CLASSIFICATION OF FOLLOWING SENTENCES IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Gayubova Komila Anvarovna
Yulanova Nargiza Davlatovna
Tashkent named after Muhammad al-Khwarizmi
University of Information Technology
senior teachers

Abstract

This article addresses issues such as the formation of joint phrases in the Uzbek language, their types, and the formation of joint sentence systems. For the meaningful syntax of phrasal verbs, the features of the main sentences and the syntactic places in the sentence are highlighted.

   Keywords: *syntactic, conjugate sentence, predicate unit, syntax, keyword, attribute, link, syntagmatic valence, attribute.*

Introduction

The syntactic places in simple sentences are not really different from the syntactic places in compound sentences, they are the same. It does not matter for the syntactic place which unit occupies the present place. In this connection, comparing the sentences Ten Slyshit Zhuravliny Crick and On Slyshit Kak Crychat, it is clear that there is no difference in the structure of these sentences, that these schemes are the same, and that the only difference is the syntactic meaning of the object. says that In the first sentence, this syntactic place is given by a phrase, and in the second sentence by a sentence. That is why he considers that there is a functional contradiction between this simple sentence and the following adverb, even if it is a specific analogue of the simple sentence.

Syntactic place occurs according to the meaning of the predicate in the sentence and, consequently, its valence. In other words, the meaning and valence of the word in the part of the main sentence ensures the essence and use of the sentence.

Main part

The syntactic place that occurs according to the valence of the predicate can be occupied by the subordinate predicate unit, if the content of the predicate allows. Otherwise, there is no compound sentence. For this reason, some linguists use the theory of valence to describe the structure of compound sentences. In studying the semantic syntax of compound sentences, it is expedient to refer to the theory of valence.

From the above considerations it follows that in the study of compound sentences it is preferable to take some of the functions of the parts of a simple sentence. This is because the system of yahlit syntactic positions as a positional structure is almost indistinguishable from simple compound sentences. In compound sentences, the grammatical "sinchi" (framework) of the sentence is directly based on the main sentence. The following sentence, in one way or another, is part of this main sentence. The same thing is meant when it is distinguished as "follow-up sentences that explain a certain

part of a sentence."

Now, when it comes to the phrase "erratic statements that interpret nonsense in its entirety," it is not logically correct. Such statements also serve as a part of the main statement. In assessing this type of ergash, some linguists often refrain from calling them ergash. In this regard, R. Saifullayeva writes: "Are we afraid that the number of cases, which are one of the secondary parts of the case, is not equal in number ?! It is not a predicative unit, but a part of speech. The case is a predicative unit and an element of discourse. This means that the following words cannot be studied in the same plan, they do not have to be equal in number of syntactic types. Lekin R. Saifullayeva still can't break with tradition: "Ergash explains part of the story. If the explanatory part of the main sentence is not expressed, then the following sentence explains the main sentence as a whole, "In fact, the phrases such as" completely explains ","" completely related to the main sentence "are not clear. How can a follow-up statement explain a nonsense? Any part of speech (except for the determiner) is functionally related only to the part. The predicative unit, which in the broadest sense takes the place of syntactic, that is, the ergash is not a whole, but a constructive part of it is related to the participle. For example, the prepositional participle in the prepositional participle, which has the meaning and valence of the verb to open as a part of the main sentence, and the participle to be given as a part of the main sentence, is a prepositional participle in the present participle. connects.

Analyses

It is even possible to change the word ergash: flowers bloom all over the country when spring comes. In this type of adverbial conjunctions, adverbs and adverbs seem to be somewhat independent of each other, while in "adverbial conjunctions connected with a part of an adverb", ergash and empty sentences are more closely related. This, too, probably leads to the view that in the previous type of utterances the ergash utterance is connected with the yahlit nonsense. However, among the syntactic places in the sentence, the syntactic place still stands out with its "relative autonomy".

In other words, the part of speech, of course, depends on the participle, but it does not realize the strong syntagmatic valence of the word in the participle position. It should be noted that the case is a part of speech that expresses the event that forms the main content of the speech, and the event that connects it in this way, and the content is characterized by the fact that it is "speech within speech." This makes it very convenient for predicative units to occupy this syntactic place and become adverbs. Therefore, it is logical to consider the syntactic position as relatively free, even if it is in a simple sentence or in a compound sentence.

Apparently, any type of adverb is connected in one way or another with a certain part of speech. Naturally, these methods of communication are diverse. However, the idea that the following sentence is related to the whole sentence leads to a reduction in the content-syntactic status of the section in the main sentence. That is why N. A. Baskakov divides modern Turkish verbs into groups as follows:

1. Conjunctions associated with the substantive parts of the main sentence. This group includes possessive and complementary adverbs.

2. Subordinate clauses associated with the attributive parts of the main clause. This group includes definite and indefinite articles.

3. The attribute in the main sentence is the adverbial participle that is connected with the present participle. This group includes cause-and-effect, condition, impediment, purpose, time, analogy, and comparison.

