

Substantial and Qualificative Indefinite Additive Syntaxema Options

Egamnazarov Qobil Abdunazarovich

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages PhD

Abstract:

Syntactic units in indefinite pronouns were analyzed separately by syntax. Their categorical differential syntactic-semantic features were revealed, and on the basis of the features, depending on the position of indefinite pronouns in a sentence, substantial and qualificative indefinite additive syntactic variants were distinguished from noncategorical features. Various transformation methods have been used to define additive syntax variants. Addition and subtraction methods were used.

Keywords: qualification, substantial, additive, transformation, syntax, categorical, noncategorical character, indefinite, subordinative relations.

In world linguistics, the problem of systematic study of the controversial issues of traditional syntax, comparative-functional analysis of the category of ambiguity using indefinite pronouns in the structure of the sentence, and the determination of the ontological nature of these phenomena, and the study of their interlinguistic relationship, has been in the constant attention of linguists. Also, from a pragmatic point of view, there is a need to identify the differential syntactic-semantic signs of language units that express the uncertainty of the actions being performed, as well as their communicative linguistics, the theory of speech activity, meaningful syntax, based on the materials of related and non-related languages. .

In this article, we set ourselves the goal of a comparative-functional analysis of the English and Uzbek languages, dividing them into syntaxes according to the syntactic distribution of indefinite pronouns in the function of a non-core subordinate component. The process of analyzing syntactic units into syntaxes is to identify the categorical differential syntactic-semantic features of the selected object and to prove the non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic features, their paradigmatic series, i.e. variants based on transformation methods, and interpret them visually.

In addition to the analyzed sentence, categorical and non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs in this sentence are studied by comparing them with syntaxemes in other sentences. One of the most important aspects is that the syntactic units in the sentence are divided into components and syntaxes based on the same syntactic relationship.

The linguist scientist O. G. Vetrova says that substantiality is one of the categorical syntactic-semantic signs, which is defined by contrast with other differential syntactic-semantic signs, that is, qualification and procedurality [1; p. 45].

Qualification is also one of the categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs at the syntactic level, and its difference from procedurality and substantiality is that it indicates a general description of a substance or a process. This description can express qualitative, comparative, static. In the speech device, its lexical source is formed in a set such as adjective, adjectivized elements, number, noun. According to F.M.Usmonov, in English, "elements expressing qualification can be combined with very, how, rather, so, too, and in Uzbek language with words like very, how, rather, so, too, based on the subordinating relation. If the qualification is expressed by a noun, it cannot be connected with demonstrative and possessive pronouns" [2; p. 119]. It is not correct to associate the representation of all three categorical symbols with word groups. That is

Published under an exclusive license by open access journals under Volume: 2 Issue: 12 in Dec-2022

Copyright (c) 2022 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

why substantiality should not be replaced by nouns from word groups, because substantiality can be expressed by nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numbers, and even adverbs. When analyzing the speech device by dividing it into syntaxes, it is taken into account that substantiality is expressed using different word groups in both languages. They differ only by non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic features.

When classifying the examples taken from works of art written in English and Uzbek languages, indefinite syntaxes and their paradigmatic series were identified and compared within the framework of substantive and qualifying syntaxes from categorical symbols.

It is known that the NP1 (core predicative 1) component also represents the substantive indefinite agentive additive (addition) syntax instead of indefinite pronouns: in English, elements expressing additivity can be combined with else on the basis of a subordinate relation.

1. Something else grew in its place [EH, 266].
2. Someone else broke a window.
3. Someone else could do that job [N.H. 270].

About additive syntax [See: 3; p. 197, 4; p. 228].

O'.U.Usmonov stated that in determining the object syntaxeme in these sentences, "...before determining the substantial object syntaxeme of the core predicative 1 component, it is appropriate to determine the differential syntactic-semantic signs of the syntactic units expressed in the place of the core predicative 2" [5; p. 58].

It is known that the syntactic units that replace the NP2 (nuclear predicative 2) component are one of the main parts in traditional grammars - participles. So, a participle is the main part that provides predicativeness in a sentence, and its expression has different morphological forms.

