American Journal of Philological Sciences

Investigating Issues In The Semantics Of Syntactic Units In Uzbek Linguistics

M. Khalilova

Senior Lecturer at Fergana State University, PhD in Philology, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article discusses the studies conducted by Uzbek linguists on the semantic analysis of syntactic units, focusing on the identification of semantic relations arising between parts of compound sentences and microtext components. It also reflects on the development of novel principles of semantic grammar aimed at defining these semantic relations, and the application of such principles to syntactic wholes. The article reviews research carried out within this framework.

Introduction: Research in Uzbek linguistics, particularly within the field of text linguistics, has achieved significant progress over the past decades in the areas of syntax and semantics. All existing events, phenomena, objects, and processes in our environment are understood through their interconnections, which are reflected by syntactic units in language. Notably, semantic relations between the components of compound sentences play a crucial role in ensuring the semantic coherence of a text. This article explores issues related to text linguistics, microtexts, supersyntactic units, and their semantic-grammatical analysis. It also reviews contemporary theories and studies on compound sentences and their semantic relations within the context of Uzbek linguistics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

At the end of the 20th century, the study of microtexts within text semantics gained momentum, focusing primarily on the semantic relations between small syntactic units (Quronov, 2004; Mamajonov, 2010) [4, pp. 71–89]. Building on syntactic-grammatical research, Nurmonov (1992) proposed semantic-grammatical approaches analyzing the dialectical relationship between form and meaning in sentences [6, pp. 178–189]. Additionally, Shuvalova's (1987) research on compound sentences in Russian adopted an ideographic approach to semantic relations [2]. Mamajonov and Abdupattoev (2014) conducted an in-depth analysis of text syntax, identifying methods that ensure the semantic unity of microtext components [3].

METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

The study employs linguistic, semantic, and textual analysis methods. Core methodologies include syntactic and semantic analysis, examination and interpretation of text structure, and identification of semantic relations between compound sentence components. The dialectical approach is utilized to analyze the inseparable connection between form and meaning of linguistic units. Furthermore, ideographic and functional approaches are applied to deepen the understanding of semantic relations within complex syntactic structures.

The main part

In the material world surrounding us, all existing objects, phenomena, and realities manifest themselves in interconnection with related processes and situations. This interconnectedness determines their various levels of semantic relations, which further reveal their unique nature, facets, and essence more vividly. These semantic relations occur in linguistic units

in one way or another. In particular, semantic relations are most fully realized at the syntactic level, emerging among components of speech units, serving to illuminate the semantic essence of events and phenomena, as well as their distinctive features.

In the late last century, text semantics—more precisely, the study of the semantic characteristics of microtexts—developed on the basis of examining semantic relations expressed by small syntactic units through compound sentences. During research and analysis of the semantic relations and their stylistic features manifested through compound sentence structures, theories emerged regarding the interconnection and semantic relations of microtext parts. Identifying and studying the semantic relations between components of compound sentences became crucial in determining and explaining the semantic relations arising between parts of microtexts—supersyntactic wholes.

For the current development and improvement of Uzbek linguistics, traditional syntax laid the theoretical foundation. Eminent scholars initially created theories and principles on syntactic connections and relations and the formation of compound sentences, defined syntactic laws, and primarily studied syntax from a formal perspective. However, linguists focused on the various semantic relations resulting from the connection of compound sentence components. Notably, in the 1987 textbook "Modern Uzbek Literary Language (Syntax)" by A. Gʻulomov and M. Asqarov, while describing the structure of compound sentences, ideas on the semantic relations within them were also expressed. The meaning expressed by each type of compound sentence is analyzed not from the perspective of generalized semantic relations like temporal, adversative, or positional relations, but rather based on the methods of connection of components within each type—such as coordinated compound sentences, asyndetic compound sentences, and subordinate compound sentences. Each type's characteristic semantic relation forms are analyzed accordingly.

In the final decades of the 20th century, research based on a novel approach to compound sentences—as the main units expressing primary ideas at the syntactic level—emerged prominently. One particularly significant aspect of compound sentences is their functional use in speech according to their semantic essence. Dedicated to this, Professor A. Mamajonov authored the monograph "Stylistics of Compound Sentences." This work addresses several pressing issues of syntactic stylistics by systematically exploring how means that shape speech types operate within compound sentence structures. It examines the role of compound sentences in enhancing emotional expressiveness and details the characteristics of syntactic-stylistic figures used therein.

