

## **Views of World and Uzbeki Linguists on System-Structural Linguistics**

**Saydaliyeva Dilzodaxon Bohodirovna**  
*Teacher of KSPI*

**Annotation:** In this article, the study issues of systemic-structural linguistics and the different views of world and Uzbek linguists are highlighted. It is known that language is the most important means of communication between people. It is the main means of conveying information about certain events in objective existence. It turns out that there are other ways of information transfer.

**Keywords:** linguistics, comparative linguistics, structure, system linguistics, text, Structuralism.

Language is among the above tools that serve to convey information. The common thing for all of them is to provide information, first of all, about oneself, and at the same time, about other known events in existence. Such tools are called symbols. In the process of knowing the world around him, a person reflects the elements of the world in his mind through images, and the elements of the world reflected in this mind are expressed through symbols. Any material representation of social information is a symbol. The fact that the language is a sign system is its main feature. Until the end of the 19th century, philosophers were mainly engaged in the theory of symbols. Only from the end of the 19th century, this issue attracted the attention of psychologists. The philosophical theory of symbols has a long history. The ancient Greeks were secretly based on the concept of signs in their scientific debates about the essence of things and their naming. Under the influence of philosophers, in almost all linguistic works devoted to the general theory of language from the 19th century, the word began to be interpreted as a sign with a dual character. In the works of V. Humboldt, A. Schleicher, L. Breal, A. Maye, F. Fortunatov, I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, N. Krushevsky, the word is approached from the point of view of signs. But F. de Saussure clearly explained the sign nature of language. He even emphasized that there is a separate science dealing with the theory of signs - the science of semiology, and that linguistics should also be part of semiology. On the one hand, due to the success of structuralism, and on the other hand, due to the development of the science of semiotics, interest in the problem of signs has increased since the 50s. The study of linguistic problems in the semiotic aspect led to a change in the position of linguistics itself. It has also become a central science in the system of human knowledge.

In the history of linguistics, the period before systematic-structural linguistics is often referred to as traditional linguistics. An important aspect of traditional linguistics is the descriptive study of the studied object based on the specific noun given by the senses. Some scholars understand "traditional linguistics" as the opposite of "modern linguistics". In particular, the same idea was expressed by R.A. Budagov more than 20 years ago. He emphasized that the use of the terms "traditional linguistics" and "modern linguistics" as if they mean "old, backward linguistics" and "new, advanced linguistics" is completely foreign to Marxist doctrine. In fact, "traditional linguistics" does not contradict "modern linguistics" or "modern linguistics". Here, "traditional linguistics" does not only mean the purely chronological meaning, that is, the meaning of

"linguistics up to now", but it is based on two stages of knowledge in the epistemological sense, and from the ontological point of view, the nature and essence of language is two different. It is evaluated as an approachable science and contrasted with linguistics, which is called systematic linguistics. They are two equal areas of linguistics that differ from each other both in terms of approach to language ontology and in terms of the methodology and methods of its verification. These two directions of linguistics do not reject each other, but one is based on the results of the other. That's why both linguistics are taking steps now. Dividing the history of linguistics into three periods, E. Benveniste states that a new period of linguistics began in the first quarter of the 20th century, that is, the period of a systematic-structural approach to language. From this period, the attention of linguistics was not focused on the philosophy of language, nor on the evolution of language, but on the immanent (lat. *immanens*, *im-manentis* specific; private) reality of language. As a result, linguistics began to strive to become a formal, compact, systematic science. However, this should not lead to the idea that traditional linguistics has stopped and given way to structural linguistics. It was from this period that structural linguistics began to take root.

