ARADIGMATICS OF SYNTAXEMS REPRESENTED BY MONOVALENT COMPONENTS INSTEAD OF THE PREDICATIVE OF THE CORE 1

Mehribon Mahmudjonova
Samarkand state institute of foreign languages
Teacher of the department of English language

Abstract. This article describes syntaxemes representing monovalent syntactic units, their variants, and the possibilities of combining them with other syntaxemes in English sentences. It was found that the univalent nuclear predicative 1 components express 7 different syntaxemes within the framework of substantiality, 2 different syntaxemes in the processual base, and can combine with 4 different processual, 2 different substantial, and 2 different qualifying syntaxemes. It also provides a brief overview of the development of syntaxeme analysis. The article may be of interest to researchers involved in functional linguistics as well as English language learners.

Key words: syntactic valence, nuclear predicative relation, nuclear predicative 1, substantial, processual, qualifying, identifying, stative, object syntaxeme.

Until now, it was believed that the problem of studying syntactic content was solved within the framework of a concept formed by lexical meanings based on word forms. However, the opinions of researchers regarding the definition of the meaning of this term in grammar differ.

It is known from the history of linguistics that English and American linguists took different approaches to the syntactic analysis of a sentence. Representatives of American structuralism studied grammar on a formalistic basis. This experience of theirs led to the need to focus on semantics at the syntactic level. Z.S.Harris supports chain analysis, putting forward the idea of dividing the sentence structure into elementary sentence fragments and adjuncts based on the distribution method [1], L.E.Longacre also uses the chain analysis method, dividing the sentence into direct participants, following it [2]. The syntactic analysis of a sentence is limited to analysis using the chain method, with the allocation of direct participles. Consequently, this method of analysis is limited by the morphological characteristics of the units involved in the sentence and cannot proceed to the synthesis process. Finally, with the advent of transformed grammar, a method of analysis arose and developed, dividing syntactic units in a sentence into segments and supporting distribution methods. In America and England, manifestations of this trend were N.Chomsky, P. Roberts, E. Bach, A. Hathaway, P.S.Rosenbaum, K. Olaf, Z. Hedde and others [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. Over time, these methods of linguistic analysis have evolved and acquired a special look.

Based on the methods of distributive, transformative, tagmemic, chain analysis in the study of grammatical features, the above-mentioned scientists, including A.I. Smirnitsky, have done notable work. In this research work, the main focus is on determining the valence of syntactic units in the structure of a sentence based on syntactic connections, determining their differential

syntactic, differential syntactic and semantic features and the possibility of their connection with other syntaxes based on certain syntactic connections [9].

When analyzed into components, the valence elements form the external structure of the sentences. In syntactic analysis, such elements cover the internal structure of sentences. But the external and internal meaning of the sentence (*surface and deepstructure*) some linguists try to analyze the device using various conversion methods: "*The deep structure"* this means *the boy is sleeping* if a variant of the sentence is understood, "*The surface structure*" this means *Is the boy sleeping?* the form of interrogation is understood [10]. In this analysis, the formal sides of the proposal are taken into account, limiting the analysis to their allocation to direct participants. This opinion of Chomsky is not fully justified. M.Hoshimov, R.M. Our scientists, such as Asadov, emphasize [11]. The purpose of this article is to analyze the monovalent syntactic units included in the external structure of the sentence, their syntactic relationships and differential syntactic features using modeling methods; to determine the semantics of syntactic units in the internal structure of the sentence at the syntactic level.

Russian linguistics The term syntaxeme first appeared in Russian linguistics. The term "syntactic form of a word" was proposed by G.A. Zolotova in 1980 in the author's work "on the syntactic dictionary of the Russian language" [12]. In it, a syntaxeme is defined as the smallest unit that is syntactically semantically not divided into others. The syntaxeme serves both as an elementary carrier of meaning and as a constructive component of a more complex syntactic device. Features of syntaxem: 1) the categorical semantic meaning of the word; 2) the corresponding morphological form; 3) implementation in a certain syntactic place based on the properties of the first and second. Zolotova G.A. there are also three main use cases and functions of syntaxems:

1. The use of units independently, in isolation.

2. The use of units as a component of the proposal.

3. Conditional use of units as an integral part of the vocabulary.

In this article, syntaxems are explored as a component of a sentence. According to the classification of the second type, syntaxems occupy the following positions in the sentence: 1) the predicative component of the sentence; 2) the predicative of the sentence; 3) sentence extenders; 4) semi-predicative complexing agents of the sentence [12].

