

SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF DEICTIC UNITS WHICH EXPRESS “SPACE” IN THE CONTEXTS

Munosibkhon Ishanjanova

Senior teacher of foreign languages faculty at Andijan State University Andijan city, Republic of
Uzbekistan

munosib77@mail.ru

Abstract: This research tackles the syntactic device of the literary text which has done through a sentence. All lexical and morphological units of language have been served by the syntactic construction of the sentence. In traditional syntax these units are formed by the relations of the subject and the predicate. The article discusses the role of the deictic units which expressing the “space” in French and Uzbek literary texts as adverbs. The adverbial modifier is expressed differently in the text and is used in different parts of the content. Also, analyzed the proportionality and disproportional functions of the units which represent the spacial deictic application on the basis of the opinion of scientists.

Keywords: linguistic units, the syntactic relationship, semiological and onomasiological study, predicates, actants, the adverbial modifier.

INTRODUCTION

In traditional linguistics, as a result of the semiotic approach to linguistic units, that the sign consists only of form increased attention to study its formal aspects. When the language systems were divided into exact levels, the attitude of the linguistic units to the object being expressed by it was excluded from research. Later proved that learning by subtracting the form from the meaning does not give a result, it does not break them apart, and scientists began to study the meaning side of linguistic units in depth. The fact that linguists approach the language units by form and meaning also did not allow enough to fully understand the language. According to F.Kiefer “Learning to associate linguistic characters with context and discourse gave them a great opportunity to understand their meaning correctly”[12,8]. Based on F. Kifer’s view required the pragmatic study of linguistic units.

The spirit of the speakers and their different understanding of information serve as a guide in the correct comprehension process. Therefore, only taking into account the interaction of this knowledge, we will approach to understanding the essence of the speech process[5,8]. A.Nurmonov argues that as a result of such a practical need, came into being the semantics and pragmatics[5,6]. Ch.Morris studied the syntactic units from the semiotic side and identify three types of them: semantics, syntax and pragmatics.

The scientists underline that, they have own terms which studied in linguistics: implication is the term of syntax, meaning is the term of semantics, interpretation is the term of pragmatics[13,51]. Sh.Safarov emphasizing that these three sides of the language complement each other, prefers to study them in cooperation[6,172]. In fact, their limited research does not yield results in perfect study of the language. Therefore, in our article we aimed to clarify the syntactic-semantic properties of spatial complexities on the basis of a substantive approach. N.Maxmudov, A.Nurmonov state that “Syntax studies the formal relationship of linguistic units. Syntactic works on the basis of syntactic forms. Hence, the syntax is based on the syntactic structure of the sentence, which is studied by the name of the traditional syntax – sentence fragments”[1,8].

A.Espersen believes that it is the main task to pay attention to the form and the content in study of speech. According to the scientist, each phenomenon can be checked - from the form to the meaning or from the meaning to the form[11,32-33]. A.Nurmonov mentions that in this case the sentence, in the first manifests itself as a semiological, and the second - the object of onomasiological study[5,3]. O.I.Moskalkaya defined, the formal side of the sentence is syntactic,

the semantic structure is the content, which bases on the fact that they form a parallel series which does not intersect with each other in the study of the sentence[13,9-19].

V.G.Gak recognizes the situation as a referent of the sentence by calculating the full sign of the language, that is, in the process of "speaking" is the sum of the elements existing in the verbal consciousness of the object being and to a certain extent creating conditions for the choice of language elements in the process of the formation the sentence[9,358]. E. Paducheva approves that the meaning of the sentence consists of lexical meanings and the meanings of syntactic devices[10,12]. In our opinion, the joint study of form and meaning in the analysis of a sentence is primary. Despite the correct formulation the sentence, if the meaning is not correct it does not actualized. It follows that the sentence is formed correctly when the meaning and form are harmonious. As noted by our scientists, language performs its communicative function through a syntactic device – a sentence. All lexical, morphological units in the language used for the syntactic construction of the sentence. These units are formed in the traditional syntax in relation of the subject and the predicate. The subject belongs the subject's group and predicate is equated to predicate's group. French linguist L.Tener did not divide the subject and the object. He summarized the participants of the action and called them the actants. (in latin means "intensify")[14.]. The scientist states that, in general, the sentence consists of predicates and actants. V.G. Gak used the term object predicate. In his opinion, the object predicate expresses the relationship between two substrates A and B. The scientist believes that any sentence will consist of predicates and actants. Actants fill out the contents of the predicate. A systematic harmonization of the relationship of meaning and content forms a syntactic structure [17,111]. But in linguistics it is a priority to consider at the fact, that the three main elements of the sentence which consist of a subject, a predicate and an object. In construction of the sentence is significant the "syntactic relationship" and "syntactic connection". Syntactic attitude expresses the meaningful relationship of syntactic units, the syntactic communication expresses of formative attitude in the sentence. Syntactic relations are differing according to the subordinating conjunctions and coordinating conjunctions. Based on this we make the sentences. Syntactic forms, which are in an equal relationship, are in a subordinate relationship with another common form. Some of our scientists deny the existence of a formal connection between syntactic units, which are in equal relations with each other. A.Peshkovsky notes that, in such devices as, "the breath of spring roamed in the gardens, mountains, and fields..." the "roamed" performed the main part of function of fragment, but there is no formal connection between organized fragments they together enter into a connection without a binder[8,202]. If one is subordinate and the other is the dominant syntactic units are called subordinate relative units. The syntactic form of subordinate conjunctions in sentences fills the "empty spaces" of the syntactic form of the main subordinate conjunctions. In the above thoughts, we mentioned that the basis of the sentence is formed by a predicate. As a rule, in sentences the predicate is expressed by a category of words. The object of our research is the deictic space which represented as an adverbial modifier in sentences.

