



## STRUCTURE OF AFFIRMATIVE AND NEGATIVE SENTENCES IN UZBEKI AND TURKISH: COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES

**Abdurahimova Nigora Azizovna**

UzSWLU, Turkish language teacher

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13767945>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2024

Accepted: 15<sup>th</sup> September 2024

Online: 16<sup>th</sup> September 2024

### KEYWORDS

Turkish, positive sentences, negative sentences, semantic-formal Uzbek, discrepancies.

### ABSTRACT

*This article aims to research common and different aspects of affirmative and negative sentences in Uzbek and Turkish languages. First of all, the problem of definition and interpretation of words in Uzbek and Turkish linguistics, which express the meaning of affirmation and negation in the compared languages, was studied. Then the adverbs and compounds that form negative sentences in both languages were compared and studied. In some situations, it is noted that the form of affirmative sentences expresses the negative meaning, and negative sentences express the affirmative meaning. That is, it was observed that in the affirmative and negative sentences of the compared languages, semantic-formal inconsistency sometimes appeared in the structure of the text. The article uses the methods of analysis, comparison, synthesis, generalization, description. As a result of the research, the common and different features of grammatical additions and tools forming affirmative and negative sentences in Uzbek and Turkish languages were studied. Also, the means of forming affirmative and negative sentences, which ensure the inconsistency of affirmation and negation from a semantic and formal point of view, are described.*

## O'ZBEK VA TURK TILLARIDA TASDIQ VA INKOR SO'Z-GAPLAR TUZILISHI: UMUMIYLIKLER VA FARQLAR

**Abdurahimova Nigora Azizovna**

O'zDJTU, turk tili o'qituvchisi

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13767945>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2024

Accepted: 15<sup>th</sup> September 2024

Online: 16<sup>th</sup> September 2024

### ABSTRACT

*Ushbu maqolada o'zbek va turk tillaridagi tasdiq va inkor gaplarning umumiy va farqli jihatlarini tadqiq*



## KEYWORDS

*Gap, o'zbek tili, turk tili, inkor gap, tasdiq gap, semantik-formal nomuvofiqlik.*

*etish maqsad qilingan. Avvalo, qiyoslanayotgan tillardagi tasdiq va inkor mazmunini ifoda etgan o'zbek va turk tilshunosligidagi gap-so'zlarning ta'rifi va talqini masalasi o'rganilgan. Keyin har ikki tildagi inkor gaplarni shakllantirgan qo'shimcha va birikmalar solishtirilib o'rganilgan. Ba'zi vaziyatlarda shaklan tasdiq gaplarning inkor ma'nosini bildirgani, inkor gaplarning tasdiq ma'nosini ifodalagani qayd etilgan. Ya'ni qiyoslangan tillardagi tasdiq va inkor gaplarda matn tarkibida ba'zan semantik-formal nomuvofiqlik o'rtaga chiqqani kuzatildi. Maqolada analiz, qiyoslash, sintez, umumlashtirish, ta'riflash, metodlari qo'llanilgan. Tadqiqot natijasida o'zbek va turk tillaridagi tasdiq va inkor gaplarni shakllantiruvchi grammatik qo'shimchalar va vositalar o'rtasidagi umumiy va farqli xususiyatlar o'rganilgan. Shuningdek, semantik-formal jihatdan tasdiq va inkor nomuvofiqligini ta'minlagan tasdiq va inkor gaplarni hosil qilgan vositalar tavsiflangan.*

## ARTICLE INFO

Received: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2024

Accepted: 15<sup>th</sup> September 2024

Online: 16<sup>th</sup> September 2024

## KEYWORDS

*Cümle, Özbek Türkçesi, Türkiye Türkçesi, olumsuz cümle, olumlu cümle, anlamsal-şekli uyumsuzluk.*

