SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 11 | November 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

# THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF FOLLOW-UP SENTENCES IN COMPOUND SENTENCES

**Teshaboev Dilmurod Rahmadjonovich**
*Senior Lecturer, Doctor of philosophy in philology (PhD), Fergana State University, City of Fergana, Uzbekistan*

**ANNOTATION**

*This article focuses on the research on the joint sentence and its structural features, the history of their study, the formal and meaningful characteristics of the joint sentence with the follow sentence, the means of forming the joint sentence and their semantics, the link pieces, the following joint sentence, the central section.*

**KEY WORDS:** *joint sentence, followed-up joint sentence, central section, one-member sentences, two-member sentences, fragmented sentences, fragmented sentences, link pieces, head predicative unit, follow-up predicative unit, grammatic formation of link pieces.*

## INTRODUCTION

A compound sentence, which is a syntactic integrity, distinguished by its structural-semantic, intonational signs as a separate integral of the syntax, by the breadth of its meaning, from simple predicative units, is the supreme unit of the syntactic level of the language.

The subject of a joint sentence is one of the problems that has been attracting the attention of Uzbek linguists for many years. It should be noted that this topic is one of the widely studied areas of linguistics, but still it can not be said that the problems with this topic are completely solved.

The importance of research devoted to the joint sentence and its structural properties on syntax, created in traditional linguistics, is incomparable. The scientifically-based ideas in these works provide a solid basis for the emergence of new views on the nature of a joint sentence and its meaningful and structural features in today's linguistics.

The first stage of the study of joint theories of speech in Uzbek language, in general, in Turkish science, was created in the form of joint theories of speech, formed mainly in Russian linguistics [15]. Of course, the method of comparison in the correct interpretation of the natural essence of each phenomenon is of great importance. In this way, the expediency of use in showing the national originality of any language phenomenon is known to many.

It is known that even in the history of world linguistics, in particular, ancient Latin linguistics was formed on the basis of copying from Greek linguistics. Such a method does not allow to correctly and objectively understand the peculiarities of language phenomena. The point is that linguistics, like other sciences, using the method of obtaining a template, other linguists must use the achievements creatively.

The classification of follow-up sentences in the Uzbek language is similar or closely related to the classification of follow-up sentences in other languages, and "types of follow-up sentences in Turkic languages, as well as in other languages, are inextricably linked with the theory of simple sentences" [5]. It has a very long tradition to correlate the following sentences with certain fragments of simple sentences [13, 19]. For example, in Spanish linguistics, the function of follow sentences is equated with the function of the word categories in simple sentences [10].

V.A.Beloshapkova noted that F.I.Buslaev the classification widely used in Russian linguistics in the middle of the XIX century. The classification is based on the similarity of follow-up sentences with simple sentences, and follow-up sentences with simple sentences. According to this classification has, cross-section, handle, complement and circumstance defined types of articulated sentences that follow. Position, style, degree-quantity, moment, cause, goal, condition and unhindered follow sentences are separated as appearances of follow sentences.

N.S.Pospelov's study plays an important role in the creation of a formative-meaningful classification in the issue of the classification of follow-up sentences. He divided the follow-up sentences into single-member and two-member types. N.S.Pospelov explains the difference between one member and two member sentences by the different

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 11 | November 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

nature of the connection between the head and the following sentences. In single-member sentences, the follow-predicate unit determines a fraction in the head-predicate unit, that is, the follow-predicate unit refers to a word in the head-predicate unit. In two-member sentences, the follow sentence connects integrity with the uppermost clause [9]. V.A.Beloshapkova calls single-member and two-member sentences "fragmented" and "nofragmented". V.A.Beloshapkova and N.S.Pospelov's views on the issue of follow-up sentences, there is almost no difference.

In Turkish science, too, it is common that N.S.Pospelov's views, that is, the follow, relate to the fact that the predicative units can fully interpret the prime predicate unit or determine its part. For example, according to M.A.Askarova the content and the structure of the follow-up predicative unit differs from the head predicative unit and emphasizes that the head predicative unit interprets a part or the head predicative unit as a whole [22]. Based on the above classification, A.Z.Abdullaev and A.G.Javadov recommends dividing the following phraseological units in the Azerbaijan language into two meaningful-syntactic groups. They argue that the follow-sentence conjugative units, which interpret a division in the prime predicate unit, have one meaningful core, while the follow-sentence conjugative units, which interpret the prime predicate unit as a whole, have two meaningful nuclei [2].

