

**ON THE PRINCIPLES OF CATEGORIZATION OF WORDS****Nizamova Shakhnoza Ubaydullaevna**

Senior teacher of the Department of primary education of Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, doctor of philosophy in philology (PhD)

**Tashpolatov Azamat Mehmonalievich**

Senior teacher of the Department of primary education of Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, doctor of philosophy in philology (PhD)

**Hamidova Kamola Mamirovna**

Teacher of the Department of primary education of Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, doctor of philosophy in philology (PhD)

**Nizomiddinova Dildora Nosirovna**

Teacher of the Department of primary education of Kokand State Pedagogical Institute

**Yigitalieva Shokhsanamkhon Isagali kizi**

Teacher of the Department of primary education of Kokand State Pedagogical Institute

**Annotation.** The article reveals the role of lexical, morphological and syntactic principles in the classification, which are used in the categorization of words. It talks about the particularity and generality of principles in the classification, and it is illuminated that the principles complement each other in the categorization of words. The classification criteria that are proposed differently are proposed as an addition to these principles. But opinions are expressed that these criteria, which are considered classic, are still not losing ground and are enriched by new research.

**Keywords:** word categories, independent words, auxiliary words, main task, approach task, vocabulary meaning, grammatical meaning, morphological character, syntactic task.

**INTRODUCTION.**

In linguistics, the issue of word and its classification into categories is one of the issues with a very long history. Since ancient times, this issue has attracted the attention of specialists as one of the main problems of linguistics. In Arabic linguistics, which was nourished by ancient Indian linguistics, words were divided into word groups under the names of nouns, verbs and letters (auxiliaries). This historical tradition also influenced Uzbek linguistics, and such a classification found its expression in scientific works created until the twentieth century (such as "Devonu lug'atit turk" by Mahmud Kashgari, "At-tuhfatuz zakiyatu fillug'atit turkiya" written by an unknown author).

From the first quarter of the 20th century, the division of words into word groups was somewhat concreted by Uzbek linguists, relying on the European views of their predecessors. In particular, in Fitrat's work "SarF" (1930), in addition to nouns and verbs, great attention was paid to the study of adjectives, numbers, pronouns, adverbs, exclamations, and auxiliary words. This classification is still the foundation of our linguistics.

The three-principle theory of word classification still survives despite much controversy. This classification, based on its a priori nature, that is, based on the principles of formal logic that the classification is strict and without residues, allows placing any word form in a certain category.

In fact, the criteria for dividing words into groups, word groups in general, and the interest in the word itself have grown steadily since the fifties of the twentieth century. This interest, or rather, the emergence of a real stream of scientific research, is rightly attributed to the "New Doctrine of Language" in 1952, after the debate on linguistic issues, leaving the dominant position in the former Soviet linguistics, holding large-scale scientific conferences on the most important issues of linguistics, focusing the attention of scientists for decades without work. start the movement to focus on the remaining acute linguistic problems..." [1. B. 65] can be attributed to the fact that.

In particular, the discussion held in 1954 at the Institute of Linguistics of the FA of the former USSR [2. B. 162-166]. The scientists who spoke at this conference paid special attention to a number of problems related to word groups, as well as the insufficient development of criteria for dividing words into groups.

In particular, E.V. Sevortyan showed that he was a supporter of the traditional three criteria for classifying words into categories. T.A. Bertagaev and T.S. Sharadzemidze emphasize that special attention should be paid to the morphological criterion, O.P. Sunik to the grammatical feature, and V.M. Zhirmunsky to the genetic aspect [2. B. 162-166].

The debate about the criteria for separating word groups was not resolved even at the second conference held in Leningrad in 1965. Different famous scientists have proposed different criteria for classifying words into categories. For example, V. M. Zhirmunsky considers the following criteria necessary:

- 1) lexical-semantic meanings;
- 2) grammatical signs;
- 3) historical genetic characteristics [3. B. 21].

O.P. Sunik criticizes the traditional criteria and emphasizes mainly the grammatical criteria. In his opinion, when grouping words into categories, their common grammatical aspects are the basis, while formal and lexical-semantic aspects are unimportant [4. 38].