## ABSTRACT

*Bu makale Özbekçe ve Türkçedeki olumlu ve olumsuz cümlelerin ortak ve farklı yönlerini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Öncelikle karşılaştırılan dillerde tasdik ve olumsuz anlamlarını ifade eden Özbek ve Türk dil bilimindeki kelimelerin tanımı ve yorumlanması sorunu incelenmiştir. Daha sonra her iki dilde de olumsuz cümle oluşturan zarflar ve bileşikler karşılaştırılarak incelenmiştir. Bazı durumlarda olumlu cümlelerin biçiminin olumsuz anlamı ifade ettiği, olumsuz cümlelerin ise olumlu anlamı ifade ettiği belirtilmektedir. Yani karşılaştırılan dillerin olumlu ve olumsuz cümlelerinde bazen metnin yapısında anlam-biçim tutarsızlıklarının ortaya çıktığı görülmüştür. Makalede analiz, karşılaştırma, sentez, genelleme, açıklama yöntemleri kullanılmaktadır. Araştırma sonucunda Özbekçe ve Türkçedeki gramer ekleri ile olumlu ve olumsuz cümleleri oluşturan araçların ortak ve farklı özellikleri araştırılmıştır. Ayrıca anlamsal ve biçimsel açıdan olumlama ve olumsuzluğun tutarsızlığını sağlayan olumlu ve olumsuz cümle kurma yolları anlatılmıştır.*



From the second half of the 20th century to the beginning of the 21st century, under the influence of Western comparative-historical linguistics, famous foreign and Russian Turkic linguists conducted effective research in the field of comparative study of Turkic languages (Abdurasulov, 2008, p.3). In particular, research in this field spread widely in 20th century linguistics: the Turkic language department of the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, its Petersburg and Siberian departments, studied all the Turkic folk and folk languages of the regions inhabited by Turkic peoples; in-depth research was carried out to study the sound system, vocabulary and grammatical structure of all modern Turkic languages; on this basis, many scientific articles, monographs, and comparative dictionaries of Turkish languages have been created so far (Abdurasulov, 2008, p. 5).

Excellent comparative grammars of Turkic languages were mainly created in the second half of the 20th century by scientists of the Moscow and St. Petersburg Linguistic Institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences. As a result of many years of effective research by Russian linguists such as N.A. Baskakov, B.A. Serebrennikov, N.Z. Gadjiyeva, A.M. Shcherbak, several volumes of scientific and historical grammars and monographs of Turkic languages were created (Baskakov, 1960, Serebrennikov and Gadjiyev, 1986; Sravnitelno-istoricheskaya grammatika tyurskih yazikov, 1984; Shcherbak, 1977; Shcherbak, 1988). These works are written on the issues of historical and comparative grammar of Turkic languages. Modern Turkic languages, at the same time, studies on the comparative grammar of Turkish and Uzbek languages began at the end of the 20th century, after the independence of Uzbekistan. In scientific studies aimed at the comparative study of the Turkish and Uzbek languages, phrases, nouns, verbs, and various aspects of sentences were the object of research, but the common and different features of affirmative and negative sentences were not specifically compared and studied (Usmonova, 1998; Khudoyberganova, 1999; Chetin, 2003; Khudoyberganov, 2004).

It is known that sentences in the Uzbek language are divided into two groups according to modality: affirmative and negative sentences (Askarova and Abdurahmonov, 1986). At the same time, there are cases where affirmative and negative sentences are studied as one of the communicative types of sentences - forms of declarative sentences (Ahmedov, 1979, p. 29; Ismatullaev, 1965, p. 5). In Uzbek linguistics, the special features of affirmative and negative sentences, the grammatical tools that form these types of sentences, as well as their form-content inconsistency were a separate object of research (Lutfillayeva 1997, Lutfullayeva 2006).

