



COMPARATIVE STUDY OF VERB CONSTRUCTIONS OF RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Mukhammadieva Dilafruz Kudratovna

2nd-year master's student

of the Denau Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8005761>

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 25-May 2023 yil

Ma'qullandi: 28-May 2023 yil

Nashr qilindi: 03-June 2023 yil

KEY WORDS

comparison, comparison, verb, construction.

ABSTRACT

The article examines typological differences of verb constructions with an object relation in the Russian and Uzbek languages. The facts are revealed and observations and conclusions made on their basis can be used to deepen and expand scientific theoretical ideas about the system of Russian and Tajik verb constructions with a dependent object, about the use of these constructions in written artistic narrative.

Currently, the comparative study of different-structured languages is one of the main directions in typological linguistics, as the great scientific-theoretical and scientific-practical value of the results of such studies is becoming increasingly obvious. It is also natural that one of the components of comparative analysis is often the Russian language, without knowledge of which it is impossible to join the peaks of science and art achievements.

Comparative language learning is directly related to the problems of typology and linguistic universals.

Touching upon the issue of typological comparison, V.M.Solntsev notes that "linguistic research can be defined as typological provided that at least two languages are compared. . The very fact of comparing different languages (at least two) is a constant moment of any typological research."

The Czech linguist V. Skalichka quite correctly sees the ultimate goal of comparing languages in the need to determine the ts of go, "what is common to all languages, in other words, what are the universals, and, conversely, what is specific only for some languages."

A.V. Isachenko defines the role of comparison as a methodological technique in language teaching and as a way for theoretical study of both languages. "A consistent comparison of the two languages allows us to reveal the structure of both languages with greater clarity.

When approaching the language being studied from the point of view of another language system, such features of this language can also be noticed that the traditional grammar of this language has been ignored."

A methodically important conclusion from the practice of comparing languages is that "it is not individual facts that should be compared, but small systems." Moreover, it is necessary to take into account the correlation of the areas of morphology and syntax, because many values transmitted in the language

of one system at the morphological level are expressed in another language at the syntax level." In addition, "when comparing languages, it is impossible to compare all the linguistic facts at the same time, since the specifics of each side of the language requires a special approach to them. The sound side of the language, the vocabulary system and the grammatical structure of the language have different properties."

Thus, it is not languages that should be compared, but separate categories of morphology and syntax that are of fundamental importance for the languages studied as a whole.

I.I.Meshchaninov, studying the different-structured material of languages, attached great importance to syntax, because against its background the morphological design of the word receives the greatest coverage. The choice of one or another way of expressing syntactic relations in the structure of the language by using the comparative typology of different-structured languages will deepen the study of the entire language system.

The features of the comparative syntax of verbal constructions, their semantics and structure have been studied incompletely, while the uniqueness of syntactic constructions of one language is especially pronounced when comparing them with the corresponding constructions of other languages, because "it makes it possible to express the same thought by other means and helps to reveal a variety of means of expression in the native".

Verb constructions show the similarity and originality of languages with the greatest force.

By the term "construction" we mean: "a syntactic whole, which includes linguistic units combined in speech, combined with each other due to their inherent grammatical properties."

The syntactic compatibility of a verb is its ability as a lexeme to have a distributor with it. Particular attention is paid to the compatibility of the verb, since the verb system. "more syncretic and more syntactic than the system of all other significant parts of speech." "The verb is the most complex and the most capacious grammatical category. The verb is the most constructive in comparison with all other categories of parts of speech. Verb constructions have a decisive influence on nominal phrases and sentences.

An important feature of the verb is that it occupies "as a rule, a central position in the semantic structure of the sentence."

In modern Russian, the observations and conclusions of A.A.Potebni, A.A.Shakhmatova, A.M.Peshkovsky, V.V.Vinogradov, etc. have not lost their significance yet. We consider it necessary to emphasize that even today it is impossible to consider the problems of syntax and semantics of verbal constructions without referring to the works of V.V.Vinogradov, whose grammatical concept has had a decisive impact on the development of morphological and syntactic science for several decades.

In recent decades, N.Y.Shvedova, G.A.Zolotova, Z.D. have worked fruitfully in the field of studying the semantics and syntax of Russian cases. Popova, Y.N.Karaulov, E.V.Klobukov, M.V.Vsevolodova, etc.

One of the most complete descriptions of constructions expressing object relations is contained in Russian Grammar.

The question of the semantic scope of each of the components of the structure of the construction in the linguistic literature is ambiguously solved and the object as a component of the semantic structure is understood in different ways, the question of the scope of the

concept of "object" is controversial.

Thus, in Russian grammar it is indicated that "the meaning of an object can be concretized as an object of a specific action (A neighbor repairs a car), speech (We are talking about business), thoughts (A mother thinks about children), perception (I see mountains), distance and approach (the train departs from the station), the addressee (A brother gives a book to his sister), an emotional relationship (a father loves his son).

Thus, this approach can be defined as a "broad understanding" of the object component of the semantic structure of the sentence. There are, however, many studies in which, on the contrary, a component with the meaning of an object (in a broad sense) is distributed among numerous categories of actants with names corresponding to the function performed by the actant. Thus, T.B. Alisova identifies 14 functions of actants, detailed taking into account the influence of predicate semantics on them.

So, it can be noted that in the linguistic literature there is no single view on the question of the place of an object in the semantic structure of a sentence. In a broad sense (Russian Grammar, 1980), a number of subject components are summed up under the object, including the object of physical action, speech, thought, perception, removal or approximation, addressee, emotional attitude, etc. In its narrow understanding (T.B. Alisova, Yu.D. Apresyan, etc.), the object is defined only as the object on which the action is directed. The remaining components with a subject value receive the definition of the addressee, recipient, instrument, etc.

Adhering to the point of view of the Russian grammar of 1980, we consider object relations in a broad sense: they denote the subject in its appeal to the action that is directed at this subject. Under the action in this definition is understood not only a specific, active activity, an active state, but also an inactive state: intellectual appeal, internal attitude to someone-L. Therefore, the object value is present not only in such cases as chopping firewood and reading a book, but also in phrases to influence the son, to enjoy music.

In the circle of syntactic relations of the verb, the predicative connection is distinguished, on the basis of which the predicative basis of the sentence is formed, and the subordinate connection regulating the set of distributors, and which is defined by N.Y. Shvedova as ".the connection of a word, in the totality of its forms, with one particular form of another word.

All verb forms have a subordinate connection: finite, infinitive, participle and adverbial, so it can be recognized as a universal type of connection for the verb.

References:

1. Abramov B.A. Syntactic potencies of the verb. // Philol.sciences. -M., 1966, No. 3. - pp.10-17.
2. Admoni V.G. Qualitative and quantitative analysis of grammatical phenomena. // VYA, 1968, No. 4. pp.5-12.
3. Avaliani Yu.Yu. To paradigmatic connections of analytical forms. // Tr. Samarc. State. Un-ta im. Navoi, issue 169. Samarkand, 1969. -pp.1-11.
4. Ayny S. Oid ba vaziyati zaborshinosii tojik. // Shar[^] and surkh. -Stalinobod, 1952, No. 6. pp.3-8.
5. Alisova T.B. Experience of semantic and grammatical classification of simple sentences. // VYA, 1970, No. 2. pp.9-16.
6. Apresyan Yu.D. Lexical semantics. // Synonymic means of language. M., 1974. - p.122-125.z