A notable and valuable feature of Mamajonov's study is its attempt to generalize semantic relations—previously insufficiently researched by other scholars—and to demonstrate, with linguistic evidence, the existence of the following semantic relations emerging between components of compound sentences: 1. additive (coordinative) content, 2. temporal content, 3. conditional content, 4. causal content, 5. explanatory content, 6. adversative content, 7. comparative content, 8. similative content, 9. purposive content, 10. separative content, 11. degree-quantitative content, 12. modal content, and 13. polysemantic compound sentences.

This comprehensive classification highlights the complexity and multifunctionality of compound sentences within Uzbek syntax and stylistics [4, 71-89].

At the syntactic level, scholars have extensively studied the realization of compound sentences in speech, their semantic-stylistic features, and the phenomenon of parallel use of various types of compound sentences to express a unified content. In this research, important theoretical perspectives have been introduced regarding macro-syntactic units—specifically, groups of relatively independent clauses that function as text units—and their functional types. Additionally, factors contributing to the emergence of semantic characteristics of microtexts have been identified and analyzed.

In the world, all events and phenomena are interconnected in one way or another. Logically, an event that is not related to any other event does not exist. This interconnectedness can manifest in different forms, for example, an event may be connected to another as a consequence, by the time of occurrence, by purpose, or through other relationships ... [5, 219-220].

The above discussion clearly shows that in the final decades of the 20th century, new theoretical approaches emerged in syntax, focusing on the formal and semantic structures of simple and compound sentences and the semantic relations among their constituent parts. During this period, linguistics advanced from merely examining the formal principles governing grammatical units and syntactic structures toward emphasizing the study of the meaning expressed within these structures. This shift—moving from form to meaning—became one of the key challenges for modern syntactic theory.

Among the foremost contributions to this theoretical development was made by Professor A. Nurmonov. He

introduced innovative frameworks dedicated to the semantic analysis of grammatical units, particularly addressing the concordance and discordance between the formal and semantic structures of simple and compound sentences. Nurmonov proposed methods for analyzing syntactic units from a semantic perspective and established principles for investigating the semantic relations that arise among the parts of syntactic wholes. His research played a significant role in clarifying how meaning relations within complex syntactic units can be identified and systematically studied [6, 178-189]. The scholar describes the principle of studying and analyzing sentences from meaning to form as follows:

"Depending on the perspective adopted by the researcher, grammatical units can be classified as active or passive in grammar. The method of analyzing from form to meaning is known as the semiological approach... Semantic grammar follows the principle of meaning to form. It studies how elements of the objective reality, reflected in the mind and manifested as generalized images, find their expression in language. Formal grammar, on the other hand, operates based on the semiological principle, proceeding from form to meaning." [6, 179].

Linguist A. Nurmonov, who was the first to define the directions for investigating the logical-semantic aspects of grammatical units, especially in his manual on semantic syntax, laid a fundamental theoretical foundation for new approaches to the semantic-structural features of compound sentences. He emphasized that every sentence, particularly compound sentences, is a bilateral unit comprising both an expressive (form) side and a semantic (content) side. According to Nurmonov, the semantic analysis of such sentences must be conducted in accordance with the dialectical laws governing the relationship between form and meaning [5, 215]. This idea is grounded on the notion that meanings emerge directly through the interaction of various linguistic means and their relationships within language. The semantic aspect of syntactic units reflects their connection to real-world states, processes, and objects, thereby aiding in uncovering their true essence.

Furthermore, the scholar discusses theories about the realization of semantic relations, explaining that semantic-logical relations primarily arise between components of compound sentences. He specifically notes:

"…subordinate compound sentences differ from coordinated compound sentences due to the nature of their semantic-structural relations and the significantly more complex semantic, logical, and syntactic mechanisms that generate these relations. Therefore, evaluating subordinate compound sentences presents considerable challenges…" [5, 212]. Accordingly, Nurmonov explains that the ongoing controversial debates regarding the evaluation and classification of subordinate compound sentences stem primarily from the diversity of semantic relations expressed between their components. He argues that this variety complicates clear categorization and assessment.

