

UDC: 81.25

FORM AND CONTENT IN SYNTACTIC UNITS

Akramov Shukurjon Tokhtasinovich

Associate Professor, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Kokand State University

Abstract: The article focuses on the issue of evaluating syntaxemas belonging to the syntactic level of the Uzbek language from a new system-theoretical aspect and approaching it based on the theory of valence. The idea is that the expandability of linguistic units is related not only to their semantic possibilities, but also to their grammatical forms. It is explained that in a given speech situation, only one of the paradigmatic rows that can enter into syntagmatic relations with each other can enter into syntagmatic relations with one of the members of another row.

Keywords: Syntactic units, form, content, grammatical unit, syntax, linguistics, language system, meaning, syntactic analysis, language units.

Introduction. The most necessary factor in implementing today's educational process in accordance with the requirements of the times is the transformation of each lesson into a unique circle of joy for students, and each educational institution into a place of joy. The spirit of the lesson, images and images, interesting exhibits, expressions, allow students to know, think, see beauty, and form their attitude to the world through their feelings, and cultivate the student's worldview, thinking, and ability to think independently. However, the current and practically used school and higher education textbooks and study guides give students full information about the theoretical aspects of education that we have emphasized above? - raises a legitimate question. Yes, it can be said that they do, but not at the required level. That is, textbooks and manuals on this subject have not been developed sufficiently, and those that exist are only in the hands of some specialists. What does a student learn in such a situation? Some substantive interpretations in higher education have not been included in school or lyceum textbooks at all. After all, new theoretical views of linguistics, although not deep, should be introduced to higher education as elementary information, similar to age characteristics, at the lower stages of continuous education. For this, it is necessary to include in textbooks the knowledge of important aspects of syntax under scientific terms such as sentence center, expander, sentence expander, word expander, modal expander, sentence segment, [P m], person-number, tense, affirmative-negative, inclination, clause, clause category, clause forms, independent clause form, non-independent clause form, grammatically formed sentence, semantically- functionally formed sentence, clause structure, possessive, possessive clause, possessive clause, attributive clause, semantically-functionally formed sentence, grammatically formed sentence, possessive clause, possessive clause, possessive clause, compound clause, compound clause, (heading clause), and more advanced forms of this should be studied in higher education, so that specialists can develop appropriate and proportionate competence in this field.

When studying syntactically simple sentences, we believe that it is necessary to explain the following to the future specialist and clarify the level of understanding. In particular, one-word syntactic devices are formed with only one independent meaningful word and include verbal sentences, nominative, adverbial, infinitive sentences, vocative sentences, in particular, Boraman, Contains sentences like "I came. Autumn."

Two-word syntactic devices are distinguished by their nature: from simple word combinations (such as *eating food, reading a book*) and simple sentences (*The lesson began, (Like spring has come)*) is formed.

Multi-word syntactic devices consist of a combination of more than two independent words: *seven faint stars standing in a crowd* (complex compound). *Honest work is the best habit.* (common saying). Of course, the center of syntax is the doctrine of the sentence. Each sentence expresses a complete thought, but the completeness of the thought in a sentence is relative: the content of some sentences, taken in isolation, is not clear, complete. A sentence is distinguished from other syntactic units by the sign of predicativity. Predicativity is the grammatical meaning of a sentence that cannot be separated into parts in the system of forms.

the linguist AG'ulomov, predicativity is a category inherent in a sentence. Predicativity is indicated by the participle, and therefore this phenomenon is formed by the sum of the categories of modality, person - number, and tense. Predicativity is the basis of a sentence, it is an affirmation - negation, It consists of a synthesis of the categories of modality (tendency), person, and number.

The predicative character of a sentence is directly related to the concept of modality. Modality expresses the relationship of the general content of a sentence to objective existence.

