

Logical and Grammatical Relations in Word Categories: The Factor of Difference and Incarnation

Laylo Raupova, Adiba Botirova, Nargiza Musulmanova,
Hurshida Kadyrova and Guzal Safarova

Abstract--- Article links thought and language, logic, grammar bond linguistic and logical relations of mutual cooperation reflected, logic and linguistics link between thought and word, sentence, and that issues such as, in the category of logical thought and language description of its lexical and grammatical units problems such as articulation, which call both logic and linguists to the same level of research.

Also in Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, logical linguistics - the dominance of linguistic direction, which equates logical and linguistic categories (phenomena), is a serious scientific step towards restricting logic and grammar are connected with such names as in philosophy F.Hegel, in linguistics V.Humbolt, our work is, basically, about the errors in grammatical analysis of grammatical categories and criteria.

Logic works according to the content. Linguistic analysis (grammar) prefers the form rather the content and it is for the next period of the property for European science. The grammatical tradition of the Orient (including Arabic / Islam), which relied on the form factor, in the early stages of development was consistent in distinguishing logical and linguistic phenomena in descriptive linguistics (American structuralism). Logic was based on the content of the event, and grammar - on the basis of form. For example, grammatical descriptions, based on medieval Arabic and ancient Indian grammatical tradition, were usually small and compact, and generally consisted of a paradigm of forms (compact tables in Arabic, sutra - rule in India). Such chart is proved by the fact that both ancient Hindus and medieval Islamic linguists were so skilled at giving all the grammatical details, rules and exceptions in "bayt"s.

Keywords--- Language, Thinking, Logic, Grammar, Understanding, Word, Sentence, Sentence, Category, Logical Category, Linguistic Category, Content, Form, Logical Understanding, Linguistic Word, Logical Sentence, Grammatical Sentence.

I. INTRODUCTION

Logic is associated with many disciplines. In particular, it is very close to grammar. The connection of language and thinking is reflected in the interplay of logic and grammar of linguistic and logical relations. G.V. Kolshansky writes about the active participation of language in the formation of thought: "Language is not only the form by

Laylo Raupova, Professor, Department of "Uzbek Language", Tashkent state University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navai.

Adiba Botirova, Ph.D., Department of "Uzbek language", Tashkent State University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navai.

Nargiza Musulmanova, Ph.D., Department of "Uzbek language", Tashkent State University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navai.

Hurshida Kadyrova, Ph.D., Department of "Uzbek Language", Tashkent state University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navai.

Guzal Safarova, Lecturer, Department of "Uzbek Language", Tashkent State University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navai.

which the results of thought are summarized, it is also a means of reflection, and it is also expressed and shown in a sound way. It is a mistake to suppose that language only records the thought formed without the help of language, and reinforces the thought process in the sounds. Language is a reflection of the thought process, it is the reality of the process[1.16.].

II. THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The connection between logic and grammar is that logic studies the general rules of thinking, understanding, judgment, their components, and relationships. Grammar is the science that studies the logic as the phenomena of language, grammatical expression in the form of the study. Of course, their connections must always be checked.

The interplay of logic and linguistics has attracted many scientists. In particular, issues such as comprehension and speech, judgment and sentence, that is, problems such as the logical notion and categorization of language, its lexical and grammatical units, encourage both logic and linguists to investigate.

Language and thinking are inseparable but, not they are not the same. So are logic and linguistics. But linguistics, from ancient times to the present days, cannot get rid of logic; after all, the two are the most important parts of the world, mastered in world linguistics, Eng. subject, fr.Sujet, german subject Esp.sujeto and the European term predicate will not be changed soon. However, these two important terms in grammar are derived from logic and have so far been misunderstood in grammatical research.

