

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 12 Volume: 104

Published: 22.12.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Zebiniso G'ayrat qizi Sulaymonova
Fergana State University
Master
Ferghana, Uzbekistan

POLIFUNCTIONALITY AND VIEWS ON IT IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS

Abstract: The article is devoted to the phenomenon of polifunctionality in Uzbek linguistics and the coverage of multifunctional linguistic units.

Key words: polyfunctionality, primary and secondary function, semantics, syntax, form, content, asymmetry, valence.

Language: English

Citation: Sulaymonova, Z. G. (2021). Polifunctionality and views on it in Uzbek linguistics. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (104), 942-945.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-104-94> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.12.104.94>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

The origin of the phenomenon of polyfunctionality is connected with the activities of the Prague School of Linguistics. By the twentieth century, along with other sciences, linguistics has undergone radical changes. New views have emerged in linguistics.

Linguists who have studied the phenomenon of polyfunction have expressed different views on this issue. In particular, a number of researches of Uzbek linguists such as Sh.Rahmatullaev, A.Hojiev, A.Berdialiev, A.Mamajonov, N.Turniyozov, G.Rozikova, N.Kadirova, D.Ganieva, G.Sulaymonova, T.Valiev is of great importance in the study.

The main part

Sources informing about the phenomenon of polyfunctionality note that the concept of primary and secondary function is inextricably linked with polyfunctionality. Researcher D. Ganieva notes that the concept of primary and secondary function was introduced into linguistics by the German scientist Slotti [14].

According to the scholar, Slotti's views on primary and secondary function are based on the mutual coincidence of the semantic and syntactic levels. That is, if the lexical meaning of word groups is a one-sided feature of word groups, the performance of a syntactic function specific to the lexical meaning

is the second feature. Hence the dual nature of word groups, i.e., the primary and secondary function. The scientist also acknowledges that there are incompatible places of primary and secondary function. For example, an adjective expresses an action from a semantic point of view, but the determiner performs a syntactic function. The idea put forward by Slotti, although the question of the relationship between the semantic and syntactic levels is of great importance in philosophical grammatical theory, has not found its full confirmation in any language.

Linguist E. Kurilovich also developed Slotti's idea with his views on primary and secondary function. According to E. Kurilovich, if the primary function is a syntactic function corresponding to the lexical meaning, the occurrence in any other syntactic function is considered a secondary function. According to him, the structural analysis of language testifies to the fact that the "old" theory that there is a correspondence between word groups and their syntactic functions has its basis. Those who argue that a phrase can perform different syntactic functions in any phrase and sentence structure do not take into account that there is a certain hierarchy in the occurrence of a phrase in a different syntactic function. Each word group will have a basic, primary syntactic function. The primary syntactic function derives from the lexical meaning of a word group and is embodied as a specific transposition of that meaning

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

[5,61]. The theory of E. Kurilovich, which expressed reasonable views on the primary and secondary function, served as the basis for the further development of multifunctionality. The theoretical views of the scientist feed the opinions of most linguists on the primary and secondary function. In particular, Professor A. Berdialiev expressed his views on the syntactic manifestation of primary and secondary functions.

Syntactic functions have a two-stage character. The first stage is that syntactic functions convey extremely general, extremely abstract grammatical meanings. In such cases, there is a balance of function and meaning. The first stage has functions, cut, filler, determiner, case (in simple terms); includes an autonomous understanding of events such as a preposition, a preposition (in conjunctions with a preposition), and the autonomous meanings associated with them. The second stage functions of syntactic units are formed due to their syntactic connection realized at a certain valence. In such cases, they differ from what they imagine to be autonomous; autonomous meanings are replaced by specific grammatical meanings. Only from the point of view of the second stage does the relation of function and meaning of syntactic units connect syntax with semantics [2,24-27]. Examples include:

Sentence *Xar kim aybsiz do'st qidirsa, uning do'sti kamayib qoladi* can also occur in the form of speech *Xar kim aybsiz do'st qidirsa, u mutlaqo do'stsiz qoladi*

Let A. Berdialiev differ in his second stage function, the following sentence contains the word "friend" in the first sentence. In the second sentence, the following sentence is reported to be in a state of mutual valence with the cut in the main sentence. In the first case, the valence is realized in the focus-view relationship, and in the second case in the predicative relationship. In this case, if everyone is looking for an innocent friend, the syntactic unit is not two events, but an event with two functions - syntactic polyfunctionality [1, 44].

Here we can see that the philosophical categories of form and content are realized at the point, and that polyfunctionality can lose the quality of speech error at the syntactic level. We know that the asymmetry of the dialectical unity of form and content leads to polyfunctionality.

