

A Pragmatic Study of the Ratio Category: Statement of the Problem

Azamat Mehmonaliyevich Toshpolatov

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in philological sciences
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract. This article analyzes the need to study the pragmatic aspect of the ratio category forms. Views on this have been critically studied. The author's concept of the study of ratio pragmatics is described.

Key words: proportion, category, pragmatics, semantics, speech practice.

It is known that typological classification is reflected in the pragmatic description of the language. In particular, as the Uzbek language is one of the agglutinative languages, there is no doubt that morphological tools are the leader in performing any task, for example, in expressing a pragmatic tone. But although this pragmatic tone is actively expressed, due to the nature of morphological units, their analysis is more complicated than the description of lexical and analytical forms. Morphological categories in Turkic languages have the quality of highly formed closed systems [see: 7,7-8]. This gives certain difficulties and certain reliefs in their research. The difficulty is that morphological categories in agglutinative languages sum up any immanent aspects of that language. This leads to their essence being very multifaceted. The lightness is that the features revealed in one category example ensure that similar features are reflected in other morphological categories as well.

The study of the ratio category, which has a special place in the system of morphological categories, undoubtedly provides valuable material for the study of other categories. Because it is in the essence of ratio that grammatical and lexical aspects are considered to be closely connected. At the same time, it is difficult to say that the debate about which aspects are grammatical and which aspects are lexical has come to an end [see: 7,82-83]. It is the ratio that has common features with other morphological categories in the formation of word forms, but also has a special feature that is not found in any other morphological category: ratio forms can be added to the same base several times, so what are the bases of such an extraordinary situation still has an acceptable solution in its research not. The study of these and other aspects of the nature of ratio is of particular importance for its pragmatic description. Pragmatic studies are scientific only when they are based on the results of grammatical studies. Before moving on to the study of the pragmatics of the ratio category, let's partially get acquainted with the views on the essence of this category and its place in the morphological system.

Considerable research has been done on the ratio category. However, views regarding the description of the category remain diverse. From M.V.Lomonosov to V.V.Vinogradov, who conducted research on ratio in Russian classical linguistics, which is the basis for Uzbek traditional-theoretical linguistics, members of the ratio category of the older generation present very different views in both classification and description: members of ratio are 3-6 are and have the following semantics:

1. Proportion shows the relationship of the action to the subject.
2. Proportion shows the relationship of the action to the object.
3. Proportion also shows the relationship of the action to the object and the subject.

Also,

1. Relative lexical category (word maker).
2. Ratio is a morphological category.
3. Relative syntactic category [see: 2,495-510; 10.39-49; 13,125-135].

In particular, A. Potebnya, who expressed a unique attitude to the word and the word form ("...the polysemy of the word is a false concept: where there are two meanings, there are two words"[10,39]) believes that each form of the verb in different proportions is a separate word. . He suggested a different definition than all the descriptions of the ratio summarized above. Ratio is "the relation of subject to

object...This includes the absence of an object. This is possible only through the existence of the subject" [10,201]. It seems that it derives the meaning of action from the semantics of the ratio. Of course, this does not mean that the scientist denies that the ratio is a category specific to the verb. But the change of the verb is not to change the verb, but to change the relationship between the object and the subject. It seems that A. Potebnya paid more attention to the pragmatic realization of the ratio than the grammatical essence. A. Potebnya is not alone in this approach to the essence of the grammatical category. According to the author of the famous "Principles of Language History" G. Paul: "Grammatical category is formed on the basis of a psychological category" [8,315]. The ratio also, according to him, serves to reflect the different relations between the psychological and the grammatical owner. G. Paul seems to have correctly advanced the psychological-pragmatic aspects reflected in the essence of ratio. But not only the proportion, but in general any morphological category, he concluded that the pragmatic aspects are not related to the linguistic unit, but to psychological categories, because according to him: "Grammatical category is in some sense a hardened form of psychological category; it is associated with a stable tradition. And the psychological category remains something alive and free, which always acquires a new appearance depending on individual feelings" [8,315]. According to him, the "birth" of grammatical categories is related to psychological processes. Psychological aspects that do not fit into the framework of existing grammatical categories lead to the emergence of new grammatical categories[8,315]. In modern world linguistics, including in Russian linguistics, there have been many studies on the study of grammatical categories, in particular, the pragmatic aspects of the ratio nature. Opinions were formed that the selection of relative forms in speech originates from pragmatic moments [12;9]. But within the framework of concrete analysis, even the most modern researches in the semantics of the ratio cannot leave the relationship of the action-object-subject trinity and do not hesitate to note that the definitions given to the ratio cannot fully describe not only its pragmatic nature, but also its grammatical nature [For example, see: 12].

