



## **PLACE OF PROFESSOR AYYUB GULOMOV IN FORMING OF MORPHOLOGICAL VIEWPOINTS IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS OF XX CENTURY\***

*Nodira ALAVUTDINOVA GANIEVNA\*\*\**

### **ABSTRACT**

The Place of Prof. Ayub Gulomov in forming Uzbek linguistics of XX century and his views on it is studied in this paper. Author show the Uzbek linguistics' works of Ayyub Gulomov, who used synthesized system of research analyzing methods of source in Uzbek linguistics in 1940 y. Especially, Prof. Ayub Gulomov was begun to studying the one of the morphological occurrence as a research subject and he substantiated that approach to the process' every conditions in the basis of system-structure and substantial way. Articles about affixes -la, -dosh are analyzed in his books, such as: "Verb", "Cases of Uzbek language", "Plural in Uzbek language". So, A.Gulomov stated, that tense, mood, voice both by person-quantity category, and by using the usage specifics of every form, and other sides, especially, refinements of meaning expression, usage by compound or swapping, didn't lose epy importance even in nowadays. Also, there is observed, that linguistics sometimes made some changes, gave this problem in modified form, but none of them didn't make serious changes to it. So, we can conclude, that theoretical ideas of the scientist on these categories are recognized by variety scientists. Besides it, in this paper shows that the good aspects of books' Prof. Ayub Gulomov.

### **STRUCTURED ABSTRACT**

The article deals with the place of Prof. Ayub Gulomov in forming Uzbek linguistics of XX century and his views on it. Particular, Prof. Ayub Gulomov was begun to studying the one of the morphological occurrence as a research subject and he substantiated that approach to the process' every conditions in the basis of system-structure and substantial way. Articles about affixes -la, -dosh are analyzed in his books, such as: "Verb", "Cases of Uzbek language", "Plural in Uzbek language". So, A.Gulomov stated, that tense, mood, voice both by person-quantity category, and by using the usage specifics of every form, and other sides, especially, refinements of meaning expression, usage by compound or swapping, didn't lose epy importance even in

---

\* Bu makale Crosscheck sistemi tarafından taranmış ve bu sistem sonuçlarına göre orijinal bir makale olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

\*\*\* Phd. Student and Researcher of National University of Uzbekistan



nowadays. Also, there is observed, that linguistics sometimes made some changes, gave this problem in modified form, but none of them didn't make serious changes to it. So, we can conclude, that theoretical ideas of the scientist on these categories are recognized by variety scientists. Author shows good aspects of book "Verb" in books expressing her opinion about "Verb".

In this paper A.Gulomov stated, that this unit is used in Turkic in two varieties, also in some Turkic, as Uzbek is used in one (definitely), literal variety, but it can be used in all two varieties in Uzbek dialects and explained their reasons. Besides, he shows, that in live talking Uzbek there is phenomena, never observed in other Turkic, that is, consonant *-d* in the beginning of affix so effects to the word last sound, that it turns to the voiced sound, for example, *saftash - sabdash*. Also he comments reasons of mentioned phenomena (Gulomov: 1946, 10). The scientist stated, that affixes, which are its variant in Tajik (acquired into Uzbek) can be synonymous too. On the assumption of these, he concluded on etymology of *-dash* affix. First of all, he pronounced on the thought of K.G.Zeleman. K.G.Zeleman stated, that *-da* in affix *-dash* formed by adjoining the *sh* to the word *esh* (friend). This opinion has been supported by N.Ostroumov too. He described *-sh* as combined unit.

Because, as approaching to every phenomena (in cognition) in world, it is impossible to approach to every lingual phenomena (also to its every unit) without bearing in mind of its relation with other phenomena and units. It is true and other research approaching ways are ineffective and one-sidedly. In this connection, professor H.Nematov stated: "Each of both structural (particularly, substantive) and formal interpretations of lingual unit are may be effective in own spheres, but they do disclose only one side of such multilateral research source, as lingual unit. And disclosing of other sides now is the task for the science. Time and development of science will go on to disclose them. That's why, in Uzbek linguistics, precisely in Uzbek, we can see diverse approaches and research ways" [Замонавий ўзбек тили: 2008, 24]. Every lingual phenomena, its features, sides and conclusions on them will be deepened and developed on the assumption of approaching character, goal, its scales, learning curve researcher, his objectivity or partiality, research size, viewpoints, research standards, general scientific-practical environment. Truly, further researches will change, supplement, develop, improve, enrich, specify and deepen them.

He approaches to each lingual phenomenon, research source by application of all principles and general regularities of dialectics. In the scientists works can be observed synthesis of system-structural, formal-functional (maybe even formal or functional) and substantive research methods. Any of his works can't be conducted in only one, for example by formal-functional way. Exactly with this feature Ayyub Gulomov is, who founded the researching the Uzbek linguistics by substantive methods, indeed. As is known, substantive linguistics in full implies both system-structural and formal-functional research guidelines. They are demanded by dialectic cognition principles. Besides it, she substantiated that the views of Prof. Ayub Gulomov are important for Modern Uzbek linguistics in this paper. In this way we can see all

---

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



aspects of place of Professor Ayyub Gulomov in forming of morphological viewpoints in Uzbek linguistics of XX century.

**Key Words:** verb, case, morphology, Turkic language, modern Uzbek language, morphologic category, predicate.

## 20. ASIR ÖZBEK DİLBİLİMİNDE MORFOLOJİYE AİT GÖRÜŞLERİN ŞEKİLLENMESİNDE PROF. EYYÜP GULAMOV'UN YERİ

### ÖZET

Bu makalede Profesör Eyyüp Gulamov'un, 20. Asır Özbek dilbiliminde morfolojiye ait görüşlerinin şekillenmesindeki yeri geniş ölçüde incelenmiştir. Bunun dışında, Özbek dili morfolojisi hakkında ciddi bilimsel araştırmaların yapıldığı 20. Asrın 40.yıllarına denk gelişi, bu devre kadar genel olarak morfolojiye ait kayıtlardan yavaş yavaş her bir morfolojik hadiseyi ayrı araştırmaya başlanması, bu yönelişteki işleri dilbilimci Eyyüp Gulamov 1940 yılında "Özbek Dilinde Hal Ekleri" broşür-araştırması ile başladığını ve çok geçmeden, âlimin "Özbek Dilinde Çokluk Kategorisi" eseri ve ayrıca "Özbek Dilinde Söz Tertibi", "Morfolojiye Giriş", "Fiil" kitaplarının ortaya çıkması ve bu kitapların Özbek Dilbilimi içerisindeki yeri incelenmiştir.