(8) He was not someone else. He - substantially identifying syntaxeme, was not someone - substantially indefinite identifying negative syntaxeme, along with expressing it also includes additive (supplementary) syntaxeme with the use of else. So, was not someone else is a substantive indefinite identifying negative additive syntax. The syntax model of this sentence is as follows:

He was not someone else – SbId1*SbIndId2 NgAdd.

In general, when the sentence with an indefinite pronoun in the place of the core predicative 2 is analyzed into syntaxes, it represents the following non-categorical: indefinite identifying negative additive syntactic-semantic sign within the framework of substantiality from categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs.

In addition to the syntaxes defined above, it can be seen that indefinite pronouns express other non-categorical syntactic-semantic features in place of the non-core subordinate predicative 1.

1. I'm getting someone else to look after you [N.H, 42].
2. They could get someone else to hunt them [E.H, 258].

In the composition of these sentences, (1) someone else - substantial indefinite object represents the additive agentive syntax as follows:

(1) I'm getting someone else - object additive, someone else to look after you → someone looks after you → represents an agentive syntax. So, someone else is a substantial indefinite object additive agent syntax (SbIndObAddAg).

In the second sentence, the indefinite pronoun someone else shows the substantive object stative loaded additive indefinite syntax.

It can be explained as follows:

(2) They could get someone else to hunt them → They could get someone else - the object represents the syntax and is connected with the procedural action modal syntax based on the subordinate relation.

(2) They could get someone else to hunt them → ... someone else to hunt them → someone else hunts them – stative loaded additive syntax. Staticity is proved as follows:

someone else to hunt them → someone else is in a state of hunting... because it is connected with the procedural stative syntax based on the non-nuclear predicative relation, the indefinite pronoun someone else represents the stative-laden additive indefinite syntax of the substantive object. So, someone else – SbObStAddInd.

When analyzing the indefinite pronouns in the structure of the English sentence by dividing them into syntaxes in the position of the core predicative 2, the negative additive syntaxes of non-categorical signs: indefinite identification were identified and analyzed within the framework of substantiality. A comparative analysis of the syntaxes in English and Uzbek sentences in which indefinite pronouns represent non-nuclear dependent predicative 1 was performed. When we analyzed the indefinite pronouns by dividing them into syntaxes, indefinite object additive, indefinite object additive agentive, stative loaded object additive indefinite syntaxes were identified.

In the course of the analysis, it becomes clear that the non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs are clarified through the distributive relationship of indefinite pronouns using the contrast method of contrasting substantiality with qualification from categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs.

In the example of the English language, the substantive indefinite object syntax is expressed using the indefinite pronouns someone, something, anybody anyone, anything, everything.

Substantial indefinite object syntax in the Uzbek language sentence is expressed using the following indefinite pronouns: something, something, something, someone, allanima, allanima, something like. From categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs, a number of studies have been conducted on qualitative and its non-categorical signs, but indefinite syntax has not been observed within the scope of qualification.

The paradigmatic series of the qualifying indefinite syntax of the English and Uzbek languages, represented by indefinite pronouns in the sentence structure, is determined and comparatively analyzed.

We can see that the indefinite pronouns in the position of the non-core dependent component (ÑD) represent the following additive syntaxes.

Substantial indefinite object additive syntax

The method of determining the object syntaxeme was proved in the previous section, and on this basis, the meaning of additive (addition) in the English sentence is expressed by adding the lexemes else or more to the indefinite pronouns in the substantive indefinite object additive syntaxeme:

1. You might think about someone else [E.H. 274].
2. She would probably want to talk about something else eventually [N.H. 208].

3. He is not very happy about me seeing somebody else [N.H. 23].
4. I've never loved anyone else [E.H. 280].
5. I've never done a top of anything else [M.E. 159].
6. He must do something more than live dozed [M.E. 369].
7. No one had said anything more until they were back in camp [E.H. 252].

When the elements of else or more are added to indefinite pronouns, someone else, something else somebody else, something more sentences are used in participle form, anything else, anyone else, anything more is used in negative sentences.

In the Uzbek language, the substantive indefinite object additive syntax is expressed by adding the adverb "again" before the indefinite pronouns in the sentence:

1. Don't stop talking, - said the handsome young man, to the girl who wanted to say something more [Sh. 309].

- Substantial indefinite object possessive additive syntax (SbIndObPsAd): You couldn't force your way into someone else's... [N.H. 62].

