

THE STUDY OF THE INCONSISTENCY OF FORM AND CONTENT IN THE COMPOSITION OF MORPHOLOGICAL UNITS

Uralov Azamat Begnarovich

Head of the Department, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at Syrdarya
Regional Pedagogical Center of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Azamaturalov06@gmail.com

Abstract

In the article, if the representation of one form by another form is the basis for the expression of synonymic series, it is proved that one meaning has the same form as the other foreign meaning. The word “olma – яблоко – apple “has different appearances in different languages, but the meaning is the same in all three languages. If the volume of the expressed content is wide, the expressed form shows the compactness and convenience of the language, and the volume of the semiotic field is larger than the field of communication. If the number of forms expressing the content is large, the possibilities of language expression will be wide, learning and assimilation will be difficult, communication will be easier, and the vocabulary of the language will be large, and it is proved that it is considered a rich language.

Also in the article, the state of understanding the meaning is felt even in the omission of some letters, and when the content expected to be understood is understood, it becomes clear what meaning is served by the overall form. For this reason, it is explained that the fact that certain forms serve exactly one meaning requires that they be proportional to that content.

Keywords. Disparity, semantics, linguistic sign (sign, symbol), cognitive, communicative-functional, and hermeneutic approaches, syntagmatic equivalent, synonymous paraphrase, semantic field, denotative-significant, connotative-stylistic, form-symbolic connection.

Introduction

It is known that the use of the term disproportion and its expression in linguistic signs is divided into two types according to the definition given in the "Great Encyclopedic Dictionary" and its type. In this case, "the distance between the aspects of form and content in linguistic signs is removed to show the imbalance in the overall situation" [1. 47.] is considered pronounced. For this reason, the issue of the discrepancy between the form and content of linguistic signs is noted as one of the existing problems. Naturally, forms do not have the same meaning or meanings do not have the same form.

Literature Analysis and Methodology

In the history of linguistics famous linguist V.M. Solntsev emphasized that any direction in linguistics, even the most radical directions, could not work without reference to meaning and

"Language, therefore, is language, its units do not consist of a simple combination of sounds, its units have a specific meaning, contains different meanings, has the ability to express one or another thought. Semantics or meaning is the heart of language". [4. 4]," he writes. Therefore, each form of language serves to express a particular content or to express content. While expanding content is appropriate for every character, growing characters also discover new content.

Based on a comparison of the position of linguistic signs (signs, symbols) and various approaches to it Y.S. In the article "Revising the definition of the sign", dedicated to the memory of the famous linguist R. Jakobson, Kubryakova shows the need to approach traditions in the history of science with deep respect and reverence, and in the modern period of research the integration of cognitive, communicative-functional and hermeneutic approaches to the sign [3. 18-19]. After all, in R. Jakobson's doctrine, signs become one of the basic, fundamental concepts not only in linguistics, but also in such social and humanitarian sciences as logic, mathematics, rhetoric, and in various other spheres of life - sciences, passing into semiotics [6, 7]. Therefore, it is important not to forget that every sign, regardless of the field or science, has its place and position in science. Since the service of the sign in semiotics depends on concepts in the fields of science, each form must be expressed within its own science or field. Naturally, the relation of one sign to another as well as the semiotics of the sign as its exact form (formative counterpart) are different within the sciences.

The results were obtained. In this connection, Peirce Jacobson's idea, which strongly attacked F. de Saussure's idea of the optionality and conditionality of language signs, introduced the idea of connection (association) of signs by similarity and proximity in the syntagmatic series. As a result, both the external (material) side and the semantic (meaningful) side of language signs enter into a specific relationship in the language system. In particular, it becomes possible to interpret, describe and classify various factors of origin of secondary units (derivatives) from primary units from the semiotic point of view, and its three forms are applied: a sign, an alternative (equivalent) expression to it will have the form:

- 1) quoting another sign of the same sign - by synonymous interpretation;
- 2) quoting another sign of the same sign - through a paraphrase;
- 3) bringing the signs of another semiotic system - through translation.

The principle of "sign to sign" is used, and the central problem of semantics is defined as the semantic equality, the equivalence of two expressions, the semantic equality of the sign in them, the main, basic features such as linguistic certainty (identical) or linguistic indeterminacy (non-identical) [3.24]. Due to these features, it is possible to describe bilateral language units - morpheme, word, phrase, as well as various relations and connections within a sentence as the essence, content, and practical type of signs in the language system. This proves that if one form expressed by another form is the basis for the expression of a synonymous series, then it is a natural phenomenon when one meaning has the same form as

another foreign meaning. For this reason, the synonymy expressed in the 3rd case above is represented by the dictionaries of several languages: olma - яблоко - apple. In such a system, the forms look different in different languages, but the content is the same in all three languages.