20. asrın 40. Yıllarına Özbek dilbiliminde Eyyüp Gulamov, araştırma kaynağına ve çeşitli yönelişlerine temel olan farklı inceleme metotlarını sentezlemiş, her yönden, kaynağın diğer hadiseler ile ilişkisinden ortaya çıkan yaklaşım şeklini kullandı. Âlimin morfolojiye ait çalışmaları, bu araştırma usulü sonuçları sıfatında ortaya çıktığı, ayrıntılı olarak gösterilmek istenmiştir.

Bunun dışında makalede Özbek dilbilimindeki incelemelerde hal eklerinin eş anlamlı veya aynı görevde kullanım ilişkilerine, kullanım sırasına, eklerin anlamını kaybetmesi gibi pek çok yönere de önem verildiği, bununla birlikte, onların edatlar ile kullanması, mana ve görevi gibi konular da A.G. Gulamov tarafından imkân dairesinde öğrenildiği belirtilmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Fiil, hal, morfoloji, Türk Dilleri, Modern Özbek Dili, Morfolojik Kategori, Yüklem.

Serious scientific researches on Uzbek morphology began in 1940s. At that time there has been silently transition of linguistics from surface researching to the deepened researching. Works on this sphere has been initiated with brochure from 1940 – research work "Cases in Uzbek" by Ayyub Gulomov [Гуломов: 1940]. By passing some time, the scientist published "Plural category in Uzbek" [Гуломов: 1941]. By this way were published such research works, as "Word forming order in Uzbek", "Introduction into morphology" and "Verb" [Гуломов: 1948; Морфология: 1953; Фейл: 1954]. In addition, the scientists such works, as "About affix *-lar*" (1945), "About affix *-dosh*" (in Russian, 1946), "About affix *-qa*" (in Russian: 1946), "Thoughts about adjective" (1979), "Literary language norms" (1973), "Word forming by internal changing" (in Russian:

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



1947), “Word forming by internal changing of word in Uzbek” (in Russian: 1947), “About changing of base in word forming” (in Russian, 1947), “On certain problems of affixation in Uzbek” (in Russian, 1953), “Orthography of compound words in Uzbek” (in Russian: 1954), “On problem of adverbialization in Uzbek” (in Russian: 1954), “On case forms in Tashkent dialect” (in Russian: 1955), “On comparative degree of adjective” (1960), “About affix *-mon*”, “About affix *-lik*”, “On accompanying phenomenon in Uzbek by affixation” (5 sheet, 1963), “On some specifications of affixes with affectionate diminutive meaning in Uzbek” (in Russian: 1964), which are dedicate to the scientific interpretation of such and such important morphologic phenomenon in Uzbek.

It is significant, that the scientist approaches to certain phenomenon, condition, unit on basis of system-structural, and especially, substantive directions. Particularly, by the attention on the scientists research of *-lik* affix we can notice, that he detailed informed on this affix origin, its varieties, place in word forming, productivity, means features, all possibilities, also other features. Also in other similar articles can be observed similarities. To be convinced of its truthfulness we can look through articles of scientist on researching of affixes *-la* or *-dosh*.

By the thought on history of researching the system of cases in Uzbek, of course, we should to draw attention to works on morphologic system of 1920s in Uzbek. Particularly, K.Kodirov researched the subject “On history of researching the morphologic system in Uzbek” [Кодиров: 2007, 3-18], and in it in the majority has been drawn attention to viewpoints in such works, as “Lessons of Uzbek” (Munavvar qori, Qayum Ramazon, Shorasul Zunnun), “Lessons of language”, “Rules of Uzbek language” by Sh.Zunnun, and “Sarf” by Fitrat. Among them, in “Sarf” by Fitrat, under the title “Grammar categories of noun”, it is only drawn attention to such case affixes, as *-ning*, *-da*, *-dan*, *-ga* (*-ka*, *-qa*, *-g’a*), and they shortly commented. Their original internal specifics hasn’t been widely commented. In generally, there can be observed, that in above mentioned works information on research history of case systems is very short.

Also, in column “From research history of case category” in “Modern Uzbek language” (2008), Morphology, as we stated, there is mentioned, that “History of case forms researching in Uzbek begins with researches of A.Gulomov”. By this, of course, has been meant brochure of the scientist “Cases in Uzbek” [Фуломов: 1941, 1]. Also, in “Grammar” by academics A.N.Kononov there is expressed an opinion such “system is described formally” [Замонавий ўзбек тили: 2008, 353].

In follow be present the opinions on research of case systems in this supply: Separate case categories forms are formally comprehensive researched by I.Ziyaev, Y.Inoyatov, A.Yuldoshev, G.Ruziev, A.Marufov, Sh.Rahmatullaev and other scientists. They studied speech meaning and syntactic features of cases. System research of case form is accomplished by H.Nematov, Sh.Shahobiddinov and Z.Qodirov. In scientists works was rebuilt general lingual grammatical meaning. After that, there are referenced to “Marking case” (Uzbek language and Literature: 1971, No. 4) of H.Nematov, “System researching grammatical category in Uzbek” (case category: abstract of the thesis of candidate of philological sciences) and “Theoretical grammar of Uzbek. Morphology”, published by A.Nurmanov and others (Nurmanov: 75-100).