From the examples analyzed above, it is known that in the English language, the substantive indefinite object represented by indefinite pronouns in the place of the subordinate component in the syntax of the sentence, such as additive, possessive additive, were identified.

Within the substantive indefinite locative syntax, locative additive, locative allative additive variants were defined. About the locative syntax, G.S. Petrova conducted research in the framework of from+S in the structure of the English sentence and stated that it is possible to prove that the from+S model can be proved by replacing the from+S model with here, there adverbs using the transformation method [6; p. 14]. In her monographic work, N.J. Sulaymonova supports the opinion of G.S. Petrova in determining locative [7; p. 64]. But no comment has been made about the syntax of the locative indefinite expressed by indefinite pronouns.

- Substantial indefinite locative additive syntax:

As we noted above, additive syntax is expressed by adding else to indefinite pronouns denoting space:

Will would be received when Marcus found a purpose to live somewhere else [N.H.104].

It is known that when determining the locative syntax in a sentence, indefinite pronouns can be replaced by the same agreement form of the locative adverbs "here, there":

- Locative allative additive indefinite:

(1) The cold air woke him up, this wakefulness dragged his mind back to his feet → ... this wakefulness dragged his mind back to his feet.

Within the framework of substantive indefinite comparative syntax, variants of comparative additive, comparative total comitative additive syntax were identified.

In the structure of the sentence, the indefinite pronoun "anyone" is combined with "as" to express comparability. In its proof, it can be determined by replacing the as element with like:

He would as soon be in bed with her as anyone... [E.H. 284].

He would as soon be in bed with her as anyone → He would ... be in bed with her like anyone.

- Substantial indefinite comparative additive syntax:

- 1) He was as entitled to a break as anyone else [N.H. 125].
- 2) But how about if you were the same clothes and haircut and glasses as everyone else? [N.H. 110]

- Substantial indefinite comparative total comitative additive syntax:

I'm getting as bored with dying as with everything else, he thought [E.H. 298].

As with everything else in the combination everything means the total (total, all) syntax, and everything else means the additive syntax, so this combination embodies the substantial indefinite comparative total comitative additive [SbIndCmpTICmtAd] syntax.

As a result of the analysis of the pronouns in the place of the non-nuclear subordinate component in English and Uzbek, the following variants of the substantial indefinite syntax were determined: in the case of the English language, substantial indefinite object additive [SbIndObAdd], in Uzbek also substantial indefinite object additive [SbIndObAdd]. Substantial indefinite object syntax options can be explained in the table as follows:

Table 1

ÑD	English language	Uzbek language
SbIndObAd	+	+
SbIndObPsAd	+	-

In addition to these syntaxes, the following semantic features were identified on the example of English and Uzbek languages: substantial indefinite locative additive [SbIndLcAdd], substantial indefinite comparative additive [SbIndCmpAdd], substantial indefinite comparative total comitative additive [SbIndCmpTICmtAdd] syntaxes were analyzed in English. Substantial indefinite locative allative additive [SbIndLcAlAdd] syntax was also identified in the structure of the Uzbek language sentence. These defined syntaxes can be explained as follows:

ÑD	English languages	Uzbek languages
SbIndLcAdd	+	-
SbIndCmpAdd	+	-
SbIndLcAlAdd	-	+

The explanation of these syntaxes is given above in the text.

The following variants of the qualifying indefinite syntax were identified based on the indefinite pronouns some and any instead of the non-core dependent component in the English sentence:

- Qualifying indefinite quantitative additive syntax:

- 1) He didn't want to tell any more lies [E.H. 106].
- 2) They don't make them any more [E.H. 60].

- Qualifying indefinite quantitative additive syntax:

- 1) He took a jar of honey, a toothbrush, and other little things [O'.H.N. 11].
- 2) Our uncle Khan did not send a single servant to help us [P.Q. 180].

It was determined that the quantitative additive syntax in the scope of the qualitative indefinite is expressed instead of the subordinate component of indefinite pronouns in the structure of the Uzbek language sentence.

