GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE COMPONENTS OF WORD COMBINATIONS AND THEIR FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES

Mehrojiddinova Khosiyat Jamol qizi

3rd-year student, Samarkand State University named after Sharof Rashidov

Abstract: This article provides an in-depth analysis of the grammatical relations between the components of word combinations and their functional-semantic characteristics. Types of syntactic connections such as **government, agreement, and adjacency** are theoretically explained, and their role in speech is revealed. The possibilities of expressing meaning in word combinations, their semantic load, and the changes that arise depending on the context are substantiated with scientific examples. As a result of the research, the role of grammatical relations in the formation of meaning is clarified.

Keywords: components of word combinations, system of grammatical relations, government, agreement and adjacency phenomena, means of syntactic connection, functional-semantic analysis, typology of semantic relations, unity of form and meaning, contextual meaning formation.

Introduction

Syntax, one of the main branches of linguistics, studies the structure of words and sentences, their interrelations, and their functions in speech. Word combinations and sentences are two independent but closely interconnected units of syntax. Determining the grammatical and semantic differences between them is important not only theoretically but also practically [1].

In modern Uzbek linguistics, the study of the linguistic nature of syntactic units, especially the systematic analysis of grammatical and semantic relations between the components of word combinations, remains one of the pressing issues. A word combination is not only a building material of speech but also a complex linguistic model that reflects logical relationships between objects, events, and actions in reality [2], [3]. Studying the functional-semantic characteristics of these relations contributes to revealing the interlevel connections of language and the cognitive foundations of syntactic structure.

Issues related to word combinations have been extensively studied by Russian scholars such as **V.V. Vinogradov** and **A.M. Peshkovsky**, as well as Uzbek linguists **G. Abdurahmonov**, **A. Gulomov**, and **M. Asqarova**. In particular, G. Abdurahmonov defined a word combination as *"a syntactic construction formed on the basis of subordinate connection between two or more independent words"* and substantiated the relationship between the governing and dependent elements through grammatical markers such as government, agreement, and adjacency [4]. However, within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics, the relations between the components of word combinations cannot be limited only to grammatical forms. As emphasized in the studies of **N. Mahmudov** and **A. Nurmonov**, semantic valency and semantic compatibility play a primary role in the formation of syntactic connections. The functional-semantic nature of components determines not only their nominative function but also their stylistic and pragmatic possibilities within a sentence. This article analyzes the semantic modification of grammatical means between the components of

word combinations and their realization in speech [5].

In traditional syntax, the grammatical relations of word combinations were mainly classified from a **formal-syntactic perspective** by **A. Gulomov and M. Asqarova**, where government, agreement, and adjacency were taken as the main criteria [6], [7]. However, as noted by **G. Abdurahmonov**, the formation of word combinations depends not only on grammatical affixes but also on the lexical-semantic nature of words and the logical patterns of relations between them.

Methodology

The components of a word combination are at least two independent words connected on the basis of **subordinate relations (semantic and grammatical connection)**. According to their function, they are divided into two types:

1. **Dependent component (modifier element)**

2. **Head component (main element)**

The dependent component is subordinated to the head word and explains or specifies it from various aspects (its quality, quantity, direction of action, etc.). It usually precedes the head word.

For example: **Red flower**

(here **"red"** is the dependent component).

Result and Discussion

The head component is considered the semantic and grammatical center of the combination. It governs the dependent word and requires it to appear in a certain grammatical form. In the Uzbek language, it usually follows the dependent word.

For example: **Red flower**

(here **"flower"** is the head component).

The main differences between the components are as follows:

Feature	Dependent Component	Head Component
Function	Explains or specifies the meaning	Expresses the central concept
Position	Usually in the first position	Usually in the second position
Syntactic Relation	A question can be asked of it (e.g., *what kind? where to?*)	Requires the word that answers the question [6; p.19]

Only independent words (noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb, adverb) can function as components of a word combination. Auxiliary words (such as bilan "with", uchun "for", kabi "like/as") are not considered separate components; rather, they form part of the dependent element and serve to establish the syntactic connection [8].

Methods of Connection in Word Combinations

The connection between the elements of a word combination—that is, the subordinate relationship—can occur in three forms: adjacency (juxtaposition), agreement, and government. The distinctive features and differences of these types of syntactic relations arise from the markers or other means that connect the components.

