



ISSN: 2249-7315

Vol. 11, Issue 9, September 2021

SJIF –Impact Factor = 8.037 (2021)

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00056.3

---

## FORMAL DIFFERENCES AND SEMANTIC SIMILARITIES IN SIMPLE SENTENCES

**Abror Odilovich Murtazaev\***

\*Freelance Researcher,  
Tashkent State University of Uzbek,  
Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi,  
UZBEKISTAN  
Email id: abror.odil@bk.ru

---

### ABSTRACT

*The article presents the formal differences and semantic accuracy in simple sentences, i.e., synonymy of simple speech, syntactic synonymy and the importance of its study, scientific views on simple sentences and their relationship to them. In scientific texts, simple sentences and ways of forming the phenomenon of synonymy in them are analyzed in detail. The development of research in Uzbekistan, the emergence of original scientific texts requires the development of a certain linguistic control (to prevent duplication). For this, it is necessary to create software that determines the level of similarity of the content of scientific texts available in electronic form. Experts in a given field, such as painters or sculptors, determine whether a work of art is copied, and scientists in a given field determine whether a work of art is copied. The increase in the number of problems in this example is related to the posting of research results in higher education on the Internet. This situation has arisen today and requires a new level of struggle against illegal use of someone else's intellectual property in the world.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Speech, Artificial Intelligence, Linguistics, Molding, Scientific Text, Synonymy, Content, Exact Similarity, Ranking, Copyright, Linguistic Expertise, Simple Speech, Content, Syntax, Scientific Text, Difference, Presupposition, Lexical, Identity, Similarity, Difference.*

---

### INTRODUCTION

As mentioned above, simple sentences have been studied extensively in Uzbek and foreign linguistics as an object of study. In this part of our study, we will consider the issue of formal differences and similarities in content in simple sentences. In this regard, in the 80s of the last century, R. Sayfullaeva's research on the synonyms of affirmative and negative statements has a special place. In this research work, many simple sentences are analyzed on the basis of works of art and sentences in colloquial speech. For example, “Қиз ўз латофати билан мени ишққа чақирар эди. У ғолиб келди” “Мен уни севиб қолдим”, “У менга ёқиб

Asian Research consortium  
www.aijsh.com

қолди”[1.10-11]emphasizes that it is synonymous with speech. Also, M. "Inconsistency of form and content in interrogative sentences" written by Haynazarova for the candidate of philological sciences, D. Lutfillaeva's dissertation on "Denial and formal semantic inconsistency in affirmative sentences" and doctoral dissertation on "The relationship between the pattern and propositive structure of the semantic-syntactic structure of the sentence." Although inconsistencies in form and content have been explored in the above studies, the phenomenon of synonymy has been overlooked or neglected in terms of the scope of the work. For example, *Бироқ Низом ҳозир бу бахтдан маҳрум.* (П.Қодиров “Авлодлар довоғи”) part of speech *бенасиб/дир, бебахра/дир, баҳраманд эмас* even if replaced by the words, the meaning of “The statute is not happy” is understood. The difference between such SQs and SQs consisting of the word deprived is that they require the use of the part to which the cut belongs in the directional agreement, and if these SQs are considered negative, the sentences consisting of the word deprived of the cut are affirmative. [2.38-39] emphasizes that such statements are united in a single meaning. It can be seen that the discourse obtained in the analysis is limited to the contradiction in form and content itself.

The dialectic of synonymy is that similarity means differences at the same time. The only principle of synonymy is the absence of complete parallelism between the plane of content and the plane of expression. “Synonyms of the same importance (core of common meaning) have different meanings denoting the same events, connections, and relations of objective reality,” which differ structurally and express additional shadows. [3.19] is also recognized as relevant. Because of this understanding of the equivalence of syntactic synonyms, their comparison often becomes a descriptive statement of disagreement in the formal organization of sentences.

A.V. Bondarko writes: “A speaker can express the same semantic content (in any case, content with an invariant semantic basis) by different means that differ from each other in terms of interpreting the semantic invariant:

- 1) Умумий маъно муаммоси анча мунозарали масала сифатида гавдаланади;
- 2) Маъно умумийлиги мунозарали муаммо сифатида гавдаланади;
- 3) Маънодаги умумийлик жиддий муаммо тарзида гавдаланади;
- 4) Маънонинг умимийлик жихати муаммо сифатида анча мунозарали эканлиги маълум бўлади.

