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ABSTRACT

The article discusses the main features of the construction of German, Russian, Arabic and Uzbek by comparing the stem of the verb in these languages.
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I. Introduction

The founder of theoretical linguistics V. According to Humboldt, some elements of the language embody its characteristic features. In order to find out if this is true, you can compare the stem of one verb in four languages: қр’ – чита – les – read (o’qi). In Arabic, the root consists of three consonants and has not only a grammatical but also a lexical meaning. If one vowel is added to it after each consonant, a lexical and several grammatical meaning appears at once. The past tense, third person, singular includes: қара’а – o’qidi. In Russian, the root of the verb has only a lexical (name) meaning.

II. Literature review

A suffix is required to express the grammatical meaning: чита­й – o’qi. In German, the lexical meaning is understood from the root and the grammatical meaning is expressed by vowel change: lies – o’qi. In the Uzbek language, we face a completely different situation. From the root (o’qi) of the verb, it is first understood that the lexical meaning, as in the Russian language, is that the action is a human activity. In addition, as in Russian and German, the possibility (valence) of combination with possessive, complementary, case is felt. At the same time, about ten grammatical meanings are understood from the root.

Person (listener), number (singularity), mood (command), tense (future), participle (affirmative), respect (neutral), ratio (head form), manner, aspect (neutrality of action completion, etc.) and sense- neutrality of feeling (expression depends on accent, etc.) is one of them. The root of the verb also performs a communicative function. By expressing a single thought, it prompts the listener to perform an implicit action. Predicativeness is fully expressed as an imperative sentence: O’qi (Read). It should be noted that in the modern Uzbek literary language, the core of the verb is the smallest sentence, and all other forms of the sentence are formed from it with additions and other means. It seems that the tool, which has been considered as a zero-indicative form until now, functions as a lexical, grammatical, and communicative unit.

III. Analysis

In Russian and German languages, the lexical and grammatical meaning are expressed by separate means, while in Arabic, both consonants and vowels participate in the expression of the lexical meaning, and the grammatical meaning is expressed only by means of vowels. In the Uzbek language, not only the lexical and grammatical meaning, but also the communicative meaning can be understood from the root of the verb without any additional means. The main reason for this is that the perception of existence of these peoples, or rather, during the formation of national languages, the way events in existence are transformed into concepts and ideas was not the same. The Arab (Som) and Uzbek (Turkish) peoples followed the path of thrift, while the Slavic and Germanic peoples followed the path of non-thrift. There is a similar difference in other word groups [2, 6365].

According to the studies of the spiritual-social or idealistic-materialistic direction, frugality is characteristic of all linguistic units in the Uzbek language in different forms and degrees. Including the economical use of adverbs [3, 124]¹, contraction [10, 2004], not using a word in a compound, not using an independent and auxiliary word in a sentence, formal and substantive inconsistency in simple and compound sentences, the

¹ G.P. Melnikov considers the sparing use of affixes to be the main characteristic of all Turkic languages.
semantics of a compound sentence followed by a simple sentence, a possessive message, an organized sentence, the presupposition, the event of implication, the incomplete sentence are all different forms of economy. Based on these, we call economy the main feature of the construction of the Uzbek literary language.

It can be seen from the above brief review that the method of studying by classifying words according to their structure (morphologically, typologically) was founded in the 19th century in comparative-historical linguistics. According to it, Indo-European, Khom-Som (Hamitic-Semitic) languages are called inflectional, and Altaic (Turkish, Mongolian) languages are called agglutinative. Therefore, the word structure in Uzbek is considered to be different from Russian, German, English, French, Arabic, Farsi-Tajik languages. One of these differences is the relationship between the parts of words (stem and suffix) (independent use, non-use, connection to each other), and the second is the expression of lexical, grammatical and connotative (stylistic, suffix) meaning through them.

Due to the fact that peoples whose language is both Indo-European and Altaic lived in the territory of the Shura, the interest in the comparative-typological research method increased, and in accordance with the state policy, the study of other languages compared to the Russian language became a priority. The same happened in Uzbek linguistics. The difference between the Russian language and the Uzbek language was prepared mainly based on the researches of influential Russian scientists (Acad. V.V. Vinogradov, Prof. A.A. Reformatsky). Because theoretical ideas were put into practice and included as a rule in secondary and higher school textbooks, they received the status of universality, universal obligation, and exemplary status.

