



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.00933.2**

AS FOR THE UNITS THAT REPRESENT THE CONDITIONAL RELATIONSHIP

Rasulova Azizakhon Muydinovna*

*Teacher, doctor of philosophy in philological Sciences (PhD),
Fergana State University,
UZBEKISTAN

ABSTRACT

The article focuses on the works done in the field of world and Uzbek linguistics, opinions about the linguistic field, the attitude to the condition and its study, the units representing the meaning of the condition. In the sentence it is necessary to open the contents of the condition, which helps the predicate. This condition arises through a barrier connection. Hindrance will be determined by the question anyway.

KEYWORDS: *Systematic Research, Area and Its Types, Conditional Area, Units Representing Conditional Semas.*

INTRODUCTION

At present, the Uzbek linguistics has begun to pay serious attention to systematic research. A distinctive feature of these studies is that without an autonomous approach to linguistics, attention is paid to the opening of the essence, which lies hidden under any phenomenon. The researcher will focus on highlighting the relationship between more linguistic phenomena. F.DeSassur focused the attention of linguists on opening the relationship between linguistic units, indicating the existence of paradigmatic and syntagmatic types of relations[1].

The main part

The unification of linguistic units on the basis of a certain meaning, the unification of lexical units in a certain language into such meaningful nests, developed in Eastern linguistics. Later in the nineteenth century, the idea of merging linguistic units into meaningful groups or dividing the idol into certain meaningful groups arose in Europe. Accordingly, this theory was inextricably linked with European linguistics [2].

In Uzbek linguistics, field theory began to be studied extensively in the following years. In Particular, A.Sabirov, T.Mirzaqulav, M.Abduvaliev, Sh.Iskandarova, N.Nishanova, D.Vakkasova, H.Hojieva, F.Safarov the work of and other researchers is noteworthy [3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10]. In each of these studies, the generalization of semesters to one archisema, their grouping under different integral SEMAS and their specificity with differential semas were investigated consistently [3].

Despite the variety of materials presented as a field and the different interpretation of this concept by some linguists, in a field-specific approach it is possible to distinguish two directions: a paradigmatic and syntagmatic approach. This is the most common approach. According to G.S.Shchurin linguistics, the "field" component involved and popular expressions can be defined as: functional-semantic field, morpheme field, phoneme field, word-constructors field, lexical field, meaningful field, micro and macro field, relativity field, time Field, number macromedias, check field, negation field, existence field, declination field, personality field, lexical-grammatic field, transformation field, absolute (relational) field, activity field, Status field, etc. [11]. what?

The study of the paradigmatic relationship of linguistic units with each other made it possible to combine them into certain groups, nests on the basis of a certain sign. In particular, the unification of linguistic units on the basis of a certain meaning forms meaningful nests. The linguistic units belonging to this Hive are located in the human consciousness in a interconnected state. The unification of linguistic units into a certain paradigm on the basis of a certain associative meaning has created a field theory in linguistics.

In his research work, T.Mirzaqulov points out his idea of space and paradigm: "when approached from the point of view of space, he confines several surface phenomena of the language and puts an end to the difference in the level, while the paradigm remains within one level and the boundary in the Level" [4].

Sh.Iskandarova according to, both the semantic groups of words that are characteristic of one category of words and the groups of words in which different categories of words have a meaningful relationship with each other, both lexical-grammatic (functional-semantic) fields and paradigms of syntactic structures connected by transformational relations, and certain types of meaningful-syntactic syntagma are included in the scope of the

The systematic analysis of language phenomena is an inextricably linked phenomenon with the structure of the field. A.Hojiev gives the definition of "a set of words and phrases that unite on the basis of a certain archaism" to the meaningful field [13].

The methodological basis of systematism shows that the expression of different meanings of language means is not expressed as their completely undiscovered features, but the variety of meanings indicates that they are adjacent at some point on the basis of a certain systematic connection and relationship.

Means indicating the conditional relationship are units that are expressed in all languages of the world. These units are studied not only by linguistics, but also by psychology, logic and philosophy, as well as by disciplines that study language and speech from different goals and perspectives. It is not surprising that the combinations that represent the meaning of the condition are given the definition of "Assumption (hypothesis) close to reality". Because the

units that represent the conditional relationship are also recognized as specific "keys" that allow us to reveal some secrets about speech activity[15].

The peculiarity of the units that characterize the conditional semas is that they directly reflect the fact that a person can choose one of two possibilities that contradict each other, think, draw conclusions on the basis of "condition", which can be between different situations, based on incomplete information, and, if this condition is fulfilled, be able to understand "the transformation of the world".

There are a number of research works in linguistics on the expression of the conditional relationship in the Uzbek language. One of these is A.Azizova, M.Askarova, A.A. Salkalamanidze The work of and others is noteworthy. These scientists have studied paradigmatically the units in the position of joint sentences that follow the condition condition, condition, condition, condition, which must be expressed in the meaning of the condition. However, studies on the interdependence of the conditional and barrier semas and the approach to them in the quality of the field, the Central and boundary semas of the conditional field, the additional meanings of the units that represent the meaning of the conditional, have not yet come across in our linguistics in a monographically. Proceeding from this, we can say that the problem of the area of conditionality and inaccessibility is one of the topical issues in the Uzbek language.

In traditional linguistics, the meaning of the surreal condition in the Uzbek language is within the framework of the verb category. Also studied by Saidov[14]. The researcher in his article expresses the idea that the meaning of surreal, that is, unequivocal condition can be expressed not only through the conditional declination, but also through other means if *-ганда эди, -са эди, -ган бўлса эди, -ётган бўлса эди, -диган бўлса эди* had commented and cited examples of such units. At the same time, Real and surreal compare the condition to each other. Surreal considers the connection of the condition with the Times of Fe. There is no significance of the contemporary category to be a surreal condition, the researcher believes.