In Uzbek linguistics, following words (as in many other linguistics) are divided into 14 types in terms of content and form: 1) possessive, 2) definite, 3) complementary, 4) definite, 5) approach, 6) measure, 7) multiplication. , 8) cause, 9) purpose, 10) moment 11) place, 12) condition, 13) unobstructed, 14) result. Although this classification is generally acceptable, it should be noted that the current classification does not reflect the specifics of the main thing. This classification, as it is said, is a classification of adverbs, not adverbs of adverbs.

In our opinion, it seems appropriate to divide the headings into two types: 1) headings with references and 2) headings without references. By "reference section" we mean "deixis signs" in general linguistics. The essence of deixis signs is that they do not directly express the content - events, signs, things, but refer to them, so they can be considered as weak, empty words. Pronouns and other relative words in the Uzbek language are such deixis signs that they can be used as conjunctions in compound sentences.

In the case of the absence of a reference part, both the preposition and the adverb are characterized by certain content and syntactic features. Let's compare the following: Tolib aka should know that Akrom Said's essay will not be published in the magazine (F. Musajonov). Until her mother got dressed, her parents would glaze over the mare (A. Kuchimov). In the first part of the first sentence there is such a reference, in the second sentence there is no reference part in the form of the parent sentence in the form of a parent's glaze.

First of all, due to the nature of the link, the complementary syntactic position in the main sentence is only formally closed, BECAUSE the link is empty in content, so the main sentence is syntactically complete, but inaccurate in content. The main point of the second sentence is full of both content and syntax. The first preposition is more complete than the reference to the next preposition, and the preposition is perceived as a complement that complements the strong syntagmatic valence of the preposition preposition. In the second case, the subjunctive is replaced by the preposition directly within the list of syntactic positions. In the first sentence, the following sentence is outside the list of syntactic places of the main sentence, and if it is included in this system through certain logical-semantic operations, in the second case there is no need for such operations, because it is a member of the same system. The adverb in the second sentence occupies a syntactic place, which strengthens the weak syntagmatic valence of the predicate of the preposition, so even if the adverb is not present, the preposition does not lose its content-syntactic meaning.

According to the above considerations, one more thing should be emphasized. Related clauses cannot be used independently when they are separated from synsematic, that is, subordinate clauses. the content is incomplete. Non-reference sentences, on the other hand, can be relatively independent in content, even if they are separated from auto-semantic, that is, ergash sentences, and do not become incomplete or inaccurate in content.

In some adverbs, the conjunction in the main clause is not limited to the clause itself. There is another link in this sentence that matches this link. The 6U references in the prepositions and adverbs form a constant question-and-answer confrontation: who-is, who-is, who-are, what-is, what-is, what-is, how-is-how, how- so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so. This connection is also peculiar in the nature of the connection between the prepositions and the adverbs, as opposed to the passages in the passages. For example: He who works enjoys it. Where there is discipline, there is success.

The relation of subordination in these sentences, in contrast to other adverbs, is two-sided, that is, "the direction of communication is from one sentence to another, and at the same time from one sentence to another."

This type of communication is called differently by different linguists. In compound sentences with a subordinate clause, the subordinate clause is preceded by a subordinate clause. The link in the sentence means a general question (who, what, how much, how, where, etc.), and the link in the main sentence means a general answer to the question (u, usha, so, so, so land). In this case, the part of the verb ergash is expressed by a conditional verb (or sometimes another verb with a conditional meaning, for example: r), but the conditional meaning is weakened, and this form is connected with the following parts of speech. the tool performs the function. The same reference passages obscure the meaning of the condition, so they are interdependent, which means that there are no conditional conjunctions among the adverbial clauses in which there are referential clauses in both parts. If it is possible to drop references, the conditional content of the sentence will be revealed and the sentence will become a compound sentence. Compare: Whoever works, he will be happy (if he works) - If you work, you will be comfortable (if necessary). Where there is discipline, there is success (following the rules) - If there is discipline, there is success (following the rules).

However, it should be noted that when the reference section exists only in the preposition, the omission of the reference section does not change the subject matter. Compare: Talib aka should know that Akrom Said's essay will not be published in the magazine either. - Talib aka should know that Akrom Said's essay will not be published in the magazine either. In each case, they have seized it, despite obstacles we can scarcely imagine. " In the second case, it is expedient to consider the words in the main clause as a reference clause, because even if the clause is not used in such cases, it is clear that its syntactic position is clear.

Typically, the omission of the referential participle in the preposition is observed mainly in conjunctions with the possessive and the accusative. The strong syntagmatic valences of the predicate expression in the sentence are often associated with these parts - the possessor and the complement. That is why, even if the referential and complementary parts of the main sentence are not used, it still exists and can be restored at any time.

Conclusion

The possessive, the definite, the accusative, the adverbial, the adverbial, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle, the participle There are two referential parts (both in the main and in the following sentence) in the known part of the compound sentences with the degree, time and place. The result is a reference part of speech, followed by a part of speech. All other conjunctions are without references.

In short, such features in the main clauses are very important for the content syntax of the compound sentences with the following clauses.

References
1. K. Kasimova and others. Methods of teaching native language. Tashkent, 2009.
2. Sh.Rakhmatullaev. Modern Uzbek literary language. Tashkent, 2006.
3. R. Rasulov. General Linguistics. Tashkent, 2010.