TYPOLOGY OF QUANTITATIVE SYNTAX IN PLACE OF NP2

Aziza Alangova
Student,
Samarkhand State Iistitute of Foreign Languages,
Uzbekistan.

Hamrokulov Tohir
Student,
Samarkhand State Iistitute of Foreign Languages,
Uzbekistan.

ABSTRACT

It is known that in both Uzbek and English languages, predicate can be formed by various types of parts of speechs. This paper includes information about the syntactical analysis of predicate, different elements like numbers, that used in the place of predicate. The similiarities and dissimiliarities of anaylizing them in both languages is briefly indicated, which will be benevolent in learning the languages grammar deeply, as all given statements are with proof examples.
KEY WORDS: *quantitativeness, syntactic and semantic character, core predicate, subordinate links, depassivation, depassivation.*

INTRODUCTION

This paper study focused on analyzing the elements that have been crossed in English and Uzbek on the basis of the kinetic-structural synthesis principles that have evolved in recent years, as well as identifying the comparative-typological features of the studied units. In the analysis of the phenomenon of the political-typological analysis, the syntactic typology used the synthesis of the syntax based on the elements of the hepatic component. This linguistic method is a unique approach to predicative analysis in both languages. In particular, this identifies differential and syntactic semantic signs of syntactic units, comparative-typological analysis of them, comparing their expression options, and clarifying syntax-based syntaxes with core predicate and subordinate links.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Quantitativeness is a differential syntactic semantic character and is one of the non-categorical symbols of qualifications. It assigns a numeric function to the item NP1 that is in the sentence:
1) He was eleven and Cheese-Face was thirteen - U paytda Martin o'n birda, Moy Qovoq esa o'n uchda edi;
2) She was almost fourty ; Davlat narxi esa bor yo'g'i o'n ming;
3) Ettore was twenty three; Bir jo'ra atlas ikki yuz so'm ekan.

The items that came in NP2 in the speech were (1) was eleven, was thirteen, o'n birda, o'n uchda, (2) was fourty, o'n ming; (3) was twenty three, ikki yuz so'm ekan with numerical explanation of such elements as NP1, He, Cheese-Face, Moy Qovoq, U, She, Price, Ettore.

In fact, when we look at the actual material, the element that comes with NP2 in addition to the quantum can also include the elective (choice) sign:

4) She was one of them – U o'shalardan biri
5) She is one in a shadow - U mingdan biri

As is well known, in English, quantitativeness differential syntactic - semantic sign is expressed by the combination of person form of "to be" and numbers, while in Uzbek it is now a integer number, past or future, with number + suffix or is represented by a non-league verb.

The representation of the static syntax in the English language instead of NP2 is represented by the verbs of the lexical-semantic group, which represent the state of the subject in the sentence.[1]
Beloxi was fainted. Kalamushlar kabob bo'ldi.

In these words, was fainted, kabab compound represented the position of elements such as Beloxi, Kalamushlar, represented by a noun instead of NP1. That's why the elements of the was fainted, kebab were considered static syntax.

There are many difficulties in distinguishing between static and active syntax in English and Uzbek, and this requires special research. Based on the English material, M.M. Boldireva estimates that when to be+ participle II is in place ofNP2, can speak of two meanings, namely action and condition, In his view, when expressing the action, the to be + participle II is associated with a placeholder in the subordinate database, with the predecessor by the action person. When to be+participle II represents condition, predecessor cannot be expressed with the preposition by to the context.[2]

O.A.Pismennaya distinguishes between static and active syntax, and can only relate to adverbial elements in a "NP2-based procedural-static syntax" subordinate database. Its main difference is that it does not relate to such elements as procedural-active syntax. [3] However, in the case of English NP2, the

procedural-active syntax can be linked to adverbial elements in a subordinate database.
Example: Riley Anderson goes there.

Differentiation of static and active syntax can be based on the following: static syntax can be linked to a locative syntax based on subordinate link, and procedural-active syntax associated with locative-allative and locative-abstract syntax.[4]

According to NE Voskresenskaya, thr elements such as intently, rapidly cannot be added to NP2, that express level when procedural-static syntax comes to place of NP2 in sentences.[5]

For example: I happened to tell him // I happened intently to tell him.

According to OE Filimonova, elements expressing staticity can be expressed in different parts of speech. It only depends on where they come from in the sentence.[6]

Generally, in English, the procedural-static syntax is expressed in the person form of a verb to be and participle II when substituted for NP2, and its past participle form is represented mainly by intransitive verbs. To the structure of such statements preposition by cannot be inserted. This issue requires special study in Uzbek as well. Factual evidence suggests that the Uzbek language may also have different interpretative static syntax. For example: a) By using passive voice: Birida qurt, birida bolasi kasallikka chalindi; b) by a verbal adverb suffix - (i) b +qo'ymoq auxiliary verb: Payl uni osiltirib qo'ydi; c) With the help of a verbal adverb suffix - (a) b +qo'ymoq: Jo narsalarni joylab qo'ydi

The foregoing examples show that the procedural static syntax in place of NP2 in English does not undergo depassivation. This syntax represents the state of the elements represented by live nouns or nominative pronouns in place of NP1 on the basis of the nuclear predicate. In Uzbek, the elements that come in the form of NP2 are undergoing a transformation passivisation:

Payl uni osiltirib qo'ydi – U Payl tomonidan osiltirib qo'yildi;
Payl hang it – It was hang by Payl.
Jo narsalarni joylab qo'ydi – Narsalar Jo tomonidan joylandi;
Jo put items – Items were put by Jo.