DISSCUSION

When the adverbial modifier is connected with a predicate which forms the center of the sentence, what position it will be has in the constructive system of the sentence? The adverbial modifier is not an absolute constructive part of the sentence.

We can make the sentence without an adverbial modifier. Hence, the adverbial modifier occupies a lower position than the predicate. Often the inclusion of the adverbial modifier in sentences the composition does not correlate intensively with the meanings of the predicate. Therefore, the adverbial modifier occupies a lower position than the subject. In colloquial speech, the restoration of the subject by the predicate is much more useful than the restoration of the adverbial modifier. It is difficult to restore the unspoken state. But it should be noted that sometimes, when lexemes, which are in strong contact with the place, moment, reason, purpose and

other meaningful actants on the basis of the predicate, occur, the surface pattern of the sentence acquires a more necessary activity than the subject. For example, when the verbs in Uzbek language (bormoq (go), kelmoq (come), yotmoq (lie down), ketmoq (leave) are coming as a predicate, the need to use the adverbial modifier of place in the sentence is raising: he went there. He came from there. He went there. He reached there. Of course, is determined not by the merger of the category of predicate, but by the semantic features of the function of the predicate. Therefore, in such cases, action verbs express the meaning of space. The distinctive features of the French movement verbs from the Uzbek language are the addition of prepositions and appear the meaning the space. For example: porter –olib kelmoq (go away), apporter - bring, mener-fetch, emmener – carry away. The verbs of action in French and Uzbek are represented with a meaningful unity of space when they are actualized in the sentence. For example, the verb “to go” like “go somewhere” or “go there”.

RESULT

Hence, the rise of the adverbial modifier to the level of the necessary section in the sentence construction is determined by the need for a certain definition of the predicate. The adverbial modifier in sentences takes the third place after the subject and the predicate. In the construction of the sentence, the space deixis is represented by syntactic units and differs according to its location. They serve to expand the content of the sentence. Adverbial modifiers are diverse in form and content. In French, the syntactic units of space in the function of the adverbial modifier are expressed in the sentence as an adverb and represented like prepositions+noun. While the sentence reveals the following forms:

Table №1

The expression of the spatial units of deictic as adverbial modifier in the French language	
Verb + adverb of place	preposition +subject
Pv+ici (Pv+here)	Loin de + S (Far from + S)
Pv+là(Pv+there)	Près de + S (Near + S)
Pv+là-bas (Pv+there)	Devant + S (in front of+S)
Pv+au-dessus (Pv+above)	Derrière +S (Behind+S)
Pv+au-dessous (Pv+below)	Autour de +S (Around+S)
Pv+en haut (Pv+on top)	Au milieu de + S (In the middle of+S)
Pv+derrière (Pv + behind)	Au centre de + S (In the centre of+S)
Pv+dehors (Pv + outside)	Au-dessus de+S (Above+S)
Pv+dedans (Pv + inside)	Au-dessous de +S (Below +S)
Pv+devant (Pv + front)	À coté de +S (Next to +S)

In the examples from the following literary texts, we observe that they come in the role of adverbial modifier:

—*Monsieur, vous êtes ici le seul représentant des muses, dit Gringoire.* (V.Hugo, Notre Dame de Paris, p-53).*La ville trouvait là tout ce qu'il faut à une bonne ville comme Paris: une chapelle, pour prier Dieu; un plaidoyer, pour tenir audience et rembarrier au besoin les gens du roi; et, dans les combles, un arsenal plein d'artillerie.* (V.Hugo, Notre Dame de Paris, p-66). *Si tu as quelque momerie à faire, il y a là-bas dans l'égrugeoir un très bon Dieu-le-Père en pierre que nous avons volé à Saint-Pierreaux-bœufs.* (V.Hugo, Notre Dame de Paris, p-95). *Rien n'y manquait, pas même la corde qui se balançait gracieusement au-dessous de la traverse.* (V.Hugo, Notre Dame de Paris, p-98). *Devant le bois de lit était un bassin de cuivre pour les aumônes.* (V.Hugo, Notre Dame de Paris, p-149). *Décadence magnifique pourtant, car le vieux génie gothique, cesoleil qui se couche derrière la gigantesque presse de Mayence, pénètre encore quelque temps de ses derniers*

rayons tout cet entassement hybride d'arcades latines et de colonnades corinthiennes. (V.Hugo, Notre Dame de Paris, p-199).

The form and content in Uzbek language can be supplemented with the following models of the sentences: [5,92]

Table №2

Representation of spatial units of the deictic in the Uzbek language as an adverbial modifier	
Adverb of place + verb	Name of the place(addition, particles)+ verb
Хбуерга+Пф (A.m here+Pv)	Хга + Пф (A.m to+Pv)
Хшуерга+Пф(A.m here+Pv)	Хда + Пф (A.m at +Pv)
Хуерга+Пф (A.m there+Pv)	Хдан + Пф (A.m from+Pv)
Хмана бу ерга+Пф (A.m here+Pv)	Хгача + Пф (A.m till+Pv)
Ханабуерга+Пф(A.m here+Pv)	Хга қадар + Пф (A.m till+Pv)
Хичкарида+Пф (A.m inside+Pv)	Хга довур + Пф (A.m till+Pv)
Хташқарида+Пф (A.m outside+Pv)	Хга томон + Пф (A.m side +Pv)
Хустида+Пф(A.m top +Pv)	Хорасида + Пф (A.m between+Pv)
Хостида+Пф (A.m bottom +Pv)	Холдида+ Пф (A.m near +Pv)
Хтепада+Пф (A.m top +Pv)	Хўртасида+ Пф (A.m in the middle of+ Pv)
Хпаста+Пф (A.m down+Pv)	Хёнида+ Пф (A.m near +Pv)

We observe the expression of these models in the following examples:

Аммо бу ердаги ҳамма нарсани яхши биламан (Ўткир Ҳошимов, Икки эшик ораси, 19-бет) *Хусан бувам билан Оқсоқол бувага худи шу ерда ажина даф қилган-да* (Ўткир Ҳошимов, Икки эшик ораси, 22-бет). *Мўралаб қарасам, у ердаям йўқ* (Ўткир Ҳошимов, Икки эшик ораси, 125-бет). *Ичкарида бирин-кетин болалар чиқиб келди: Бирови юз-қўлини ювди, бирови юз-қўлини ювмади* (Тоғай Мурод, Отамдан қолган далалар, 65-бет). *Бобомиз таиқаридан эшитилмиш овоздан уйғонади* (Тоғай Мурод, Отамдан қолган далалар, 14-бет). *Устидан пуркагичда сув сепдим* (Тоғай Мурод, Отамдан қолган далалар, 11-бет). *Аёл мажнунтоллар олдида одимлади* (Тоғай Мурод, Отамдан қолган далалар, 50-бет). *У чапанича катта-катта қадам ташлаб, тепагга келди* (Ўткир Ҳошимов, Икки эшик ораси, 176-бет). *Дадам ҳарсиллаб нафас олиб, нариги томонга - паства тушди* (Ўткир Ҳошимов, Икки эшик ораси, 23-бет).

The examples presented in two non-relative languages reflected the differences which shown in the models. In the Uzbek language, it was observed that spatial arrangements lead to the fulfillment of the deictic signs of the function of an adverbial modifier, and in the French language this circumstance is expressed differently by the prepositions. The expression of space with adverbs formed their common side.

From these examples, we can see, in the Uzbek language the adverbial modifier is represented by deictic units of space. In addition, the objects which actualized with cases of place and additional are also reflect the meanings of space.

For example, the word “the care(la voiture)” performs the function of an object in a virtual state and in an actual state is expressed as an adverbial modifier. In French, it is expressed with prepositions. For example: *Dans la voiture il y a les enfants.* (There are children in the car.) As can be seen from the example, the car, the main meaning of the subject - the word “car (la voiture)”, refers to the space. Through additional and preposition moved to the function of the adverbial modifier.

