

ASYMMETRIC DUALISM AS A SEMIOTIC PRINCIPLE OF COMMUNICATION

Aitbaev Dilshodhuzha Temirbaevich

Professor of Tashkent State Pedagogical University named after Nizami, Candidate of
Philological Sciences

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10694107>

Abstract. *This article discusses the fact that asymmetric relations are two sides of a sign, that one sign can have several expressions, and one expression can be expressed by several signs, that asymmetric dualism is related to the main principles of the semiotics of communicative activity, and that the syntactic level of the language system and its unity are discussed. On the basis of the syntagmatic relationship of phonological units, opinions are expressed about the formation of meaningful units and whether the sentence has both a formal structure and a meaningful structure.*

Keywords: *fundamental aspect, principle of asymmetry, asymmetric relations, linguistic sign, asymmetric dualism, semiotics, semantic ellipsis, phonological units, formal structure, content structure, ellipsis transforms, elliptical constructions, transformational grammar, syntactic-semantic asymmetry, syntactic constructions, syntactic valences, semantic valences.*

One of the fundamental aspects of general linguistic theory is the asymmetric principle of the linguistic sign. Asymmetrical relationships connect two: the denoting and designated sides of the sign as a two-sided mental phenomenon.

The signifying and signified (sides) of a sign are not isomorphic in relation to each other, but are in asymmetrical relationships; one sign can have several signifiers and one signifier can be conveyed by several signs [1, 78]. A linguistic sign has meaning only at the point of conjugation (connection) of the designation plan and the content plan in specific contextual situational conditions of discourse at the request of the communicant only at a certain time. In other cases, as A.A. Potebnya and young grammarians emphasized, a change in meaning occurs. Words are used with a new meaning each time, just as you cannot step into the same water twice. Therefore, R. Barthes evaluates the word not as a strict combination of two semiotic plans: meaning and designation, but as the possibility of meaning.

For young grammarians, such shifts in the expressive plane and content plan are opportunities for language development. Linguistic experience helps a person create new signs - lexemes and new structures necessary for their connection [1,179]. Systemic changes are carried out first with the help of individual psychological, and later, collective psychological steps. This is reminiscent of the theory of catastrophes, which characterizes “landslide” system changes as a result of the collection of a sufficient number of small partial shifts, which is put forward by modern mathematics. *Gutta cavat lapidem* – a quantitative change leads to a qualitative one.

As C. Peirce, L. Hjelmslev and W. Eco emphasized, the study of a linguistic sign in the diachronic aspect reveals its creative and dynamic nature. The sign is formed at the junction of meaning and designation [3, 44-46], there is no presence in the word itself [2, 213]. The division of continua into segments, according to Peirce, occurs in the boundless creative process of semiosis [4, 309-314].

Asymmetric dualism is associated with the basic principles of communicative activity: the fundamental “natural” lack of motivation and the historical formation of the use of cash signs; the dualism of the diversity of cultural language and the universal semiotic capacity; stability, rigor of the system of sign relations and creative, poetic possibilities of limitless semiosis; dualism of the emergence of new signs and limitless shifts of meaning” [1, 181].

There is no unity in the opinions of linguists about the nature of the sign; a group of linguists recognizes the one-sided feature of the sign. In particular, V.M. Solntsev argues that every sign in the meaning of the opposite of what it signifies has a one-sided nature. What is designated by a sign (through a sign) is outside it and has a complex structure.

The signified consists of the mental content associated with the sign and the class of real objects designated through the sign. According to the author, introducing into a sign all the objects included in the concept of “signified” encourages us to talk not about a sign, but a sign situation. What is denoted by a sign is the content of the sign [7, 109].

So, there are three concepts to take into account here:

sign → denoted by it → concept.

That is, the sequence of certain sounds (for example, o + t + a), by agreement by members of society, indicates a specific thing present in society (in this case, a person (ota - father). This in our minds forms a certain concept (a man, the head of a family, a revered person). As we see, the sequence of sounds (part of the whole), indicating what is the basis for the concept formed in our consciousness, is a linguistic sign. Since accepting a part of the whole (sound shell) also means accepting its content. The part is the fulcrum for the content. In language, the function of such support is performed by sequences of sounds endowed by society with a certain content. The association of sound and content for people speaking the same language constitutes a single whole, forming linguistic units.

Thus, when speaking of a linguistic sign, we mean only linguistic forms (parts pointing to the whole). A linguistic sign is a whole, consisting of a sign + content. This means that when we talk about the syntactic layer of a language system and its unit, we should keep in mind that it is a two-sided entity.

