

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 06 Volume: 98

Published: 15.06.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



**Dilarom Akhmatkhanovna Babaxanova**

Namangan State University

Department of Uzbek language and literature

Associate Professor, Candidate of Philological Science

## PROPOSITIVE NOMINATION AND DENOTATION STRUCTURE IN UZBEK

**Abstract:** *The proposition differs from the sentence, first, in terms of its content. Because if a sentence is recognized as a whole consisting of a relationship of form and content, the propositive structure is considered to belong only to one side of its semantic structure. At the same time, proposition differs from speech in that it expresses the relation of a certain event to objects that are logically equal to each other.*

**Key words:** *Proposition, language codes, speech process, human, mind, nomination, denotation, speech activity, syntactic device, relational predicate, valence, syntactic members, traditional linguistics, semantic syntax, language and thinking.*

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Babaxanova, D. A. (2021). Propositive nomination and denotation structure in Uzbek. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (98), 380-383.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-98-44> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203.

### Introduction

Any speech process is the process of expressing a person's thoughts about the objective world using language codes (signs). Therefore, speech is connected with the objective world through the mind. A certain part of the objective world is reflected in the human mind, and the generalized images of the members of this reflected being are expressed through language codes. It seems that language and thought are inextricably linked. In the human brain, consciousness and language are two relatively independent aspects. Each of them has its own memory in which knowledge is stored and the means to activate it.

These tools act by extracting from the memory of these two types of knowledge what is needed to describe a particular event [1,6].

Thus, these two aspects are so closely intertwined that the activity of the mind always monitors the activity of language and, according to its composition, forms a single and complex process of verbal thinking.

Consciousness is the body of knowledge about the world around us. One acquires such knowledge not

only by observing the world directly, but also by obtaining information from others.

Therefore, human cognitive activity cannot take place without the help of the language system. The basic knowledge stored in the "memory" of language is the knowledge of the word and its meanings. The means of activating this knowledge are grammatical means. Selecting the right words in the speech process and bringing them directly into the speech is based on the speaker's prior knowledge of the word. Any speech process requires two stages: the first stage (formation of thought), the second stage (the emergence of thought through material means for the purpose of communication). In the first stage of the process of verbal thinking, the activated elements of the mind are divided into separate frames, and each of them reflects a separate event or phenomenon.

The means of dividing the flow of thought into individual frames are relational predicates and their specific meanings.

Proposition is formed from the combination of relational predicates and their meanings [2,6].

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

The concept of proposition is widely used in modern linguistics to refer to an objective reality expressed by a particular syntactic device.

Although any sentence represents a particular proposition, it is not necessary that any proposition be expressed through a sentence. From this it follows that proposition refers to the content of a sentence, and that the concepts of proposition and speech are not the same.

The proposition differs from the sentence, first of all, in terms of its content. Because if a sentence is recognized as a whole consisting of a relationship of form and content, the proposition structure is considered to belong only to one side of its semantic structure. At the same time, proposition differs from speech in that it expresses the relation of a certain event to objects that are logically equal to each other. For example: 1) *Aziz ukasiga qarzagapul berdi*; Aziz lent money to his brother; 2) *Ukasi Azizdan qarzagapul oldi*; His brother borrowed money from him (Aziz); 3) *Pul ukasi tomonidan Azizdan qarzga olindi*. The money was borrowed from Aziz by his brother.

All of the above represent a common event, a proposition, involving the same participants. The participants are Aziz and his brother, as well as money transactions between them. The reason why this story is expressed in different sentences is that in one place Aziz is taken as a base, in the second place his brother is taken, and in the third place money is taken. For example, the phrase *Anvar Ra'noga gul uzatdi* Anvar gave flowers to Rano (A. Qadiri) forms a syntactic paradigm by expressing a proposition with expressions such as *Ra'no Anvardan gul oldi*, *Anvar Ra'no uchun guloldi* Rano received flowers from Anvar, Anvar received flowers for Rano. The means by which members of the paradigm are united is proposition. All three sentences have the same proposition structure: S-subject agents + subject patients + (predicate) P. From the above examples, it can be seen that the propositional structure differs from the formal structure. The relational predicate plays an important role in the expression of the proposition. Some linguists liken the relational predicate to a drilled board. Just as the holes drilled in the board are covered with wooden nails, the relational predicates also have certain spaces, empty cells. Filling in such gaps in relational predicates creates a proposition.

