

SOME REMARKS ON NEW APPROACHES TO THE SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF THE SENTENCE

Tuychiev Sokhibjon Erkinovich

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract. This article is called some comments on new approaches to the syntactic analysis of the sentence and aims to highlight the specific features of the traditional and modern methods of analysis of the linguistic units involved in the structure of the sentence. The opinions of a number of international and Uzbek linguists on the analysis of sentence fragments are also presented.

Key words: syntax, method, syntactic analysis, componential analysis, parts of sentence, sentence structure, language unit.

1. Introduction

In modern linguistics, several linguistic research methods are employed for analyzing sentence structures, including distributional analysis, immediate constituent analysis, transformational analysis, statistical analysis, comparative-functional analysis, and componential and syntactic modeling approaches. The selection of an appropriate method depends on the research object, and an effective application of these methods allows researchers to achieve significant and productive results in the field. Therefore, utilizing linguistic research methods efficiently requires a high level of scholarly expertise.

Literature Review

Approaches to syntactic analysis have long been a focal point for many linguists. Scholars such as Sh. Safarov, T. Bushuy, U. Usmonov, N. Turniyazov, F. Buslayev, and others have contributed to the study of these methods. Similarly, English linguists such as Y. Curme, R. Zandvoort, R. Kempson, and P. Roberts have provided insightful analyses with illustrative examples in their research.

2. Material and Methods

Proper application of linguistic methods in research is crucial for distinguishing linguistic levels and identifying their interrelationships. For instance, in distributional analysis, linguists emphasize three key aspects:

1. Complementary or supplementary distribution
2. Contrastive distribution [1]
3. Free alternation distribution [2]

A fourth aspect of distributional analysis has also been incorporated into sentence analysis [3].

Analysis and Results

It is important to note that distributional analysis is primarily applied at the morphological level of language. However, at the syntactic level, instead of focusing on the arrangement of individual word forms within a sentence, the characteristics of entire groups are analyzed. This approach necessitates preliminary data processing by the researcher.

In contemporary linguistics, syntactic modeling methods such as componential and syntagmatic analysis are widely used to determine the placement of syntactic units within sentence structures. When applying immediate constituent analysis, sentence analysis typically

begins at the syntactic level and progresses to the morphological level. However, this method proves inadequate in identifying the semantic fields of coordinated sentence elements. Instead, it is useful for modeling the morphological features of sentence components by breaking them down into the largest and smallest constituents, thereby describing their external structures.

Linguists hold divergent perspectives on traditional syntactic analysis. Some scholars argue that sentence structure should be analyzed by distinguishing only the subject, while incorporating all other elements into the predicate.

For example, H. Wijk analyzes the sentence “The reporter gave the lady a present” by classifying “The reporter: as the subject, and “gave the lady a present” as the predicate, further breaking it down into “the lady” (inner complement) and “a present” (outer complement) [4]. P. Roberts, on the other hand, models sentence structure based on the morphological representation of lexical units [5].

Another group of linguists recognizes only primary sentence components, categorizing secondary elements as modifiers, which are further divided morphologically as follows:

- a) Attributive modifiers – adjectives modifying a noun or pronoun
- b) Objective modifiers – modifying a verb, adjective, or adverb
- c) Adverbial modifiers – modifying a verb, adjective, or another adverb [6]

Meanwhile, R. Zandvoort classifies secondary sentence components as “adverbial adjuncts” [7]. These varying perspectives highlight the controversy surrounding the classification of secondary sentence elements, particularly in Russian linguistics, where two primary approaches are observed:

1. Logical-grammatical principles, which rely on semantic interpretation and syntactic relations [8].

2. Morphological representation, where word classes determine sentence components [9]. Some linguistic philosophers advocate using “subject” instead of “subject noun”, and “predicate” instead of “verb phrase” for syntactic analysis [10]. **N. Kh. Turniyazov** asserts that subject and predicate concepts are essentially logical categories, and secondary sentence components such as complements, attributes, and adverbials are not purely grammatical but semantic in nature [11].

Despite these theoretical contributions to syntax, it remains evident that the principles for distinguishing primary and secondary sentence components, along with the linguistic methodologies for their analysis, are not yet fully established. Some scholars argue that the traditional classification of complements, attributes, and adverbials forces sentence structure into artificial schematization, necessitating a re-evaluation of secondary sentence components [12].

