Huriniso Usmonova
NamSU
Professor

SYNTAGMATIC MEANING AND ITS WAYS OF EXPRESSION

Abstract: This article analyzes the syntactic relationship between language units and the linguistic features of the means to express such relations.
Key words: syntactic meaning, level relation, speech activity, functional meaning, referent meaning, syntactic form, morphological form.
Language: English

Introduction

Our definitions of the objective world are formed by the use of material, which is formed by the sequence of sounds. In this process, there is a discrepancy between the sequence of sounds, the location of the language units in a single line, and the level of meaning (hierarchical), "tree of subordination". That is why A.Martine said that the vocal nature of our language requires a linear representation of our nonlinear experiences [3.277]. An example of this is the relationship between headaches and speech patterns. In fact, there is no linearity in the case of human headaches. However, a linear structure is used to describe this condition in a particular language: To explain this to the physician, we use consecutive linguistic means like I have a head -ache. Speech activity requires segmentation. Segmentation requires large integrity to be subdivided from simple to complex based on small elements.

According to some authors, the existence of a separate syntactic meaning in the passage of speech requires a shift from a chain-like arrangement of word forms to a "tree-like" meaning.

First of all, the syntactic meaning combines the functional meaning of the words with the lexical meaning. For example, the syntactic meaning of the word *bugun(today)* is combined with its lexical meaning of the word *bu kun*(this day). There is a balance between the referent meaning of the word and the syntactic function of the word.

Often there may be a mismatch between the functional meaning of the word and the referent meaning. This is particularly the case in a case of functional transposition.

As noted above, there is a distinction between dividing the speech chain into phonetic segments and meaningful parts. There is often a mismatch between them. Taking into account such disproportions, linguistics also differ in terms. Functional meaning and syntactic function are overlapped.

Functional meaning also refers to meaningful integrity. It contains the lexical meaning of the word and its functional meanings in the chain of speech. Functional meaning can combine several referenced meanings. For example, when is the combination of *kecha kechqurun(last night)* in the whole sentence? The answer to the question is a single functional meaning. The verb, formed in the form of a cross-section, is a syntactic unit that complements the **temporal** valence of the predicate.

Likewise, when considering the relation of form and meaning in syntactic units, its formative aspect consists of the interaction of syntactic function or syntactic form and morphological forms, with a dialectic of generality and identity.

Any syntactic form represents the complete integrity of syntactic units. The syntactic form, in turn, consists of morphological forms. Therefore, the material agents that form the syntactic form are morphological forms.

Although the syntactic form and the morphological form are interconnected concepts, they are mutually exclusive.

First of all, these two concepts are quite different in level. If the morphological form is related to the morphological level of the language, the syntactic form is the syntactic unit. Therefore, the morphological form acts as a material basis for the syntactic form. The syntactic form now consists of a morphological form.

The syntactic form and the morphological form are often inconsistent. Just as a syntactic form can be composed of a single morphological form, it can also consist of several morphological forms.

When a syntactic form consists of a single morphological form, there is a quantitative coherence between the two forms.

If a certain syntactic form consists of several morphological forms, then there is a discrepancy between the syntactic form and the morphological form. For example, a combination of ***Shamoldan tez uchgan poezd* (the train flew faster than the wind)** is composed of two parts, from the point of view of the syntactic form - four components, and the morphological four. The previous three morphological forms are interconnected and come in one syntactic function for the word ***train***. Therefore, within these compounds, these three morphological forms act as one syntactic form. The grammatical agents that generate morphological forms are nonfunctional for the syntactic form. Their function applies only to the internal members of the syntactic form.

For example, ***the apricot erected in the yard of Murodali was the largest of all trees in the village.***

In the given sentence, the combination of ***apricots raised in the yard of Murodali*** consists of two parts - the detectors of the ***erected in the yard of Murodali*** and ***the apricot*** identification form three unity morphological units.

Accordingly, word forms that have such a grammatical value, that is, morphological forms, also serve as the inner members of the syntactic form.

It is important to note that the syntactic structure of the sentence is not only a syntactic approach, but also a lexical meaning of the verbs that are the grammatical and meaningful center of the sentence. Therefore, the more meaningful the syntactic connection between the members of the sentence, the more the lexical meaning of the verb in the sentence is. With this in mind, the meaningful study of the verb was also based on its syntactic relation. Also, in recent years, the syntactic analysis of the sentence has become more and more important.

Studying the structural content of syntactic connections by structural methods has somehow prevented the asymmetric relationship between the meaningful and formative structure of syntactic units. Structural methodological study of linguistic units has focused mainly on the formal aspect of syntactic units. The main goal was to model syntactic units based on the formal side.

Further emphasis on the existence of synonyms and synonyms in syntactic units has increased the need to illuminate the relationship between form and content of syntactic units as one is convinced that a syntactic situation can be expressed by several syntactic units.

