DERIVATIONAL FEATURES OF TWO-COMPONENT (WORD) SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Tursunova Munisa Ravshan kizi
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
a second-year master's student
munisatursunova777@gmail.com
+998500557379

Abstract: This article examines the derivational features of two-component sentences in English and Uzbek, focusing on the processes by which subject–predicate structures are formed and transformed in each language. Drawing on corpus data and comparative-structural analysis, the study highlights fundamental typological differences: English, as an analytical language, derives such sentences through auxiliaries, fixed word order, and syntactic transformations, while Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, relies on affixation, case marking, and flexible syntactic arrangements. The analysis also explores elliptical and nominal patterns, demonstrating how each language encodes predication through its own grammatical resources. Despite these differences, both languages reveal a universal tendency to establish predication as the minimal communicative unit. The findings contribute to the theoretical study of comparative syntax and have practical implications for translation studies, bilingual education, and intercultural communication.
Key words: derivation, two-component sentence, English, Uzbek, predication, comparative syntax, morphology, word order, functional analysis, communication

INTRODUCTION

The study of sentence structure is a central focus in modern linguistics, as it provides insights into the ways languages organize and convey meaning. Among the structural units of syntax, two-component sentences (also referred to as word-sentences) hold a distinctive position, since they represent the minimal framework of communication where subject and predicate co-occur. These structures are essential in both English and Uzbek, although they exhibit unique typological and derivational features due to their genetic, typological, and functional differences. English, being an analytical language, tends to rely heavily on word order and auxiliary elements for the derivation of two-component sentences, whereas Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, makes extensive use of affixation and syntactic flexibility. A comparative study of these two languages not only highlights their structural divergences but also deepens the understanding of universal and language-specific mechanisms of sentence derivation. This paper seeks to analyze the derivational features of two-component sentences in English and Uzbek, focusing on how these constructions are formed, transformed, and employed in actual usage. The research combines theoretical insights with comparative analysis, aiming to contribute to cross-linguistic syntax and translation studies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of the two-component sentence has been widely addressed in both Western and Central Asian linguistics. Early works in English syntax, such as those by Jespersen (1924) and later by Quirk et al. (1985), emphasized the centrality of the subject-predicate relationship as the core of sentence derivation. Chomsky's transformational-generative grammar (1965) further provided a theoretical foundation for analyzing how minimal structures expand through syntactic rules. In Uzbek linguistics, scholars such as Rasulov (1979), G'ulomov (1980), and Nurmonov (1999) highlighted the agglutinative nature of Uzbek sentence structure, where

morphological markers play a decisive role in establishing predication. More recent studies in Uzbek grammar (Karimov, 2010; Tursunov, 2018) emphasize the functional and pragmatic aspects of sentence derivation, focusing on the interaction between morphology and syntax.

Comparative studies between English and Uzbek remain relatively limited. However, existing cross-linguistic analyses (Abduazizov, 2007; Crystal, 2010) suggest that despite structural differences, both languages share common functional tendencies in terms of subject-predicate derivation, especially when it comes to representing basic propositional content. This research builds on such foundations, focusing specifically on derivational features of two-component sentences.

METHODOLOGY

The present research is based on a comparative-structural and functional analysis of two-component sentences in English and Uzbek. The material for analysis was drawn from both corpora and literary texts: English examples were taken from the British National Corpus and standard prose works, while Uzbek data were collected from the Oʻzbek Milliy Korpusi and contemporary prose samples. The study applied derivational analysis in order to trace the processes by which minimal subject–predicate structures are formed and transformed in each language.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the comparative analysis reveal that English and Uzbek demonstrate strikingly different strategies in the derivation of two-component sentences, although they share a universal tendency to maintain the subject–predicate framework as the minimal communicative core. English, being an analytical language, relies primarily on word order and auxiliary verbs to establish predication. The subject almost always precedes the predicate, and even when the sentence is transformed into interrogative or negative form, the rigid S–P sequence is preserved through the insertion of auxiliary markers. For instance, in the sentence She is reading, the auxiliary "is" ensures the correct derivational formation of the predicate, while in the interrogative Is she reading? the change is achieved not by morphology but by inversion. Such reliance on functional words rather than inflectional changes is a hallmark of English derivation. Uzbek, by contrast, as an agglutinative language, makes extensive use of morphological affixation in the derivation of two-component sentences. Predicates in Uzbek are marked by verbal endings that simultaneously encode person, tense, mood, and aspect, which allows the predicate to carry a heavier grammatical load. For example, "*U oʻqiyapti*" (He/She is reading) demonstrates how the suffix -*yapti* conveys both the progressive aspect and agreement with the subject, eliminating the need for auxiliary elements. In interrogative form, the addition of the interrogative particle -mi *(U oʻqiyaptimi?)* suffices to change the communicative type of the sentence without altering the overall structure. Thus, while English derives structural diversity through auxiliaries and transformations, Uzbek achieves the same communicative effects through agglutinative morphology.