In Turkish linguistics, affirmative and negative sentences are considered types according to the meaning of the sentence (Dizdaroğlu, 1976, pp. 282-295; Karahan, 1991, pp. 71-74; Hatiboğlu, 1982, pp. 164-167; Hengirmen, 1995, pp. 350-353; Yemen, 2000, pp. 287-289). It can be seen that A.N. Kononov focused on the features of the negative sentence in the Turkish language (Kononov, 1941, p. 210-212). A.N. Baskakov, who carried out special work on the specific features of the sentence in the Turkish language, puts forward the opinion that affirmation and negation are the subjective modality of the sentence, that is, affirmative and negative sentences do not represent the type of sentence (Baskakov, 1984, pp. 18-25). So, in Uzbek linguistics and Turkish linguistics, affirmative and negative sentences and their specific



features can be recognized as one of the issues that have been thoroughly researched. However, the composition and properties of affirmative and negative sentences have not been studied in a comparative aspect.

Cases of classification of affirmative and negative sentences are observed in Turkish linguistics. For example, H. Dizdaroğlu groups affirmative and negative sentences as follows: affirmative sentences in the Turkish language are of two types according to the composition of the clause: affirmative nouns and affirmative verbs. Affirmative noun-sentences are further divided into two groups: affirmative sentences according to their form and content; negative noun-phrases according to their form, affirmative according to their content. Unlike Uzbek, negative sentences in Turkish are divided into two groups: negative nouns and negative verbs. Negative noun-sentences are divided into two groups according to their structure: noun-sentences negative in form and content, affirmative in form, negative noun-sentences in content, etc. (Dizdaroğlu, 1976, p. 282-291). A similar opinion is expressed by M. Bilgin. Although he does not classify affirmative sentences, he divides negative sentences into the same types as H. Dizdaroğlu (Bilgin, 2006, p. 511-513). As a result of the analysis of the same sentence types, the opinions of linguists seem to be controversial. For example, sentences with the modal word **yok/ yo'q** and **değil / emas** cannot be called an affirmative sentence. Because the participation of the same words, which is an indicator of indivisibility, can be a sufficient evidence for us to include such sentences in the group of negative sentences. Or: **ne...ne** prepositions are elements with a negative meaning in content. So, when looking logically and analyzing the examples, it is necessary to include the sentences with **ne...ne** prepositions in Turkish as a negative sentence. H. Dizdaroğlu comes to the conclusion that such statements are negative in content and affirmative in form.

In the languages being compared, the meaning of negation is expressed as follows:

In the languages being compared, the meaning of negation is expressed as follows:

- Negative sentences expressed by participle verbs are mainly formed by means of **-ma** and **-ma, -me** affixes.

For example:

*Nizomjon uni quvdi, yetolmadi* (Ahmad, 1996. S. 34).

*Benim için de başka kadın ve aşk olmayacak* (Edip-Adivar, 1993, s. 23).

*Men uchun ham undan o'zga ayol va ishq bo'lmaydi.*

Also, the present-future verb with the suffix **-makta, -mekte** can be used with the infinitive indicator, unlike its Uzbek counterpart:

*Kendi adı bilinmemektedir* (Güntekin, 1994, s. 18).

*O'zining asl ismi noma'lumdir.*

So, when indicative verbs **-ma /-ma, -me** perform the participle function, it means that the action understood from the sentence has not been performed, that is, a negative sentence is formed. From conjugational verbs, the present-future verb and the undivided form of the verb form (their full or short form) formed by joining this verb form with the imperfect verbs **-mas (-masdi , -mas edi, - masmish, -mas ekan), -maz, -mez (-mazdi, -mezdi; -mashish, -mezmiş)** are made using the affixes. The mentioned additions serve to form a negative sentence.





For example:

*U nima deyishini, nima qilishini **bilmasdi**(Ahmad, 1996, s. 45).*

*Handan'in yüzünde insan sade gözleriyle saçlarını görür, başka yerlerini **düşünemez** bile(Edip-Adivar, 1995, s. 98).*

*Xandanning yuzida odam faqat ko'zlariyu sochlarini ko'radi, boshqa joylarini **o'ylamaydi** ham.*

The indicators of indivisibility recorded in both languages have full semantic-functional identity, that is, they are mutually equivalent;

- when the participle is from words other than the verb, it is **emas** in Uzbek and its Turkish alternative is used with the word **değil**, forming a negative sentence:

