

## The Concept of “Words” in French and Uzbek Linguistics

**Sayfullaeva Ra’no Raupovna,**

Doctor of philology, Professor,  
National University of Uzbekistan

**Bobokalonov Po’lotshoh Ramazonovich,**

Researcher at Bukhara State University

### Abstract

*The scientific article presents the concept of „words“ in French and Uzbek linguistics and structural interpretation of simple sentences and phrases, lexical-semantic and functional aspects, indicators of interdependence and the peculiarities of anomalous properties and problems.*

*Key words and phrases: linguistic, interjection indicators, modal, exclamation, affirmative-negative words, lexical-syntactic units, interjection meanings.*

### INTRODUCTION

In system linguistics, morphologically, words are mainly divided into three categories. The first - independent word groups, the second - auxiliary words, the third - verbs. Words are often phenomena between morphology, lexicology, semantics, and syntax. In morphology, words connect syntax with lexicon. In syntax, it is recognized as a separate sentence construction. It should be noted that in linguistics, especially in morphology, to say independent, auxiliary, and verb is not new.

In V.V. Vinogradov the concept of independent, auxiliary and predicative words [3, 79 - 80], and in R.Sayfullaev it is noted that separate words which can come as a third part, can come more as an introductory word, an introductory sentence, an introduction [9, 16- 38]. In this sense, in Uzbek grammar it is given as "word-speech", "introduction", "introduction", "introduction". Such derivatives are essentially a communicative speech unit between morphology and syntax. That is why it is not a mistake to give it as a rumor. Thus, the study of lexical level and syntactic level, the phenomenon of "words" reflecting mixed diffuse phenomena in the process of studying the theory of system linguistics was integrated into a separate system in the form of "SFFWS".

The essence of [ SFFWS ] was to try to systematize and clarify words that were scattered and did not contain certain boundaries. It is known that at first, Professor Ayyub Gulyamov recognized words as "inseparable words" [13, 12-18; 14. 5-157]. Features related to the development of syntax at that time. The term "words" in Uzbek linguistics was introduced from other languages as an international term.

Although S. Usmanov studied in depth the pronouns within this system, he did not openly comment on or group them into "inseparable parts." However, the urge was to give the utterances in the form of “utterances” [11, 13-25].

**THE MAIN PART**

The naming problem of SFFWS. With the description of the linguistic concept of speech, not only Uzbek, Kyrgyz and Russian linguistics, but also all world linguistics have approached this issue in one way or another, trying to solve this problem in one way or another. From the linguistic point of view, the Uzbek system is studied in the model developed by H. Nematov, R. Sayfullaeva [10, 42-47]. Naturally, there is a lot of debate about these terms.

Indeed, the term is introduced by one person, but is not easily accepted: it is more concise to call a semantic-functional sentence than a semantically-functionally formed phrase. Or it is easier to call it "grammatical sentences" - "functional sentences". However, SFSHSG was chosen because the essence and purpose of the issue was to clarify [2, 137]. In this way, statements such as "Falakning dastidan dod, Unisiga ha, Bunisiga yo'q" are easily systematized.

Indeed, groupings such as "pure words, spoken words, the words being spoken" indicate that words are spoken according to the function they perform. The verbal capacity of such words is not limited. These words take on an entirely different position when they are moved to a series of auxiliary words, when they are transposed into another word group. Similarly as "Ha" "Yo'q" words can also be seen in the form of cuts in the transposition method. The words "Bunisiga ha, bunisiga yo'q" are grammatically formed together. Sayings like "Unisiga ha deydi, bunisiga yo'q deydi" have been transposed, their **yes** and **no** function has changed.

Therefore, such words can equally perform a lexical category in a lexicon and a syntactic category in a syntax. This occurs not only in Uzbek, but also in Kazakh, Kyrgyz and other Turkic languages, and even in Romance-Germanic languages.

As a new phenomenon is identified on the basis of scientific analysis, it is necessary to name the event in a certain way as a scientific concept.

Expanded rumors, such as "Bunisiga ha," "Unisiga yo'q," "Zolimlar dastidan dod," do not seem to be true. After all, in our minds, a word is only associated with a separate word or a single lexical unit. It is probably more accurate to call such statements extended sentences. Or they can be described as 'verbal devices'. In particular, it seems wrong to call words "-lashgan", "-lashayotgan", "-simon". However, it should be understood that these terms only served as a scientific-theoretical dimension [2, 3-137]. This intermediate third phenomenon is not systematized in all languages.