For example, the relational predicate of lending, which is the basis for the formation of the above sentences, has three spaces - an empty cell: a) the lender; b) the borrower and d) the value of the loan or the loan instrument (what the debt is).

When these empty cells are filled with specific lexical units, the three-digit predicate becomes a proposition. Thus, although relational predicates with a certain number of spaces are important for expressing a proposition, the predicate itself is not sufficient for the proposition. For a predicate to

become a propositional expression, it must fill in its blanks with the appropriate lexical units. This means that the relational predicate reveals its valences, and as the composition expands, they all come together to express a certain proposition. The role of syntactic members in a sentence is not limited to which member is related to which member.

For example, *U kitob o'qidi* He read a book and the Book was read by Him *Kitob u tomonidan o'qildi* consists of the same words. These words are used interchangeably in both sentences to form the same "tree of subordination." However, the above statements differ in that the same words have different syntactic positions. In the first sentence, it is used in the possessive position, the object in which the action takes place is in the filler position, in the second sentence, the subject (s) who performs the action is in the filler position, and the object that receives the action is in the possessive position.

Thus, not only what words the members involved in the syntactic device are expressed from, but also what syntactic position (situation) these members come from is important for the semantic structure of the sentence. This is because two or more sentences may have the same words, but the fact that these words occur in different situations makes them different. Thus, in such cases, the main differential sign of a sentence is not the material aspect of the members involved in the sentence, but the sign of their position. It seems that the substantial (material) aspect of the members that make up a sentence is as important to the sentence as the position of those members. This shows that the meaning of a sentence corresponds to the objective being it represents, the parts of that being is not enough to name (fragments) correctly. You also need to be clear about the relationship between them.

It should be noted that the choice of certain words by the speaker to express this or that information is possible only after the selection of the syntactic structure necessary for the correct expression of a certain objective reality, a certain syntactic situation increases. That is why E. Kurilovich emphasizes that syntactic meaning is primary to lexical meaning [3,179]. In the process of speaking, a syntactic device is selected, and a word is selected to complete the device. Both of these processes are inextricably linked to the nomination process. That is why VG Gak said: "Word and syntactic device perform nominative and organizational functions at different levels in the process of sentence construction." [4,54]. This suggests that not only words but also patterns of speech can be studied in a nominative aspect. According to the approach to the structure of speech from the point of view of phrases, speech is considered as a combination of nominative units - words and phrases.

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

From the point of view of semantic syntax, the participants of the speech are studied as a set reality. Participants are referred to as “actants”. Thus, the functions of the syntactic link between the semantic participants of the sentence - the actants - are not the same. Therefore, the study of the relationship between content participants and the syntactic situations they occupy has also become more and more popular among syntax experts in recent years. As a result, in semantic syntax, special attention was paid to the study of the relationship between form and content of speech. Syntax research in traditional linguistics has focused on the formal side of syntactic units, the interrelationship of formal units, the function of a syntactic unit in a dependent relationship, and how it is expressed. When considering the content of syntactic units, attention was paid to the relation of these syntactic units to the logical structure of thinking. As a result, the researcher, in addition to determining the main expressed content of the sentence, also tried to determine the general syntactic state (model) of this syntactic unit. As a result of the development of semantic syntax, the direction of the relationship between the syntactic structure of a sentence and its semantic structure, the definition of the essence of the semantic structure has changed. Accordingly, a sentence is a complete linguistic sign, and the main focus is on illuminating the relationship between the situation (referent) expressed by that sign. It is on this basis that the relationship between the structural model of the syntactic unit and its content is revealed. The situation expressed by any syntactic unit has the essence of universality. Because the reflection of objective reality in the human mind, finding its image, acquires the same identity, regardless of language or nationality. As a result of increasing attention to this universality of the situation expressed through syntactic units, he developed comparative and typological studies that study the expression of a particular syntactic situation with different syntactic structure in languages of different systems.

