LEARNING A CONCESSIVE ATTITUDE AT THE GRAMMATICAL LEVEL

Rasulova Azizakhon Muydinovna
Teacher
Doctor of philosophy in philology (PhD),
Fergana State University
Fergana, Uzbekistan

ANNOTATION
The article describes the study of the relationship of concessive as an area, its inextricably linked with the meanings of conditions and conflict, the units taking place from the core and periphery of the field.
KEYWORDS: *concessive attitude, area, concessive category, concessive sema, concessive and conflict.*

INTRODUCTION

In world linguistics, the definition of language units as a complex system consisting of certain integrals among the directions that approach them on an anomasiological basis, the analysis of all units of the level by form and content, language and speech has become one of the important issues. Interpretation as a member of a functional-semantic field, inextricably combining tools into one semantic group under the archisemy of condition and concessive, also creates a favorable opportunity to perfectly illuminate the ontological nature of the language.

As a result of the development of society, language is also improving and the problem of enriching Uzbek linguistics with new research methods becomes relevant. Particular importance is attached to the study of high-level units of the language on the principle of "from content to form" through to the meaningful side of linguistic units. The study of concessive and conditional relations as a field of interrelationships is also among such tasks.

In the following years, different opinions arose about certain meaningful features of inaccessibility. But it is necessary to allocate a meaningful invariant, which is unique for the units of the category of invariance, the only method for the semantic expression of these units should be taken into account. Of great importance is the identification of important directions inherent in the development of such tools. According to this, it is necessary to take into account the meaning components that form the meaning of the other than the invariant within the meaning concessive category, that is, the meaning makers [1].

Concessive began to be recognized by the twentieth century as a linguistic concept. This can be seen in French linguistics, in particular in the works of Morel. In it, the attitude of concessive is defined as a conflict, which consists in the rapprochement of two events, which in fact differ from each other. This concept implies the expression of the concessive relationship on the basis of certain language units-lexemes and constructions.

In world linguistics, the words denoting inaccessibility P.M.Grechishnikova, A.P.Makareva researchers like add to the range of sentences that follow the cause, B.V.Lavrov, P.P.Rogojnikova, A.N.Gvozdevs necessarily believe that the views of the sentences that follow, A.A.Vasileva, M.C.Guricheva, T.G.Pechenkina, N.G.Rubsov, Chin Suan Tkhan, L.C.Estrina., N.P.Perfileva researchers like emphasize the similarity of unobstructed and contradictory statements.

Unlike other scientists who covered the category of concessive, P.M.Teremova considers the attitude (situation) of concessive on the basis of three different degrees:

1. Clear-concessive situation. The concessive component retains the non-barrier basis, which clearly reflects the (real) event. In other words, concessive arises when the expected work-the movement, in itself, has a clear result. Such sentences are more than met in the follow-spoke joint sentences.

2. Approximate concessive situation. Even if the concessive component is an obstacle, it shows the non-causal basis as a hypothetical event, as well as a condition that occurs regardless of the outcome of the event.

3. Fixed concessive condition. The concessive component keeps the sema enhancing, as well as the indicator of the manifestation of a high degree of character, action or condition.

P.M.Teremova believes that by looking at the results, there is a two-way relationship – enhancing and causal relationship-and this situation generates three different situations from the above [2].

Analysis of the views on the linguistic field created in recent years in world linguistics shows that there are many different-style interpretations of phenomena that are considered as fields. In particular, in Uzbek linguistics, a lot of serious research on field theory is being carried out T.Mirzaqulov, M.Abduvaliev, Sh.Iskandarova, A.Sobirov, S.Muhamedova, N.Nishanova, M.Hakimova, D.Vaqqosova, H.Hojieva, F.Safarov, B.Qurbanova, M.Ergashova, L.Elmuradova works are from sentence. In each of these studies, the generalization of semesters to one archisema, their grouping under different integral semas and their specificity with differential semas were investigated consistently.

In Uzbek linguistics, the units representing the concessive attitude have not been studied monographically on the basis of the field. However, in traditional linguistics there are terms and concessive conjction, concessive modifier, concessive clauses, the polysemy of joint clauses, which candidate and doctoral dissertations that provide information about. In Particular, A.Azizova, M.Askarova, A.Mamajonov, G.Roziqova research work of such scientists ar noteworthy [3; 4;5;6]

M.Abduvaliev's article" the area of the concessive and the units that make up it" is considered one of the first steps to the study of the sema's "concessive" as a field. The article interprets the synonymic attitude of the combined syntactic means under the term "concessive". Also, in his article, the researcher points out that these syntactic units "differ in terms of stylistic meaning ottencas, emotional-expressiveness power and the degree of their application in different manifestations of speech"[7].

