Research Article

ANALYSIS OF SYNTAGMS IN WORD AND WORD COMBINATION MODEL

Makhmudova Nigora | **Researcher of Karshi State University. City Karshi, Uzbekistan**

Abstract

The article deals with the tasks of studying the problem of word combinations, studying the syntax of estates and describing word combinations with a subordinate component and combining words in an equal relation characterizing as a combination. The importance of objects of all its directions, related to an integral language system.

The study of word problems has long been the focus of linguists. Evidence of this can be found in the work of Astadhyayi ('Eight Books'), created by the Indian linguist Panini in the 5th century BC [1, 73]. It is safe to say that this book is a masterpiece that has not lost its value in the world of linguistics today. Reading the work (translated from the German and Russian linguist Otton Bötlingk) [2]. We see that at that time fundamental work was done in India in all areas of linguistics (which is also reflected in modern linguistics).

Speaking about this, V.L.P. Thomsen said: "The achievements of the Hindus in the field of linguistics were absolutely great. European linguistics did not reach this level until the nineteenth century. But even then, we had to learn a lot from the Hindus" [3, 10].

The content of "Astadhyayi", which covers the area of syntax, is very rich, along with the parts of the sentence; it considers questions about the phrases of nouns and verbs, while the constituent ones, which occupy a large place in grammar, are considered as examples of phrases [1, 78]

Over time, linguists have become increasingly interested in the interpretation of phrases. For example, in their first grammatical research, Russian linguists believed that the basic content of syntax was overshadowed by information about word structure. In particular, A.Kh. Vostokov in his work "*Grammar of the Russian language*" gives a detailed description of the types of word combinations [4, 228]. However, by the middle of the 19th century, the interpretation of the word problem in Russian linguistics had become secondary. Now the main object of study of syntax is the study of speech. This can be observed in the scientific works of such well-known linguists as F. I. Buslayev, N. I. Grech, N. I. Davidov, and N.P. Nekrasov [5].

Interest in the study of the word combinations revived by the end of the 19th century, the description of this problem became the center of the scientific activity of F. F. Fortunatov and his students. In particular, F. F. Fortunatov considered syntax as a study of word combinations and studied a sentence as a set of word combinations [6, 317].

In our opinion, it is incorrect to study the object of this direction in a narrow range, defining the center of the study of the field of syntax as a word combination or a sentence. Because today the syntactic part of linguistics is divided into small and large syntactic networks and is widely studied by our linguists [7]. Therefore, considering the language as a whole system, we should know that objects of all its directions are important.

The objection is that in V. V. Vinogradov's teaching the word combination is the building material of the sentence. But a word combination is not a building material of a sentence. Because the language does not have a set of ready-made word combinations. For example, let's say that *a gentle breeze coming in through the window slowly moves the curtain.* This requires a product of the activation of the elements of the paradigmatic series in the syntagmatic series. By paradigmatic elements we mean a phoneme, a morpheme, and a word, not a word combination. Now we can see from this product that there are such word combinations as *slowly moving, moving the curtain, gentle breeze, gentle breeze coming in through the window.* This indicates that the word combination is a product of a syntagmatic sequence and is formed together with the sentence.

Prof. Assist. N. K. Turniyazov rightly points out, if the word combinations were available in the language, they could be said to be the building material of the sentence [8, 15].

It should be said that in linguistic literature, word combination is understood as a description of word combinations with single subordinate components. In our opinion, equivalent connections of words also form a connection. But words with equal links are increasingly called the term 'word connection'. At this point it is better to use the term 'combination' for both types of connection of words. Therefore, it would be useful to study them as equal and subordinate components.

It should be noted that in our opinion, the use of the terms 'word connection' and 'compound word' seems to be an explanatory issue. After all, as long as the function of language signs follows the law of hierarchical relations, a sign will never be formed in its shell.

Commenting on the hierarchical relationship of language units, B. N. Turniyazov writes: "The concept of complex sentence leads to a violation of the laws of hierarchical relations of speech units. In other words, this concept requires that the sentence be included in the sentence. This, in turn, contradicts the principle of hierarchical approach.

Clearly, a hierarchical approach requires one of the trinity (paradigmatic, syntagmatic, hierarchical) associated with the practical application of both language units and speech units. This trinity, of course, has the status of law" [9, 95].

