

ASYMMETRY OF FORM AND CONTENT IN DIFFERENT LEVELS OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE



Literature

Keywords: Uzbek language, linguistic asymmetry, form and content, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, cross-linguistic analysis, cognitive linguistics, language evolution.

**Aytbaev Dilshodkhuja
Temirbaevich**

Associate Professor at Tashkent State Pedagogical University, named after Nizami

Abstract

This article explores the phenomenon of asymmetry between form and content across different linguistic levels in the Uzbek language. It investigates a multifaceted relationship between the structural elements of language, including phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, and how these elements convey meanings. The study highlights the universal and language-specific aspects of this asymmetry, demonstrating how the same semantic content can be expressed through various forms and, conversely, how similar forms can carry different meanings depending on context. The research methodology combines theoretical analysis with empirical data, drawing on examples from the Uzbek language to illustrate the dynamic interplay between form and content. Furthermore, how asymmetry impacts linguistic functionality and efficiency, challenging traditional notions of a one-to-one correspondence between form and meaning, is explored. It posits that asymmetry enhances linguistic flexibility and adaptability, allowing for the expression of nuanced meanings and the development of new linguistic constructs.

INRODUCTION

As of today, for many linguists, it has become a tradition to approach the study of language units from the perspective of the sign, to consider language as a sign system, and to include linguistics in the system of semantic sciences. Despite this, there are still many problems related to the internal structure of the linguistic sign and the relationships between its internal and external structures awaiting their solutions.

First of all, it cannot be said that there are no scholars who doubt the existence of language as a sign system, approaching it with hesitation. In particular, L.O. Reznikov, even if in his previous research he assessed such an approach as an idealistic theory [1; 401], eventually came to recognize it [2; 100].

The theory, based on the sign nature of language in its research, approaches the ontological aspect of the sign from two sides. One group of scholars understands the sign as a substance expressing all existing objects and events, all states of their activity, and their sound aspect. As noted by V.M. Solntsev, the unity of expression and meaning constitutes a linguistic unit. For example, a word and a morpheme. If the discussion is about a linguistic unit, then, of course, its composition should include the concept of the meaning of the unit. Indeed, a linguistic unit in isolation is not yet a sign; it is organized from the sign and its meaning [3; 19].

The second school of thought views the sign as complete, arranged according to the relationships between the things it expresses, based on the dual character of the sign. In particular, F. de Saussure, in expressing his thoughts on the nature of the linguistic sign, interprets it as a

whole consisting of the signifier and the signified [4; 99]. By the signifier, he understands the acoustic image, and by the signified, the meaning. The researcher argues that the linguistic sign is arranged by the relationships between the concept and the sound image rather than as a unit representing the relationships between the notions of the object and its designation. Therefore, the sign is defined as a two-sided non-physical entity, which indicates its abstract nature.

RESULT

Thus, the linguistic sign is a whole, consisting of the unity of the signifier and the signified. As a unit of meaning, based on its possibilities, it is divided into senses, subdivided into the linguistic (simple) sign and the maximal (complex) sign.

Determining the expression plane's divisibility or indivisibility into other smaller pieces serves as the fundamental basis for splitting the linguistic sign into minimum and maximal types [5; 63]. That is, the indivisibility of the expression component of the smallest linguistic unit determines its integrity. For example, in the Uzbek language, the word *borsam* (*if I go*) is a whole, organized from elementary particles in specific relations: *bor-sa-m*. These elementary particles are further dispersed. However, the indivisibility of components further pertains only to the expression plane associated with a specific meaning. From the standpoint of meaning, these smallest particles can be further divided.

This demonstrates that the problem of divisibility into parts depends on the plane of expression, while the identification of minimal units in known groups is realized in accordance with the plane of meaning. Therefore, when analyzing minimal units within the semantic system, there is a need to take into account the relationships between the planes of expression and the meaning of the sign.

Between the planes of expression and meaning of a linguistic sign, there can be both proportional and disproportionate relationships. But in contrast to proportionality, F. de Saussure already noted in 1966 [4; 84] the ongoing shifts, driven by the principles of language evolution, between the signifier and signified planes of linguistic signs.

