

Grammatical views of Nizomiddin Mahmudov

(D.M. Boshmanova)

Annotation. In the article, it is given that one of the guiding elements of our national notion should be the question of the official language. We must pay special attention to the proper teaching of the Uzbek language on the basis of cutting-edge technology at all levels of school if we hope to instill our own tongue in the minds of the younger generation from an early age. Our head of state outlined how we want our pupils to develop as Uzbek speakers, writers, and critical thinkers

Key words: *national, notion, school, early age, tongue, younger generation*

In the culture of speech, grammatical correctness in speaking has a specific position. The foundation for the communicative characteristic of accuracy is grammatical correctness. Strict adherence to grammatical norms in speech is a sign of grammatical accuracy.

The principles governing the morphological and syntactic structure of the language have been generalized, and practically all cases have been controlled. The grammar of the Uzbek literary language, that is, its morphology and syntax, has been examined in great depth in linguistics. They are represented in a number of scientific studies in modern linguistics, normative grammars, secondary and higher education textbooks, and textbooks. On this foundation, it is acknowledged that the Uzbek language has a set of grammatical rules for word forms, suffix usage, word pairings, phrases, and sentence construction.

Grammatical norms naturally include morphological and syntactic standards. The rules guiding the morphological form of words and how they are used in speech are referred to as morphological norms, while the rules governing word combinations, sentence structure, and the way words are joined are referred to as syntactic norms.

Unfortunately, speech frequently deviates from literary morphological conventions. The combination of the accusative and the accusative is one of the most frequent infractions of these rules. The rule governing the use of these conjunctions should actually have been a strong norm because, by the very nature of our language, the accusative case serves to connect words that are nouns in the broadest sense (for example, a tree leaf, the capital of Uzbekistan), and the future tense connects verbs and nouns in the broadest sense (such as reading a book, loving the Motherland). But language and rhetoric have undermined this standard. Today's most popular varieties of Uzbek utilize the accusative case similarly to how they use the accusative case in other languages (like reading a tree leaf, a book). The suffix -ni is more frequently used, according to well-known linguist A. Hajiyev, who was researching the language of written materials around the turn of the past century. Even in the 1950s, there was a suggestion to standardize the future tense by adding the suffix -ni to dialects. A. Marufov, a dedicated linguist, said it well when he said, "Combining these two forms is an overflow of syntax, impairs the accurate grasp of the idea, and breaks the fluidity of style." A. Hajiyev claims that at the start of that century, some

¹ *Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, The teacher of the department of primary education*

individuals even sought to adopt the accusative form instead of the accusative and tried to promote it as a sign of intellect. They believed that speaking less leads to literary language. In Naimi's work *The Sisters*, Askad Mukhtor, a gifted author who meticulously researched the conditions of the time, depicts one of the unfavorable characters like follows: Mushtipar seals of the parents! Family in the wilderness, kids in the forest! I want you to put down your blanket and head over to the artel to work. Your spouses will be able to manage you and take care of you because they are uneducated. You must go from this impolite family. Your kids will be sent to orphanages. Such discussions, of course, persisted at the time because they were incompatible with the Uzbek language's inherent characteristics. Anyhow, the practice of substituting the infinitive for the accusative in oral and dialect speech diminishes this morphological requirement. To maintain this norm in the speaker's consciousness, it is therefore vital to practice regularly.

There are laws that govern the use of conjunctions and adverbs in speech, whether with or without a suffix. Considering that these agreements convey specificity and emphasis when employed in a specific meaning (book page, book reading, it's about a specific book), and generality when used without a sign (book page, book reading, it's about a book generally), For instance, the accusative case must be used specifically if there is a word between the accusative case word and the subject in issue. As a result, a book page may be referred to as a school student, but if the words "great student" and "yellow" are put between them, the yellow book page deviates from the standard. The best student in the school has to be on the yellow page of the book for a compound to be grammatically proper. This standard, nonetheless, is occasionally broken in the speech of certain persons.

