

## ABOUT THE COMPLEX (CIRCUMSTANTIAL) TYPES OF ATTRIBUTES

Sh. Akramov

Associate Professor, Qo'qon State University

**Annotation.** This article explains the compound type of the attribute (*aniqlovchi*) and clarifies its differences from the word combination (*so'z birikmasi*) based on examples. It also discusses the possibility of extracting these constructions from the sentence and their ability to express highly complex meanings in extended simple sentences and complex sentences with subordination.

**Keywords:** sentence nucleus, verbocentric syntactic relation, syntactic chain, valency, functional object, non-functional object, word extender, sentence extender, valency potential.

**Аннотация.** В данной статье рассматривается составной тип определения (*aniqlovchi*) и на основе примеров разъясняются его отличия от словосочетания. Также обсуждается возможность выведения таких конструкций за пределы предложения, а также их способность выражать сложное содержание в распространённых простых и сложноподчинённых предложениях.

**Ключевые слова:** центр предложения, вербоцентрическая синтаксическая связь, синтаксическая цепь, валентность, функциональное дополнение, нефункциональное дополнение, распространитель слова, распространитель предложения, валентностный потенциал.

In Uzbek linguistics, traditional sentence constituents are often described as extended, complex, or expanded types, and these are interpreted differently by various linguists. Regardless of whether they are referred to as extended, complex, or expanded, their essential nature lies in the fact that several words functioning as a single sentence constituent are unified under one question. Indeed, the extended or expanded types of attributes are also closely connected in certain respects with the issues discussed in the above-mentioned topic of syntactic analysis. In particular, in modern Uzbek, there are several types of expanded attributes, one of which is attributes expressed through participial constructions formed with the suffix *-gan*. These *-gan* participial constructions are interpreted by some specialists as subordinate clauses, while others oppose this view. Since this issue is highly complex, special studies on complex sentences also pay particular attention to the relationship between expanded attributes and subordinate clauses. Nevertheless, there is still no unanimous agreement among scholars as to whether participial constructions should be regarded as expanded attributes or as subordinate clauses.

Those who classify participial constructions as subordinate clauses base their arguments mainly on two points. Some emphasize that such constructions correspond to subordinate clauses when translated into Russian, while others argue that these constructions express complete meaning and contain both a subject and a predicate. However, basing their classification on Russian translations and considering them subordinate clauses is not appropriate. The most complex aspect of the issue is determining whether such constructions possess the defining features of a clause or not. In recent years, the number of scholars who recognize that such constructions are not subordinate clauses has been increasing, and their works provide strong arguments supporting this view. At the same time, studies that continue to classify participial constructions as subordinate clauses and attempt to justify this position are still being produced today. Therefore, it is necessary to highlight and discuss certain considerations regarding this issue.

Researchers who accept that constructions of the type under discussion are not subordinate clauses emphasize that they do not possess any of the features typical of a sentence. In contrast, those who classify them as subordinate clauses argue that they express complete meaning and contain both a subject and a predicate. However, in no study has this view been convincingly



proven with reliable evidence. On the contrary, the arguments presented as proof are often inconsistent with reality and do not meet the criteria that define subordinate clauses or complex sentences in general. For example, in his doctoral dissertation devoted to the study of attributive clauses in French and Uzbek, N. K. Turniyozov attempts to prove that the construction in the sentence *Opam o‘qigan hikoya hammamizni qiziqitirdi* (“The story my sister read interested all of us”) is a subordinate clause as follows:

“Opam hikoya o‘qidi. Hikoya hammamizni qiziqitirdi.”

As shown in this example, two independent simple sentences are linked through transformation in an SOU–SOU structure. During this process, the word *hikoya* from the first sentence is omitted to avoid repetition, since it also appears in the second sentence. However, this word does not disappear without a trace; instead, it is replaced by the participial form *-gan*.

The *-gan* participial form, in turn, attaches to the verbal element of the sentence and changes its form. Thus, the sentence *Opam hikoya o‘qidi* becomes *Opam o‘qigan*, acquiring a structure that expresses an incomplete meaning and becomes dependent on the second clause. However, in this case, the claim that two independent simple sentences are transformed into a complex sentence through deletion of *hikoya* and transformation of the verb form is not supported by any convincing evidence. Similarly, justifying the subordinate-clause status of such constructions by reconstructing sentences based on their possible meanings is also incorrect. If this approach were accepted, nearly all extended simple sentences could be artificially transformed into complex sentences. This would lead to the conclusion that complex sentences express complex meanings while simple sentences express only simple meanings, which is not accurate, since extended simple sentences may also express highly complex meanings. Those who argue that *-gan* participial constructions express complete meaning and contain both subject and predicate reach this conclusion by analyzing them in isolation from the sentence. For example, in the sentence *Otam keltirgan xabar hammamizni hayajonga soldi* (“The news brought by my father excited us all”), the construction *otam keltirgan* (“brought by my father”), if taken separately, indeed appears to express complete meaning and seems to contain both subject and predicate.