*Hozir birovdan gina qiladigan payt **emas**(Ahmad, 1996, s. 65).*

*Tabii bu diqqatimi chekecek levha **değil**(Edip-Adivar, 1993, s. 29.).*

*Tabiiyki, bu diqqatimni jalb etadigan manzara **emas**;*

- ♦ The negative form of verbs in Turkish and Uzbek Turkish is formed by the words **değil emas (değil)**. The word " **emas** " in Uzbek Turkish is derived from the verb **emoq - imek** cewher. This word is often used to create negative sentences. can be used with an incomplete verb and express the meaning of incompleteness:

*Sen aytgan odamni umrimda **ko'rgan emasman**(A'zam, 2000, 78).*

*Lamia zaten başka türlü hayata **alışmış değil**(Güntekin, 1995, 53).*

*Zotan, Lamia boshqacha yashashga **odatlangan emas**.*

Expression of negation in Turkish by means of **-miş + değil** is not active at the same level as its formal equivalent in Uzbek (-gan+ emas). If the verbs of the **-ma +-miş** type indicate that the action-state implied by the sentence has not been completed, the participle in the form **-miş + değil** emphasizes the meaning of negation, and the same meaning is strengthened.

- In the Uzbek language, if an adjective in the form of **-gan** appears as participle, the meaning of indivisibility is expressed by the word **no** (Gulomov and Askarova, 1987, p. 51):

*Esimni yeganim **yo'q**, bolam(Do'stmuhammad, 2000, s. 26*

There is a phonetic alternative to this word in Turkish, but the word **yok** is not used with an adjective.

The Uzbek word **yo'q** has the following characteristics (Gulomov and Askarova, 1987, p. 51-52):

a) this word itself forms a certain sentence and is the answer of the previous interrogative sentence. denotes negation as:

*Menda gaping **yo'q**mi, singlim? – **Yo'q**(Ahmad, 1996, s. 121);*

b) this word itself is a participle:

*Yaxshi gapdan boshqa yordamim **yo'q**(Ahmad, 1996, s. 213);*

v) comes in the complex participle:

*O'sha voqeadan so'ng uni **ko'rganim yo'q** (Do'stmuhammad, 2000, s. 76).*

In Turkish, the situation is quite different. Because apart from the word "**yok**", which means negation, there is also the word "**hayır/ yo'q**". Although the words "**yok**" and "**hayır**" are used interchangeably, it can be seen that the word "**hayır**" is more common. These words can be a separate sentence and express negation as an answer to an interrogative sentence.



For example:

*Boylu? Etlı? – **Yok, yok** ne tuhafsiniz!(Edip-Adivar, 1995, s. 12)*

*Baland bo'yli, to'ladan kelganmi? – **Yo'q, yo'q**, qanaqa g'alatisiz-a! Handan'in resimleri seni rahatsız mi ediyor? – Hayır, hayır(Edip-Adivar, 1995, s. 21).*

*Xandanning rasmlari seni bezovta qilyaptimi? – **Yo'q, yo'q**.*

the word "**hayır**" is not part of a complex participle, nor is it a separate participle. Although the word "**yok**" cannot be a component of a complex clause, it can act as a clause by itself:

*Seninle hayatta kazanılmayacak yarış **yoktur**, cesur çocuk (Edip-Adivar, 1993, s. 53). — Sen bilan birgalikda g'olib bo'lmaydigan musobaqa **yo'q**, jasur bolakay.*

So, the words "yo'q" in Uzbek and "yok" in Turkish are phonetic alternatives and have a semantic-functional commonality. However, the semantic and scope of use of the lexeme no is relatively limited, so some meanings specific to the lexeme no are provided by the word no.

