

# Semantic and Syntactic Characteristics of Compound Words in the French and Uzbek Languages

Karimova Nilufar Habibullaevna

Department of Theory and practice of translation, Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi

## ABSTRACT

The problem of the relationship between form and content is, without a doubt, the main issue of any science, both natural and humanitarian, for this is the immediate basis and essence of any science. The relationship between form and content is very complex, often contradictory and infinitely unique in its manifestations.

**KEYWORDS:** semantics of words, field, French linguistics, Uzbek linguistics.

## Introduction

In a language where the dialectical unity of form and content is often contradictory, there is no direct coincidence of form and content. Naturally, this contradiction between the unity of form and content manifests itself in its own way at each level of language. The manifestation of the unity of form and content at the syntactic level of language has its own, complex specificity, as in any language, and semantic-syntactically asymmetric sentences significantly predominate in the Uzbek language.

The semantics of a word, its semantic structure, semantic relations, the development of polysemy and its types have repeatedly attracted the attention of researchers and, as a rule, we are talking about acquiring a new meaning through metaphor, metonymy and other meanings. Synecdoche, the existence of such words with opposite meanings in the semantic structure, is not analyzed if indicated, although this semantic phenomenon was noted in ancient times. Given the above, perhaps it is time to “done” the existing linguistic gaps, especially since modern French provides many examples of an interesting linguistic phenomenon.

## Main Part

The article is based on the point of view of domestic linguists who are developing the theory of the functional semantic field (FSF), which includes a group of combined means of expressing grammatical (morphological and syntactic), lexical, and temporal meaning. The temporal domain is based on the concept of time, that is, the localization of action in relation to the moment of speech. The temporal FSS in French is monocentric. The core of the field is the grammatical category of time, based on the opposition *passé simple* (*imparfait*) / *présent* / *future simple* (*futur dans le passé*). The area is surrounded by: lexical units, temporary conjunctions and prepositions, syntactic constructions, subordinate clauses, as well as verbal periphrases.

It is known that the term field was first introduced into semasiology (G. Ibsen, J. Trier, L. Weisgerber, W. Porzig). [1] The reasons prompting linguists to move to the category of semantic field must be related to the main direction of linguistics of the twentieth century. The revision of the language system required the use of different approaches. The category of the semantic field, which includes all possible types of relations between linguistic units of a language and establishes the hierarchical relations of the latter, is a systemic formation. As many researchers note, the works of W. von Humboldt had a direct influence on the emergence and development of field theory in linguistics, his doctrine of the internal form of language, the prism of the systematic perception of the world by native speakers.

The concept of field is interpreted differently by different authors depending on the problems under consideration. Thus, if A. V. Bondarko studies the verb in the Russian language, E. V. Gulyga and E. I. Schendels study the grammatical structure of the German language, then the study of grammar is possible without analyzing the use of grammatical forms in speech, that is, the interaction of grammatical forms is reduced to the conclusion that this is not so. Depending on the environment, the meaning and functions of a particular form change, the meaning of a certain word in a certain grammatical form changes significantly [2].

E.V. Gulyga and E.I. Shendels, when constructing a grammatical-lexical field characterized by a number of mandatory features, take into account the following fact. Various means of the grammatical and lexical levels, intended to express and denote general meanings, are connected not by random relationships, but by relationships that make it possible to establish certain patterns. A set of interacting tools forms a system, interpreted as a field. The field is heterogeneous and usually has a complex structure. The concept of field was not considered in French linguistics, so consideration of this problem can be considered very relevant. The functional-semantic field of temporality (FSFT) was singled out as the object of study, since time is the main characteristic of any process.

Therefore, temporality can be understood as a functional semantic field based on the grammatical category of time, as well as lexical-grammatical and grammatical-contextual means used to express contextual variants of the French language.[3]

In French, the tense domain is monocentric. The core of the functional-semantic field of temporality is represented by the grammatical category of time. The main category of tense is characterized by a large number of paradigms of verb forms. This multiplicity of the French tense system clearly shows that the category of tense is the dominant category of the French verb. The verb forms of each tense lead to a single starting point - a grammatical sign, which in its meaning and formal expression is represented by the moment of speech or another moment in which the action is located.

