ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOGICAL AND GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES OF SENTENCES

JALOLOV SHERALI ABDUVALIYEVICH
Senior teacher of Namangan State University, Namangan.

NEMATJONOV SHARIFJON RUSTAMJONOVICH
Teacher of Namangan State University, Namangan.

QODIRJONOV XASANBOY QODIRJON OGLI
Teacher of Namangan state university, Namangan

ABSTARCT:

The article discusses the relationship of sentences with logical and grammatical categories. Logical categories can be expressed in a language by various means: combinations of words, single words, affixes, intonation, etc., but they always get a corresponding expression in the language.

KEYWORDS: Logical, grammatical categories, psychological stress and inversion, situational-structural, relational-structural, formalism.

INTRODUCTION:

Thinking and the two main types of thought acts that implement it - predication and attribution, expressed in language by a sentence and a phrase, have the goal, in the first case, to generalize a known concrete subject of thought and speech by means of an abstractive comparison of it with some generalizing dynamic feature, and in the second case, the concretization of the abstract object of thought, by concretizing its comparison with any feature that characterizes its property, action or state, its relation to other objects and other thinking. So it is quite obvious that the logical category of the subject is closely related to the grammatical category of the subject, whatever it is expressed in the language, just as the logical category of the predicate is closely related to the grammatical category of the predicate, regardless of what it is expressed in the language - a name with a potential or real a bunch or verb.

Categories of thinking - in this case, two types of mental acts - predication and attribution and categories of language, in this case, two types of syntactic units - sentences and phrases are correlated with each other and are categories common to thinking and languages of all people. Logical and grammatical categories may not coincide with each other, but they always, to some extent, correspond to each other.

Predication processes - integration of generalization and attribution processes - differentiation and concretization, as well as their implementation in the language are general processes, and therefore, they cannot but mutually act in the formation of the corresponding linguistic grammatical categories, which, nevertheless, have different implementations in specific languages. Thus, the main syntactic units in all languages: a sentence and a phrase have a structure that, to one degree or another, more or less approximately reflects the logical relations of various grammatical categories.

So, in each individual sentence, the subject is opposed to the general, expressed in the predicate, in other words, the separate (concrete) contained in the subject is

generalized in a general sentence, more abstract in relation to the subject, the concept contained in the predicate.

Logical categories can be expressed in a language by various means: combinations of words, single words, affixes, intonation, etc., but they always get a corresponding expression in the language.

In this regard, it should be noted that regardless of the specific models of the main types of acts of thinking, i.e., whether the judgment is a message, a question, an exclamation or an urge, as well as regardless of logical or psychological stress and inversion, the structure of the judgment, and also, the structure of the corresponding sentence remains unchanged, that is, the logical subject of the judgment - the grammatical subject always remains a specific, separate concept, which is generalized by the logical predicate of the judgment - the grammatical predicate of the sentence - by means of a generalizing dynamic feature that expresses the attitude of the statement to reality at a given moment.

From the point of view of the internal structure of the grammatical relationship of its members and their grammatical design, sentences - narrative and expressive - do not have any fundamental features.

The structure of sentences can remain unchanged, and their differentiation in speech is achieved, mainly, by intonation, inversion and addition of some service particles or morphemes.

The communicative aspect as the basis of the comparative typology of the sentence is distinguished by two closely interconnected aspects: a) situational - structural, b) relational - structural.

If a certain "consensus" is reached regarding the recognition of the role and position of aspect (a) in the typology of a sentence in the latest literature (disputes are

mainly about the taxonomy of subject situations and the nomenclature of their octants), then aspect (b) unites the components (grammatical categories of the sentence), which are still not studied systematically enough or generally remain outside the scope of semantic and syntactic research. In this case, the components of aspect (a) More universal, components of aspect (b) are more ideo-ethnic.

In the comparative typology of languages, as in any comparison of objects or phenomena, it is absolutely necessary to rely on something in common.

Only under this condition it is possible to reveal the coincidences and discrepancies in the interpretation of a certain fact of reality between the speakers of different languages and to reveal the functions of different-level means of language in relation to this event. The general condition of what we rely on in the transition from language to language is the situational - structural aspect of the sentence structure.

