



From The Manifestation of Speech to Universality (Morphology), From Fundamental Nature to Practical Application (Syntax)

Kavilova Laura

JSPU, Jizzakh Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article examines how parts of speech are classified in French and Uzbek languages from a comparative standpoint. While In French verbal inflection, the stems convey lexical meaning, while the inflectional suffixes trigger functional information based on morphosyntactic features, Uzbek classification primarily considers the logical-semantic features of words due to the absence of inflections in the language. Our study delved into the morphological breakdown and processing of inflectional suffixes using visual lexical decision tasks.

Key words: morphology, comparative studies, affixation, suffix, syntax

Dialectical unity of morphology and syntax — the minimal form of a sentence, the manifestation of dialectical relations at the morphological level, the concept of ordering (syntagmatic), the concepts of grouping (paradigmatic) and traditional (hierarchical), general forms of singular and plural numbers meanings.

Everyone knows that grammar means morphology and syntax in a narrow sense, and all construction levels of the language in a broad sense. Language levels mean phonetics and phonology, lexis and semasiology, phraseology, morphology, syntax and stylistics. Morphology and syntax are mutually dependent levels. A genetic approach to linguistic units made it possible to make judgments about the dialectical unity of morphology and syntax.



Morphology is the field of grammar about the meaning of word form, while syntax is the field of grammar about the function of word form. Since the main social function of language is communication - intervention, means of exchange of ideas between people, in sentences, which are the source of learning syntax, units of all levels of the language - phonology and phonetics, lexicon and semantics, morphemics and morphology - are manifested. Each of these units is studied by separate departments of linguistics. But in sentences that are a source of learning syntax, the signs of all level units are highlighted.

For example,

1. Telefonni opamga oldim. / J'ai acheté le portable à ma mère.

Telefonni opam uchun oldim. / J'ai acheté le portable pour maman.

2. Lorelia xafa oldi. / Lorelia a été offensée.

Lorelianing kapalagi uchdi. / Elle a pris la mouche

situations such as syntactic situations are interpreted as syntactic synonymy. But in the 1st case, it is possible to observe the meaning and function of morphological units, and in the 2nd case, the meaning of words and phrases. Such morphological events are considered syntactically, and the study of purely syntactic situations is excluded.

Muzaffar ketdi	-y/yu -da / de (*slang) lekin/ammo yoki shuning uchun chunki deb	men keldim
----------------	--	------------



Muzaffar est parti	et	je suis venu
Je suis venu	lorsque	Muzaffar est parti
Muzaffar est parti	mais	je suis venu
Muzaffar est parti	ou	je suis venu
Muzaffar est parti	alors	je suis venu
Muzaffar est parti	c'est pourquoi	je suis venu
Je suis venu	parce que	Muzaffar est parti

If we pay close attention, in these examples we can see not different sentences (syntactic derivatives), but morphological phenomena formed by different connecting means - the paradigm of connectors. Here, too, it can be noticed that morphological units are "mixed" in syntax. "When the syntax is freed from the confusion of units of other levels (especially lexis and morphology), it takes the form of diagrams of relationships of very simple and easily understandable patterns..."

Whereas in French examples the paradigm of connectors, i.e. conjunctions, prevails compared to case of suffixation in Uzbek language. In French syntax the position of sujet and prédicat exchanges positions with COD (complement d'objet direct) according to the context.

In particular, the syntactic pattern is derived in the same way. For this, we will turn to a simple sentence in the speech: Alinaning murg`ak qalbi muhabbat alangasida yondi.¹ Le cœur tendre d'Alina brûlait dans la flamme de l'amour (Alina's tender heart burned in the flame of love) Units of all language levels are expressed in this speech derivative. In order to determine the syntactic structure of this sentence, we remove the non-syntactic categories of the sentence in speech one by one:

¹ Mengliev B.R. Modern Uzbek literary language. – Karshi, 2004



1. Intonational completion. The above sentence has intonational completion. If we give a different tone to this sentence, it may not be complete in terms of intonation, i.e "Alinaning murg`ak qalbi muhabbat alangasida yondi va uning ko`z o'ngida olam o`zgacha tusga kiydi". The first part of the sentence is melodically incomplete. Such features are considered characteristic of speech sentences. But the form of the sentence is irrelevant, because the study of sentences in terms of tone is the object of phonetics, phonetic analysis.