There are also views that prioritize the semantic criterion. M.V. Panov's opinions in this field are noteworthy. The original aspect of his ideas is that he pays special attention to additions. Also, they carefully approach their content, not their formation, as is usually assumed. Considering the nature of the Russian language, his ideas are actually quite reasonable. For example, although the word forms *trus*, *trusit*, *truslivyy* have a common root, they cannot belong to one word group. Or, on the contrary, the words *pisali* - *puchalo*, *sonnyy* - *tolknu*, *morogoe* - *bolshoy* have the same grammatical form (-l-, -n-, -oe), but belong to different categories. This shows that the role of suffixes in the division of words into categories is quite significant, precisely according to their semantic characteristics [5. B. 61].

At the foundation of its classification is the task or general meaning in the nomination process. It distinguishes functions such as procedurality, signification, direct and indirect relation to the object. A number of other differences are not important for the classification of word groups. If the suffix does not have the above characters, this case refers to the noun family.

However, it seems that the category of the noun (*imya sushchestvitelnoe*) is extremely widened, and in particular, the number also enters its scope.

These views of M. V. Panov are very similar to the views of A. M. Peshkovsky in this field. At his time, A.M. Peshkovsky also approached the separation of word groups in Russian from a functional-semantic point of view. According to him, the Russian language has four independent word groups: noun, adjective, verb, adverb [6. B. 68].

Although M.V. Panov supports this classification, he hesitates in a number of places. For example, when comparing the word combinations "bejat naperegonki" and "beg naperegonki": the first word combination, in his opinion, is legal both lexically and grammatically, and the second word combination is legal only lexically. Because "naperegonki" as an adverb cannot be connected to a noun-object (*beg*). Such cases, that is, cases where the noun is a sign of the object, are very common.

The same situation can be seen in the Uzbek language. Linguists have always paid attention to the fact that adverbs and adjectives can be mutually used [7. B. 271-272, 528.]. Fitrat distinguishes "its denotation of a noun" as an important sign of adjectives. Therefore, he states that "adjectives derived from verbs are not adjectives, but are called cases [8. B. 277].

It seems that when the semantic aspect is taken as a basis (although logically it is quite legitimate to apply a single criterion to the classification), it is felt that this alone is not enough to avoid the existence of problems.

Accordingly, it can be concluded that other criteria allow the classification to be complete. In particular, the morphological criterion. I.G. Miloslavsky shows that the morphological principle of classification can be of two types:

1. A set of the same morphological categories.
2. Uniformity of members of the paradigm.

In the first case, lexemes are classified based on their reflection of the same morphological categories.

In particular, in the Uzbek language, the lexemes of tree, person, universe belong to the same category as they can reflect the categories of agreement, number, and possession, and are contrasted with adjectives that differ, for example, by indicating degree. But there are certain difficulties here. These problematic situations can be conditionally divided into three groups:

1. Lexemes that seem to fall into one group do not correspond to each other in the reflection of morphological categories.
2. When different word forms of one lexeme begin to undergo different morphological changes.
3. When the lexeme has a single word form.

Although the first case is not much, it attracts the attention of linguists [9. B. 158-160.; 10. B. S. 37-38.; 11. B. 149-150.].

A.I. Smirnitskiy writes about doubting whether there is a degree category in adjectives: "The fact that many adjectives cannot form a comparative and accusative degree does not prevent them from distinguishing the grammatical category indicated by them. As we have seen in other word groups, the absence of one or another form of a grammatical category in individual words does not prevent the presence of this category in a certain whole lexical-grammatical class of words. In other words, just as one or another number form is not characteristic for

some nouns, some adjectives may not have comparative and accusative degree forms either" [9. B. 158.].

A.I. Smirnitsky focuses on the issue of whether a specific grammatical category is present or not in some words within a category, and concludes that the absence of a specific form in some words does not mean that this category does not exist in this category. Although not specifically mentioned, it is known from the above opinions that he believes that the lack of the same morphological formation cannot be an obstacle to grouping words into one category. It is indeed a very interesting and quite common phenomenon that different word forms of the same lexeme reflect different morphological categories. This situation is especially common in the verb group. For example, in Russian, the tenses affect the person expression of the verb. The word form in the past tense does not have a person concept, but there is a rod. The present tense has a person but no stem. In the Uzbek language, some forms of the verb are fundamentally different from each other according to their morphological features. In particular, an action noun can express neither tense nor person-number, nor does it take an indicator of indivisibility. Adjectives show time and express indifference. The indicators of Ravishdosh are also different from each other. Some forms show indivisibility, some do not, etc. [7. B. 515-525.].

