CLASSIFICATION SYMBOLS OF WORDS

T. Rustamov*; X. M. Jumanazarov**; U. Almatova***; Z. X. Mamaziyayev****;

Z. A. Alibekova*****

*Assistant Professor,
PhD,
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: ilhom.rustamov.1982@mail.ru

**Lecturer,
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: ismoil.jumanazarov@mail.ru

***Senior Lecturer,
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: almato78@mail.ru

****Lecturer,
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: zoxid.mamaziyayev.@gmail.com

*****Lecturer,
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: alibekovazilola91@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The article looks at the classification features of word clusters, a complex and frequently discussed issue such as word classification in the history of linguistics. Indeed, the word as a spiritual and grammatical whole requires each researcher to determine its nature, lexical and grammatical description accordingly, as well as to study the classification of words and their division into lexical-grammatical groups for linguists of each period, remains an important issue. In a language system, all lexical units are required to have semantic, syntactic, and morphological features. Therefore, as the role and meaning of words in the system are determined, it is necessary to pay attention to the same three signs of them. In the classification of words, these signs are generalized. The possibilities of categorizing words prove once again that language is a holistic system. In the language system, the differentiation of events in a particular group is limited to a distinctive sign at a particular level, and there is no need to refer to other levels. For this reason, while categories such as noun, adjective, number, and verb differ morphologically, the similarity of semantic and syntactic characters is sought.

KEYWORDS: *Noun, Noun, Subject, Conjunction, Preposition, Adverbs, Transitive And Intransitive Verbs, Lexicon, Grammatical Field.*

INTRODUCTION

In the history of linguistics, there seems to be no more complicated and much-discussed issue than word classification. From the time of the Indian Panini, the Greek Aristotle, and the Arabic linguist Sabawayh, everyone has been pondering this subject. Zyero, as a semantic and grammatical whole of the word, requires each researcher to determine its nature and, accordingly, a lexical and grammatical description. Such a description can be achieved by identifying and classifying indirect similarities and differences in words. Therefore, the study of the classification of words and their division into lexical-grammatical groups remains an important problem for linguistics of any period.

According to the classification that has become a tradition in Arabic linguistics, words were divided into categories of nouns, verbs, and letters. In Western linguistics, the practice of dividing words into more than a dozen groups relative to grammatical features has spread. As the famous linguist S.D. Katselson wrote, "the application of the traditional classification of words to descriptive grammar leaves no doubt" [1, p.128]. The same tradition continues in contemporary research, including functional and communicative grammars [2].

RESEARCH DESIGN

The problem with the classification of word groups is, first of all, that this classification does not have a single principle. Henry Suite, the first author of theoretical grammar of the English language, chose morphological indicators as the main principle and divided lexical units into declinable and indeclinable words. The same author goes the way of classifying words in relation to their syntactic functions, distinguishing between noun-words and verb-words. From the first group, in addition to the original horses, there are diamonds, numbers, adjectives, and so on. Gerundi, infinitive, adjectives are included in the group of verb-words based on morphological indicators.

Invariant words include conjunctions, prepositions, and adverbs that do not have such a function, as well as acting as an independent part of speech.

Danish linguist Otto Yespyersyen argues that it is impossible to combine the principles of form and function. In his view, when relying on a morphological indicator (variability and immutability) in the classification of word groups, words such as must, the, then, for, enough would have to be grouped into a single group. This author prefers to categorize lexical units according to the syntactic positions they occupy. The nouns that make up the main part of a phrase and have a place in the sentence are called "primary" and the nouns that replace the second part are called "secondary" and the nouns that define these primary and secondary words. Suggests calling them "tertiary" horses [3].

Another linguist, Charles Friese, completely rejected the traditional classification of word groups and recommended that this classification be based solely on the syntactic place of words in a sentence. Although Ch.Friz took the four categories of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, but the principle of their classification is to occupy a syntactic place. For example, group 1 includes the words concert and tax in the sentences The concert was good and The clerk remembered the tax, while group 2 includes the elements was (to be) and remembered in these sentences. Finally, group 3 takes good place in the first sentence, and group 4 includes words of the type there [4].

Indeed, their classification features play an important role in determining the grammatical properties of words. Take, for example, the phrase My friend lives in London, and we see that each word in it can be replaced by words that are grammatically correct. In particular, we see that the words my, his, our, this, their are used instead of the word my, and the use of the words brother, family, wife is prohibited. These words and similar ones like father, teacher, sister can replace the word friend in the quoted sentence. It is possible to replace the element of lives in this

sentence with words such as arrives, stays, works. All this testifies to the need to divide lexical units into certain groups in the language system.