M.I.Cheremisina and T.A.Kolosovas cannot deny that the functions of the components of the follow-sentence joint sentence and the sentence fragments are mutually similar. In their opinion, the possessive, the fractional, the complement, the predicate, the functions of the case in a simple sentence, the word form, through the word combinations, itches to the surface. When these functions are performed through predicative units, it becomes a joint sentence [23].

Any sentence in the language is a phrase from a certain system of syntactic places. Syntactic positions in simple sentences and compound sentences do not differ from each other, on the contrary, they form a commonality in this aspect [20]. I.N.Egorova also bases the presence of functional compatibility between simple sentences and follow-up sentences with the fact that the syntactic place is given by a sentence fragment or a predicative unit [12].

In ensuring the essence and application of the following sentence, the meaning and valence of the word in the task of the cross-section of the main sentence are considered important [11]. The syntactic place arising from the valence of the predicate can sometimes be occupied even by the subordinate predicative unit, due to the meaningful possibility of the predicate. On the contrary, if the syntactic place is not occupied by the subordinate predicate unit, the following sentence does not find a compound sentence. Therefore, some linguists use the theory of valence in determining the composition of a follow-sentence compound sentence [17]. It is also worthwhile to sometimes turn to the theory of valence in the study of the semantic aspects of a subordinate clause.

Based on the above points, it can be said that it is more acceptable to classify the following sentence sentences by taking a template from the tasks of the fragments in simple sentences. Because, when the syntactic system of places is taken from the point of view, the following sentence-joint sentences are practically not distinguished from simple sentences. The grammatic basis of the sentence is the uppermost sentence in the follow-up sentence joint sentences. The following sentence is a sentence that interprets a particular section of the sentence structure [16].

In ensuring the essence and application of the predicative unit of the pronoun, the meaning and valence of the word in the task of the intersection of the main predicative unit are considered important. The syntactic role arising from the valence of the predicate can sometimes be occupied even by the subordinate predicative unit, proceeding from the meaningful possibility of the predicate. On the contrary, if the syntactic place is not occupied by the subordinate predicative unit, the following sentence predicative unit does not find content. Therefore, some linguists use the theory of valence in determining the composition of the phraseological unit with the pronoun follow. It is also worthwhile to sometimes turn to the theory of valence in the study of the semantic aspects of phraseological units with a follow sentence.

Based on the above points, we can say that it is more acceptable to classify phraseological units with a follow-up sentence, taking a template from the tasks of the parts in simple sentences. Because, when the system of syntactic places is taken from the point of view, the following phraseological phraseological units are not distinguished from simple sentences, almost, by the way. The grammatic basis of the sentence is the chief predicative unit in the predicative units of the follow-up sentence. The follow-up predicate is a sentence that interprets a particular part of the composition of the chief predicate unit [16].

In 50-60 years of the last century, serious attention was paid to the study of Uzbek language syntax. Sentences, which are considered a syntactic unit, formed as a result of a predicate connection are divided into simple and joint sentences according to the quantitative designation of the "predicate connection".

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 11 | November 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

The study of joint sentences in Uzbek linguistics was initially conducted by H.Gaziev, M.Askarova, G.Abdurahmonovs was studied by in 40-60 years [1, 3, 21]. Later N.Mahmudov, N.Turniyazov, R.Sayfullaeva continued by a joint statement study, M.Askarova, G.Abdurahmonov, A.Berdialievs special attention is paid and their scientific views [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 22].

Research of joint sentences with syntactic integrity, which differs from simple predicative units philolog scientist A.Mamajonov it was also studied. In his monograph entitled "joint sentence stylistics", the scientist views on joint sentences with follow-up sentences, the reference also refers to joint sentences with follow-up sentences, which are formed by fragments [14].

As in other linguistics, discussions on the following sentences in Uzbek linguistics have been going on for a long time.

In the classification of prepositional units with a follow sentence, it is necessary to pay attention not only to the following predicative unit, but also to the prime predicative unit. In this respect, the prime predicate units are also divided into two types: 1) prime sentences without reference parts, 2) prime sentences with reference parts [16, 18].