But, there are no opinions on subject in conclusion part of “Cases” by A.Gulomov. This work of the enrolled as rare production and republished as heritage in 2008 (work 4<sup>th</sup>). And “Modern Uzbek. Morphology”, handed over to publishing in 2007. In the case of the scientist has seen before work of A.Gulomov, he could think over his opinion: “System research of case forms are carried out by H.Nematov, Sh.Shahobiddinov and Z.Kodirov”.

---

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



First of all, researching of case system in turkology, particularly, in Uzbek linguistics began earlier, and it is known, that case system in Uzbek is researched also by such scientists, as Z.Marufov, M.Kodirov, S.Mutallibov, R.Ko'ngurov, Sh.Rahmatullaev, S.Soliev. By drawing attention to researching of this system in 1940s by A.Gulomov, it should be analyzed his work, even if its part.

Work is fair-sized, approximately consist of 6 sheets. Work consist of 7 parts, which are divided into these divisions – “Instead of foreword”, “Introduction”, “Main case”, “Consonant case”, “Genitive case”, “Accusative case”, “Dative case”, “Locative case”, “Initial case” and “Auxiliary construction”. In addition, A.Gulomov dedicated to the problem of genitive case and possessive affix under the title “Genitive syntagma” majority part of his work “Attribute case in Uzbek” (1940) [Фуломов: 1940, 12-48].

“Introduction” of work is dedicated to 3 conclusions: 1) declension of nouns by cases brings to a change in a word in main case; 2) cases shows relations of nouns with other words...; 3) This relation displays the relations of subjects with other subjects or action, or another signs” [Гулямов: 1946]. No one of these conclusions can be denied. Because, bare bones of case system reflected in these conclusions (anyhow to look). Other conclusions are: “Task of case not only word form changing, but firstly, it is meaning effect. Declination of nouns depends on demanding for them in speech. Cases are shows role of nouns in sentences” [Айюб: 2008, 88]. To this day, no one could repeal these conclusions (first three of them), anyhow they look to subject. It is because, these conclusions are covered exactly cases system.

Following conclusion concerns the cases naming: “Name of cases are related to their main-leading functions. That is, there are very much variety of meaning and grammatical task of each case type, and one of them displays its leading feature, which give occasion to naming the case. For example, noun forms with “-dan” affix can express a thought in such meanings, as noun initial, causative, means, value, comparative, increase, but first of them is determinative. That’s why, it is named an initial case. Therefore, none of mentioned names can (in all meanings) display its all sides” [Фуломов: 2008, 88].

Next conclusion is on case quantities in Uzbek, in this connection, the scientist stated: “to this day their number were six,... But we joined one another to them – vocative case. According to the properties, this case has character distinct from the main case”. As is known in Uzbek linguistics there are many varieties of states on case quantities. In addition, there are have been mentioned in works on subject such additional cases, as marking cases (-gacha), comparative case (-day), that is, sometimes they were counted eight, sometimes nine, and sometimes six cases (also, there are opinions about their definition according to dialect) in Uzbek. All the same, most scientists recognized the six cases. Even A.Gulomov further recognized them in this quantity. It appears from this, the scientists opinion on case quantity in Uzbek is partially contradicted. But this not wholly responsible. To this days this problem os not finally solved. Maybe, in Uzbek, really and truly, there are seven cases (this is the next task, because the scientists opinions and comments are substantiated).

After that, A.Gulomov comments general features of case using in Uzbek by 12 items. In first item, he concluded on order of case affixes accession to word bases, that is their possibilities to accession to word bases as like as to words, after quantity and possessive affixes. In item second has been stated, two case affixes at simultaneously can’t be joined to one base word, and rightly explained such isolated exceptions, as *sen+ing+da*, *uyda+gi+da*, *uyda+gi+larga*, *bir yildanga kesildi*, *uch so'mdanga sotildi* (they commented by the scientist too).

---

### Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



In third item is given opinion on implicating (formal-informal – N.A.) of some case forms and specified, that they are not main case and their joining to the leading word determines it as another case, affix. These two condition are reasoned for meaning demand. At present, there are linguistics, who states, that in such sentences, as «*u kitob o'qidi*» (also in example «*Magazindan kitob sotib oldi*») word “*kitob*” in main case form. In spite of this, we consider this state of the scientist is appropriate.

Forth item devoted to relation of case affixes and postpositions: a) there is sign of equivalence of postpositions with affixes; b) sometimes, they can be used coupled with, and in that event, postposition is used in at the end of word; c) in that event, may be certain semantic differences.

In fifth item has been suitably stated, that case affixes are joined by similar way both to singular and plural words, and they vary in words with vowel-consonant, hard-soft sign, voiced-voiceless sound ending.

In sixth item considered another side of problem. It maybe, that controlled word can be located before the control word, but in prose can be observed changing of this rule (attention to style side – N.A.). Controlled and control words used to locate back-to-back, sometimes they can be used separately (for example, *vazifani tez bajardi*). Herein, observed the importance of word parts and role of logical accent.

Should be said, that even A.Gulomov stated, that genitive, besides its some features, also has separateness of case (adaptation by person in its parts), and with it, he leaves it in cases list, and stated, that indicated its features suitably.

In seventh item, the case affixes, joined to structures, which were acquired from Persian are categorized to genitive words (and meanwhile, they always join to attributes), but they according to the contents are subordinated to the attributes. In such events, this structure is considered one whole and the affix is joined to the word end, for example: *Mardumi Farg'ona+ni*.

In eights item, accent changing after joining the case affix to the word, word base changing because of joining the case affix to it in other items, consideration of some words with case affixes as adverb (*jihatidan, chindan, orqasidan, yonidan, u yoqqa, bu yoqqa*), but their possibility of becoming noun by declension with genitive, joining the case forms to last word or every word, style features in this. All this conclusions are substantiated. They are really and truly general features of cases.