On the other hand, it is not possible to classify these same words in relation to differences in the grammatical categories they represent. In particular, we see that words such as brother, family father, group, which can be used instead of the word friend, have a number category: friends, family - families, wife - wives, sister - sisters, etc. Also, words such as arrives, stays, works, which can replace lives, are defined by the specifics of the time category: works - worked, arrives - arrived, comes - came, etc. Of course, it is recommended to apply this feature to the classification of word categories in part, only in relation to variable words.

It should be noted that word groups are the largest groups in the language system. Each word group has its own internal division, taking into account the specific grammatical features of small groups. Consequently, there is a tradition of dividing words in the noun category into countable and uncountable, and verb categories into transitive and intransitive verbs.

Performing a syntactic task and taking into account the position of a word in a sentence is helpful in categorizing words of the same appearance. Because each word in the dictionary fund can only belong to one word group.

Compare:

1. She wore a yellow dress;

2. Do not use this soap – it will yellow your linen;

3. The yellow of an egg is called the York.

Yellow in the quoted sentences is not a single word, but three separate lexemes. These lexemes are described as representatives of different word families: yellow in the first sentence is an adjective, yellow in the second is a verb, and yellow in the third sentence is a noun. The three lexemes differ not only in their participation in sentence construction, but also in their various morphological features and grammatical categories. Adjectives do not have the property of morphological variability, while those in the verb category form word forms (to yellow, yellows, yellowed, yellowing).

It is known that when a lexeme is used in speech, it is expressed in a grammatically complete form, that is, in combination with a grammatical morpheme. However, a lexeme cannot be combined with any grammatical morpheme. Therefore, the series of lexemes in relation to the grammatical category and the different relation to the form are determined. For example, the grammatical rules of the Uzbek language do not allow the structure of speech like "Achillar gullar". However, the structure of "Flowers opened" is in line with the rules. Because, as we have just seen in the analysis of the forms yellow, yellowes in English sentences, open verbs cannot take the plural form. It is a rule that this verb takes the form of the past tense. Therefore, what grammatical category of a lexeme and its form have meaning, and how it enters into a syntagmatic relationship with suffixes, can be regarded as a basis for the classification of words.

In a language system, all lexical units are required to have semantic, syntactic, and morphological features. Therefore, as the role and meaning of words in the system are determined, it is necessary to pay attention to the same three signs. In the classification of words, these signs are generalized. For example, a book in English and a "book" in Uzbek - a semantically independent type of word, a type of lexeme, a specific type of horse in the category of horses. This word is a lexeme belonging to the thematic group "science-culture"; syntactically connected, intertwined, syntactically unlimited lexeme. Its morphological features are variability and fineness.

The authors of the textbook "Modern Uzbek" believe that such a description of the lexeme in three aspects allows drawing a detailed, deep and mutually exclusive, complementary conclusion about

Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities
ISSN: 2249-7315   Vol. 12, Issue 02, February 2022   SJIF 2022 = 8.625
A peer reviewed journal

it **"[5, p383].**

These authors propose a step-by-step separation of the following group of lexemes based on spiritual, syntactic, and morphological classification **[5, pp383-384**]:

Stage	Aspect Group name	Meaning	Syntactic	Morphologic
I	Type	1.Auxiliary 2.Independent	1.Distinctive 2.Connecting	1.Unchangeable 2.Changeable
II	Sort	1.Descriptive 2.Nominative	1.Inoffensive 2.Offensive	1.Countable 2.Rankable 3.Sortable 4.Relatable
III	Volume	1.Symbol 2.Name	1.Limited 2.Unlimited	Syntagmatic attitudes
IV	Parts of speech	1.Noun 2.Adjective 3.Numeral 4.Verb 5.Adverb 6.Modal verb 7.Exclamation 8.Imitation	1.Conjunction 2.Auxiliary 3.Particle	Syntagmatic attitudes
V	Type	Parts of speech includes	Parts of speech includes	
VI	Group theme	Type includes		
VII	Vocabulary meaning group	In Group theme		
VIII	Dictionary series	Within the lexical meaning group		

It is clear from the table that in the semantic classification the division goes from type to a separate lexical row, in the syntactic classification it is limited to the category, and in the morphological classification it is limited to the class stage. The main reason for this is the uniqueness and originality of the lexeme, while the grammar has a very generalizing nature.

The possibilities of categorizing words prove once again that language is a holistic system. In the language system, in the differentiation of events in a particular group, there is no need to be limited to a separate level of distinction and to refer to other levels. For this reason, while categories such as noun, adjective, number, verb differ morphologically, the similarity of semantic and syntactic nouns is sought. Based on the table above, all of these categories are combined into a single ball, i.e., a nomenclature ball, in the classification process. For the same reason, the semantic differentiation of words belonging to this category had posed a major problem in traditional linguistics. As a result, the question of whether the element "good" in both cases refers to quality or to different word groups in structures such as "A good student reads well" has caused a great deal of controversy. It has now become clear that the morphologically differentiated word must take into account the semantic and syntactic convergence.