The cognitive situation reflected in the sentence is focused on a part of reality and its semantic-syntactic model. Named components with two or more model style differences formed by one can represent the same typical value. “The typical meaning of a sentence is a generalized semantic result of the predicative conjugation of subjective and predicative components (semantic structure in other terminology)” [4] and Zolotova’s view of “looking for correlations in proposing grammatical features with semantic features” [4.19] is also important. The scientific conclusion that begins with the definition of the semantic functions of elementary syntactic forms and ends with the identification of typical values of sentence models is also confirmed by the statements analyzed above. If the reflection of specific situations is done because of a certain conformity of certain lexical units, then the typical objective is due to the typical conformity of certain classes of lexemes (lexical units of certain semantic types). situations can be specified ”[4.19]

Ledeneva argues that a multidimensional cognitive situation, which has gone through all the stages of syntactic processing and is carried out in a linear syntactic sequence, retains all the existing relationships between concepts in the initial mental formation. Syntactic connections thus reflect the projection of connections and relationships within the primary knowledge structure ”[5.15]

A number of sentences that differ in content but repeat the same usual situation can be recognized as cognitively synonymous. In structurally different sentences, for example:

The answer to the puzzle is then displayed on the monitor. [5.17] The answer to the puzzle is then displayed on the monitor; the display on the monitor reflects the usual single content, the work to be performed and the place of its means in the speech have changed. The relationship between the action and the object to which it is directed remains unchanged. “The general semantics of a class of sentences that reflect a typical situation and are repeated in an infinite number of sentences of different specific content” is the typical meaning of a sentence. [5.19] In terms of the situational approach, “speech is not only a predicative but also a nominative unit, because it reflects a certain objective situation with its ideal side, with the material side (a combination of material units that make it up). In order to understand syntactic synonyms most thoroughly, it is important to take into account the different syntactic constructions at this stage in the development of a particular language, their proximity to the main lexical content and grammatical meaning, the specificity of grammatical position.

Evidence suggests that the properties of syntactic synonyms cannot be limited to words or areas of application, because in terms of functional-semantic relationships, the elements of these categories interact and collide. We follow the second point of view: Мамнуният билан айтиш мумкинки, бизда луғатчилик анъанаси бениҳоя қадимий.[11.11] – Бизда луғатчилик анъанаси бениҳоя қадмий эканлигини мамнуният билан айта оламан. Simple and complex sentences expressing the same idea are used here, they are synonymous. However, it should be noted that in different types of synonymous constructions, the similarity is revealed only in the composition. [1.8-9] Therefore, according to our research, we found it necessary to introduce that although simple verbs are synonymous, simple verbs and compound sentences can also be synonymous. For example, let's analyze the following compound sentence:

1. Алоҳида таъкидламоқ жоизки, нутқ маданияти жамият маданий-маърифий тараққиётининг, миллат маънавий камолотининг муҳим белгисидир.[11.7]

2. Нутқ маданияти жамият маданий-маърифий тараққиётининг, миллат маънавий камолотининг муҳим белгисидир.

or

1. Хорижий тилларни ўқитишда ривожланган чет давлатларининг етакчи таълим муассасалари билан ҳамкорлик алоқаларини йўлга қўйиш алоҳида аҳамиятга эга.[11.11]

2. Таъкидлаш лозимки, Хорижий тилларни ўқитишда ривожланган чет давлатларининг етакчи таълим муассасалари билан ҳамкорлик алоқаларини йўлга қўйиш алоҳида аҳамиятга эга.

In the previous parts of our chapter, we looked at several ways to change a sentence while preserving its content. We have also considered the preservation of syntactic synonymy in connection with the change of word order in the sentence in the example of studies conducted before us (in the example of sentences in the artistic ages). What we are talking about below is a phenomenon related to changing the order of words in a scientific text:

1. Ўзбек тилининг ривож ва адабий тил бўлиб шаклланишида буюк мутафаккир-шоир, олим, қомусий билимлар соҳибии Алишер Навоийнинг хизмати беқиёс.[11.31]

2. Буюк мутафаккир-шоир, олим, қомусий билимлар соҳибии Алишер Навоийнинг Ўзбек тилининг ривож ва адабий тил бўлиб шаклланишида хизмати беқиёс.

3. Алишер Навоийнинг Ўзбек тилининг ривож ва адабий тил бўлиб шаклланишида буюк мутафаккир-шоир, олим, қомусий билимлар соҳиби СИФАТИДА хизмати беқиёс.

In the above two sentences only the word order has changed, in the third sentence the word has been added as the word structure has changed, and the content has no effect on the accuracy.