V.B. Kasevich, speaking about the place of semantics in the language system, considers it as a relatively autonomous layer standing above the syntactic layer. According to his opinion, where a sign exists, semantics also exists. A sign is a two-sided entity, one side of it is associated with the content. Therefore, content and semantics completely cover the language system. For language is intended for the communication of meanings, all its units have meaning or serve significant elements [5, 43].

This means that units that do not have direct meaning serve as material for meaningful units. These units include phonological units. On the basis of syntagmatic relations of phonological units, meaningful (meaningful) units are formed.

It is noteworthy that when we talk about morphemic units (morpheme), this unit is not divided into parts. those. the form side is not considered as an object of one layer, the content side - another, it is emphasized that it “in general” refers to a specific layer. When we are talking about a sentence, its form side is associated with syntax, and its content side with semantics, and the two sides of a complex sign are separated by two layers. As we see, syntax is brought into a completely asemantic state, and its units, in the words of L. Yelmslev, are not signs, but figures [5, 43].

Regardless of the approach to the sign, the question of approaching the sentence as a unit of language, i.e. its two-sided essence, on the issue of its presence both form and content in the dialectic of content, linguists are of the same opinion.

Thus, no one doubts that the sentence has both a formal structure and a substantive structure. However, there are different opinions about the fact that these two aspects are not always proportional, as well as the factors leading to such disproportion.

Thus, S.E. Nikitina, in the process of semantic analysis of the text, draws attention to the issue of semantic ellipsis. In her opinion, one of the requirements for an elementary meaningful phrase (statement) is that it must be potentially complete, i.e., in expanded form it should reflect all abbreviations and ellipses [8, 93-94].

In transformational grammar it is known that ellipsis is one of the forms of formation of transforms. Phrases into which additional words can be introduced without distorting the content of the information they denote are elliptical. According to S.E. Nikitina, this definition refers to grammatical ellipses that arise from the incompleteness of the formal structure of the phrase (for example, this pencil is white, that one is black. Came! In the first of these phrases, what is being explained is missing, in the second, the subject performing the action), the replenishment of abbreviations with specific units is associated with the text and situation [6, 142]. At the same time, situations related to semantic or content ellipsis also correspond to this definition. For example, Sits on pilaf (at the place where they gathered to prepare and eat pilaf); I bought a freckle cream (cream for use against freckles). Such phrases, subjected to ellipsis in semantic terms, have grammatical completeness. Here, the restoration of missing parts is not related to the context or specific situation pointing to them, but to the communication participant's general knowledge about objects, their skills to formulate conclusions about the relationship between them.

It is advisable to call this type of ellipsis semantic message compression. It can be seen that grammatical and substantive ellipsis, called substantive compression of a phrase, becomes the cause of formal and substantive inconsistency and asymmetry of the phrase. Phrases that are fully formed grammatically are incomplete semantically; this incompleteness is filled based on the knowledge and skills of the communicants.

S.E. Nikitina, analyzing combinations with prepositions, emphasizes the possibility of skipping only words whose semantic sign is necessary for correctly determining the meaning of prepositions in elliptical constructions. According to the author, such combinations can be rephrased according to the following scheme:

“A bulgan payda B buladi” (When there is A, then there will be B).

They don't talk at lunch - When they have lunch, then they don't talk (Ovkat bilan bolib, gapirmaydilar - Ovqat yeyotgan paytda gapirmaydilar); During the argument, they didn't notice how... - When they were arguing, they didn't notice... (Bahs bilan bulib, ... paykashmadi - Bahslashayotgan paytda ... paykashmadi). Now it is emphasized that when encountering such combinations, the meaning of the preposition can be determined intuitively, as was done above, but for automatic definition, the process sign must be present in the main (control) word, otherwise the meaning of the preposition may be interpreted incorrectly or the preposition may be left without meaning at all [6, 144].

It is appropriate to emphasize here that statements like Keldim (came), Topshiriqni bajardim (performed a task), although in fact they are elliptical in nature, are equal to non-elliptical statements, since the missing part in them (here the subject performing the action) is not be sure

to restore it meaningfully. The indicator of the predicate (in this case, person and number) ensures the completeness of the statement.