Thus, on the one hand, the semiotic interpretation of the sentence, i.e. its interpretation as a sign, on the other hand, the strengthening of semantic syntactic analysis, which focuses on the nominative side of the sentence, and finally, in addition to A. Gardiner's views on F. de Saussure, development led to a reconsideration of the direction of syntactic research.

As a result, the categories of formal logic and psychology used in linguistics have been replaced by the categories of semiotics and logical semantics.

The semantic triad [form (representing) - expressed (meaning) - object, situation] has become the main method of syntactic analysis. The term proposition has become more commonly used to describe the nominative aspect of a sentence. The term came into linguistics under the influence of logic and philosophy. The term proposition, used in logic, philosophy, and their influence in linguistics, refers to the out-of-time relationship between verbs and nouns that are devoid of the modal parts of speech.

Modal meanings include negation, tense, and inclination. Thus, the relationship between the predicate and its arguments, which are devoid of affirmation, tense, and inclination, is the basis of proposition. This shows that even if there is a certain proposition at the base of any sentence, only the sign of the expression of the proposition is not enough for the syntactic unit to be formed as a sentence.

You just have to be more discriminating with the help you render toward other people. It is this mode that adds affirmation, tense, and inclination to the proposition, and the addition of a system of grammatical elements representing the mode to the system of lexical elements representing the proposition turns any syntactic device representing the proposition into a sentence. Thus, the semantic structure of any sentence can be expressed as follows: S MQP. Here is the symbol of the S-sentence, the symbol of the M-modality, the symbol of the P-proposition. Apparently, a particular proposition is expressed in terms of linguistic means of expressing certain modus meanings. For example: **Cho‘ponota tog‘ining etaklarida, naryog‘i Zarafshon sohilida yuzlab o‘tovlar va chodirlar paydo bo‘lgan.** *Hundreds of meadows and tents have grown at the foot of Mount Chophonota, on the banks of the Zarafshan River.* If the symbol of the whole sentence above is represented by S, then the meaning of the participle in the resulting participle is in the form of person-number (personality), tense (temperament), indivisibility (modality), affirmation-negation (negativity). Accordingly, the differential difference between the syntactic units representing a particular proposition and the non-speech is the presence or absence of linguistic units representing the mode.

## References:

1. Katsnelson, S.D. (1984). *Speech-thinking processes*. V. № 4, p.6.
2. Kurilovich, E. (1962). *Essays on linguistics*. (p.179). Moscow.

**Impact Factor:**

**ISRA (India) = 6.317**  
**ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582**  
**GIF (Australia) = 0.564**  
**JIF = 1.500**

**SIS (USA) = 0.912**  
**ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126**  
**ESJI (KZ) = 9.035**  
**SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184**

**ICV (Poland) = 6.630**  
**PIF (India) = 1.940**  
**IBI (India) = 4.260**  
**OAJI (USA) = 0.350**

---

3. Gak, V.G. (1967). *Problems of the lexical and grammatical organization of the sentence: Author's abstract. diss. Dr. Filol. sciences.* (p.54). Moscow.
4. Aminov, M., Madvaliyev, A., Mahkamov, N., & Mahmudov, N. (2017). *Clerical work.* (p.78). Tashkent: State Scientific Publishing House.
5. Mamatov, A.E. (2014). *100 most important functions of language.* (p.5). Tashkent: Bayoz.
6. Shomaksudov, A., Rasulov, I., Kungurov, R., & Rustamov, H. (1980). *Stylistics of the Uzbek language.* (p.155). Tashkent: Teacher.
7. Shomaksudov, A., Rasulov, I., Kungurov, R., & Rustamov, H. (1980). *Stylistics of the Uzbek language.* (p.11). Tashkent: Teacher.
8. Kholmonova, Z.T. (2010). *Theory of Linguistics.* (p.15). Tashkent State Pedagogical University.
9. Berdialiev, A. (1989). *Ergash Semantic-signifiable paradigmatics in compound sentence constructions.* (p.107). Tashkent: Fan.
10. (1974). *Gegel. Encyclopedia of philosophical sciences.* (p.290). Moscow: Mysl.