshadows the three-base criterion in word categorization: "these criteria are the problem of word development in the, On the other hand, it is connected to the polifunctionality of words. In other words, the fact that, along with the phenomenon of diachronically leaving certain words to move to other categories, the possibility of entering at least two paradigms in a particular synchronous state of the language indicates that these criteria cannot always apply in the same way. Because "linguistic evidence is not sufficient to include a word in a category, and the semantic, syntactic, and morphological criteria for categorizing words are not sufficient to include a word in a category"[2,7]. It follows that the emergence of problems related to word classes and their differentiation is sometimes also due to the social nature of language. In general, some words in contrast to TI's sociability evazi goes to acquire polyfunctionality. This makes it possible for them to find a place in two or more paradigms as well. But the polysemy of a word does not always allow a word of one category to pass into another.

There has long been a twofold view in science on the issue of the relationship of such words to word classes. In this regard, some researchers point out:"the arrival of the second in the function of one word category ends with the fact that this word completely passes into another, that is, becomes another category "[4,27], while other researchers believe that"the process of functional change in the sentence of all words was always completed with the transformation of one word category, of course, We can agree with the next point and say that, of course, the spoken context cannot be the basis for classifying words, that is, taking into account the laws of the language level can be a partial solution to the confusion in classifying words. It is true that the polifunctionality of some words has created the possibility for this word to be found in two or more paradigms.

Observations show that there are a number of words in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language whose morphological characteristics are

indicated as both nouns and adjectives[9;10;11;12;13]. Such words can be divided into two categories: one or more paradigms.

Observations show that there are a number of words in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language whose morphological characteristics are indicated as both nouns and adjectives[9;10;11;12;13]. Such words can be divided into two categories: First type of words: *alomat, aqiq, aravakash, aybdor, aylana, asl, barxit, baxmal, bejama, biofizik, bog‘dor, brezent, buqalamun, buyurtma, dabba (I), detektiv, dilbar, do‘ng, dolzarb, dono, elektrik, haqiq, ganchkor, gulnor, ideal, intellektual, issiq, ittifoq, jonon, jul, kasal, katolik, metin, nam, nasroniy, odamiy, omixta, oval, pana, patak, pakar, par, pardozchi, paytavaquloq, qabohat, qadim, qavariq, qiltiriq, qiya, qo‘shni, quroq, quyi, rohatbadan, rohatijon, royish, savag‘ich (II), savsar, saxtiyon, sement, sovuq, sur (III), tirishiq, titroq, tomizg‘i, vayrona, vertikal, xaroba, xushxat, yoqut, yosh (II), zarg‘aldoq, zarhal, zenit, zo‘r, shamshir, shodiyona, chamberak, chandiq, charchoq, chillaki, chin (I), chiqiq.*

Second type of words: *binafsha, bo‘lak, bo‘rtma, bo‘z, dildor, diqqat, gajak, hayot, mangulik, namat, nayza, paxta, paxtakor, qaltiroq, qum, talab, zaxob, o‘rta, charm, cho‘yan.*

The words of the first group are in the dictionary a noun in the initial meaning (primary task), followed by an adjective in the following meaning (secondary task) (adj.) are quoted and annotated in style. Although the words of the second group are explained in the dictionary according to their primary meaning, the category marker (noun) is not indicated, but only in the second and subsequent explanations is the adjective (adj.) is exaggeratedly interpreted as a noun.

Since the object of our research is the first group of words, we will give some examples of these words:

BUYURTMA 1. noun. Bir narsa yasab, tayyorlab, ishlab berish haqidagi topshiriq, talab. Buyurtma bermoq. Buyurtma qabul qilmoq. (A request or requirement to make, prepare, or produce something. To order. To accept an order.) Toshkentda katta konsert zalining foyesini bezashda katta buyurtma ham unga topshirildi. “Yoshlik”. Ofitsiantka buyurtma olgani keldi. P.Qodirov, Uch ildiz.

2. adjective. Topshiriq asosida tayyorlanadigan; buyurtirilgan. Buyurtma etik. (Made to order; ordered. custom-made boots.) Qunduzning onasi azondan turib, nari-beri hovlilarni supurib, buyurtma toppilarni tikishga o‘tirdi. Oydin, Bechora.

DO‘NG 1. noun. Yerning yoki biror narsaning birmuncha baland ko‘tarilgan joyi; tepalik. (A slightly elevated place on the ground or something; a hill.) O‘g‘ri – tun oshguncha, bo‘ri – do‘ng oshguncha. (Maqol) U do‘ngga, bu do‘ngga chiqib qaradi, ukasining qaysi tarafga ketganini bilmadi. “Qunduz bilan Yulduz”.

2. adjective. Bo‘rtib chiqqan, ko‘tarilgan, do‘mpaygan, qappaygan. Do‘ng yer, Do‘ng joy. Do‘ng peshona, Do‘ng qishloq. (Bulging, raised, swollen, swollen. A hill, a hill. A hill, a village.). Qo‘chqor bo‘lar qozining peshonasi do‘ng bo‘lar. (Maqol) Do‘ng yerga o‘tirib, odatdagidek yana daryoga tikildi. Mirmuhsin, Temur Malik.

