

Syntactic-semantic analysis of locative adhesive syntax in english and uzbek languages

Nilufar Zubaydova^{1*}

¹Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, 140100 Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract. In linguistics, there are various approaches to the selection of sentence elements: sentence members, word classes, theme and rheme, etc. One of the types of sentence division can be syntax analysis, namely, the allocation of differential syntactic-semantic features of elementary syntactic units in the structure of sentences. It is known that in all existing practical and theoretical grammars in linguistics, the syntactic analysis of the sentence by dividing the syntactic units involved in the sentence device into primary and secondary parts has become a tradition. Some scholars of English studies say: only "subject" and "predicate" part of the primary clauses are recognized, and secondary clauses are called "modifiers" and are divided into three groups according to their morphological characteristics: 1) Attributive Adjective modifiers, which modify a noun or a pronoun. 2) Objective modifiers, which modify a verb, an adjective or an adverb. Adverbial Modify a verb, an adjective or another adverb”.

1 Introduction

Syntactic units representing the space in the system of unrelated languages, that is, in English and Uzbek languages, have a great place and importance in the perfect knowledge of the theory of linguistics. In the example of English and Uzbek languages, locative adhesive, locative allative, locative ablative, locative translative, locative object, locative instrumental, and locative type terms are determined on the basis of substantiality from the categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs. In this regard, it is necessary to show the expression of syntactic units referring to space or locative themes in micro context.

In grammar, an adessive case (abbreviated *ade*; from Latin *adesse* "to be present (at)": ad "at" + esse "to be") is a grammatical case generally denoting location at, upon, or adjacent to the referent of the noun; the term is most frequently used in Uralic studies.

Locative means the location of a person or object. Adessive is one of the variants of locative syntaxemes which means “categorical form of case, indicating the location, belonging, an instrument of an action”.

Substantiality denotes the objectivity of location and person, while locativity indicates the circumstance of place, which expresses a number of variants of the locality. One of them is offensive syntax. In the "Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" by O. S. Akhmanova, “adessive”

* Corresponding author: shahramaslanov97@gmail.com

is defined as "... a categorical form of the case, indicating the location, belonging, instrument of action". In this work, the main meaning of the categorical form is used".

In research conducted to date, the means of anaphoric expression of locative semantics can be provided by means of different lexemes. In the case of the English language, regardless of the variants of the locative semaphore, they are expressed as follows:

when expressing the adhesive, allative, ablative variants of the locative seme in the meaning, the anaphoric device that reminds of space is given using the adverb there:

1) He had been in the office alone. Haso was c there
as well [1.159].

2) Igor run over to their yard. When he washalf-way there he stopped and then walked on [1.119].

3) He had got back from the town. Magus was a good man and everybody there esteemed him [1, 268].

In these given examples, in the office (1) locative adhesive, to yard (2) locative allative, from the town (3) locative ablative syntaxes are expressed, but the space is expressed by the means there. It is known that in literary texts, the speaker is considered to be the author of the work, and his audience is the reader, and the place of action that happens or does not happen is far away for both of them [24]

2 Materials and methods

Syntactical units, expressing locative adessive syntaxes can be realized on the position of the dependent component in relation to the nuclear component on the base of a subordinate connection. So, in this article, we try to point out two main things: 1. The ways of expressing locative adessive syntax; 2. Its variants, may be connotative, facultative and adverbial in English and Uzbek sentences.

The ways of expressing the locative adessive syntaxeme:

Locative adessive syntaxeme in English can be expressed with the combination of different types of prepositions and nouns, denoting places:

at +s: We spent two very pleasant days in Oxford (JKI, 176).

in+s: I dropped off the train in Milan (EHFA, 169).

on+s: We had decided to sleep on board (JKL, 86).

across+s: Susie heard Dr. Porhoit slip his hand across the river (WSM, 184).

over+s: the old man was leaving over the chair (JKL,25).

under+s: This will keep you safe under the water (STAN, 30).

by+s: at Abingdon the river passes by the streets (JKL, 133).

in the middle of +s or in thecentre of +s: I was just in the middle of a set (WSM, 166).

in front of+s: This cord will be given you at 3 o'clock tomorrow in front of Westminster Abbey (WSM, 60).

opposite+s: We were almost opposite the hotel now (EHFA, 183).

near+s: A man lived near a famous college (STAN, 91).

behind+s: I flew behind a tree (STAN, 91).

insite+s: Inside the train we were all standing in the corridor when the train started (EHFA, 113).

on the other side of + s: There was something alive on the other side of the door (WSM, 192).

between +s: The door was closed between this room and the next (WSM, 192).

round+s: They began to run madly round the room (WSM, 42).