As B.N. Turniyazov rightly points out, the hierarchical approach is connected with the practical application of language units. Therefore, when we use the term 'compound word', we think that language units are acting contrary to the hierarchical law. In other words, it leads to the vague conclusion that one word is activated within another. Therefore, the sunflower, the watermelon, the eyebrow, etc., are not a compound word, but a single word. After all, they serve to express a one concept. Only their structure consists of a syntagmatic relationship of two morphemes. In general, L. Bloomfield was right when he considered the sentence as the main object of investigation and considered the morpheme as its unit of analysis [10, 13]. But we also used the term 'compound word' in order not to confuse the reader when discussing the description of the syntagms in the word model above. In fact, we think it would be better to study them under the term 'complex morphemes'.

As we know, the relationship of language units in the direction of a horizontal line is called a syntagmatic relationship. This relationship, in turn, requires micro- and macrosyntagmatic relationships. If linguistic elements enter into a syntagmatic relationship only at the level of language, then it is called a microsyntagmatic relationship, and if language elements move to the level of speech and acquire a syntagmatic relationship as units of speech, we call it a macrosyntagmatic relationship. A syntagm is formed as a result of a syntagmatic relation, just as a derivative is formed from a derivative relation and an applicit is formed from an applicative relation. Therefore, we are right to call the product of a syntagmatic relationship at the level of a paradigmatic series also a syntagm. For example, the horizontal line between the leading and the auxiliary and complex morphemes is evidence of this. However, for some reason, some sources do not have a ready-made syntagm in the language, because it is argued that the syntagm is formed only in speech [11, 23-24].

It should be noted that in the formation of morphemes it is necessary not to understand the macro state of horizontal communication. The fact that morphemes emerge from phonemes, even though the relationship between morphemes is horizontal, does not mean that it has moved into speech. In doing so, we observe a syntagmatic process occurring at the level of the paradigmatic series.

A commentary on the first views on the syntagmatic relationship was elucidated by I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay under the term 'Nebeneinander' ('row content'). However, a thorough study of this theory is reflected in the teachings of F. de Saussure [12, 447].

Accordingly, it is noted that the use of various suffixes that express activity according to the law of sequence along a straight line is also a specific syntax [13, 37]. In turn, they occur on the basis of the structural units of language.

We know that the structural units of language serve to form nominative and communicative units. Nominative units include morphemes and words. The sentence is understood as Communicative unity. The structural units of language belong to the phoneme.

Indeed, from the morpheme in the language to the units of speech, it is evidenced by the horizontal linear relationship of phonemes. At this point, the question arises as to whether the horizontal linear relationship of phonemes can be called a syntagmatic relationship. In modern linguistics, a syntagmatic relationship is observed at all levels of language and speech, including the phonetic level [12]. In our view, the occurrence of a syntagmatic relationship is not observed at the phonemic level. This is because phonemes, when taken alone, have no meaning and are not broken down into meaningful parts. A syntagmatic relationship requires the combination of at least two morphemes (as we saw in the previous paragraph). As a type of horizontal linear communication, an applicative relationship also prevails in language and speech. The applicative relation is a much broader concept than the syntagmatic relation. In other words, an applicative relation is a phenomenon that encompasses both a syntagmatic relation and a syntactic relation. Therefore, we believe that the combination of phonemes to form the original semantic unit of language is the product of an applicative relationship.

From the applicative relation of phonemes the morpheme arises: c-a-n – can, d-o-g – dog, b-o-x – box. Once phonemes begin to form a semantic unit of language, we can talk about a syntagmatic relationship. After all, now phonemes leave their level and begin to form morphemes: dis+agree, il +legial. Here we see the formation of a syntagm in the word model, which shows the attributive – attribute form from the applicative-syntagmatic relationship of morphemes occurring on the basis of structural units of language.

We have already mentioned that speech units can also occur on the basis of the structural unit of language. One such unit of speech is free speech, which, in the words of L. Bloomfield, is a group of syntactically interconnected elements in a horizontal linear relationship [14, 102]. In turn, we study free expressions in hypotactic and paratactic devices. By hypotactic devices we mean subordinate clauses, and by paratactic devices we mean equivalent components. Hypotactic phrases are endocentric in nature, with one of the direct participants in their structure acting as the central nucleus: a red apple, a letter to my sister, to do a task (done), a conversation with a poet, a school garden. Apparently, the last of the direct participants in these phrases is its center. In other words, they do not need to be commented on.

