



The Factors Determining the Development of the Modern Uzbek Literary Language

Shukurova G.Kh.

Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i5.4840>

Abstract

In this article discussed linguistic units on materials based on the classification of the dialectical unity of speech and languages. As it is known, a linguistic unit is a widely used term and concept in linguistics and there are many materials devoted to specific units of languages.

Keywords: *Development; Literary Language; Lexeme; Connection; Idiom; Interpretation*

Introduction

The modern Uzbek literary language is an established national literary language that serves the cultural needs and needs of the Uzbek people. Science and technology, press and literature, government and agencies, education and television operate on the basis of the literary language. The literary language is constantly changing and polished. As the literary language develops, it can rise from the state language level to the next level. At the same time, the function of the language is expanding and its position is increasing. Sometimes the state language and the literary language in society can be different. In such conditions, the development of the language slows down, and it becomes the language of everyday life. The economic and cultural upsurge of society, the observance of the norms of a single literary language, radio and television broadcasts open the way to narrowing and, finally, to the disappearance of the difference between the literary language and the dialect.

The Uzbek national language is a multi-dialect language and includes a number of dialects, which is explained by its unique complex conditions of historical development and the diverse ethnic composition of the Uzbek nation in the past. During this period, due to the certain living conditions of the Uzbek people, the dialects of the Uzbek language became common, merged into a single common language, and became a component of the form, but some dialects have survived to this day.

According to its vocabulary, the Uzbek language is considered one of the richest Turkic languages. Linguistic unity is one of the most widely used terms and concepts in linguistics. Although not much has been written about this concept, volumes of books, dissertations and many articles have been published on each of the units that fall under the concept. Among them, there are many sources that provide information about specific units that make up the basic units of a language construction. In this

respect, S. Usmanov (2010), Sh. Rakhmatullaev (2002), Kh. Nematov (1995), and M. Khalbekov (2008) have done especially significant work.

However, it is clear from observations that, despite a large amount of research, the exact number of basic language units in Uzbek linguistics has not yet been sufficiently studied. This leads to new problem situations, especially in language teaching, which leads to negative rather than positive consequences. Only when education is organized on the basis of uniformity, and not theoretical diversity, will there be holistic, comprehensible, holistic, systematic education and efficiency. Therefore, a positive solution to this problem is very important for both Uzbek linguistics and literary language education.

The Main Part

The observation of scientific and educational literature have shown that the number of units that are interpreted as linguistic units varies from one level to another, and in some cases even more dramatically. In other words, they can vary from 3 to 14. It is difficult to see the same in their naming, in the order in which they are given. Some combined linguistic and speech units, without separating them, singled them all out among the basic units of language (constructions), while others noted them separately. For example, Sh. Rakhmatullaev (2006), a well-known representative of Tashkent systemic linguistics, gave 6 different linguistic units in accordance with the author's accent and order, but in practice there are 7 different linguistic units: 1. The main, primary linguistic units are lexemes and morphemes; 2. There is a literal hierarchical relationship between the lexeme and morpheme and the unit formed by their union—the lexeme; 3. A lexeme is a primary constituent unit; 4. The following hierarchical relationship arises between the token and the component formed by the token and their syntactic relationship; 5. The most important unit of a language is the dialect; 6. Phrasema is a linguistic unit of a complex nature. The above provides an initial introduction to the six language units involved in the construction of a language. The nature of these linguistic units is described in turn in the sections of the textbook (Rakhmatullaev, 2006).