Based on the same aspects, it is known that in this case the classification is directed to the word form, not to the lexeme. I.G. Miloslavsky pays attention to another situation that complicates this type of classification: there are lexemes in the Russian language that have a single word form. For example, coat, taxi, hydroelectric power station. Therefore, they also do not meet the basis of this classification.

Nevertheless, I. G. Miloslavskiy showed that it is possible to distinguish categories in the Russian language based on this classification:

- 1) noun (represents agreement and number); this includes quantity and aggregate numbers;
- 2) quality (represents agreement, number, rod and brevity-completeness);
- 3) infinitive (represents aspect and proportion);
- 3) adverb (represents vid);
- 5) adjective (represents agreement, number, rod, brevity-completeness, form, proportion, tense);
- 6) present-future verbs in definite mood (number, form, ratio, tense, person, mood);
- 7) verbs in the past tense in the definite mood (number, rod, vid, ratio, tense, mood are expressed);
- 8) conditional mood verbs (number, rod, form, proportion, inclination);
- 9) verbs in the imperative mood (represents number, form, ratio, person, mood);
- 10) grammatically undefined word forms; undifferentiated nouns and adjectives, comparative degrees and adverbs [10. B. 38.].

This system of independent word groups that arose when classified according to the above criterion is characterized by the fact that it is more compact for the noun group and more branched for the verb group, compared to the traditional system.

If the second aspect of the morphological criterion is also taken into account, the presented classes are further fragmented. "Uniformity of members of a paradigm" is not always observed even within a category.

For example, while in Russian it is clear that nouns indicate number, some nouns only indicate the plural (*chasy*), and some nouns only indicate the singular (*moloko*). Although it is clear that verbs show proportion in Uzbek, some verbs do not take certain proportion indicators. It can be seen from the above that although the morphological criterion has been presented as one of the traditional criteria for several centuries, applying it to the classification neither as the only criterion nor as one of the three criteria does not give a satisfactory solution in all respects.

Now about the third syntactic criterion. According to some linguists, it is the syntactic criterion that takes the first place in the classification of word groups. In particular, A.I. Smirnitsky: "...the syntactic aspect is more general and occupies the first place in the grammatical classification of the word. This is due to the fact that morphologically not all words are clearly distinguished from each other, but syntactically they are sufficiently distinct. For example, morphologically invariant words, for example, interjections and adverbs, are divided into separate groups of words with different grammatical descriptions on the syntactic level" [9. B. 103] believes.

This point of view is also quite widespread, and was explained quite reasonably by I.I. Meshchaninov, the author of major studies on word groups and sentence fragments [12. B. 241-247.; 13. B. 249-255.]. According to him, we observe the word only in the process of speech. Therefore, the syntactic potency of the word plays a special role in its description. "It is possible to observe such a connection of the word group to the parts of the sentence in the verb. Words that express the process of action or state according to their content, due to their use in the function of regular participles, have tense, person, inclination, ratio and other predicative indicators. These indicators are attached to the same word group and become its descriptive grammatical categories. Thus, the group of words - the verb is separated.

In this way, a noun is distinguished by becoming a part of speech (possessor or complement) in its objective sense, an adjective is formed by becoming an attributive part of a sentence (determiner), and an adverb becomes a case..." [12. B. 241-247.; 13. B. 245-246.].

Of course, Turkologists and Uzbek linguists have not lost sight of certain relationships between speech fragments and word groups.

In particular, H.G. Nematov, while classifying morphological-grammatical categories, shows that some morphological categories are connected with certain word groups according to their syntactic features, not semantic-morphological ones [14. B. 3-9.; 15. B. 34.].

In modern Russian linguistics, there are cases where special attention is paid to the syntactic criterion. For example, I.G. Miloslavskyi: "...the morphological criterion becomes insignificant in relation to invariable words. Only a semantic and syntactic approach is possible here" [10. B. 39.] believes that.

The essence of the syntactic criterion covers two aspects:

- what lexemes the checked word can combine with;
- what is the function of the sentence.

The application of this criterion to invariant words in the Russian language helps to distinguish modal words and comparatives (or forms of comparative degree - starik, glubje...) that are left out in the application of other criteria [10. B.38.].