At the same time, Nurmonov comments on S.A. Shuvalova's research titled "Semantic Relations in Compound Sentences and Their Means of Expression", which focuses on compound sentences in Russian from an ideographic perspective. He particularly highlights that Shuvalova's monograph is fundamentally built on the aspect of identifying a specific "idea" conveyed by a linguistic sign—that is, the search for a language marker expressing a particular semantic notion. This observation underscores the importance of ideographic approaches in studying semantic relations within compound sentences, especially in the context of subordinate structures [2].

With the further development of syntactic theories, Uzbek linguist A. Mamajonov, who laid the foundational theory of text linguistics, discusses in his textbook Text Linguistics the methods of combination and connective means that ensure the semantic integrity of microtext components (small functional blocks). He also determines the origin of semantic relations among text components, emphasizing how these relations arise from the ways components are linked and integrated within the text structure [2].

It is known that compound sentence components express semantic relations such as coordination, comparison, opposition, cause-effect, condition-time, specification, and explanation. These relations are realized through syntactic linking devices that connect components within the three types of compound sentences: asyndetic, coordinated, and subordinate compound sentences. Such syntactic devices include intonation, conjunctions, words functioning as connectors, clause order, pronouns, repetition of certain words, shared secondary elements, and temporal relations of predicates. It is evident that syntactic linkage in compound sentences is established between predicative units. In the text, syntactic connections emerge between entire sentences, superfrazal syntactic wholes, paragraphs, sections, and chapters, ensuring both semantic and structural unity. Between relatively independent sentences forming the text, strong semantic connections are established, which contribute to the coherence and integrity of the entire discourse [2, 15-16].

To provide a more comprehensive interpretation of the phenomena under study, a deeper approach is required, where the full reflection of relationships between events is represented by the semantic unity of several relatively independent clauses (simple or compound sentences). This unity forms a small "semantic core"—a speech unit aimed at conveying a single, coherent idea that elucidates a particular topic. Compared to compound sentences, such supersyntactic wholes express any content more extensively and completely.

Microtexts (supersyntactic units) arise in connection with indicating the purpose or cause of an event, its place, specification, supplementation, or explanation. They do not merely express limited semantic relations; instead, their components interact with each other to present the relationships between events in a semantically complete manner with all relevant details.

In previous research within text linguistics, the semantic study of supersyntactic wholes has been theoretically elaborated in the subsequent manuals by A. Mamajonov and M. Abdupattoev, reflecting their significant contribution to this field [3].

Professor A. Mamajonov, in his study of Uzbek linguistics, investigates microtexts under the term "supersyntactic syntactic wholes" (SSWs). He proposes that SSWs can be categorized based on their syntactic-stylistic functions into the following types: repetitive SSWs, descriptive SSWs, and explanatory SSWs.

Since microtext (SSW) components consist of various types of clauses, the semantic relations between them are diverse. Predominantly, the semantic relations among SSW components include coordination, temporal relations, cause-effect relations, comparison, and explanation. Although the components within an SSW are formally independent, semantically they unite around a common central idea, expressing a logical unity.

A fundamental characteristic of textual coherence is the semantic connection between the units and parts (components) that make up the text. This connection and the unification of components form semantic cohesion. The complete thought or fully developed meaning expressed through microtexts requires that the logical relationship between its components ensures that one part logically entails another. Within syntactic wholes, semantic ties exist among components, and their combination results in the expression of various semantic relations.

In scholarly literature on text linguistics, researchers have used terms such as "complex syntactic whole" [7, 277-284], "supersyntactic syntactic whole" [2, 23] and "supersyntactic whole" [5, 94-95] to refer to large syntactic structures.

In the study of simple sentences, the issue of actual division into topic and comment has been analyzed by A. Hayitmetov, who described the topic as the "known part" and the comment as the "unknown part" of the sentence [3].

A. Nurmonov, who established principles for the semantic study of syntactic units, introduced novel perspectives on the communicative aspects of sentences, particularly concerning the relationship between topic and comment as "known" and "new" information. He emphasized that in any syntactic construction, the elements forming the sentence are divided into topic (known) and comment (new) parts from the viewpoint of their communicative function, i.e., their actual role in conveying the communicative goal. Nurmonov highlights that the comment (rheme) is the most significant part of the sentence, serving as the communicative center or focus of the utterance [6].