Based on the diverse approaches to sentence analysis, it can be concluded that morphological and syntactic features of each sentence component should be thoroughly examined—including the word class it belongs to, its form, its syntactic relationship with other components, and its semantic field within the syntactic structure.

Among the linguistic research methods, comparative linguistics is an independent field that allows for the cross-linguistic analysis of both related and unrelated language systems. Given the focus of this study, we will limit our discussion to the comparative-functional analysis of coordinated elements in unrelated languages such as English and Uzbek.

According to J. Buranov, linguistic typology is divided into four main categories:

- a) Genetic typology
- b) Areal typology

c) Comparative typology

d) Structural typology [13]

Linguistic typology considers both formal (structural) and semantic aspects of language. B. A. Uspensky states that typological research aims to identify universal linguistic features across different languages [14].

In comparative analysis, this approach helps identify numerous differential features, and it is advisable to systematically differentiate linguistic levels during the syntagmatic and paradigmatic segmentation of the research object.

The fundamental syntactic units in syntactic typology include words, phrases, and sentence structures. It is generally more effective to compare word combinations or sentence structures rather than individual words.

A review of the development of comparative linguistics in Uzbekistan reveals that significant progress has been made in studying English-Uzbek, English-Karakalpak, German-Uzbek, English-Uzbek-Russian, and German-Uzbek-Russian linguistic comparisons. J. Buranov has contributed substantially to the theoretical foundations of comparative linguistics.

These findings suggest that comparative linguistic research serves both theoretical and practical purposes by establishing connections between linguistic theory and practice. Moreover, comparative studies help identify similarities and differences between a native language and a foreign language, facilitating deeper understanding and learning.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The application of linguistic methods in sentence analysis offers several advantages:

1. It allows for the study of the structural and semantic characteristics of syntactic units.
2. It provides a foundation for syntactic and semantic classifications of sentences.
3. It enables the systematic study of syntactic relationships at the sentence level.
4. It facilitates the use of modeling and experimental observation methods.

Thus, the identification of syntactic structures, their interrelations, and their paradigmatic characteristics plays a crucial role in comparative-functional research on coordinated sentence components in typologically different languages.

Failure to adhere to these systematic principles may lead to incomplete or inaccurate interpretations of the selected research object.

References:

1. Бушуй Т., Сафаров Ш. Тил курилиши: таҳлил методлари ва методологияси.—Тошкент: Фан, 2007.—274 б.
2. Буранов Дж. Сравнительная тинология английского и тюрских языков. Москва: Наука, 1983.—268 с.
3. Усмонов У.У. Гап таҳлилига янгича ёндашув//халқаро илмий-анжуман материаллари. СамДЧТИнинг 10 йиллигига бағишланади.—Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ наши, 2004.—Б—105—107.
4. Whitehall H. Structural Essentials of English. New-York: 1996.—394 p.
5. Roberts P. English Syntax: A programmed instruction to transformational Grammar: New-York: Horcourt, Brace and World; 2008,—524 p.
6. Curme Y.O. A Grammar of the English Language.vol.2-3 London- New-York, 2006,—240 p.
7. Zandvoort R.W. A Handbook of English Grammar. Cronin-gen, 1998.—436p.

8. Буслаев Ф.И. Историческая грамматика русского языка.-Москва: Учпедгаз, 1968.-623 с.
9. Пешковский А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. Москва: Наука.2006.-467 с.
10. Kempson R.M. Sematic Theory. Cambridge University Press: 2007.-440 p.
11. Турниёзов Н.Қ. Гап ва унинг лингвистик табиати ҳақида баъзи мулоҳазалар//Тил ва жамият маданият мулоқотлар. Республика илмий-амалий анжумани материаллари. Самарқанд, 2013 йил 26-27 апрель, 1-китоб, СамДЧТИ нашри, 2013. –Б. 17-18.
12. Back K., Harris R.M. Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts. Cambridge Mass Press, 2008.-484 p.
13. Буранов Дж. Сравнительная типология английского и тюркских языков. Москва: Наука, 1983.-268 с.
14. Успенский Б.А. Структурная типология языков. Москва: Наука, 1965.-286 с.
15. Мухин А.М. Структура предложений и их модели. – Ленинград, Ленинград отд.: Наука, 1968.–230 с.
16. Мухин А.М. Функциональный синтаксис. Функциональная лексикология. Функциональная морфология –СПБ.: 2007.–198 с.