As an example, let's take the two rules given in the general information section of the Uzbek language textbook. "In agglutinative languages, each grammatical meaning is usually represented by a separate affix. For example, in the Uzbek language, separate affixes express plural and concord meanings: Ishchilari, lar-mukofot-leri topshir-dik. We gave awards to the workers. In inflectional languages, more than one grammatical meaning is usually expressed by a single indicator. For example, in the sentence Эти книги сдаю в библиотеку, the suffix -у at the end of the word сдаю (сдай+у) indicates mood, tense, person, number" [4, 16].

First of all, the comparison is incomplete. In Russian, it is shown that the suffix in the verb (participle) expresses four grammatical meanings, and in Uzbek, it is not said that -di in the verb (topshir-di-k) indicates mood and tense, and -k indicates person and number. If the last suffix (-k) is omitted in the word, it means neutrality in addition to mood, tense, person, and number; If -di is omitted, the number of grammatical meanings increases again. It seems that the plural meaning of the suffix is characteristic not only of the Russian language, but also of the Uzbek language. Russian and Uzbek, if we take a broader view, the difference in the construction of inflectional and agglutinative languages is different.

The difference is that in Russian the root of the word is used to express a lexical meaning, while in Uzbek the root can express both a lexical and a grammatical meaning. Accordingly, in Russian, the stem of the verb is not grammatically formed and cannot be used independently, in Uzbek we see the opposite. There are other peculiarities in the construction, more precisely, the structure of these languages [2, 4357].

From the above brief comparison, it is clear that the claim that adverbs in agglutinative languages have one meaning, and plural in inflectional languages, is not justified. It is known that this opinion in Shura linguistics, including prof. A.A. It was put forward by Reformatsky [5, 212]. In addition, representatives of historical-comparative linguistics in the 19th century claimed that the peoples whose language has an inflectional character are mentally and spiritually superior to the peoples whose language belongs to a different structure. This idea is rejected by V.Humboldt, the famous scientist who considered language as a product of mental activity. Based on my own experience, I can clearly say that he writes that if as many languages with different structures are studied in depth as possible, it will be clear that this point of view is empty, an empty claim, because not a single language can be called purely inflectional [11, 241]. Unfortunately, this claim was also attributed to the language of the ruling people and colonial peoples in Shura linguistics. This point of view was taken as a basis in comparative-typological studies.

IV. Discussion

It should also be recognized that V. Humboldt said that the mental strength of peoples is not the same, therefore the structure of languages is not the same. If the suffix does not combine with the stem as a word, it is called a suffix (young suffix). He writes that such language also expresses a grammatical relationship, but the mental power is somewhat weak.

It should be noted that Leo Weisgerber, a major representative of the young Humboldt movement, does not fully agree with this opinion of his teacher. He writes like this. V. Humboldt said that the rules of
thinking are exactly the same in all nations. Whereas Kant's system of categories consists only of the European system of categories [1, 114, 116].

According to Shura linguists, L. Weisgerber does not distinguish between the logical and the substantive aspect of thinking. He denies the commonality of logical categories (subject, predicate, etc.) for all mankind, admitting that meaningful forms have a national character. In other words, L. Weisgerber is absolutely right when he interprets language as the interdependence (contradiction) of two inner aspects. Accordingly, it can be said that he approached the research object from a dialectical point of view. However, the general metaphysical methodology of the new L. Humboldtists. It prevents a full transition to a Weisgerberian dialectical approach (position). He recognizes the language as a product and activity, which are interrelated, and sees only the unity of these two aspects, mutual harmony and compatibility. He does not consider their mutual competition (борьба) as a conflict (противоречие) that creates incompatibility with each other. Whereas the competition, conflict (борьба) between the derived language and activity (that is, speech with the language system) allows to reveal something that does not exist in the language system. At the same time, it prevents the realization of what is already in the language system. The language system is characterized by meaningful differences and changes in the representation of existence. In the speech, these are eliminated, and the conditions for the formation of a single, multifaceted modern practice and the level of modern scientific knowledge appear [9, 51].

V. Conclusion

The following conclusions can be drawn from these points. When assessing the structure of national languages, it is necessary to recognize that there are specific ways of perceiving the world. The psyche of peoples whose language is so-called inflective uses a two-step synthesis to transform existence into language.

In the people whose language is called agglutinative, the synthesis happens at once. Both phase characteristics occur in the core. In this case V. Humboldt's opinion that what expresses a grammatical meaning is considered a grammatical form is taken into account.
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