



DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE FORM AND CONTENT OF A CONNECTED JOINT STATEMENT

Aitbayev Dilshodxuja Temirbayevich

Professor of Philosophy at the Tashkent State University of Pedagogy, Nizamiy University, etc.

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: May 28 th 2024 Accepted: June 26 th 2024	The article reflects on the expression of dictal and modal meanings in connected compound statements and the origin of the discrepancy between the form and content of the linked compound statement
Keywords: Simple sentences, bound compound sentences, dictal meaning, modal meaning, exclamations and inputs sentence fragments, content relation, input devices, proposition, context	

The interconnected joint statements are made up of independent, meaningfully interconnected statements¹. (Matthew 24:14; 28:19, 20) Jehovah's Witnesses would be pleased to support more than the bodies of a person.

Among the parts that make up the joint statements, the same content relationship is not always expressed. We can often see that more than one content relationship is expressed in a joint statement. For example, a combination relationship can be linked to other meaningful relationships and a result-outcome relationship can be expressed together in connection with comparison in a separation relationship. No matter how complex the content relationship may be, however, one of these content relationships is a leader, and the rest consists of additional, boundary relationships, which can also cause asymmetric dualism.

The expression of dictated and modal meanings in connected joint statements differs from simple, unrelated joint statements, and follow-up joint statements. In simple statements, modal meaning is expressed through encouragement and input. We all know that incentives and inputs do not have synthetic contact with the vocabulary, i.e. there is no formal relationship between them, but they have a content relationship with the content of the sentence. This content relationship is subjective. The relationship between the content of the sentence and the content of the sentence is called a modal relationship. In such sentences, you can see two different attitudes, such as objective thought and subject relationships. For example, *Hoy is a little boy, get out in the cart.* (Ch.Sha'drach, Me'chach and A'go) For the purpose of expressing this simple statement, the order is expressed because the second person is represented by a verb cut in the form of a command. It describes an objective idea, such as ordering a child to ride, and a subjective attitude of the speaker, such as encouraging and encouraging the second person to his conversation. *Heroes, bottle-gourd plant sons, may you have a dear manglay.* (G. Gulom) Even in a simple statement that is complicated by these unified incentives, two different propositives are expressed, as above. First, an objective idea (objective propositis, dictation), and second, the subjective attitude of the speaker (subjective propositis, modus). Objective propositis is expressed through the main part of the sentence (*let's have a dear manglay*), and subjective propositis is expressed through encouragement (*Hero sons, bottled children*).

The stars faded one by one, and the horizon began to turn white. (A.Maylie) (1) *The stars faded one by one; and (2) the horizon began to turn white.* However, because the fading rabbi does not fully display the signs of prediction, he cannot be cut off, resulting in the formation of a rabbi-shaped framework with his extenders and more than one proposition expressed through a form of speech. The resulting embryo was placed in nutrients and then inserted into her womb, where it implanted. At the same time, it should be noted that some linguists describe such statements as a follow-up joint statement. For example, in the "Modern Uzbek Language" textbook, co-authored by A.Gulomov and M.Asqarova, the statement was described as a joint statement. However, in our view, such statements are not a follow-up joint statement, but a complicated simple statement. Because, as N.Mahmudov, A.Nurmonov correctly pointed out, "Prediction is the grammatical meaning of speech. It is a grammatical meaning that is not divided into parts of the vocabulary system. Prediction is made up of a collection of forms that represent individuals (numbers), time, mayl, confirmation, and denial. Therefore, any smallest synthetic unit with such a grammatical meaning and a system of forms that represent it is a statement." [4; 37]. It seems that units that cannot fully display signs of prediction cannot be talked about.

In his book Synthetic Theories About Speech, A. Nurmonov says of such devices: "The following component of many statements, which are considered to be a joint statement that follows in modern Turkish grammar, especially In English grammar, does not meet the above requirements of the word." [5; 33].