For example, in the combinations tez yurmoq (to walk quickly), qalamni olmoq (to take the pen), and kitobning varag'i (the page of the book), the grammatical form of the dependent word is often determined by the governing word (qalamni olmoq). In some cases, however, both components determine each other's grammatical form (kitobning varag'i) [9].

Adjacency (Bitishuv)

In adjacency, the connection between words is mainly determined by word order and intonation.

Although there are no morphological markers in adjacency relations, word order plays a crucial role. The dependent word does not change its grammatical form in order to occupy this position; rather, the word inherently possesses semantic and functional characteristics suitable for such use.

Examples:

qizil gul (red flower), oq qog'oz (white paper).

Sometimes nouns can also function as dependent elements without any additional markers:

oltin soat (gold watch), tosh yo'l (stone road).

In such cases, nouns become closer in function to adjectives, numerals, or adverbs that inherently function as dependent elements. This phenomenon is primarily contextual and speech-related, rather than determined by the inherent lexical nature of the words oltin (gold) and tosh (stone) [10].

The following word combinations are connected through adjacency:

Adverb + verb: o'z-o'zidan gapirmoq (to speak spontaneously)

Adjective + verb: yaxshi so'zlamoq (to speak well)

Numeral + noun: o'nta qalam (ten pens), sakkiz daftar (eight notebooks)

Noun + noun: kumush qoshiq (silver spoon), chang yo'l (dusty road)

Pronoun + noun: hamma odam (all people), qanday kitob (what kind of book)

In some sources, combinations where the dependent element is a converb (shoshilib gapirdi – spoke hurriedly) or a participle (o'qigan bola – the boy who read) are also regarded as adjacency constructions. However, in these cases the suffix -ib connects a verb to another verb (shoshilib gapirdi), and the participial suffix -gan connects a verb to a noun (o'qigan bola) [11], [12].

Since these forms are considered lexical-syntactic forms in morphology, such combinations should be regarded not as adjacency relations but rather as government relations.

In adjacency relations, the hierarchical structure between components is mainly determined by word order and positional factors:

(dependent element + head element).

That is, the dependent word precedes the head word, and no other word can be inserted between them. For example, the phrase kumush qoshiq (silver spoon) cannot be transformed into kumush o'nta qoshiq.

Sometimes adjacency may appear to disregard word order:

Majlis bo'ladi – Majlis kechqurun bo'ladi.

However, it should be noted that in this case the word majlis is connected to the verb not through adjacency but through the nominative case.

Thus, word order and intonation play a significant role in adjacency relations. The subordinate relationship becomes evident through the position of words, their grammatical properties, and their meanings.

Expressions such as tezda kelmoq (to come quickly), o'z-o'zidan raqsga tushib ketmoq (to start dancing spontaneously), and birdan gapirmoq (to speak suddenly) should also be regarded as adjacency relations [13]. In such cases, the case suffix has lost its original grammatical meaning and has become lexically fixed within the word. These are words that have historically acquired an adverbial function through case affixes [14].

Government (Boshqaruv)

Government relations function within word combinations that are formed unilaterally in grammatical terms. If only the dependent element receives a subordinating suffix in order to connect with the head element, the word combination is considered to be connected through government.

In this case, the head word determines the grammatical form of the dependent word.

For example, in kitobni o'qimoq (to read the book), the accusative case of the dependent word is determined by the transitivity of the verb o'qimoq. If the verb becomes intransitive (o'qildi – was read), the accusative form disappears:

kitobni o'qimoq – kitob o'qildi [15].

In government relations, the dependent word may be governed by words of different parts of speech:

Examples:

• uyga bormoq – verb government (to go home)

• mendan katta – adjective government (bigger than me)

• tovushdan tez – adverb government (faster than sound)

• o'qishda birinchi – numeral government (first in studies)

• aytgan bola – noun government (the boy who said)

Depending on the grammatical means used, government relations may be classified as:

case government

postpositional government

converb government

participial government

Agreement (Moslashuv)

Agreement is a bilaterally grammatically formed type of word combination. In this case, the dependent element takes the possessive form corresponding to the head element, while the head element takes the genitive or nominative form corresponding to the dependent element.

Examples:

ukamning daftari (my younger brother's notebook)

sizning uyingiz (your house)

Fuzuliy g'azali (a ghazal by Fuzuli)

The term agreement indicates that both components possess morphological markers that mutually require each other.

