

FORMATION OF SIMPLE SENTENCE PARADIGMS WITH THE HELP OF SEMANTICS INTENSIFICATION/DEINTENSIFICATION IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Ziyaev Avazjon

Doctor of Philological, Sciences, Professor
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ANNOTATION

This article touches upon forming new words and expressions with the help of the philosophical law "transition from quantity to quality" which is the semantic way of forming new words and simple sentences what can be called gradual way of forming new words and simple sentences.

Keywords: quantity, quality, intensification, deintensification, extralinguistic and intralinguistic factors, paradigm, simple sentences, interrogative sentences, rhetorical interrogative sentences.

The phenomenon of increasing/decreasing the amount of a symbol is also considered as a paradigm for the system of units.

As noted by B. Mengliev, a system of linguistic units united on the basis of a common sign and requiring each other, but each opposing the other with its own sign, is called a paradigm (paradigm is the Greek word for paradeigma - example, example). In this case, it is assumed that the associative connection between them, that is, when one is mentioned, the other comes to mind, forming a "nest" set based on the mutual similarity of intensive/deintensive units [5; 14-17].

The system of phonemes forms a phonetic (phonetic-phonological) paradigm, the system of lexemes combined into a synonymous, antonymic, graduonymic series forms lexical paradigms, the morphological category (system of morphological forms) forms a morphological paradigm, and the system of syntactic patterns forms a syntactic paradigm. The syntactic paradigm is divided into sentence and phrase paradigm. The sentence paradigm, in turn, is divided into a simple and compound sentence paradigm [2; 12-16].

In this article, under the influence of extralinguistic and intralinguistic factors, the change in the amount of linguistic signs, as a result of which, the formation of new language units and forms, in particular, the phenomenon of the formation of simple sentence paradigms, is studied.

Simple sentences are divided into the following types according to their content or purpose of expression: declarative, interrogative, command, emotion (emotional). In each of these sentences, the phenomena of intensification/deintensification of the expression side and the content side are manifested in their own way.

In prepositional phrases, an event is reported, or an affirmation or denial of the existence of some characteristic of something is expressed. The average or more or less expressiveness of the expressive part of the sentence has its own means of expression.

First of all, we should note that the types of content of a sentence affect the types of expressions, requiring them to be pronounced in different degrees of strength or weakness [2; 34-37].

If a metaphor expresses a wish, it is said in a lower, more emotional way. For example, I wish I could go where you have been (from conversation).

The relatively weak utterance of this type of figurative speech is due to the fact that the content of the speech is completely focused on the speaker himself, expressing the feelings of the speaker related to him. The sentence in the content of the advice is not spoken strongly, because it also has a positive attitude towards the listener (modality): Brother, you value this craft (from the conversation).

Expressions with emotional, modal color, such as joy, surprise, suspicion, pity, sarcasm, are also spoken in a relatively low tone. The fact that the content is not only focused on the listener, but also on the speaker himself: I feel sorry for you, brother (from the dialogue).

If the anger type of emotion is expressed in the example sentence, this sentence is said with a strong negative emotion: Get out of my sight right now! (from the conversation). Such a sentence is also called a prepositional phrase [6; 31-34].

As can be seen from the above, the strength-weakness (intensification/de-intensification) in intonation is related to the types of content of figurative sentences and also serves to form them. Logical emphasis is one of the tools that creates a strong-weak tone in a sentence. This type of accent serves to separate different parts of the sentence, to make them stronger (higher). When a sentence is logically stressed, its typical moderate (neutral) tone has various intensification/deintensification options. For example, the standard (typical) tone of the phrase "I went to Tashkent yesterday" is raised to the word "Tashkent" and the word "went" is pronounced with a low tone. Logical emphasis forms other high-pitched tones based on this intonation contour (scheme) of the sentence. The first option is to show the importance of the word Tashkent for the context of speech, that it is a rheme (newness).

It is about where exactly the speaker went. In this regard, when the logical accent falls on the word Tashkent, this word is pronounced with a strong tone. The tone peak of the sentence in this communicative variant is this word (Tashkentga). Also, with the demand of different contexts, the logical emphasis falls on the word yesterday, I, and the strong pronunciation (intensification) of these words turns them into the tonal peaks of the sentence. I (not another person) went to Tashkent yesterday/I went to Tashkent yesterday (not another day).

These show that the strong pronunciation of one of the parts of a sentence serves to form communicative variants of this sentence [3; 54-56].

One of the grammatical tools that provide intensification/deintensification in the tone of sentence fragments is emphasis-intensification loads. In particular, the emphasis load -ku is pronounced with a strong tone, indicating that this clause has a logical emphasis, and on this basis it serves to express a presupposition (an additional, additional idea):

I went! (presupposition: Why do you say that); -ak, -yok emphatic load is added to the words in the sentence and is said strongly: You are coming to us today; When the polyfunctional predicate in - is used as an emphasis, the word receiving it is strongly pronounced: I did this! As I did this; -ki is added to the polyfunctional auxiliary word, separates it, and the word that receives it is pronounced louder than other words. The same preposition is added to the words in the sentence, giving them an emphatic emphasis, and this word is said strongly with emotion: The scarf is so beautiful that..., You are so good... [3; 87-89].