When indicating the part of speech of words in the dictionary, we usually see that dictionary compilers are based on semantic and syntactic principles. This situation occurs in a number of units that can be classified as noun-adjective. Let's observe:

AQIQ [a. – qizil rangli qimmatbaho tosh(red gemstone)] **1** ot Turli rangli qimmatbaho tosh; haqiq (Zeb-ziyat buyumlariga ishlatiladi).(A gemstone of various colors; a gem (used in jewelry).) Qozikalon sandiqlarni ochib ko‘rsatdi: ba‘zida olmos, yoqut, aqiq, zumrad va marvarid.. ba‘zilarida zeb-ziyatlar to‘la edi. Ayniy, Dokhunda.

2 kochma adj. Shu tosh rangiga o‘xshash rangli. (It is similar in color to the stone.) Xolingga mahliyo ko‘p, ko‘rgach aqiq labingni. Sh.Shomammedov, Odam borki.

TITROQ. 1 noun. Sovuqdan, qo‘rquvdan hayajondan yoki darmonsizlik, kasallik va sh.k. dan yuzaga keladigan g‘ayrishiuriy harakat, qaltiroq.(From cold, fear, excitement, or from weakness, illness, etc.k. Unconscious movement, trembling, caused by the) [Siddiqjonning] telegramma qog‘ozini tutib turgan qo‘li titradi. Bu titroq asta-sekin butun vujudini qamrab oldi. E.Usmonov, Ko‘ngil.

2 adj. Titrab, qaltirab turdigan, titraydigan, titroqli; qaltiroq. Titroq qo‘l. Titroq oyoq.(Trembling, trembling, trembling, trembling; trembling. Trembling hand. Trembling foot.) Muhammadjon uning titroq lablariga suqlanib qaradi-yu, lekin jur‘at etolmay, qo‘lidan cho‘pillatib o‘pdi. P.Qodirov, “Uch ildiz”.



From this it can be seen that the appearance of an additional meaning in a word (in the case of the word *aqiq*) leads to the semantic and functional progress of this word (polyfunctionality), and polyfunctionality (in the case of the word *tremor*) leads to homonymy.

In many cases, such a meaning in intermediate words expressing a subject-sign meaning is classified depending on whether this meaning is "innate" or "acquired" in them. Reducing one (for example, subjectivity) creates conditions for increasing the other (attribute-property). Sometimes the opposite is also observed.

It can be said that lexical (semantic) and syntactic principles prevail in the differentiation of subject and attribute meanings (belonging of a particular word to a noun or adjective)[14, 18]. This situation is also evident in the classification of intermediate adjectives in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language. So, regarding the dictionary expression, the relation to nouns and adjectives of intermediate words, the following considerations can be made:

a) Although Uzbek linguistics talks a lot about intermediate parts of speech and related theoretical issues, little is said about the expression of intermediate parts of speech in dictionaries and the problem of their relation to parts of speech in the dictionary. k. classification/categorization of words has not always attached great importance to the differentiation of linguistic and speech phenomena (differentiation of speech units from linguistic units), therefore, when categorizing words, a number of contradictions and mutually exclusive points of view arose.

d) polyfunctionality, homonymy of words in Uzbek linguistics, the resulting cases of transition from one gender to another with one of the meanings or meanings of the word, the interchangeability of categories of words, etc. k. may cause difficulties in categorizing words, which requires special supervision from researchers. from one genus to another with one of the meanings or meanings of a word, the interchangeability of categories of words, etc. k. may cause difficulties in categorizing words, which requires special observation from researchers.

References

1. Асадов Т.Х. Сўз туркумлари тизимида равиш. Монография. –Т.: Мухаррир, 2010.

2. Ботирова А.Э. Ўзбек тилида сўз туркумларининг бирламчи ва иккиламчи вазифасининг функционал-синтактик таҳлили: Филол.фанлари номзоди... дис. –Қарши, 2018.
3. Элтазаров Ж.Д. Сўз туркумлари ҳақида лингвистик назариялар. Монография. – Самарқанд, 1996.
4. Фузаилов С. Ўзбек тилида равиш ва унинг сифат билан муносабати // Совет мактаби. – Тошкент, 1956. №1. – Б. 25-29.
5. Потенбя А.А. Из записях по русской грамматике. Об изменении значения и заменах существительного. Т. III. – М.: Просвещение, 1968.
6. Суник О.П. Общая теория частей речи. –М. –Л., 1968.
1. 7.Хўжаев Т. ”Яхши” типдаги сўзларнинг гапда ҳол вазифасида қўлланишига доир// А.Навоий номидаги Самарқанд давлат университетининг асарлари. Янги серия. -№ 102. – Самарқанд, 1960.
7. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. I том. –Т.: Фан, 1975.
8. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 1-жилд. – Т.: Ўз.мил.энц., 2006.
9. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 2-жилд. – Т.: Ўз.мил.энц., 2006.
10. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 3-жилд. – Т.: Ўз.мил.энц., 2007.
11. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 4-жилд. – Т.: Ўз.мил.энц., 2008.
12. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 5-жилд. – Т.: Ўз.мил.энц., 2008.
13. Ширинова Н. Ўзбек тилида предметлик ва белги-хусусият маъноларини фарқлаш воситалар: Фил. фан. номз...дис. автореф. – Т., 2010.