The relationships between the two planes of the linguistic sign have attracted the attention of linguists since the beginning of the second quarter of the last century. The Prague Linguistic School, which paid special attention to the functional side of language, turned into serious researchers of this problem. In contrast to the idea of the laws of asymmetry and the forward change of language, the idea of asymmetry and the principle of dualism were advanced. In 1929, S. Karcevski, a Czech linguist, brought up this notion. By focusing solely on the semantic aspect of the linguistic sign, he notes that the sign and the meaning it expresses do not fully complement each other; their boundaries at a certain point may not correspond to one another. A single sign can serve multiple purposes; conversely, a single meaning can have multiple planes of expression. Each sign can potentially be both a homonym and a synonym at the same time [6; 85].

According to his view, language, as a semiotic mechanism, operates between two poles: those of the general and the individual, the abstract and the concrete. On one hand, language serves as a means of communication for all members of society; on the other hand, it performs the function of self-expression for each individual member. As a result, a semi-functionality of language units is observed.

If linguistic signs were immutable and each performed only one function, language would be a collection of labels [6; 85]. Changes in signs outside of specific situations cannot fail to signify something. Thus, the nature of the linguistic sign requires it to be simultaneously unchanging and effective. A linguistic sign, based on specificity in a particular situation, can partially change. Due to the indivisibility of its other parts, it remains constantly recognizable.

V. Skalička, another functional linguistics representative, expanded on S. Karcevski's concept of asymmetric dualism in the language sign. According to his thought, in all languages, there are two sides to the same linguistic sign: the signifier and the signified. F. de Saussure had already warned about the complex nature of the relationships between these two aspects. The signifier exists because it expresses something. At the same time, the signified also exists because it is capable of having a concrete signifier. Through the relationship between these two sides, V. Skalička introduces the terms homonymy and homosemy [7; 120].

He notes that each sign is a homosemantic unit, as it constantly expresses one meaning, and at the same time, it is a homonymic unit, that is, expressed through one form. The boundaries of homonymic signs usually correspond to the boundaries of homosemantic boundaries. However, sometimes they may not correspond, as the scope of a homonymic unit can be larger than that of a homosemantic one, and vice versa, the scope of a homosemantic unit can be larger than that of a homonymic one. As a result, homonymic and homosemantic groups collide. The homonymic group acquires a formal basis, while the homosemantic group acquires a semantic basis. On the basis of this, V. Skalička believes that the linguistic sign's formal and semantic bases are not always symmetrical, and he agrees with S. Karcevski's suggestion that we might call this range of form-meaning non-correspondences the asymmetric dualism of your language.

He asserts that asymmetric dualism exists in all languages of the world, but with varying degrees of presence. He illustrates, for example, that in the Czech language, such a phenomenon is extremely pronounced, while in Turkish, it is weak [7; 121].

The phenomenon of asymmetric dualism is a characteristic of all semantic units. However, it does not apply to the dialogical level of these units, as they do not possess meaning at this level. This indicates that asymmetric dualism, ranging from the morphological to the supersyntactic level of language, is a universal phenomenon encountered in level-specific units.

N.D. Arutyunova researched the asymmetric phenomena of units at the morphemic level using the Russian language as a source [5; 58]. According to her, in the process of language evolution, on the one hand, while retaining the divisible structure of the expression plane of the

linguistic sign, semantic condensation occurs. On the other hand, in the expression plane, as a result of consolidation, an indivisible whole can appear. In studying the asymmetric relationships between form and meaning in the morphemic units of the Russian language, N.D. Arutyunova distinguished between free morphemes and zero morphemes, separating the differences between the two. The concept of the zero morphemes was introduced into linguistics by F.F. Fortunatov. He understands a zero morpheme as the expression of meaning without form, based on a certain paradigm of opposition between form and meaning. Regarding the zero morpheme that F.F. Fortunatov included, N.D. Arutyunova interprets it as a free morpheme. In her view, a sign that has lost its expressed meaning is considered a free element (morpheme) without an expressing sign and is considered a free morpheme. In both cases, there is an asymmetry between the form and meaning of the morpheme.