4) the auxiliaries **na...na/ ne...ne** are used to express the negation of united clauses in the languages being compared. This auxiliary is repeated before each compound clause, and is not used alone:

*Menda **na** yigitlik izzat-nafsi, **na** g'urur, **na** iroda qoldi (Yoqubov, 2018, s. 19).*

***Ne** karakış, **ne** açlık, **ne** hastalık evin davet programını kıl kadar değiştirmemişti (Güntekin, 1996, s. 56). — **Na** ayo, **na** ochlik, **na** xastalik bu uyga mehmonlarni taklif qilish dasturini qilchalik o'zgartirmagan edi.*

5) In the Uzbek language, participles expressed with the adjective formed using the affixes, prefixes **no-**, **-siz**, **be-** create a negative sentence:

*Men bu marhamatga **noloyiqman** (Oybek, 2009, s. 67).*

*Bunchalik **betamizsan**(Qahhor, 2007, s. 19).*

In Turkish, a negative sentence is formed by using the adjectives **-siz**, **-siz**, **-suz**, **-süz** as participles:

*Sözü nereden açacağıma da **kararsızdım** (Güntekin, 1994, s. 93).*

*Gapni qaerdan boshlashni bilmay garang edim.*

So, there is a clear difference here. In Turkish, one adjectival affix, and in Uzbek three adjectival affixes indicate the absence of one or another character. When such adjectives perform the function of participles, a negative sentence is formed. So, in this situation, the prefixes that have been adopted into the Uzbek language from the Persian-Tajik language appear as a differentiating factor.

The negative sentence in Uzbek and Turkish languages has special negative indicators, the affirmative sentence is characterized by the absence of negative means. However, every sentence in the form of negation does not always have to express indivisibility, and also the sentence in the form of affirmation can sometimes be used in the content of negation (Gulomov and Askarova, 1987, p. 50-51). The meaning of divisibility is understood in both Uzbek and Turkish languages as a result of the participation of two infinitive forms of the verb or infinitive element in the composition of the participle. For example:

a) with the double use of indivisibility affixes:

*Burungi Normurod **indamay turmas edi** (Yoqubov, 2018, s. 92).*

*Para! Diye **yapmayacağız kalmaz**(Güntekin, 1994, s. 4).*



*Pul, deb qilmagan ishimiz qolmadi.*

The meaning of the first of these sentences is " Normurod albatta gapirar edi ", and the meaning of the second is " hamma ishni qilib ko'rdik ". In this situation, through the double use of indicators of indivisibility, emphasis is placed on the meaning of confirmation understood from the sentence, additional strictness and accuracy shades are loaded;

b) «yo'q/ yok + emas/değil» with a cut in the mold:

*Hatto, ular yordamida butun boshli ko'rinmas qo'shin barpo qilish rejasi ham yo'q emas*(Oybek, 2009, s. 84).

*Bunlarning ichinde seninle bir zamanlar ahbaplik edenler de yok değildir*(Karaosmanoğlu, 1996, s. 83).

*Ular orasida sen bilan bir paytlar aka-uka tutinganlar ham yo'q emas.*

With the help of this construction, the modal attitude of the speaker to the thought he is expressing is expressed, in addition to the meaning of affirmation, various shades depending on the context are added;

c) also when a verb in the infinitive form and a compound made with the affixes **-siz, no-, be-/-siz, -siz, -suz, -süz**, with an adjective denoting the non-existence of a specific sign, perform the function of a participle of a sentence. the meaning of language is understood.

For example:

*Rost, qizni yo'ldan urgan Jamol Bo'riboyev ham jazosiz qolmadi*(Yoqubov, 2018, s. 77).

*Fakat telaşi pek sebebsiz görünüyordu*(Güntekin, 1993, s. 21).

*Ammo uning bezovtaligi unchalik asossiz emasdi.*

In this case, participial sentences of the given type indicate the content of an action-state that has been realized, happened without a doubt.

In Turkish, when verb-participles that receive the indicator of infinitive come with the incomplete verb *değil/emas*, the meaning of the action is understood. The word "not" can be used with all verb forms in the mood of the message. For example, the participles of the following sentences are composed of the form "past tense verb with **-medi** suffix + **değil** word" and "present tense verb with **-mıyor** suffix + **değil** word" in the form:

*Bu cihazleri ben de düşünmedim değil*(Güntekin, 1993, s. 51).

