

SYNTAX IS BETWEEN CONTENT AND FORM COMMUNICATION AND INTERNAL CONFLICT

Usmonova Huriniso Sharapovna

Namangan State University,
Department of Uzbek Linguistics
professor, doctor of philological sciences

ABSTRACT

Content is the leading aspect in terms of form and content. The form of formation depends on what is formed. It is not an external force, but content that shapes itself. There is an internal conflict between content and form. The emergence, development and elimination of contradictions between the form and content of things and processes is one of the most important and most general expressions of development through contradictions.

Keywords: *linguistic units, form, content, dialect, type of content, structure of content, form of processes, contradiction, morphological-syntactic, phenomenon, feature, linguistics, phonological level, signification, syntactic homonymy.*

SINTAKSISDA MAZMUN BILAN SHAKL O‘RTASIDAGI ALOQA VA ICHKI ZIDDIYAT

Usmonova Huriniso Sharapovna

Namangan davlat universiteti,
O‘zbek tilshunosligi kafedrasida professori,
filologiya fanlari doktori

ANNOTATSIYA

Shakl va mazmun munosabatida yetakchi tomon mazmundir. Tashkil topish shakli nimaning tashkil topishiga bog‘liqdir. Hech qanday tashqi kuch emas, balki mazmun o‘zini-o‘zi shakllantiradi. Mazmun bilan shakl o‘rtasida ichki ziddiyat bor. Narsalarning, jarayonlarning shakli bilan mazmuni o‘rtasidagi ziddiyatlarning paydo bo‘lishi, rivojlanishi va bartaraf qilinishi - taraqqiyotning qarama-qarshiliklar yo‘li bilan eng muhim va eng umumiy ifodalanishlaridan biridir.

Kalit so‘zlar: *lisoniy birliklar, shakl, mazmun, dialekt, mazmunning tipi, mazmunning strukturasi, jarayonlarning shakli, ziddiyat, morfologik-sintaktik, hodisa, xususiyat, tilshunoslik, fonologik sath, signifikat, sintaktik omonimiya.*

СИНТАКСИС МЕЖДУ СОДЕРЖАНИЕМ И ФОРМОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ И ВНУТРЕННИЙ КОНФЛИКТ

Усмонова Хуринисо Шараповна

Наманганский государственный университет,

Кафедра узбекского языкознания

профессор, доктор филологических наук

АННОТАЦИЯ

Контент является ведущим аспектом с точки зрения формы и содержания. Форма образования зависит от того, что формируется. Формируется не внешняя сила, а содержание. Существует внутренний конфликт между содержанием и формой. Возникновение, развитие и устранение противоречий между формой и содержанием вещей и процессов - одно из важнейших и наиболее общих проявлений развития через противоречия.

Ключевые слова: *языковые единицы, форма, содержание, диалект, тип содержания, структура содержания, форма процессов, противоречие, морфолого-синтаксический, феномен, признак, лингвистика, фонологический уровень, значение, синтаксическая омонимия.*

INTRODUCTION

One of the types of interrelationships and connections between things and events in the universe is the dialectic of form and content. Just as there is no formless content, so there is no form, form, and structure of form. Hence, form and content are two sides of a particular object that are dialectically related [5,32]. Content refers to the composition of all the elements of an object, the unity of its properties, internal processes, developmental contradictions and inclinations. For example, the essence of an organism is not a simple set of its organs, but a process of vital activity that takes place in a certain form.

Form refers to the method of external expression of content, the relatively stable specificity of the relationships of content elements and their interactions, the type and structure of content. Content and form are two opposing poles of the same object. These concepts are interdependent and cannot exist without each other.

Form and content are inseparable in a particular object.

The form consists of an indoor and outdoor unit. As a way of connecting content elements, form is an internal phenomenon. It forms the structure of the object, and the content remains an instantaneous moment.