If we look at the study of proportion in Uzbek linguistics, we see the same picture as above. A great deal of research has been done on the genesis and development of the ratio category and its synchronic status. The tendency to follow the views of the world linguists discussed above in determining the meaning of the ratio is leading. At the same time, there are also studies that go much further with their views on the essence of proportion, and that, taking into account the characteristics of the Uzbek language, penetrate deeply into the essence of this category. In particular, M.A'lamova proposes a system of 12 different relations of subject, object, factor and predicate related to the semantics of the ratio, and in the compound application of the ratio, each relative suffix performs a specific grammatical task (usually it is noted that only the last of the ratio forms of the word is taken into account and other ratio forms in the series are ignored), in this regard, he distinguishes the terms ratio and degree, which are usually used interchangeably [1,18-21].

Sh.Shahobiddinova has also paid attention to this peculiarity in the use of relative forms in her research, and connected this situation with strong lexicalization in relative forms compared to members of other morphological categories: as a result of the increased lexicalization potential characteristic of the ratio as a whole, it can be shown that another incremental level indicator is added to increase the dominance of the grammatical aspect over the indicator in which the lexical aspect begins to increase. For example, historically *қай+m+ap*, like synchronous *уула+m+mup* [16,111].

In general, in Uzbek linguistics, a very diverse system of views on the grammatical nature of the ratio has been created in the research, is conducted until today, but no unified solution has been reached in this regard. In our opinion, the existence of any language unit in the language is closely related to its necessity for practice. The representatives of structuralism, who defined the language as a system "in and for itself", also emphasized that the systemic landscape of the language is individual for each language speaker[11]. Of course, this individuality should not be understood primitively. A perfect system called language lives in the mind of the nation (perhaps it forms its mind). The relationship between the consciousness of the nation and the consciousness of the representative of the nation constitutes a system of requirements.

In today's science, the ratio category is studied from the point of view of methodology, which is an expression of pragmatics, at a very low level. In some of the literature, which is not so much, this large category is completely ignored[18], while in some, very little information is given[19,55-58]. In the

pragmatic direction of world linguistics, which was the leader in the next few decades, researches on this category were not conducted.

In our opinion, the need for a pragmatic analysis of the ratio category is based on the following:

1. A pragmatic description of this category has not been created.
2. Nisbat is a category that classifies verbs from the most numerous word groups not only in the Uzbek language, but also in all world languages. Based on the fact that the verb is the most active group of words in speech, it can be seen that the ratio has a great role in speech characteristics - pragmatics.

3. Relative Turkic languages, including Uzbek, are distinguished by the quantitative abundance of their forms within morphological categories and their uniqueness in terms of use. The pragmatic study of such a category will undoubtedly provide great material for the study of other morphological categories.

4. Ratio occupies a special place among the morphological categories of the Uzbek language as it changes not only the morphological and syntactic characteristics of the word form, but also the lexical characteristics. The relative clause changes the base valence of the verb to which it is added, and can change its lexical characteristics such as transitive-intransitive. In the system of form builders, word modifiers, and word builders, the members of the ratio system are distinguished by the fact that they have their own aspects and individualize these aspects. Therefore, the pragmatic study of this category is of particular importance in the pragmatics of the word formation and formation system of the Uzbek language in general.