Discussion

The meaning of signs determines their place and role in the language system. As in any language, it is natural that one form expresses at least one meaning in Uzbek. First, if the volume of the expressed content is wide, the expressed form shows the compactness and convenience of the language, and the volume of the semiotic field is larger than the field of communication. Secondly, if the number of forms expressing the content is large, the possibilities of language expression will be wide, learning and assimilation will be difficult, communication will be easier, and the vocabulary of the language will be large and it will be considered a rich language.

This essence takes the meaning (content) of the form in the process of speech from this process itself, i.e., the form manifests additional content in the process of speech (in other cases, the meaning of the form itself may be observed). Therefore, the semantic expression of the form changes in the course of the speech process, i.e., a normally expressed meaning can expand the scope of the field in the course of the speech process and begin to express an additional (new) meaning. Consequently, the range of semantic expression of a particular form is limited (bounded). Although this expression of disproportionality is studied as theoretical information for linguistics, it is accepted indifferently in speech structure. This is because the topic of communication is clearly focused in speech. One form used in several topics of communication has a different semantic field in meaning.

According to Y.S. Stepanov, the way to study the problem of semantic equality (equivalence) is to divide the plan of expression and the content plan of signs, and then divide the content plan into two directions, somehow denotative or extensional, conceptual or denotative, i.e. Extensional study is recommended [5]. It follows from the idea that a change in the composition of the form affects the area of the sky. But several forms representing a certain theme have their place in the theme space. This can be examined with the lexeme "laugh".

If we observe these different interpretations of the word laughter, the lexeme is neutral in meaning. As its synonyms, we use such units as smile, grin, laugh, and giggle. The Sema expression plan serves to visually expand the lips and make the appearance more beautiful. The content plan is different in each form. While we first observed the disproportionality of different forms serving to express the same content, the disproportionality of several forms serving the same content (in terms of shades of meaning) causes disproportionality. Dividing the word "laugh" into negative and positive connotations will shed light on this issue.

To laugh is neutral; to smile, giggle (there is a negative connotation), to laugh in a positive state of connotation; in a negative mood, to smirk, scoff, squeal (there is also a positive mood, but it is not neutral, it adjusts to the situation), to laugh (depending on the situation, also has a positive attitude), to laugh, (as a word combination). It has been shown that in terms of surface area, it belongs to two groups. Now the above synonymic line can be arranged in terms of increase and intensity of the area of the seme: smile > giggle > snicker > laugh... It is clear that the surface area slowly rises upward in the state, and the motion, which begins with the state, increases with the sound. In these forms, an imbalance between semas is slowly forming. The lexeme to smile (to smile by slightly spreading the lips without making a sound), formed in a disproportionate position to the smile unit, now forms an imbalance from the plan of the content area. The scheme of mutual evaluation differs from the dominant (laughing) lexeme by the richness of positive coloration. Because smiling is more pleasant than laughing. Rano's beauty is on her smile. Sirojiddin woke up disturbed by someone's loud laughing.

The symbolic aspect of form in science adapts to the moment of speech. We have seen this expressed in the above example. In the treatment of signs, form, and content are not always symmetrical. The introduction into the science of R.Jakobson's notion of "interpreters of signs" not only in relation to the orientation of signs towards subject existence but also through other similar and related signs in the language system has created a great opportunity for research, such as description, and interpretation. In this respect, contradictions are natural to any science. A language sign is no longer isolated but reveals and manifests itself within the whole communication and relations in the language system - text, and discourse. Interrelational, cognitive-informational, conceptual, pragmatic, and emotional-expressive aspects of the denotative, meaningful, and connotative meanings of language signs open new perspectives for researchers. The expression of each character in the language in the emotional or expressive state begins late but ends earlier at the level of understanding the plan of content expression. In this case, form comes ahead in the initiation and lags behind in understanding. That is, the understanding of form in relation to 'Sign is characterized by a fundamental imbalance (asymmetry). The temporal relationship of meaning and sound lies in its disproportionality.' [2.425]. Actually, in linguistics, every sign form serves to express a concept, and its understanding for humans depends on linguistic abilities and the ability to think. According to Y.N. Karaulov, form begins before content and ends after content. That is, after the beginning of the form, when we come to the state of giving the content, we think about the content, and before the end of the form, there is a representation of the content. More precisely, in order for us to understand the content, a certain form (an external material shell) must begin, but when form begins, understanding of content begins as well. Thus, it is implied that the content exists only in a certain form. Therefore, the external material shell always begins first and ends later. From the point of view of understanding, the beginning of the pronunciation of a sound (the outer material shell) coincides with the beginning of the sense, but the completion of the

pronunciation of the outer material shell lags behind: the sense is perceived by the speaker before the pronunciation of the outer material shell ends, and the sense goes beyond the pronunciation.