With these general features, it the book reflected internal specifics of each cases as it possible. Also reflected meanings, functions, historical using, place in live talk of each case. Particularly, features of main case reflected in 13 items. There have not been observed such interpretations and analyzes in any works. That's why, this work of A.Gulomov can be estimated as standard for scientific and substantial approach to case system in Uzbek. Because, in any works, initiated to research of this system, its features didn't in-depth studied as Ayyub Gulomov. This work of the scientist still works as theoretical source for research works, executed after 1940s, even after 1950s.

Of course, in Uzbek linguistics researches are studied such problems, as relations of synonymous and co-task, using of cases back-to-back (*ketma-ket – ich-ka-ri-ga*), affixes desemantization, also their controlling by postpositions, synonymous and functionalism. Particularly, in his DPhil work “Semantic-stylistic features of form affixes on nouns”, R.Kongurov [Кўнгуоров: 1984, 1-250] concluded on synonymous feature of case affixes by following examples: *talabalardan biri – talabalarning biri; otni minib – otga minib; oshni ye – oshdan ye* and etc

---

### Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



[Қўнғуров: 1984, 20-110]. In this work by author mentioned phenomena regarded as synonymity of grammatical forms. In other works he stated, that this phenomena estimated as syntactic synonymity [Тожиёв: 1991, 53; Мамажонов: 1991, 67; Тўйчибоев: 1991, 9-17]. Subject of mentioned works was such type constructions, as *ukamga oldim – ukam uchun oldim* too.

There been draw attention in work to desemantization of affixes *-ning*, *-dan*, in such examples, as *mening borishim kerak – men borishim kerak*; *tezda borib kelaman – tezdan borib kelaman*. In a word, goal of work, initiated by A.Gulomov was to research very many sides of problem and we can conclude, that further researches are rank after developing, complementing, confirmation of his viewpoints.

As was stated by scientist M.Djurabaeva, “His ten articles, equally to large books, is rare in treasury of science to this days, still worth and serving as fundament to an enormous mass of works” [Жўрабоева: 2004, 7]. On the assumption of this and analyzing methods of A.Gulomov, it is supposed right to consider his small article on affix *-dosh*. First of all, the scientist expounded briefly its using in speech: “Suffix *-dosh* (he is right for using this term for his times, because, then this affix has been joining after the base word) is one of the passive affixes, few-used and used in *-dash*, *-tash*, *-nash*, *-lash*, *-das*, *-des*, *-tas*, *-las*, *-les* forms in Turkic. It was known from the beginning of Turkic history, but in that times was the unit, rare used, and which attention-getting of P.M.Melioransky” [Айюб: 2005, 10; Гулямов: 1946].

As is stated in work “Grammar of Turkish” (in Russian, M.L.: 1941, 64) by academician A.N.Kononov above mentioned opinion has been supported by Bang and Nemeev too. Also A.Gulomov brings the opinion of J.Denu: “This affix is the remainder of word *adash*, indeed”. Also he expresses an opinion on other opinions within reason. A.Gulomov supported the opinion of K.G.Zeleman about formation of this affix from combination of two morpheme and defined these two morpheme like this: first part consist of verb forming affix *-la*, and the second part, maybe word forming component or combining unit, and argues these opinions. A.Gulomov comments his opinions on problem by nine items. Also he leaves problem of truly origin the suffixes *-da* and *-sh* as separate research object.

As we can see, the scientist by above mentioned: 1) determines the potential of modern and old time using of affix *-dash*; 2) fully shows their varieties in Uzbek and Turkic; 3) draw attention to their using in Uzbek dialects; 4) draw attention to their place in live talk; 5) expounded and reasoned effect to last sound of word in case of affix joining to base word; 6) described its meaning relations with other affixes (draw attention to synonymity); 7) examined it stylish; 8) gives an opinion on describes about affixes origin; 9) describes, argues own opinions on this affix etymology; 10) determines the perspective research scale (general problem).

Thereby, A.Gulomov follows the way of disclosure of all sides and features of this unit (they can be endless). Of course, for it, research can be further deepened. Particularly, in his works there are possibilities to research further the phenomena of falling into steady state of unit, joined *-dash* affix (units, which part is *-dash* affix), becoming a term of this unit and its other similar (adverbial participle, participle) features.

In 1940s Ayyub Gulomov used synthesized system of research analyzing methods of source in Uzbek linguistics. He founded the process of separately and deepening research of every phenomena, unit, by realizing them as element of general lingual system and their relations with other phenomena and units. We will dwell on it below. Above mentioned morphological works of the scientist came into because of his own research methods.

Verb words are recorded since earliest times in Turkic. Particularly, M.Koshgariy separated this problem as independent part of speech, and begun its seriously analyzing. Also he informed of

### Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



such verb categories, as tense, voice and person types of verbs [Sayfullayeva: 2007, 45]. Likewise, M.Koshgariy took cognizance on using of verb moods, numerals in speech [Devonu lug'atit turk: 1960-1963]. Also, there are notes on paying attention to verbs in works "History of Uzbek linguistics" and "Muqaddimat ul-adab" by Mahmud Zamahshariy. In "At-tuhfatuz zaniyatit fillugatit turkiya" by unknown author there has been paid attention to such categories of verbs as affirmative–negative, personal, tense, moods [Fozilov, Ziyayeva: 1978, 46-61].

In the XX century's beginning A.Fitrat in his work "Sarf" informed of such categories of verbs as personal, tense, affirmative–negative, transitive verb– intransitive verb, simple and compound verbs.

In the XX century's middle can be followed separate researches of "Verb" issue: "Verb stylistics" by M.Sodikova, "Verb", "Defective verb" and "Auxiliary" by A.Hojiev, "Development of verb tenses in Uzbek language" by Sh.Shukurov, "Verb categories in memorials of XI century" [Sodiqova: 1973; Hojiyev: 1970; Hojiyev: 1966; Shukurova: 1976] by S.Mutalibov, and others. But, in none of them wasn't defined the goal to whole analyzing of the "Verb" category in Uzbek language.