Leveling of SFFWS. The features of pure lexical, lexical, lexical, lexical phenomena in the lexical system are completely different from the feature of grammatically formed sentences. In this sense, the word is taken at the syntactic level, as [SFFWS]. The fact that [ SFFWS ] is expressed in a syntactic environment in the form of word-for-word, word-for-word, word-for-word is based on the expansion of the structure of lexical units. It is noted that such statements are hierarchically hierarchical from "pure" to "-simon" and form a set of lexical units as a result of periodic change.

Words, that is, [SFFWS], are a lexical unit in the lexicon, a sentence in the syntax. The naming in morphology is a bit unusual, but it is easier to study and know when the term is given in this way. The ability of such lexical units to speak is of a growing nature and constitutes high speech "amplitude." Conversely, independent word groups lack this ability and cannot exist without a morphological index. An example of the hierarchy of affirmative meanings of affirmative-negative lexemes in structure of SFFWS:

1) Ha - pure affirmative, 2) Mayli - affirmed, 3) To'g'ri - affirmative, 4) Xuddi shunday, Juda soz – very affirmative. Now an example of denial: 1) Yo'q - pure denial, 2) Aslo. Aksincha – negative, 3) Tamom – negative, 4) Shartmas – negative.

Hierarchical phenomenon of SFFWS. The hierarchy of historical development according to dialectical law is universal. This natural state is also inherent in social phenomena.

Accordingly, the hierarchy of the phenomenon of speech is expressed in the form of "pure, - lashgan, - lashayotgan, - simon" [2, 127]. For example, in biology, the ascension of a child from the mother's womb to the human level is inherent in the principle of dialectical regularity and gradational hierarchy. Therefore, differences between words and emotional expressions cannot be defined by strict norms.

Because emotional speech is pure speech. Another example. The mathematician Al-Khwarizmi has a wonderful hierarchical equation: "If a person has good behavior, he is equal to 1.

If a person has got beauty, add zero to the side of one.

If a person is rich, add another zero = 100. If there is a lineage, add another zero = 1000. If the number 1, that is, the character disappears, the value of the person disappears and the zeros remain = 000. The implication is that just as a person ascends to the hierarchical level of "possessive, beautiful, hereditary, rich, immoral," so does the amplitude of the pendulum swing. In simple terms, this can be described as a "speech vibration." In this regard, SFFWS . It is structurally different from the study taken as Shodmonov's "Words" [12, 5-18].

Indeed, the lexico-syntactic category derived from words includes lexical-syntactic units that are traditionally considered modals, pronouns, and affirmative and commonly referred to as introductory words.

In Uzbek linguistics, a word is distinguished by its structure, boundaries, its integral lexical-syntactic features, and it's belonging to a separate lexical group.

In addition, comparing the linguistic concept of [ SFFWS ] with the concept of "GSS", it is explained that the means of forming a sentence is expressed as a morphological indicator in the [m] - marker in [WPm]. In non-verbal, that is, independent words such as noun, adjective, number, form, rhyme, interjection functions are introduced with morphological sign [Pm] - interjection indicators, and, as noted, in SFFWS such syntactic function is abnormally integrated in their semantic structure. It is unfair to science to equate words with the tasks and requirements of the last century and the tasks of the present.

Of course, it is good to put a dichotomous contradiction between "morphologically formed sentences" and "non-morphologically formed sentences", but it is necessary to answer the question of how it is based in the sentence is not morphologically formed. This question was answered with the term SFFWS.

Lexical and syntactic style in SFFWS. In SFFWS lexical style is equated with syntactic style. [SFFWS] are words that come only as the center of speech, as a cut. That is, it merges into lexicon and syntax.

Therefore, these phenomena are considered in lexicon and syntax as an "intermediate third" - a clash of lexical-semantic and syntactic phenomena. It is this factor that unites SFFWS into one group, allowing them to be separated as a separate syntactic device. Theoretical ideas and issues, such as the complexity of the sentence in which it participates in a simple sentence, its independent and non-

independent use, and its connection with the structure of a compound sentence, have not yet been seriously studied in Uzbek linguistics.

In some places, the lexical-semantic context and appearance of SFFWS are challenged.

Syntactic circle and syntactic category in SFFWS. Intersections to independent word groups are generated only when [GSS] is added. For example, kel + di, kel + a + di, kel + moqchi. Auxiliary word groups are tools that serve a syntactic function. But words have the ability to be talkative. If we analyze the probability in the sentence "Ehtimol bugun yomg'ir yog'ar", there are two types of statements in one sentence: / - Bugun yomg'ir yog'ar? - Ehtimol./ For example, "Albatta kelaman" and "Albatta, kelaman" there are two types.

