

ANALYZING SENTENCES INTO COMPONENTS AND SYNTAXEMAS IN THE INTERPRETATION OF SYNTACTIC UNITS

Abdukodirova Yulduz Safaraliyevna,

Navoi State Pedagogical University

PhD student in Comparative Literature, Comparative Linguistics
and Translation Studies

Annotation: As every subject has its own methods and styles theoretically and practically, every theme as a little branch gets own appropriate ways while explaining that theme. Grammar is treated is one of the scientific fields by which learner makes the model of the language. Nearly, students' acquiring depends on teachers' ability. In other words, teachers should be able to use all proper methods of making grammar themes comprehensible. This article is devoted to the problems that arise in the process of learning English grammar, in the process of analyzing the sentence into components and syntaxes. The authors have proposed the solutions to the obstacles on analyzing them thoroughly.

Key words: Component and syntax analysis, distributive, division into direct participants, transformation, substitution, sentence device, syntactic units, semantic features, junctional model, predicative communication.

АНАЛИЗ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ НА КОМПОНЕНТЫ И СИНТАКСЕМЫ ПРИ ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ СИНТАКСИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ

Аннотация: Поскольку каждый предмет имеет свои собственные методы и стили теоретически и практически, каждая тема как небольшая ветвь получает свои собственные подходы при объяснении этой темы. Грамматика рассматривается как одна из научных областей, с помощью которой учащийся создает модель языка. Во многом успеваемость учащихся зависит от способностей учителей. Другими словами, учителя должны уметь использовать все надлежащие методы, чтобы сделать грамматические темы понятными. Данная статья посвящена проблемам, возникающим в процессе изучения грамматики английского языка, в процессе анализа предложения на компоненты и синтаксис. Авторы предложили пути решения препятствий после их тщательного анализа.

Ключевые слова: Компонентный и синтаксический анализ, дистрибутив, деление на непосредственных участников, трансформация, замена, аппарат предложения, синтаксические единицы, семантические особенности, узловая модель, предикативная связь.

**GAPLARNI SINTAKTIK SATHDA KOMPLEMENTLAR VA
SINTAKSEMALARGA AJRATIB TAHLIL QILISH.**

Annotatsiya: Har bir mavzuning nazariy va amaliy jihatdan o'ziga xos uslub va uslublari bo'lganligi sababli, har bir mavzu kichik bo'lim sifatida ushbu mavzuni



tushuntirishda o‘ziga xos usullarga ega bo‘ladi. Grammatika til modelini yaratadigan ilmiy sohalardan biri sifatida o‘rganiladi. O‘quvchilarning bilim olishi deyarli o‘qituvchilarning qobiliyatiga bog‘liq. Boshqacha qilib aytganda, o‘qituvchilar grammatika mavzularini tushunarli qilishning barcha to‘g‘ri usullaridan foydalanishlari kerak. Ushbu maqola ingliz tili grammatikasini o‘rganish jarayonida, gapni tarkibiy qismlarga va sintaksislarga tahlil qilish jarayonida yuzaga keladigan muammolarga bag‘ishlangan. Mualliflar ushbu jarayonda yuzaga keladigan muammolarni har tomonlama tahlil qilish yo‘llarini taklif qildilar.

Kalit so‘zlar: Komponent va sintaksis tahlil, distributiv tahlil, bevosita ishtirokchilarga bo‘lish, o‘zgartirish, almashtirish, gap qurilmasi, sintaktik birliklar, semantik xususiyatlar, birikma modeli, predikativ aloqa.

It is widely known that syntax is a part of grammar which classifies sentences according to the purpose of utterance, structure, form and communicative relation. The term syntax itself is borrowed from Greek language, which includes to study the ways of expressing of sentence, syntactic relations between lexical units in the structure of the sentence and investigates the sentence dividing into the primary and secondary parts of it. It is known that syntactic connection is given with the term syntactic relation in the traditional grammars. Syntactic connections are agreement, joinment and government whereas syntactic relations are attributive, objective and adverbials. But according to the view of points of Ilyish, those syntactic connections and relations are seen in the analyses of word combinations but not in the syntactic analyses of the sentence structures. Moreover, some English linguists studied syntactic connections in the sphere of word combinations and sentence structures. Consequently, the words are divided into depended (adjunct+ words) and head words, and syntactic relation or connection may be two types: coordinative or subordinative. Besides those in the composition of word combination may be agreement (concord) and government. To illustrate, on the base of agreement between heed and adjunct words the morphological category of number can be seen: this book, these books. Government expresses that the head word dominates adjunct word. Take the followings as examples: a house’s garden in this composition the unit house’s is governed by the head “garden” or in the sentence She respects him the unit him is governed by the transitive verb respects. There are no any considerations about joinment in the literatures of grammar. But some grammarians mentioned the joinment and wrote that association may be certain without any morphological measures. For example: hand watch, house work and etc.