In Uzbek however, locative adessive syntaxeme is formed by means of adding the suffix – ga to the noun or adverbial elements. According to some grammarians of the Uzbek

language, the locative adessive syntaxeme expresses the action where takes place or person, an object where is located [23, 161].

So locative adessive syntaxeme is formed by the following ways:

- s+ da: Endi cherkovda toat – ibodat etasan! (TMO, 19).
- s+ oldida: Bolalar oldida sir boj bermadim. (ShOZ, 114).
- s+lar+da: Brigadir mazhlislarda ishtirok etadi. (TMM, 112).
- s+orasida: Xar qator orasida bittadan ўksimon panzha qўjdim. (RBAD, 110).
- s+chetida: Tandir chetida chўnqajib ўtirdim (PKYuT, 108).
- s+ ichida: Bir rўzam zhўl ichida bўldi (TMO, 103).
- s+ketida: Shijpon ketida iyak-chakkasini rўmoli bilan ўrab turdi (TMM, 101).
- s+ostida: Ayolimiz kajrafoch ostida beshikka suyanib jifladi (OYOqD, 98).
- s+betida: Er betida kolmish shўrni sўrib olaberadi (ADK, 77).
- s+boshida: Men dorilangan dala boshida yonboshlajdi. (RBAD, 57).
- s+koshida: ўchoq koshida chўk tushib ўt yoqaman (ShT, 67).
- s+barrida: Shlyapali odam hirmon barrida yonboshlajdi. (RBAD, 57).
- s+uchida: Fўza uchida pahtani qўshqўllab ushlabman. (ShOZ,60).
- s+yoqasida: Zhigitlarimga daryo yoqasida yotinglar dedim (ShT, 40).
- s+bujida: Shu daryocha bўjida oyok iladi. (PYuKT, 38).
- s+tarafalarda: Anovi Xissor tarafalarda turk odamlari itdaj izrib yuribdi (RBAD, 45).
- s+teveragida: Fўza teveragida ajlanib, tohani tortib oladi (ADK, 159).
- s+ўrtasida: Kanotlari ўrtasida 2qўnfir doq bshldi. (PKYuT, 147).
- s+adorida: Shoirlar adorida oyok ildi. (TMO, 163).
- s+chetida: Katta jўl chetida tashlab ketdi. (ShT, 161).
- s+tўrida: Ayolimiz mekhmonhona tўrida yotdi. (RBAD, 139).

In general, the coincidence of locative adessive syntaxeme expressions between English and Uzbek languages can be presented in the followings:

Uzbek locative adessive syntaxeme variant s+ da is expressed by means of different types of prepositions + s:

- in+s
- on+s
- S+ da at+s
- About+s
- S+ (ning)ustida
- on+s across+s over+s
- S+(ning)tagida
- Under+S at the bottom+S
- S+ (ning)orkasida
- Behind on the other side of+ S on +S's back
- S+(ning)oldida/ yonida
- By/near+S in front of+S
- S+(ning)karshisida – against/ opposite +S
- S+(ning) atrofida – around +S
- S+(ning)ichida –in/inside+S
- S+(ning) orasida-among+S
- S+(ning) ўrtasida –in the middle of +S

As can be seen from the above, in English the locative adessive syntaxeme is expressed by various prepositional combinations of nouns, while in Uzbek it is expressed by nouns of the local case and S+ adverbial elements with the ending of the local case. One variant of the locative adessive syntaxeme of the Uzbek language corresponds to several prepositional combinations of a noun in English.

When studying the morphological and syntactic features of each part of the sentence, it is assumed that they are represented by a group of words, what is the form of the word, and on the basis of what syntactic connection it is connected with other syntactic units. In this regard, it should be noted that syntactic relations mainly mean adaptation, negotiation and control [12; 23; 16, 14-16] are understood as such. However, the so-called syntactic relations of adaptation, agreement, management relations do not have a universal character in the syntactic layer, that is, such relations are often not mentioned in the process of syntactic analysis of sentences. In some scientific studies, there are cases of studying these relations both at the level of word combinations and at the syntactic level [14; 240; 237]. Sometimes syntactic relations are "attributive, objective, complementary" [11, 116; 62]. In this regard, it is known that in the research carried out in the following years, the process of dividing the sentence device into elementary syntactic units required the revision of "management" at the syntactic level [111, 50]. As a result of the separation of elementary syntactic units in the sentence device on the basis of subordinate or subordinate communication, the term "management" has no place at the syntactic level [8, 64].

