

## Linguistic methods used in the study of the speech device of indefinite pronouns

Qobil EGAMNAZAROV<sup>1</sup>

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

### ARTICLE INFO

#### **Article history:**

Received January 2021

Received in revised form

15 January 2021

Accepted 20 February 2021

Available online

7 March 2021

#### **Keywords:**

Structure, syntactic connection, subject, predicate, method, distributive, component, syntaxeme, transformation, differential, syntactic and semantic character, functional model.

### ABSTRACT

In modern linguistics studied the distributive analysis of the speech device, the method of direct division into participants, methods of analysis, transformation, substitution, components and syntaxemes, the linguistic methods of Uzbek and world linguists on the syntactic analysis of the speech device. In defining syntaxemes, in addition to the sentence being analyzed, the functional status of elements that occur in the same syntactic position in another sentence is also compared. In the analysis of the speech device, the process of syntactic analysis, as well as the systematic relationship of syntaxemes and their variants serve as basis for the comparative study of indefinite pronouns in different structural languages.

2181-1415/© 2021 in Science LLC.

This is an open access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

## Ноаниқ олмошларнинг гап қурилмасини тадқиқ этишда фойдаланилган лингвистик методлар

### АННОТАЦИЯ

#### **Калит сўзлар:**

тузилиш, синтактик алоқа, субъект, предикат, метод, дистрибутив, компонент, синтаксема, трансформация, дифференциал, синтактик ва семантик белги, юнкцион модел.

Ҳозирги замон тилшунослигида гап қурилмасини дистрибутив таҳлили, бевосита иштирокчиларга ажратиш методи, трансформация, субституция, компонентларга ва синтаксемаларга ажратиб таҳлил қилиш методлари, гап қурилмасининг синтактик таҳлили борасидаги ўзбек ва жаҳон тилшунослигидаги олимларнинг лингвистик методлари ўрганилган. Синтаксемаларни аниқлашда таҳлил қилинётган гапдан ташқари, бошқа гапдаги бир хил синтактик ўринда келган элементларнинг функционал мақоми ҳам қиёсланади. Гап қурилмасини таҳлил қилишда синтаксемаларга ажратиб таҳлил қилиш жараёни, шунингдек, синтаксемаларнинг систем муносабатларини ва

<sup>1</sup>Independent researcher, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Deputy Dean for Academic Affairs, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

уларнинг вариантларини ажратиш турли тизимли тилларда ноаниқ олмошли гапларни қиёсий тадқиқ қилиш асосий база сифатида хизмат қилади.

## Лингвистические методы, применяемые при изучении речевого аппарата неопределенных местоимений

### АННОТАЦИЯ

#### Ключевые слова:

структура, синтаксическая связь, субъект, предикат, метод, дистрибуция, компонент, синтаксема, трансформация, дифференциальные синтаксические и семантические признаки, юнкционные модели.

В современной лингвистике изучаются дистрибутивный анализ речевого устройства, метод прямого разделения на участников, методы анализа, преобразования, подстановки, компонентов и синтаксисы, лингвистические методы узбекских и мировых лингвистов по синтаксическому анализу речевого устройства. При определении синтаксисы, помимо анализируемого предложения, также сравнивается функциональный статус элементов, которые встречаются в одном и том же синтаксическом позиции в другом предложении. При анализе структуры речи процесс синтаксического анализа, а также систематическая взаимосвязь синтаксис и их вариантов служат базой для сравнительного изучения неопределенных местоимений в разных структурных языках.

It is well known that in world linguistics it is common in all practical and theoretical grammars to analyze the syntactic analysis of the speech device mainly by dividing the syntactic units into primary and secondary parts [Jigadlo et al. 1956; Sov.rus.yaz. 1979, Gulomov, Askarova, 1987, Tojiev, 2005]

In this regard, some English scholars point out that only the possessive in the sentence structure distinguishes it and adds a predicate to the other parts of the sentence. According to H. Whitehol: "The reporter gave the lady a present" in the sentence "the reporter" - "subject", "gave the lady a present" - "predicate" and "the lady" - "inner complement", "a present" - analyzes a sentence using "external complement" methods [Whitehall, 1956, 36-34], while P. Roberts models it according to the morphological expression of the units involved in the sentence structure [Roberts, 2008].

Another group of linguists, recognizing only the main parts, morphologically classifies the secondary parts with the term "modifiers" as follows: a) attributive Adjective Modifiers, which modify a noun or pronoun; b) Objective Modifiers which modify a verb, an adjective or an adverb; c) Adverbial Modifier, which modify a verb, an adjective or an adverb; [Curme, 2006; Jilin, 1990; Kolshanskiy, 1975]. R.B. Zandword calls secondary parts "Adverbial adjuncts" [Zandworf, 1998].

It is clear from the above considerations that linguists have not yet reached a complete conclusion on the question of secondary parts, although the main parts of speech are fully recognized.