Qualifying indefinite syntaxes can be explained in the table as follows:

ÑD	English language	Uzbek language
QlfIndQunad	+	+

The explanation of these signs is as follows:

ÑD – non-core dependent component;

Qlf Ind – qualifying indefinite syntax;

Kun - quantitative indefinite;

QunAd – quantitative additive;

In conclusion, the following can be noted by comparative analysis of categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs in the framework of substantiality and qualification in the place of a non-core subordinate component in the structure of indefinite pronouns:

1. Substantial indefinite object syntax is expressed in the structure of an English sentence using the indefinite pronouns someone, something, anybody, anything, everything, in Uzbek language it is used as a noun with something like something, something, something, someone, allanima, allanima, one thing, etc., based on a subordinate relationship. binds to the component. In both languages, this syntax can be proved using the transformation-passivization (passive ratio) method of transformation.
2. Additive (addition) of the variants of the indefinite syntax of the object is expressed by adding the words else or more to the indefinite pronouns in English, and is expressed by somebody else, something more, anything else, anything more. In addition to these, the variants of this syntax in English are possessive, causal, comparative, qualitative, sociative; and quantitative, comparative, attributional, desiderative options were found in Uzbek language.
3. Substantial indefinite locative additive and its variants such as substantial indefinite comparative additive, substantial indefinite comitative additive and others have been identified in English. Substantial indefinite locative syntax in the Uzbek language is defined as substantial indefinite locative allative additive syntax.
4. In English and Uzbek languages, the indefinite syntax variants represented by indefinite pronouns within the scope of qualification from categorical symbols were analyzed. In the example of the English language, the qualifying indefinite is the quantitative additive; On the basis of the Uzbek language material, a variant such as the qualitative indefinite quantitative additive was determined.
5. Qualifying indefinite syntaxes in the system of unrelated languages were determined based on the distributive relations of indefinite pronouns in the place of subordinate components, and different methods of the transformation method were used to prove them.

LIST OF REFERENCES USED

1. Vetrova O.G. Vokativnost kak syntaxisko-semanticheskyy priznak// Lingvisticheskie issledovaniya - 1981. Grammaticheskaya i lexicheskaya semantika. Acad. Nauk USSR. Institute Yazykoznaneya: - Moscow: 1981. - S. 44-49.
2. Usmanov F.M. Sintaktika-semanticheskaya sopostovleniya dvusostavnyx bezglagolnyx predlojeniy (na materiale angliyskogo i Uzbekskogo yazykov) / diss.kand.filol.nauk. - Samarkand: 2012. - 149 p.

3. Mukhin A.M. Model vnutrennyx syntaxischeskix svyazey predlozheniya // Vopr. Yaz-niya. - Moscow: 1970. - No. 4 - S. 68-80.
4. Antipina N.A. Sostavnye syntactic elements "modal verb + infinitive" and modal constructions in the structure of the present English language // Author. diss... cand. Philol. science Leningrad, 1974. – 20 p.
5. Usmanov.U., Kuchibaev A. Zero substantive syntax and position [[NP]]_1 nepolnyx predlozhenyy angliyskoy dialogicheskoy rechi // Funktsiya i semantika lingvisticheskikh edinits Tash.GPI im. Nizami, Tashkent: 1983. - S. 56-61.
6. Petrova G.S. Sochetaniya s prelogom from v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke // Aftorof.diss.....kand.filol.nauk. - Leningrad, 1979. - 17 p.
7. Sulaymanova N.J. Syntactic-semantic and deictic features of the locative category (in the case of English and Uzbek languages). Diss. according to Phil. phil. doc. (PhD). - Tashkent, 2018. - 153 p.

Reference list and abbreviations

1. E.H. - Ernest Hemingway. Selected stories by Ernest Hemingway. - M.: Progress Publisher, 1971. - 378 p.
2. M. E. - Jack London "Martin Eden". - M.: Foreign Language publishing house, 1960. - 442 p.
3. N.H. – Nick Hornby. "About a boy". – United Kingdom. Gollancz, 1998.-278 p.
4. O'.H.N. - Hashimov O'tkir. "There is light, there is shadow" / novel / "Eternal works" series. - T.: "Ilm-ziyo-zakovat", 2019. - 256 p.
5. P.Q. - Pirimkul Kadirov. Starry nights. "Eternal living works" series - T.: "Navroz", 2019. - 576 p.
6. Sh.- Fame. Those who seek paradise. - Tashkent: Gafur Ghulam Publishing House, 2018. - 460 p.