Russian linguists used the term syntaxeme to refer to the primary syntactic units of the Japanese language that are incompatible with Russian. In his work "General linguistics", I.I.Meshaninov called the word-bundles "syntactic words" [13]. According to English scientists, in particular A.M. In the works of Mukhin and his students, a syntaxeme is understood as units representing a more general meaning than a word form.

In the process of determining monovalent syntaxes in our study, the linguistic methods created by A.M.Mukhin [14], as well as a number of other scientific studies, were effectively used, and it paid off [15]. Based on this method of linguistic analysis, in English and Uzbek languages, in a simple prepositional structure, monovalent syntactic units are determined on the basis of syntactic connections. A simple sentence, which is the object of research in the analysis broken down into syntaxems, is also compared with other sentences having monovalent elements when determining monovalent syntactic units in the sentence structure. In some scientific studies, it has been recognized that such an approach to the analysis of proposals gives a positive result [16].

When analyzing sentences with monovalent syntactic units, syntaxes are mainly distinguished by categorical differential syntactic and semantic signs of content (syntactic unit denoting a person or object), processality (syntactic unit denoting this action or state) and qualifications (quality,

volume, quantity, degree, syntactic unit representing the situation) are in the center of attention the researcher.

Monovalent elements participate in the structure of a sentence based on a single syntactic connection. In this article, we will try to determine the differential syntactic-semantic features of these syntactic units, assuming that the syntactic unit standing in place of the nuclear predicative 1 (has) in the structure of the sentence, it participates with the help of nuclear predicative communication.

1.   *He'd come home not long before ... (AAPN, 8).*
2.   *he'd be unable to finish his work (AAPN, 9).*
3.   *He'd turned on the fan (AAPN, 9).*
4.   *Another three weeks passed without any news (AAPN, 10).*
5.   *the fire grew brighter in the darkening evening (AAPN, 219).*
6.   *It was these ashes that Rani's son-in-law would pick up the next day (AAPN, 218).*
7.   *He picked up the bottle of kerosene (AAPN, 215).*
8.   *She couldn't have had any sense of the plot (AAPN, 213).*
9.   *The sense of hearing was vital to the sense of participating in a situation (AAPN, 213).*
10.   *The pattern had been broken to some degree (AAPN, 210).*

The elements that took the place of the main predicate 1 in these sentences *he (1,2,3,7), weeks (4), fire (5), son-in-law (6), She (8), The sense (9), the pattern (10)* the category expresses the substantiality of syntactic and semantic features. And in order to determine non-categorical syntactic and semantic features based on examples, it is necessary to determine in the sentence the categorical and non-categorical features of the elements that took the place of the core predicate NP2. If the syntactic analysis does not begin with the elements that took the place of NP2, it is impossible to determine non-categorical symbols from the elements that took the place of NP1.

These sentences contain elements that have taken the place of the main predicative 2 *'d come (1), 'd be unable to finish (2), 'd turned on (3)* from categorical to procedural features, from non-categorical to *'d come* axiom, *'d be unable to finish* axial-modal negative, *'d turned on* represents axial syntaxems. The axial syntaxeme requires that the syntactic unit that took the place of NP1 in the sentence structure express agentiveness. But the Russian scientist N.A.Antipina argues that "modal syntax refers only to axial syntax" [17]. In this context, the elements that have taken the place of the predicative of core 1 represent the agency at the heart of substantiality. The last elements in the sentence *not long before (1)* qualificative negative temporal, *his work (2)* an essential possessive object, *the fan* (3) a substantial object represents syntaxems. The component and syntactic composition of these sentences can be interpreted as follows:

1) He'd come home not long before ...	*SbAg . PrAc . QlfNgTm*
2) he'd be unable to finish his work.	*SbAg . PrAcNgMd . SbPs . SbOb*
3) He'd turned on the fan	*SbAg . PrAc . SbOb;*

