Syntaxes Representing Indefinite Pronouns Replacing the Kernel Predicate 1 (NP1)

Egamnazarov Qobil Abdunazarovich

Independent researcher at the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: *In this article, the elements of uncertainty in the Uzbek speech device are analyzed in a semaphore. When analyzing speech components for syntax, first of all, categorical differential syntactic-semantic features, "procedural", "qualifying", "meaningful" semantics, as well as non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic features and their paradigmatic series are found definite.*

Keywords: procedural, qualitative, meaningful semantics, external form, internal form, A. Khodzhiev, N. Chomsky, syntactic-semantic features.

Introduction

It is well known that in world linguistics there are different approaches of linguists in the analysis of the speech device. In addition to traditional linguistic methods, with the emergence of N. Chomsky's "Transformational Grammar", the concept of external and internal structures of speech entered linguistics.

In N. Chomsky's concept the idea that the initial form of any sentence is the external [surface structure], the product formed as a result of transformation is the internal [deep structure] device of the sentence. However, on the basis of linguistic methods created by AMMukhin, the internal structure of the sentence, as UUsmanov admits, is a

separate analysis of syntaxes or internal structure of the sentence. determining the possibilities of

obtaining must be the focus of the researcher [7; 105 – 108-б., 8; 35 – 37-б.].

In addition to the sentence being analyzed in the definition of syntax, the categorical and non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic features in this sentence are studied in comparison with the syntaxes in the other sentence. One of the most important aspects is that the syntactic units in a sentence are based on the same syntactic connection, both in the division into components and in the syntax.

It is well known that the term "procedural" means a process, that is, a process, which is opposed to substantive and qualitative features. It is one of the categorical signs and at the syntactic level it also reflects several non-categorical signs such as action (action), passivity (orientation) and staticity (state) [1; 4;303-б.].

The lexical source of the elements representing procedural syntaxes consists mainly of verbs representing different semantics, infinitives, present and past tense adjectives. Some linguists suggest that verbs denoting a state should be distinguished from verbs denoting action, and attribute this feature mainly to the fact that lexical units are transitive or intransitive. [2; 123-б.].

Literature review

According to the linguist A.Khojiev, in Uzbek language "... the verb represents action, state, mental state, biological process" [9; 4-b.]. Thus, on the basis of procedural, it is recognized that the verb expresses an action or a state, but the issue of distinguishing an action or a situation from each other is not sufficiently covered in the scientific literature. However, in our opinion, verbs expressing action and staticity can be distinguished based on their distribution in the speech device and their ability to combine with other syntaxes.

Qualification is also one of the categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs at the syntactic level, and its difference from procedural and substantive is that it reflects a general description of the substance or process. This description can mean qualitative, comparative, static. In a speech device, its lexical source is formed in a set such as quality, adjective elements, number, horse.

According to FMUsmanov, "elements of qualification can be combined with very, how, rather, so, too on the basis of subordinative communication, and in Uzbek very, both, and so on. If a qualification is expressed by a horse, it cannot be associated with the pronouns of show and possession. "[5; 119-б.].

It is incorrect to associate the representation of all three categorical symbols with word groups. This is why substantiality should not be replaced by a noun from a series of words, because substantiality can be expressed even by means of a noun, a diamond, an adjective, a number. In the analysis of the speech device divided into syntaxes, it is taken into account that substantiality is expressed in both languages using different word groups. They differ from each other only by non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic features. Since indefinite pronouns never express procedurality, we examine them comparatively and functionally in the speech device, mainly within the context of substantial and qualitative syntaxes from categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs.

Research Methodology

It should be noted that in comparative linguistics it is important to make a comparative analysis of syntactic divisions of indefinite pronouns in the predicate 1 place in the speech device of the English and Uzbek language systems. In the process of studying the speech device by syntax, first of all, categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs are identified, which cover non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs. On the basis of their identified syntactic connections, the cases of connection with any other syntax are analyzed comparatively and functionally in the system of both non-sister languages. When classifying examples from works of art written in English and Uzbek, the indefinite (indefinite) syntax and their paradigmatic series were identified and compared within the substantive and qualitative syntax of categorical signs.