2. Types of sentences according to the purpose of expression. The above speech derivative can be formed as a question, a command, and an emotional sentence. But since the types of the sentence according to the purpose of expression should be studied in the semantics of the sentence, as well as the fact that such features do not apply to the smallest form of the sentence, we abandon this non-syntactic phenomenon.

3. Types according to modal meanings. Speech can have different modal meanings (suspicion, assumption, confidence, determination...). For example, if we use the above statement in the following form: Alinaning murg`ak qalbi muhabbat alangasida yonganga o`xshaydi. In this sentence, the meaning of suspicion is expressed. We exclude this phenomenon from the sentence because it is not important for the syntactic construction of the sentence and it should be studied in the category of language modality. In short, after removing such non-syntactic phenomena from the sentence, the fragments of the sentence remained.

Based on the grammar of the famous French linguist L.Tener (the position and ranking of the parts of the sentence in the sentence), we will begin to determine the central part of the sentence. This is the second step in determining the smallest form of the sentence ("dropped") is left and the following plot can be generated:

These words and phrases express the characteristic of naming. Expression of opinion is embodied in the phrase "He threw fire". The above sentence is formed based on the valence of the word "He threw fire". This word form consists of two parts: fire — the part representing the lexical meaning, -di — the part of the lexical indicators, that is, it is equal to [WPm].



Above, we moved from the verbal expression to generality and created a general derivation. This drawing, pattern (WPm) is realized in hundreds of thousands of sentences. That is, the inherent essence is manifested in speech in various forms. At this point, it should be noted that with our above example, at first, we created a generality from the specifics, and this generality shows different properties further down. From this follows the main purpose of morphology and syntax. "...unifying specifics into generalities based on certain principles and, on the contrary, revealing the possibilities of different manifestations of a specific generality in direct observation, in other words, moving from specifics to generalities relying on the inductive method, establishing the relationship between generalities opening — is considered the main goal of theoretical morphology". The main features and tasks of the theoretical morphology of the Uzbek language are as follows:

1. On the basis of language-speech conflict, to demonstrate the manifestation of the dialectical relation of generality-particularity, possibility-reality at the morphological level.

2. Morphology relies on the relationship of morphological units.

3. Three types of relationships between language units are in the focus of research: alignment (syntagmatic) — grouping (paradigmatic) — hierarchy (hierarchical). Alignment — the sequential arrangement of language units. The grouping relationship is the relationship between the unit units of a certain class on the basis of a certain unifying sign, and it is formed by "Cognitive linking". Hierarchy — the relation of small units to the composition of units larger than themselves. This relationship shows the connection of whole and part. For example, a morpheme consists of an affixal morpheme and a word morpheme, a morpheme is real in the word form.

4. Unifying and differentiating signs of morphological units are determined based on their opposition within a given paradigm. This is why contradiction lies at the bottom of any grammatical paradigm. The task of linguistics is to reveal these signs of contradiction. These contradictions are built not on the basis of specific speech meanings, but on the basis of the general - linguistic meaning of the grammatical (morphological) form. General - linguistic



meanings are revealed on the basis of the relationship of mutually proportional grammatical forms. For example, if we compare the speech meanings of singular and plural forms²:

Uzbek		French	
Unit number	Plural number	Unit number	Plural number
oyna	oynalar	fenêtre	fenêtres
1 ta oyna		un fenêtre	
ko'p oyna			beaucoup de
20 ta oyna			fenêtres
bu qarash	bu qarashlar	ce regard	vingt fenêtres
			ces regards

By comparing the meanings of two forms, we can make a judgment that the singular number can represent a definite quantity, an indefinite quantity (*ko'p* oyna), a unit, and a definite and indefinite plural. The plural number always represents an indefinite number. Expressing the indefinite plural is the general meaning of the plural number, and being able to express unity and plurality, precision and uncertainty is the general meaning of the singular number.