One in the sentence, the other in a separate syntactic circle: / -Ertaga kelasizmi? -Albatta./ Because in "Albatta, kelaman" Albatta - a separate sentence, kelaman - the second sentence. In this case, it does not matter whether the modal word is separated by a comma, or separated by a semicolon. Because a speech event can be limited to punctuation only in written speech. The range of live speech is limited by the speaker himself (for example, Uzbekistan is my homeland). Nevertheless, this siege is, of course, a rumor. It is not correct to put a comma after "albatta, keladi".

"Falon joyga borasanmi?" If 'Albatta boraman' is not comma-separated, then the word is not used here, but serves to express modality in the verb. If it's "Albatta, boraman," you can put two sentences, a comma, or a full stop. Sayings such as "Qadamlariga hasanot", "Xush kelibsiz" are considered to belong to the category of word-speakers. Because some words lose their lexical meaning or some sentences lose their verbal function [5, 232]. The role of SFFWSs in GSSs also requires special research.

"Spiritual independence" in the classification of SFFWS. It is known that lexical level units are divided into two major groups: independent word and auxiliary word. The contradiction between them is "spiritual and functional independence." According to this sign of contradiction, the auxiliary word is a definite article, and the independent word is a member without a definite article. The auxiliary word is never used independently, it can only come in a connected circle. An independent word, on the other hand, has the ability to be used independently and to express meaning. A distinctive feature of SFFWSs, in contrast to the lexical level, depends on their place in the syntactic environment, in addition to modal words.

At the lexical level of this system, only in modals does spiritual independence and non-independence occur. Thus, 1) in the composition of heterogeneous meanings from suspicion to firmness: Albatta - completely independent, firm; Qaydam, ehtimol - incompletely independent, suspicious; Words like *Shekilli* have subordinate, suspicious meanings. But 2) Yes in the affirmation and denial groups. *Ha. Xo'p. xo'sh. Bo'pti. Mayli. Yo'q. Aslo.* 3) Suggestion-signal and call-command: *Ma. Mang. Qani. Po'sht! Kisht! Marsh;* 4) Encouragement and emotion: *A. A-ha. Bay-bay. Urra. Olg'a. yo Xudoyo tavba* etc. is completely independent. In this group, non-independent and subordinate independent verbs are very rare.

The reason why the first stage in the spiritual classification of all lexemes, which are in conflict in SFFWS, is not "spiritual independence", but "spiritual independence" is the neutrality of the independent lexeme in relation to this sign. ... In the word independent, the sign of "spiritual independence" is conditional [10, 34].

Expanded SFFWS. Collective sentences in Uzbek language are based on the patterns of Western languages in the formal approach, and in the substantial approach they are based on the smallest

structural patterns of speech [10, 462].

It is well known that in most languages an independent word group takes a predicative person-number index to be a cut. SFFWS implicitly embodies the properties of cross-section. For example, in French, verbs cannot have a predicative index without the possessive: the predicate in the verb corresponds to the possessive: / Je suis professeur. – Men o'qituvchiman./ In the status of predicative, any independent word can be a participle with the auxiliary verb "bo'lmoq". However, in French linguistics, SFFWS specific phenomena are not absent. They are defined by the term "canonical model" (modèle canonique). We can see this in the following examples:

1. Je vais bien. "Men yaxshi yuribman." 2. Comment allez-vous? "Qanday yuribsiz?" (Qandaysiz? Sog'-salomatmisiz?) — Merci. — Rahmat. Yaxshi. Obviously, Je vais bien. "Men yaxshi yuribman." - [GSS] - [WPm], a very simple statement. All other speech derivatives belong to SFFWS- [WP]. In the first sentence, the [W], [Pm] feature of the cut and their interrelationship are fixed in French, but in Uzbek *Men yaxshi yuribman* instead of *Men yaxshi. Yaxshi yuribman*. You can leave the owner and the cut - "Yaxshi."

[SFFWS] is also a special form of the possessive pronoun: 1. – Bugun bormoqchimisiz? - Ha. 2. – U ham bormoqchimi? – Yo'q. 3. – Kitob olasanmi? "bo'lmasamchi" 4. Nasriddin threw the sack: Ma! To'y! (From "Mr. Anecdotes"). 5. "*Salom,*" dedi ko'rishi bilan hamma birdan. *Qo'llar o'tdi biqinlarning orasidan.* (G'.G'ul.)