The analysis of a sentence in a relational-structural aspect also contributes to the solution of the general problem of the typology of a sentence, which is not only to designate the types of sentences, but to relate them to each other on the basis of differential features, to identify similarities and differences in their structural-semantic organization. To determine in this way the systemic place of each type in the syntax of a particular language. Therefore, the task before us is twofold.

On the one hand, it is necessary to describe the most important typological characteristics and clarify the taxonomy of structures that make up syntactic systems and subsystems in the compared languages. On the other hand, it is important to create the prerequisites for achieving a practical goal - establishing on a single basis those semantic shades that

distinguish constructions that are close in meaning in each language.

In this section, we will only outline the main theoretical directions, concepts and units of research of the proposal in each aspect, and in more detail they will be described in special parts of the work.

"Comparison of languages is carried out on the basis of types, subtypes, sentence models and speech patterns, the semantics of which includes the abstract syntactic values of the models."

Undoubtedly, the priority in the development of problems of the semantic structure of the sentence belongs to L. Tenier (L. Tenier, 1988). The author's general approach to the typology of a sentence over the past decades has not only not become obsolete, but, on the contrary, has become even more relevant. We can say that the scientist with his work, as it were, set the main directions and methods of typological and contrastive study of languages for many years to come.

We share the opinion expressed by S. D. Katsnelson about the possibility of splitting all simple sentences into two classes: 1) sentences expressing a feature of any substance; 2) sentences expressing the relationship between substances (Katsnelson, 1972, pp. 174-179).

In accordance with the concept we are developing, in the typical meanings of sentences, the aggregate of objective situations of the same type reflected by consciousness receives its most generalized linguistic implementation. In this case, the following TK proposals are distinguished:

1. Substantively presented (without octant) situation; there is no sense in talking about the semantic structure here, since the situation is undivided and is encoded by one event name, for example: "War", "Spring".

2. The TK "object and its attribute" is represented by two-component sentences, in the semantic structure of which there is one octant - the carrier of the attribute, for example: "It is warming up. The day is lengthening"; "This game is interesting"; "There were three of them."

3. TK "relationship between objects":

1) The relationship between two objects is represented by three-component sentences, in the semantic structure of which there are two octants, for example:

"A boy is reading a book"; "I do not smoke"; "My daughter is a student"; "Children in the country".

2) The relationship between three objects is represented by four-component sentences, in the semantic structure of which there are three octants, for example:

"I gave the book to a colleague"; "I dropped the letter in the mailbox."

The relationship between the four objects is represented by five-component sentences, in the semantic structure of which there are four ooctants, for example:

"The instructor put the pistol from the holster into his pocket."

Finally, all these design choices make the languages described with our system belong to the class of mildly context sensitive languages. We illustrate our formalism with a small subset of interleaved phenomena that deal with extraction. The formalization is still technical, but we argue that this technicality is mostly of linguistic nature. Indeed, the interplay of these phenomena raises a number of particular cases one eventually needs to describe

REFERENCES:

1) Bach, E. (1983). On the Relationship between Word-Grammar and PhraseGrammar. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory, 1(1), 65-89. Retrieved December 14, 2020, from http:// www. jstor. org/ stable/ 4047514.

2) Evgrafov, P.M. The relationship between speech, grammar and logic as models of thinking. Autom. Doc. Math. Linguist. 41, 233–241 (2007). https://doi.org/ 10.3103/S0005105507060015

3) Isroilovich, U.I., Rustamjanovich, N.S., Sultanovich, S.S., & Vahobjonovich, E.A. (2019). The efficient ways of teaching English through proverbs and sayings using the CLT method.

4) James Rogers (2003a), Syntactic Structures as Multi-Dimensional Trees, Research on Language and Computation, 1(3--4):265–305.

5) James Rogers (2003b), wMSO theories as grammar formalisms, Theoretical Computer Science, 293(2):291–320

6) Lambek, J. (2012). Logic and Grammar. Studia Logica: An International Journal for Symbolic Logic, 100(4), 667-681. Retrieved December 14, 2020, from http:// www. jstor. org/stable/23262129

7) U. Yusupov., "Теоретические основы сопоставительной лингвистики." Tashkent. Press "Fan", 2007.