Hurinisa Sharapovna Usmonova
Namangan State University
Professor, Doctor of Philology,
Department of Uzbek language
and literature

Mahliyo Adhamjon qizi Sheralieva
Namangan State University
Master of linguistics, Department of
Uzbek language and literature

FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF PARTS OF SENTENCE

Abstract: This research discusses the status of the secondary degree (subordinate) clause of a sentence by analyzing the previous research and giving examples. In this research, the role of the secondary degree (subordinate) clause was explained and propositional nomenclature was suggested as the means of identifying the status of the secondary degree parts of the sentence.
Key words: Predicate, subject, attribute, modifier, propositional nomenclature, parts of a sentence.
Language: English
Citation: Usmonova, H. S., & Sheralieva, M. A. (2020). Functional-semantic properties of parts of sentence. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 12 (92), 170-172.
Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-92-32   Doi: crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.12.92.32
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

In both Uzbek and Russian linguistics, any subordinate clause of a sentence that is the answer to a specific question in a subordinate clause is simultaneously separated from the sentence structure. This separation has become normal to many. For example: "A smart person will be friends with noble, wise, honest people". ("*Оқил киши доно, олийжаноб, ростгўй кишиларга дўст бўлади")* **the given sentence has two principal parts of a sentence- "person" ("киши")** (subject) and "will be friends" (*дўст бўлади)* (predicate) the sentence is divided into these parts and it is also divided into subordinate parts such as "with people" "*кишиларга"* (indirect object) **smart, wise, noble, honest** (attributes). At first, the main clauses are identified in the sentence and then the subordinate clauses are highlighted. When identifying the subordinate clauses, it is not considered whether they are part of the sentences or smaller particles.

Main part

Some Uzbek linguists have also been critical of traditional views about the status of the subordinate particles in the sentence. Particularly, professor Sh. Rahmatullaev in 1970 was critical of the parts of a sentence, including, the views about the separation of the subordinate parts. Therefore, he wrote the following: «...It must be said that we give the questioning to the attributed from attribute's point. Thus, attributes questioning is internal questioning. However, as part of the sentence, the adjective conjunction will be given. The questioning to the adjective is related to the internal structure of the given part of the sentence that serves as the clause.

The internal characteristics mentioned above (the lack of order and serving as the answer to internal questioning) highlights the syntactic meaning of the adjective clause. The part inside the adjective clause will come as the particle of this part.

Due to the adjective clause's unique features, it was named as the **sub-subordinate** part but the idea and terminology were later dismissed. This terminology doesn't uncover the meaning of this dismissal. We think that it is more accurate to name adjective clauses (if we take it generally, all types of

attributes) as part of the sentence but as part of the conjunction. [4.19].

Professor N. Mahmudov shows that it is necessary to distinguish the roles of the object and modifier, as attributes are not considered to be the constructive part of a sentence. [3.46]. He points out that when two or more predicates are present, one of them is in the primary state and the others are in a secondary degree. However, every predicate, whether it is the main or secondary degree, will be connected with the object's relation. This situation is observed in the simple sentence which is shaped with structures that include participles and adverbial layers (turnovers), action nouns and conditional verb devices, as well as predictive words (words like-to have (*бор*), to lack (don't have) (*йўқ*)). For example, "The human offspring has not yet been able to create a word that is relieving to his sorrow" ("*Унинг дардини енгиллатадиган сўзни инсон боласи ҳали ярата олгани йўқ*") (S.Ahmad) in this sentence second-degree predicate "that is relieving to his sorrow" ("*унинг дардини енгиллатадиган*") has taken part as participle turnaround. The sentence has two predicates, one of them is the main form of the verb (as a predicate)- "has not been able to create" "*ярата олгани йўқ*" the second one is "relieving" ("*енгиллатадиган*") is the second degree which is described in adjective form. If the main predicate ("word") is connected with the object via word form, the second-degree predicate "his sorrow" ("*дардини*") is connected with the indirect object's relation that is described with the word form. But even if these two objects are the same in terms of their relation to predicates, it is not logically correct to equate them with each other. Because these predicates themselves are not exactly equal in position, that is, one is primary and the other is secondary. Therefore, the idea that there are two indirect objects in the syntactic structure of this sentence that have the same status has no scientific basis.

As the author rightly points out, such objects also differ from each other in terms of functionality. Secondary predicates occupy the situation. Accordingly, such devices in a particular syntactic situation are evaluated as extended, compound, extended parts of speech. [1,2,3].

The fact that participle, adjective clause, conditional verbs have a syntactic status as a whole, as a part of a sentence, the internal divisions of such verbs are non-functional for the whole sentence, only the internal division of the verb, was also shown by A.Nurmonov.