Modern linguistic analysis methods occupy an important place in the analysis of language materials. In the analysis of syntax materials, methods such as distributive, direct division into participants, transformation, substitution, analysis into components and syntaxes are effectively used. It is known that the use of these methods in the analysis of the selected topic also requires special skills. When using the method of distributive analysis, it is important to distinguish between its 3 main phenomena:

1. Additional and complementary distribution;
2. Comparative contrast distribution;
3. Distribution of free replacement.

The method of distributive analysis analyzes the language units at the morphological level, while at the syntactic level, in contrast, the signs of the language are generally analyzed more in the group state. The analysis of the direct participants consists mainly of the analysis of language units into the largest type of two parts and small parts and its morphological



modeling. The internal meaning and structure of the sentence appears as a result of the transformation method studying the relationship between the meaning and the form of the sentence. This is expressed in the source "English transformational grammar" as follows: "...the meaning of a sentence is conveyed by its deep structure; the form of a sentence is given by its surface structure". [Roderick A., 1968.]

We know that as a result of researching the external and internal structure of the sentence within the framework of descriptive linguistics, Professor Mukhin developed a method of analyzing the sentence by dividing it into components and syntaxes. So, what is the analysis by dividing it into components? What are its functions? Analyzing into components means analyzing the syntactic relations of the syntactic units involved in sentence devices based on junctional models, describing their differential syntactic features and morphological features through component models. O.N. Seliverstva says that the method of component analysis, when viewed at the lexical level of the language, "...consists of determining the meanings, synonyms, variants, antonyms of lexical units in the dictionary and context" [Seliverstva O.N., 1975] V.V.Burlakova, the most well-known grammarian, mentioned that there are three types of syntactic connections in the formation of word combinations such as coordinative, subordinative and accumulative. To begin with, coordinative connection can be used between independent lexical units which expresses by means of conjunction i.e. girls and boys, white and yellow. Coordinative connection maintains to connect the depended component to nuclear component. As an illustration, a new wood house, a list of products. In such word combination the nuclear component may be realized in regressive or progressive positions according to depended component.

Accumulative connections are often used to increase the word combinations with other lexical units. For example: (to give) his mother a call or a call to his mother so in those combinations two objects are connected with each other by accumulative connection. In general, syntactical connections are examined on the word combination level. On this print O. Jespersen paid attention in his theory of three ranks. For example: wonderful sunny day in this word combination the last word day, which is evidently the chief idea, may be called primary, sunny, which defines day, secondary, and wonderful, which defines sunny, tertiary. So in this case O. Jespersen took into consideration that on the base of junction the nuclear component's connection with depended components. This combination can be fallen into the following transformation: wonderful sunny day □ the day is wonderful sunny. The results of transformation this sentence is called nexus that the predicative relation between the subject and predicate. But they are not proved enough in the structure of the sentence on syntactic level. In the recent years, while syntactic analysis of the structure of the sentences many linguists paid attention to the syntactic connections. A.M.Mukhin and his disciples worked out the following syntactic connections: Nuclear predicative, unnuclear predicative, subordinative, coordinative, appositive zero predicative, introductory and there are effectively used while syntactic analyzing the structure of the sentences.

Analyzing speech devices into components is mainly syntactic it is also important to distinguish syntactic units from each other, along with identifying connections. The syntactic relations determined between these syntactic units provide a wide opportunity to determine the differential syntactic features of the components involved in the structure of the sentence. In addition to the method of analysis of syntactic components, the method of additional transformation is widely used, because this method plays an important role in determining the main core components of the sentence.



At the next stage of syntactic analysis of the sentence, the identified components differential syntactic-semantic signs are a method of opposition in the paradigmatic direction is determined using. In this process, when identifying syntaxes, the syntaxes in this sentence are compared with the syntaxes in another sentence. An important step in this process is that both the syntactic units in the sentence are divided into components and the syntaxes are based on the same syntactic relationship in the sentence device. The following opinion of U.Usmanov clearly explains this issue: "... not analyzing the syntactic units involved in the sentence device into parts of the sentence (primary and secondary), but analyzing them into components and syntaxes, the form and content of the syntactic units in the sentence a wide opportunity will be created to explain its essence in detail". [Usmanov U., 2004]