It is understood from the scientific data presented above that they are studied mainly at the level of vocabulary. To prove this point, let's look at the syntactic analysis of the following sentences, which have the same structure at the syntactic level:

1. I read a book – Men kitob (ni) *ŷkiman*.
2. I came home – Men uiga *keldim*.

In the first sentence, the elements "read a book" and "I read a book" are combined with the help of mutual control, and in the second sentence there is no control, adaptation, or connection from syntactic relations [16; 19]. So, in the first sentence, since the verb read is transitive according to its lexical meaning, the word a book, *kitob (ni)* is controlled, and since the verbs came, *keldim* are intransitive, it does not have a control relationship. It can be seen that control is not a syntactic communication, but a type of lexical (lexic) communication. Both adaptation and conjugation occur at the morphological or lexical level. In order to fully understand the linguistic nature of control, control is found in word combinations, which are mainly covered in dictionaries, while syntactic devices are not reflected in dictionaries. That is why it is appropriate to call control not syntactic communication, but lexical communication.

Lucien Tener says about syntactic communication: "Syntactic connection is necessary for the expression of thought. Without it, we wouldn't be able to convey related content. Our speech would be a mere sequence of isolated images and ideas with nothing to do with each other. It is the syntactic connection that makes the sentence a living organism, and it is in it that its life force lies. So, the concept of syntactic connection is thus the basis of all structural syntax" [16]. That's why in this study, in the analysis of sentences with locative elements, we first start by determining the mutual syntactic relations of the syntactic units involved in the sentence device.

In addition, in the syntactic analysis of the sentence, a number of problematic cases are visible in the analysis by dividing the sentence into parts. For example, when attention is paid to the issue of the complement, the action expressed in the part of the sentence, the sign of direction, or the second-level part indicating the subject - the object to this action is called a complement, that is, it completes the part. In English, it is represented by a noun in the main agreement, by personal, possessive, definite, possessive, demonstrative, presumptive pronouns, by a possessive adjective, by an adjective, by an infinitive or infinitive conjunction or device, by a gerund or a device with a gerund, by any element of speech that is possessive. if it is emphasized [15 314-315], and in the Uzbek language, the types of fillers are classified as noun fillers, noun fillers, adjective fillers, adjective fillers, number fillers, adjective fillers, and verb fillers [5, 112].

In English, the complement is divided into prepositional, non-prepositional, medial, non-medial, complex complements according to the form and the direct and indirect transition of the action, and according to the meaning of the verb and the element acting as a complement (cognate object), it is divided into a relative complement. In the Uzbek language, it is divided only into passive and passive complements.

In the grammars of English and Uzbek languages, the participation of the filler in the structure of the sentence depends on the dictionary meaning of the verb in the place of the participle, that is, there are concepts that only transitive verbs require a filler in the structure of the sentence, and if we interpret the filler as we mentioned above, it will lead to some difficulties and confusion for the students in the process of syntactic analysis of the sentence. In our opinion, it would be appropriate to study the semantics of the syntactic units that are used as fillers and their variants in such cases.

As for the question of determining from the parts of speech, it is defined as indicating characteristics such as the sign, quality, quantity, and relationship of the subject. At this point, the segment whose sign is being detected is called detection. The relationship between the determiner and the determined is called an attributive relationship. In this regard, the relationship between the determining factor and the attributive relationship is also considered in the structure of word combinations. When looking at the example of the Russian language, some linguists say that "the determiner is connected with the determined by means of adaptation" [17, 18]. In addition, the determining clause can appear in "strong" and "weak" syntactic positions. A determiner in a strong syntactic position is given a direct definition without additional meaning. A determiner in a weak syntactic position is understood to be incompatible with the definition [17, 19].

If we focus on the morphological characteristics of the determiner in English, it usually determines a sign of the possessive, complement, case, and predicative expressed by a noun, pronoun, or predicate. According to the position of the determiner in relation to the determined, it is divided into determiners that stand before the determined and determiners that stand after the determined. Determinants are expressed mainly by adjectives, present participles, past participles, possessives, demonstratives, interrogatives, conjunctions, relative pronouns, countable and ordinal numbers, nouns, prepositional phrases, adverbs, infinitives, infinitive phrases, and determining clauses. In addition, the interpretant is considered a type of determiner, and it is being researched by scientists into dense (inseparable) and isolated interpretants. It is obvious that this issue is also a controversial issue. In the Uzbek language, the determiner is divided into such types as adjective-defining, pointing-defining, defining-defining, explanatory-defining. In general, as evidenced by the above evidence, it is clear that both the complement clause and the determining clause are considered and analyzed at the level of word combinations.

If we pay attention to the issue of second-order clauses, there are still many unsolved puzzles in this regard. In terms of content, case is divided into several types, such as case of manner, case of place, case of time, case of cause, case of purpose, case of quantity-degree, case of condition, case of result and case of comparison.