In the 50<sup>th</sup> of XX century A.Gulomov, the researcher of verbs in Uzbek language in the capacity of whole study, modestly published his "Verb" monograph (1954) in "Materials of modern Uzbek language course" column [G'ulomov: 1954].

The researcher stated, that verbs senses movement and position, movement word envelopes wide meaning, therefore, position expression can be considered in much the same way (within the movement scope), also even such words, as *to happy, to slumber, to grow white, to grow old and e.t.c.* doesn't regarded as indicating physical condition, but should be regarded in this way.

First of all, Ayyub Gulomov stated, that the assumption of Uzbek verbs analyzing, substantiating the express of movement as differentiating sign of the verb from other parts of speech.

A.Gulomov put forward such hypothesis, as "Place category is expressed by case forms and auxiliaries, and time category is used to be expressed by tense forms of verb" [G'ulomov: 1954, 20].

Also, author stated, that one of morphological specifications of verb is their conjugation.

The scientist decidedly stated, that this morphological specification of verb demonstrates its enactment of predicative role. Also, he argues viewpoint: "Productivity is dominant syntactic feature of verb" (G'ulomov: 1954, 3-7).

A.Gulomov differentiates the verbs to personal or non-finite forms on the basis of their designation or non-designation, and views the infinitive, participle, gerund forms as contradictory to clear verbs. He designates non-finite verb forms as following: "first, deprived of some verbal specifics; second, appropriated some specifics of other parts of speech. "...These are words, integrated up to other parts of speech". The scientist detailed decrypted integration of pronouns up to nouns, participle up to adjective, gerund up to adverb (Hojiyev: 1973, 6-7 and 86-87). Also, he described most specifics of verb, at once concluded on every specific, for example, as following: "verb, as morphologic category used to shows the relations of words. There is no need always to affix in there... Imperative verb (second party in the singular) by the lexico-grammatical specifics (used to be almost in all verbs), shows the relation with the action word, outgoing from verb word (for example, come – you come)". These specifics helps to realize, that verb syntax position is more signify than other parts of speech, verb is important means, it has word combination capacities. In the majority of cases, verb is considered as sentence basis constructor, that is, it has a

---

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015





constructivist's specific. In many cases (verbal sentences), about sentence's general specifics is concluded on the basis of verb – verb in the capacity of predicates specifics” (Hojiyev: 1973, 4). Purpose of the above mentioned large scale direct speech is to point out the attract attention to scientists opinion to “Verb” problem, harmony of his conclusions with modern ideas on appropriate problem, in every conclusion reverberated serious scientific viewpoint. Also, he indicated, that verbs functions as formation source of modern doctrines on such problems, as sentence, predicate, its stausing. See, Verb:

a) goes a great way in morphology as complicated morphologic category; b) productivity is main specific of verb; c) verb shows word relationship (in this case may not be grammar indicator) – shows relationship with action word; d) syntax in verb more distinctive; e) it is the constructor of sentence basis; f) general characteristic of sentence is determined by verb in a predicative role (here it seems, that statement “is determined by verb in a predicative role” as-if changed the mind trend. Indeed, there is the same meaning – N.A.), g) what can we add into like conclusion, as “determined by predicative verb”. Herein, maybe will be right the assertion on “one-sided theoretical” views forms the bulk of expressed affirmations.

A.Gulomov was completely right, when argued, that verbs has transitive verb– intransitive, affirmative–negative, voice, mood, tense, personal-quantity categories, even, distinctive categories in Uzbek. Scientist, speak of species category, it is arguable, that it differences from categories in, for example, Russian and original in Uzbek. Later, this problem, named verb mode or mode of action, mode category, also, especially researched [Ғуломов: 1940]. Therefore, this mode is exists in language. It is single question, what should be called it, category or mode. Actions in Uzbek has such characteristics, as repeatability, suddenly execution, sharpness, increasing, decreasing, continue, hint at completeness – incompleteness, growth, diminishment indeed. There are affirmations (beginning of XXI century) about availability of mode category and possibility of such naming. In spite of multiply view opposition, A.Gulomovs theory from 50<sup>th</sup> of XX century is being supported by modern linguistics. In “Second compound-type verbs” part (verb + verb compound-type verbs, § 77) of book “Verb”, the scientist, before commenting each auxiliary showed their general specifics (most important indeed – N.A.) on 9 types, and accentuating on their specific meanings and methodological aspects, stated, that auxiliaries serves to show action characteristics of main verb (suddenly beginning, continue, repeating, finishing and other types of action), also this is named category type and in Uzbek type is expressed in analytic and syntactic ways.

A.Gulomov tried to substantiate the existence of transitive -intransitive verbs categories with distinctive expression in Uzbek. He approached to this problem by deep comprehension of grammar form meaning (singular-plural nouns, affirmatively-negatively verb forms – everyone knows, that he approached likewise to its grammatical opposition – N.A.). That is, he approached the entering into some relations of formed verbs with accusative, in an another forms enters into relations with other case words, if their forms will change after verb form adding, relation of that verbs may be changed with other case words, herein the relativity of each verb forms and their importance. And this gives an opportunity to suppose, that the “Grammar form valence” theory was founded by A.Gulomov. He gave a separate consideration to using of each unit, using possibilities. By this way he approached attentively to the word valence and grammar form valence problems. But, he just didn't use “valence” term. Maybe by attention to the meaning of unification of units with others, the scientist even couldn't imagine that he widely dwell on valence problem. As we know, in 70<sup>th</sup> appeared a viewpoints, as “there are no state of transitive – intransitive verbs, it doesn't have a form, that's why no more to say about this”. This has result the conclusion: “Absence of transitive – intransitive verbs exaggerate the possibility of discussion this problem” [Hojiyev: 1974, 81-82]. By this way, there were such opinions, as “it is difficult to talk about any verb categories in Uzbek (we suppose in other Turkic too)” (p. 89). Probably, because of existence

### **Turkish Studies**

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



of unification – no unification verb forms, academician A.Hojiyev was compelled to deny this problem and divided them into objective and nonobjective verbs, on the assumption of their unification possibilities with any form words (nouns). Yo.Tojiyev, in 80<sup>th</sup> at first time in Uzbek linguistics substantiated, that the transitive – intransitive verb categories in Uzbek has defined forms in his article on the science of “On transitivity-intransitivity in verbs” [Tojiyev: 1987, 3-116].