Linguist OG Vetrova notes that substantiality is one of the categorical syntactic-semantic signs, which is determined by contrasting it with other differential syntactic-semantic signs, ie qualification and procedurality.[3; 45-б.].

In the Uzbek language, two- and three-component simple sentences contain nuclear predicative 1 and nuclear predicative 2 components on the basis of nuclear predicative communication, while non-nuclear dependent components are also represented using subordinative communication.

1. Someone came out [O'H, 228].

2. Something pierced his heart [PQ, 110].

3. Some people greeted him [O'HN, 230].

Someone instead of the predicate 1 component of the nucleus, something, while Allakim represents substantiality from categorical signs, while nokotegorial characters represent agency and infinit

syntax. The nucleus came out in place of the predicate 2, passed through, greeted — expressing the procedural action syntax, the nucleus is

connected to the substantial agent infinit syntax using a predicative connection. The heart of the second and third sentences (2), to which (3) the substantial object represents the syntax, is connected with the procedural action syntax by means of subordinate communication. The syntax models of these statements are as follows:

(1) Someone came out. SbAgInd. PrAc;

(2) Something   pierced   his   heart. SbOb.SbAgInd.PrAc;

(3) Some people greeted him. SbAgInd.SbOb.PrAc.

Linguist O.U.Usmanov states that in defining the object syntax in these sentences "... before defining the substantial object syntax of the nuclear predicate 1 component it is expedient to determine the differential syntactic-semantic features of the syntactic units expressed in the nucleus predicate 2"[6; 58-б.].

Analysis and results

In the Uzbek language examples, it was found that indeterminate pronouns represent non-categorical syntactic-semantic signs within the substantiality from categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs instead of the core predicative 1: agent indefinit, statin-loaded indifinit, object indefinitic, existential indefinite, existential indefinite.

1. *Кимдир тош билан урди (someone hitted with a stone) [CA, 370].*

2. *Кимдир уни ташқаридан чақириб кетди (Someone called him from outside)[CA, 285].*

3. *Нимадир уни ўша томонга тортди (Something pulled him that way) [Ч.А. 292].*

4. *Ҳозир кимдир уни уйига судрайдигандек бўларди (Now it was as if someone was dragging him home) [CA, 453].*

In these sentences someone (1,2,3) instead of the nucleus predicate 1 and something, they represent the substantive agent indefinit syntax. In the first sentence, someone connects the nucleus with a

prepositional participle and expresses the urdi-procedural action syntax, syntactically interacting with the substantive agent indefinit syntax. it represents a substantial instrumental syntax. The syntax model of this sentence is:

1. *Кимдир тош билан урди.(someone hitted with a stone) SbAgInd.SbIns.P$_r$Ac;*

In the second sentence, the nuclear predicative component 1 is also associated with the nuclear predicate 2 component "called" on the basis of the nuclear predicative connection, the "it" subordinate components that are not "outside" the nucleus are connected subordinatively with the nuclear predicate 1 component. Syntactic-semantic features of the components of a sentence: Someone-substantial agent indefinit [SbAgInd], uni-substantial object (SbOb) represents an outside-substantial locative allative, called-procedural action syntax.

2 *Кимдир уни ташқаридан чақириб келди. (Someone called him from outside) SbAgInd.SbOb.SbLcAbl.P$_r$Ac.*

In the third sentence, "Nimadir" instead of N, "pulled" with the N component, the nucleus is associated with a predicative connection, the substantive agent indefinite syntax, and the nucleus represents a procedural action syntax based on a predicate connection.

Coming in the place of the subordinate component, it represents a qualitative locative alluvial syntax and is associated with a procedural actional syntax on the basis of subordinative communication. The uni-component is also subordinate to the torti component on the basis of a subordinate connection, which represents the syntax of the substantial object. The syntax model of this sentence is:

Conclusion / Recommendations

In the speech device instead of the predicate 1 component of the nucleus were identified indefinite

syntax loaded with substantial staticity, indefinite syntactic loaded with substantial object indefinite, substantial existential indefinite loaded with substantial existence.