During XVI-XIX centuries in Europe linguistic and logical category came to dominate the equalizer linguistic lines. Logic and grammar take serious steps to limit the period of German classical philosophy, built on with the names of great figures F.Hegel philosophy, linguistics of V.Humboldt. In particular, the great F.Hegelin his introduction to the book "Introduction to logic" writes: "as two different types of grammar or logic of bilateral importance, it seems, now for the upcoming science in general and for returning him something. A person who is just getting acquainted with grammar finds dry abstractions in its forms and laws, and in their literal sense, only a few definitions of its meaning are quite different. At first knowledge does not understand them and others. Conversely, anyone who speaks a language and at the same time knows other languages that are comparable to that language only feels the mentality and the level of knowledge of the people in the grammar of his language; only those rules and forms will have a meaningful meaning to it. He is in the position of understanding the logic of the psyche, in general, of logic. In the same way, a newcomer to science finds a system of abstractions that are self-limiting, separated from each other by no other knowledge or science. This science performs everything in its abstract, colorless, cold simplicity in its pure descriptions, compares the imagination of the universe with other realities of science and realities, and the promise of an absolute science to reveal the essence of this world about the world. not as an opponent of this wealth deprived of its meaning"[2.112.]. This introduction was written on November 7, 1831, 187 years ago. So far, no one has ever emphasized the importance of grammar, grammatical material in the study of the spiritual world of human – linguists in the rigor and rigor of the great philosopher. This was not possible during the reign of communist ideology. As the national language is the expression of the national spirit, it requires a national grammar (Note the words of F. Hegel, "that this language of the people's spirit and enlightenment can be reproduced by anyone who knows several languages besides their own language and compares

the construction of these languages with their own language.") interpretation. National grammatical interpretation and national ideology - on the basis of the inseparability of language and thinking, are interdependent and intertwined. Such an approach to the interpretation of grammar of national languages was contrary to Soviet ideology. Soviet linguists have often referred to this work by F. Hegel. However, researchers did not take this extract in the form and volume we have presented here, but was limited to VI Lenin's part in the "Philosophical Notebook". In this passage, VI Lenin emphasized the importance of logic and grammar as something that is only for those who learn them, but for those who can deeply grasp and compare grammar. However, it was unreasonable to say that the scientist was a national of grammar and that during the Soviet period this was impossible. We will come back to this issue when we discuss about "National ideology and national linguistics" and we can see of Hegel's prophecy in Uzbek linguistics comes only after national independence. Now, the great philosopher of logic and grammar subjects of apparent similarities are only superficial, and the trick is that the teachers should keep the idea is always the center of attention once again. Today, in almost every step of the grammar and logical analysis of grammatical categories and criteria measurements mix, we have the same grammatical errors. In particular, the first edition of A. Gulomov's and M. Askarova's work in 1960, the third edition in 1989, higher education is still in practice, the book "The current Uzbek language. Syntax" the sentence *The fruits are picked (Mevalarterildi)* is used as a sentence with unknown subject. However, by the structure of the sentence, a word that is unknown in the classification is given as an expression of a simple compound sentence. And the sentence *The fruits are picked (Mevalarterildi)* is a two-part phrase. For this reason, it cannot be a component. Here, the great scholar of logic and grammar criteria of differentiation, and diverted them to blend: *The fruits are picked* from the **logic** - in the sense of identity is unknown, but according to the construction (**grammatical structure**), two component sentence.

In the grammatical research, one of the "traps" can be seen in the grammatical terms which are derived from logic and they are very close to each other (one is - language and the second - thought) and far (philology and the second one - philosophy) science are being used. Two of them - the subject and predicate terms were explained above. The commonality of these two terms in European linguistics and logistics presents unimaginable complications in linguistic research. In particular:

1. *When Karimjan came, he helped us.* (Karimjonkelgach, bizgayordamlashdi)
2. *Karimjan came and helped us.* (Karimjonkeldi, bizgayordamlashdi)
3. *When Karimjan came, his brother helped us.* (Karimjonkelgach, ukase bizgayordamlashdi)

