

## THEORETICAL INTERPRETATION OF PHRASES IN A SENTENCE MODEL

Shodiev San'at Ergashevich

Acting Professor of the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

**Abstract:** The article is devoted to the study of fixed combinations in the form of sentences, phrases, and their study in linguistics in foreign linguistics. It analyzes the specific features of fixed combinations, phrases, and freely constructed sentences in the sentence structure. Also, the interpretation of fixed combinations in the sentence pattern is discussed, and special attention is paid to the issue of determining the functional boundary between a fixed sentence and a sentence. The researcher presents their conclusions using the examples given in this article.

**Keywords:** phrase, idiom, fixed phrase, sentence phrase, communicative phrase, nominative phrase, syntactic phrase

## INTRODUCTION

One of the prominent American structuralists who studied language based on pure grammatical rules is Zellig Harris. Z. Harris put forward the idea that the sequence of different types of sentences and complex structures consist of one sentence or the transformation of another. In his opinion, transformation transforms a sentence into a noun group, an adjective group, or a compound and subordinate clause<sup>1</sup>. In this type of sentence analysis, the terms "transformation" and "transforma" are used. In transformation, it is assumed that the given sentence transitions to another transformation as a result of the transformational synthesis operation: The director is putting on a new stage - The director put on a new stage - The director put on a new stage - The director put on a new stage. We touched upon the possibilities of transformation when covering the scientific views of N. Chomsky, but it should be noted that even in this theory of Z. Harris, the presence of flaws is noticeable. For example, transformation cannot always be used to determine the syntactic or semantic structure of syntactic devices. In particular, the syntax and semantics of words larger than a sentence are analyzed not through transformation, but through the theory of derivation. Indeed, derivation is comprehensive, and transformation is one of its working mechanisms. Although the theory of derivation was substantiated somewhat earlier than descriptivism, it subsequently split into large branches. While Y. Kurilovich used derivation in word formation and sentence formation, today the syntax and semantics of micro- and macrottexts are also studied through this theory. The noteworthy aspect of the issue is that the existing forms of language and speech units have been studied by Uzbek linguists and are being resolved in the Samarkand School of Derivatology, founded by the famous scientist N.K. Turniyozov<sup>2</sup>.

1 See: Мамедова К.Г. Метод трансформации в описательной лингвистике // Вісник університету імені Альфреда Нобеля, 2020. – №2. – С.206-211.

2 See: Турниязов Н.К. Синтаксическая деривация гипотаксиса в современном узбекском языке: Дисс.док...филол.наук. – М.: Институт языкознания АН СССР, 1986; Бобоев У.Н. Синтаксическая деривация придаточного предложения времени в современном узбекском языке (в сопоставлении с французском языком): Дис.кан...филол.наук. – Алма-ата, 1992; Гаффаров А.А. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида парцеллятив ва иловали курилмаларнинг синтактик деривацияси: Филол.фан.номз...дисс. – Самарқанд: СамДУ, 1997; Турниёзов Б.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик курилмалар деривацияси. Монография. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2006; Турнёзов Н.К., Турниёзов Б.Н., Турниёзова Ш.Н. Ўзбек тили деривацион синтаксиси. Монография. – Тошкент: Наврўз, 2011; Раҳимов А.С. Лексик ва

The issue of syntactic derivation is highlighted in the doctoral dissertation of our teacher N.K.Turniyozov "Syntactic derivation of hypotactic constructions in modern Uzbek," and the author understands syntactic derivation as the formation of a phrase or sentence from various constructive elements united in a single syntagmatic series according to the laws of syntactic subordination and having a relatively limited sequence. N.K.Turniyozov, analyzing factual materials of the Uzbek language, comes to the conclusion that the transformation of a certain device leads to the emergence of new syntactic connections. The scientist rightly emphasizes that the sphere of influence of syntactic derivation cannot be determined only in the sentence pattern, and that derivational expansion constitutes a paradigm of syntactic derivation methods<sup>3</sup>. Indeed, the scope of scientific work carried out in the field of derivatology has expanded so much that this circumstance testifies to the correctness of N.K.Turniyozov's reasoning.