In the linguistic literature one can find various signs of temporal relations. Some linguists recognize the existence of a single category of time, others distinguish between the category of time and the category of temporal relation.

For example, A. Klum distinguishes the present, past and future on the basis of two opposites: tenses are located in relation to the moment of speech or another point associated with the past (allocentric position). When localizing an action relative to a reference point located in the future, the linguist identifies two additional points: the present future and the past future, relative to which the action is located only in priority order. The first position includes the following forms: *passé composé*, present, future simple, that is, these are temporary forms focused on the moment of speech. In the allocentric case: *plus-que-parfait* (*passé antérieur*), *futur dans le passé*. These forms are located in relation to the moment of speech and the expressed imperfect or simple pass. [4]

According to the chronogenetic concept of G. Guillaume, for example, movement develops in time, presented by the author using the axis - chronogenesis. Approximate forms are at the end of chronogenesis and indicate actual action. In the indicative mood, the author distinguishes three levels: present, past and future. The present form reflects real time, which includes both a particle of the coming, passing time, represented by a chronotope, which has the meaning of depression, and a particle of the time of non-arrival, coming time, that is, a chronotope, which has the meaning of an event. From the point of view of the past and future, the meanings of events and decadence are expressed differently. Future and *passé simple* are casual forms, while *imparfait* and *conditionnel* are decadent. J. Guillaume identifies 4 semantic fields that determine the choice of verb mood. These are the realms of possibility, conjecture, certainty, and reality. The first field requires the use of the subjunctive mood, the last three require the indicative mood.

L.P. Pitskova does not classify the future simple and forms ending in *-rait* as the indicative mood; she divides these tense forms into separate declensions - *inpositive*. According to him, the forms in *raita* are nothing more than conditioning. Therefore, the indicative mood is expressed by a zero change with the opposite form in *-ait*, *-a*, *-it*, *-ut*/forms. This representation is based on grammatical formants: the absence of *r* and the presence or absence of inflection. [5]

The grammatical category of tense is unique to the indicative system and is based on the opposition *passé simple (imparfait) / présent / futur simple (futur dans le passé)*. The conditional can be considered not as a temporary form, but as a special mood of the verb, which has the meaning of approaching the action, that is, a modal meaning. *Futur dans le passé* is an analogue of *futur simple*, i.e. a real future action, but not in relation to the moment of speech, but in relation to some moment in the past. L.P. Pitskova believes that the simple future does not express a real action, but is considered as a categorical future from the point of view of the speaker, and to confirm this opinion she turns to the semantic fields of G. Guillaume.

However, it should be remembered that G. Guillaume, excluding the first field of doubt, connects the remaining three semantic fields with the indicative mood, i.e., the mood of real tenses. The action of the future simple tense is real, it is categorical, it will definitely happen in the future. It is not localized, just as the *passé simple* is not localized, but is located in a zone “strictly symmetrical to the past, devoid of any hypothetical modality.” [6]

The grammatical category of time is the core of the temporal functional-semantic field of the French language. The following nuclearity criteria are proposed:

- invariability of temporary meaning (mandatory presence of a time frame);
- the ability to independently implement temporary localization;
- it is necessary to express the temporal characteristics of movement.[7]

The relevance of the problem in Uzbek linguistics lies in the relevance of filling the gap caused by insufficient attention to semantics when studying syntactic phenomena in Turkology, in particular in Uzbek linguistics. The most important and central part is the relationship between semantics and syntax, or more precisely, the issue of semantic-syntactic asymmetry. Semantic-syntactic asymmetry, although it is the most important aspect of the problem of the unity of form and content at the syntactic level of language, has not yet become the object of special research. In some (non-linguistic) works (for example, the works of N.D. Arutyunova, A.V. Suprun, E.N. Starikova, T.B. Alisova, etc.) this issue is considered only briefly in connection with other issues. This problem has not been studied at all on the material of the Turkic languages. In general, the semantic direction of syntactic theory in Turkology has not yet begun, or at least not formed as a clear direction. Naturally, all this requires a separate, monographic study of the problem of the relationship between semantics and syntax, that is, semantic-syntactic asymmetry in a simple sentence (the problem of such asymmetry in a complex sentence is a separate and larger problem that requires a separate study).