Any sentence is grammatically distinguished by its structural completeness. It is necessary to emphasize that the idea that it is formed by a possessive and a participial group or one of them and acquires intonational integrity is not a characteristic of modern linguistics for Turkic languages. Also, a sentence represents a complete thought only in speech. Its representation of a complete thought may depend on several factors. It should also be emphasized that It is important to note that syntax is directly related to the morphology, lexicology, and phonetics of a language. These areas cannot exist without each other. This is where the holistic systematicity of the language is revealed , and the basic essence of syntax becomes clear.

It is no secret that it has become a tradition and a habit to study syntactic categories in connection with morphological means , and at the same time , taking into account the fact that speech is made up of words and that words have a real life within a sentence and are used within speech, it is clear that syntax is closely related to lexis.

Syntactic units are interconnected not only formally , but also substantively. The correctness of the formal connection alone is not enough for two syntactic forms to be correctly connected to each other. For example, the verb *to eat* , since it has a special grammatical meaning of transitivity, formally governs the noun in the accusative case. Therefore, it requires that the subordinate part be in the accusative case. The grammatical connection of a noun in any accusative case with a transitive verb is formally correct. For example, noun + verb = to **eat** a stone. **However, the context does not allow** the “ at ” in any accusative case to be connected to the dominant part to eat.

The subordinate clause in the agreement of the income *In order for* the dominant part to be correctly connected with the subject, it must also have semantic compatibility. The subordinate and dominant parts must have a common semantic pattern that is repeated in both. This common semantic pattern is the basis for the semantic connection of the subordinate and

dominant parts. For example, the verb to eat can only be connected with words that fall into the semantic field of “ eating” (meat, soup, apple, cherry, etc.). This is also evidenced by the fact that it is considered an opportunity for expansion from the perspective of theoretical linguistics.

When we talk about the expansion possibilities of linguistic units, we mean that the internal potential (in terms of content and function) capabilities of these units are manifested in speech in a certain way and can enter into syntactic connections with other linguistic units. As a result of such expansion, the potential embodied in a linguistic unit is clarified in speech. Therefore, the expansion possibility of linguistic units is a linguistic phenomenon, and the potential of this unit also takes place in the speaker's memory. The realization of these possibilities takes on a purely verbal or private appearance. For example, the verb *to write* expresses the creation of a certain source (object) in written form as a result of performing a certain type of action, and therefore this verb-lexeme as a linguistic possibility can be used to denote written sources such as *a letter, a book, a story*, It has the ability to combine with words such as *poetry and verse*. It is this linguistic ability that, when realized in speech, manifests diverse speech formations - word combinations such as "*to write a letter*", "*to write a book*", "*to write a poem*". *If the "to write" lexeme contains the possibility of connecting with the names of written sources (or parts thereof)*, "*to write a letter*". In speech derivatives such as "*to write a book*", this linguistic possibility is realized and comes to the surface in a specific speech form. Although the range of possibilities for combining *the* lexeme "to write" with various words denoting written sources is wide, only one of such possibilities occurs in the derivative "to write a letter". Thus, in each specific speech situation, only one of the paradigmatic rows that can enter into syntagmatic relations with each other can enter into a specific syntactic relationship with one of the members of the other row.

The ability of linguistic units to expand is related not only to their semantic possibilities, but also to their grammatical forms. Because not only lexemes, but also grammatical forms create the possibility of expansion. For example, possessive suffixes, in addition to indicating the belonging of the noun or the object, event to which they are attached, to a certain person and number, can be expanded using a definite or indefinite accusative noun: My name. Salim... (his)...-i/-si. Like. From this it can be seen that expansion also exists in morphological forms, in other words, as a possibility of a meaningful syntagmatic relationship, and it is not without benefit to explain them as "preceding means" (i.e., possessive, person, number, relative suffixes) and "subsequent means" (agreement, adverb, -dagi, -niki, etc.).