It should be noted, that in spite of disuse of “valence” term, A.Gulomov is scientist, who founded its theory in Uzbek. In his attempts of syntactic and no syntactic form separating of affixes (sometimes it used as word changing, and sometimes word-formative – N.A.) from word-formative affixes, and by his discussion the specifics of –s affixes and other affixes using, including, by commenting the tasks and usage, also brochure “Cases in Uzbek” (1941), part “Genitive syntagma” of “Genitives in Uzbek” (Materials for scientific grammar of Uzbek, T.: 1941) and at last, by substantiating of transitivity – intransitivity of verbs, it can be followed widely approaching the valence grammar form. Comparing these viewpoints with modern novelty viewpoints shows it obviously. Compare these two viewpoints: 1) “...Genitive case surely is in need of determinate. Thereupon without embarrassment, it is arguable, that valence of determinate with possessive affix or determinate without possessive affix: genitive case form can't be used without possessive affix” [Zamonaviy o'zbek tili: 2007, 101]. Possibilities of this combination widely informed, expanded and commented in his work “Genitives in Uzbek” (Gulomov: 1940) by A.Gulomov; 2) “Altogether the another circumstance is seen – in valence of intransitive verb in impelling voice (for example, The wonderful news came – Salimjon brought wonderful news) and in objective with impelling voice form agentive mean (Salimjon wrought this letter – Karimjon made Salimjon to write this letter). Herein patient and indirect agentive valence closely allied with grammatical-impelling voice” [Zamonaviy o'zbek tili: 2007, 104]. As known, analogous assertion was expanded in “Verb” by A.Gulomov. It is obvious in other cases too.

At the beginning of XX century A.Gulomov advanced an opinion on the subject of state category, which is confirmed by fact of Uzbek, from whichever side of linguistics to look (system-structural, formal, formal-functional, substantive...). Particularly, “In our opinion, action verb meaning (in works of A.Gulomov – “action characteristics” – N.A.) formative affixes should be studied in the composition of mode verbs”. It is beyond all doubt, that these forms are expresses action mode. And, they distinguished by synthetic-analytic forms of action mode categories as synthetic forms formative indicators” [Sayfullayeva: 2007, 206].

This aforesaid opinion, in spite of expressed more than 70 years ago, fully equal to opinion of Ayyub Gulomov to analogical problem. Also, opinions on transitive-intransitive and affirmative-negative verb categories (by A.Gulomov) unchanged per se and durable up to date.

In his opinions, professor Ayyub Gulomov, laconically expressed most important qualities, even on propositions, which stayed beyond attention of other scientists. His opinions are distinguished by their logicity, for example: “Other words than verbs can conjugate too: word in the capacity of predicate, receives personal-quantities affix, that is predicatively meaning. By these affixes expressed agreement of subject and predicate (for example, you will go – you are a boy; you are a student, I am a student; we are healthy” (G'ulomov: 1954, 16].

These viewpoints of A.Gulomov, in spite of their expression in the 50<sup>th</sup> of XX century, they are confirmed again in the beginning of XX century by analogical exemplification (rightness of scientists opinion). They have suggested to be theoretical source for modern linguistics opinions. Particularly, if draw attention to opinions on “conjugation” and “person-quantity” in “Verb” by A.Gulomov (G'ulomov: 1954, 16-19 and 38-44], they all qualities, even methodological qualities widely, logically enveloped, and theory of person-quantity and conjugation, argued their usage

---

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



without the scope of verbs. These very same to the theory of Ayyub Gulomov, opinions and analytics were stated in division “Predicative category” [G’ulomov: 1954, 206] (in half of page) of tutorial “Uzbek of present days” [Zamonaviy o’zbek tili: 2007], in headline of noun connection – relationship validity in division “Predicative category, copula” (in half of page), and by swopping of examples *I’m a student, you are a student ...* with examples *I’m a worker, you are a worker*, also by whereas only one specific. Herein there is no goal to derogate the works of authors of the tutorial. Herein, just should be noted, that Ayyub Gulomov has approached to the problem fully and comprehensively, concluded argued on it, and these conclusions are served as source for many tutorials and dissertations. A.Gulomov gave attention to differentiation of this nature affixes (conjugating affixes) by accent, and meaning, grammatical changing of words by the use of them. Scientist stated, stated that conjugating affixes are added after the formative affixes. And with it, he divided the conjugating affixes into full and reduced forms and expanded their specifics. There is no such division and expanding in works of other researchers. Scientist stated, that for the expression of personal-quantity, tense and even mood meanings no need of conjugating affixes adding always, also verbs in radical form can express the second party, singularity, future tense, imperative mood. By the expanding of conjugating affixes specifics (phonetic variant, accent able – non-accent able, meaning, historical forms, methodological aspects (see paper: Osman: 2015), the scientist approaches to them by whereas, that they are considered as predicative forms in nowadays. That is, by the stating “other words in predicate role can conjugate too”, he meant exactly this problem. A.Gulomov also gave attention to polyfunctioning of affixes: such as affix **-di** a) expresses past tense (*keldi*) (Ahmet: 2014); b) expresses notifying mood; c) expresses third party (he/she); affix **-gan** – expresses the tense (*kelgan*); expresses the person (*keldi – u*); forms the participle and etc. The scientist expanded the relation of verb with tense forms and mood forms, even with a mode [G’ulomov, 1954: 21; Muzaffer: 2011].