U.N.Boboev, based on the theory of syntactic derivation, studied the syntactic structure of a complex sentence with a temporal subordinate clause and presented his scientific views in his candidate dissertation "Syntactic Derivation of a Complex Sentence with a Temporal Subordinate Clause in Modern Uzbek (in comparison with the French language)." He identifies the differences and similarities in the structure of complex sentences with temporal clauses in Uzbek and French. It is emphasized that in the French language, derivation operators have an independent place within the subordinate operand, they are represented by prepositions and subordinate conjunctions, and in the Uzbek language, these operators consist of a collection of various affixes, postpositions, and functional suffixes of the verb<sup>4</sup>. This research by U.N. Boboev is of great importance in the study of comparative grammar of the Uzbek and French languages. Although various topics have been written about the comparative analysis of the Uzbek and French languages, in addition to existing work in the field of derivational syntax, the study of any new topic devoted to the comparative study of these languages has not yet been put on the agenda. It would not be wrong to say that such monographic research works are few and far between.

A.Gafforov, identifying the derivational types of syntactic constructions, proved that appositive and parcellative constructions, following the leading sentence and following it in the same syntagmatic row, are separate syntactic phenomena. In the work, the principles of syntactic derivation of parcellative and appositive constructions are studied, the fact that parcellative and appositive constructions require specific methods of transferring language elements into speech and are closely related to the feature of specificity of speech are highlighted using examples taken from factual language materials<sup>5</sup>. We especially note A.Gafforov as one of the linguists who made a worthy contribution to the field of speech syntax, which is one of the current objects of modern linguistics.

B.N.Turniyazov, in the process of studying the syntactic structure of compound sentences, comes to the conclusion that the current syntactic analysis of the sentence is unfounded. He rightly emphasizes that the use of the term "compound sentence" is inappropriate, that as long as this term is in use, the systemic law requiring the hierarchical relationship of language units will be violated, since such a situation is the basis for the conclusion that one sentence receives

---

семантик деривация муаммолари. Монография. – Тошкент: Наврўз, 2011; Турниёзова Ш.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида матн шаклланишининг деривацион хусусиятлари. Монография. – Тошкент: Extremum-press, 2016; Шодиев С.Э. Турғун сўз бирикмаларининг синтактик деривацияси: Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Самарқанд: СамДУ, 2020; Turniyazov B.N. Kauzativ qurilmalar sintaktik derivatsiyasi. Monografiya. – Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2022.

3 See: Turniyazov N.Q. Ko'rsatilgan dissertatsiya. – B.112.

4 See: Boboyev U.N. Ko'rsatilgan dissertatsiya avtoreferati. – B.13.

5 See: G'afforov A.A. Ko'rsatilgan dissertatsiya avtoreferati. – B.12.

functional activity at the disposal of another. Therefore, he introduces the concept of MSQ (complex syntactic device) and studies it in the status of microtext<sup>6</sup>.

Indeed, a sentence is activated not within another sentence, but within a larger unit in the hierarchy - the text. In addition, in the status of microtext, the studied SSS integratively embodies speech units. Such an approach to the issue helps to clarify the problematic points of text linguistics, which are relevant in our modern linguistics.

X.Z.Xayrullayev dedicates the third chapter of his dissertation "The Relationship of a Word, Phrase, and Sentence to Predicativity" to the study of a sentence and its predicative feature. The study substantiates that, despite the presence of a predicative feature in any type of sentence, it is incorrect to understand it as predicativity, since predicativity is expressed not only by the predicate, but also by all the participating elements of the sentence<sup>7</sup>. Therefore, as X.Z.Xayrullayev correctly points out, predicativity should not be understood only as predicativity. In other words, it is the speaker's attitude towards reality, and modality and intonation are its components. Predicativity can be expressed by a single word or a sign.