Form is an external thing as a way of connecting a particular content with the content of other things. For example, the internal form of a work of art consists

primarily of the plot, the artistic images that make up the content of the work, and the way in which ideas are connected. The external form is the emotionally intelligible image of the work, its external formation.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

According to Hegel, when considering the contradictions between form and content, it should be borne in mind that content is not without form. Form, on the other hand, exists in the content itself and consists of something external to it [2,290]. The leading aspect in terms of form and content is content. The form of formation depends on what is formed. No external force, but content, shapes itself. There is an internal conflict between content and form. The emergence, development and elimination of contradictions between the form and content of things and processes is one of the most important and most general expressions of development through contradictions. Although form and content are dialectically related, they have a certain degree of relative independence. Form and content differ, first of all, by their internal structural units. Form and content structure may or may not be compatible. This dialectical connection is also reflected in the language. Because the relation of form and content is relevant for all level units of the language system except the phonological level.

Only when any content is expressed through a certain material form does it become a real linguistic unit. Therefore, it is important to study the relationship between form and content between linguistic units. The relationship between the form and meaning of linguistic units has attracted the attention of philosophers since ancient times. They have long debated the nature of the relationship between the representing and the expressed side of linguistic units, i.e., whether the relationship between them is free or natural.

Finally, a large group of philosophers affirmed that the relationship between representation and expression is free. The substantive approach to the relationship of form and content is also an integral part of this problem. Both the views of the famous Danish linguist L. Yelmslev on figures, the principles of integral analysis in the lexicon, and SN Ivanov's views on substantial morphology were based on a substantial approach to language structure. A certain feature of the grammatical form in relation, which is manifested in the syntactic function - substantial understanding as a carrier of meanings, reflects its ambiguous and contradictory morphological-syntactic nature. From the point of view of substance, it has an independent existence even before it enters into a certain relationship.

At the same time, he is real only in his personal relationships. From this point of view, such a contradictory unity of grammatical forms is a manifestation of the commonality and individuality, the essence and the phenomenon in dialectics.[5,32]

Just as it is important to study the relationship between the form and content of lexical and morphological units, it is just as important for modern Uzbek linguistics to elucidate the relationship between the form and content of syntactic units. The expression of a meaning by several forms has been sufficiently studied at the lexical and morphological level. But there is still no serious focus on the syntactic nature of the same issue.

At the syntactic level, the question of whether a particular information can be expressed in different syntactic forms or in the same syntactic form can represent several information, leads to the demonstration of the internal capabilities of the language, its specific features. This allows us to unravel the dialectic of commonality and uniqueness of each language. Therefore, the relationship of form and content of syntactic units has attracted the attention of a number of Uzbek linguists. In this area prof. The work of such scientists as N.Mahmudov, A.Berdaliev should be especially noted [4,107]. First of all, when thinking about the relationship between syntactic units between form and content, it is natural to first ask which aspect of it can be used as a basis. To solve this problem, two directions have emerged in linguistics so far: 1) the semantic direction; 2) onomasiological direction.

Proponents of semantics take form as a basis and try to explain what each form means.

Proponents of onomasiology, on the other hand, focus on meaning and focus on how a particular meaning is expressed. The two paths that exist in linguistics do not deny each other, but complement each other. While the onomasiological direction focuses on the study of how a particular meaning is expressed by means of expression, the same direction focuses on the typological study of languages in different systems, where common, different points of these languages are specific, is of great importance in illuminating where its peculiar aspects are.

Therefore, this method is of great importance in the typological study of languages in different systems. In the onomasiological direction, the main point is to consider the content, the semantic structure of syntactic units, and first of all, to solve the problem of how to define these units of semantic structure.

Scholars who have focused on solving this problem have taken the term proposition in philosophy as their starting point. The concept of proposition is a state of speech, a reflection of the objective reality that exists in the mind of every speaker.

Generalized images of elements of a certain speech situation that interact in an objective being and affect the human senses. Some linguists also call these elements of the being reflected in the human mind by the term **signification**.