However, such an approach is methodologically incorrect. In isolation, *otam keltirgan* would function not as a subordinate clause but as an independent simple sentence, which would eliminate the possibility of considering it as part of a complex sentence. The most important and complex issue is to determine whether such constructions actually contain an independent subject and predicate. In this regard, examining the relationship between the subordinate and main clauses and the formation of the predicate in subordinate clauses may help to clarify the issue more precisely.

In Turkological literature, including Uzbek linguistic studies, it is stated that subordinate clauses are connected to the main clause through specific formal means. However, in reality, it is impossible to claim that subordinate clauses are not linked to the main clause by any connecting devices. In sentences containing *-gan* participial constructions discussed above, it is also not possible to identify any explicit linking means that connect the subordinate clause to the main clause.

For example, in the sentence *Otam keltirgan xabar hammamizni hayajonga soldi* (“The news brought by my father excited us all”), there is no doubt that there is no linking word or special intonation between the segments *otam keltirgan* and *hammamizni hayajonga soldi* that would function as a subordinate-clause connector to the main clause. The only possible assumption is that the suffix *-gan* performs this function (and some scholars indeed hold such a view). It is true that the suffix *-gan* has a linking function in this case. However, this function is not that of connecting a subordinate clause to a main clause; rather, it is the function of linking a verb to a noun—i.e., forming an attributive form that connects a verb to a noun. The same applies when the participle appears in present or present-future forms: *otam keltirayotgan xabar* (“the news being brought by my father”), *otam keltiradigan xabar* (“the news that my father usually brings”).



Therefore, if the construction *otam keltirgan* in the sentence *Otam keltirgan xabar hammamizni hayajonga soldi* is regarded as a clause, then constructions such as *otam keltirayotgan* and *otam keltiradigan* would also have to be considered clauses. However, there is no doubt that these forms do not possess any of the characteristics of clauses.

In particular, if attention is paid to the fact that the present participle form (*keltirayotgan*) can never function as a predicate, this issue becomes even clearer. In general, linguistic facts of Uzbek show that it is impossible to claim that the suffix *-gan* has the function of linking a subordinate clause to a main clause. Thus, considering the construction *otam keltirgan* in the sentence *Otam keltirgan xabar hammamizni hayajonga soldi* as a clause is a consequence of treating the participial form *-gan* as capable of functioning as a predicate. However, within this construction, there is strong evidence that the noun in the nominative case is not a subject and that the participle is not a predicate; therefore, the construction is not a subordinate clause.

First of all, it should be noted that judging the noun in such participial constructions as a subject merely because it appears in the nominative case is not sufficient. This is because when the noun appears in other cases, the overall syntactic function of the construction does not change. For instance:

- Otam keltirgan xabar hammamizni hayajonga soldi;
- Otamning keltirgan xabari hammamizni hayajonga soldi;
- Otamni ko'rgan odam biznikiga keldi;
- Otamga olgan kitob uning o'tmishi haqida edi;
- Otamda bo'lgan kitob uning o'tmishi haqida edi;
- Otamdan olgan kitob uning o'tmishi haqida edi.

In these examples, the nouns in accusative, genitive, dative, locative, and ablative cases within the participial construction are not independently treated as objects or adverbials. Therefore, it is also unjustified to regard the nominative noun in such constructions as a subject. Since the noun in the nominative case is not a subject in such constructions, the participle linked to it also does not acquire any person-number agreement markers; that is, it does not display predicate-like properties. In contrast, in subordinate clauses whose predicate is a participle, the predicate carries person-number markers, i.e., grammatical person is expressed. Moreover, in such subordinate clauses, the predicate can be replaced with other forms expressing person, number, and tense (synonymous forms). Compare:

Biz borganda guruh a'zolaridan ikkitasi mashina aylanadigan joyning egatlarini tekislayotgan ekan;

Biz borganimizda guruh a'zolaridan ikkitasi mashina aylanadigan joyning egatlarini tekislayotgan ekan;

Biz borsak, guruh a'zolaridan ikkitasi mashina aylanadigan joyning egatlarini tekislayotgan ekan;

Biz borar ekanmiz, guruh a'zolaridan ikkitasi mashina aylanadigan joyning egatlarini tekislashga kirishdi.

In the types of constructions we are discussing above, such a situation does not occur at all. Therefore, in such constructions, it is more appropriate not to regard the noun in the nominative case as the subject merely on the basis of its form, but to proceed directly from concrete linguistic facts and note that a noun in the nominative case does not always function as an independent subject. A similar situation can be observed in other types of constructions as well: *tezligi yuqori mashina* ("a car of high speed"), *qarashi chiroyli qiz* ("a girl with a beautiful gaze"), etc. In these constructions, the participial forms used in attributive position undergo contamination (blending), and even without them the meaning remains sufficiently clear to the listener. For example: These young people, who are fond of technology, are demanding that sharp-minded youths like Yolqin be trained as machine operators (P. Qodirov, Meros).