The moment the study of the pragmatics of the ratio category is undoubtedly complicated. There are several reasons for this:

1. As we have seen, the ratio category has not been given an acceptable description for everyone.
2. The study of concepts such as diathesis, casualness, mediality related to ratio is not up to the level of demand.

3. Research on the pragmatics of not only the ratio, but also the morphological categories in general has not been conducted at the level of modern requirements.

There is no doubt that the solution of the problems indicated in the creation of the pragmatic description of this category has a special place in the development of Uzbek morphopragmatics.

References:

1. Аъламова М. Ўзбек тилидаги феълларда нисбат категорияси. – Т.,1992.-144 б.
2. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык. – М.: Высшая школа,1986. – 640 с.
3. Мещанинов И.И. Глагол. – М.-Л.: Изд. АН СССР,1949. – 198 с.
4. Миртожиев М. Нисбат категориялари формантлари ва улар семантикаси генезиси. Ўтимлилик ва ортирма нисбат категорияси // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. -1982. -N4.-Б. 6-10.
5. Миртожиев М. Нисбат категориялари семантикаси ва улар формантлари генезиси. ўтимсизлик ва ўзлик нисбати // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. -1983. -N2. -Б. 11-13.
6. Нейматов Ҳ. Феъл нисбатларнинг муносабати ҳақида // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. -1970. -N3. - Б. 37-39
7. Нигматов Х.Г. Функциональная морфология тюркоязычных памятников XI - XII вв. - Т.: Фан, 1989. - 191 с.
8. Пауль Г. Принципы истории языка. – М.: Издательство Иностранной литературы,1960. – 499 с.
9. Пестова Н.В., Суменкова Е.М. Прагматическая направленность страдательного залога в политической коммуникации // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. №25. 2009. – CyberLeninka.ru>article/n/pragmatic
10. Потебня А.А. Из записок по русской грамматике.т.1-2. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1956. – 536 с.
11. Соссюр Ф.де. Курс общей лингвистики(извлечения) // www.slovesnik.ru
12. Суменкова Е.М. Процесс усвоения прагматики категории залога на занятиях по практической грамматике в языковом вузе//Педагогическое образование в России. №1.2012. – CyberLeninka.ru>article/n/pragmatic
13. Фортунатов Ф.Ф. Избранные труды. т.2. – М.,1957. – 540 с.
14. Фозилов Э. Феъл даража ясовчи аффиксларнинг тарихи // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. -1960. - N3. -Б. 54-58.

15. Шайкевич А.Я.и др. Введение в языкознание. – Т.: Ўқитувчи,1989. - 312 с.
16. Шаҳобиддинова Ш. Ўзбек тили морфологияси. – Андижон: Андижон нашриёт-матбаа МЧЖ, 2012. – 151 б.
17. Шаҳобиддинова Ш.Х. Татбиқий тилшунослик тезислари.// АДУ.Илмий хабарнома.2016.№3. – 78-81 б.
18. Шомақсудов А. ва бошқ. Ўзбек тили стилистикаси. – Т.:Ўқитувчи,1983. – 248 б.
19. Қиличев Э. Ўзбек тилининг амалий стилистикаси. – Т.:Ўқитувчи,1992. – 160 б.
20. Гуломов А. Феъл. – Т.,1954. – 128 б.
21. Ҳакимов М. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. –Т.: Академнашр.2013. – 116 б.
22. Ҳожиев А. Феъл. -Т.: Фан, 1973. -192 б.
23. UMAROVA, N. R., & YIGITALIYEVA, S. (2021). Concept as a basic unit of cognitive linguistics. *THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука*,(9), 701-704.
24. Oripova, K. E. (2020). Semantic and semic analysis of antonyms. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (84), 724-726.
25. Shoqosim o'g'li, Abdurahmonov Umidjon, Meliyeva Xusnida Xafizaliyevna, and G'ofurov To'lqinjon. "MODERN DIDACTIC MEANS OF TEACHING MATHEMATICS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND PROBLEM EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY." *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal* 10.4 (2022): 460-467.