A.Nurmonov, N.Mahmudov, A.Ahmedov and S.Solikhojaeva in the book "the meaningful syntax of the Uzbek language" of there are opinions about the interdependence of the meanings of terms and concessive: "in connection with the condition, the concessive stand close to each other. This is seen in their main means of expression, that is, in the expression of both relationships the suffix -sa necessarily declination is involved. Only in the expression of a concessive relationship – both in conjunction with the -sa, (-da) loading is used, and this overload necessarily weakens the attitude. But it should be noted that the conditional relationship will be available anyway, but it lies on the basis of the non-blocking relationship as a base, not directly. If such a knowledge does not exist, there will be concessive relationship" [8].

Hence, concessive includes a wide range of semantic variability as a functional-semantic category, at the same time it is built on the basis of a complex conditional relationship of different views. In other words, it can be said that in cases of violation of the "unwritten law of the world", that is, in place of the event that it should be, the execution of an unexpected action is expressed in the specified sentences concessive. For example: Even if Akmal was sick, he went to work in the morning. Usually a sick person goes nowhere and lies at home, but the usual law is violated, and Akmal went to work.

Proceeding from this, it can be said that the term "concessive" is in many cases an inalienable link with the meaning of dependence. However, in the attitude of concessive and conflict, it can be seen that the attitude of concessive cannot be replaced by units that express concessive in most cases, even if the attitude of concessive can be expressed by oppositionists. At the same time, the means that denote the meaning of the concessive represent the meaning of the concessive stronger than the units that denote the conflict. In cases where the units denoting the obstacle and the conflict are used together, the units denoting the conflict perform the function of highlighting that obstacle. This means that the conflict forms the periphery of the concessive area and occupies a wider place than this area.

The meaning of concessive is also inextricably linked with the meaning of the condition. The collected materials indicate that in the language units pronoun, which represents the semas "concessive", there is, of course, the semas "term". This means that the semaphore of "concessive" is formed by means of a relative condition that cannot be prevented by an action or condition. This indicates that the role of the conditional sign in the concessive area is at the dominant level. In this regard, it should be noted that both the "concessive" sema and the "term" semas are expressed mainly with the help of the –sa condition declination suffix. In the attitude of concessive -sa suffix is also used in combination with (- da) predicates, although in its meaning a weak, hidden condition is preserved.

The peculiarity of the meaning of concessive is that it generates not only the expected result concessive to the "term", which is expressed among different situations, but also a completely different action or condition.

Proceeding from the above-mentioned points, the area of concessive can be described as follows: the set of units expressed by means of different language means of relations based on the content of cpncessive, while retaining the partial conditional meaning of the object in reality, is called the area of inaccessibility.

Conclusion.

Thus, the area of the concessive is formed on the basis of the expression of the meaning of the concessive of the language tools, the expression of which is different, and the means of expressing the concessive, depending on which level of belonging these language units, are also different in form: on the

morphological level, the word categories and the means that form them.

The concessive area also has its own core and periphery, like other functional-semantic areas. Morphological and syntactic units, which express the meaning of concessive more strongly and more accurately than other semas, constitute the core of the inaccessible area. In cases where this sema is expressed weakly in relation to other semantic relations, the sema of "concessive" takes place from the periphery of the field.

REFERENCES

1. *Ш. Искандарова. Тил системасига майдон асосида ёндашув. – Тошкент: Фан, 2007. – Б. 130-131.*
2. *Теремова Р.М. Семантика уступительности и ее выражение в современном русском литературном языке. – Ленинград, 1986. – С. 70-73.*
3. *Азизова А. Ўзбек тилида шарт ва тўсиқсиз эргаш гаплар. – Тошкент, 1955.*
4. *Асқарова М. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тилида қўшма гаплар. – Тошкент, 1960.*
5. *Мамажонов А. Қўшма гап стилистикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1990. –Б. 110.*
6. *Розиқова Г. Ўзбек тилида синтактик полисемия: Филол. фанлари номзоди дисс... автореф. – Тошкент. 1999. – Б. 24.*
7. *Абдувалиев М. Тўсиқсизлик майдони ва уни ташкил этувчи бирликлар // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 1988, 4-сон.. –Б. 69.*
8. *Нурмонов А., Маҳмудов Н., Аҳмедов А., Солихўжаева С.. Ўзбек тилининг мазмуний синтаксиси. –Тошкент. Фан, Б. 278-279.*