

## SEPARATION OF ELEMENTS INSTEAD OF VERBS INTO SYNTAXEMAS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Melieva Nargizakhon Bahodirovna

Lecturer, Tashkent Renaissance university

Safarova Jasmina Shuxrat qizi

Student, 1st course of Tashkent Renaissance university

**Abstract:**the aim of this article is to determine the differential syntactic and semantic features of the elements in the place of the participle, their typology and to find the forms of isomorphism and allomorphy of the syntactic elements in the place of the participle in both languages, to explain their expression options, and it consists in clarifying that it can be combined with differential syntactic and semantic symbols by means of syntactic relations. In determining the differential syntactic-semantic features of the elements that are part of a scientific article, work is carried out based on junctional and component models, and the analysis of sentences by dividing them into components and syntaxes complements each other.

**Key words:**syntactic-semantic, differential syntactic, syntax, procedurality, substantiality and qualification

There are different approaches to cut semantics. Some scientists emphasize that the semantic understanding of a clause is manifested only in its semiotic interpretation, while others show that the semantics of units in a sentence can be determined through a structural hierarchy. In addition, it is possible to find opinions that emphasize that the semantics of each element in a sentence depends on its use in speech.

In the analysis of syntaxes, it is important that we can see the situation where various differential syntactic and semantic signs are embodied in the sentences falling into the same junction and component models. In general, the analysis of the elements in the sentence by separating them into syntaxes is manifested in the determination of the semantic field of each element in one place or another in the syntactic layer. For example, a certain element can appear in different places in sentences with different components in both languages and have different semantic fields. If we take the English word a pen and the Uzbek word ruchka, we can witness the above-mentioned idea in the following sentences:

1. I buy a pen. Men ruchka sotib olaman.
2. A pen writes. Ruchka yozadi.
3. I write with a pen. Men ruchka bilan yozaman.

If we proceed from the lexical meaning of the words a pen, ruchka, these words express an object, but have a different semantic field in the syntactic layer. In the first sentence, the words “a pen” and “ruchka” have substantiality from categorical signs, and object from non-categorical signs, and in the second sentence, they receive the sign of agency (performer of action). In the third sentence, in addition to the sign of substantiality, the words with a pen have the sign of instrumentality. The syntax models of these sentences are as follows:

In English:

- (1) SbAg. PrAc. SbOb;
- (2) SbAg. PrAc;
- (3) SbAg. PrAc. SbIns.

In Uzbek:

- (1) SbAg. SbOb. PrAc;
- (2) SbAg. PrAc;
- (3) SbAg. SbIns. PrAc.

It can be seen that the words "pen" and "pen" have substantiality from categorical signs in sentences of both languages in the syntactic layer, while non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs embody the signs of objectivity, agency, instrumentality in different places. However, in this work, only the syntactic units that appear in the place of participles are studied on the example of sentences in both languages. The analysis is divided into syntaxes, mainly based on three categorical signs, i.e. procedural, substantial and qualitative. Based on them, several non-categorical signs of

syntactic units are determined. Therefore, the above-mentioned categorical symbols in the work are 1) typology of procedural syntaxes that replace NP2; 2) typology of substantive syntaxemes replacing NP2; 3) Qualifying syntaxes that take the place of NP2 are described by dividing them into groups like typology.

In the analysis of the syntactic elements of the sentence into syntaxes, one of the other categorical signs, qualification, takes an important place. This sign can basically represent the quality, quantity or condition of an object or person. Qualitative differs from categorical signs in that it means one or another sign or feature of a syntactic element, in contrast to procedural and substantive signs. The representation of all three categorical symbols is different, that is, they can be represented by different sets of words. That is why substantiality should not be confused with nouns from word groups, because substantiality can be expressed by nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numbers, and even adverbs. And procedurality, as noted by J. Maruzo, means an action or a state, and is also expressed by personal and impersonal forms of the verb, and in some cases, by word groups.

So, qualification can be expressed by different sets of words and differs from substantiality and procedurality by its non-categorical features. When analyzing factual materials, we can find differential syntactic-semantic signs such as qualitative, qualitative-comparative, qualitative-negative, qualitative-stative, qualitative-temporal, stative-negative, quantitative, quantitative-elective from non-categorical signs based on the categorical sign of qualification.

If we consider the feature of stativeness in the morphological layer based on the material of the English language, considering it as a separate word group as a case category leads to a lot of difficulties. That is, if it is analyzed in depth, we will come across two different opinions. Some linguists believe that the words asleep, alike, afraid given with the prefix a- also represent the status category, while others, taking into account semantic and syntactic signs, in addition to the morphological principle when classifying words into categories, consider that a- is not a prefix words, i.e. glad, sorry, ill, etc., are synonymous with words expressing the state, according to O.E. Filimonova, the state of the subject or person in the sentences is not only through the words or adjectives representing the state category, but also through the conjunction. It can also be expressed by combinations such as “verb+preposition+noun”: to be in fear, to be in pain, to be in trouble.

According to F.G. Ishakov, the qualifying-stative syntaxes that take the place of NP2 in sentences are mainly expressed by verbs in the Uzbek language. But the meaning of the situation can be expressed through other word groups. For example: 1) Erkak orzularga to‘la (TMK, 321); 2) Eshik lang ochiq (PQYU, 40); 3) Qish chillasi avjida (PQYU, 119); 4) Miyasi joyida (JAB, 26); 5) Men sendan o‘la-o‘lguncha minnatdorman (SHOZ, 226).

In the Uzbek language, when the qualifying-stative syntax occurs in the place of NP2 in the sentence, the nucleus is connected with the substantive syntax loaded with the case marker in the place of NP1 based on the predicative relation. The qualitative-stative syntax can be connected with the following syntaxes on the basis of the subordinate relationship: with the qualitative-comparative syntax: Xashaklar ko‘rpaday yastangan (JAB); with temporal-limiting syntax: Men sendan o‘la-o‘lguncha minnatdorman (SHOZ, 226). Kvalitativ sintaksema bilan: Eshik lang ochiq (PQYU, 40).

As it turns out, in English and Uzbek languages, the situation of connection with the substantive syntax loaded with status on the basis of predicative communication is similar to each other, but if the qualifying-stative syntax based on subordinate communication is connected with different regional syntaxes in English, In the Uzbek language, it is noticeable that this situation is quite limited.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

1. Cook G. Discourse and Literature. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. – P. 242.
2. Теньер Л. Основа структурного синтаксиса: Перевод с франц. - Редкол.: Г.В.Степанов (Предисловие) и др.- Вступ. статья и общ. ред. В.Г.Гака. - М.: Прогресс, 1988. – С.53.
3. Gruber J.S. Lexical Structures in Syntax and Semantics. – Amsterdam, 1996. – P. 48-49.
4. Мухин А.М. Синтаксемный анализ и проблемы уровней языка. – Л.: Наука, 1980. – С. 155.



5. Исхаков Ф.Г. Имена действия и состояния в современном узбекском языке (формы на – и(ш), -моқ, -(у)в): Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. - Самарканд: СамГУ, 1960. – С. 12.
6. Марузо Ж. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Лит. на иностр. языке, 1960. – С. 136.