In such cases, not emphasis, but quantitative increase and lengthening of the emotional sign is observed; The preposition "gina" is added to the word in the sentence and serves to limit and emphasize the meaning of this word: You came only yesterday. This task can also be performed by its synonym: Only you came yesterday. If only, -gina auxiliaries are used in the proposition and postposition, the emphasis (intensification) becomes stronger: Only you came yesterday. [6; 65-68].

One of the means of intensification of interrogative sentences is interrogative pronouns. Interrogative pronouns used instead of nouns, adjectives, numbers, adverbs, and verbs take part in the formation of this type of sentence, and the uncertainty they determine is distinguished by strong intonation. It is worth noting that in the answers given to the interrogative sentences with interrogative pronouns, the defined concepts related to the interrogative pronoun get logical emphasis and gain intensification or expressiveness. For example: Who will go to work tomorrow - I will go - I - possessor, which is the determination of the interrogative pronoun in the answer sentence, has a logical accent.

One of the tools for creating interrogative sentences is intonation. Interrogative intonation serves to repeat the news with surprise, to show the related excitement: My brother has arrived - My brother arrived!; The guests are coming tomorrow. Guests? It can be seen that with the help of intonation, the previous indicative sentence is turning into an interrogative sentence. Inversion, which is an expression of logical emphasis, occurs in a unique way in interrogative sentences [2; 48-51]. As we can see, in interrogative sentences with predicate -mi, the predicated word can be inverted: Has your brother come? - Did you come, brother?

In this case, it should be recognized that in a sentence with the usual order - mi, the inversion in the part formed with the preposition "Akang keldimi" strengthens the emphasis even more. Phrases with -chi, -a, -ya are not inverted.

Interrogative sentences are divided into pure interrogative sentences and rhetorical interrogative sentences according to the presence or absence of interrogative content. It is shown that while pure interrogative sentences require an answer, rhetorical interrogative sentences do not have this characteristic. Some researchers also object that rhetorical interrogative sentences are not interrogative sentences.

In fact, if the matter is taken seriously, it turns out that rhetorical interrogatives are not interrogatives. Because the most important semantic feature of an interrogative sentence is the characteristic of turning something uncertain into something concrete, that is, it requires an answer. Rhetorical interrogative sentences do not have this important feature. Rhetorical interrogatives, as many linguists have pointed out, resemble interrogatives only in form. In the classification of types of sentences in terms of content, the form should be considered as a secondary sign.

Based on these considerations, we recognize that rhetorical interrogative sentences are not actually interrogative sentences, in which the interrogative sentence uses the form to give the content of the declarative sentence, that is, the form of the interrogative sentence is accepted and transferred to the framework of declarative sentences for certain purposes [2; 68-71].

As noted in the literature, rhetorical interrogative sentences are a form that expresses the emotional-expressive state of a sentence. In fact, it should be taken as an expressive form of an indicative sentence rather than an interrogative sentence, and on this basis, rhetorical

interrogative sentences should not be considered within the framework of interrogative sentences.

Rhetorical interrogative sentences have affirmative and negative types: Who does not love his country (affirmation: Everyone loves his country); To the trouble that came out of you, to the claim where you are going (negation: Like nowhere. In addition, if we pay attention to the sentence who does not love the child, the word who receives logical emphasis in this sentence. In the equivalent of this sentence (Everybody loves the child), the logically stressed clause is everyone (has). In such sentences, the emphasis is on the subject of the sentence.

In rhetorical interrogative sentences involving the pronoun who, the concept of "everyone" or "nobody" is strengthened. In this case, if the participle is in the negative form, "all" (the subject) is strengthened, and the general content expresses the affirmation. If the part of the sentence is in the affirmative form, the subject "nobody" is strengthened and the sentence is negative. One of the most characteristic grammatical signs of such sentences is that the negative form serves for the affirmative content, and the affirmative form serves for the negative content [1; 47-49].

So, it is clear from the above that interrogative sentences have their own intensity, emotional-expressiveness, that is, tools and methods that strengthen the expressive side. They form a certain system of intensification within interrogative sentences.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullaev A. Expression of expressiveness in the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Science, 1983. - B. 60 - 61.
2. Bozorov O. Graduality in Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Science, 1995. 132 p.
3. Kononov A. N. Grammar of modern Uzbek literary language. M.—L., 1960, p. 71.
4. Kongurov R. Figurative words in the Uzbek language. Tashkent, 1966, 103-104
5. Mengliev B.R. The current Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Tafakkur Boston, 2018. - 200 p.
6. Tursunov U.T., Mukhtorov J., Rakhmatullaev Sh.U. Modern Uzbek literary language. - Tashkent, 1965. - 245 p.