The scientist in “Verb” divided separately the problem of verb formation and stated, that verbs can be formed by two ways (as we can see there two ways in verbs – N.A.) – by the morphological way (affixation); by the syntaxes way (composition, word addition). By the scientist distinctively expanded verb formation problem in two ways. 1. In the 50<sup>th</sup> of XX century, A.Gulomov acknowledged problem of internal formation by verb from verb in such examples, as *kick-kick away, scratch-scratch once, rinse-shake* (Gulomov: 1954, 68). Such voice forms too has been mentioned as word-formatives, allegedly: “Degree category is formed by verb formative affixes from verbs” (Gulomov: 1954, 57). This theory of the scientist has changed in every way. In his all works on this issue, he on repeated occasions stated, that verbs are formed from the other words from verbs; 2.He assimilate the auxiliaries as component after verb-verb type (leaved, tolled) junctions. (Gulomov: 1954, 76-82). Further, A.Gulomov named such junctions as “auxiliaries verb junctions”, “Analytic verb junctions”, and acknowledge his oversights in previous works on this issue.

Main viewpoint of A.Gulomov about “Defective verbs” further was supplement and developed by A.Hojiyev.

So, by the estimation of main viewpoints of A.Gulomov about verb morphology gives an opportunity for following conclusions:

1. A.Gulomov chosen the verb as separate research issue and at first time studied it in monographic level.
2. By researching the issue “Verb” he set about study by using all achievements, advanced viewpoints, research methodologies of his day and prevailed.

---

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



3. Tried to expand and estimate all specifics of verbs in Uzbek, pendent problems and problem.

4. Collected very huge size material on issue as scientist who know the nationwide Uzbek to perfection and involved them in scientific analytics.

5. Approached to every problem in complete understanding condition and stated them in his works. These viewpoints, expressed as issues stuck out because of their comprehensive substantiation. That's why scientific conclusions of scientist are not diverse from modern scientist's viewpoints, and contrary, serving as foundation for conclusions, which are estimated as innovation in linguistics. That is, subsequent researches (works on verb, verb-predicate, auxiliaries, mode forms, defective verbs, verb functional forms, voice forms and others) are confirming the validity of scientific viewpoints of Ayyub Gulomov from 50<sup>th</sup>. We can be convinced of this, by consideration of scientists viewpoints about syntaxes in the next part of work.

Also his monograph "Plural in Uzbek" (Gulomov: 1944) originated because of his own synthetic research methods.

This work of the scientist is the first pattern of researching of the separate Uzbek lingual phenomena – grammatical category. There was not any perfect research on plural in Uzbek till this work. Professor Ayyub Gulomov, by stating that phrase "Plural in Uzbek" involves wide meaning, supplemented, "it give to understand not only plural, reflected by affixes (object multiplicity in word "gullar", executor multiplicity in word "gulimiz", executor multiplicity in word "gullatdik"), but also plural, reflected by some words, word combinations (*biz, ko'p odam, shoda-shoda marvarid*)" [Фуломов: 1944, 4]. The scientist drawn attention to difference phenomena of logical approaching from grammatical approaching. And with it, on talking on sentence phenomena, he stated, that used to draw great attention to nouns, and partially to personal pronoun and plural in verbs are defined according to them (Фуломов: 1944, 4).

Recently, there are opinions as like as "Substantial approaching to language phenomena in Uzbek linguistics has been founded by C.N.Ivanov" [Замонавий ўзбек тили: 2008, 25]. We have reason to consider them unfounded, because they expressed without accounting of researches of A.Gulomov in 1940s – 1950s. Researches of S.N.Ivanov are from 1920s and they reflect superseded information, while researches of 1940-1950s of A.Gulomov involves first model of substantial approaching to language phenomena in Uzbek linguistics. Should be said, in disclosure of lingual unit, Ayyub Gulomov: a) approached in terms of dialectic philosophy (in that time it wasn't available without this); b) worked out theoretical foundation of grammatical research; c) draw attention to research methodology (used wholly approaching method); d) subordinated private specificity to general specificity of phenomena; e) preferred internal similarity to external similarity which based on representation subject (object too); f) considered lingual unit as possibility unity; g) generality in substantial unity in speech interpreted to privacy – considered it as fulfillment of possibilities; h) felt the necessity of approaching to lingual phenomena not by external, but internal (by comprehending) features – draw attention to research them in interrelation, as parts of system, hierarchy and interactive.

If we conclude, that "A.Gulomov was carelessness to these phenomena's", it will injustice and unfairness in terms of science. In the second part of above mentioned book, pointed out, that plural in Uzbek is used by three methods and profound means, historicity. Initial scientific viewpoints of Ayyub Gulomov on plural category has begun with this part. His following conclusions are actual even at present: "Second method of historical view to collective meaning (lexical signing – N.A.) is very old. It is collective by own naming. Every appellative can mean undesignated numeral, when it used as generalized meaning. It is capacity numeral. Designation of

---

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



subject quantity is indefinite numeral. It is clear, that third method of grammatical designation of plural is more ancient than the first. Really, till affixation plural, in general, has been expressed by lining the repeated words, that is by syntactic method. Even after appearance of plural affixes and plural obtained own former, this method was used one of the method of plural expression.

On the basis of above mentioned can be concluded followings: a) the oldest method of speech plural expression is to express by means of words, and grammatical expression is the further phenomena; b) syntactic method is older than morphologic method in grammatical expression; c) and affixes originated later.

As the scientists concluded, affixes originated from words, that is “this opinion descended on the assumption of meaning and formal changing, its transition in an auxiliary word and affixation – checking the several lingual materials and their history”. For example: Affix *-digan* in participles (*yuraturg'on – yurating'an – yutig'an – yuradig'an – yuradigon - yuradiga*) indeed originated from word *turg'on* [Фуломов: 1941, 80]. Each of this methods are being used at present.