It turns out that the elements of the certificate serve as a basis for comparison with the formal elements. A structure of a single signifier can be expressed by several units of formal structure. This creates syntactic synonymy. Conversely, multiple signifiable meanings can be represented by a single syntactic form structure. The result is syntactic homonymy. Thus, the dialectic of form and content of syntactic units, in addition to studying the problem of finding complete or incomplete formal expression of semantic units, to determine whether there is a proportional (symmetrical) and asymmetric (asymmetric) relationship between these two structures, syntactic synonymy, syntactic homonymy and covers issues of syntactic polysemy. Therefore, a careful study of syntactic synonymy, syntactic homonymy, and syntactic polysemy provides an opportunity to shed more light on the relationship between the form and content of syntactic units. It seems that in the process of speech there is often a mismatch between the units of content and the units of form. Because in the process of speech the speaker tries to express more meaning using less material means, the impression of the speaker from the objective world does not fully find its formal expression. Only the most important aspects of the idea are separated, and the most important aspect has its own form. The rest will be determined by the speakers' prior knowledge and language skills. For example, consider a situation where a pen is on a certain table. These include the color, shape, tip, pencil shape, color, aesthetics, and more.

The speaker selects the most important aspects of the situation for the flow of information and sets the appropriate forms for these selected parts. That is why the famous German scholar W. Humboldt says that in speech there is both understanding and misunderstanding between speakers. The relative independence of form and content can also be seen in the fact that the same content can take many forms (syntactic synonymy). One form can have several meanings (syntactic homonymy). Such a dialectic of form and content in units of syntactic level, with the exception of a few works, has not yet attracted the attention of linguists.

This shows how relevant this topic is for today's Uzbek linguistics. Commenting on the connection between the form and the content of the sentence, D. Lutfullayeva said, "As long as the content of the sentence requires a proper form, it is impossible to speak of a complete incompatibility between the two sides. There is not a word that does not completely agree with the form and content "[3,5].

In expressing the relationship between the form and content of linguistic units, we also take into account the dialectic of generality and specificity. Because any linguistic unit is a direct unit of observation. By comparing particular units and finding commonalities between them, the properties are grouped into specific commonalities. Thus, any commonalities are manifested through specifics in the direct observation phase.

At the level of parts of speech, the dialectic of generality-specificity is expressed through the relationship of morphological form and syntactic form, morphological meaning and syntactic meaning. Morphological form and meaning determine the syntactic form and the inner side of the meaning, what it consists of, its structure. The functional aspect refers to the position of the sentence. With this in mind, the work reveals the relationship between morphological form and syntactic form, morphological meaning and syntactic meaning.

REFERENCES:

1. Berdialiev A. Ergash Semantic-signifiable paradigmatics in compound sentence constructions. - T.: Fan, 1989. - 107 p.
2. Gegel. Encyclopedia of philosophical sciences. - M.: Mysl, 1974. - p. 290.
3. Lutfullaeva D.E. Denial and formal-semantic inconsistency in affirmative statements: Philol. candidate of sciences ... diss. avtoref. - T., 1997. - B. 5.
4. Mahmudov N.M. Semantic-syntactic asymmetry in simple Uzbek sentences. - T.: Teacher, 1984. - 146 p.;
5. Nurmonov A., Yuldashev B. Linguistics and natural sciences. - T.: Sharq. 2001. - B. 32
6. Nurmonov A., Yuldashev B. Linguistics and natural sciences. - T.: Sharq, 2001. - B. 33
7. Katsnelson S.D. Speech-thinking processes // V. 1984. № 4 p.6
8. Kurilovich E. Essays on linguistics. - M., 1962. -- p. 179.
9. Gak V.G. Problems of the lexical and grammatical organization of the sentence: Author's abstract. diss. ... Dr. Filol. sciences. - M., 1967. - p.54
10. M.Aminov, A, Madvaliyev, N, Mahkamov, N.Mahmudov. Clerical work - Tashkent: State Scientific Publishing House, 2017, p-78
11. H Usmonova, M Xodjayeva, O 'tkir hoshimov asarlarida fonetik pragmalingsvistikaning qo 'llanilishi va uning lingvistik tadqiqi: Educational Research in Universal Sciences 2 (2), 627-630, 2023

12. H Usmonova, N Ibragimova, Innovative technologies (portfolio) in the method of teaching the russian language and literature: Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology, 2 (4), 283-286, 2020
13. H Usmonova, M Xodjayeva, Lexemas of process expressions and their semantific analyses: Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology 2 (4), 286-290, 2020
14. H Usmonova, Advanced foreign experience and innovations in teaching the module of “sentence parts”: Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology 1 (2), 189-193, 2019