Based on these considerations, it is worth noting that the device in question is such following possibilities as a result of analysis based on linguistic methods is created:

- First of all, it creates an opportunity to study the formal and substantive features of the syntactic units in the sentence;
- Secondly, it justifies the semantic classification of sentences at the syntactic and syntactic level;
- Thirdly, in the process of analyzing the elements of the sentence by separating them into syntaxes, it opens the way to analyze their structural relations at the syntactic level;
- Fourthly, based on the methods of linguistic analysis, it creates an opportunity to use the modeling of the speech device and experiment methods;
- Fifthly, the modeling of system relationships of syntaxes, summarizing the results of the research, serves as the main basis for the comparative analysis of sentences in different system languages of the selected object.

When analyzing syntactic units by dividing them into components and syntaxes, sentence devices are analyzed by dividing them into the following primary and secondary parts:

1. Semantic features of syntactic units that come in the place of possessor;
2. Semantic features of syntactic units that come in the place of a participle;
3. Semantic features of the syntactic units in place of determiners;
4. Semantic features of the syntactic units that take the place of the filler;
5. Semantic features of the syntactic units in place of case.

The problems related to the relationship between syntax and semantics arose as a result of the research of linguists with an expression plan rather than a content plan. In connection with this issue, let's analyze the personal pronouns in the possessive position according to the traditional syntactic aspect and separate them into components and syntaxes:

- He plays;
- He is a sportsman;
- He is confident;
- He is strong;
- He is thirty.

After looking at these examples, we can conclude that the possessive pronoun is represented by the third person singular form, regardless of the language in which it is given. But here some questions arise during the analysis of the section. For example, in the combination He reads, the verb reads can be analyzed as simple participle, third person singular, and imperfect form of the present tense verb. Here, the syntactic units in the sentences "is a sportsman", "is confident", "strong" and "is thirty" can be analyzed as participles with content. It is true that "is a sportsman" is a compound noun, and if the words "confident" and "strong" are



characteristic of the adjective and "thirty" group, there are reasonable questions about how these compounds can be participles. It is clear that these compounds are connected on the basis of predicative relation. If we analyze the above-mentioned examples in terms of components, the sign NP1 denotes the owner of the sentence (derived from the word N-nuclear, which means the nucleus, P1- the owner of the sentence is determined by the participle), and the sign NP2 denotes the part of the sentence. [Mukhin A.M., 1968]

We know that it is appropriate to express syntactic units represented by independent word groups using capital letters: S-noun, VF-personal form of the verb, Pnp- plural pronoun, A-adjective, Nu-number, auxiliary elements, i.e. A copula-c-conjunction is represented by small symbols like a verb, and can be illustrated with examples through component models as follows.

1. He plays. NP1.NP2

Pnp Vf

2. He is a sportsman NP1.NP2

Pnp cS

3. He is confident NP1.NP2

4. He is strong Pnp Ca

5. He is thirty NP1.NP2

Pnp cNum

According to A.M. Mukhin, procedurality is a process, a syntactic unit representing an action or a state; Substantiality is the representation of a person, object, noun, verb, etc., qualification is the sign, number, state, and manner of action of an object or person. We know that the participle is the main part of the sentence that expresses predicativeness, and it is morphologically diverse. [Mukhin A.M., 1980]

They can be expressed in English as follows:

- With a simple verb: she started
- With the impersonal form of verb+verb: a mother began to cook
- With modal verb+infinitive: I have to leave
- To be+with adjective II: she is
- To be+ot: she was a teacher
- To be+adjective: the late was reasonable
- To be with number: he is twenty
- To be+with adverb: she'll be back
- To be+with pronoun: the book is his

It is known that the determiner is considered one of the second-level clauses, and it is connected to the syntactic units represented by nouns and predicates in the sentence. Unlike other second-level clauses, verbs such as the determiner case and complement It is connected to the horse, not 1. That is, the complement and case are always connected to the participle as an independent part of the sentence, and the determiner is considered a part of the compound in the sentence and is subordinate to the possessive, participle, complement, case and even the complement. In the traditional practical and theoretical grammars of linguists, determiners are analyzed only morphologically, the sentences they are part of are divided into components and syntaxes, and semantic analysis is not carried out at the syntactic level:

1. The old man opened the window.

2. She has been thirsty for many hours.



3. The two tables formed the letter T.
4. They had a dinner in a Palace restaurant.
5. He heard a boy screaming.
6. The pupils in the lesson were laughing.
7. The girls upstairs cleaned them at once.
8. I have time to rest.
9. They were both speaking.
10. I appreciate, Miss Clark.