There are two different approaches to this issue in Russian linguistics:

–That is, if F.I.Buslaev and M.V.Badchen came from the logical-grammatical principle, questioning according to the meaning and determining the methods of interconnection of syntactic units [Buslaev, 1968; Badchen, 1986];

–others, relying on the method of morphological expression, argue that word groups arise from the proportionality of parts of speech [Kononov, 1960; Peshkovskiy, 2002; Potebnya, 1958; Shakhmatov, 1948].

Some researchers have replaced the secondary parts with "Semantic distributors, a semantic object, semantic attribute, semantic addressee, independent, determinative distributors, spatially, temporal, conditional, reasons, goals, setting (situations)." V.A.Beloshapkova recommends analyzing the parts of speech into "major and minor". "Major" - the part that forms the predicative part of the sentence, "minor" - units that are not part of the predicative part of the sentence, which in turn are divided into two, ie those that are part of the structural scheme of the sentence and those that are not part of the structural scheme of the sentence. [Beloshapkova, 1977].

Logic linguists recommend analyzing a sentence using linguistic terms such as "subject" instead of "ega", "predicate" instead of "kesim". But in this regard, it is overlooked that the similarity aspects of the subject with the possessive, the cut and the predicate, and their different aspects lead to several problems.

In this regard, the Uzbek linguist A.Nurmonov says: "In system linguistics, the structural elements of a sentence are parts of speech or syntactic position, the elements of the propositive structure are isomorphic to the structure of objective reality, the communicative structure is thematic (known) and rema (new), and the modal structure is objective. and studied in terms of subjective attitudes "[Nurmonov, 1988].

According to N.K.Turniyazov, "The use of the concepts of "ega" and "kesim" which we currently use, with the terms subject and predicate, does not require an explanation that they are logical categories. They are semantically important. Based on this, we can explain all the issues related to the analysis of the syntactic structure of the sentence, which is currently in practice " [Turniyozov, 2013,17].

It should be noted that although these theoretical views have made a significant contribution to the development of syntax, it is clear from the above comments that they did not fully define the principles of division into primary and secondary parts in speech devices and linguistic methods of their study. In distinguishing the types of parts (object, modifier, attribute), the structure of the sentence is artificially plotted in determining the relationship of words in the speech device. This forces us to reconsider the secondary parts of speech. " [Valgina, 1978; Kert, 1963; Kholodovich, 1969; Back, 2008; Bennett, 2005; Ash Asuden, 2005].

Different approaches of linguists to the syntactic analysis of a sentence are observed. In summary, the study of the morphological and syntactic properties of each part of speech takes into account what word group they are represented by, what form the lexical units take, and on what syntactic connection they are connected to other syntactic units. But syntactic relationships remain one of the most contentious issues among linguists. Most scholars have acknowledged adaptation, coherence, and control when referring to syntactic relations. [Pankryatova, 1978; Uzbek Grammar, 1976; Ilysh, 1971; Irtinyeva 1969] The syntactic connections recognized by them are not of a universal nature, as they are generally overlooked in the process of analysis at the syntactic level of the sentence. If we look at them on the basis of linguistic material, it shows that adaptation is a morphological connection, and that adhesion and control are lexical connections based on lexical meanings within phrases. In this work, the syntactic relations "nuclear predicative,

non-nuclear predicative, subordinative, coordinative, introductive" identified by Professor A.M.Mukhin are widely used in a number of scientific studies [Mukhin, 1968; 1970].

In modern linguistics there are methods of distributive analysis of the speech device, the method of separation into direct participants, methods of analysis of transformation, substitution, components and syntax. When linguistic methods are used correctly and effectively in the research process, it is important to distinguish language levels from each other, to determine their interrelationships. For example, when using the method of distributive analysis, it is necessary to distinguish three aspects:

- a) additional or complementary distribution;
- b) the distribution of comparative contradictions
- c) free exchange distribution

The method of distributive analysis can be more widely used at the morphological level of language. At the syntactic level, the characteristics of the whole group are analyzed, not the relative position of the derived word forms in the sentence structure. Such a requirement requires a certain degree of pre-processing of research materials. In modern linguistics, this method can be widely used to determine the position of selected syntactic units in the speech device at the syntactic level, to analyze them into components and syntaxes. When using the method of direct analysis of direct participants, the analysis of speech is mainly continued from the syntactic level to the lower level of the language, ie the morphological level. When analyzed by this method, it is difficult to achieve a positive result in determining the semantic field of indefinite pronouns in the sentence structure. This method can be useful in modeling the morphological characteristics of participants, mainly at the syntactic level, dividing the speech device into the largest and smallest participants. This makes it possible to describe only the external device of the sentence, i.e. the morphological features.

A.M.Mukhin created a method of analyzing a sentence into components and syntaxemes. The mentioned method is widely used by his followers in the comparative study of language units at the syntactic level [Mukhin, 1968, 1980; Usmonov, 1992, 213-216]. It should be noted that when component analysis is applied at the lexical level of the language, according to O.N. Seliverstova, "... meanings, synonyms, variants of lexical units are defined in the dictionary and context [Seliverstova, 1975].