In a number of cases, the listener's position (stance) is as follows: understanding does not occur simultaneously with the pronunciation of the outer material envelope; for the listener, meaning is also understood in the process of pronouncing the outer material envelope: at this point, the beginning of meaning is delayed, and understanding occurs before the pronunciation of the outer material envelope. And here meaning (content) precedes the utterance of the outer material shell [2.425].

The existence that one must think and understand depends on the direction in which the materials are given. From a stylistic point of view, it is clear that each style has its own characteristics. That said the meaning understood from the form is different in all styles. For example, in the style of speaking, meaning trumps form in every situation, if there is no science such as logic, philosophy, rhetoric, scientific laws, and silly sentences, if the meaning is used in its place, meaning is quickly and easily understood. The relationship between form and meaning is different on the side of understanding in the scientific method. The object of understanding becomes complex in the terminology of the scientific method. Its substantive essence, the carrier of meaning, and the level of understanding are considered complex, so the form is ahead in this case, and the meaning lags behind. This process can also be observed in morphological forms. Writing the terms metathesis, metaphor, and metonymy is an example of the level of understanding of meaning. Because the first four letters of these words are the same. Therefore, it becomes clear what form of meaning follows the fifth letter of these morphological units. "Sign is characterized by a fundamental imbalance (asymmetry). The temporal relationship of meaning and sound lies in its disproportionality." [2.425]. Actually, in linguistics, every sign form serves to express a concept, and its understanding for humans depends on linguistic abilities and the ability to think. According to Y.N. Karaulov, form begins before content and ends after content. That is, after the beginning of the form, when we come to the state of giving the content, we think about the content, and before the end of the form, there is a representation of the content. More precisely, in order for us to understand the content, a certain form (an external material shell) must begin, but when form begins, understanding of content begins as well. Thus, it is implied that the content exists only in a certain form. Therefore, the external material shell always begins first and ends later.

We also notice a state of understanding meaning in the omission of some letters. Because when the content expected to be understood is clear, it becomes clear what meaning the general form serves. For this reason, the fact that certain forms serve exactly one meaning requires that they be proportional to that content.

The fact that meaning is understood in form, and that it is taken in relation to that form, is the basis for making the right decision. When we add the -lar form to the pronouns we, you, and

them, which we often have "consumed," in some cases it means respect for the plural, which creates an imbalance in the pronouns. You in the form you mean respect, and -lar means plural. You may sit (as the respect for senior person), all of you may sit (to the group of people). You can see from the example that the pronoun you is used to meaning respect, in which the plural form of the form you, loses its position in a certain sense. That is, it is used as an aggregate. Since the form you have changed to the meaning of respect, the plural form must be added to it again, and the form you will give it the task of meaning plural as a whole: you stand up, you stand up, also! (to a sole person) All of you may sit down. The form you, recognized as a plural form, loses part of its function and needs the form -lar. This situation causes an imbalance in the semantic expression of morphological units.

Summary

The form is +, which is formed by this situation, also creates an imbalance. In this case, we always (except for the scientific method) specify the plural. It can express respect (partial plural) only in the scientific method: in our work, we focus on the logic. We can see from the example that both respectful and plural expressions are noticeable, albeit partially. But in content, it represents a partial unity. The plural form can now be added to this form: "We shall not stay here." In this case, the -lar form serves to express respect. Such thoughts and textual composition always appear in singular, plural, or respect, whichever form they take, depending on the style. This aspect is disproportionate in form and content.

List of References

1. The Great Encyclopedic Dictionary. Linguistics. - M.; 2000.
2. Karaulov Y.N. Asymmetry of writing signs and tenses - In. kn.: "Modern problems of literary criticism and language" to the 70th anniversary of Acad. M. B. Khrapchenko. - M.; 1974.
3. Kubryakova E. S. Returning to the Definition of Sign (in memory of R. Jakobson) // Problems of Language, 1993, No. 4.
4. Solntsev V. M. On the question of semantic or linguistic meaning. -Preface to the collection "Problems of Semantics". - M.; 1974.
5. Stepanov Y.S. Names. Predicate. Prepositions. Semiological grammar. - M.; 1987.
6. Jakobson R. Sound and meaning; Jakobson R. Selected works. - M. 1985.
7. Morris C.W. The basic theory of signs. Semiotics. - M. 1963.