Thus, substantively elliptical statements also reflect asymmetric dualism. Completion of such statements also leads, from the point of view of transformational grammar, to the manifestation of certain content in various forms and on this basis forms a semantic-syntactic asymmetry: quyoshda qoraymoq (sunbathing in the sun) → quyosh nuridan qoraymok (sunbathing from the sun's rays) → quyosh nurining ta'siri natijasida qoraymoq (sunbathing under the influence of the sun's rays) → quyosh nuri ta'sir etganligi sababli qoraymok (sunbathing due to exposure to the sun's rays), etc. In such statements we have to talk about two types of asymmetries. Firstly, there is a formal and substantive discrepancy in the elliptical utterance itself: grammatically formed, but not complete in content. Secondly, the syntactic-semantic asymmetry between the elliptical utterance and its supplemented, extended forms.

V.B. Kasevich, speaking about units for studying syntax, distinguishing between surface and deep syntax, emphasizes that the subcomponent of surface syntax differs from deep syntax in that it deals with units that do not require relations with semantic structures, and the unit for studying surface syntax is the phrase. A statement, as defined by descriptivists, is the part of speech addressed to the interlocutor, highlighted by the opinions of two sides and the replacement of interlocutors.

V.B. Kasevich considers it appropriate to establish two boundaries in the nature of the statement as a unit. On the one hand, a minimal statement, on the other, a statement that is not elliptical. These two boundaries are interconnected: non-ellipticity means the functioning of an utterance autonomously, regardless of the context, while minimality means the impossibility of a greater reduction of an utterance that has not been subjected to ellipsis [5, 97].

Syntactic constructions, supplemented by lexical units, and, if necessary, transformed and combined, form sentences. Sentences, relativizing in relation to the communicative act and its participants, the text, undergoing ellipsis, form statements.

It can be seen that units of language that are abstract at a high level - constructs, their form supplemented by concrete units - sentences, types adapted in speech to the text, participants in a speech act, situation - statements manifest the dialectic of generality, individuality and particularity in philosophy. Here sentences, contrasting, on the one hand, with constructs, on the other hand, with statements, constitute an intermediate element connecting them. Constructs can be interpreted as a set of possibilities for combining grammatical units, i.e., word forms, and sentences - as materialization, realization of these possibilities. This means that each sentence is the materialization of the semantic and syntactic valences of certain forms of words (word forms).

Just as the semantic and syntactic aspects of words are not always proportional, their semantic valence and syntactic valence differ from each other.

Valence can refer generally to a word, e.g. covering all forms in the paradigm of word forms or interpreting a specific member of a given paradigm. In the first case we are talking about semantic valence, in the second – about syntactic valence. For example, the verb form yozilgan (written) can simultaneously be combined with the words qo`l bilan (with one's own hand) and muallif tomonidan (by the author):

Muallif tomonidan qo`l bilan yozilgan (written by the author in his own hand), but the form of this verb yozmoq (to write) can only be combined with the word qo`l bilan (with his own hand):

qo`l bilan yozmoq (to write with his own hand, but not muallif tomonidan yozmoq (to write by the author).

This means that the content and syntactic valence of sentence members and their speech implementation are also the reason for the asymmetric dualism of syntactic units.

REFERENCES

1. Popova Z.D., Sternin I.A. General linguistics. – M.: AST: Vostok – Zapad, 2007. Pp. 181.
2. Pierce C.S. Selected philosophical works. – M.: Logos, 2000. Pp. 213.
3. Eco U. Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language / U. Eco. – Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984. – X, p. 44-46.
4. Elmslev L. Prolegomena to the theory of language. – New in linguistics. – Vol. 1. – M.: IL, 1960. P. 309-314.
5. Kasevich V.B. Semantics. Syntax. Morphology. –M.: Nauka, 1988. Pp. 97.
6. Nikitina S.E. On semantic ellipsis in prepositional combinations // Problems of linguistic analysis. –M.: Nauka, 1966. P. 142.
7. Nuradilova A.D. Nutqiy savodxonlikni rivojlantirishda leksik birliklar semantikasining o`rni. Mugallim x`om uzliksiz bilimlendiriy. No. 3/2-2022 yil, 10-13-bet.
8. Solntsev V.M. Language as a systemic-structural formation. – M.: Nauka, 1971. P. 109.
9. Martemyanov Yu.S. On the structure of utterances in the language of meaning. – “Problems of formalization of language semantics” (Abstracts). –M., 1964. Pp. 93-94.
10. Bakiyeva, H. (2019). Developing articulation of elementary class students using independent work methodology. European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences Vol, 7(6).