On the first and second sentences words Karimjan and came (kel) are considered as subjects of the predicate, but on the second sentence it is the grammatical subject of the sentence in the same time. It is controversial in the first sentence that it is not a subject of the sentence but in the third it is doubtful, because "logicists" (who blend logical and grammatical criteria in grammatical research) recognize it as a subject and pure grammatists say 1st and 3rd are equal according to building and structure. This poses a number of problems in distinguishing and classifying joint and simple sentences. The point is well developed in the construction of structures of the syntactic structure of language (for example, Turkic, Semitic / fat-dough, ancient Oriya / Indian, Latin languages, etc.) assume the logical grammar cut morphological differences (in particular, the principles of conjugation of – person and number suffixes availability) can be lost, but what about these forms, primarily in English, French, Spanish and German languages?

In these languages, predicativity and verbs are almost always appropriate, but this compatibility is not absolute. So, for example, in German *accusativus com infinitive* (accusative case) - *Ich sah die Kinder spielen*- *I've seen kids playing* (*Men bolalarningo 'ynayotganiniko 'rdim*) logically *the die Kinder is the subject*, and *spielen* is a predicative position in device sentences. However, European linguists don't consider these kind of sentences as compound ones, because, first of all, *die Kinder* in accusative form, and secondly, *spielen* keyed expressed in the form of the verb. But what about linguists, who have accepted European grammatical interpretations and followed them without any study? For example, the majority of Russian Turkic and a Turkish national linguists who followed them. They can say that the sentence *When Karimjan came, his brother helped us* (*Karimjonkelgach, ukasibizgayordamlashdi*) as a compound sentence consisting two simple sentences. There are two reasons for this. First, availability of logical entity-relationship between words *Karimjan* and *came* and the second –the equal translation of the sentence *When Karimjan came, his brother helped us* into Russian (*Posletogokak Karimdjanprishel, yegomladshiy brat stalnampomogat*). It is clear that the words of *When Karimjan came, his brother helped us* were regarded as a joint sentence on the basis of non-grammatical and non-turkish criteria.

In European linguistics, majority of grammatical terms are derived from logic (such as *independent-dependent, object-subject, attribute, caution, genitive, copula, casus*, etc.). The influence of logical grammar to the unity of these terms, as we have seen so far, creates a certain difficulty and confusions.

Logic science works only with meaning. European grammatical traditions till the eighteenth century, during the reign of logical grammar - based on the same grounds. Ensuring form priority in the linguistic analysis rather than meaning is next period of the property. However, this principle cannot be generalized in grammar, because in grammatical terms, for example, the causative forms of verbs *to go out* (*chiqmoq*), *to enter* (*kirmoq*), *to come close* (*yaqinlasmoq*) are *chiqarmoq, kiritmoq, yaqinlashtirmoq*. Whereas, *-ar-*, *-it-*, *-tirare* completely different meanings. For this reason, the European grammatical interpretation of the traditions of their own, on the basis of logical gap - the essence of grammar (language, linguistic) units just two - both form and content be based on the principles of liters, logically the same classification, a period of two reasons, is logical mistake to rely on. Therefore, current grammatical interpretations always leave room for objections and contradictions and may not be otherwise. In this reason, the grammatical tradition of the Orient (including Arabic / Islam), which is largely based on form factor, and in the early stages of development was more consistent in distinguishing logical and linguistic phenomena in descriptive linguistics (American structuralism). Logic was based on the content of the event and grammar - on the basis of form. For example, grammatical descriptions, based on medieval Arabic and ancient Indian grammatical tradition, were usually small and compact, and generally consisted of a paradigm of forms (compact tables in Arabic, sutra-poem in India). In this byte table all the grammatical rule delicacy, and exclude the number of bytes to the ancient Hindus, the medieval Islamic linguists BC were also discovered in the same level of skill, by Panini in the previous period and the current level measurements sheet 1/8 (0.25 Foliant), volume 100 page " Sanskrit grammar" according to Franz Bopp "it was more perfect and complete than his(Bopp's) grammar". However, F.Bopp's "Sanskrit Grammar" was composed of five volumes of at least 200 pages each of the folios. For this reason, the Republic of the XIX century account (*deshifrovka*), opened the mystery of the Turkish alphabet Rooney's first appearance key and explanation prepared by the Danish linguist Wilhelm Thompson (1842-1927)

