Relationship between Grammatical and Contextual Aspects of Speech

Kudratkhodjaeva Nargis Akbarovna, candidate of philological sciences,

Usmanova Oyista Yuldashalievna, candidate of pedagogical sciences

Languages Department of Tashkent State Technical University named after Islam Karimov

Abstract: *This article is devoted to the actual problem of linguistics of newly formed text in Uzbek linguistics. It contains theoretical interpretations of the actual division marks. Constructive and communicative syntax units have been explained in detail.*

Key words: semiology, traditional syntactic theories, the generalization of the language, onomasiology, propositional meaning, semantics.

Any linguistic symbol is a form and unit of meaning. In traditional syntactic theories, however, the structure of the word has been studied. However, in some places it is addressed to semantics in determining the types of communication, in the internal classification of secondary elements, for example, the division of the place into place, time, purpose and other types, definition of descriptors, attraction, interpretation, etc.). The essence of the conversation and its content, as well as the content of the conversation, the content of the subject and the predictions, and the relationship between the form and the content of the predictions did not have the object of special study until recently.

According to N. D. Arutyunova, in the mid-seventies, the word "storm" began to be used [1, 6]. There are a number of factors influencing the development of the linguistic theory of interest in the word semantics: the meaning of linguistics – the rise of the attitude of the logic to the proposition, the generalization of the language and the meaning, as well as the emergence of the concept of syntactic transformation and the concept of syntactic

transformation, which is based on the notion of meaningful equality of words.

O. Espersen also tried to distinguish the form from linguistics to G. While criticizing suites and other linguists, the form and content are interconnected, and that the emphasis on the two sides of the linguistic phenomenon is the main function of any linguistic one. In his opinion, every linguist can examine the event in two ways – from form to meaning or from form to point [2, 32-33]. The first one is semiology and the other is onomasiology.

Though semantics today are almost universally recognized by all linguists, there is no uncertainty about the status of syntactic sentence. According to N. Y. Shvedova, the main task of syntactic semantics is to determine the specific meaning of the formulas and syntactic models. Accordingly, the generalized meaning of the spatial structure and the relationship between them serve as the basis for the syntactical structure of the word. According to N. Y. Swedov`s conception, the essence of the statement

is that the meaning of the typical elements of the meanings in the abstract language system is understood [3, 461]. It tries to learn the content from the purely linguistic material without the content of extreme extra linguistic factors. Any layers of the language, including the layout scheme, also have a meaningful, unique feature derived from the relationship of the category and specific meanings.

The second direction supporters are basically based on their lexical meaning, the minimum number of words. Accordingly, the content of the conversation is separated not from the boundaries of the scheme, but beyond. The structure schema and the contextual structures are arranged in parallel rows that are not intersect.

Y. P. Paducheva`s researches on syntactic semantics are essential. In his opinion, this means the meaning of the lexeme, the grammatical forms of the word forms, and the meaning of syntactic devices. Therefore, lexical and morphological semantics should be a

semantics component [4]. V. G. Gak speaks as a full-fledged sign of language [5], a reference point, that is, a combination of elements that make up a linguistic element in the word of the speaker and exist in the vocabulary of the word itself [6]. The relationship between the situation and the expression that expresses it is studied in two ways – from the person who expresses it to the meaning of the plan and, on the contrary, from the meaning to the plan of expression. The first is the act of understanding the speech, and the second represents the act of expression. Accordingly, in syntactic semantics, there are two aspects that are interconnected and that are contradictory to the same direction: semiology and onomasiology. The first one is to show what a particular syntactic unit represents, and the second one describes the particular situation.

Since the meaning of the first link is associated with an objective existence, it attaches particular importance to the definition and analysis of the situation,

and it is also called denotative or nominal aspect of the conversation.

In many cases, the term "proposition" is used to describe the narrative aspect of the conversation. This terminology was influenced by logical and philosophical research into linguistics. He points out the role of the concept of proposition in the logical construction of U. Quine, and its reflection of the generality of the word and its interpretation in another language or in one language. With its interest in the proposition, its diversity is also moderate.

