_____

Substantial Morphology: Principles of Research

Madrahimov Ilhomjon Sobirovich

Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Candidate of philological sciences, associate professor

*Corresponding author's E-mail: madraximovilxomjon1958@Kspi.uz

Article History	Abstract
  CC License CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0	*This article discusses the substantive morphology, the principles of its research, theoretical issues. Based on the interpretation of the two stages of cognition of the universe in philosophy, the current problems of linguistics, in particular morphology, are considered.* **Keywords:** *Epistemology, Philosophical Method, Perception, Empiricism, Sensualism, Dialectical Approach, Substantiality, Linguistic Unity, Linguistic Construction, Linguistic System.*

1. Introduction

It is clear to many that the process of studying things and events takes place in two necessary stages. The first is perceptual cognition through intuition, and the second is intellectual (mental) cognition [28,11]. It would not be a mistake to say that the study of the universe takes place in two stages is a view that unanimously recognized in epistemology. Although these two stages of cognition of the universe are called by more than ten different terms in the philosophical methodical literature, such as empirical and theoretical, emotional and perceptual, vital and simple (formal) [28; 21; 2; 19; 14; 16;11], in fact, the difference between these two cognitive stages is very simple. One considers the knowledge that gained by cognitive/emotional sense organ that is by seeing, feeling, sensing, and even understanding and perception as absolute truth, while the other considers that mental (intellectual) knowledge (what one sees, feels, hears, senses) is not an essence, but a form of occurrence of another phenomenon, that is, a form of a random occurrence of some possibility, and this essence is disconnected from cognitive knowledge, the materiality of its form, and tries to reveal the basis, the essence, which lies at the root of the phenomenon, on the basis of relations. Therefore, the perceptual method describes, while the intellectual method reveals. In this approach, cognitive/emotional information usually obscures the essence that is revealed by the intellectual method. That's why the thinker A. Navoi embodies this conflict in a very concise phrase, saying: "Qosir etdi fahmdan idrokni" in his work "Lison-ut-Tair". In the cognitive process, various aspects given in the direct observation of the things are described. **Cognitive (outward, emotional, external) knowledge** is created by means of human senses. By perceptual cognition, the linguist acquires knowledge of the external perceptible characteristics of the linguistic unit. In this way of cognition, the speech unit given in direct observation is described, every feature of it is explained. In other words, at this stage of cognition, the wholeness, whose essence is not yet clear, is divided into parts for the purpose of scientific cognition. The main focus is on finding out the internal and external condition of the isolated part on the basis of the noticeable signs. In fact, in the cognitive method the phonetic feature of vowel-consonant, phonetic change, orthoepic norm, speech meaning of a word and an affix, word combination and a type of sentence, its usage, semantic features are described. "Cognitive knowledge is of great importance in any discipline, particularly in linguistics. It is the fundament, material basis for all kinds of theoretical work" [16; 28]. But such kind of scientific activity cannot allow a deep understanding of the language and its true essence. The thinker-poet A.Navoi describes the one-sided nature of cognitive knowledge, the inability of the knower to see things as a whole in emotional cognition, in other words, the perception that seeks to know the truth is hindered by the perception (emotional cognition) that describes the part in the story dedicated to the image of the elephant in his epic "Lison-ut-Tair" with high skill [1, 203]. The blind men's knowledge of the elephant in "The Story of the Blind and the Elephant", that is, their imperfect imaginations of the elephant because of weakness, were all correct, but they were all imperfect, lack of order, because this knowledge was the result of perceptual (empirical) cognition produced by feeling.

In philosophical-methodological literature, there noted **mental (inner, intellectual...) knowledge** as the opposite of perceptual cognition (cognitive knowledge) of the things. While cognitive knowledge mainly analyzes and describes the speech unit as a solitude, phenomenon, event and consequence (abbreviated as SPEC), mental cognition, which has a nature of generality, essence, possibility and cause (GEPC), is based on the cause and laws of the diversity of the defined, described phenomenon and determining their essence. For example, the conclusion that the subject in Uzbek language is not explicit (doesn't have to be materially expressed) has been studied repeatedly and repeatedly for several years together with the morphological feature of the predicate structure, i.e. it always has a reference to person and number in it, and it occurred through the systematic interpretation of the sentence. For example, the general essence such as the case "connecting the previous word to the next word", the possessive form "connecting the next word to the previous word", the adverbial "connecting the verb to the verb" is described in the perceptual cognition, and is obtained on the basis of a consistently studied examples.