There is frequently a second error. Let's examine this phrase: The deputy directors of the area's spiritual colleges attended the event on spirituality and enlightenment (*Voice of Uzbekistan*, June 29, 2006). It might be referred to as a deputy director or a deputy director in general. The vice-principal of the possessive suffix -i implies affiliation, which is unrelated to the term "college," hence it is erroneous to claim that the college is the deputy principal. Therefore, using either college vice president or college vice president is grammatically and logically valid. According to the aforementioned rule, the accusative case is employed if the adjective is followed by another adjective, as in the example of the deputy director of the college for spirituality and enlightenment or the director of the college for financial affairs. The sentence has to be modified as follows to be grammatically correct: The deputy directors of professional colleges in the area participated in the discussion on spirituality and enlightenment.

While each agreement has a specific meaning and purpose and is used in accordance with explicit literary criteria, there are instances in which one agreement is substituted for another in speech. For instance, the use of directional conjunctions rather than place-time conjunctions substantially impairs the accuracy of literary speech in languages like Samarkand, Bukhara, and Shakhrisabz. It is against the rules to study in Tashkent, work in the fields, and travel by rail. I have something to say to you, which I will continue to say to the train, but I also have something humorous to say to you, which is, "I say what I say to you, not to you, to the train," in different dialects.

In terms of the meaning of the contractions of arriving and departing, contrast these two instances: A grape is a grape is a grape. It implies "to eat all the grapes" in the future tense and "to consume some of the grapes" in the future tense. Without a doubt, not knowing this results in such a grammatical and semantic mistake while creating a statement. In this instance, it was important to use the future tense

rather than the future tense since to unload indicates to go all the way, hence the term needs to be in the future tense.

Also frequently breaking morphological rules is the usage of verb tenses. This is particularly true of the verb's analytic forms (prepositional verb with auxiliary verb). The famous philologist A. Rustamov describes these situations as follows: When auxiliary verbs, such as begin and come, are present, the suffix is appended to the main verb to denote the passive action but not to the auxiliary verb. As a result, the suffix -ya is linguistically unnecessary in the following sentences that I have heard and that others may hear or read again. 1. The seed of life was first sown. 2. The deserts started to encroach. 3. Since ancient times, pumpkin seeds have been utilized. 4. Cotton harvesting started. Of course, planting the root of life is planting it. The deserts allegedly started to grow, not develop. It should be emphasized that since ancient times, pumpkin seeds have not been consumed. It should be noted that although cotton has not yet been picked, it has.

The usage of grammatical categories in literary language in all word groups is governed by a number of morphological principles.

Of course, the content consists of word combinations, phrases, and morphologically generated words. Thus, these morphological standards serve as the foundation for syntactic norms.

Speech also deviates from syntactic conventions. As was already said, the speaker is often hesitant because of some unique traits that make the cut's personal adaptation to the owner a strong norm. Take the third person plural possessive and participle as an illustration. When there is a word designating the possessive, the participle can appear in both the plural and the singular: The possessive participle does not necessarily have to match the plural in the third person. Students arrived at school. Students arrived at school. However, the cut is mostly utilized in the singular when it comes to the term possessive, which refers to animals or inanimate objects: Dogs howled, not dogs howled; the flowers weren't open, but they appeared to be open (except for the special uses in artistic discourse, which will be discussed later). However, even when a word is used to describe an inanimate thing or idea, it is still possible to come across phrases that are syntactically erroneous. For instance, all educational institutions are well equipped for the winter (imitating full adaptation in Russian).

A breach of syntactic conventions results from failing to differentiate between a logical plural and a grammatical plural. For instance, according to "People's Word", published on June 30, 2006, the Israeli army has boosted the quantity of military hardware in the area (multiplied). The speaker believed that the army was in the majority, which is why they did this. In actuality, the word refers to a grammatical unit rather than a logical plural or plural noun. As a result, the Israeli army must have... increased, as it is grammatically wrong.

According to grammatical conventions in our language, the word designating the object is only used in the singular if the determiner gives the precise quantity of the object, as in ten books, twenty readers, and five flowers. It is improper to add the plural suffix -s to the definite article in these instances. However, such appropriation occurs often in speech, the press, radio, and television. For instance, 80 vocational institutions in the area are presently home to more than 55,000 students (Uzbekiston ovozi, June 29, 2006).