"History of Linguistics" Panini grammar book he writes: "The current supplied with the Latin letters 75-100 pages of the brochure size of Panino work to this day live and dead languages based on the description of the grammar of the most detailed and complete" [3.12]. Of course, Danish linguistics' valuation is exaggerate but it has got the real reason and basis.

The perfection of the Arabic grammatical descriptions of a bright mark that is created in the twentieth century in Europe (including the Arab grammar, Karl Brokkelmann and works N.V. Yushmanovd) a broad usage such tables in the Middle Ages[4.56].

III. CONCLUSION

Arabian and Indian achievements in linguistics and modern interpretations of grammatical debatable, in particular , Arabian and Indian classification and form the base of the brief (only one) and based on the current grammatical interpretation of his two (form and content) based on the case. Therefore, the modern linguistics focus on the form factor and flow direction and development.

Both modern grammatical interpretations and logical research - each has its own criteria of study, the foundation stones. This framework is right or wrong - the other side of the issue, but the judgment on the basis of logical criteria (for example, the conclusion in the sentence *The fruits are picked (Mevalarterildi)* is the passive form of the subject) moving to the grammatical version (for example, the logical basis of the sentence *The fruits are picked (Mevalarterildi)* cannot be **equalized** as passive form in the middle of the sentence). This is the error in grammar. In the same way *Need to go home (Uyga boorish kerak)* The logical conclusion that the verdict in the ape lacks or cannot be based on the grammatical sign is that the Uzbek sentence can be composed only of a predicate part - in that case the basis of both conclusions is irrelevant to the subject of judgment. Each subject has its own learning object (subject matter if it is the same), research methods, research units, goals and objectives, basic concepts. Therefore, the following paragraphs are mutually proportionate, but each has its own specifics in the context of research and implementation:

- a) Logical and linguistic categories;
- b) Logical understanding and linguistic expression;
- c) Logical sentence and grammatical sentence

Pause on comparing events such as these. The reason is philological studies are the main factor in our study, so much attention is paid to the nature of linguistic phenomena and not to confuse them with logical connections.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kolshansky G.V. Logic and Structure. - M.: V ysshaya School, 1965. - p. 16.
- [2] Hegel G.V.F. Nauka logic. Volume 1. - M.: Mysl, 1970. - p. 111– 112.
- [3] Thomsen V. History of linguistics until the end of the XIX century. With an afterword by prof. – M.: Moscow nopro the RSFSR, 1938. - P.
- [4] Brockelmann Carl. Arabische Grammatik. – Leipzig: Enzyklopedie, 1962. p-56.
- [5] Yushmanov N. V. Grammar of the literary Arabic language. Ed. 3-E.-M.: Nauka, 1985. - P. 56.
- [6] Karimov N., Doniyorov A. Conflicting Views Regarding the Hadiths, *IJITEE*, ISSN: 2278-3075, Volume-8 Issue-12, October 2019, pp. 2090-2094

- [7] Doniyorov A. Kh., & Karimov N. R. (2020). An Incomparable Book of a Great Scholar. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research*, (6 (8)), 63-71.
- [8] Rustamiy, S. (2018). Typological Peculiarities of Science of Balaghah, Rhetoric and Stylistics. *The Light of Islam*, 2018(1), 16.
- [9] Rustamiy, S. (2019). On Significance of Science of Balāḡat in achieving Linguistic aesthetic Perfection. *The Light of Islam*, 2019(4), 14.