As a result of an in-depth study of the relationship between form and content of syntactic units, E. Kurilovich has come to the conclusion that there are two types of syntactic functions: primary and secondary functions [1.182; 2.59]. He came to this view because of the asymmetric relationship between the form and the content of the syntactic units.

First of all, it is a syntactic designation that takes into account the specific grammatical forms of the lexeme in the sentence. However, asymmetry involves not only functional indicators, but also syntactic positions that are free from the specific form of syntactic meaning. In the first case, we are talking about the different meanings of particular words that take part in the speech process, and in the second case the poly functionality of syntactic positions. In particular, the position may include not only the subject of action, but also the names of other participants in the objective reality, speech state - object or other participants.

Apparently, according to E. Kurilovich's conception, the speech situation is more specific for the position of the subject and the subject with the aggressive type of participants. However, having a position is not limited to ***agens***. At the same time, agens do not always have to be in a position of subject. Therefore, the presence of the subject-agens in its existing position is its primary function, and the remaining position is its secondary function.

References:

1. Kurilovich, E. (1962). *Problem classification of cases* // Essays in linguistics. Moscow: Nauka.

2. Kurilovich, E. (1962). *Derivation Lectures and Derivation Syntactic*. Essays in linguistics. Moscow.

3. (1972). *General linguistics. Internal structure of the language*. Moscow.

4. Mahmudov, N.M. (1984). *Semantico-syntax asymmetry in the simple sentence of the uzbek language:* autoref. diss ... d-ra filol.nauk. - Toshkent.

5. Tojiev, O. (1995). *Meaning and Syntactic Structure of Native Predictive Speech in the uzbek language:* Philol. Candidate of Sci ... Dis. autoref. -Toshkent.

6. Susov, I. P. (1973). *Semantic structure of the sentence*. - Tula: Gos.ped. in-t.

7. Sayfullaeva, R. (1990). *Organizing and Organizing Elements in the present uzbek language*. Toshkent: Mehnat.

8. Kurilovich, E. (1962). *Problema klassifikacii padezhej* // Ocherki po lingvistike. - Moscow.: Nauka.

9. Kurilovich, E. (1962). *Derivacija leksicheskaja i derevacija sintakticheskaja* // Ocherki po lingvistike. - Moscow.

10. (1972). *Obshhee jazykoznanie. Vnutrennaja struktura jazyka*. Moscow.

11. Mahmudov, N.M. (1984). *Semantiko-sintaksicheskaja asimmetrija v prostom predlozhenii uzbekskogo jazyka*: Avtoref. diss... d-ra filol.nauk. -Toshkent.

12. Tozhiev, O. (1995). *Ŭzbek tilida ot predikatli gaplarning mazmunij va sintaktik tuzilishi:* Filol. fanlari nomzodi... dis. avtoref. -Toshkent.

13. Susov, I. P. (1973). *Semanticheskaja struktura predlozhenija*. – Tula: Gos.ped. in-t.

14. Sajfullaeva, R. (1990). *Ҳozirgi ŭzbek tilida ujushuvchi va ujushtiruvchi jelementlar*. - Toshkent.: Meҳnat.

15. Mahmudov, N. (1984). *Ŭzbek tilidagi sodda gaplarda semantik-sintaktik asimmetrija*. (p.148). Toshkent, Ŭҡituvchi,. - 148 b.

16. Mahmudov, N. (1986). Presuppozicija va gap. *Ŭzbek tili va adabijoti, №6*, pp.28-31.

17. Mahmudov, N. (1990). Ŭzbek tili sintaksisining dolzarb masalalari. *Ŭzbek tili va adabijoti, №2*, pp.23-27.

18. Mahmudov, N. (1991). Jergash gaplarning tabiati va tasnifi masalasi. *Ŭzbek tili va adabijoti, №3*, pp.14-20.

19. Mahmudov, N., & Nurmonov, A. (1995). *Ŭzbek tilining nazarij grammatikasi (sintaksis)*. (p.232). Toshkent: Ŭҡituvchi.

20. Abdullaeva, D. (2000). Sintaktik birliklarning ichki va tashҡi tuzilishi ŭrtasidagi munosabat ҳaҡida. *Ŭzbek tili va adabijoti, №3*, pp.59-60.

21. Abdupattoev, M. (1997). *Ŭzbek tilida supersintaktik butunliklar:* Filol.fanlari nomzodi...diss.avtoref. (p.24). Toshkent.

22. Vasileev, L.M. (1990). *Sovremennaja lingvisticheskaja semantika.* (p.176). Moscow.: Vysshaja shkola.

23. Novikov, L.A. (1982). *Semantika russkogo jazyka*. (p.272). Moscow: Vysshaja shkola.