A comparative-functional analysis of the indefinite pronouns in both language systems instead of the core predicate 1 in the sentence revealed five syntaxes in the Uzbek language. Thus, it was found that relatively indefinite pronouns are used more in English in the Uzbek language. These syntaxes can be explained in the table as follows:

Table 1

Description of these characters:NP1 - Nuclear predicate 1 (yes)

Sb- Substantial,

AgInd-Agentiv indefinit,

ObInd-Object indefinit,

QltInd-Qualified loaded indefinite,

StInd-Static loaded indefinit,

ExInd-Existential indefinit,

Qlt Ind-Qualitative indefinite.

Analyzing the syntax of indefinite pronouns in the Uzbek language instead of the core predicative1 components, the following conclusion was reached.

Categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs of indefinite pronouns were identified in the context of substantiality, qualification, procedural, non-categorical signs and their variants. However, in our article, the syntaxes, which represent indefinite pronouns in the structure of the Uzbek language, are analyzed in terms of their substantiality, qualification, and their non-categorical features. Indefinite pronouns do not occur in Uzbek in procedural terms. In the Uzbek sentence structure, indefinite pronouns, which take the place of the nucleus predicate 1, are expressed as agent, statically loaded indefinite, object, existential, qualitative syntaxes. The cases in which these syntaxes take the form of Uzbek language are clearly explained with examples.

Ўзбек тили

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Ашуров Ш.С. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларида кесим типологияси/ филол.фан.номзоди. дисс-цияси. Самарканд: 2007. – 154б.17

2. Бархударов Л.С., Штелинг Д.А. Грамматика английкого языка: Учебник. Изд. 7-у. – М.: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2013. – 424 с.19

3. Ветрова О.Г. Вокативность как синтаксико-семантический признак// Лингвестические исследования – 1981. Грамматическая и лексическая семантика. Акад. Наук СССР. Институт Языкознания: Москва: 1981. – С. 44-49.28

4. Мухин А.М. Синтаксемный анализ и проблема уровней языка.- Ленинград: Наука, 1980. – 303с.80

5. Усманов Ф.М. Синтактика-семантическая сопостовления двусоставных безглагольных предложений (на материале английского и узбекского языков) / дисс.канд.филол.наук. Самарканд: 2012. – 149с.113

6. Усманов.У., Кучибаев А. Нулевые субстанциальные синтаксемы в позиции NP_1 неполных предложеный английской диологической речи // Функция и семантика

лингвистических единиц Таш.ГПИ им. Низами, Ташкент: 1983. – С. 56-61.114

7. Усмонов Ў.У Гап таҳлилига янгича ёндашув\\ Халқаро илмий-назарий анжуман (СамДЧТИнинг 10 йиллигига бағшланади) – Самарканд. 2004. – Б.105-108.115

8. Усмонов Ў.У Талабаларга синтактик таҳлилни ўргатишга доир айрим мулоҳазалар// Чет тили ўқитиш методикасининг асослари/ Республика илмий-амалий конференцияси материаллари, Самарканд, 2011 йил, 12-13 апрель, СамДЧТИ, Самарканд – 2011. -Б. 35-37.116

9. Ҳожиев А. Феьл. Тошкент: Фан, 1973. – 192 б.128

Used internet resources

10. www.MDU.edu.tw/ssmith/1ing/fall2007.syntax2.ppt.

List of fiction and commentary on abbreviations

1. O'HN - Utkir Hoshimov. "There is light, there is shadow" / novel / "Eternal works" series. T .: "Ilm-ziyo-zakovat", 2019. - 256 p.

2. O'H - Utkir Hoshimov. "Lives in a dream" / novel / "Eternal works" series. –T .: "Sparks of Literature", 2018. - 256 p.

3. PQ - Pirimqul Qodirov. "Starry Nights" / novel / "Eternal works" series - T.: "Navruz", 2019. - 576 p.

4. SA - Said Ahmad. "Ufq" / -T .: "Sano-standart" publishing house, 2019. - 632 b.

5. CHA - Chingiz Aitmatov. The Day of the Century: Translated from the Russian by Asil Rashidov. -Tashkent: New Age Generation, 2018. - 432 p.

6. Sh - Fame. Those who seek heaven. - Tashkent: Gafur Gulom Publishing House, 2018. - 460 p.