The views expressed by Professor A. Berdialiev support previous theoretical views and differ in their specific aspects. According to the scientist's theoretical views, the first stage function is general and extremely abstract and is imagined autonomously by all language users. In the second stage function, semantics and syntax are intertwined. Contrary to previous theoretical views, A. Berdialiev puts forward the theoretical view that syntax and semantics intersect only in the second stage function. The emergence of polyfunctionality in simple sentences

has led to new and well-founded ideas about its connection with paradigmatics and syntax. The scientist also noted that in the formation of syntactic polyfunctionality, the syntactic relationship of syntactic units realized at a certain valence is important. Indeed, in Uzbek linguistics, the question of the connection of the concept of syntactic function with the concept of valence has been considered by linguists. As a result, the issue arose from the research covered. In particular, we can cite the monograph of linguist R. Rasulov "Obligatory valences of state verbs in the Uzbek language" [9, 10]

Linguist A.Khojiev criticized previous theoretical views on the polyfunctionality observed in affixal morphemes. According to the scientist, the phenomenon of ambiguity and multifunctionality is not observed in affixes: there is no possibility of expression. The linguist supports his ideas with the example of the *-chi* affix. A word made from the word morpheme (on the basis of word formation) can have two different meanings. For example, the word *gulchi* means: 1) *flower grower*, 2) *flower seller*. However, both meanings are not specific to the *-chi* morpheme, but are understood in general terms [15, 62-63]. Linguist A.Khojiev denies that affixal morphemes have polyfunctional and polysemic properties.

However, scientific studies in recent years have shown that the phenomenon of polyfunctionality can be observed in affixal morphemes as well. In addition, scientific evidence has shown that affixal morphemes have the ability to manifest phenomena of polysemy, polyfunctionality, not only in the process of word formation, but also in the process of connecting compound sentences. In particular, this situation can be seen in the research of researchers G. Rozikova [10], N. Kadyrova [13].

Professor A. Mamajonov acknowledges that the emergence of polyfunctionality is inextricably linked with the phenomenon of polysemy. At the syntactic level, the linguist provides specific and well-founded information about the occurrence of polyfunctionality within compound sentences. In particular, it connects polyfunctionality in compound sentences with the ability to perform more than one syntactic task without formal changes in sentences. He gives the following linguistic evidence, stating that such a condition can be observed mainly in conjunctions with the case-following sentence:

Nur borki, soya bor (O'.Hoshimov).

1. Causal clause – (“nur bo'lganligi uchun, soya bor”).
2. Time clause – (“nur bo'lganda, soya bor”).
3. Conditional clause – (“nur bo'lsagina, soya bor”) [6, 107-108].

In the theoretical views on the phenomenon of polyfunctionality, we also observe the existence of differences in the opinions of scientists. Linguist N. Turniyozov evaluates the phenomenon of polyfunctionality as a parallel with functional

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

transposition. Features of the scientist's thinking, each word belongs to a certain morphological category in relation to its function. It is determined that words within a syntagmatically clear range can be moved from one morphological category to another.

"Muncha shirin bu bola! /O'. Xoshimov. Dunyoning ishlari, 77/.

Aytishga oson. Hammasi ishlik odamlar / O'. Usmonov. Sirli sohil, 171/.

In the examples given, the words *shirin* (sweet) and *oson* (easy) belong to the category of form quality. However, in terms of function, they are far from the scope of their morphological category. Therefore, the ability of words to interact depends on their grammatical forms and the syntactic functions they perform" [12, 55-56]

Recognizing that multifunctionality is a universal phenomenon for all levels of language, D. Ganieva supports E. Kurilovich's views on the idea of primary and secondary function [14]. According to him, formal functions can be divided into phonological primary-secondary function, morphological primary-secondary function and syntactic primary-secondary function, respectively. The primary and secondary functions of linguistic units occur at all levels of language and reveal their syncretic nature, while at the same time serving to define polyfunctionality [14]. The scholar's research is significant in that it is extensive, studied at the phonological, morphemic, morphological, and syntactic levels. Researcher D. Ganieva studied the dialectical relationship between the phenomena of polyfunctionality and syncretism through the functional forms of the verb. Evidence for the polyfunctionality at the phonological level is as follows: "When we contrast the expression of the lexeme of beauty with the lexeme of beauty: *yli*, we see that the distinguishing sign between them is the short vowel *o* and the long vowel *o:*. These vowels do not serve to distinguish one lexeme from another, but the long vowel represents the speaker's emotional-expressive attitude to the object. So, in this case, the difference of the vowel according to the short-length sign is not an phonological function, but an emotional function" [14] In addition to the fact that phonological units refer to meaning, the scientist has proved that they can also express the emotional-affective relationship of the speaker in a speech situation. Until now, such phenomena have been interpreted only within the framework of degree forms, but have not been approached as a multifunctional phenomenon.