As it turns out, if Pale and Jo elements are syntaxes of action or substitution agents, things, it elements, with the meaning of the positioning components. Thus, in Uzbek, the procedural-static syntax is associated with a substitution-agent syntax based on the core predicate connection, whereas the object with the meaning of the subordinate connection can be associated with the syntax. English is exception in that case. There are also verbs in the Uzbek language (hayajonlanmoq, to'lqinlanmoq, iztirob chekmoq, bezovta bo'lmoq, qayg'urmoq, harat chekmoq, ma'yuslanmoq, ranjimoq,o'pka qilmoq, hursand bo'lmoq, sevinmoq, quvonmoq, ga'azablanmoq, sog'inmoq, jahli chiqmoq, achinmoq) represent the procedural static syntax when they are in place of NP2 in the sentence, and the object, like English, is not associated with syntax.

This syntax is expressed in English using a person form of to be. For example:
The Mitty Crowd is in there. June has been here.

The is and has been that are substituted for NP2 in these words represent niether the action nor the condition. According to A.N. Smirnitsky, there is no reason to call is as predicate because its lexical meaning is insignificant and vague. He says that the verb acts as an auxiliary word, as in the phrase "He is a doctor." The phrase "He is here" predicate is more complex according to its formation, it consists of a linking verb and a place component. But semantically, the second component of the sentence here is predicate, because it serves as a predicate. This type of predicate is called modifier predicate as A.N. Smirnitsky case.[7]

In the Uzbek language, however, the situation is different:
All are here – Hammasi shu yerda
I am at the Institute – Men institutdaman
He is in school – U maktabda

In the context of the foregoing, here (shu yerda), at the institute (institutda), in school (maktabda) elements are marked as predicate. According to A. Gulomov, M. Askarova argues that the nounnin the place of predicate serves as predicate besides possessive case and accusative case. Thus, nouns that receive predicative affixes act as predicate in the sentence structure.[8] But it's hard to believe that the words like here, in school, are recognized as predicate. Because when these words are converted into past or future forms, a different form will occur:

Hamma shu yerda – Hamma shu erda edi;
Everybody is here – Everybody was here;
Hamma shu yerda – hamma shu yerda bo'ladi;
Everybody is here – Everybody will be here.

When the elements of the words there, here, shu yerda, institutdaman, maktabda are divided into direct individual participants,the syntactic links between them and forms such as, is, has been, edi edim, bo'laman, bo'ladi can be found. This, of course, indicates that they are interconnected by subordinate connection. To prove this, if the words like work, o'qiyman are included to the sentences The Mitty Crowd is in there, and Men institutdaman, they cover the following sentences. The Mitty Crowd works and Men institutda o'qiyman and the words there, indtitutda remains locative syntax as in the previous sentences. But the elements works, o'qiyman represent procedural when the elements of the text are syntactically and semantically derived. If they represent an active action, then the elements of is, edi, edim, bo'laman, bo'ladi mean the existence. Therefore, The Mitty Crowd, June, hammasi, men, u, are considered the substantial existential syntax. The elements of the syntax is has been, edi, edim, bo'laman, bo'ladi considered as

existential variants. In the sentences Men intitutdaman, hammasi, shu erda, u maktabda, the existentialism is not grammatically expressive, that is, they are equal with zero or existentialism is loaded with person suffixes. This is also evident in the translation:
 The grocery was below – Do'kon pastda edi.

CONCLUSION

By the way of conclusion, learning both languages, that is Uzbek and English is being attracted by students of both nations, and day by day the number of them is increasing rapidly. It should be metioned that even indigenious English people are having an interest to be aware of Uzbek language and its grammar. What is more, this topic is quite important in teaching and learning other grammatical themes, especially syntactical analysis of other parts of sentences and speechs, as many students tend to do mistakes at differentiating part of sentences. This paper has a great advantages on doing and correcting aforementioned statements.

REFERENCES

1. *Гнушине   Э.Ш. Соотношения пассива и статива   в   литовском   языке   // Сб. Лингвистические исследования. – М., 1973. – С. 50.; Плоткин В.Я. Грамматические системы в английском языке. – Кишинев: Штиинца, 1975. – С.   104.;   Райхель   Г.М.   К   вопросу   о грамматическом значении сочетания to be + причастие II в современном английском языке: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М.: МГУ, 1954. – С. 11*
2. *Болдырова М.М. Сочетания to be+Participle II со значением результативного состояния в современном английском языке // Учен.зап. МГПИ т. 59. – М., 1971. – С. 35.*
3. *Письменная О.А. Двухядерные безглагольные предложения в современном английском языке: Дисс. канд. филол. наук. - Киев: КГПИ, 1975. – С.104.*
4. *Мухин   А.М.   Лингвистический   анализ: Теоретические и методологические проблемы. – Л.: Наука, 1976. – С. 106.*
5. *Воскресенская Н.Е. Предложения с ядерном дважды   предицируемым   компонентом   в современном   английском языке: Дис. канд. филол. наук. – Л., 1976. – С. 122.*
6. *Филимонова О.Е. Стативная синтаксема в английском предложении: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Л.: ЛОИЯ, 1978. – С. 11-12*
7. *Смирницкий А.Н. Синтаксис английского языка. – М.: Лит.на иностр.яз., 1957. – С. 114-115.*
8. *Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987. – Б. 87.*