The syntactic derivation of a simple sentence in modern Uzbek was studied by G.Kh.Yakhshiboev. The linguist's views differ somewhat from the opinions expressed about simple sentences in traditional research. In his opinion, the derivational features of a simple sentence are directly related to the semantic and syntactic weight of the basic structure. Therefore, when discussing the syntactic derivation of a sentence, it is first necessary to determine the basic structure, and the components of the basic structure have the possibility of semantic and syntactic expansion at the level of the syntactic structure. When the syntactic derivation of a simple sentence is based on its formal expansion, transformation does not play an important role<sup>8</sup>.

It should be noted that G.Kh.Yakhshiboev's dissertation is the first monographic research work in Uzbek linguistics devoted to the problem of syntactic derivation of a simple sentence. This work is considered one of the important theoretical manuals in the structural study of simple sentences.

N.M. Suleymanova, who studied the interrelationship of predicative, communicative, nominative, and propositional features of a sentence, their intersection point, and cognitive-pragmatic features: "The main material of speech is a sentence. The communicative aspect of the sentence should not be considered simply as the formation of the communication process. Communicativeness, first of all, requires a person not only to use the language system in practice, but also to have perfect knowledge of reality. In this regard, the formation of speech is also inextricably linked with human cognitive-pragmatic activity"<sup>9</sup>.

In this regard, it should be noted that N.M. Suleymanova, like S. Kartsevsky, did not distinguish between syntactic and syntactic relations. Because he puts forward the idea that a syntactic relationship is necessary for the formation of a syntactic structure<sup>10</sup>. In our opinion, a syntactic device arises due to syntactic connection. After all, a syntactic relationship is formed only after the syntactic connection of the components of the syntactic structure. Compare: uy,

6 See: Турниёзов Б.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик қурилмалар деривацияси. Монография. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2006. – Б.28-29.

7 See: Хайруллаев Х.З. Сўз, сўз бирикмаси ва гапнинг предикативликка муносабати: Филол.фан.номз...дисс.автореп. – Тошкент, 2001. – Б.15-17.

8 See: Яхшибоев Ғ.Х. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида содда гап синтактик деривацияси: Филол.фан.номз...автореп. – Самарқанд, 2004. – Б.9-11.

9 Сулейманова Н.М. Гапнинг номинатив аспекти ва синтактик муносабатлар: Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс.автореп. – Фарғона, 2019. – Б.24.

10 See: Suleymanova N.M. Ko'rsatilgan avtoreferat. – B.21.

bormoq - uy+ga bormoq (case syntactic connection; adverbial modifier relationship); sen, olmoq - sen+ga olmoq (case syntactic connection; complement relationship).

We briefly discussed some of the work done by representatives of the Samarkand School of Derivatology in illuminating the state of study of the sentence. However, in Uzbek linguistics, there is a wide range of works devoted to the study of speech, in which speech is studied on the basis of different approaches. In this regard, the contributions of our linguists A. Gulyamov, G. Abdurakhmanov, M. Askarova, A. Safoev, B. Urinboev, A. Nurmanov, R. Sayfullaeva, N. Makhmudov, Kh. Usmanova, G. Rozikova, and others were effective<sup>11</sup>. In particular, G. Abdurakhmanov, engaged in the study of compound sentences with conjunctions, notes that their components have relative independence, and this independence appears only in the grammatical plan, in fact, the components require each other in the same environment, otherwise the whole intention will not be understood<sup>12</sup>.

M. Asakarova also acknowledges that the independence of the components of a compound sentence with a conjunction is relative, and says: "If the components of a compound sentence (in particular, a compound sentence) are considered separately, each of them seems equal to an independent sentence. However, they do not have full independence in the composition of the compound sentence. In this respect, it is more correct to call them relatively independent"<sup>13</sup>.

Indeed, the opinions of G. Abdurakhmanov and M. Askarova are valid and are very close to the observations made by B. Turniyazov many years later. The aforementioned B. Turniyazov, taking into account these aspects of the issue, rejects the concept of a compound sentence and puts forward the idea that a single whole requires a complex syntactic device, that is, a microtext, and the introduction of this concept into use is justified in the correct solution of the problem. Therefore, it is no exaggeration to say that the use of the concept of a complex syntactic device has clarified the issue that has been controversial for many years.