Linguists A. Mamajonov and M. Abdupattoev, in their textbook Text Syntax, were the first to emphasize that various semantic relations expressed through microtexts are reflected in the topic-comment relations within syntactic wholes. They highlighted that the topic-rheme relations are also manifested in text units, and that the largest text unit—the supersyntactic whole—is closely connected with the issue of the actual division of the sentence. Moreover, microtexts exhibit actual division just like simple sentences, where the topic represents the subject of the utterance (i.e., what the thought is about), and the comment (rheme) provides the development or explanation of the topic, clarifying its content [3].

Thus, the emergence of semantic relations in supersyntactic wholes (SSWs) through topic-rheme relations is determined by the internal semantic connectivity among the sentences constituting the SSWs, whereby the main idea is conveyed by providing information about the topic. It is especially emphasized that a semantic (content) relation arises between the topic and rheme of supersyntactic wholes.

In microtexts, the topic is realized through the first relatively independent sentence, which serves as the main foundational component of the microtext and defines the semantic core of this complex unit. The topic is established by this initial sentence. Regardless of the number of relatively independent sentences that make up the microtext, the remaining sentences serve to illuminate, explain, compare, or provide additional information about the topic, thereby functioning as the rheme. This sequential structure reflects the manifestation of the topic-rheme relation in microtexts.

Like other speech units, microtexts possess distinctive features. They are characterized by the complete, precise, and comprehensive expression of thought relative to the sentence. Sentences within such a unit are semantically and grammatically interconnected and serve to express various semantic relations such as temporal, coordinative, explanatory, comparative, causal, and similative relations. Furthermore, a single microtext can express several complex semantic relations simultaneously, which underscores the vast and multifaceted functional role of such complex syntactic wholes in speech.

Because microtext components consist of various types of relatively independent sentences, the semantic relations among them are also diverse.

In the 1990s, during the process of studying the semantic structure of texts in Uzbek linguistics, the concept of "textually connected sentences" was introduced. These sentences are such that their meaning and content can only be clarified through the preceding sentence; they are semantically tightly linked to the prior sentence. When used independently, their reference—what or whom they are about, or which events they describe—is unclear, and their meaning remains highly vague. Their semantic content becomes clear only when combined with the preceding sentence. Such sentences were termed "textually connected sentences." [10, 38-39]. Such sentences are semantically closely connected to the preceding sentence and together form the category of text, necessitating the semantic study of this text category. The semantic analysis of texts places great importance on these sentences because those that are tightly semantically linked to the previous sentence collectively create the text as a whole.

CONCLUSION

The investigation of semantic relations in compound sentences within text linguistics contributes significantly to a profound understanding of the semantic dimension of syntactic units. These relations ensure the coherence and logical unity of texts. Historical and current research in Uzbek linguistics, particularly by Mamajonov and Nurmonov, has laid a solid theoretical foundation for this field, retaining its relevance today. Continued practical and theoretical research in this area will substantially contribute to the advancement of linguistic sciences.

REFERENCES

Абдупаттоев М. Ўзбек матнида суперсинтактик бутунликлар: Филол.фан.ном. ...дисс. авторефераты. – Т., 1998.

Мамажонов А. Текст лингвистикаси. Ўқув қўлланма.– Т., 1989.

Мамажонов А., Абдупаттоев М. Матн синтаксиси. – Фарғона, 2002.

Мамажонов А. Қўшма гап стилистикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1990.

Нурмонов А., Маҳмудов Н., Аҳмедов А., Солихўжаева С. Ўзбек тилининг мазмуний синтаксиси. – Т.: Фан, 1992.

Нурмонов А. Танланган асарлар.III жилдлик, III жилд. – Тошкент, 2012.

Расулов И. Мураккаб синтактик бутунликлар. Танланган асарлар, II жилд, - Тошкент: MUMTOZ SO'Z, 2015.

Ҳайитметов А. Ўзбек тилида гапнинг актуал бўлиниши ва позицион масалалари. – Т.: Фан, 1984.

Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987.

Халилова М. Матний боғлиқ гаплар семантикаси // Ўзбек тилшунослигига оид тадқиқотлар. Республика ёш тилшуносларининг анъанавий илмий конференцияси материаллари. (VI чиқиш) – Тошкент, 1994. – Б.38-39.