In morphological paradigms, forms are contradicted on the basis of such common meanings. The discovery of such common morphological (grammatical) meanings and the description of the conflicting signs of the members of the paradigm is the source of research of the theoretical morphology of the Uzbek language today³. Uzbek linguistics has just begun

² Nematov H. Tajalli Sufism Theory of Knowledge and Issues of Syntax Study in Linguistics. "Uzbek language and literature", 1993, issue 2.

³ Kavilova Tamara. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. Word and Language, 1971, 260–66.



this work, and its development is directly related to the future activities of talented young people.

The general meaning of the morphological form revealed in this way is realized in the use of this form - in syntax. Therefore, the general meaning of the morphological form is hidden in it as a possibility. And in speech, it is realized and the integral connection and inseparability of morphology and syntax is ensured.

If a morphological form is a possibility, a syntactic clause is an actualization. For example, let's take the word form "to my brother". In this form

- 1) the dictionary meaning is a male relative of the same generation who is younger than himself, from the same parent;
- 2) belonging to a certain group of words (noun);
- 3) quantitative uncertainty;
- 4) coming to some other word in the subordinate position (complementary or case) and directing an action or something to it;
- 5) The meaning of relation to the first person is embodied.

All these meanings are vague and general in the word form "singlimga". The above meanings become more specific when this word form occurs in connection with other words in speech. "Yostiqni kichik singlimga oldim", "Shu voqeani kenja singlimga aytib berdim" // "J'ai apporté l'oreiller à ma petite sœur", "J'ai raconté cette histoire à ma sœur cadette"⁴

From this we come to another conclusion: the morphological form is inextricably linked not only with its syntactic use, but also with its lexical meaning and lexical complement. It is naturally related to the interrelationship of lexicon, morphology and syntax and the integrity of the language. We artificially divide the language and its units into different levels, we divide them for certain purposes. In reality, they live as a whole, they cannot be separated from each other. But for each level, in order to determine the features

⁴ Kavilova, Laura A Q U I L I N A. "THE CASE OF PREFIXATION IN UZBEK AND FRENCH NEOLOGISMS." PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES AND TEACHING METHODS, 2023.



unique to this level, we must artificially free the unit of the studied level from the influence of other levels. For example: the meaning of the suffix -lar in the word form "Mishalar" differs from the meaning of "-lar" in the word form "books". This distinction was undoubtedly the name of a single person. The equivalent to the plurality in French would be “-s”, for example “Benoîts”.

But this diversity is not related to the general morphological meaning of the form "-ni", but to the words it is combined with. The general linguistic meaning of the subjunctive is to connect a noun or a word with a narrow meaning to a transitive verb in the position of a subordinate clause (indirect object). Therefore, since grammar works both with general meanings and with meanings that occur in private speech, we should focus on these two different meanings separately.

References:

1. Kavilova Tamara. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. Word and Language, 1971, 260–66. doi:10.1515/9783110873269.260.
2. Kavilova, Laura A Q U I L I N A. “THE CASE OF PREFIXATION IN UZBEK AND FRENCH NEOLOGISMS.” PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES AND TEACHING METHODS, 2023.
3. Madrakhimov I. On the issue of the composition of lexemes in the Uzbek language.// Uzbek language and literature. 2002. No. 4, p. 29–32.
4. Mengliev B.R. Modern Uzbek literary language. – Karshi, 2004
5. Nematov H. Tajalli Sufism Theory of Knowledge and Issues of Syntax Study in Linguistics. "Uzbek language and literature", 1993, issue 2.
6. Rodenko A.V. Comparative analysis of nominal parts of speech of the Russian and Uzbek languages // Slavic languages: systemic descriptive and sociocultural aspects of research: collection. scientific tr. : at 2 o'clock / editor's note. : L. A. Goduiko [etc.]; under general ed. O. B. Transition. – Brest: BrGU, 2014.- Part 1. - 288 p.