In conducting an analysis of asymmetric relationships between form and meaning in morphemic units, these relationships are subdivided into several types. In the first type, symmetry is revealed: one signifier corresponds to one signified. In the second type, the problem corresponds to two or more signifiers. This type of relationship leads to homosemy (heterophony). For instance, two types of affixes (si and i) in Uzbek terms like "uka-si" (his/her brother) and "kitob-i" (his/her book) convey the idea of third-person possession.

One signifier in the third type indicates two or more signifiers. For instance, one prefix (lar) in the Uzbek language determines the meanings of plurality and respect. Alternatively, the suffix -siz (without) forms the meanings in plural form and the negative absence of an individual, thing, or phenomenon. These relationships between the signifier and the signified can be considered by the following arithmetic equations: the first 1:1, the second 1:2 (and more), the third 2 (and more): 1, etc. Of these, the first is symmetrical, while the second and third are asymmetrical.

At the lexical level, asymmetric dualism between the signifier and the signified is manifested in polysemy, homonymy, and synonymy. The first and second correspond to the equations 2 (and more):1, while the third corresponds to 1:2 (and more).

Asymmetric dualism is characteristic of units of parts of speech at the morphological level. For example, in the Uzbek language, "*na...na...*" (Neither...nor) can be both a conjunction and a particle. Or the base "*hali*" (yet) in one context functions as a conjunction, and in another, as a particle. Therefore, semi-functionality at the morphological level can be considered a manifestation of asymmetric dualism.

In the study of relationships between form and meaning of linguistic units based on syntactic-level materials, generative linguistics, a branch of American structural linguistics, played a foundational role. In particular, the idea of Noam Chomsky's division between deep and surface structures and the primary role of the deep structure in the transformation of the surface structure served as a basis for research on syntactic dualism. Chomsky asserts that the abstractness and generality of the deep structure set it apart from the surface structure [8; 29]. His research on

dividing syntactic units into two structures contributed to the study of asymmetric relationships between the planes of expression and meaning.

Another American linguist, Wallace Chafe, has a specific position in the study of the asymmetry between form and meaning of syntactic units, as Prof. A. Nurmanov points out. The central idea of Chafe's work came from the connections between form and meaning. The semantic study of dualistic theory forced theories that advocated relationships of symmetry and accuracy and were based on isomorphism between units of different structures to modify [1; 401].

The issue, which has been the cause of various debates and discussions in world linguistics, has also captured the attention of Uzbek linguists. If N. Mahmudov in the 1980s focused his monographic research on the asymmetric dualism in simple sentences of the Uzbek language, then M. Mirtazhiyev [9; 10], 24 years later, studied these same relationships in the clauses of sentences [10; 200]. However, the positions of N. Mahmudov and M. Mirtazhiyev regarding the semantic structure are not identical. This is due to the fact that the linguistic concepts of semantic construction of syntactic units have not yet been defined, and this problem is addressed in various directions. After carefully examining each of these possibilities, N. Mahmudov is more likely to view the sentence's semantics as a whole, structured around the relationships between the sentence's objective and subjective meanings, comprehending the objective reality that the sentence expresses, and impacting an individual's consciousness under its objective meaning. This reality, in the nominative direction of syntactic semantics, bears the term proposition. It is considered in the semantics of the sentence as a certain event or situation that has found its expression [8; 31].

Mirtazhiyev, in turn, is inclined to consider the semantics of syntactic units not based on the nominative principle but on the logical principle. As a result, by determining the syntactic plane of sentence components, it becomes clearer how a particular syntactic unit (syntacteme) fulfills its syntactic function. Semantic planes are interpreted as syntactically produced logical units (subject, predicate, and object). Under the term semantic-syntactic asymmetry, the expression of logical units through several sentence members is understood. The author evaluates the primary functions of syntactic-level logical units (e.g., subject in function of subject, predicate in function of verb, and object in function of complement) as symmetrical relationships based on the theory of the primacy and secondary nature of the functions of logical units. The secondary functions, on the other hand, are the transitions of the subject from function of subject, predicate from function of predicate, and object from function of complement to others.