The sign of space basically serve as an adverbial modifier of place, their connection with the verb and expressing the place like this:

1) Refers to the place of being of action. At this time, the place is represented by the objective case. *What were you doing there? Aziza was reading a book in downstairs.* The adverbial modifier of place is expressed through the auxiliary verbs. *I did not die in the field of fencing.* In the sentence case of place “da” is formed equivalence – to preposition “inside”.

2) Indicates the position of the “go” (direction) represent the movement. This is expressed by the case of movement. *Call him here.* The adverbial modifier of place can also be represented by the auxiliary verbs in Uzbek “tomon”, “sari”. *He went towards school.*

The cases of relocation, which came with the adverbial modifier of place, denote generality, inaccuracy. This semantic type of location is represented in forms *Ҳгача, Ҳгадовур, Ҳгакадар* (table№2).

For example: *up to the house, until the house* there is a subtle difference between them: in the first the house itself does not enter into the account—the “gacha” suffix also gives such a meaning, in the second “the house” enters into space, that is, it also goes into the house. These are distinguished by the word stress, sometimes used together.

3) The output of the movement refers to the position of the beginning. At this time it is denoted by a word in the form of an exit. For example: *He goes upstairs.* As can be seen from the examples, the units that represent the adverbial modifier have filled the meaning of the verb. These cases are referred to as local actants of the verb[4,143].

S.Muhammedova says that the accusative case can also be an actant lokalis. For example: *Went through the desert.* [3,17] M. Mirtojiev states and subdivided the syntactic units in two groups: the units of group are proportional to the relationship of space and to the units of group a disproportion in the relationship of space. [2,188]

The scientist says that it is simple for the cases of space to perform the function of an adverbial modifier, but accusative case is disproportionate form in the formation of an adverbial modifier. M.Mirtojiev in his research underlined the units of space is a proportional form of performance of the function of the adverbial modifier but to use the subject, predicate and addition as an adverb is disproportionate to the application in the function of form.

CONCLUSION

In French and Uzbek literary texts, the participation of spatial phenomena helps to determine the direction of the space, the spatial location, and the distances of space which used in the context. Their main function in the text is the adverbial modifier. The roles of adverbs in these two languages are different, but the adverb is determined by the question, regardless of which part of the speech it comes and does not change its function. One of the issue which waiting to be studied their varied expression in the literary texts and theirs role in the context.

REFERENCES

1. Maxmudov N, Nurmonov A. Theory of the Uzbek language (syntax). "Teacher" publishing house. Tashkent, 1995. www.ziyouz.com.kutubxonasi
2. Mirtajiev M. Semantic-syntactic inconsistency in sentence fragments. Tashkent, 2008.
3. Mukhamedova S.H. Predicatively and valence of directional verbs in Uzbek language. Abstract of.diss.of the doc.of philol. – Tashkent, 1999.
4. Narimova G.A. In Uzbek, the verb is an object argument. Abstract of.diss.of the doc.of philol. – Tashkent, 2005.
5. Nurmonov A, Mahmudov N and others. Meaningful syntax of the Uzbek language, Tashkent, 1992.
6. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistic."National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan" State Scientific Publishing House. Tashkent, 2008.
7. G'ulumov A.G', Askarova M.A. The current language of Uzbek literature.(syntax) Tashkent, 1965.
8. Gak V.G. and others. Essays on the comparative study of the French and Russian languages. Moscow, 1965.
9. Gak V.G. About two types of signs in the language (utterance and words). Materials of the conference "Language as a sign system of a special kind" Moscow, 1967.
10. Gak V.G. Utterance and situation. –The problems of structural linguistics. Moscow, 1973.
11. Espersen O. Philosophy of grammar. Moscow, 1958.
12. Kiefer F. O. The role of pragmatics in the linguistic description. New in foreign linguistics, Issue XVI, Moscow, 1985.
13. Moskalskaya O. Problems of system description of syntax. Moscow, 1974.
14. Paducheva E. V. On semantics of syntax. Moscow, 1974.
15. Stepanov Yu.S. Semiotics. Ekateringburg, 1999.
16. Russian syntax in a scientific light. Ed.7, Moscow 1956.
file:///C:/Users//Downloads/PeshkovskiyRusskij sintaksis nauchnomosveshchenii(2001)(ru)(545s).pdf
17. www.tapemark.narod.ru - linguistic encyclopedia