In works on Uzbek grammar, adjectives, numerals, verbs, adverbs, adverbs, and adverbs are usually evaluated as possessives. This is due to the fact that the categories of ownership and ownership are unreasonably included in the categories of classification. However, these categories cannot be a factor in the movement of words from one category to another. For example, the word "gold" can come in the form of a possessive, and in the function of determining the meaning of an object - the meaning of a sign:

a) Gold - a precious metal;

b) A gold watch is being sold in a shop.

CONCLUSION

According to some scholars, in the process of speech transposition in this form, the word "gold" remains a member of a single set of words without changing its lexical and grammatical features **[5, p.387].**

The morphological principle of word group classification is based in detail in the works of famous Russian linguists such as AM Pyeshkovsky, DN Ushakov, FF.Fortunativ, MN Pyetyerson. But no matter how far this principle differs in its logical consistency, it is not without a number of shortcomings. The one-sidedness of morphological classification, its weakness in some cases, was strongly criticized by Russian academicians VV Vinogradiv, LV Shchchyerba **[6].**

None of the semantic, morphological, and syntactic principles mentioned above allow for the complete division of lexical units in a language system into groups. In the application of any principle, it can be observed that a certain number of words remain in the range of categories. Academician L.V. Schchcherba once wrote about this: "When it comes to word groups, no researcher is required to classify words according to a certain standard. He must determine which classification belongs to the language system. ...... there is no need to be afraid that some words do not belong to any category, so we do not really put them in any category "**[7, p.64].**

Seeing the difficulties in the classification of word groups, linguists were forced to look for a solution to this problem through the application of field theory. Proponents of the application of field theory show that any word group contains a group of words with all the distinguishing features of that category, which are at the center of the field. However, there are also units that have only a certain portion of the characters specific to this category. Thus, in the grammatical field, the central and boundary elements exist in the same, interrelated way. The task of researchers is to determine the area of the lexical-grammatical field, to distinguish the grammatical features of its units and to know which features of them correspond to words in other categories **[8].**

Thus, the classification of traditionally distinguished word groups is not logically consistent. The separated word groups are the result of "mutual agreement" of semantic, syntactic and morphological approaches **[9].** The tradition of such "mutual agreement" makes the problem of word groups one of the constant problems of linguistics.

When the expressed subject area, i.e., the denotation, fully forms the lexical meaning of the word, grouping relative to the categorical schemes of horses would be sufficient to describe their semiological features. But the set of categorical semantic characters shapes its syntagmatic possibilities rather than defining the nominative value of the word. Semantic grouping is therefore important in determining whether horses are associated with units (e.g., adjectives and verbs) that belong to other word families. **[10]**

One of the important criteria for distinguishing word groups is that the units they contain have some grammatical form. One of the main features of the words in the horse category is that they have a number category. But the dependence of horses on the number category does not look the same.

The difference in languages in which grammatical categories are analytically expressed in synthetic-morphological forms is reflected in the occurrence of a particular pattern.

The question of the expression of the plural in famous horses is a little-studied field. Most researchers completely deny that famous horses have a plural meaning. British scientists such as H. Suniy, A. Gardinier acknowledge the existence of collectively famous horses. According to them, when famous horses are used in the plural, the plural is taken in the singular. The same idea is supported by P. Christopher. **[11]**

In various textbooks and manuals, we find a description of the phenomenon of word groups: "Word groups are lexical-grammatical groups of words." No matter how accurate this description may seem, it needs some explanation. First, the contribution of the original lexical meaning in the separation of word groups is insignificant. Second, it should be noted that grammatical groups differ on the basis of syntactic and morphological indicators. Third, it is necessary to determine whether the word itself or the word form is grouped. **[12]**

REFERENCES

1. Katsnelson SD. Typology of language and speech thinking. London: Nauka; 1972. p. 128.

2. Slyusareva NA. Problems of functional morphology of the English language. Moscow: Nauka; 1986.

3. Jespersen O. Philosophy of Grammar. Moscow; 1958.

4. Fries Ch. The Structure of English. NewYork: Brace; 1952.

5. Modern Uzbek language. Morphology. Tashkent: Classic Word; 2008. p.387.

6. Kubryakova ES. Parts of speech in onomasiological coverage. Moscow: Nauka; 1978.

7. Shzerba LV. About frequent speeches in Russian. In kN: Selected Works on the Russian Language. London, 1957. p.64.

8. Shchur GS. Field theory in linguistics. Moscow: Nauka; 1974.

9. Beloshapkova VA. etc. Modern Russian language. Moscow: Higher School; 1981.

10. Ivanova IB, Burlakova VV, Pochentsov GG. Theoretical grammar of modern English. Moscow: Higher School, 1981.

11. Rustamov I. Ethnic Stereotypes in Anecdotes. Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI, 2020;1(96).

12. Rustamov I. National Stereotyped View Of Anecdotes. Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI, 2020;1(96).