In agreement relations, the dependent element is called the possessor, and the head element is called the possessed element.

Sometimes the dependent element may appear without a marker, as in Fuzuliy g'azali, and the head element may also appear without an explicit marker:

sizning uyingiz – sizning uy

bizning kitobimiz – bizning kitob

This phenomenon can be explained by the historical genetic relationship between the pronouns siz, biz and the possessive markers -ngiz and -miz.

However, constructions such as ularning kitobi cannot be reduced to ularning kitob.

Functional Roles of Connection Types in Speech

The types of syntactic connections in word combinations (agreement, government, adjacency) are not merely grammatical patterns but also perform important functional-communicative roles in shaping ideas and conveying information clearly.

1. Function of Agreement: Predicativity and Logical Relation

Agreement (e.g., mening orzum – my dream, talabalarning bilimi – students' knowledge) ensures the logical connection between a subject and the attribute or state associated with it. It clearly identifies ownership or belonging in speech. Agreement-based constructions often function as the subject of a sentence or a possessive modifier, forming the structural framework of speech.

2. Function of Government: Relation Between Action and Object

Government (e.g., kitobni o'qimoq, maktabga bormoq) expresses the dynamics of speech and the direction of an action. It indicates on which object an action is performed or toward which point it is directed. Case suffixes prevent ambiguity in speech. For example, the difference between "ukasi ko'rdi" and "ukasini ko'rdi" drastically changes the meaning.

3. Function of Adjacency: Expressiveness and Economy

Adjacency (e.g., shirin so'z, tez yugurmoq) serves as an important means of ensuring expressiveness, stylistic richness, and linguistic economy in speech. Connections without affixes add speed and vividness to expression. Adjectives and adverbs enrich speech through adjacency and allow ideas to be expressed concisely without excessive grammatical markers.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study of grammatical relations between the components of word combinations and their functional-semantic characteristics demonstrates the hierarchical and systematic nature of the syntactic level of the Uzbek language. The method of government ensures the substantive relation between action and object, while agreement provides logical identification between a subject and its attribute. Adjacency relations, on the other hand, reveal deep semantic proximity and the principle of linguistic economy even without the participation of material (affixal) markers.

In the process of speech, the components of word combinations acquire not only their primary nominative function but also contextual and pragmatic meanings. The method of combining components plays a crucial role in determining the communicative center of a sentence and shaping its logical emphasis (rheme).

Although grammatical relations within word combinations exist in the language system as ready-made patterns, their functional-semantic characteristics become fully apparent only in speech situations. This confirms that syntax should be studied not merely as a set of forms but as a dynamic process consisting of the dialectical interaction between meaning and form.

Overall, studying the relations between the components of word combinations contributes not only to understanding the structure of language but also to revealing the linguistic representation of logical relations between objects and actions in human cognition.

References

1. G. Abdurakhmonov, Uzbek Tili Grammatikasi. Sintaksis. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan Publishing, 1972.

2. G. Abdurakhmonov, Uzbek Tili Grammatikasi. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'qituvchi Publishing, 2008.

3. G. Abdurakhmonov, Uzbek Tili Grammatikasi. Vol. 2: Sintaksis. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan Publishing, 1972.

4. N. Mahmudov and A. Nurmonov, Uzbek Tilining Nazariy Grammatikasi. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'qituvchi Publishing, 1978.

5. R. Sayfullayeva and B. Mengliyev, Hozirgi O'zbek Adabiy Tili. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: FTM Publishing, 2009.

6. A. G'ulomov and M. Asqarova, Hozirgi O'zbek Adabiy Tili. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'qituvchi Publishing, 1987.

7. A. Nurmonov, O'zbek Tilining Sintaksisi. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan Publishing, 2001.

8. V. V. Vinogradov, Russian Language: Grammatical Doctrine of the Word. Moscow, Russia: Nauka Publishing, 1972.

9. A. M. Peshkovsky, Russian Syntax in Scientific Perspective. Moscow, Russia: Prosveshchenie Publishing, 1956.

10. L. Tesnière, Elements of Structural Syntax. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 2015.

11. R. Huddleston and G. Pullum, The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

12. N. Chomsky, Syntactic Structures. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1957.

13. A. Radford, Syntax: A Minimalist Introduction. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

14. T. Givón, Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 2001.

15. J. Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1968.