B. O'rinboyev, discussing asyndetic compound sentences, states that their components communicate through repetition of sentence parts, tense meaning, and lexical elements<sup>14</sup>. This opinion shows the groundlessness of the prevailing opinion that the components of an asyndetic compound sentence are connected by means of intonation. B. O'rinboyev's observation is noteworthy because it doesn't consider melody as the primary connecting tool. Because a change in intonation cannot cause the connection of elements of the syntagmatic series. For example, let's look at an example: Winter came, melons ripened in the garden. At first glance, the components of this sentence seem to be ideally connected. Actually, it's not like that. Because the components of this device are logically disproportionate to each other. The

---

11 See: Абдурахмонов Ф. Ўзбек адабий тилининг кўшма гап синтаксиси асослари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1960; Асқарова М. Ўзбек тилида эргаш формали ва эргаш гапларнинг типлари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1963; Сафоев А. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тилида содда гапнинг иккинчи даражали бўлаклари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1969; Ўринбоев Б. Ўзбек сўзлашув нутки синтаксиси масалалари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1976; Нурманов А. Проблемы системного исследования синтаксиса узбекского языка: Дисс.док...филол.наук. – Ташкент, 1983; Сайфуллаева Р. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида кўшма гапларнинг формал-функционал талқини: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1992; Махмудов Н. Ўзбек тилидаги содда гапларда семантик-синтактик ассиметрия: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1984; Усмонова Х. Ўзбек тилидаги гап бўлақларининг позицион структураси: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 2009; Розикова Г. Ўзбек тилида синтактик полисемия: Филол.фан.номз...дисс. – Тошкент, 1999.

12 See: Абдурахмонов Ф.А. Кўшма гап синтаксиси. – Тошкент, 1964. – Б.59.

13 Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. – Тошкент, 1987. – Б.163.

14 See: Ўринбоев Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Ўқув қўлланма. – Самарқанд, 2001. – Б.111-112.

question arises: how do we change the tone, how do these components interact with each other? Whether we say this in an emotional tone, in a command tone, or in a questioning tone, the arrangement of the components is logically flawed, so they cannot be connected. Therefore, we have the right to say that in the syntactic connection of the components of an asyndetic compound sentence, the significance of semantic distribution, not intonation, is great.

R. Sayfullayeva takes a critical approach to the classification of compound sentences as conjunctive, asyndetic, and subordinate. In his opinion, a simple sentence has absolute completeness in terms of intonation. After the concept of a simple sentence is transferred to the composite sentence, it loses this property and adapts to the intonation range of the new device. Therefore, it is advisable to say that the components of a compound sentence consist of separate predicative units<sup>15</sup>. This opinion of R. Sayfullayeva is consistent with the opinions of the aforementioned teachers and is important in substantiating the semantic and grammatical features of the compound sentence. R. Sayfullayeva made a great contribution to the modeling of compound sentences with this research. He found that the smallest model of sentence structure is in the form of WPm, and the compound sentence is realized in the form of WPm, WPm.

Thus, in this section, we discussed the state of the sentence and its study, as well as such concepts as predicativity, proposition, actual division, complex syntactic construction, and in the study of the structural scheme of the sentence, we witnessed its comparison with complex semiotic signs, therefore it is studied as a linguistic sign. Indeed, there is no doubt that the sentence consists of semiotic signs. Even larger speech units constitute a set of semiotic signs. Moreover, a sentence, like a word, has both expressive and expressive properties. But these features cannot be the basis for studying it as a linguistic unit. After all, the structural scheme of a sentence does not exist in a ready-made form in human consciousness. If this were the case, we would have no objection to interpreting it as a linguistic unit. Therefore, it is expedient in all respects to study the sentence, which is a product of the dynamic paradigm, as the smallest unit of speech.