True, signs of systematicity in Uzbek linguistics up to the 70s and 80s cannot be denied. Because each new scientific direction is formed in the bosom of the old one and grows out of it. F. Mikush claims that any linguistic direction in a certain sense shows an element of structuralism. But any direction that does not determine the typical structure of the language and does not rely on it cannot be evaluated as a structural direction. In Uzbek linguistics, since the methodology of systematic linguistics and the method of verification have been popular since the 70s, it is unnecessary to search for the principles of systematicity from earlier studies. L.S. Barkhudarov also emphasized that traditional linguistics does not have strict scientific research methods such as distribution, transformation, binary opposition, as in structural linguistics. It is inappropriate to interpret systematic linguistics, which is opposed to traditional linguistics, as "advanced linguistics". First of all, the views of representatives of systematic linguistics are not the same, and in many cases they even contradict each other. In particular, F. de Saussure himself divides linguistics into internal and external linguistics and thinks only about internal linguistics. Foreign linguistics is beyond his attention. F. de Saussure's view that language is not a substance, but a form, became the main idea of the glossematic direction of structural linguistics, and they interpreted language as a system of pure relations, separated from materiality. Studying the relationships between the structural units of the language was considered the main task of linguistics. However, a number of issues such as language and society, language and speaker, language evolution, the relationship between literary language and folk dialects, language and thought, text linguistics, and language aesthetics remain out of his view. The direction of functional linguistics, while developing F. de Saussure's view that speech activity consists of the interaction of language and speech, paid attention to the development of language through speech and the implementation of language-speech dichotomy at all levels of language. Therefore, speech activity was approached from the point of view of both substance and form, and at the same time, a number of the above issues that were overlooked by glossematics attracted the attention of functional linguistics. With this, functional linguistics was connected with traditional linguistics. American generative linguistics has become even closer to traditional linguistics.

From the 70s of the 20th century, structuralism began to enter Uzbek linguistics. In this field, the services of Professor Sh. Rahmatullayev, who divided the lexical units of the Uzbek language into macro and microsystems and recommended a number of their microsystems to his students as a monographic research object, should be highlighted.

I. Kochkortoyev developed the ideas of Sh. Rahmatullayev and conducted extensive scientific research in this field. The research on the distinction between language and speech, the relationship between form and content in language units, and the linguistic concept of F. de Saussure was of great importance in the formation and development of the structural direction in Uzbek linguistics. Wide spread of systemic-structural studies coincided with the 80s. During this

period, a number of works were published that researched the phonology, lexicology, and syntax of the Uzbek language from the point of view of its systematic structure. The call for systematic and structural research of all units of the Uzbek language began with the article published by H. Nematov, N. Mahmudov and A. Nurmonov. As a result, it can be said that the period of attack on systematic research in Uzbek linguistics has begun. After that, A. Nurmonov's "Phonology and Morphology of the Uzbek Language" (1992), dedicated to the phonological system of the Uzbek language, A. Abduazizov's book of the same name (1994), devoted to the morpheme paradigmatics and syntagmatics of the Uzbek language monograph by T. Mirzakulov (1994), "Basics of Uzbek language system lexicology" (1995) by H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov, devoted to the system lexicology of the Uzbek language, R. Rasulov's "O "Semantic structure of verbs of the Uzbek language" (1990), "Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language" of the group of authors. Morphology" (2001); "Substantive syntax of the Uzbek language", "Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language" devoted to the syntactic system of the Uzbek language. Syntax", A. Berdialiyev's "Semantic-significant paradigmatics in compound sentence constructions with subordinate clauses" (2001), "Structural syntax of the Uzbek language" by M. Qurbonova, R. Sayfullayeva (2004), "Introduction to functional syntax" by N. Turniyozov (2003), H. Ne'matov and O. Bozorov's "Language and Speech" (1989) devoted to the dichotomy of language and speech, O. Bozorov's "Graduation in Uzbek" (1997) devoted to the classification of linguistic units, linguistic A. Nurmonov's works dedicated to the sign "Linguistic sign and its characteristics" (2008) and several other monographic studies and scientific articles were published.

**Conclusion.** as can be seen from the above-mentioned principles, it incorporates the most rational aspects typical of all three branches of systemic-structural directions and the teachings of Eastern philosophy about perceptual and perceptual knowledge of the object. This direction pays more attention to the internal structure and function of linguistic units. Therefore, it is appropriate to call it "structural-functional direction".