The theoretical grammar published by a team of authors under the guidance of professor U. Shakirov actually lists 6 different linguistic units: The unit of each level in the language system is a phoneme, morpheme, lexeme, word form, syntax, linguistic text, (Shakirov U, 2001). It can be seen that firstly, although this is not a fundamental mistake, we think that it would be appropriate to generalize them as linguistic units and then differentiate them according to the style and order of linguistic units and speech units. Secondly, linguistic and linguistic terms are not synonymous where language and speech are different. Consequently, an internal contradiction arises in the presentation of the text as a linguistic phoneme, morpheme, lexeme, word form, syntax. Linguistic term means “linguistic” and has a terminological meaning. However, the term “linguistic” refers to linguistic units that are stored in our linguistic memory and are used to distinguish between the finished linguistic units based on them, the speech obtained as a result of their use, and the speech units that make it up. Now the term “linguistic” is used to describe linguistic units, that is, linguistic units that are not given by direct observation, in the form of a mental print, acoustic image or neuron stored in our linguistic memory, imagination. Therefore, in scientific interpretation, especially when the linguistic and speech status of the language is different, it is necessary to use each of the linguistic, linguistic and speech terms in their place and meaning. Otherwise, it is obvious that there will be confusion in the understanding of the classification and interpretation. When the units of consciousness and language contradict each other, the term “linguistic” can be replaced by the term “linguistic” in the linguistic sense, but this does not justify itself in different places of language and speech, because it undermines scientific accuracy and consistency. In this regard, let's talk about the classification of Sh. Rakhmutullaev. Because its classification and interpretation is not devoid of contradictory ambiguity. It is true that the foundations of distinguishing and interpreting language and speech as two states of the existence of language are more visible in the studies of Sh. Rakhmatullaev. Even the Bukhara School of Linguistics, which gave many lectures about this difference,

was forced to replace the difference between language and speech with the difference between language and speech after Sh. Rakhmatullaev's interpretations. In this regard, the interpretation of Sh. Rakhmatullaev, in fact, fully justified itself. However, Sh. Rakhmatullaev also uses the term "sounds of language" in the system of basic units of linguistic construction, which in itself leads to a contradiction between the sounds of the language and the sounds of speech. In this case, it should be recognized that there is still a third particular state of language, which differs from the state of language and speech, and this must be proved.

From our point of view, language is inherent in two different states of existence, and the name of one of them language, and the other – speech, serves to distinguish them. Spontaneous linguistic units are called linguistic, and linguistic units associated with speech are called colloquial. To think that there are linguistic sounds is to recognize that language is different from language and speech, or that there is another separate linguistic state that embodies both of them. This further complicates the problem, which is already much more difficult to understand and comprehend. Because now it is necessary to define three different states of each type of linguistic unit, be it sound, word or addition, in order to define their three different states, define their boundaries and name each of them separately. This is required by scientific precision and consistency. How difficult this work is, can be seen from the problems that arise only in relation to tokens and words. The answer to this question remains open. Now imagine that in this case you distinguish between three different states of each linguistic unit. Can you imagine?! In fact, in our opinion, this is due to the mixing or mixing of units of consciousness, thinking, language. In order not to do this, it is advisable in all respects to identify and distinguish two real states of the existence of the language and their units, as well as name, designate, and then describe and classify each according to its form, meaning, function, and use. Many linguists who think about this, including Sh. Rakhmatullaev, tried to do the same with respect to other units, except for the sounds of the language. However, the intention is good, but ... as they say, it all depends on how clear and consistent, successful, objective and consistent this action will be. Unfortunately, in this regard, in particular, in the classification and description of linguistic constructive units, this manifests itself not only in some aspects of his interpretation of the sounds of the language mentioned above, but also in the identification and designation of other units. In particular, the researcher puts forward the basic units of linguistic construction, as well as linguistic sounds, lexemes, morphemes, phrases, as well as units that should be designated as lexemes, conjunctions, speech forms. In our opinion, there is no separate linguistic–speech unit different from a sentence, a compound word, which should be called a compound, and a compound–a syntactic unit. There are rules for writing sentences, but the terms compound and colloquial do not mean the name of such a rule in the same place. They are given as the name of a linguistic unit of one type or another. Of these, it is also unknown whether these types of units are linguistic or verbal units. However, there is a special suffix used to distinguish between linguistic and speech units, and the scientist himself uses the terms lexeme, morpheme and phraseme, which are linguistic units and are attached to them. However, the researcher does not use this tool to the maximum, for some reason abandoning this widespread and accepted method, he goes in a completely new way, using the terms lexeme, connection, idiom, which require deep scientific understanding. These terms could be understood by the researcher even when they were used and described in the research monograph, but they are given in the textbook for higher education. Such innovations in textbooks put users in a difficult position, upsetting them.