#### THE LIST OF USED LIERATURE:

1. Мамедова К.Г. Метод трансформации в описательной лингвистике // Вісник університету імені Альфреда Нобеля, 2020. – №2. – С.206-211.
2. Boboyev U.N. Ko'rsatilgan dissertatsiya avtoreferati. – B.13.
3. G'afforov A.A. Ko'rsatilgan dissertatsiya avtoreferati. – B.12.
4. Suleymanova N.M. Ko'rsatilgan avtoreferat. – B.21.
5. Turniyazov N.Q. Ko'rsatilgan dissertatsiya. – B.112.
6. Абдурахмонов Ф. Ўзбек адабий тилининг қўшма гап синтаксиси асослари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1960;
7. Абдурахмонов Ф.А. Қўшма гап синтаксиси. – Тошкент, 1964. – Б.59.
8. Аскарова М. Ўзбек тилида эргаш формали ва эргаш гапларнинг типлари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1963;
9. Бобоев У.Н. Синтаксическая деривация придаточного предложения времени в современном узбекском языке (в сопоставлении с французским языком): Дис.кан...филол.наук. – Алма-ата, 1992;

---

15 See: Сайфуллаева Р. Ҳозирги ўзбк тилида қўшма гапларнинг формал-функционал талқини. – Тошкент, 1994. – Б.33-55.

10. Гаффоров А.А. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида парцеллятив ва иловали курилмаларнинг синтактик деривацияси: Филол.фан.номз...дисс. – Самарқанд: СамДУ, 1997;
11. Гуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. – Тошкент, 1987. – Б.163.
12. Махмудов Н. Ўзбек тилидаги содда гапларда семантик-синтактик ассиметрия: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1984;
13. Нурманов А. Проблемы системного исследования синтаксиса узбекского языка: Дисс.док...филол.наук. – Ташкент, 1983; Сайфуллаева Р. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида қўшма гапларнинг формал-функционал талқини: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1992;
14. Раҳимов А.С. Лексик ва семантик деривация муаммолари. Монография. – Тошкент: Наврўз, 2011;
15. Розикова Г. Ўзбек тилида синтактик полисемия: Филол.фан.номз...дисс. – Тошкент, 1999.
16. Сайфуллаева Р. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида қўшма гапларнинг формал-функционал талқини. – Тошкент, 1994. – Б.33-55.
17. Сафоев А. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тилида содда гапнинг иккинчи даражали бўлаклари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1969;
18. Сулейманова Н.М. Гапнинг номинатив аспекти ва синтактик муносабатлар: Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс.авторев. – Фарғона, 2019. – Б.24.
19. Турниёзов Н.Қ., Турниёзов Б.Н., Турниёзова Ш.Н. Ўзбек тили деривацион синтаксиси. Монография. – Тошкент: Наврўз, 2011;
20. Турниёзов Б.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик курилмалар деривацияси. Монография. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2006;
21. Турниёзов Б.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик курилмалар деривацияси. Монография. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2006. – Б.28-29.
22. Турниёзова Ш.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида матн шаклланишининг деривацион хусусиятлари. Монография. – Тошкент: Extremum-press, 2016;
23. Турниязов Н.К. Синтаксическая деривация гипотаксиса в современном узбекском языке: Дисс.док...филол.наук. – М.: Институт языкознания АН СССР, 1986;
24. Ўринбоев Б. Ўзбек сўзлашув нутқи синтаксиси масалалари: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 1976;
25. Ўринбоев Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Ўқув қўлланма. – Самарқанд, 2001. – Б.111-112.
26. Усмонова Ҳ. Ўзбек тилидаги гап бўлақларининг позицион структураси: Филол.фан.д-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 2009;
27. Хайруллаев Х.З. Сўз, сўз бирикмаси ва гапнинг предикативликка муносабати: Филол.фан.номз...дисс.авторев. – Тошкент, 2001. – Б.15-17.
28. Шодиев С.Э. Турғун сўз бирикмаларининг синтактик деривацияси: Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Самарқанд: СамДУ, 2020; Turniyazov B.N. Kauzativ qurilmalar sintaktik derivatsiyasi. Monografiya. – Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2022.
29. Яхшибоев Ғ.Х. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида содда гап синтактик деривацияси: Филол.фан.номз...авторев. – Самарқанд, 2004. – Б.9-11.