In general, even in complex sentences, when a subordinate clause appears together with the word it explains in the main clause, the compound-sentence nature of the construction does not disappear. Likewise, when it is used together with the word it modifies, it does not necessarily express a complete independent thought, i.e. it does not form a syntactic whole on its own. For example:

When the sack once again rolled into the ditch, I struck it with my hands and burst into tears (P. Qodirov, Meros).

In the last five years, our country has covered such a path that other countries would need 5–10 times more time to pass it (from a newspaper).

In the first sentence, even if the temporal subordinate clause is taken together with the predicate it modifies, its compound-sentence nature remains: When the sack once again rolled into the ditch, I burst into tears. In the second sentence, however, when the attributive subordinate clause is taken together with the word it explains in the main clause, it still does not form a complete thought and cannot function as an independent syntactic whole. Constructions of the type *otam keltirgan* (“brought by my father”), as in the sentence *Otam keltirgan xabar hammamizni hayajonga soldi* (“The news brought by my father excited all of us”), first, even when combined with the word it modifies, never express a complete thought: *otam keltirgan xabar* (“the news brought by my father”). Thus, it cannot be considered a sentence (not even a simple sentence). Second, such constructions always form a certain syntactic unity together with the word they combine with. However, this unity is not a sentence-level syntactic whole, but rather a unity expressing a complex concept—more precisely, it is a phrase (word combination).

In addition, the construction we are discussing can occur within a simple sentence, within a main clause, within a subordinate clause, within parenthetical constructions, and even within vocatives. For example: when the car stopped by the spring under the jujube trees with drooping branches growing along the canal where the millstone once again rolled into the ditch (thankfully it did not stop at the dam; otherwise, Sayyora, whose heart was trembling with excitement, might have met Mohira Xola), she, overwhelmed with emotion, involuntarily shed tears (O. Yoqubov, Davr tabassumi). In some cases, within a single expanded syntactic unit, the occurrence of another extended attributive construction is also observed.

For example: For several days, Maxsum, whose head felt as empty as a hollowed-out pumpkin, sat around listlessly, and after eating dinner without appetite, reluctantly recited a prayer at the table (V. Gʻafurov, Vafodor). The above observations clearly show that sentences of the type *Otam keltirgan xabar hammamizni hayajonga soldi* (“The news brought by my father excited all of us”) are simple sentences. In such cases, the noun in the nominative case together with the participle construction it combines with (*otam keltirgan*) forms a single syntactic whole—a phrase (word combination). This phrase functions as a unified sentence component and, in the second stage of analysis, is examined in terms of semi-predicativity (i.e., expansions based on its combinatorial potential).

Therefore, in analyzing expanded or extended forms of attributes within sentences, it is more appropriate to recognize them as expanded sentence constituents. A key conclusion that follows is that not only attributes but also other sentence parts may appear in expanded forms. These can be generalized as a single constituent in terms of structure, while at the same time revealing their specific non-functionality from a systemic-structural perspective in terms of secondary predication. This approach leads to certain revisions in distinguishing between the structural types of sentence constituents and their relation to word combinations, which we consider a necessary direction for further research.



**REFERENCES**

1. Akramov Sh. O'zbek tili gap qurilishida to'ldiruvchi va hol [WPm] valentlik aspektida. PhD dissertation. Tashkent, 1997.
2. Akramov Sh. The Structure of Uzbek Sentences: Object and Adverbial in the [WPm] Valency Framework. PhD Dissertation. Tashkent, 1997.
3. Nurmonov A., et al. O'zbek tilining mazmuniy sintaksisi [Semantic Syntax of the Uzbek Language]. Tashkent, 1992.
4. Nurmonov A., et al. Semantic Syntax of the Uzbek Language. Tashkent, 1992.
5. Turniyozov N.K. O'zbek tili derivatsion sintaksisiga kirish [Introduction to Derivational Syntax of the Uzbek Language]. Samarkand, 1990.
6. Turniyozov N.K. Introduction to Derivational Syntax of the Uzbek Language. Samarkand, 1990.
7. Gulyamov A., Asqarova M. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili (Sintaksis) [Modern Uzbek Literary Language: Syntax]. Tashkent.
8. Gulyamov A., Asqarova M. Modern Uzbek Literary Language: Syntax. Tashkent.
9. Shvedova N.Yu. Russkaya grammatika (Russian Grammar). Moscow: Nauka.
10. Vinogradov V.V. Problems of Russian Syntax. Moscow.