In connected joint statements, the expression of dictated and modal meanings differs from that of simple statements. In simple statements, subjective modalism is expressed through the modus part of the sentence, i.e. through input

¹ Uzbek grammar. Volume II. Syntax. – Toshkent: Fan, 1976. – B. 333.

and encouragement. And in linked joint statements, modus appears in different relationships between two statements. (Matthew 24:14; 28:19, 20) Jehovah's Witnesses would be pleased to answer with you. For example, *your neighbor is peaceful—you are peaceful*. Without this linker, the purpose of the speaker is not to provide information about two events, but to show the conditional relationship between them. In this case, if the neighbor's peaceful and you peaceful units are dictated expressions of meaning (dictatorship), the contractual relationship between them is modus. The sentence can be changed as follows:

1. *Your neighbor is peaceful—you are peaceful.* 2. *If your neighbor is calm, you will be calm.* 3. *When your neighbor is at peace, you will also be calm.* 4. *If your neighbor is not calm, you will not be calm either.*

This describes the conditionality in the first, second, and fourth examples, and the third example describes the relationship between time. Therefore, as it turns out, with the same props expressed in all four statements, the relationship between parts of the sentence also changes, depending on the change in the expressions of the modus.

A similar situation can be observed in linked joint statements. To illustrate: *Imagine that a man who is walking on a traffic suddenly finds that it becomes two diverging paths.* (Ch.Sha'drach, Me'chane'go) These joint statement components are combined using a *mutually exclusive and interconnecting tool*. In it, *the car already climbed a mountain, and suddenly it plunged to the bottom, toward the foot of the mountain* —the dictators. And the meaning of "work that arises quickly" is modus, which is expressed between parts and using the tool. The second word suddenly *increased the modal meaning expressed through the ravishi and binding tool* used. In simple statements above, we mentioned that semantic-synthetic asymmetry occurs at the expense of modus. But in linked joint statements, the relationship (modus) between the parts does not always lead to asymmetry. Our example of the above analysis contains semantic-synthetic asymmetry, but not on the modus account. The mountainous *region convevered mostly of high, slanderous wood*, had to be cared for by a car and car. As a result, through a joint statement consisting of two prediction units, three propositions were expressed and led to an asymmetry between the shape and content of the sentence. The talk contains the following props: (1) *the car already climbed to the hill*; (2) *suddenly plunged to the bottom*; and (3) *the low is the foot of the mountain*.

But there are joint statements that bind their parts do not represent grammatical meanings that are unique in contextual demand. This results in a discrepancy between the shape and content of the sentence. For example, *at night, the car hit concrete pillars on the side of the road, and two of them were upraised and lying down.* (Ch.Sha'drach, Me'chan'ne'go) Parts of this linked joint statement are *interconnected* using a mutual and equal linker. This connective sequence is usually used to describe grammatical meanings such as the work that occurs at the same time, time, and cause. The resulting embryo was given to support more than the body's body parts, but a sledging out entity used by Jehovah's Witnesses in your country. Therefore, there is a discrepancy between the shape and content of this statement. Let's see *another example: I would carry my little girl in my hand, but the older one would go side by side as long as she grabbed her by the bar.* (Ch.Abdullah) Parts of this connected joint statement are interconnected *using a mutual but contradiction linker*. Typically, in addition to linking parts of a joint statement, this linker creates a relationship of contradiction between them. However, there was no contradiction between the parts of the above joint statement, *but it served as a tool that represents a comparison relationship*. Let's compare: *I would carry my little girl in my hand, but the older one would go side by side as long as she grabbed it from my bar / I would carry my little girl in my hand, and the older one would go side by side as long as she grabbed it from my bar.* The resulting embryo was accepted to develop in nutrients and then inserted into her womb, where it implanted. The resulting embryo was allowed to develop in nutrients and then inserted into her womb, where it implanted.

LIST OF AVAILABLE PUBLICATIONS:

1. Aytbayev D. Relationship that is expressed and expressed in synthetic units. /University 4.0: Digital technologies and modern trends in teaching. International scientific and scientific-technical conference. – Tashkent, 2023. – B. 143-144;
2. Aytbayev D. The role of assistants in the connection of joint statements in Turkish. /Issues of Job Gulom and Uzbek linguistics. – Toshkent, 2012. – B. 140-143;
3. Aytbayev D. Asymmetric dualism pole. / Tailoring pedagogical personnel: history, modernity, destination. Scientific and practical conference materials. – Tshkent, 2015. – B. 19-20;
4. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. – Tashkent: Teacher, 1995. – B. 37;
5. Nurmonov A.N. Synthetic theories about speech. – Tashkent: Tashkent State Pedagogical Institute named Nizamiy, 1988. – 33 B.C.E.