## References

1. Неъматов Ҳ. Ўзбек тили тарихий фонетикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992. Б.5.
2. Shleyxer A. Der Ursprung der Sprache. 1851; Maye A. Urushdan keyingi Evropadagi lingvistik vaziyatning sharhini nashr etdi (1918); Фортунатов Ф. Ф. О происхождении глаголицы. — СПб., 1903; Бодуэн де Куртенэ И.А. Национальный и территориальный признак в автономии. — СПб.: Типография М. М. Стасюлевича, 1913; Н.Крушевский. Избранные труды по языкознанию. М.: Наследие, 1998.
3. Будагов Р.А. Очерки по языкознанию. 1953. – С.19.
4. Nurmonov A. Struktur tilshunoslik: ildizlari va yoʻnalishlari. – Toshkent: Taʼlim, 2009. – B.31.
5. Qoʻchqortoyev I. F. de Sossyurning lingvistik konsepsiyasi. – Toshkent, 1976.
6. Yigitaliyeva, S., & Yoʻldoshboyeva, O. (2023). OLIY TALIMDA ONA TILI FANINI OʻQITISHNING NAZARIY MASALALARI. *Общественные науки в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования*, 2(8), 41-44.
7. Yigitaliyeva, S. (2023). Yaxshilik konseptining bilvosita ifodalanishi. *Mugʻallim*.
8. Isogʻaliyevna, Y. S. (2023). Boshlangʻich sinf oʻquvchilariga ona tili darslarini oʻrgatishning lingvistik konseptual asoslari. *Integratsiyalashgan taʼlim va tadqiqotlar jurnali*.
9. Yigitaliyeva, S. (2022). Hayrat-ul abror dostonida soʻz taʼrifi. *Scienceweb academic papers collection*.
10. Egamkulovna, A. M. (2023). USING A SPELLING DICTIONARY IN STUDYING LITERACY AND CORRECTING STUDENTS' MISTAKES. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(2), 194-199.

11. Egamkulovna, A. M. (2022). Enhancing students' oral and written speech through educational dictations in primary school mother tongue classes.
12. EGAMKULOVNA, A. M. Lexical Devices Used in Lyrical Works in the Textbook. *JournalNX*, 7(1), 88-90.
13. Makhramovna, B. D. (2023). Methodical Views of Nizamiddin Mahmudov. *World of Science: Journal on Modern Research Methodologies*, 2(3), 149-154.
14. Boshmanova, D. (2023). Nizomiddin Mahmudovning lingvistik qarashlari. *Qo'qon DPI. Ilmiy habarlar*.
15. Valieva, M. S. (2022). LINGVOCULTUROLOGY AND PAREMIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF A LANGUAGE. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(12), 1223-1228.
16. Валиева, М. С. (2022). Лингвокультурология как особая научная дисциплина. *Экономика и социум*, (5-1 (96)), 346-348.
17. Soliyevich, I. Z. (2023). LINGVOPOETIKANING O'RGANILISH TARIXI. *Conferencea*, 199-204.
18. Isaqov, Z., & Abduganieva, M. Attention to Literature is the Attention to The Owners of Our Bright Future. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*.
19. Isaqov, Z. S. 2nd Grade in the Textbook" Native Language and Reading Literacy" the Use of Types of Words According to the Attitude of Form and Meaning. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*.
20. Oripova, K. (2022). Turli tillardagi antonimlarning strukturaviy jihatlari. *Scienceweb academic papers collection*.
21. Oripova, K. (2022). Ingliz tilidagi antonimlarning o'ziga xos xususiyatlari. *Scienceweb academic papers collection*.
22. Andrew, J. S. (2023). ARTISTIC DISCOURSE AND ANTONYMS IN IT AS A CULTURAL FACTOR. *Open Access Repository*, 9(3), 409-411.
23. Орипова, К. Э. ЎХШАТИШЛАР ИШТИРОКИДАГИ БАДИИЙ МАТНЛАРДА АНТОНИМЛАР МАДАНИЙ ОМИЛ СИФАТИДА. *МУ АЛЛИМ ЁЎМ ЗЛИКСИЗ БИЛИМЛЕНДИРИ*<sup>2</sup>, 52.
24. Oripova, K. (2023). PROBLEMS IN THE STUDY OF ANTONYMS IN COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS. *Scienceweb academic papers collection*.
25. Shahista, K., Shohida, I., & Saidaxon, M. (2023). COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND GERMAN LANGUAGES. *O'ZBEKISTONDA FANLARARO INNOVATSIYALAR VA ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI*, 2(20), 46-49.