*Bu tomonlarini men ham xo'b o'yladim. İlk zamanlarda bu kadını sevmiyor degildim*(Güntekin, 1993, s. 25).

*Avvalboshda bu ayolni haddan ziyod sevar edim.*

Interjections with the same structure mean that the action is continuous or performed at a high level and are used to increase the expressiveness and effectiveness of the speech. The phonetic or semantic alternatives of these grammatical indicators in the Uzbek language cannot be used together in such a form, but it is observed that they meet in the composition of coherent clauses that enter into a conflicting relationship in oral conversation:

*Tushunmadim emas, tushundim, lekin baribir bormayman.*

However, if we compare this situation in both languages, it becomes clear that these types of participles are used alone in Turkish and that no additional explanation is needed for stylistically correct sentence structure.



In particular, in the languages being compared, the meaning of divisibility is understood even when one of the two indivisibility elements is part of the participle, and the other is part of another part of the sentence. For example, in the Uzbek and Turkish languages, the determiner and the participle expressed by the adjective are in the form of infinitive, and the meaning of the confirmation of the situation understood from the sentence is expressed. This situation can be, for example, in the following forms:

a) "definitive expressed by an infinitive verb" + "infinitive participle":

*O'rtaga **solmagan** odami **qolmadi**(Yoqubov, 2018, s. 91).*

*Hayriye Hanım'ın istediği pek öyle olmayacak bir şey değildi(Güntekin, 1994, s. 31).*

*Xayriya xonimning istagan narsasi amalga oshmaydigan orzu emasdi.*

The sum of the negative meanings of the adjectives **solmagan**, **olmayacak** – **bo'lmaydigan** and "didn't" and **qolmadi**, **degildi** – **emas edi** in the given examples means that the action-state expressed in these examples has come true;

b) "case expressed by an adverbial form without participle" + "participle without participle":

*To'y haqida, Fazilatxon bilan quda bo'layotgani haqida **aytmasdan sira iloji yo'q**(Qahhor, 2007, s. 85).*

*Hele bir tanesini **yazmadan geçmeyeceğim** (Güntekin, 1995, s. 101).*

*Hech bo'lmaganda, bu voqealarning bittasini **yozmasdan o'tolmayman**.*

g) "non-participle conditional" + "partial participle":

*Taklifni **bajarmasam bo'lmadi**(Ahmad, 1996, s. 72).*

*İstediklerini yedirip **giydirmezsek olmaz**(Güntekin, 1994, s. 53).*

*Istaganlarini yedirib **kiydirmasak bo'lmaydi**.*

This type of conjunctions indicates that the action understood from the sentence has a necessary, mandatory character.

A certain tone turns affirmative sentences in Uzbek and Turkish into negative sentences, that is, by changing the tone of an affirmative sentence in a certain way, the content of the negative is understood. In this case, affirmative sentences in the form of rhetorical interrogative sentences mean negation.

For example:

*Qallig'ini ko'rsatarmidi feodal o'g'lingiz? (ko'rsatmaydi) (Qahhor, 2007, s. 49).*

*Ayşe, şimdi on dördünü bitiriyor, ablaları gibi güzel olmaya başlıyordu. Fakat onun bu ilkbaharını kimin gözü görüyordu?(Güntekin, 1994, 112)*

*Oysha hozir o'n to'rt yoshga kiriyapti, opalariday go'zal qiz bo'lib yetilyapti. Ammo uning bu go'zalligini kimning ko'zi ham ko'rardi? (hech kim ko'rmayapti)*

And, on the contrary, negative sentences with an element of indivisibility are transformed into an affirmative sentence by means of a certain tone. In this case, negative sentences in the form of some rhetorical interrogative sentences often carry the content of affirmation:

*Nega aytmas ekanman(aytaman)? Ipirisqi bo'lmay nima? (Ipirisqi-ku!) (Oybek, 2009, s. 28)*

*Tanımamak kabul mu? Karşımdaki adam Hindistan'ı karış karış dolaşan Tevfik efendi...(Karaosmanoğlu, 1996, s. 96)*