It is also obvious to higher education professionals that textbooks, manuals, and research are two different things. Unfortunately, however, the disappearance of this difference between them, especially for higher philological education, complicates the teaching of linguistics, especially the modern Uzbek literary language, and leads to a sharp decrease in efficiency. After all, it is difficult not only for a student, but also for a university teacher to master these new terms and concepts. Is it possible to achieve efficiency with a poorly learned theory?! Of course, we do not want to destroy the textbook of Sh. Rakhmatullaev. Our views are the general classification and description of language units, the most widely recognized Uzbek literary language, its development and enrichment, "System of lexemes", "System of morphemes", "System of compound words", "System of phrases". "Alphabet", "Correct

writing”, “Correct pronunciation” are distinguished by their clear and consistent, systematic solution, and their inclusion in the educational process undoubtedly improves the quality of language teaching and increases efficiency. Only teachers should take into account the aforementioned characteristics of the researcher when distinguishing between linguistic and speech units, it is best to ignore concepts that have not yet been tested in practice, ignore new perspectives and turn to clear and consistent interpretations of familiar units. Therefore, we will not dwell in too much detail on the analysis of these terms.

Other differences in the classification and interpretation of linguistic units can be observed in textbooks used in Uzbek linguistics and language education, especially in higher philological education, which indicates that the border between linguistics and language education has practically disappeared.

Take, for example, textbooks created for higher education by representatives of the Bukhara linguistic school, which were originally called formal–functional, immanent, and then meaningful, and are now called meaningful. In particular, in the textbook, professors Kh. Nematova and R. Rasulova presented language and speech units in the form of 3 different linguistic units (phoneme, morpheme, pattern). There are 7 types of speech units (sound, letter, syllable, phrase, sentence, compound sentence, text) and a total of 10 language units (Nematova, Rasulova, 1993). However, representatives of this school M. Abuzalova and S. Nazarova (2008) distinguish between language and speech and say that there are 4 types of language and 5 types of speech units. There are the following specific units of language and speech:

Linguistic units – phoneme, morpheme, lexeme, pattern; speech units – sound, suffix, word (artificial word, compound word...), phrase, speech (Abuzalova, Nazarova, 2008). For the sake of fairness, it should be noted that, unlike Sh. Rakhmatullaev and A. Nurmonov, representatives of the school use almost all language units–terms with suffixes. However, when recording units of speech, they prefer to use the terms that have been used until now. We approve of that too. However, it should be noted that the number of basic units of a linguistic structure is not limited to linguistic and speech units. If this were so, our speech would not be so attractive, touching, figurative, meaningful and expressive. However, the Uzbek language is not left out of the speeches created by world languages. This means that the units of the modern Uzbek literary language have not yet found their complete classification and interpretation.

Unfortunately, subsequent studies also failed to reflect the system of linguistic units in accordance with objective reality. On the contrary, it has been shown that their number is limited to a minimum. This relatively new information belongs to the researcher M. Khairullaev, who emphasizes that there are 3 different language units, according to which there are no more than three language levels: ... the definition of language levels should be consistent with its units. Thus, the language should not have more levels than phonemic, morphemic and verbal. The level of word formation cannot have a special status, because an artificial word does not require any unity, except for the word (Khairullaev, 2010).