The values in the "greater than" and "near to" formulations that generalize the estimated quantity are frequently selected improperly, which is another common flaw in the usage of quantifiers. Both grammar and logic are sound in situations like ten, twenty..., one hundred..., more than a thousand or ten, twenty..., one hundred..., roughly a thousand since rounding and generalization are obvious. You giggle, though, when you hear expressions like "more than thirteen," "approximately nineteen," "more than seven," "about thirty-six," let alone "logic," or "grammar." Following all, the norm must be a specific integral amount after "greater than...", "near to...", the standard that rises or lowers! Nobody who can count to seven, nine, thirteen, nineteen, etc., can count the other numbers. These kinds of errors imply that the speaker is mentally lazy.

The failure to comprehend the structural schemes of language models also results in violations of syntactic standards. According to A. Gulyamov, "The arrangement of a phrase is its structural design." This structure, which consists of the very minimal elements required to create a sentence, is the formal-grammatical side of the sentence. The youngster fled; has + cut + link: Karim will be my brother. Possessive + cut. A sentence is a syntactically complete structure, and these constructs are built using the principles of association of linguistic elements.

It should be noted that these limited-scale, linguistically-specific models of speech range in size from 40 to 50. The speaker chooses the language model that best satisfies his communication objectives from among several options, then multiplies it into various forms to produce the necessary phrase. This is one of the crimes committed in the mysterious world of language. French scholar Murtaza Mahmudyan quotes this fact. Most linguists concur that punctuation, which they describe as no more than 20 words, lies between the range of 1030 to 1086. A century is made up of 109 seconds multiplied by 3. A person will only be able to master a very small number of sentences in their lifetime, even if they live for a century and learn a new sentence every second. Mahmudyan notes that the fragmentation of the language structure ensures that the process of language learning and usage occurs in a highly efficient manner. In other words, language is fragmented and these pieces are linked; spoken phrases are not studied and memorized as a whole. As a result of these passages and their grammatical links, language has speech patterns. These passages and a variety of sentence constructions are learned by the student, who then produces countless other sentences as a result. The variety of language patterns in speech is an endless opportunity for the speaker to ensure the accuracy and effectiveness of speech.

It should be noted that the Uzbek language also has its own unique speech patterns. They reflect the syntactic and grammatical norms of the Uzbek literary language. For example, in Russian, there is a sentence model that is the basis for building a sentence like *Мне десять лет*, so this sentence is grammatically correct. But there is no such model of speech in Uzbek, so if this Russian sentence is translated as *Ten years old*, it will not be Uzbek at all. There are other models in the Uzbek language for expressing the same idea, according to which a sentence such as *My age is ten* or *I am ten years old* is formed. Sentences like *Ten Years Old*, written according to Russian or other language patterns, completely destroy the quality of speech accuracy.

It is known that syntactic units, such as phrases and sentences, are formed by the addition of words. There are certain conditions that must be met in order for words to be combined to form phrases and sentences. Of course, there are rules and regulations in the combination of words. No two words are the same. Conjunctions must be grammatically and semantically compatible.

By teaching Nizomiddin Mahmudov's creative legacy, I learned to interpret new approaches to working on speech and vocabulary. By teaching his creative heritage, I understood the Uzbek language and language culture, the "civilized", literary, lexical structure, grammatical, semantic, stylistic aspects,

the level of richness, the essence of the language. N. Mahmudov's books helped us to draw conclusions about his contribution to the development of language and speech culture. During the writing of this course work, I studied the systematic methods and techniques of studying the writer's creativity, image-making skills, style in literary education on the basis of a new approach.

References:

1. Alisher Navoi. Works. 15 volumes. Volume 14 Tashkent: Gulom Publishing House of Fiction, 1967.
2. Marufov A. On two forms of agreement in the Uzbek literary language // Issues of the Uzbek language and literature. 1958, SH,
3. Mahmudov N. Teacher speech culture. - National Library of Uzbekistan named after T.Alisher Navoi, 2007. - 184 p
4. Mahmudov N. Language. - Tashkent: "Writer" Publishing House, 1998. - 37 b
5. Mahmudov N., Saidqulov Z., Sotimov F. The key to perfection. - T.: Manaviyat, 1999. - 277 p
6. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. History of Uzbek linguistics. Part 1