



PRESUPPOSITION BASED ON THE ANTONYMIC RELATION OF A LEXEME

Mahmudov Shukhrat Abdulazizovich
Researcher at Namangan State University.

Annotation

This article contains the main ideas about the bright manifestation of presupposition in sentences composed of lexemes signifying action in the Uzbek language.

Keywords: lexemes denoting sign, lexemes denoting action, pause, tickle

There are lexemes in the Uzbek language that, when used in a sentence, form a presupposition by referring directly to their antonymic contradiction. In general, an important characteristic of antonyms is that they remind each other at the same time. This situation allows the expression of presupposition in speech through antonymous lexical units. In the Uzbek language, especially in sentences composed of lexemes denoting signs and actions, presupposition is clearly manifested. Certain syntactic sieges play an important role in referring to the presupposition of such lexical units in antonymic relations. In particular, lexemes denoting a sign form a presupposition by referring to the second contradiction being compared when it comes as a comparable member in a sentence. For example: A friend who is taller than himself is counting. (O. Hoshimov. "Ikki eshik orasi")

The sign represented by the vertical lexeme from this sentence served as a metaphor. It is known that the comparison is based on the interaction of two things - the object, the sign, the action-state. The comparative members in this sentence are the signifiers. One of them is clearly expressed by the vertical lexeme, while the second comparative sign is not directly reflected in the sentence. This comparable member is reconstructed on the basis of the self-contradictory sign of the vertical lexeme. As a result, the presupposition "He is short" is understood. In a given sentence, the relation of comparison is expressed using the conjunction *dan*. The *-roq* affix formed the character level (reduction level). Compare: A self-righteous friend is counting.

In general, in all constructions of the [*dan* + sign lexeme] pattern, a reference is made to a lexeme that is semantically opposite to the sign lexeme. The following examples show the same situation:

Deliberately married to an older wife. (S. Ahmad. "Toyboshi") (He is younger than his wife)

Of course, this type of statement should be distinguished from any comparative statement.

It is characteristic that even when the members of the analogy consist of words denoting persons, a presupposition of a nature contrary to the basic information is expressed. For example, you probably know better than I do what a salty land is. (O. Hoshimov. "Ikki eshik orasi") presupposes the presupposition "I know what a salty land is like." This presupposition arose through a mutual comparison of the persons represented by the pronouns me and you, and their characteristic (knowledge of the salty land). In this sentence the presupposition is not formed on the basis of the antonymic feature of a good lexeme, but is formed by the syntactic construction of [*dan* + sign lexeme + verb predicate].



Similarly the presupposition is not expressed by the antonym of the good lexeme: Is there anything better than lard on a cold day! (O. Hoshimov. "Ikki eshik orasi")

It's a rhetorical question, "There's nothing better than lard on a cold day!" presupposition is understood. This presupposition is expressed through the syntactic structure of the rhetorical interrogative sentence.

The fact that lexical units refer to a presupposition that contradicts the information expressed in a sentence also depends on the syntactic environment in which they are used.

For example, when I arrived on the street, it was still light (O. Hoshimov. "Ikki eshik orasi"). The role of the lexeme, which still represents the meaning of time, is also significant. Compare: It was light when I reached our street.

It is important for the listener to know the context, the situation of speech, the language skills of the participants, that is, the meaning of the lexeme used in the sentence, in order for the listener to understand the presupposition that arises through the antonyms of lexical units.

If the participants do not know the meaning of the lexical units that refer to the presupposition used in the sentence, they will not be able to clearly understand the meaning of the sentence. Therefore, language users will need to have a certain theoretical knowledge of the lexical units that refer to presupposition.

In the Uzbek language, some lexemes denoting action also form a presupposition in a sentence through the antonym. D. Lutfullaeva explained this characteristic of lexemes in the example of the verb lexeme of reduction. According to her, the verb decreased in the phrase "the number of my sheep has decreased" refers to the presumption "the number of my sheep has increased". Presupposition occurs in connection with the semantics of the same verb. The scientist explains this phenomenon as follows: "The realization of the diminishing motion requires that a certain thing-object be in a numerically normal state or in an increased state.

In other words, it is observed that an object is affected by a decreasing motion only if it is normally or increased in number. This interdependent objective reality leads to the latent expression of the action of multiplication in speech through the verb of decreasing, and vice versa, of the act of decreasing through the verb of increasing. Of course, the context, the demands of the speech situation, and the general knowledge of the semantics of these verbs play an important role in the fact that these verbs in an antonymous relationship point to each other in speech. If the speech situation requires a clear expression of the action of multiplication by the verb to decrease, and vice versa, the action of decreasing by the verb to increase, then there is no reference to the hidden information that reflects their contradiction through these verbs.