In our opinion, the views of Professor S. Usmanov, who was the first in Uzbek linguistics to try to scientifically substantiate that language and speech, their units are interconnected, but different phenomena, units, and who managed to do this complex work in one language of the fundamental basis, deserve attention. It is noteworthy that at that time, that is, in the 60s, he did the most important work on which many focused in the 90s: the scientific and practical distinction of language (speech) and speech, the definition of units for each of them, enumeration them one by one and writing them down with some comments made for comparison, S. Usmanov’s observations seem closer to objective reality–to the modern Uzbek literary language, to its founders, than to most modern interpretations. He notes that...includes the element of language and the phenomenon of language:

1. The sum of individual derived words, that is, the total vocabulary;
2. Morphemes (i.e. stems and single affixes);
3. Stable phrases, complex terms, phraseological expressions;

4. The phoneme system of the language;
5. Existing grammar rules;
6. Permanent (stable) synonymy, homonymy and polysemy. Speech phenomena and elements of speech include:
 1. Modal and verbal forms of the word;
 2. Free expressions;
 3. Compound (that is, “compound”) verbs, complex numbers;
 4. The gap;
 5. Specific speech sounds, that is, variants of phonemes;
 6. Newly formed words (neologisms).

Of course, sixty years have passed since then, some terms and definitions have been clarified, but it is clear that S. Usmanov is far ahead of us in defining linguistic and speech units. Proof of this is that a single newly created word is interpreted as a unit of speech. Such cases cannot go unnoticed only by the most talented linguists. In the 90s, this situation was observed only in Kh. Nematov (1995). But even then, he noted them not in a direct classification, but in response to critical opinions when he defended his views.

Obviously, since the 1960s, special observations have been made in Uzbek linguistics for the classification of linguistic units depending on language (speech) and speech differences, and on this basis for their determination and quantitative assessment. But so far no satisfactory answer has been found. And research continues in its own form. This article has been supplemented by research in the field of Uzbek linguistics over the past two decades with the aim of contributing to a positive solution to this problem, albeit to a lesser extent.

Conclusion

Each type and unit form has its own semantic–functional, structural properties, and this is known to many linguistic sciences. There are separate degrees and interdisciplinary subjects that study them. In addition, phonology, phoneme, morphology, lexicology, lexeme, onomasiology, morpheme, syntax, sentence, phraseology are analyzed in parts. But the fact is that the interpretations of these studies, the correctness of their conclusions, the description in them of the types, content, meaning and function of linguistic units are clearly, reasonably, fully reflected. Unfortunately, most of the problems appeared in the same process, in particular, our article cannot be an exception too. Consequently, these blocks and related issues are separate objects of research that require special research work. Therefore, in our further studies, it is appropriate to dwell on this in more detail.

References

- Абузалова М., Назарова С. Тилшунослик асослари. Бухоро: 2008. – б. 144.
- Шокиров У. ва бошқалар. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. Т.: Янги авлод. 2001. – б. 264.
- Неъматов Х., Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили лексикологияси асослари. – Т.: Укитувчи, 1995. – б. 156.
- Рахматуллаев Ш. Тил қурилишининг асосий бирликлари. Т.: 2002. – б. 168.
- Рахматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Дарслик. Т.: 2006. – б. 244.
- Усмонов С. Ўзбек тилида сўзларнинг морфологик таркиби. Т.: Мухлис, 2010. – б. 156.
- Халбеков И. Д. Тил бирликларининг иерархик муносабати. Т.: Фан, 2008. – б. 144.

Ўзбек тилининг лексикологияси. Тошкент: 1981. – б. 4–10.

Шоабдурахмонов Ш., Асқарова М., Хожиев А., Расулов И., Дониёров Ҳ. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Тошкент, 1980 йил.

Миртожиев М. Ўзбек тили лексикологияси ва лексикографияси. Тошкент, 2000 йил.

Ирискулов М. Тилшуносликка кириш, Тошкент, 1992 йил.

Турсунов У., Мухторов Ж., Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Тошкент, 1992 йил.

Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Тошкент, 1966 йил.

Абдуллаев Ф. Тил қандай ривожланади? Тошкент, 1972 йил.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).