In comparing indefinite pronouns in English and Uzbek, the syntactic units of the sentence are divided into components, their syntactic connections are determined, the differential syntactic features of the components and their syntactic place and morphological features in the sentence are syntagmatically contrasted or contraposition, they can be demonstrated visually using unification and component models. In this method, when analyzing the syntactic units of a sentence into syntaxes, first of all, categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs are identified, on the basis of which non-categorical signs are distinguished according to their position in the sentence.

In defining syntaxes, in addition to the sentence being analyzed, the functional status of elements that occur in the same syntactic place in another sentence is also compared. It is worth mentioning the opinion of Professor A.M.Mukhin: "The object of structural syntax is to analyze the speech device into components, ie to determine the syntactic relationships of syntactic units and to analyze their differential syntactic features. The task of functional syntax is to analyze the syntactic units of a sentence in a paradigmatic direction by syntaxemes "[Mukhin, 2007, 154].

Analysis of a sentence using linguistic methods creates the following possibilities: first, it is possible to study the formal and semantic features of the syntactic units in the sentence structure; second, substantiates the syntactic and semantic classification of sentences; third, in the process of analyzing the elements of a sentence by breaking them down into syntaxes, the system encourages the study of relationships in the syntactic layer. Because each syntax consists of the content of syntactic units, which gives the researcher ample opportunity to determine the paradigmatic sequence of syntaxes; fourth, it opens the way for the use of modeling and experimental observation techniques. Also, the separation of systemic relations of syntaxes and their variants serves as a basic basis for the comparative study of indefinite pronouns in different structural languages.

The above, in our opinion, are vague pronouns are the basic principles of system analysis. Failure to follow these principles may result in a misinterpretation of the selected object.

When methods are used correctly and effectively in the research process, it is important to distinguish language levels from each other, to determine their relationship.

In our opinion, these linguistic methods complement each other in the syntactic analysis of sentence structure using different methods of distribution and transformation methods in the use of methods of analysis of indefinite pronouns into components and syntaxes in the system of unrelated languages.

It should be noted that when analyzing indefinite pronouns sentences by breaking them down into syntaxemes, the cohesive nucleus in the Uzbek language is replaced by predicative1 [HNP1], it does not occur in English. This is not the case in the Uzbek language, if the English sentence is given in place of the components non-nuclear subordinate predicate 1, non-nuclear positive predicate 1.

### References:

1. Жигадо В.Н., Иванова И.П., Иофик Л.Л. Современный английский язык. Изд-во литературы на иностр. языках. Москва:1956. – с. 43.
2. Фуломов А., Асқаров М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. “Ўқувчи”, Тошкент : 1987.
3. Тожиев Ё. Ўзбек тилида гап ва гап бўлақларининг мақоми масаласига доир//Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. Тошкент: №4,2005-49-54 б.
4. Roberts P. English Syntax:A programmed Instruction to transformational Grammar: New-York: Hozcourt, Brace and world, 2008-524p.
5. Whitehall H. Structural Essentials of English: New-York:1956.
6. Curme Y.O. A grammar of the English Language. Vol. 2-3. London-New-York: 2006.
7. Жилин И.М. Вариативность в синтаксисе современного немецкого языка.-иностр. яз. в школе, 1990: №4.
8. Кольшанский Г.В. Соотношения субъективных и объективных фактов в языке. Москва: Наука, 1975- с. 231.
9. Zandvoort R.W. A handbook of English grammar. Groningen: 1998-436 p.
10. Булаев Ф.И Историческая грамматика русского языка. Москва, Учпедгиз, 1968.



11. Бадхен М.В. Понятие пространственный локализации и его интерпретаций в английском языке // Лингвистическая исследования. Анализ синтаксических единиц. Москва: Изд-во АН СССР, 1986.
12. Кононов А.К. Грамматика современного узбекского литературного языка. Ленинград: Наука. 1960.
13. Пешковский А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении Москва: Наука. 2006.
14. Потебня Н.А. Из записок по русской грамматике. Москва: Учпедгиз. 1958.
15. Крилова Т.С. Грамматическая и семантическая структура двухсоставных предложений с осложненным именным сказуемым \ \ Автореф. дисс..... к.ф.н. Москва: 1983- с. 24.
16. Белошапкова В.А. Современный русский язык. Синтаксис. Москва: Наука, 1977- с. 328.
17. Нурмонов А. Тилни системаси ўрганиш ва синтаксиснинг айрим мунозараси масалалари \ \ Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 1988. N5.-Б 22.26.
18. Турниёзов Н.Қ. Гап ва унинг лингвистик табиати ҳақида баъзи мулоҳазалар / Тил ва жамият маданият мулоқотлар. Республика илмий-амалий анжумани материаллари. Самарқанд, 2013-йил 26-27 апрель, 1-китоб, СамДЧТИ нашри, 2013- 17-18 б.
19. Мухин А.М. Структура предложений и их моделей. Ленинград: Наука, 1968- с. 230.
20. Усманов У.У. Компонентный и синтаксический анализ неполных предложений и их применения в сравнительной топологии// общения в исторические проблемы романских и германских языков. Научные труды СамГУ.- Самарканда: 1992- с. 213-216.
21. Селиверстова О.Н. Компонентный анализ многозначных слов. Москва: Наука, 1975.- с. 240.