



GENERAL CONCEPTS OF COMPARATIVE-DIALECTOLOGICAL COMPETENCE SYSTEMS IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Musurmankulova Madina Nosirovna

Denau branch of Termez State University, Master, Russian language teacher, Department of General Linguistics, Republic of Uzbekistan, city of Denau, Sh. Rashidov 360

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the dialect system of the Russian and Uzbek languages in a comparative aspect. Studying the dialect system of the Russian and Uzbek languages in a comparative aspect makes it possible to create a comparative dialectological competence. This article is devoted to the creation of dialectological competence at the comparative level of different languages.

KEY WORDS: *Comparative dialectological competence, aspect, dialect system, provincial environment.*

DISCUSSION

The democratization processes of modern society stimulate the need to master effective communicative behavior [A. Vorobyova. Conditions for achieving the communicative duality of rhetorical discourse. American Journal of Science and Technologies, 441-447 pp., P. 411]. Communicative behavior is not only determined in the modern environment, but even in remote areas.

“The beginning of the nineteenth century in Russia it is characterized by a revival of socio-political life, an upsurge of national self-awareness, especially after the war of 1812. It was then that interest arises in the comprehensive study of the peasantry: its customs, beliefs, culture, language, ethnography develops (from the Greek ethnos – “people”), which studies the material and spiritual culture of the people. It should be noted that language and linguistic features at that time were considered as ethnographic features, not standing out in a separate area of knowledge. Researchers recorded mostly “exotic” words and phrases related to the description of local customs and rituals. So, with the collection of local words and vivid expressions, the science of dialectology began (from the Greek dialektos – “conversation, dialect, adverb” and logos – “word, doctrine”), studying local dialects” [From the history of the study of Russian dialects, Teacher’s newspaper, No. 38 of September 21, 2010].

We know that in remote areas there are still dialects, dialect systems, folklore. Improving the system of comparative dialect competence of the

Russian and Uzbek languages at present can give a methodical direction to students from the national group.

“At the same time, one should deeply study the peculiarities of the Uzbek language and its dialects, issues related to its history and development prospects, increase the effectiveness of specialized scientific research, and drastically improve the quality of training” [Shavkat Mirziyoyev, Gazeta.uz.].

Studying the dialect system in a comparative aspect in different languages makes it possible, as mentioned above, to realize the highest value of oral folklore by two peoples and two nations.

A focus on competency-based education is already being formed in the 70s. XX century in America in the context of the concept of “competency” proposed by N. Chomsky as applied to transformational grammar [5, 240 p.]. Chomsky writes: “... we draw a fundamental distinction between competence (speaking and listening to one’s own language) and use (real use of the language in specific situations). Only in an idealized case ... use is a direct reflection of competence” [11, p. 9]. We draw attention to the fact that “use”, according to Chomsky, is a manifestation of competence as something potential, that is, use is associated with skills, thinking, the speaker himself, his experience [5, 240 p.].

Competence – these are some issues in which a person is knowledgeable, has knowledge and certain experience.



You can divide the concept of competence into linguistic, communicative.

Subsequently, in foreign linguistics, the concept of communicative competence was developed in line with the methodology of teaching foreign languages (see J. Van Ek (1986), M. Channel (1980), R. Bell (1991), L. Bachman (1990), M. Svein (1980), C. Keen (1992), S. Savignon (1997), J. Manbai (1978), H. Widowson (1978), R. Clifford (1985) and others) [5, P. 239.].

The concept of linguistic competence is associated with knowledge of the language system (E. D. Bojovich (2013), E. M. Shulgina (2014), *intuitive knowledge of the rules and norms of the language, language code* (M. N. Vyatyutnev (1975), E. Movsesyan (1982), Y. B. Emelyanova (2010), T.P. Ogluzdina (2011), N.S. Kuznetsova (2010), M.K. Kabardov (1996), V.A. Pishalnikova (2004), *measure language proficiency* (G. Yu. Bogdanovich, 2001), *correctness of the language* (A.K. Grigoryeva, 2005), *real knowledge of the language* (I.N. Gorelov, 1987), *verbalization of the mental content* (E.V. Yakovchenko, 2003), *construct* (S. G. Makeeva, 2011, A. M. Shakhnarovich, 1991) [5, 239 p.]. N. Chomsky defines language competence as: a) “a certain *system of intellectual abilities*, a system of knowledge and beliefs that develops in early childhood and in interaction with many other factors determines the types of behavior that we observe”; b) “a *system of rules* that we have mastered and which allows us to understand and produce new offers in every suitable case”; c) “an ability specific to a given (human) biological species and basically independent of mental abilities” [12, p. 15, 30, 37, 89, 97].

Comparatively - dialectological competence is interconnected with both linguistic and communicative competence. The main direction of sociolinguistics.