## REFERENCES

- AHMET G. Kirgizca ve türkçede geçmiş zamanlı basit cümlelerde eşdeğer yapılar. Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 9/6 Spring 2014, p. 455-467, ANKARA-TURKEY
- DEVONI lug'atit turk. (1960-1963). I-II-III jildlar. – Toshkent.
- FOZILOV E., Ziyayeva M. (1978). Isiskaniy dar tyurkskomu yaziku. – Toshkent: Fan.
- G'ULOMOV A. (1954). Fe'l. Hozirgi zamon o'zbek tili kursidan materiallar, O'zFA nashriyoti. – Toshkent.
- HOJIYEV A. (1973). Fe'l. – Toshkent: Fan.
- HOJIYEV A.(1970). To'liqsiz fe'l. – Toshkent: Fan.
- HOJIYEV A. (1966). Ko'makchi fe'llar. – Toshkent.
- MUTALLIBOV S. (1955). XI asr yozma yodgorliklarida fe'l kategoriyasi. – Toshkent: Fan.
- MUZAFFER M. Dil biliminde zamanin tanimi ve işlevi nedir. Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 6/3 Summer 2011, p. 1075-1081 TURKEY.
- NURMONOV A, Mahmudov N. (2000). O'zbek tilshunosligi tarixi. – Toshkent.
- OSMAN Y. Birleşik kelimelerde görülen fonetik hadiseler, terimleri, tanımları ve örneklerinin tasnifi üzerine Turkish Studies International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic Volume 10/8 Spring 2015, p. 231-252 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8277> ISSN: 1308-2140, ANKARA-TURKEY
- SAYFULLAYEVA R. va boshqalar. (2007). Hozirgi o'zbek tili. – Toshkent.
- SODIQOVA M. (1973). Fe'l stildistikasi. Toshkent: Fan.
- SHARIPOV F.G. (2009). Fe'llarda harakat tarzining sintetik ifodalanishi, f.f.n. diss.avtoref. – Toshkent.
- SHUKUROV O.U. (2005). Harakat tarzi shakllari paradigmasi: filol.fan.nomz. diss.... avtoreferati. – Samarqand.

---

## Turkish Studies

International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



- SHUKUROV Sh. (1976). O‘zbek tilida zamon fe’llari taraqqiyoti. – Toshkent: Fan.
- ТОҶИЙЕВ Ҳ. (1987). Fe’llardagi o‘timli-o‘timsizlik haqida / O‘zbek tilshunosligining aktual masalalari. – Toshkent, ToshDU ilmiy to‘plami. P. 3-116.
- ZAMONAVIY o‘zbek tili, morfologiya. (2007). – Toshkent.
- АЙЮБ Ғуломовнинг илмий мероси. (2008). – Тошкент. 4-китоб.
- АЙЮБ Ғуломовнинг илмий мероси. (2005). Тошкент, Университет, 1-китоб.
- ГУЛОЯМОВ, Айюб. (1946). «О суффиксе -даш в узбекском языке», ЕЛЕК, С.Е.Малович. сб. статей. – Фрунзе.
- ЖЎРАБОЕВА М. (2004). Ғуломов А. Библиографик кўрсаткич. – Тошкент.
- ЗАМОНАВИЙ ўзбек тили, Морфология. (2008). – Тошкент. «Мумтоз сўз».
- ҚОДИРОВ Қ. (2007). Ўзбек тили морфологик тизимининг ўрганилиш тарихидан: Номз. дисс... автореф. – Тошкент.
- ҚЎНҒУРОВ Р. (1984). Отларда форма ясовчи аффиксларнинг семантик-стилистик хусусиятлари: Филол.фан. док.... дисс... – Тошкент.
- МАМАЖОНОВ А. (1990). «Қўшма гап стилистикаси». – Тошкент.
- МОРФОЛОГИЯГА кириш. (1953). – Тошкент.
- ОСТРОУМОВ Н. (1910). Этимология сартовского языка. – Тошкент.
- ТОҶИЕВ Ё. (1991). Ўзбек тилида аффиксал синонимия: Филол.фан.докт. дисс... – Тошкент.
- ТЎЙЧИБОВ Б. (1991). «Синтактик синонимика». – Тошкент.
- «Феъл». (1954). – Тошкент.
- ҒУЛОМОВ А. (1975). Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. – Тошкент.
- ҒУЛОМОВ А. (1940). Ўзбек тилида аниқловчилар. – Тошкент.
- ҒУЛОМОВ А. (1941). Ўзбек тилида келишиқлар. Труды узбекского филиала АН СССР. Сер.2.кн.2. –Тошкент.
- ҒУЛОМОВ А. (1940). Ўзбек тилида келишиқлар. ЎзР ФА, асарлар. II. – Тошкент.
- ҒУЛОМОВ А. (1944). Ўзбек тилида кўплик категорияси. – Тошкент.
- ҒУЛОМОВ А. (1948). Ўзбек тилида сўз тартиби, Тошкент.

### Citation Information/Кайнақча Bilgisi

ALAVUTDINOVA NODIRA, G., (2015). “Place Of Professor Ayyub Gulomov In Forming Of Morphological Viewpoints In Uzbek Linguistics Of XX Century / 20. Asır Özbek Dilbiliminde Morfolojiye Ait Görüşlerin Şekillenmesinde Prof. Eyyüp Gulamov’un Yeri”, *TURKISH STUDIES* -International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic-, ISSN: 1308-2140, (Prof. Dr. Şefik Yaşar Armağanı), Volume 10/12 Summer 2015, ANKARA/TURKEY, [www.turkishstudies.net](http://www.turkishstudies.net), DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8400>, p. 1-14.

---

### Turkish Studies

*International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*  
Volume 10/12 Summer 2015



Linguistics - Linguistics - The 20th century: The term structuralism was used as a slogan and rallying cry by a number of different schools of linguistics, and it is necessary to realize that it has somewhat different implications according to the context in which it is employed. It is convenient first to draw a broad distinction between European and American structuralism and then to treat them separately.Â Two important points arise here: first, that the structural approach is not in principle restricted to synchronic linguistics; second, that the study of meaning, as well as the study of phonology and grammar, can be structural in orientation. In both cases â€œstructuralismâ€ is opposed to â€œatomismâ€ in the European literature.