But it is difficult to conclude that the syntactic criterion can always be used effectively. In our opinion, the reason for this is as follows: first of all, the question of what this classification is applied to remains unanswered: lexeme, word form? Because of this, it cannot be said that it is applied to the lexeme, because the syntactic aspect of the lexeme is not clearly revealed, it is in a potential state, and it cannot be answered logically from the syntactic position. It is also quite controversial to say about the word form. Because, "Word form is a whole, a device is considered. It can be expressed as follows: lexical morpheme+grammatical morpheme (Ml+Mg). Vocabulary exists as ready-made blocks in the mind of language owners. Therefore, there are certain models of such devices. As a word form is a construction, its building units are morphemes. So, the morpheme functions as an allomorph in the word form" [11. B. 48.]. It seems that the position occupied and the function performed by a certain word form can be derived from both the lexeme (Ml) and the indicator (Mg).

The analysis of traditional criteria shows that their application, either individually or together, does not give sufficient results and is not sufficient in revealing the ontology of word groups.

H.G. Ne'matov, taking into account such aspects, comes to the following conclusion: "...semantic, morphological and syntactic aspects of word groups do not come from each other and do not form a unity. Each of these features can be the basis of examination in the separate acquisition of a word group, that is, it is necessary to consider oppositions of word groups according to three lines: semantic, syntactic, morphological signs. Only in this case, the basic rule of formal logic, which is a prerequisite for applying dialectical logic methods to linguistic facts, is not violated" [14. B. 26.].

As we have seen above, no matter how long the history of classifying words has, this matter has not yet ceased to be hotly debated. It has different classification bases and different results based on it. In our opinion, the main reason for the debate on the issue of dividing words into categories is the diversity of approaches to the word itself, the definition of its essence, and the lack of a clear answer to such questions as what a word is and what its nature is.

Until the emergence of the theory of morphemics in the history of linguistics, until the recognition of the morpheme as the central unit of the language, the attention of specialists was focused on the word. All other units were defined on a word basis (units smaller than a word and units larger than a word). The tradition of dividing words into independent and auxiliary words is also a result of this "word-centered" view.

Recognition of the multi-level, hierarchical (level) structure of the language and the relationship of level units and inter-level units, consistent differentiation of language and speech units created a basis for some clarification of the approach to the word. First of all, the development of the morpheme theory led to the interpretation of all the smallest meaningful units of the language as morphemes. Accordingly, morphemes were divided into lexical morphemes and the smallest meaningful units with grammatical meaning - grammatical morphemes.

Proponents of descriptive linguistics distinguish between language and speech units and recognize phonemes, morphemes and constructions as language units. At the same time, the emergence of the concept of linguistic level and increased attention to the inter-level (gradual) relationship, the recognition that the function of each lower level unit is manifested in the structure of the level unit one level above it, created a convenient opportunity to define the essence of the word. The thesis that the mutual syntagmatic relationship of the lower level units and the higher level unit is formed from the lower level units helps to reveal this possibility.

Syntagmatic relationship of phoneme variants (allophones) creates the material aspect of a morpheme, so syntagmatic relationship of morpheme variants creates a larger part - a word, a morphological unit. However, it should be noted that not any syntagmatic relation of morphemes, but the relation of morphemes based on a certain scheme, template: the relation of lexical morpheme (Ml)+grammatical morpheme (Mg) creates a word [16. B. 109.; 11. B. 42]. So, the word, according to the descriptive language units, is a construction, which comes into play on the basis of a certain scheme. Its scheme is listed as (Ml+Mg).

If we approach the word as a construction and recognize the above pattern as its structural scheme, then the structural units of the word are morphemes, or rather, variants of morphemes. It was noted above that morphemes are divided into lexical and grammatical morphemes. But although grammatical morphemes form one group based on the general scheme of "grammatical meaning expression", they acquire diversity with the level of "syntagmatic" and other features. In particular, both adverbs and auxiliaries form a common class according to the sign of "expressing grammatical meaning". What they have in common is that both adverbs and some of the auxiliaries are added to the lexical morphemes and form a higher-level unit. This is especially evident when using the distribution method. In the same conditions, two units, one of which was replaced by the other and did not make a significant change in meaning, are in a mutually complementary distribution relationship. Units in such a relationship are different manifestations of the same essence, invariant [17. B. 82]. For example: to the institute/school.

The -ga part of the word form of the institute is being replaced with the helper under the same conditions without significantly affecting the meaning. That is why they are different material manifestations of one common essence.