1. Ўзбек ҳикоячилигида сўнги жумланинг хилма-хил шакллари учрайди. [11.24] 2. ҲИКОЯЧИЛИГИМИЗДА сўнги жумланинг хилма-хил шакллари учрайди. Here the phrase is replaced by a word. The important thing is that when the word Uzbek storytelling is replaced by a word in our storytelling, it is necessary to know that the author of the text is Uzbek, in order to know that the issue is about Uzbek storytelling.

In the analyzes conducted so far in our study, we have seen that there is no change in sentence content by replacing a word (including suffixes) with a synonym, adding a new word and removing a particular word, changing the word order. Below we consider another phenomenon related to the issue of content.

A particular proposition is expressed through different levels, through syntactic structure: through speech, through turns, and even some words and grammatical forms in a simple sentence can express a separate presupposition and semantically complicate that simple sentence. In this case, the proposition expressed in some word or grammatical form has its most concise form. Presupposition helps in its comprehensibility for the speaker and the listener. That is why in recent times the presupposition side of speech has attracted the attention of linguists. [8.113]

Among linguists, this language is interpreted differently as a phenomenon. The concept of presupposition (presumption) German logician G. It has to do with Frege's ideas. He argues that presupposition is the natural basis of judgment. For example, Иккинчи мисолда эса, маъно кўчишига кўпроқ “бутун–қисм” алоқаси асос бўлгандек кўринади. [11.27] ёки Иккинчи мисолда эса, маъно кўчишига кўпроқ “бутун–қисм” алоқаси асос бўлгандек кўринмайди. that there is a natural basis for the judgment that there is a phenomenon of migration, but that there is no whole-part basis in it. G. According to Frege, the main verdict often comes with another secret verdict. He considers only a secondary secret judgment of existence to be a presupposition. [8.113] E. Kinen recommends dividing it into practical and logical presuppositions. The first is the structure of the speaker's individual knowledge, and the second is the semantic relationship between the sentences. [8.113]

Linguist L. M. Vasilev, on the other hand, studies the components of meaning according to the degree of connection to a particular meaning into mandatory and facultative (potential) components of meaning. The first is related to the signifiable (semantic) aspect of meaning and, of course, necessary for its existence as a linguistic unit, while the second is related to the denotative aspect of the presupposition plan, and this component is understood only through presupposition in speech. In his view, the optional components expand the semiotic possibilities of meaning. For example, in the sense of reported construction, there are optional components that can be expressed by verbs such as say, write, call, telegram. [8.115] an event that is known only through practical knowledge.

V. Humboldt's antinomy “any understanding is not understanding at the same time,” A.D. Potebnya's individual psychological views, such as the “image center” (“near meaning”) and the “long meaning” of words, are also directly related to the concept of presupposition in modern linguistics. [8.115] The use of the term “presupposition” in linguistics It is associated with the name Strausson, which indicates that there is a special type of implication in the language. This type of implication is G. It is interpreted very close to Frege's “natural basis.”

Both authors derive presuppositionality from the semantic relationship between sentences. This relationship is expressed by the formula "X requires it". The "Mary cleans the room" design has the presumption that "the room is dirty." The same presumption is maintained in the construction "Mary did not clean the room." [8.116]

Nowadays, it is becoming more and more common to define a presupposition as a "general fund of knowledge", a "total of prior knowledge" between speakers, which allows them to correctly understand a particular sentence and the proposition it expresses. [8.117]

In linguistics, the term presupposition is understood to mean a hidden meaning that is not directly expressed in a particular sentence. The concept of presupposition includes the concepts of context (linguistic environment of this language unit) and situation (extralinguistic substrate of this sentence, the conditions of its emergence). [8.117] For example, *Аслида, миллат шу учликнинг бир бутун яхлит қиёфасидир.* [11.8] the information in the sentence is related to the text. It was the subject of information "Хар бир халқнинг ўтмиши, бугуни ва эртаси мавжуд." [11.18] It is explained by the fact that he came after the speech. The idea in the previous sentence is about the history of the nation, its present and future. Therefore, the above statement has the presupposition that "all nations that have life have night, today and tomorrow." There will be no presupposition event outside the text. For example, in *Caikous's Nightmare*, it is said that Harun al-Rashid had a dream in which all his teeth fell out, and the king summoned a dream interpreter and asked for a dream interpretation. He told the king who interpreted the dream that "all his relatives would die and he would be left alone," and the king ordered him to be flogged a hundred times. When he finally told another dream-interpreting king, "Your life will be the longest of all your relatives," the king gave him a hundred pieces of gold. [9.35] In fact, the meaning of both interpretations is the same, that is, all the relatives of the king die first in the king.