SFShSGs can be expanded or come with cohesive pieces: 1. Hormang. Hormanglar. Hormangizlar! 2. Barakalla. Barakalla sizga. Hey barakalla. Barakalla sizga ey. E barakalla sizga ye. 3. Ofarin. Sizga ofarin. Ofarin sizlarga. Ming ofarin. 4. Olg'a! Vatan uchun olg'a! ona-yurtimiz uchun, xalqimiz uchun muqaddas tuproq uchun olg'a.

In some functional cases, the urge may be a component of a separate verb in the binary position with the verb. For example: "Ona Vatan uchun olg'a!" If the constructive sentence belongs to the extended [Wp] -fixed phrase of [ SFFWS ], "Olg'a, Ona Vatan uchun!" - is a word divided into two-tiered binary positions, and we will focus separately on the similarities and differences between these syntactic frameworks.

In short, the systematic analysis of words is a gap for syntax by Ayub Gulyamov's "Simple speech", E. Shodmonov's "Words", He supplemented some aspects of Usmanov's theory of "Undovgaplar". In contrast to E.Shodmonov's work, it was clarified that the cut-off indicators in words are systematized around words and in the lexical sense of the lexeme, that is, semantically and functionally embedded cut meanings [5, 232].

## CONCLUSION

Of course, it is possible to have dozens of other intermediate events in this continuous chain, and to perfect it, to separate dozens of links in the chain. Thus, the issue studied and being studied is not easy and easy in itself. This issue can still lead to a lot of research. In particular, it is very difficult to fully address such an issue in a single study. However, it is clear that Uzbek system linguistics is developing in the system-theoretical teaching of syntax using the achievements of Romanism, Germanism, Slavic studies.

Here we paid attention to the conclusion of the professor Nizomiddin Mahmudov on the transcript: ... Alisher Navoi quotes a hundred verbs in Turkish and gives an analytical explanation of the four verbs associated with that weeping, such as sing, read, groan. In my case, I said that Alisher Navoi

had misinterpreted this a bit. Seeing this, the teacher said:

"To say that, you have to live in the Navoi era," he said. It was a live event that took place in 1973-74. ... He also said, "To evaluate Navoi, you have to go back to the Navoi era." In any case, this is the result of courage. "

## REFERENCES

1. Болтабоева Ҳ. Ўзбек тилида мураккаблашган содда гаплар. Тошкент: Фан, 1967, -170-175 б.
2. Bobokalonov R. O‘zbek tilida gap sintaksisi va so‘z-gaplarning sistem-struktur talqini: monografiya. –T.: Fan, 2006, 3-127 б.
3. Камилдъжанова Р. Модальные слова в современном узбекском языке. АДК. Тошкент, 1975 -9-22 б.
4. Нигматов Х.Г., Абдуллаев К.М., Банару В.И., Махмудов Н.М., Мухаммедова Д.А., Нурмонов А. Структура предложения и актуальные вопросы синтаксиса тюркских языков/ Тезисы формально-функционального исследования// Сов. тюрк. 1984, №5 -5-10 б.
5. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Модал сўзлар. Тошкент: Фан., 1957.
6. Саидов С. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тилида модал сезларнинг классификацияси масаласига доир//ЎТА, 1963,№ 6 27 б.
7. Сайфуллаева Р. Уюшган гаплар. ЎЗМУ –Тошкент. – 2019 3-88 б.
8. Sayfullayeva R.R., Mengliyev B.R., Qurbonova M.M., Raupova L.R., Abuzalova M.Q., Yo‘ldosheva D.N. HOZIRGI O‘ZBEK TILI, darslik, TOSHKENT – O`ZMU, 2020 3-549 б.
9. Усмонов С. Ундов-гаплар. Тошкент: Фан, 1955 3-25 б.
10. Шодмонов Э. Слова предложения в современном узбекском языке. НДА, Тошкент, 1970 -5-18 б.
11. Фуломов А. Содда гап. Тошкент: Фан, 1955, -12-18 б.
12. Фуломов А. Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987. 5-29; 37-42; 154-157 б.
13. Фуломов А. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. –Т., Маориф нашриёти,1940. –Б.84
14. Bobokalonov R. R., Hayatova N. I., Bobokalonov P. R. NEUROLINGUISTIC PROBLEMS: PROPERTIES OF NON-VERBAL MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AND EXPRESSION //International scientific journal. – 2016. – С. 38.
15. Bobokalonov R. R., Bobokalonov P. R., Khayatova N. I. MEANINGS OF CANONICAL WORDS-SENTENCES IN THE SPIRIT OF TOLERANCE //International scientific journal. – 2016. – С. 44.