Professor Sh. Rakhmatullaev commented on multifunctionality: "The phenomenon of ambiguity should be distinguished from the phenomenon of multipurpose. For example, the future tense is a

function; but the general agreement is multifunctional; the lexeme in this contraction comes: 1) in the possessive function, 2) in the explanatory function, and in other functions. On this basis, the agreement cannot be considered ambiguous" [8, 125] The linguist first emphasizes the need for polysemy and polyfunctional phenomena. The two events are close to each other in many places, and at the lexical level they even resemble the same speech process. But there is a difference between these events. The linguist has also shed light on morphemic polyfunctionality in terms of its ability to perform a syntactic task.

Polyfunctionality is being studied by linguists today in a variety of areas. In particular, in the field of computer linguistics examples of such dissertations are, O. Mengliev's "Linguistic basis for the formation of the educational corps of the Uzbek language" [7], Sh. Gulyamova's "Linguistic bases of semantic analyzer of the Uzbek language" [4]. In these studies, polyfunctionality has been studied mainly at the lexical level, and polyfunctionality has been assessed as a phenomenon between the phenomena of polysemy and homonymy. In terminology, T. Valiev's dissertation "Structural-semantic features and lexicographic interpretation of the Uzbek language road-building terms" also studied multifunctionality [3], a speech that was far removed from polysemy in relation to the event, but had not yet reached the point of survival, expressed its attitude as an event.

Conclusion

In conclusion, polyfunctionality is a phenomenon associated with the manifestation of a secondary function in addition to the primary function. Scientists have differing views on polyfunctionality, and the phenomenon is awaiting a solution in its new research. It should also be noted that topics such as the linguistic foundations of semantic analyzer in the context of computer linguistics are an important issue in the field of linguistics today, and one aspect of this issue is increasingly intertwined with multifunctionality. For this reason, it is important to provide a clear grammatical law for the phenomenon of polyfunctionality and its introduction into practical dentistry.

Since polyfunctionality occurs at different levels of language, it is necessary to approach the phenomenon of polyfunctionality at each level in accordance with the laws of that level. If we see the emergence of polyfunctionality at the syntactic level when the valence and syntactic functions are different in one place, we observe it in a specific way at the morphemic or phonological level.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

References:

1. Berdialiev, A. (1989). *Ergash gapli qo'shma gap konstruksiyalarida semantik-signifikativ paradigmatika*. – Toshkent: Fan.
2. Berdialiyev, A. (1981). Sintaktik konstruksiyalarda polifunksionallik. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2-son, pp.24-27.
3. Valiev, T. (2017). *O'zbek tili yo'l so'zlik terminlarining struktur-semantik hususiyatlari va leksikografiya talqini*. Filol.fan.bo'yicha fal. doktori(PhD) dis. avtoref. – Samarqand.
4. Gulyamova, Sh. (2021). *O'zbek tili semantik analizatorining lingvistik asoslari*. Filol. fanlari doktori(DSc) diss. avtoref. – Farg'ona.
5. Kurilovich, E. (1962). *Derivatsiya leksicheskaya i derivatsiya sintaksicheskaya*. Ocherki po lingvistike. – Moscow.
6. Mamajonov, A. (1990). *Qushma gap stilistikasi*. –Toshkent: Fan.
7. Meng'liev, O'. (2021). *O'.O'zbek tili ta'limiy korpusini tuzishning lingvistik asoslari*. Filol.fan.bo'yicha fal. doktori(PhD) dis. avtoref. – Termiz.
8. Rahmatullaev, Sh. (2006). *Hozirgi adabiy o'zbek tili*. – Toshkent: Universitet.
9. Rasulov, R. (1989). *O'zbek tilidagi holat fe'llari va ularning obligator valentilari*. – Toshkent: Fan.
10. Roziqova, G. (1999). *O'zbek tilida sintaktik polisemi*. Filol. fanlari nomzodi... diss. avtoref. – Farg'ona.
11. Sulaymonova, G. (2010). *O'zbek tilida ot turkumidagi so'zlarning polifunksionalligi*: Filol.fan.nomzodi...diss.avtoref. – Toshkent.
12. Turniyozov, N., & Turniyozova, K. (2003). *Funksional sintaksisga kirish*. Toshkent: Fan.
13. Qodirova, N. (2002). *O'zbek tilidagi affikslarda polifunksionallik*. Filol. fanlari nomzodi... diss. avtoref. – Toshkent.
14. G'anieva, D.A. (2012). *O'zbek tilidagi fe'lning funksional shakllarida sinkretiklik va polifunksionallik*: Filol.fanlari nomzodi... diss. avtoref. – Toshkent.
15. Xojiev, A. (2010). *O'zbek tili morfologiyasi, morfemikasi va so'z yasalishining nazariy masalalari*. – Toshkent:Fan.