Givenness in direct observation , i.e., the clarity of the apparent sign of a thing, is the basic aspect of perceptual cognition. The aspect that is the basis for mental cognition is the relation system of the thing, the place of the part in the whole, the aspect of content, task, relation of the thing, that is, it **is ungivenness in direct observation.**

Mental knowledge reveals the reason and law of SPEC. It is not possible to draw a sharp line between these two knowledges. They are interdependent, one develops on the basis of the other.

In the philosophical and methodological literature, terms such as sensualism, empiricism, realism, atomism, and phenomenalism are used as a method of perceptual cognition of things. This is a simple materialistic approach that treats things as **independent stable individuality**. A simple (vulgar) materialist approach is based on describing what is given in direct observation as it exists in reality. Although its different orientations differ from each other by paying special attention to different aspects of the object/event given in this direct observation, they are united by the fact that the information given by direct observation is considered to be true. For example, **Atomism,** which is derived from the word "individual particle", is based on the physical-chemical basis of the structure of matter. **Sensualism** (Latin sensus - feeling, intuition) is a doctrine in the field of epistemology, which recognizes intuition as the only source of knowledge. Intuition can be a necessary aspect of cognition only if it is in integral unity with the other aspect of the cognitive process, that is, with experience and abstract thinking.

Empiricism (Greek emperia - experience) considers sensory experience as the only source of knowledge.

Empiriocriticism means "criticism of experience" and clears the concept of experience from the concept of substance, necessity, causality [24, 57].

In contrast to this concept, there is a method of cognitive knowledge such as rationalism, functionalism, structuralism, semanticism, in which the relationship of a thing with its relative, its place and function in the whole structure is revealed, that is, a thing is **dialectically** approached. The knowledge created on the basis of the dialectical approach is based on revealing the reason for the variety of phenomena defined, described and systematized by a perceptual cognitive method. The dialectical approach is a continuation of the nominalist approach, that is, the nominalist approach requires a dialectical approach. This connection in science is clearly justified in the following opinion: "The dialectics of the development of sciences in the history of mankind shows that the development of each science consists of a continuous chain of "empirical - dialectical - empirical - dialectical..."... first of all, things are studied through vital observation, through direct observation, its features, aspects, sides are determined, as a result, this feature, evidence, phenomenon is collected, sorted;... there will be a need to switch to the intellectual, dialectical analysis method" [14, 31].

Substantiality is one of the important concepts of philosophy, and it is understood in two different ways in the above-mentioned two approaches – materialist and dialectical way of cognition. In the materialistic approach, on the basis of substantiality, the objectivity and realness of a substance – a thing/event/phenomenon that has a material existence is recognized as absolute. In the dialectical approach, substantiality is considered completely different – as a "complex of attributes and characteristics" of a thing/event/phenomenon given in direct observation, that is, a sign is considered as an essence that is revealed as a complex of characteristics and relations and not given to the direct observation. Therefore, in the materialistic substantial approach, the thing is described in a specific state of materiality, while in the dialectical substantial approach, the complex of relations underlying the infinite form and state of the thing, which is the reason for this occurrence, is understood as the substantial essence of the thing. Thus, in the materialistic substantial approach, the substance is the

thing itself (no matter it is general or special), and in the dialectical approach, the substantiality is not the thing itself, but the complex of its relationship with another thing similar and different, but related to itself. While the materialistic substantial approach derives the essential essence of a thing from its own, the dialectical substantial approach derives the essence of a thing from its relation. This is the reason why the materialistic approach is often called naive ("unsophisticated") in philosophical literature. In fact, let's just take the word form "uyga" (to the house). The word form "uyga" (to the house) is a separate unit, a materialistic substance, existence, separated from the relation. What information can this atomistic, sensualist material phenomenon, separated from relation give us? When we analyze thousands of texts in descriptive way, we can't get any other information than that it consists of stable units like "uy" (house) and "ga" (to). Based on the observation, we can also determine and describe in what context "uy" (house) and "ga" (to) can come. Based on the analysis of such a text, we can replace a stable units such as *kitob* (a *book), daftar (a notebook), odam (a man), qiz (a girl)* instead of the unit *"uy" (house),* and instead of "-ga" in the position "uyga" (to the house) we can replace the units such as *"-ning" ('s, of), "-ni"(as a direct object), "-da" (in), "-dan"(from)*, that is:

Uy   ga (to the house)

Daftar   ni (notebook)

Kitob   da (in the book)

Qiz   dan (from the girl)

can be replaced by *uyga (to the house), odamga (to the man), daftarni (the notebook), qizni (the girl)*; we can also describe in what context *uyni (the house), uydan (from the house), odamdan (from the man) ... can come.* But we cannot explain why the form "uyga" (to the house) is not used instead of "uyda" (in the house) in such a context, why the form "qizga" (to the girl) is not used instead of the form "uyga" (to the house) in this context, on the basis of simple cognitive, textual, and material observation. A simple materialistic substantial approach cannot solve the problem of why the form "uyga" (to the house" is used in this case and not the form "uyda" (in the house), because such an approach cannot reveal the essence of "ga" (to), that is, the basis of its use in various forms and conditions.

Dialectical substantial approach reveals the reasons for the manifestation of this thing in unlimited forms and appearances and conditions, analyzing their mutual relations. Thus, the substantiality which is dialectically understood is also considered as a "complex of relations".

In dialectical epistemology, 16 main principles of approaching the source of knowledge, learning and research and creating dialectical knowledge about it are distinguished in modern dialectics. These principles have been improved in different ways in the philosophical view since the time of Plato until the XX century, and are considered the highest peak of the philosophical thought of the XIX-XX centuries. Although these principles, which are the methodological basis for the formation of dialectical scientific concepts about things recognized by modern philosophers, as well as the scientific-technical and practical revolution at the level of flight from nuclear physics to space, from the steam engine to computer technology, were developed in the works of Ibn Arabi, Ibn Rushd, Hamza Fansuri [20, 78], the European scientific revolution received this methodological basis through Ibn Rushd, René Descartes, Immanuel Kant, Francis Bacon, Friedrich Hegel, and in the interpretation of these dialectical principles the interpretations by Hegel and the Hegelians are regarded as the modern supreme peak. These principles, which were the basis of the revolutionary turn of science of the XIX-XX centuries, particularly, they were improved by a large group of philosophers led by academician B.M. Kedrov on the basis of latest achievements of science and explained in detail in the books as "Dialectics - Theory of Knowledge" consisting of 5 volumes [4, 217], **"Dialectics and Logic"** consisting of two books [4, 98], as well as dozens of monographs [2; 5; 22]. These principles are as follows:

1. Real (objective, independent) individuality of the thing.

2. A set of things is a relationship.

3. The thing is in change and progress.

4. Internal conflict in things.

5. A thing as a whole of conflict (contradiction).

6. Occurrence of opposition.

7. The unity of analysis and synthesis (generalization).

8. The infinity of the relations of a thing with another thing.

              *Available online at: *

9. Reflection of a thing.

10. The infinity of thing-relationship.

11. The infinity of deepening into the essence of things.

12. An infinite increase in the relevance of things.

13. A repetition of the previous stage in the development stage.

14. As a result of the negation of the negation, it seems to revert to the old one.

15. Renewing the form while keeping the content.

16. Transition of quantitative change to qualitative change.

The substantial approach is becoming common today due to its methodological importance in modern grammar teaching.

When a linguistic unit comes in the position of a thing, this approach makes the basis of substantial linguistics. Such linguistics interprets the type of a linguistic unit as its general meaning.

It is appropriate to study the history of the substantial approach to the study of language structure dividing into two periods:

The first period: determination of the basis of substantial approach to the interpretation of language structure [SAILS];

The second period: substantial approach to the interpretation of language structure as a methodological principle.

It is known from the general laws of dialectical development that the development of the rational seed (effective seed) existing in the period when the desired type of innovation was denied, and the innovation of the previous period, the development and normalization of the phenomenon that was "abnormal" for its time [21, 63].

Therefore, the process of substantial research of language structure is a long-term historical result of linguistics.

When historical development is approached in this way, what was the basis of the substantial approach to the interpretation of language structure, and what was the "bud" of the substantial approach in the period before this research principle became the methodological basis? the question is natural. This basis is related to the answer to the question "Does a linguistic unit have its own specific meaning, separated from speech, or does a linguistic unit have a specific meaning only in the context of speech?" put forward by F. Bopp, A. Schleicher, and particularly J. Grimm in Indian, Arabian and European linguistics. To answer this question, it is enough to state G.Paul and G.Shteinthal's following opinions given in the monograph of H.G.Nematov [18; 17;]. For example, G. Shteinthal's following opinion is given: "Case has no material meaning and only serves to express grammatical meaning." G.Paul puts forward a completely opposite opinion: "The choice of this or that case depends on not only with the governing word, but also with the meaning of the case form itself."