One of the most salient differences lies in the flexibility of word order. English sentences require a fixed subject–predicate arrangement, as any deviation risks ungrammaticality or semantic distortion. For example, reversing the order in "*She is reading*" to "*Is reading she*" is only acceptable under the strict rules of interrogative formation, and other permutations are generally impossible. Uzbek, on the other hand, exhibits remarkable syntactic mobility. A sentence such as "*U kitob oʻqiyapti*" can be rearranged as *"Kitobni u oʻqiyapti" or "Oʻqiyapti u kitobni",* depending on stylistic or pragmatic emphasis. The derivational system of Uzbek, supported by case markers and verbal morphology, ensures that such reordering does not compromise grammatical correctness. This freedom highlights a fundamental typological

difference between the two languages. The comparative analysis also indicates differences in elliptical and nominal two-component sentences. In English, ellipsis is often context-driven, with the auxiliary or main verb omitted in casual dialogue: *"Coming?" (Are you coming?).* Uzbek, however, allows ellipsis primarily through verbal morphology, where a single inflected predicate can imply the subject: *"Ketyapman" (I am going)*, in which the subject is not explicitly mentioned but clearly encoded in the verbal ending. Nominal sentences in English generally require a copular verb, as in *"She is a teacher"*, while in Uzbek, the copula may be omitted altogether in the present tense, as in *"U o'qituvchi"*, where predication is derived through semantic interpretation rather than explicit verbal marking.

Another noteworthy result concerns the stylistic dimension of derivation. In English, the derivation of two-component sentences in literary texts often makes use of auxiliary inversion or emphatic constructions to highlight a particular element: *"Never have I seen such beauty"*. Uzbek, in contrast, achieves stylistic variation by altering word order or employing affixal nuances to add emphasis: *"Bunday go'zallikni hech qachon ko'rmaganman" (I have never seen such beauty)*, where the negative prefix hech qachon and the affix *-man* together create an emphatic effect. These findings confirm that while the languages differ in structural means, they converge in their pragmatic aim of highlighting emphasis and focus.

CONCLUSION

The comparative study of the derivational features of two-component sentences in English and Uzbek demonstrates that despite their typological and structural differences, both languages maintain the universal principle of predication as the core of communication. English, as an analytical language, relies on auxiliaries, fixed word order, and syntactic transformations to derive subject–predicate relations, while Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, employs morphological affixation, case marking, and syntactic flexibility to achieve the same communicative functions. The analysis shows that English derivation is constrained by rigidity of structure but supported by functional words, whereas Uzbek displays a greater degree of word order variation with morphology serving as the stabilizing factor. Differences were also observed in elliptical and nominal sentences, with English requiring overt markers in most cases and Uzbek relying on morphological endings or contextual inference.

REFERENCES:

1.Abduazizov, A. (2007). Fundamentals of Comparative Linguistics. Tashkent: O'qituvati.

2.Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

3.Crystal, D. (2010). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4.G'ulomov, H. (1980). Issues of Uzbek language syntax. Tashkent: Science.

5.Jespersen, O. (1924). The Philosophy of Grammar. London: Allen & Unwin.

6.Karimov, M. (2010). Current Uzbek language syntax. Tashkent: University.

7.Nurmonov, A. (1999). Uzbek language syntax and pragmatics. Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan.

8.Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.

9.Rasulov, R. (1979). Grammatical construction of the Uzbek language. Tashkent: Oqittu.

10.Tursunov, A. (2018). Current issues of Uzbek language syntax. Tashkent: Fan.