

SEMANTIC STRUCTURE IN SIMPLE SENTENCES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Usmonova Nilufar

Teacher of Samarkand State, Institute of Foreign languages

ARTICLE INFO.

Keywords: Semantics, simple sentences, comparative linguistics, syntax, meaning construction.

Abstract

This article explores the semantics of simple sentences in Uzbek and English, aiming to highlight the similarities and differences in meaning construction between the two languages. Through comparative analysis, it delves into how each language structures simple sentences and conveys meaning, considering aspects such as word order, context, and linguistic nuances.

<http://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/> © 2024 LWAB.

A syntactic theory can only be a valid theory when it fully implies two sides, both the formative and the substantive. Because the connection between the formative and substantive constructions of the sentence is complex and contradictory, in so many basic cases these constructions do not interact with each other exactly the same, equal, consistent, between which it is almost always observed that there is a violation of conformity (symmetry) ¹. Originally S. The concept of inappropriate dualism of the linguistic sign, put forward by karsevsky, is also fully manifested at the syntactic level. V.G. Gak considers a sentence to be a complete linguistic sign, as opposed to a word, and argues that the referent of the sentence is a situation.

Semantics, the study of meaning in language, plays a crucial role in understanding how different languages convey ideas and information. Simple sentences, which are the building blocks of more complex expressions, offer an ideal starting point for semantic analysis. This article compares the semantics of simple sentences in Uzbek and English, two languages with distinct linguistic backgrounds. By examining their syntactic structures and contextual usage, we can gain insights into the unique ways each language constructs and conveys meaning.

In both Uzbek and English, simple sentences consist of a subject and a predicate. However, the word order and the way meaning is constructed differ significantly. English typically follows a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) structure. For example, "The cat (subject) eats (verb) fish (object)." This fixed order helps in determining the roles of each word in the sentence.

In contrast, Uzbek, an agglutinative language, often follows a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) structure. For instance, "Mushuk (subject) baliqni (object) yeydi (verb)" translates to "The cat eats the fish." Here, the verb usually appears at the end of the sentence, which is a common trait in Turkic languages. Examples: Masalan, Alisher maktabga boradi, Alisher maktabga borsa edi, Alisher maktabga bormoqchi, Alisher, ehtimol maktabga boradi. Alisher goes to school; If only Alisher went to school; Alisher is going to school; Perhaps Alisher would go to school. All of his sentences expressed the same opinion, but each sentence expressed another - another structure, that is, reflected the different attitude

of the thinking subject to the same objective content. It seems that objective content forms the basis of any sentence content, the “semantic core”. The occurrence of semantic-syntactic inconsistency in a language consists in the manifestation in one form or another of two constant principles in a language – the principles of redundancy and saving language tools. According to the first principle, a certain proposition that must be expressed in one syntactic simple sentence can be expressed in a syntactic compound sentence, resulting in sentences that are structurally simple but syntactically compound.

The semantic roles in English are mostly determined by word order, whereas in Uzbek, they are indicated by suffixes attached to the nouns and verbs. For example, the suffix "-ni" in "baliqni" marks the direct object. This morphological feature allows for more flexibility in sentence structure without losing meaning.

In fact, the subject of a secondary predicate (nature fascinated//nature took the spell) with the subject of the basic predicate in the sentence (nature magic is elitist//fascinated by the magic of the nature) corresponds to each other according to their referents, they are the same. In adjectival Scrolls, where the subject clause is not syntactically directly expressed, the subject clause, although not syntactically directly expressed, is essentially the same as the subject, object, sign, or the like of the main predicate, according to its referent. In other words, the syntactically unrepresented branch of the subject of this secondary predicate will contain content in a sentence that is the primary predication representation. The referential homogeneity of certain fragments participating to one degree or another in the expression of these basic and secondary predicates ensures the expression of two or more propositions within the framework of one simple sentence and, therefore, creates the necessary conditions for the complication of the content construction of the sentence.

Additionally, context plays a vital role in both languages. In English, pronouns and articles help clarify the subject and object, whereas in Uzbek, context and verb conjugation provide similar clarifications. For instance, the verb form in Uzbek changes to match the subject in number and person, adding a layer of meaning through morphological markers.

As a conclusion we can say that while simple sentences in Uzbek and English share the fundamental components of a subject and predicate, they differ significantly in their syntactic structures and semantic construction. English relies heavily on word order to convey meaning, while Uzbek utilizes morphological markers and a flexible sentence structure. Understanding these differences enhances our comprehension of how meaning is constructed and communicated in these languages, contributing to the broader field of comparative linguistics.

References:

1. Ashurov Sh. S. Cross-section typology in English and Uzbek. Nom. diss, Samarkand, 2017.
2. Buranov J. Comparative grammar of English and Uzbek languages. Tashkent, 2013. 3.
3. Bushuy T., Safarov Sh. Language construction: methods and methodology of analysis. Tashkent, 2017.
4. Lyons, John. (1995). *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Comrie, Bernard. (1981). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. University of Chicago Press.