It is obvious that there is no research method for studying the asymmetric relationship between semantics and syntax of simple sentences. The specifics of the problem require the use of various methods developed in modern linguistics. Taking this into account, the work uses descriptive, comparative, transformational and structural methods, as well as methods of structural and valence analysis, the combination of which helps to objectively and specifically determine the nature and patterns of semantic-syntactic asymmetry in simple words.

The methodological basis of the work was the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism on language, the rules of Marxist-Leninist philosophy on language. When studying the problem, the author relied on the work of leading Soviet linguists and, of course, on his own observations.

Throughout its historical development, traditional linguistics has made significant strides in the study and explanation of linguistic phenomena and has prepared a natural basis for the emergence of new and colorful advanced concepts of linguistics today. Traditional linguistics, in explaining linguistic phenomena, relies mainly on formal analysis, as a result of which the very important and comprehensively necessary question of the meaning of a sentence has remained outside the field of view of researchers; in their interpretation, the features of the formal sentence came to the fore. The syntactic theory relied mainly on a form that logically did not allow a concrete and deep explanation of the essence of syntactic phenomena or a clear definition of many syntactic patterns. At first glance, it seems that traditional syntax takes into account the semantic side of the sentence. In particular, semantic features are also used to explain individual syntactic events. For example, when they define sentence types as statements, questions, and motives, this is clearly based on the communicative purpose of the sentence. But this communicative goal does not constitute the specific semantics of the sentence; it is connected with it.

**General organization of the proposal.** Traditional syntax turned mainly to semantics to explain the meaning of syntactic connections when assessing the functions of small members of a sentence: definition, reason, etc. In a word, as N. D. Arutyunova correctly noted, “syntax, being part of grammar, tried not to go out beyond real grammatical categories.” [8]

### Conclusion

Thus, a brief overview of the problems of French enantiosemy represents a first attempt to pose the problem and develop a taxonomy. The need for a more accurate, more serious analysis is obvious, and therefore a special monographic study should be highlighted. In particular, the development of models, types, types, contrasts, criteria for determining enantiosemy, the formation of a stylistic function, etc. can be considered promising. The results of such work help to understand the French language, its typology, semantics, stylistics, as well as to carry out translation or comparative analysis, in particular, to compare it with the Russian or Uzbek languages.[9]

### References

1. Десницкая А. В. Сравнительное языкознание и история языков. - М.: УРСС, 2004. - С. 23-36.
2. Гулыга Е. В., Шендельс Е. И. Грамматико-лексические поля в современном немецком языке. - М.: Высш. шк., 1969. - С. 5, 8-9.
3. Бондарко А. В. Теория функциональной грамматики. Темпоральность. Модальность. - Л.: Наука, 1990. - С. 6.
4. Гак В. Г. Теоретическая грамматика французского языка. - М.: Добросвет, 2004. - 860 с.
5. Пицкова Л. П. Системное значение морфологической формы в аспекте синтагматики и парадигматики (на материале вида и перфектности французского глагола). - М.: Народный учитель, 2002. - С. 76.
6. Martin R. Temps et aspect. - Paris: Klincksieck, 1974. - 450 p.
7. Торопова, Е. Н. (2006). Функционально-семантическое поле темпоральности во французском языке. Нефтегазовые технологии и экологическая безопасность, (5), 168-172.
8. Махмудов, Н. М. (1984). Семантико-синтаксическая асимметрия в простом предложении узбекского языка.
9. Рузибоева, Н. К. (2018). Энантioseмия в современном французском языке: основные проблемы. *Молодой ученый*, (51), 203-209.