In this respect, predicates and conjunctions differ sharply from the additional distributional relation of conjunctions and auxiliaries. But, but, but, because, because, if, -mi, -u, (-yu), -da, -ak, yak, -gina, only cannot be replaced by grammatical morphemes. Grammatical morphemes are stressed, prepositions are unstressed, and are added to the lexical morpheme (Ml) as enclises. Conjunctions, while expressing the relationship of one word form with another word form, do not form a phonetic unity with units between sentences. This shows that the contrast of auxiliary morphemes (helper, linker, load) with affix morphemes has two extreme poles. However, as we saw in the above example, the auxiliary is an intermediate phenomenon of two poles (affix morpheme and auxiliary morpheme).

So, the auxiliary is added to the lexical morpheme, forming a generality according to the grammatical meaning expression and the lexical morpheme as a word form. But prepositions and connectors do not belong to the morphological word as a word form. Because prepositions

and connectives do not have the property of construction, the property of dividing into morphemes [9. B. 49].

As the word form is a whole, a structure, its building units are morphemes. Just as grammatical morphemes have a special relationship with lexical morphemes, auxiliary morphemes have a special relationship with lexical morphemes.

Although the historical three principles are still the leading ones in the classification of words, in addition to these, the application of measures related to the morphemic structure and formation of words serves to help to more clearly reflect the differences in categorization. When we analyze words morphemically and structurally, we can see similarities and differences in the function of some independent words of auxiliaries:

1. The auxiliaries form a subjunctive to the agreement forms in some places (I took it for my mother - I took it to my mother), the sign of this noun group is considered to be similar to the auxiliary group - the helper.
2. Some of the predicates (-mi – interrogative predicate) remain functional to person-number suffixes depending on the type of sentence they form. If the person-number affixes form a demonstrative sentence in Uzbek, prepositions form an interrogative sentence from a demonstrative sentence.
3. If all the auxiliaries are considered as a morphological whole, then the ravish of the independent words is also rounded and the morpheme is not divided into the composition.
4. Formation is characteristic of nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs, but it does not have the characteristics of number and pronoun formation, like auxiliaries.
5. These auxiliary classification methods in word classification contribute to more efficient and accurate classification.

## REFERENCES

1. Eltazarov J. Syntactic theories about word groups. - Samarkand, 1996. - 128 p.
2. Gadjeva N. Z., Ivanchikova E. A. Discussion about chastyakh rechi // Voprosy yazykoznaniya. – 1955. – No. 1. - S. 162-166.
3. Zhirmunsky V. M. O prirode chastey rechi i ix classification // Voprosy teorii chastey rechi (na mat. yazykov razlichnyx tipov). - Leningrad: Nauka, 1968. - S. 19-21.
4. Sunik O. P. Voprosy obshchey teorii chastei rechi // Voprosy teorii chastei rechi (na mat. yazykov razlichnix tipov). - Leningrad: Nauka, 1968. - S. 34-48.
5. Panov M. V. O chastyakh rechi v russskom yazyke. – Nauchnye doklady vyshey shkoly // Filolog. science – 1960. – No. 4. - S. 60-71.
6. Peshkovsky A. M. Russian syntax v nauchnom osveshchenii. - Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatelstvo ministerstva prosveshcheniya RSFSR, 1956. - 512 p.
7. Grammar of the Uzbek language. T. I. - Tashkent: Science, 1975. - 610 p.
8. Nurmonov A. Selected works. Volume 2. - Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2012. - 448 p.
9. Smirnitsky A. I. Morphology of the English language. - Moscow: Izdatelstvo literatury na inostrannyx yazykax, 1959. - 440 p.
10. Miloslavsky I. G. Morphological categories of modern Russian language. - Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1981. - 254 p.
11. Nurmonov A., Shahobiddinova Sh., Iskandarova Sh., Nabieva D. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. Morphology. - Tashkent: New age generation, 2001. - 164 p.



12. Meshchaninov I.I. Члены предложения и части речи. - Leningrad: Nauka, 1978. - 387 p.
13. Meshchaninov I.I. Problemy razvitiya zazyka. - Leningrad: Nauka, 1975. - 351 p.
14. Nigmatov Kh. G. Funktsionalnaya morfologiya turkoyazychnykh pamyatnikov XI – XII v.v. - Tashkent: Science, 1989. - 191 p.
15. Shahobiddinova Sh. Morphology of the Uzbek language in the interpretation of the generality-specificity dialectic. Part 2. - Andijan, 1994. - 182 p.
16. Serebrennikov B.A. Obshchee yazykoznanie. Vnutreniyaya structural language. - Moscow: Nauka, 1972. - 382 p.
17. Trubetskoi N. S. Basic phonology. - Moscow: Izdatelstvo inostarnoy literatury, 1960. - 372 p.