

SYNTAXES EXPRESSED BY NEGATIVE CONJUNCTIONS

Khalikova is the daughter of Mushtari Sultanali,
Teacher of legal technical school of Surkhandarya region
 UDK: 811.512.133.

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8556-0343>

Abstract: In this article, negative syntactic units in English and Uzbek are relevant as they are divided into components and syntaxes in the sentence device, and are devoted to a comparative analysis. Because the traditional syntactic analysis of the sentence device cannot fully meet the requirement, that is, the interpretation of the syntactic units in the sentence into primary and secondary parts indicates the need to determine the semantic essence of these units at the syntactic level and to perform a perfect comparative analysis of them typologically.

Key words: English and Uzbek languages, elements expressing negativity, syntax.

Аннотация: В данной статье отрицательные синтаксические единицы в английском и узбекском языках являются актуальными, поскольку они разделены на компоненты и синтаксисы в аппарате предложения, и посвящены сопоставительному анализу. Поскольку традиционный синтаксический анализ устройства предложения не может в полной мере удовлетворить этому требованию, то есть расшифровка синтаксических единиц предложения на главные и второстепенные части, указывает на необходимость определения смысловой сущности этих единиц на синтаксическом уровне и выполнения совершенный сравнительный анализ их типологически.

Ключевые слова: английский и узбекский языки, элементы, выражающие негатив, синтаксис.

INTRODUCTION. Elements expressing negativity are widely used in the sentence structure of English and Uzbek languages. In the comparative-typological study of sentence devices with negative elements in the example of these languages, the study of the

system relations of the category of negativity by dividing it into components constitutes the external device of the sentence, while the analysis by dividing it into syntaxes constitutes the internal device of the sentence. Comparatively typological analysis of syntactic units with negative elements in the sentence structure, determination of their isomorphism, allomorphism are also relevant issues, and researches in this regard provide a wide opportunity to determine the syntactic position of the category of negativity in different systematic languages. Analyzing the category of negativity using such linguistic methods synsemantically contributes to the further development of the sciences of theoretical and applied grammar, comparative typology of English and Uzbek languages.

METHODS. In world linguistics, the category of negativity has been a constant focus of attention of scientists. P.A.Afanasev, R.O.Yakobson, A.I.Bakharev, T.G.Tsakalidi, V.N.Bondarko, M.V.Andriychev conducted research on the basis of materials of Indo-European and Turkic languages in the study of this category. V.G. Kolshansky, A.M. Mukhin, F. Allan, R. Lakoff, T. Baller, R. A. Close, Z. S. Henis, H. Sweet, A. Nurmonov, S. Rahimov, O. Usman, D. Lutfullaeva, M. Yoldoshev, The studies of linguists such as E. Qilichev and V. Vositov are noteworthy.

DISCUSSION. In English and Uzbek, neither ... nor, na ... na are included in the group of connectives (1.203; 2.211; 3.145), which mainly express the negative form of the connected parts of the sentence. Or in the Uzbek language, na ...na comes as a connector, they are mostly repeated in front of conjunctive clauses and serve to express the meaning of negation (4.168). In some grammars of the English language, the conjunction neither ... nor is given the

following definition: "neither ... nor is a coordination expressing the negative meanings of more than one syntactic unit that has a syntactic function in the sentence device" (5.33). Compound clauses Regardless of the syntactic position of compound clauses in the sentence device, "they are connected on the basis of coordinative relation"(6.11).

Analyzing the syntactic units that have been combined in the sentence into syntaxes, we can see that they appear in different syntactic positions in the sentence structure and are preceded by the conjunctions neither ... nor in Uzbek.

1. Neither Pop nor the widow would find me again (M. Twain)

2. Denis neither tried to persuade Dave nor discourage him (D.Carter)

3. He raised his head looking neither to the right nor to the left (E.L. Voynich)

When we analyze these sentences, Neither Pop nor the widow are connected with each other on the basis of coordinative relation, and they participate in the sentence device on the basis of core predicative relation with syntactic units would find. So, the syntactic units connected by the coordinative relationship come in the place of the core predicative 1 in the sentence, and their differential syntactic-semantic signs are also the same. That is, they represent substantial negative agentive syntaxes. In this sentence, the meaning of negativity applies only to the agentive syntax. To prove this case, they can be transformed as follows:

1) Neither Pop nor the widow would find me again → Neither Pop nor the widow would find me again but the others would find.

It seems that in the substantive negative agentive sign of Neither Pop nor the widow, it is possible to observe the expression of the (partial) syntax of partivity. In English, if the element in the place of the core predicative 2 in this sentence is converted into the infinitive form, the element either can be added to the end of the sentence by adding only the subtractive conjunction instead of Neither ... nor: Neither Pop nor the widow would find me again → Pop or the widow wouldn't find

me again either. In this case, the combined clauses Pop and the widow represent only substantial agentive syntax.

In the next sentence Denis neither tried to persuade Dave nor discourage him combined elements neither tried to persuade nor discourage core predicative 2, their differential syntactic-semantic signs represent procedural negative active syntax. The syntactic unit that replaces the core predicative 1, Denis, remains a substantial agentive syntax. From the derivation of this analysis, it is known that the elements in the core predicative 2 position in the sentence device are implemented using the transformation of adding elements of neither ... nor instead of didn't ... or ... either, the elements in the core predicative 2 position remain procedural negative active syntax: Denis neither tried to persuade Dave nor discourage him → Denis didn't try to persuade Dave or discourage him either.

When the third sentence is analyzed by dividing it into syntaxes, the existence of negative partitiveness is also shown in it.