We preferred the usage of the terminology of propositional nomenclature for the syntactic clause that contains a non-functional part of the whole sentence.

Propositional nomenclature can appear in different syntactic positions:

1. In the position of subject:
"The trains that fly faster than wind Will be exhausted till they reach North" (*"Шамолдан тез учган поездлар ҳам то Шимолга етгунча кетади ҳолдан".*) (H.Olimjon).

2. In the position of the object: He ordered to bring my brother from the kinder garden" ("*Укамни боғчадан олиб келишини* буюрди.").

3. In the position of the modifier:
"Will be exhausted till they reach North" (*"Шимолга етгунча* кетади холдан.")

If the syntactic clauses mentioned above appear in a certain syntactic position in the sentence, the connections inside them are considered non-functional. Their functionality is related to the support that makes the propositional nomenclature. The main goal of our work is to identify the members of the propositional nomenclature, their semantic and grammatical analysis, and classification.

Determining the structural scheme of a sentence in terms of the cut and its 'gaps' requires a completely different approach to the determiner and the interpreter. Because these parts cannot come as an independent part that fills in the gaps of the cut, they fill a "gap" in the cut and occupy a certain syntactic position relative to it. For example: "The soft smell of red flowers spread with the wind" ("*Қип-қизил гулларнинг майин ҳидлари сабо билан тарқалади*") there are two parts of a sentence that are interacting and filling the "gaps" of the verb "spread" ("тарқалади") and appearing in two syntactic positions: the first one -is in the position of the subject, the second one is in the position of the direct object. The first syntactic clauses that appear in the subject's position are expanded with the usage of attributes and made a proposition. The attribute in its composition belongs to the internal division of this whole and is irrelevant to the whole sentence structure.

Besides, it is possible that the sentence's predicate can come expanded with attributes. For example, "You are Said's beloved sister" ("*Сен Саиднинг севган синглиси".*).

Conclusion

Therefore, attributes are functionalized in the content of propositional nomenclature, and they are integral particles of the parts that appear in syntactic positions of the predicate, subject, object, and modifier. They are separated only when the proposition is divided into internal parts.

Therefore, in modern linguistics not all of the subordinate clauses have the same status in sentence structure.

References:

1. Abdullaev, H. (1974). Gap bўlaklarining tuzilishiga kўra tasnifi masalasiga doir. *Ўzbek tili va adabijoti,* Toshkent, № 3, p. 34.
2. Askarova, M. (1970). *Birikmali gap bўlaklari va uning jergash gaplarga munosabati.* Tilshunoslik masalalari, (pp.119-128). Toshkent.
3. Mahmudov, N. (1981). Funkcional va nofunkcional tўldiruvchilar хakida. *Ўzbek tili va adabijoti*, Toshkent, №1, pp. 43-46.
4. Rahmatullaev, Sh. (1970). *Nutkimiz kўrki*. (pp.19-20). Tashkent.
5. Omonturdiev, Zh. (1988). *Xozirgi ўzbek tilida gap bўlaklari tipologijasi*, (p.210). Tashkent: Ўkituvchi.
6. Ortikova, N.X. (2005). *Gap tuzilishida aniklovchining ўrni:* Filol. fanlari nomzodi dis. … avtoref, (p.23). Fargona.
7. Ne#matov X. (1993). Tazhalli tasavvuf bilish nazarijasi va tilshunoslikda sintaksisni ўrganish masalalari. *Ўzbek tili va adabijoti*, Toshkent,№2, pp. 27-30.
8. Ne#matov, X., & Bozorov, O. (1993). *Til va nutk*, (p.30). Tashkent: Ўkituvchi.
9. Musaev, A.S. (2000). *Ўzbek sўzlashuv nutki uslubida gap bўlaklari tartibi*: Filol. fanlari nomzodi. dis. avtoref, (p.25). Samarkand.
10. Muhammadzhonova, S.O. (1999). *Xozirgi ўzbek adabij tilida uushgan gaplar*: Filol. fanlari nomzodi … dis. avtoref, (p.26). Samarkand.
11. Mahmudov, N.M. (1981). Funkcional va nofunkcional tўldiruvchilar хakida. *Ўzbek tili va adabijoti*, Toshkent, -№1, pp.43-46.
12. Mahmudov, N. (1990). Ўzbek tili sintaksisining dolzarb masalalari. *Ўzbek tili va adabijoti*, Toshkent,№2, pp. 36-43.
13. Mahmudov, N.M. (1984). *Ўzbek tilidagi sodda gaplarda semantik-sintaktik asimmetrija*. (p.146). Tashkent: Ўkituvchi.
14. Xozhiev, A. (1985). *Lingvistik terminlarning izoхli luƣati*. (p.144). Tashkent: Ўkituvchi.