As you know, the functional-semantic field is a hierarchical structure of language units, United on the basis of common content and denoting a certain concept in the language. In the center of each functional-semantic field lies a certain semantic category, which combines different language tools and creates their interrelation. Proceeding from the above points, the area of the condition can be described as follows: the sum of the units expressed by various means of relations based on the content of the condition in the object reality is called the area of the condition.

The functional-semantic field reflects all the features of the language tools in terms of form and content in two ways, that is, in form and meaning, under one commonality. For the structure of the functional-semantic field, the relationship of Central and peripheral meaning is significant. From the center of the field are the language units that are more used in the expression of a certain semantic category.

Hence, the combination of language tools with different types of expression under the general condition content constitutes a prerequisite area. From the core of the square takes place the language tools representing the sema in the central plan. At the morphological level of the conditional declination and the conditional conjugation are significant, at the syntactic level, the

conditional declension and the conditional declension follow. And from the periphery of the field there are units that indicate the meaning of the condition as a boundary sema. These units, in turn, can take place from the central part of other semantic fields, and indicate the conditional semasas an additional meaning "in the shadow" of other semantic meanings, or in part.

One semantic meaning, which takes place from the center of the field, can also be reflected in the periphery of another field. Or vice versa, the meaning in one field periphery can be located at the core of the next field. For example, it also indicates a barrier, as well as representing a scheme of some language units that take place from the conditional area.

If he has not yet repented, he will eventually repent anyway. (T.M.)

Although a given sentence is necessarily formed as a follow-up clause joint sentences, you can see hindrance in meaning. In the sentence it is necessary to open the contents of the condition, which helps the predicate. This condition arises through a barrier connection. Hindrance will be determined by the question anyway. If we formulate the sentence with the help of the form –sada, then the attitude of Hindrance is more noticeable: although he has not yet repented, he will eventually repent anyway. In this joint sentence, it seems that hindrance, the meanings of the condition are connected with the moment: the fact that the third person has not yet repented, and repentance is associated with time. The same "time "in turn arises in relation to the "condition". That is, his act of repentance arises through the condition that he does not repent at a certain time interval.

It should be noted that the conditional scheme is also tied to the occasion of the moment in most cases. That is, the implementation of an action or condition with a certain "condition", of course, brings the time category together with itself.

If attention from something remained, the poem that stood as would also remain. (S.A.)

In a given joint sentence, along with the literal meaning of the condition, the causal relationship also appears. The parts of the joint gap are interconnected using a reciprocal conditional bias. When speaking follow the uppermost sentence to see the contents of the moment? it is enough to ask: when would the poem that was called bite be left? - At a time when attention is drawn from something. The conditional relationship in the sentence can be seen in the following case: in order for the poem to remain standing bite, the condition "to be careful of something" must arise. The meaning of the result coming in the task of another boundary seam appears in the case after the action in the first sentence (attention from something) (as a result of which the poem that stands as bite is left). It follows that in this example, the meaning of moment is the core, while the meaning of condition and result comes from the function of peripheral – boundary seam.

CONCLUSION

Proceeding from the above, we can say that the meaningful fields are interrelated in most cases and differ in that the meanings indicated with each other take place from the core or periphery of the field. The material obtained for the analysis can also be analyzed on the periphery of another area according to the concave meanings, if it is included in the core of a certain area according to the first indicative meaning. Fields such a link opens the way to new research.

REFERENCES:

1. Соссюр Ф. Курс общей лингвистики// Труды по языкознанию.- М.-1977.
2. Нурмонов А. Искандарова Ш.Тилшуносликназарияси.–Т.: Фан, 2008.
3. Rasulova A. THE GRAMMAR LEVEL ATTENDANCE //Конференции. – 2020.
4. Мирзақулов Т. Ўзбек тили морфем парадигматикаси ва синтагматикаси масалалари: Филол. фанл. докт...дисс. автореф. Тошкент, 1994
5. Абдувалиев М. Тўсиқсизлик майдони ва уни ташкил этувчи синтактик бирликлар // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти.-1988
6. Искандарова Ш. Ўзбек тили лексикасини мазмуний майдон сифатидаўрганиш (шахсмикромайдони).Филол. фанл. докт...дисс. автореф. Тошкент
7. Нишонова Н. Ўзбек тилида “хайвон” архисемали лексемалар майдонининг мазмуний таҳлили: Филол. фанл. номз...дисс. автореф. Тошкент, 2000
8. Ваққосова Д. Ўзбек тилидаги анемонимларнинг семантик таҳлили: Филол. фанл. номз... дисс. автореф, 2005
9. Ҳожиёва Ҳ. Ўзбек тилида хурмат майдони ва унинг лингвистик-нутқий хусусиятлари: Филол. фанл. номз...дисс. автореф. Самарқанд, 2001
10. Сафаров Ф. Ўзбек тилида сон-микдор микромайдони ва унинг лингвистик-нутқий хусусияти. Филол. фанл. номз. ...дисс. автореф.Самарқанд, 2004.
11. Щур Г. С. Теориии в лингвистике.-М.:Наука, 1974.
12. Искандарова Ш. Тилсистемасигамайдонасосидаёндашув. –Т.: Фан, 2007.
13. Ҳожиёв А. Тилшунослик терминларининг изоҳли луғати. –Т.: ” Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси” Давлат илмий нашриёти, 2002.
14. Саидов Ю. Формы глагола, выражающие нереальность всовременном узбекском языке//Совесткая тюркология. Баку. 1971. №1.
15. [newdissertation.com > page/cat/idc/303/s/2/st/...](http://newdissertation.com/page/cat/idc/303/s/2/st/...)