The fourth sentence consists of syntactic units that have taken the place of the main predicative 2 *passed* the procedural stative represents syntax because in this sentence *passed* since the verb is used in relation to time, it refers to a state, not an action. It follows that instead of NP1 *weeks* the static component is loaded with a substantial temporal syntax, as well as *weeks* subordinates *Another* additive, *three* since they represent quantitative syntaxems, these non-categorical symbols are also *weeks* loaded into the component. The last subordinate components involved in the proposal *without any news* within the framework of substantiality, a negative style (manner) is a

syntax that serves to indicate how the process has changed. Thus, the syntactic model of the sentence will be:

4) Another three weeks passed without any news	*QlfQun . SbTmStQunAd . PrSt . SbNgMn*

Also in the fifth sentence NP2 came into place *grew brighter* since the syntactic unit expresses a qualitative change, it represents a qualitatively comparative syntax within the framework of qualifying and NP1 – *the fire* the component is assigned a qualification. Subordinate components of darkening procedural axial,*evening* substantial temporal syntaxems.

5) the fire grew brighter in the darkening evening	*SbSt . QlfQltCmp . PrAc . SbTm*

In the following sentence, inversion and the form of stress were applied to reduce the logical emphasis to a subordinate component. Let's convert a sentence into a short simple one using the conversion method:

   6) It was these ashes that Rani's son-in-law would pick up the next day. – Rani's son-in-law would pick up the ashes .

Syntaxeme analysis of a derived sentence. Let's analyze the sixth and seventh sentences. The core of the predicative is 2 components *would pick up (6), picked up (7)* since it represents the axial-modal syntax within the framework of procedurality, the kernel is a predicative of 1 *son-in-law (6), He (7)* expresses agentiveness within the framework of substantiality. Subordinate components *Rani's (6), of kerosene (7)* - substantial posessive, *the ashes (6), the bottle (7)* – a substantive object is a syntax.

(6) Rani's son-in-law would pick up the ashes	*SbPs . SbAg . PrAcMd .SbOb*
(7) He picked up the bottle of kerosene	*SbAg . PrAc . SbOb . SbPs*

In English *to have* the verb has the meaning of posessivity [18] and can be defined using transformation methods such as substitution or conversion to vocabulary.

8) She couldn't have had any sense of the plot → her sense of the plot.

In this sentence, the predicative component of core 2 represents the syntax of negating positional modality within the framework of procedurality, which, in turn, imposes positionality on the NP1 component. Subordinate components are syntaxems that represent degree-quantity (*any*) at the basis of qualifiability, existence/existentiality (*sense*) at the basis of substantiality and possessiveness (*of the plot*) at the heart of substantiality. The syntactic model of the sentence will be:

(8) She couldn't have had any sense of the plot	*SbPs . PrMdNgPs . QlfDg . SbEx . SbPs*

In the next sentence, instead of NP2 *was vital* within the framework of qualifiability, this means qualifiability, and the predicative component of kernel 1 is loaded with this qualifying function, which leads to NP1 – *The sense* the qualification component is loaded with a substantial syntax. A subordinate component in a sentence – *of hearing* represents the procedural possessive syntax.

(9) *The sense of hearing was vital ...*	*SbQlt . PrPs . QlfQlt*

The component of the nuclear predicate 1 expresses the objectness of non-categorical features when it is associated with the verb in a mandatory relationship based on the nuclear predicative connection.

10) The pattern had been broken to some degree.

NP$_2$ in this sentence (*had been broken*) procedural axial-passive syntaxeme, NP$_1$ (*The pattern*) while a substantial object, subordinate components (*some*) qualifying quantitative and (*to degree*) the substance level represents syntaxems. The syntactic model of the sentence looks like this:

(10) The pattern had been broken to some degre	*SbOb . PrAc . QlfQun . SbDg*

It should be noted that there are many difficulties in distinguishing the axial and stative syntaxem represented by the elements occupying this syntactic place, and this issue may be the object of special research.