Bistinguishing a complement from a subject or a determiner is more difficult. Or, if we look at the opinion of R.V. Zandvort, he interprets secondary clauses as "Adverbial adjuncts" (adjective determiner, adverbial case) only after recognizing the owner and participle of the sentence [22, 211]. In this case, no attitude is expressed about the filler. According to H. Whitehall, he prefers to analyze the sentence by reducing it to the following model:

Table 1. The reporter gave the lady a present

Subject	Predicate		
1	2	3	4
	Verb	inner complement	outer complement
The reporter	Gave	the lady	a present

[22, 36-40]

From the above model, we have seen that the verb and all the syntactic units involved in it are called participles.

And P.Roberts gives examples of seven examples of simple sentences according to the morphological characteristics of the units involved in the sentence device and molds them morphologically.

For example:

1. n↔v	2. n↔v	Adj.	3. n↔v	n
Lions rear	Albert was	unhappy	Lions eat	meet

[22, 201-208]

Such an approach to the syntactic analysis of the sentence by the mentioned English scholars is not a syntactic analysis, but a morphological analysis.

In the English language system, we can't use term "adverbial modifier" for all adverbial modifiers. Because the term has two meanings. In this article we analyzed syntactic elements which express locativeness and based lexical units.

3 Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that the syntactic units expressing the substantive locative adessive syntaxeme are realized in the position of a dependent component in the sentence structure of the English and Uzbek languages. The expression of this variant of the locative syntaxeme in English is represented by prepositional combinations of nouns, and in the Uzbek language - by nouns with locative case endings or nouns with adverbial elements.

References

1. Rudolf Jasik. St. Elizabeth's Square. (Artia, 1964)
2. N. Sulaymanova, N. Giyasova, Motif Akademi Halkbilimi Dergisi / 2014-2 (Temmuz–Aralık), 215-221 (2014)
3. A.A. Abduazizov, A.M. Bushui, T. Bushui et al., History of linguistic typology. (Tashkent: NUU, 2006)
4. M.A. Abdurazzakov, Essays on the comparative study of different system languages. (Tashkent, Fan, 1973)
5. N.G. Aga-Zade, IYaSh. Moscow **6**, 107-112 (1960)
6. V.G. Admoni, Members of the sentence in languages of various types. Leningrad - S. - 3-18 (1972)
7. A.M. Akbulatova, Genitive case in the structure of sentences in the English language // Abstract of the thesis. diss.... cand. philol. Sciences. Leningrad: 1984. - 21 p.
8. G.N. Akimova, New in the syntax of the modern Russian language. (Moscow, Higher School, 1990)
9. S.I. Alatortsev, Linguistic Research, 1981, Grammatical and lexical semantics. Moscow 3-15, (1981)
10. V.D. Arakin, Comparative typology of English and Russian languages. (Leningrad, Enlightenment, 1979)
11. E.B. Aristova, Substantive variants of the agentive syntaxeme // In the book: - Linguistic Studies. Syntactic analysis of multisystem languages. (Moscow, Russian Academy of Sciences. 1979)

12. I.V. Arnold, Semantic structure of the word in modern English and methods of its research. (Leningrad: LGPI named after A.I. Gertsin, 1966)
13. N.D. Arutyunova, Sentences and their meaning. (Moscow, Nauka, 1976)
14. O.D. Afanas'eva, History of Linguistics, Literary Studies. Moscow **3**, 93-96 (1989)
15. O.S. Akhmanova, Dictionary of linguistic terms. Ed. "Soviet Encyclopedia", (Moscow, 1969)
16. Sh.S. Ashurov, Ingliz va Uzbek tillarida kesim typology. Philol. fanlari nomzod. diss... Samarkand: 2007. 154 p.
17. M.V. Badkhen, The concept of spatial localization and its interpretation in English. - In the book: Linguistic Research. Analysis of syntactic units. (Moscow, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the SSR, 1986)
18. L.S. Barkhudarov, D.A. Shteling, English grammar. (3rd ed. Moscow, Higher. school, 1965)
19. G.P. Belinskaya, Paradigmatic genus of substantive locative syntaxes and their variants in modern English (AKD, Leningrad, 1981)
20. Ghafur Gulom. Asarlar. Oltinchi (Tashkent, 1974)
21. Jonathan Swift, Gulleverning sayohatlari. (Tashkent, 1974)
22. N. Z. Kotelova, On the logical and grammatical level in the language. Language and thinking. (Moscow, Nauka, 1967)
23. E. Kilichev, Xozirgi uzbek adabiy tili. Bukhoro, Bukhoro un-t nashriyoti, 2001, -228 b. <https://presedu.jdpu.uz/index.php/presedu/article/download/2704/1883/7001>].