Semantic-syntactic asymmetry in simple Uzbek sentences develops from Makhmudov's idea of propositional structure and how this proposition is articulated through syntactic structures in asymmetric interactions. N.D. Arutyunova's equation can be used to display the relationships between propositional and syntactic structures as 1:1, 1:2, and 2:1.

In this process, the first has one proposition expressed through one sentence, the second through a complex sentence, and the third—two propositions are expressed through a simple sentence. The first equation indicates symmetrical relationships between both sides of the sentence, while the rest indicate asymmetrical relationships.

This means that the relationships between the planes of expression and meaning at the syntactic level apply to both simple and complex sentences. T.A. Kolosova studies the issue of semantic-syntactic asymmetrical links in complicated sentences in the Russian language. This is done based on the comparison of relationships between propositional and syntactic structures of the asymmetrical phenomenon. It has been established that asymmetrical relationships in complex sentences are a universal event for the evolution of every language [11].

CONCLUSION

In complex sentences of the Uzbek language, various types of semantic-syntactic asymmetry are observed. N. Mahmudov, who has been studying the problem of semantic-syntactic asymmetry in simple sentences of the Uzbek language since 1992, notes that to date, this asymmetry in complex sentences has not yet become the object of specialized monographic research [12; 232]. The issue of subordinate clauses within complex sentences has been partially studied by N. Mahmudov, but not in a comprehensive monographic manner. At the same time, in his mentioned work, N. Mahmudov proposed an interesting idea that the semantic-syntactic asymmetrical event in simple and complex sentences occurs on the basis of opposition to each other: based on the principles of economy and redundancy. According to his thought, just as there is a semantic-syntactic mismatch in simple sentences based on the principle of economy, so too is asymmetry observed in complex sentences based on the tendency towards redundancy. Therefore, in the realm of complex sentences, the study of semantic-syntactic asymmetry needs to include the examination of the tendency towards redundancy.

From the above, it can be concluded that asymmetrical relationships between the form and meaning of the linguistic sign at different levels of language are an operating universal phenomenon. In this regard, at various levels of the language system, including in the realm of complex sentences, studying this issue in a monographic plan is considered one of the current tasks of linguistics.

References

1. Резников, Л.О. Против агностицизма в языкознании -Изв АН.1948, Оля Т.УП, вып. 5. С. 401.
2. Резников, Л.О. Не опозитивистическая гносология и знаковая теория слова. Вопросы философии. 1962. №2, С. 100
3. Солнцев, В.М. Язык как системно-структурное образование М.1971, С.19.
4. Соссюр, Ф. Курс общей лингвистики. М., 1933, С. 99.
5. Арутюнова, Н.Д. О значимых единицах языка. –Сб. Исследования по общей теории грамматики. М., 1968, С.63
6. Карцевский, С. Об асимметричном дуализме лингвистического знака. В.А. Звегенцев. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях. М., 1967, С.85.
7. Скаличка, В. Ассиметричный дуализм языковых единиц. – Пражский лингвистический кружок, М. 1967, С.120.
8. Нурмонов, А. Шакл ва мазмун муносабати – лингвистик тадқиқотлар асоси. // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти – Тошкент, 2010. №4. Б. 29.
9. Махмудов Н. Ўзбек тилидаги содда гапларда семантик-синтактик асимметрия. Т.: Фан, 1984. Б. 10.
10. Миртожиев, М. Ўзбек тилида гап бўлақларининг шаклий ва мазмуний номувофиқлиги. Тошкент, 2008. Университет. б 200.
11. Колосова, Т.А. Русское сложное предложение асимметричной структуры. Воронеж, 1980.
12. Нурмонов, А., Махмудов, Н., Ахмедов, А., Солихўжаева, С. Ўзбек тилининг мазмуний синтаксиси. Тошкент: Фан, 1992. б 232.