Conclusion.

In conclusion, we can say that in Uzbek linguistics it has become customary to interpret the predicative unit subordinate to the prime predicative unit in the phraseological units by the term "follow sentence" and is absorbed. Taking these into account, we also found it desirable to study in this article the unit that is subject to the prime predicative unit with the term "follow predicative unit" [18].

In general, the problems associated with the study of conjugative units are quite a few. These issues are among the problems facing the Uzbek language syntax today and require thorough and thorough study.

## REFERENCES

1. *Абдураҳмонов Ғ.А. Қўшма гап синтаксиси асослари. Тошкент, 1958.*
2. *Абдуллаев А.З., Джавадов А.Г. О семантическом ядре азербайджанского сложноподчиненного предложения. Советская тюркология, 1987, № 1, С. 52*
3. *Асқарова М. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек тили ва қўшма гаплар. Тошкент, 1960.*
4. *Аскарова М.А. Способы подчинения и типы придаточных предложений в современном узбекском языке. АДД. Ташкент, 1963.*
5. *Баскаков А.Н. Предложение в современном турецком языке. М.: Наука, 1984, С.119.*
6. *Бердиалиев А. Эргаш гапли қўшма гап конструкцияларида семантик-сигнификатив парадигматика. Тошкент: Фан, 1989.*
7. *Бердиалиев А. Семантико-сигнификативная парадигматика и синтагматические отношение в конструкциях сложноподчиненного предложение узбекского литературного языка. АДД. Ташкент, 1989.*
8. *Бердиалиев А. Ўзбек тилида омоним моделли эргаш гапли қўшма гаплар. Тошкент: Фан, 1990.*
9. *Белошапкова В.А. Современный русский язык. Синтаксис. М.: Высшая школа, 1977, С. 216-219.*
10. *Васильева-Шведе О.К., Степанов Г.В. Теоретическая грамматика испанкого языка. Синтаксис предложения. М.: Высшая школа, 1981, С.232.*
11. *Гаврилов Г.Ф. Об изоморфизме сложно-подчиненного предложения и словосочетания. – В кн.: Подчинение в полипредикативных конструкциях. Новосибирск: Наука, 1980, С. 29.*
12. *Егорова И.Н. Позиционные эквиваленты слова в составе предложения. – В кН.: Русский язык. Грамматические исследования. М.: Наука, 1967, С. 78.*
13. *Корнилов В.А. К проблеме изоморфизма сложно-подчиненного предложения и подчинительного словосочетания. – В кН.: Подчинение в полипредикативных конструкциях. Новосибирск: Наука, 1980, С. 13.*
14. *Мамажонов А. Қўшма гап стилистикаси. Тошкент. 1990. 110 б.*
15. *Маҳмудов Н.М. Қайта қуриш ва ўзбек морфологиясининг айрим масалалари. Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 1988. 3-сон, 16-20-бетлар.*
16. *Нурмонов А., Маҳмудов Н., Аҳмедов А., Солиҳўжаев С. Ўзбек тилининг мазмуний синтаксиси. Тошкент: Фан. 240-б.*
17. *Страхова В.С. Некоторые лингвистические основы обучения гипотаксису. – В кН.: Проблемы ученика русского языка как иностранного. Синтаксис. М.: Русский язык, 1980, С. 456-457.*
18. *Тешабоев Д. Ўзбек тилидаги ҳавола бўлакли синтактик конструкциялар: Филол. ф.ф.док. (Phd) дисс. автореф. – Фарғона, 2019.*
19. *Щеулин В.В. О классификации сложноподчиненных предложений. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронежского университета, 1972, С. 3-12.*
20. *Шутова С.И. Вопросы теории синтаксиса, М.: Наука, 1984, С.55*
21. *Ғозиев Ҳ. Ҳозирги замон ўзбек адабий тилидаги қўшма гапларнинг состави ҳақида / / Ўзбек тили илмий грамматикасидан материаллар. Тошкент, 1941. 127-156 бетлар.*
22. *Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. 3-нашри, Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987, 187-бет.*
23. *Черемисина М.И., Колосова Т.А. Очерки по теории сложного предложения. Новосибирск: Наука, 187, С. 61.*