Thus, it is clear from these two opinions that G.Shteinthal supports the idea that the linguistic unit, including the case form, does not have its own substantial ontological meaning, while G.Paul, on the contrary, puts forward the idea that each linguistic unit, including the case form, has its own meaning and realized in speech only on the basis of this meaning, and gives various special meanings under the influence of the text.

The problem "Does a linguistic unit have an substantial meaning or is it formed only in speech?", that put forward in linguistics in the middle of the XIX century, is still controversial in Uzbek linguistics, and two tendencies are sharply distinguished.

Functionalists - a linguistic tendency related to the research principle of the "Prague school of Linguistics" developed the theory of G. Paul and put forward the idea that each linguistic unit has its own substantial ontological meaning (function) and on the basis of this function it has a colorful meaning in speech. **Descriptivists**, on the contrary, expressed the opinion that the meaning of a linguistic unit is formed only in speech, under the influence of the neighboring unit. In some works, both principles are mixed. For example, Z. Kadirov, who was engaged in the study of the case form as a system, put forward the idea of the substantial meaning of the case in the 1st chapter of his research work, and in the 2nd chapter he expressed an opinion that the meaning of the case form can be formed only in the text. It is clear from his following statement:

"The fact that *"dan"(from)* is a case form is determined when it falls into the case paradigm. The meaning of the case is general in relation to concrete usage" [26, 57].

An opinion contrary to this opinion is observed on page 62 of the research work: "The locative case in the Uzbek language expresses a number of meanings, as other types of case, depending on the meaning of the word of which is a part and the meaning of the word that governs this word".

It should be noted that the method of substantial dialectical research of language structure was initially started by the representatives of the Prague school of linguistics, first of all, by the research of R.Jacobson. the fact that the general meaning of the case is the general set of the specific meaning in the text was first noted in the research work of this scholar [25, 32].

The Prague Linguistic school, which was founded in 1926, included Russian linguists – N. Trubetskoy, R. Jacobson, S. Kartsevsky; Czech linguists – V. Mathesius, V. Skalichka, F. Travnichek. The multi-volumed publication of "Trudi" by Prague Linguistic School (PLS) was established. In Volume I of this publication, the thesis of the Prague Linguistic School related to the formal-functional, substantial approach to language was published. The following opinion presented in the thesis confirms once again that language is a functional system: "... "....язык есть система средств выражения, служащая какой-то определенной цели. Ни одно явление в языке не может быть понято без учёта системы, к которой этот язык принадлежит. Славянская лингвистика также не может игнорировать этот актуальный комплекс программ" (… language has a system of means of expressions, functioning in a certain goal. No phenomenon in the language can be understood without the system that the language possesses. Slavic linguistics cannot ignore this actual complex program either) [6, 49].

In R. Jacobson's view, the problem of general grammatical meaning, in the research of N. Trubetskoy, the general linguistic meaning of phoneme, phonological conflict was studied, while in the work of L. Elmslev, we observe the issue aimed at distinguishing language and speech stages in speech activity.

In the linguistic school of Prague, in particular, in the research of R. Jacobson, V. Skalichka, A.V. Isachenko, the idea was put forward that each linguistic unit, including grammatical form, has its own general meaning, and R. Jacobson and A. Isachenko defined this general meaning as a grammatical form (linguistic unit) described as a generality in a specific sense that can be expressed in speech, that is, an abstract generality created on the basis of the principle of separating the generality from the particularity of formal logics. This is the effective root of the previous era, which was the basis for the substantial approach to the interpretation of language structure – the theory of the existence of an abstract general meaning (function) in the ontological nature of the unit, which is the basis for its speech realization in the substantial nature of each linguistic unit and is complicated by various specificities and this period can be considered as **the basis of the threshold of a substantial approach to the interpretation of language structure.**

A complete description of language structure from this point of view is written in the two volumed book by A. V. Isachenko **"Грамматический строй русского языка в сопоставлении со словецким". ч.I Братислава, 1959. ч II . Братислава, 1960** while the abstract general meaning of some grammatical categories, particularly, the category of number, case, person-number and form is given in the work of R.O. Jacobson. In the substantial approach to the interpretation of language structure, the analysis principle of the Prague structuralists was extended by the principle of conscious and consistent dialectical research. Therefore, **as a scientific, material and theoretical basis of a substantial approach to the interpretation of language structure,** one can count the idea of a linguistic unit having an independent substantial meaning of a young grammarian G. Paul and the interpretation principles of the Prague structuralist.

Professor S.N. Ivanov initiated the system-structural studies and substantial approach to the language in Uzbek linguistics. **The 2nd period** of the development of the current Uzbek substantial linguistics (USL), in other words, formal-functional, substantive, dialectical linguistics, is associated with the name of the scientist S. Ivanov. Because the first research in this direction was S.Ivanov's candidate dissertation devoted to the general linguistic meaning and speech realization of the grammatical form, integration of speech specificity into linguistic generality, linguistic meaning and syntactic function. The dissertation monograph "Очерки по синтаксису узбекского языка (форма на **-ган** и её производные)" was published in 1959 [10,43]. In the following years the scholar deepened his work in this field in his numerous articles generalized them in his doctoral dissertation. He developed the substantial – dialectical research method of language structure [9, 55]. S.Ivanov 's success was that he created a unique new doctrine by approaching the essence of linguistic unit from the point of view of dialectical philosophy. The scholar also developed the theoretical basis of grammatical research [8, 61]. S. Ivanov's opinion about the necessity to pay attention to the issue of methodology, the object of the

research process first is reflected in the following statement: "An artist, who wants to reveal the real essence of what is being depicted, must subjugate the private side to the general side without losing sight of the truth, prefer deep internal similarity to external similarity based on understanding the subject of the image". In his numerous scientific works, he aimed to theoretically study the grammatical fact that is evident empirically. According to the scientist, "... in order to achieve a deep analysis of the object of the research... it is necessary to go beyond it, move away from it, to include in the scope of perception not only the part of the object that can be observed (felt) at the same time, but also some new sign-the feature related to it, which makes it possible to understand it should also be sought to be advanced and inclusive. The essence of science, as it has been mentioned several times, is not only increasing the amount of empirical fact, but also, first of all, creating a new combination of it (that is, a harmonious combination of several things of the same kind)..." [7, 13]

Since the scientist applied the factor of substantiality to the grammatical form, what is the essence of such an approach? Linguistic unit is a unity of embodied possibilities. Linguistic unit privatizes the generality that exists in the speech, realizes the possibility. The methodological basis of this approach is the direct practical application of the GEPC and SPEC category in the language system.

The further development of Uzbek substantial linguistics and its popularization in Uzbekistan at present is is related to professor H. Nematov, the student of S. Ivanov, and the linguistic school he established.

S. Ivanov's substantial interpretation was formed on the basis of a morphological category, while in the works of H. Nematov and his numerous students, a new, national, essence-based description and interpretation of not only morphology, but also phonetics, lexis, syntax and other levels was developed [13,29]. The achievement of substantial scientific analysis of Uzbek linguistics is reflected in the general and higher education programs and textbooks created in our republic [23, 8].

In fact, Uzbek substantial linguistics followed the way chosen by the Prague linguistic school at the starting point of its activity and first of all, published its thesis defining the essence of its direction.

In paragraph 8 of the formal-functional thesis, which started the direction of formal-functional research in linguistics, we read the followings: "В данных тезисах предпринята попытка наметить основные вехи одного возможных путей создания нового синтаксиса предложения в тюркских языках на основании критериев, диктуемых внутренней системой самых тюркских языков, и новейших достижений субстанциальной морфологии, системной лексикологии и теории о рангах членов предложения. Каждый из схематически поднятых в этих тезисах пунктов нуждается во всестороннем детальном научном анализе, уточнении и дополнении, что является задачей будущего. Авторы сознательно ограничились вопросами структуры предложений номинативного строя. Проблемы трансформации предложений номинативного строя в обороты и в притяжательные конструкции, явлений, переходных между посесивностью и номинативностью (узб. қилишим керак; я должен сделать), в также синтаксиса словосочетаний на основании формально – функционального подхода будут объектом дальнейших поисков и исследований" [17, 20]. ("In these theses, we attempted to outline the main milestones of one possible way to create a new syntax of sentence in the Turkic languages on the basis of the criteria dictated by the internal system of the same Turkic languages, and the latest achievements of substantial morphology, systemic lexicology and the theory of the ranks of sentence members. Each of the points raised schematically in these theses needs a comprehensive detailed scientific analysis, clarification and addition, which is a task for the future. The authors deliberately limited themselves to questions of the structure of sentences of the nominative system. Problems of transforming sentences of the nominative structure into turns and into possessive constructions, phenomena transitional between possessiveness and nominativeness (Uzbek. qilishim kerak; I must do), as well as the syntax of phrases based on the formal-functional approach will be the object of further investigations and research").

4. Conclusion

H. Nematov proved in his research that the methodological basis of the substantial approach is related to the doctrine of Sufism about substance and tajalli (reflection), that the substance (complex of attributes and quality) is reflected in reality, and that it is not given in direct observation [15, 29]

H. Nematov achieved to create the Uzbek national grammar, researched the level of the Uzbek language in a new formal-functional (substantial) direction with his followers (M. Abuzalova, Sh. Akramov, R. Bobokalonov, O. Bozorov, S. Nazarova, B. Yorov, B. Mengliev, S. Muhammadjonova, G. Nematova, L. Nematova, Sh. Orifjonova, R. Rasulov, L. Raupova, R. Sayfullaeva, H. Saidova, M. Saidova, M.

Fayzullaev, Z. Yunusova, B. Qilichev, M. Kurbonova, Sh. Shahobiddinova, A. Tsalkalamanidze, A. Gulomov, S. Giyosov and others). The main principle of this direction, which is developing in Uzbek linguistics and has found its practical application in the programs and textbooks in use today at the general secondary education system and the higher education system, is defined in the research of the scientist M. Kurbanova as follows:

1) the substantial nature of the linguistic unit;

2) each linguistic unit belongs to at least two paradigms;

3) the absoluteness of the intermediate third at all stages of the linguistic system;

4) hierarchical structure of the linguistic system; in this hierarchy, each joint is interconnected as an open microsystem with a hypo-hyperonymic relation;

5) each linguistic unit can have its own synonymic and graduonymic series, and this series is not directly related to the general linguistic system and microsystem.

It should be mentioned here that the above-mentioned five principles of substantial research can never be separated from each other, and all of them are integrated.

References:
1. Алишер Навоий "Лисон-ут тайр"(Насрий баёни билан) –Т.: Ғ.Ғулом номидаги нашриёт-матбаа бирлашмаси, 1991. 200–203- б.
2. Андреев И.Д. Диалектическая логика. –М.:Высшая школа, 1985;
3. Диалектика и логика. Законы мышления. Под общей редакцией Б.М.Кедрова. –М., 1962.
4. Диалектика – теория познания. ... об элементах диалектики. Под общей редакцией Б.М.Кедрова. –М.: Наука, 1968.
5. Есперсен О. Философия грамматики. –М.: Изд-во иностранной литературы, 1958;
6. Звегинцев В.А. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях. Часть II. –М.: Просвещение, 1965. –С. 123.
7. Иванов С.Н. Грамматик тадқиқотларнинг методологик муаммолари. Монография. Рус тилидан И.Мирзаев таржимаси. –Самарқанд: СамДУ нашри, 2004.
8. Иванов С.Н. Курс турецкой грамматики. –Л.:ЛГУ, 1975.
9. Иванов С.Н. Родословное древо тюрок Абул-Гази Хана. Грамматический очерк. (Имя и глагол). –Т.: Фан, 1969.
10. Иванов С.Н. Очерки по синтаксису узбекского языка. –Л.: ЛГУ, 1959.
11. Кедров Б.М. Единство диалектики, логики и теории познания. –М., 1963.
12. Кириллов В.И. Логика познания сущности. –М.: Высшая школа, 1980;
13. See: Менглиев Б. Лисоний тизим яхлитлиги ва унда сатҳлараро муносабатлар. Abstract of doctoral dissertation. –Т., 2000;
14. Неъматов Ҳ., Бозоров О. Тил ва нутқ. –Т.:Ўқитувчи, 1993;
15. Неъматов Ҳ. Тажалли тасаввуф билиш назарияси ва тилшуносликда синтаксисни ўрганиш масалалари // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти, 1993,-№ 2.
16. Ne'matov H., Hamroyeva Sh. Lingvistik tadqiqot metodikasi, metodologiyasi va metodlari. –Buxoro, 2005;
17. Нигматов Х.Г., Абдуллаев К.М., Банару В.И., Махмудов Н.М., Мухаммедова Д.А., Нурманов А. Структура предложения и актуальные вопросы синтаксиса тюркских языков. (тезисы формально – функционального исследования) // Советская тюркология, - 1984, -№5.
18. Нигматов Х.Г. Функциональная морфология тюркоязычных памятников XI–XII вв. –Т.: Фан, 1989;
19. Панфилов В.З. Философские проблемы языкознания. Гносеологические аспекты. –М.: Наука, 1977;
20. Степанянц М.Т., Философские аспекты суфизма. –М.: Наука, 1987.
21. Туленов Ж., Ғофуров З. Фалсафа. –Т.:Ўқитувчи, 1997;
22. Уемов А.И. Вещи, свойства и отношения. –М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1963
23. Умумий ўрта таҳлимнинг Давлат Таҳлим стандарти ва ўқув дастури // Таълим тараққиёти, 1999 йил, 1-махсус сон.
24. Философия луғати. –Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1976.
25. Якобсон Р.О. Заключителғное слово по докладу // IV международный съезд славистов. Материалы дискуссии.Т.2. Проблемы славянского языкознания. –М., 1962. стр.47–48.
26. Қодиров З. Ўзбек тили грамматик категориясини систем тадқиқ этиш (Келишик категорияси): филол.фан.номз. ...дисс...автореф. –Самарқанд, 1993, 21- б.
27. Қурбонова М.Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тили (Содда гап синтаксиси учун материаллар). –Т.:Университет, 2002.
28. Хайруллаев М., Ҳақбердиев М. Мантиқ. -Т.:Ўқитувчи, 1993, 11–12- б.
29. Sobirovich, Madrahimov Ilkhomjon. "A Word in Dichotomic Aspect." JournalNX 7.12 (2021): 39-41.
30. Базаров, О., and И. Мадрахимов. "Человек-творец своего родного языка." (2016).
31. Мадрахимов, И. "К вопросу о составе лексем узбекского языка." Узбекский язык и литература,(4) (2002): 29-32.

32. Madrakhimov, I. "O ʻzbek tilida so ʻzning serqirraligi va uning tasniflash asoslari (= Polysemy of words in the Uzbek language and basics of their description): author. dis." Cand. philol. sciences. Tashkent (1994).
33. Sabirovich, Madrakhimov Ilham. "About Morphological Classification of Lexemes." " online-conferences" platform. 2022.
34. Мадрахимов, И. "Сўзнинг серқирралиги ва уни таснифлаш асослари: филология фанлари номзоди диссертацияси автореферати." (1994).
35. Sobirovich, Madrakhimov Ilkhomjon. "Results of Consistent Classification of Lexemes." Middle European Scientific Bulletin 24 (2022): 325-328.
36. Sobirovich, M. I. "Results of Consistent Classification of Lexemes. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 24, 325-328." (2022).
37. Madrahimov, I. "Versatility of words in Uzbek language and bases of its classification: phylol. fan. nomz.... dis. avtoref." (1994).
38. Мадраҳимов, Илхомжон Собирович. "Луғатларда тасниф талқини." Actual Problems in Higher Education in the Era of Globalization: International Scientific and Practical Conference. 2023.
39. Мадраҳимов, Илҳомжон Собирович. "Тасниф фалсафий, илмий категория сифатида." Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes. 2023.
40. Мадраҳимов, Илҳомжон Собирович. "Тасниф билишнинг бир усули сифатида." International Conference on Research Identity, Value and Ethics. 2023.
41. Мадраҳимов, Илҳомжон Собирович. "Ахборот технологиялари тизими таснифи." International Congress on Models and methods in Modern Investigations. 2023.
42. Sobirovich, Madrahimov Ilhomjon. "About problems of word categorization." Gospodarka i Innowacje. 33 (2023): 286-289.
43. Rahimovna, O. M., & Vahobovna, K. V. (2022). Graduonymy Of Activity Verbs In Uzbek And English Languages. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(11), 1372-1377.
44. Rahimovna, O. M. (2023). SIMILARITY AND DIFFERENCES ASPECTS OF GRADUONIMIC SERIES FORMED BY SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF VERBS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, *11*(4), 505-508.