It should be noted that L. Bloomfield also interprets phrases such as *John and Mary* with an equal-component paratactic structure as endocentric. According to the scientist, any of the direct participants of such phrases can replace the whole phrase in a large device. For example: *John and Mary ran away - John ran away; Mary ran away (John and Mary ran away - John ran away; Mary ran away)* [14, 102].

We think that Bloomfield's conclusion is based on his interpretation of sentences as phrases. If, as L. Bloomfield points out, we assume that a single member of an equal-component combination such as *John and Mary* can replace all its participants, then the resulting *John ran away.*

We see that products such as *Mary ran away (John ran away; Mary ran away)* form separate structures, and in turn, they are not considered a paratactic device. Because in this case, the control nucleus (center) of the combination is occupied by the verb, not the words John or Mary. Because it has a condition and requires decisiveness. In possessive pronouns, as L. Tenyer rightly points out, there is a verb in the center [10, 53]. Therefore, we cannot say that paratactic phrases are endocentric.

Analyzing the syntagms in word and word combination models, we came to the conclusion that the syntax section of linguistics studies word combinations and sentences. But word syntax problems are still relevant today. So you have to start learning the syntax from the words. In the linguistic literature, a word combination is a description of a word combination with a single subordinate component. We believe that words are equally connected form a combination. But equally connected words are called 'word connection'. In this case, it is better to use the term 'combination' for both types of word connections.

References

1. Desnitskaya A.V., Katsnelson S.D. Istoriya lingvisticheskix ucheniy. Drevniy mir. L.: Nauka, 1980. P.73.
2. Bötlingk O.N. Panini's Grammatik mit Übersetzung. Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1887.
3. Tomsen V.L.P. Istoriya yazikovedeniya do konsa XIX veka. M.: Uchpedgiz, 1938. P.10.
4. Vostokov A.X. Russkaya grammatika. SP.: Tipografiya I. Glazunova, 1831. P.228.
5. https://scicenter.online/russkiy-yazyik-scicenter/kratkaya-istoriya-voprosa-56706.html Accessed on 13.03.2021.
6. L.L.Kasatkin. Moskovskaya fortunatovskaya shkola // Bolshoy ensiklopedicheskiy slovar. Yazikoznaniye. M.: Bolshaya Rossiyskaya ensiklopediya, 1998. P.317.
7. Iomdin L.L. Bolshiye problem malogo sintaksisa // Trudi mejdunarodnoy konferensii po kompyuternoy lingvistike i intellektualnim texnologiyam. Protvino, 2003; Ter-Minasova S.G., Mikoyan A.S. Maliy sintaksis kak sredstvo razgranicheniya stiley. M.: MGU, 1981; Shubina E.L. Voprosi malogo sintaksisa v shveytsarskom variante nemetskogo yazika // Uspexi

gumanitarnix nauk, №4, 2020; Turniyozov N.Q. Matn lingvistikasi. Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2004; Turniyozova Sh.N. Hozirgi oʻzbek tilida matn shakllanishining derivatsion xususiyatlari. Toshkent: Exstremum-press, 2016.

8. Turniyozov N.Q. Soʻz birikmasi va gap boʻlaklari haqida ba'zi mulohazalar // Roman-german tilshunosligining dolzarb masalalari. Toshkent, 2009, P.15.

9. Turniyozov B.N. Murakkab sintaktik qurilma va uning lingvistik maqomi // Oʻzbek tili derivatsion sintaksisi. Toshkent: Navroʻz, 2011, P.95.

10. Turniyozov N.Q. Xorijiy mamlakatlar lingvistik nazariyalari. Samarqand: SamDChTI, 2007, P.13.

11. Gʻulomov A., Asqarova M. Hozirgi oʻzbek adabiy tili. Sintaksis. Toshkent: Oʻqituvchi, 1978, Pp.23-24.

12. Ye.S.Kubryakova. Sintagmatika // Bolshoy ensiklopedicheskiy slovar. Yazikoznaniye M.: Bolshaya Rossiyskaya ensiklopediya, 1998. P.447.

13. Turniyuzov N.Q., Turniyozova K.A. Funksional sintaksis gakirish. Toshkent: Fan, 2003, P.37.

14. Ivanova I.P., Burlakova V.V., Pochepsov G.G. Teoriticheskaya grammatika sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika. M.: Visshaya shkola, 1981. P.102.