When a classic logic is propositioned or a logical verdict, it is understood that the form of the idea that communicates or rejects certain predictions of the existence. The term "proposition" is first used by linguists in the same sense as the form of expression of the sentence, and then applies to all types of speech. The term "sentence" was also derived from "judgment" in Latin through the Russian term "предложение".

Symbolic logic, in contrast to classical logic, seeks to define the concept of direct indivisibility by simply ignoring its conceptions in the human mind [7]. As a result of this general tendency of propositional thinking, it later turned from an imaginary to objective reality, from a subjective factor to an objective factor. As a result, he began to focus not on the form of thinking but on the content of the objective realities expressed through it. He was liberated from the category of subjective modality and began to state the situation. Proposition came into linguistics with the same meaning.

The nominative theory was reflected in Frege's works firstly. In his opinion, every word has its content and meaning. Content is its designation, referring; the meaning is denotation. It is understood that the content of this statement is wider than the meaning. Thus, G. Frege says that in any case, the level of the idea goes from level to point of reference, meaning that there is an act of confirmation or denial of certain meanings. The referent uses the proposition term for a layer.

The concept of proposition is more specific in B. Rassel's works. In his opinion, proposition is an actual phenomenon similar to the structure of reality. About Proposition Ch. Fillmor says: "In the main structure of the conversation, we see a structure called "proposition" a combination of interconnected nouns between the verb derives from the modal part of the word. The modal part of the talk includes features such as denial, time, inclination, and character that define its entire character. "

Today, many linguists understand the objective meaning expressed in the semantics of proposition under the term proposition. O. I. Moskalskaya has acknowledged this aspect of the word as the central point of the discussion. The proposition does not simply have to be expressed through sentences. It can also be expressed through words expressions and words. For example: Sobir keldi. Sobir came – Sabirning kelishi. Thus, in

order to be a specific syntactic structure, besides expressing a particular proposition, it must have other criteria – communicative independence and modalities. Therefore, whenever any statement is transposed to a noun position, its communicative division (theme-rheumatic division) and ideally deviated, but its nominative meaning remains. Compare More-

> Bola kitobni o`qiyapti -
>
> Child is reading the book,
>
> Bolaning ktob o`qishi

The essentially approximation of these comparative structures is the basis of the central elements in them. The central element of speech as a communicative unit in the transposition process is the center of nomadic unity [8]. Communicative structure of speech also influences its nomenclature. It also affects the communicative center of the sentence at the same time as a nominee.

In the semantics of every sentence, besides the propositional meaning, it would have to be the communicative intent of the speaker and one of the possible modalities. In other words, in addition to the propositional framework for transition from propositional to real-life, two more frameworks – a modal and communicative framework. The next two frames are the essential elements of any statement. Thus, the content of each statement is complex, versatile, with at least three components: 1) proposition 2) modal 3) communicative component. The content of the conversation: The most important element in the structure is the propositional structure that reflects some situations or events in the objective.

References:

[1]. А р у т ю н о в а Н. Д. Предложение и его смысл. М., 1986, С. 6.

[2]. Е с п е р с е н О. Философия грамматики. М., 1958, С. 32—33.

[3]. Ш в е д о в а Н. Ю. О соотношении грамматической и семантической структуры предложения. — Славянское

языкознание. VII. Международный съезд славистов. Доклады русская делегации. М,, 1993, С. 461; see*: А р у т ю н о в а Н. Д. shown work, 14-бет.

[4]. М о с к а л ь с к а я О. И Проблемы системного описания синтаксиса. М., 1984, С. 9—19; 2-е издание. М., 1981, С. 9— 18; Б е л о ш а п к о в а В. А. Современный английский язык. Синтаксис. М., 1977, С. 123—124.

[5]. П а д у ч е в а Е. В. О семантике синтаксиса. М., 1984, С. 12.

[6]. Гак В. Г. О двух типах знаков в языке (высказывание и слова). Материалы конференции «Язык как знаковая система особого рода» М., 1987, С. 198.

[7]. Гак В. Г. Высказивание и ситуация. — Проблемы структурной лингвистики. М., 1993, С. 358; see*: А р у т ю н о в а А, Д. Уша асар, 6-бет.

[8]. *See:* Общее языкознание. Внутренняя структура языка. М., 1992, С. 309.