All natural languages existing in the world have national boundaries, therefore, one of the main ones in modern linguistics is the concept of a *national (nationwide) language*, which is the language of a particular nation in the aggregate of all its inherent features that condition it as such and differentiate it from other languages [6, p.p. 416]. *Dialectism* can be interpreted as a word used only in a certain territory within the boundaries of any dialect and absent in another dialect and in the literary language.

Modern dialectology distinguishes the following types of dialectisms: a) grammatical dialectisms – words that have grammatical characteristics different from the literary language, manifested in a different declension, the special formation of the forms of parts of speech, the transition from one grammatical gender to another, etc.: *мимо избе* (instead *мимо избы*), in the *степе* (instead of *в степи*), *широкие степя* (instead of *широкие степи*), *слабше* (instead of *слабее*). The whole face has become so blue (I.

Bunin). (*Вся лицо так вроде как голубая стала* (И. Бунин).

Smells the cat whose meat it ate (A. Sholokhov) (*Чует кошка, чью мясу съела* (А. Шолохов); b) phonetic dialectisms – words with a pronunciation of separate sounds and sound combinations other than in the literary language: *девцонка, крицать, цай* (tea), *нясу, мяшок, курица* (chicken), *бочья* (barrel); c) *semantic dialectisms* - general literary words with a different meaning than in the literary language: *гораздо* (very), *наглый* (arrogant), *залиться* (drown), *угадать* (guess, recognize in person), *верх* (top, ravine); d) *word-building dialectisms* - words with a different word-building structure than the same-root literary synonyms: *бечь* (run), *блюдко* (saucer), *гуска* (goose), *дождок* (rain), *нехожая и неезжая сторона* (a bad and unladen side), *сбочь* (side); e) *lexical dialectisms* - local names of objects and phenomena that have other names in the literary language: *баз* (indoor courtyard for livestock), *бурак* (beetroot), *векша* (squirrel), *гашник* (belt), *дежа* (sour), *закут или закута* (cattle for small livestock), *зараз* (now), *кочет* (rooster), *стерня* (stubble); g) ethnographisms - local names of local objects: *обедник, побережник, полуношник, шалоник*, (names of winds at pomors), *журавель* (a lever for raising water from a well), *коты* (birch bark bast shoes), *новина* (severe canvas) [7, p. 119-120].

Complex Uzbek concepts also exist in the system of Uzbek dialectisms. In a comparative aspect, it is possible to create a system of dialectological competence.

Uzbek dialects are divided by researchers into three main dialects, which were given different names: 1) Central Uzbek (southeastern, Chagatai, or Karluk-Chigile-Uyghur); 2) South Khorezm (southwest, or Oguz); 3) Northwest (Kypchak, Shaybani to Uzbek, OR jacking). E. D. Polivanov, the first to outline this division, outlined the difference between these dialects with three phonetic attributes using two words as examples: 1) tag, sart, q •, 2) daq, sarb (sa: rb) •, 3) daq, sarb. A.K. Borovkov, preserving basically the same division, lists the characteristics of each dialect separately. To delimit the “Sheybanid-Uzbek, or jacking, dialect”, it gives eight signs, of which two are morphological [3, p. 55].

It can be concluded that in the dialectic system, two languages distinguish phonetic, lexical, and morphological dialects.

REFERENCES

1. Borovkov AK, *Classification issues of Uzbek dialects, "Izvestia Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR", 5, 1953, p. 73.*
2. Vorobyova A., *Conditions for achieving the communicative duality of rhetorical discourse.*



- American Journal of Science and Technologies*, 441-447 pp., P. 411.
3. Zhirmunsky VM, *On some issues of linguistic geography of Turkic dialects*. Publishing house "Science", M.-1960. S. 11.
 4. Kononov AN, *Grammar of the modern Uzbek literary language*, M. — L., 1960, pp. 9-10; N.A. Baskakov, *Turkic languages*, M., 1960, 160.
 5. Minina A.I., *Actual problems of language competence*. P. 236-242, p. 239.
 6. Mistyuk T.L., Zaeskova S.V., Tum E.A., *Some aspects of modern dialectology in the course "Russian language and culture of speech"*. P. 416-422.
 7. *Russian language / ed. L. Y. Maksimova*. M.: Education, 1989. P. 287, P. 119-120
 8. Reshetov V., Shoabdurakhmonov Sh., *Uzbek Dialectology*, p. 85.
 9. Reshetov V., *The Uzbek language*, pp. 73-74.
 10. Polivanov E.D., *Uzbek Dialectology and the Uzbek literary language (to the modern stage of the Uzbek language construction)*, Tashkent, 1933.
 11. Chomsky N. *Aspects of theoretical syntax*. M.: Moscow State University, 1972.
 12. Chomsky N. *Language and thinking*. M.: Moscow State University, 1972. 126 p.