3) In the sentence He raised his head looking neither to the right nor to the left, cohesive clauses take the place of a non-core dependent component, and they represent a substantial negative locative syntax. To the right or to the left subordinate components can be replaced by here/there locative sign: He raised his head looking neither to the right nor to the left → He raised his head looking neither here nor there. It is known from the result of the exchange transformation that together with the negative locative syntax, partitiveness is expressed. It can be determined that there is a partitive syntax by adding the elements but to the straight to this sentence: He raised his head looking neither to the right nor to the left but to the straight.

Cohesive clauses are also found in the Uzbek language sentence structure in various syntactic functions, they are connected with their connectives na ... na in the base of coordinative communication. Let's analyze the following examples by syntax:

1. There is neither a good doctor nor a habib here (O. Yakubov).

2. These vagabonds know neither good nor evil (O. Yakubov).

3. He neither works nor studies anywhere (B. Rahim).

Before analyzing these sentences, we use the drop-down transformation method to identify the main core components.

1) There is neither a good doctor nor a habib here. here there is neither tabib, nor habib, in the derivation of the transformation, neither tabib nor habib is the core predicative 1 in the sentence structure of the syntactic units. When we turn the core predicative 2 component of this sentence into the form of indivisibility, neither ... nor instead of ... also + no. Both ... and elements are used after the core predicative 1 components:

There is neither a good doctor nor a habib here → There is neither a good doctor nor a habib here. At the first appearance of this sentence, when it is expressed using neither ... nor etc., the negativity mainly applies to the elements of doctor and habib, and with the help of both ... and + no, we see that the negativity appears in the element that comes in the place of the core predicative 2 of the sentence.

So, in this sentence neither tabib nor habib syntactic units represent substantial negative existentiality, the core is connected with procedural existential syntax based on predicative relation. In the sentences tabib and habib, the elements of tabib and habib represent substantial existential, while the elements of no ... no represent procedural negative existential syntax.

We use the drop-out transformation to determine the kernel components of the second sentence as well.

2) These humrohs know neither good nor evil → ... humrohs know. According to the result of the transformation, the syntactic units of neither good nor bad syntactic units come in the place of non-core subordinate component in the sentence, they are connected to each other on the basis of coordinative relationship, and are connected to the core predicative 2 component of the sentence (knows) on the basis of subordinate

relationship. The combined clauses in the sentence represent the qualifying negative object syntax, the elements of which are neither good nor bad. It reflects the presence of qualification, negative object and partivity.

If we convert the combined clauses in this sentence into the form neither ... nor → both ... and + Vng, the negativity will only be characteristic of the syntactic unit that is in the position of the core predicative 2 of the sentence: These humrohs know neither good nor evil → These humrohs know both good and evil doesn't know or → These people don't know.

The combined elements in the sentence express qualification, objectivity and partitiveness in the place of non-core subordinate component, neither good nor bad, and are connected with the procedural active syntax by means of subordinating relation.

But in the last sentence, without expressing the sign of partitiveness, the combined clauses are expressed using na ... na, the nucleus comes in the place of predicative 2 in the sentence and represents the procedural negative active syntax. Syntactic units in the place of core predicative 2 remain procedurally negative active syntactically when the connectives expressed by means of coordinative relationship are replaced by elements VfNg + and VfNg +.

3) He neither works nor studies anywhere → He neither works nor studies anywhere.

In English, the use of the conjunction neither ... nor between united components corresponds to the connecting conjunctions ha ... ha in Uzbek. However, no other negative form is used in the English sentence structure, regardless of which component it replaces, and in Uzbek, when neither ... nor cohesive clauses replace the subordinate components, the component that replaces the core predicative 2 can be given in an undivided form:

He knew neither to run nor to swim → He didn't know neither to run nor to swim. He could neither run nor swim →

He could neither run nor swim.

In English, if the element replaced by the core predicative 2 component is converted

into the form of infinitive, then "neither ... is dropped, and either is added after the unitary component or conjunction and the last unitary clause"(7.142).

He knew neither to run nor to swim → He didn't know to run or to swim either.

In the Uzbek language, neither ... nor instead of ... and the element in the place of the core predicative 2 can be turned into a non-divisive form.

He can neither run nor swim → He can neither run nor swim.

In such cases, negative syntaxes change their place in both languages.

CONCLUSION. It is known that there are different approaches to the research of negativity category in world linguistics, i.e., there are approaches to it from philosophical,

logical, psycholinguistic, and paralinguistic aspects. In our work, the devices with negative elements were studied at the syntactic level using comparative-typologically specific linguistic methods (analysis by dividing them into components and syntaxes, distributive analysis method, experimental method). This linguistic method is a new approach to the analysis of negative elements in both languages. In particular, identifying the external and internal devices of sentences with negative elements, i.e., determining the syntactic relations of syntactic units in the sentence, identifying differential syntactic signs and their semantic field, and their comparative analysis is one of the unique new approaches of modern syntactic typology.

REFERENCES:

1. Жигadlo В.Н., Иванова И.П., Иофик Л.Л. Современный английский язык. (Теоретический курс грамматики) – Москва: Литература на иностранных языках, 1956. - 350 с.
2. Винокурова Л.П. Грамматика английского языка. - Ленинград: Учпедгиз, 1954. - 344 с.
3. Ballmer T. Logical Grammar - Amsterdam. - North-Holland, 2004. - 416 p.
4. Kilichev E. Modern Uzbek literary language. - Bukhara: Bukhara University Publishing House, 2001. - 228 p.
5. Cook G. Discourse and Literature. - Oxford University Press, 1994. - 340 p.
6. Одилов Б.Б. Уюшган қўшма гапларнинг семантик-прагматик хусусиятлари: Филол.фан. номз... дисс. афтореферати. –Тошкент, 2008.- 29 б.
7. Blokh M.G.Course of Thereotical English Grammar. - Москва: Высшая школа, 1983. - 383 p.