We analyze these sentences by dividing them into components and syntaxes at the syntactic level. The old man opened the window. In this sentence, the syntactic unit "before" is subordinate to the owner of the sentence and is connected to the owner on the basis of a subordinate relationship. The determining element is the main component, which is defined in relation to any part of the sentence. "Man"-substantial shows agentivity in relation to the section, "opened" represents procedural action, "the window"-substantial object expresses syntaxes.

He has been thirsty for many hours. In the sentence, the many component is subordinate to the subordinate component hours and is connected to it with a subordinate relation. In the third sentence, the two tables formed the letter T, the syntactic unit that came in the place of the determiner, the two- came in the place of the non-nuclear subordinate component, and was subordinate to the NP1 (tables) component of the sentence, and connected with it in a subordinate relationship, it represents a qualitative-quantitative syntax. In the sentence "The pupils in the lesson were laughing", it is far from the truth that the unit "in the lesson" is defined as a determiner, because this sentence falls under the following transformation of addition and substitution: The pupils in the lesson were smiling - the pupils had been in the lesson who were laughing or the pupils who were in the lesson they were laughing.

As for the component and syntax analysis of the last sentences, syntactic units such as they were speaking, I appreciate, Miss Clark are interpreted as a type of determiner, i.e. interpretive in traditional grammars, but based on the syntactic relations of such syntactic units in the sentence device no information can be found about differential syntactic and syntactic-semantic signs. In this regard, "It is noted in the scientific literature that according to the grammatical nature of the interpreter, there are two types of opinions, that is, one of them is a form of the interpreter-determiner, and the second is a secondary part of the sentence, unlike the interpreter-determiner." [Severyanova V.A., 1973] In the next part, we will talk about the filler, and the filler is one of the second-level clauses. It is stated in the sources.

In traditional grammars, fillers are usually divided into mediated and non-mediated fillers, complex and blood-relative fillers. In particular, we can see that there are many examples of the type of complement such as complex and blood relatives. In the sources of traditional grammar, the complex filler is defined as follows: "Complex filler is structurally composed of two components, the second component has a predicative relation to the first." In this brochure, it is emphasized that the component of the complex complement forms a single indivisible unit and is considered a part of the sentence. The definition of a part of the sentence in the last sentence does not correspond to the situation that the second component has a predicative relationship with the first component. One of the main reasons for this is that the syntactic relations between the so-called complex filler units and their differential syntactic and differential syntactic-semantic signs have not been thoroughly studied. Let's look at the examples below and analyze them by component and syntax:



- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-----|-----|
| 4. | My grandfather was a doctor | NP1 | NP2 |
| | | S | Cs |
| 5. | The lie was trustable | NP1 | NP2 |
| | | S | cS |
| 6. | She is twenty | NP1 | NP2 |
| | Pnp cNum | | |
| 7. | We'll be back | NP1 | NP2 |
| | Pnp cAdv | | |
| 8. | You are mine | NP1 | NP2 |
| | Pnp cPnps | | |

The phrase "an inspector began to question" in the second sentence is interpreted differently by English linguists in different literature. In particular, some scholars interpret them as compound verb aspect participles, others consider them as complex verb participles, and others consider them as the second part of the participle, that is, the function of filling impersonal forms of the verb from secondary parts. [Iyish B A., 1971]

In conclusion, it should be noted that during the creation of the article, the main shortcomings are analyzed in the syntactic analysis of the sentence by separating the primary and secondary clauses. The syntactic analysis of the sentence is based on specific linguistic methods, i.e. the method of analysis by dividing it into components and syntaxes, the method of distributive analysis and the methods of transformational analysis. analysis based on models, although briefly, was explained based on factual materials.

Literature:

1. Roderick A. Jokobs ,Peter S. Rosenbaum, Paul M. Postel. English Transformational Grammar. London, 1968.
2. Seliverstva O.N. Component analysis of polysemous words. Moscow, 1975.
3. Usmanov U. A new approach to speech analysis, SamDChTI, Samarkand, 2004.
4. Mukhin A.M. Sentence structure and their models. Leningrad 1968.
5. Mukhin A.M. . Syntaxeme analysis and problems of language levels. Leningrad, 1980.
6. Severyanova V.A. Application in contemporary English language. AKD, Leningrad, 1973.
7. Buranov J. Comparative grammar of English and Uzbek languages. Tashkent, 1973.
8. Iyish B A. The Structure of Modern English. Leningrad, 1971.
9. Danieva M.J. Derivative-functional and text-forming features of noun phrases in English. Name. diss. autoref., Samarkand, 2012.