Thus, presupposition is a phenomenon that is considered as an object of study of pragmatics, which is inextricably linked with the semantics of speech. The text with the speech situation forms the basis of pragmatic research. Therefore, there is a growing need for pragmatics where a speech situation or text is needed so that the proposition expressed by the syntactic device is understandable to the speakers.

In the words of ND Arutyunova, in the mid-60s, a "storm" on the semantics of speech began. [3.29] A number of factors influenced the development of linguistic theory in the awakening of interest in the semantics of speech: factors such as the emergence of the view as a linguistic sign and the emergence of a theory of syntactic transformation based on the concept of semantic equivalence of sentences. O. Espersen also tried to separate form from content in linguistics. While criticizing Suit and other linguists, he argues that form and content are inextricably linked, and that focusing on these two aspects of the linguistic phenomenon is the main task of any linguistics. In his view, any linguist can examine a phenomenon in two ways - from form to meaning or from meaning to form. [3.29] The first will be the object of semantic and the second the object of onomasiological study.

In addition to the propositional content, the communicative intention of the speaker and one of the possible modalities had to be involved in the semantics of any sentence. In other words, in order to move from proposition to real content, in addition to the propositional frame, it is necessary to add two more frames - the modal and the communicative frame. The next two frames are a necessary part of the semantic structure of any sentence. [10.10] Thus, the semantic structure of any sentence is complex, multifaceted, with at least three members: 1) propositional, 2) modal, and 3) communicative. The most important of the above members, which form the semantic structure of the sentence, is characterized by a propositional structure that reflects certain situations or events in the objective being.

Some researchers also focus on constructions that are distinguished by lexical elements

(connections, prepositions, particles, modal words), lexical-syntactic synonymy, and constructions that differ in morphological elements (word forms) - morphological-syntactic. Conjunctions and prepositions (syntactic lexicon) and word forms are recognized by them as the main features of syntactic synonymy. Not all scientists agree. We have identified the following means of creating synonymy of declarative sentences: synonymous and non-synonymous interchangeable independent words, auxiliary words and case forms, intonation is in the same state, but the principle of exchange is treated differently. [1] Synonyms can form synonymous sentences, used instead of the latter. There may be words that are not mutually synonymous. This applies to text synonyms.

Дарс якунида тўпланган карточкалар сонига қараб, ғолиб гуруҳ аниқланади. Фаол ўқувчилар баҳоланади.[11.9]

1. Фаол АЪЗОЛАР баҳоланади;

2. Фаол ИШТИРОКЧИЛАР баҳоланади;

3. Фаол ҚАТНАШЧИЛАР баҳоланади.

4. Фаол ҚАТНАШГАНЛАР баҳоланади.

5. Фаол ўқувчилар РАҒБАТЛАНТИРИЛАДИ. In the text, the word participant is used as a synonym for the word participant, participant, and the word evaluation is used as a synonym for the word motivation, forming synonymous sentences. Based on the above, there are also phenomena of linguistic synonymy and syntactic synonymy, which are not discussed in detail in the next stage of our research, ie in the development of linguistic models of the degree of semantic similarity of simple sentences in scientific texts.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Sayfullaeva R. Synonymy of declarative sentences in the modern Uzbek language, Abstract of thesis, candidate, phil, sciences, Tashkent, 1982, 35 b
2. Lutfillaeva. D.E. Denial and formal-substantive inconsistency in affirmative statements. Ph.D. name. Tashkent 1997, 145 p
3. Kachanova.L.A. Syntactic synonymy of Russian sentences within the functional range "complex submission - simple sentence" (cognitive-syntactic aspect) Ph.D. R.: 2006. 125 B
4. Zolotova GA Onipenko NK, Sidorova M.Yu. 1999 -Communicative grammar of the Russian language. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola 225 B
5. Zolotova G.A. 1973 - Essay on the functional syntax of the Russian language. Moscow: Nauka, 1973.25 B
6. Ledenev Yu.Yu. 2005— On the question of the syntactic status of a sentence // Pedagogical Science and Practice - to the Region. Materials of the VII regional scientific-practical conference on April 8-9, 2005 - Stavropol: SGPI, 2005.320 B
7. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N., Ahmedov A., Solikhojaev S. Semantic syntax of the Uzbek language. T.: 1992. 149
8. Kaikovus. Nightmare. T.1994. 172
9. Mahmudov N. Semantic-syntactic asymmetry in simple sentences in Uzbek language. Tashkent.: 1984. 128 B
10. Language and literature education.2017.11 No. 82 B
11. Language and literature education.2017.10-Son. 83 B