In order to understand the information correctly, in addition to the speakers' knowledge of the language, it is necessary to add the listener's knowledge of the world, the knowledge of the social situation in which the sentence is used, the knowledge of the speakers' psyche during the speech process, and other knowledge. In this case, single-word compound sentences are also directly related to the above processes and provide pragmatic assistance for speech clarity. As a result of such a practical need, attention is increasingly paid to the semantics and pragmatics of simple compound sentences.

Sometimes in a dependent relationship the subordinate part serves to reveal the valence of the dominant part, if everything is connected with it, in a free relationship the subordinate part does not reveal the valence of the dominant part. In what form the subordinate part

comes does not depend on the dominant part. For example, *a worker in a factory. An excellent student in our class.*

Free communication is similar to another type of communication that is part of the connected communication. Therefore, in Uzbek linguistics, such types of compounds have been studied under the name of the quality of the controlling communication - the control of the noun.

But elements that enter into free communication differ from control elements in an important way. The semantic-grammatical properties of the dominant part, its categorical sign, play a key role in the emergence of the control relation. The categorical properties of the dominant part predetermine the form of the subordinate part and the nature of its connection with the dominant part. For example, in the construction *Mashinada keldim*, the occurrence of the subordinate noun (*mashinada*) in the instrumental case is predetermined by the general categorical meaning (belonging to the verb category) and the specific categorical meaning (intransitivity, relation, etc.) of the dominant part.

In free communication, neither the general categorical meaning nor the specific grammatical meaning of the dominant part requires the subordinate part to be in the form of a control. Words such as *thank you* (*thank you for your help*), *gift* (*gift to children, gift from children, gift from children*), *letter* (*letter from my brother, letter to my brother, letter from my brother*) do not require a consistent form for themselves. The fact that such words are freely combined with words in the conjugations of departure, place, and exit indicates not that they control words in a specific conjugation form, but rather that they are neutral in relation to these forms. Compounds of the type "permit me", "greet my brothers" are formed by dropping the auxiliary verb: "permit me", "greet my brothers". Subordinate The participle (*to me, to my brothers*) took the form required by the categorical and specific grammatical meanings of the governing verb. The omission of the governing verb also eliminated the relation of the subject and led to the occurrence of elliptical or cantamihation phenomena in linguistics.

In addition, sometimes ordinary complements and cases are connected to verb clauses by means of conjunctions or control relations, forming word combinations and serving to complete them. In this case, the complement or case is subordinate, and the verb clause acts as a dominant word. However, in sentences where determiners formed in the form of case or complement are used, it is not possible to determine the word combination, let alone any dominant component specific to its word combinations, in the first place. These parts are related to the whole sentence, to its integral predicative basis consisting of the possessive and the clause. They expand not a specific word, a part of a sentence, but the whole sentence. In such a situation, a formal-substantive imbalance arises. This also requires some adjustments to the traditional classification of word combinations in terms of syntactic connection.

Conclusion. In all the above-mentioned types of compounds, the form of the subordinate part does not depend on the general categorical meaning and specific grammatical meaning of the dominant part. Therefore, this type of connection constitutes a separate type - free connection. The gradual introduction of such phenomena characteristic of the syntactic level of a simple sentence into the educational system on a scientific basis indicates the need for a deeper study of the formal-semantic relationships of syntactic units.

Reference

1. Akramov SH. Complement and case (Wpm) in the aspect of valency in the sentence construction of the Uzbek language. ND. Tashkent.1997. 48-p.
2. Akramov Sh.T. The possibility of expansion in linguistic units. QarDU messages. 2022 (3/2) 52.
3. Akramov Sh.T. On the system-theoretical interpretation of speech fragments. Kokand DPI. Scientific Reports. 2 (6)-2022.March.
4. Akramov Sh. T. Determinant as a verb expander. Economic science. ISSN 2409-1677.
5. Makhmudov N., Nurmonov A. Theoretical grammar (syntax) of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent : Educational Publishing House , 1995. - 232 p. No. 5. - P.64-66.
6. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. et al. The semantic syntax of the Uzbek language. pp. 26-113.