It is understood that in verb lexemes, which signify that the action of one action takes place in connection with another action, a reference is made to the initial action.

As a result, the sentence expresses a certain presupposition in relation to this action. Sentences involving these types of verb lexemes are always semantically complicated at the expense of presupposition. The presupposition that emerges as additional information to the basic information expressed in the sentence is of a latent nature.



In the Uzbek language, in the sentences formed with the participation of the following verb lexemes, there is a phenomenon of semantic complication due to presupposition: to stop, to stop, to pour, to dilute, to whiten, to darken, to heal, to heal, to die. R. Rasulov calls such verbs "state verbs that are the result of action." According to the scholar, "in situational verbs, which are the result of an action, the state is transferred from a particular action or a state. That is, in the transition to the state, the action sometimes has a clear "appearance", and sometimes the opposite. In this case, the movement is important in that it is hidden from external influences, but actually exists. In other words, the transition from one state to another also actually occurs as a result of action. Thus, the verbs of the state which are the result of the action are subdivided into types according to the nature of the action: a) the transition from one action to a complete state, and b) the transition from one state to another as a result of the action.

It is understood that the verb denoting the result of an action is based on a different action. Therefore, the same verb lexemes in a sentence refer to the initial action on which the result is based on the action. Below we examine the semantic structure of some sentences formed with the participation of these verb lexemes.

1. The music stopped. The trumpet blast was extinguished. (O. Hoshimov. "Ikki eshik orasi")
2. The second car also stopped. (O. Hoshimov. " Ikki eshik orasi ")
3. The light in the next room went out. (S.Ahmad. «Mehribon»)
4. Here, years later, the hair turned white... (S.Ahmad. "Qorako`z majnun")

The lexeme of silence in the first sentence is applied to music and means "to stop, to press." Of course, in this example, the movement of the music's silence also points to the fact that this music had been affected before. This meaning, understood through the semantics of the pause lexeme, emerges through presupposition in the sentence. Therefore, the presupposition "Music was playing" is understood from the given sentence.

Describing the semantic nature of the verb to rest, R. Rasulov includes it in the list of verbs with the logical expression "hearing" of the semantic state verbs, which distinguish "from one movement to another". The lexemes of the verbs to turn off, to extinguish, to stop, to be silent also belong to this group, and presuppositions that sound, noise, etc. occur in speech are also understood.

The second carriage is also stopped (O. Hoshimov. " Ikki eshik orasi"). As a result, the presupposition "The second car was moving" is understood. The presupposition ("Other cars also stopped") is used in this sentence, both through the load. So, this sentence, although in a simple form, has a complex meaning.

The lamp in the next room went out (S.Ahmad. "Mexribon") and the presupposition is expressed by the lexeme of the verb to go out. This lexeme refers to the presupposition that the lamp is on until it is turned off. For this reason, the statement "The light was on in the next room" is hidden.

Here, years later, the hair turned white (S.Ahmad. "Qorako`z majnun") expresses the presupposition "His hair was black", which reflects the state of the hair before it turned white through the lexeme of the verb to turn white.



There are also verb lexemes in the Uzbek language, in which the presupposition expressed by them contradicts the content of the information reflected in the sentence, and not the action of the verb. The fact that such lexical units refer to presupposition in speech is related to the nature of the action they signify. While such a presupposition does not contradict the action represented by the verb lexeme, it does contradict the content of the information expressed through it. For example, the presumption "Umrikhan was inside" is understood from the statement that Umrikhan went out (S.Ahmad. "Laylak keldi").

References

1. Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили феълларининг маъно тузилиши. – Тошкент, Низомий номидаги ТошДПУ, 2008.
2. Лутфуллаева Д. Ўзбек тили феълларининг прагматик хусусиятлари // Олима аёлларнинг фан-техника тараққиётида тутган ўрни. – Тошкент: ТошДПУ, 2008
3. Маҳмудов Н. Ўзбек тилидаги содда гапларда семантик-синтактик асимметрия. - Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1984.
4. Нурмонов А., Ҳақимов М. Лингвистик прагматиканинг назарий шаклланиши // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. - Тошкент. 2001.
5. Нурмонов А., Ҳақимов М. Лингвистик прагматиканинг назарий шаклланиши // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. - Тошкент. 2001. - №4.
6. Нейматов Ҳ., Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили систем лексикологияси асослари. - Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995.