According to M.M.Boldyreva, in English " *... to be + participle II''* in the sentence structure, the core can express an action or state when the predicative stands in place 2. In his opinion, when expressing the meaning of an action *to be + participle II* in combination with an addition based on a subordinate relationship, the action is conjugated with the preposition of the executive *by*, *to be + participle II* when expressing the state, the actor *by* it cannot be inserted into the device of a sentence with a preposition [19]". G.M.Reichel, however *to be + participle II* talking about the grammatical property of the combination *participle II* emphasizes that it can be an adjective or a verb form, and that its meaning varies [20].

According to A.M.Mukhin, the following can serve as the basis for distinguishing stative and axial syntaxes: a stative syntaxeme can be associated with a locative syntaxeme based on a subordinate relationship. Procedural axial syntax, on the other hand, is associated with both locative allative and locative ablative syntax [21].

Thus, in the English language, the core has taken the place of the predicative 1. syntactic units from categorical syntactic semantic symbols the structure of substantiality includes agentive, object, identifiable, qualified, stative (status), quantitative, possessive syntaxems; in the procedural framework, it was observed that the axial and positional syntax are implemented and associated with the procedural axial, procedural stative, procedural directive, procedural modal axial, substantial identifier, substantial positional, qualifying stative, qualifying-qualifying syntax.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar

1. Harris Z.S. String Analysis of Sentence Structure. – The Hague, 1964. - 358 p.

2. Longacre R.E. String Constituent Analysis. Language, 1960. – V36.–№1– P.163-189.

3. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. 2-nd edition. Berlin – New York: MOUTON de Gruyter, 2002. – 118p. – ISBN 3-11-017279-8;

4. Chomsky N. Deep Structure, Surface Sructure and Semantic Interpretation// In Stainberg and Jacobits. 1971.– P.183-216.;

5. Roberts P. English Syntax.–New York, 1964. - 414 p.; Bach E. An introduction to transformational grammar. – New-York, 1964. – 284 p.;

6. Hathway B.A. Transformational Syntax. The Grammar of Modern American English.– New-York, 1967. – 421 p.; http://www.amazon.com/transformational-Syntax-grammar-American;

7. Rosenbaum P.S. The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions.– Cambridge, Mass: The M.I.T. Press, 1967. – 278 p.; http://www. jstage.jst.go.jp/article/elsjp/45/1/45;

8. Olaf K., Hedde Z. Introducing Syntax. Cambridge University Press, 2017. – 226 p.; https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/pbml/86/kolarova.pdf

9. Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. – Москва: Лит. на иностр. яз., 1957. – С. 8-23.

10.en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_structure_and_surface_structure

11. Золотова Г.А. О синтаксическом словаре русского языка // ВЯ. 1980, №4.

12. Золотова Г.Ф. Синтаксический словарь: Репертуар элементарных единиц русского синтаксиса. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2006. – С. 5.

13. Мещанинов И.И. Общее языкознание. 1940.

14. Мухин А.М. Структура предложений и их модели. – Ленинград, Ленинград отд.: Наука, 1968. – 230 с.;

15. Мухин А.М. Лингвистический анализ: Теоретические и методологические проблемы.– Ленинград: Наука, 1976. – 282 с.;

16. Сафаров Ш.С. Принципы системно-семантического анализа синтаксических единиц.– Ташкент: ТГПИ, 1983. – С. 36-38.

17. Антипина Н.А. Составные синтаксические элементы «модальный глагол+инфинитив» и модальные конструкции в структуре предложений современного английского языка. Автореф. дисс.канд. филол. наук. – Ленинград: АНЛОИЯ, 1974. – С. 11-12. (20с)

18. Xotamova P.I. Ingliz va oʻzbek tillari gap tarkibida posessivlik (egalik) sintaksemalarining qiyosiy – funktsional tadqiqi. // Fil. fan. bo'yicha PhD … diss. avtoref. – Samarqand, 2023. – B. 15.

19. БолдыреваМ.М. Сочетаниеtobe + participleIIсо значением результативного состояния в современном английском языке // Вкн.: Учен. зап. МГПИ Т. 59.– Москва, 1971. – С. 35.

20. Райхель Г.М. К вопросу о грамматическом значении сочетания to be + причастие 2 в современном английском языке. Автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук. – Калинин, 1954. – С. 15.

21. Мухин А. М. Функциональный синтаксис.– СПб.: Наука, 1999. – С. 106