*Tanimay bo'ladimi? (albatta, taniyman) Ro'paramdagi odam Hindiston hududini qarichma-qarich o'lchab chiqqan Tevfik afandi...*

Certain grammatical forms in the Uzbek and Turkish languages turn affirmative sentences into negative ones. For example, the combination in the form of **-(i)b** affixed adverb + personal suffixes + **bo'lmoq** means indivisibility, non-performance of an action (Ahmedov, 1979, p. 41):

**Kechib bo'pman!** (Kechmayman) (Hoshimov, 2017, s. 39).

By replacing the verb **bo'lmoq** in the same grammatical form with the interrogative form of the word **o'lmoq**, a negative compound is formed:

*Ustingizdan kulib o'libmanmi?* (kulmayapman) (Hoshimov, 2017, s. 22).

When used with the interrogative form of the auxiliary verb **olmak-bo'lmoq**, the third-person singular singular form of the Turkish present-future verb forms a negative sentence, but these sentences have an affirmative meaning. In this case, the same sentence, pronounced with a special intonation, has shades of accuracy and concreteness:

Söylediklerinizi **anlamaz olur muyuz?** (Karaosmanoğlu, 1996, s. 45)

Aytganlaringizni tushunmay bo'ladimi?

Affirmative and negative sentences in Uzbek and Turkish languages can be recognized as one of the most well-developed topics. In Uzbek linguistics, the same types of sentences are classified as types of sentences according to modality. In Turkish linguistics, the types of sentences are studied according to the purpose of expression, and these types of sentences are divided into groups according to the structure and expressive material of the clause.

## References:

1. A'zam, E. (2000). Pakananing oshiq ko'ngli. Toshkent: Sharq.
2. Abdurahmonova, M. (2004). O'zbek va turk tillarida otning grammatik kategoriyalari. Yayinlanmamiş Doktora Tezi. Özbekistan Cumhuriyeti Fenler Akademisi Dil ve Edebiyat Enstitüsü.
3. Ahmad, S. (1996). Ufq. Toshkent: Sharq.
4. Ahmedov, A. (1979). O'zbek tilida gapning kommunikativ turlari. Toshkent: Fan.
5. Asqarova, M. va Abdurahmonov, G'. (1986). Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent: Fan.
6. Baskakov, A.N. (1984). Predlojenie v sovremennom tureskom yazike. Moskva: Nauka.
7. Baskakov, N.A. (1960). Tyurkskie yaziki. Moskva: Nauka.
8. Bilgin, M. (2006). Anlamdan Anlatıma Türkçemiz. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
9. Chetin, M. (2002). O'zbek va turk tillarida sintaktik derivatsiya. Yayinlanmamiş Doktora Tezi. Özbekistan Cumhuriyeti Fenler Akademisi Dil ve Edebiyat Enstitüsü.
10. Dizdaroğlu, H. (1976). Tümcebilgisi. Ankara: TDK, 1976.
11. Do'stmuhammad, X. (2000). Bozor. Toshkent: Sharq.
12. Edip-Adivar, H. (1993). Kalp ağrısı. İstanbul: Remzi.
13. Edip-Adivar, H. (1995). Handan. İstanbul:Atlas.
14. G'ulomov, A., va Asqarova, M. (1961). Hozirgi zamon o'zbek tili. Sintaksis. Toshkent: O'rta va oliy maktab.
15. Güntekin, R.N. (1994). Dudaktan Kalbe. İstanbul: İnkilap.



16. Güntekin, R.N. (1995). Yaprak Dökümü. İstanbul: İnkilap.
17. Güntekin, R.N. (1996). Bir Kadın Düşmanı. İstanbul: İnkilap.
18. Hatiboğlu, V. (1982). Türkçenin Söz Dizimi. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi basımevi.
19. Hengirmen, M. (1995). Türkçe Dilbigisi. Ankara: TDK.
20. Hoshimov, O'. (1997). Nur borki, soya bor. Toshkent: Adabiyot va san'at.
21. Karahan, L. (1991). Türkçede Söz Dizimi. Ankara: