Typology of Collocations in the English and Uzbek Languages

Yu. Ch. Mehmonova

Bukhara State University, Teacher at the department of translation theory and language studies

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the usage of semantic-grammatical collocations and their components in English and Uzbek languages. The expression of typological studies of collocation comparatively in English and Uzbek languages has been analyzed and differences identified.

Introduction

The typological study of word combinations in the compared languages aims to investigate and establish allomorphic and isomorphic features at the level of word combinations and thus to identify their main types. In order to give a correct definition of the concept "type of a phrase as a unit of comparison", it is necessary to proceed from the features and properties inherent in a phrase as a special unit of the syntactic level that exists in different languages.

Main part

The syntax of a language is such a subsystem of the structure of the language that deals with units more complex than a word is a phrase and a sentence.

A phrase is a combination of two or more significant words combined on the basis of a certain syntactic relationship and performing a nominative function (for example: *yangi soat - a new watch; kitobni o'qimoq - to read a book)*

The criteria for selecting types of phrases are:

✓ the nature of syntactic relations (attributive, object, adverbial);

✓ a way of expressing syntactic relations (coordination, control, contiguity);

✓ the position of the dependent word in relation to the core - in preposition and postposition.

The combination of these criteria, taken in the system, forms a stable set of features that can be used as the basis for the definition of "word combination type as a unit of comparison". The type of a phrase is understood as some two-term (rarely three-term) model, which has a nominative function, organized on the basis of a subordinate connection with a stable combination of syntactic relations

that are expressed in a certain way, and with a constant placement of components.

Phrase classification:

1) coordinating phrases - both words are equal (*hills and valleys*), expressed in a possible rearrangement of components without compromising the meaning

2 subordinate phrases - main + dependent component, if

swap components, meaning may be damaged (*to write a letter - a letter to write, sovuq havo – havo sovuq)*

There are many subordinating phrases in the language.

The name of the subordinating phrase depends on the syntactic function of the dependent component – attributive phrase + object phrase + adverbial phrase.

1) semantic - the nature of syntactic relations (definitive), 2) proper-linguistic character - pre or postposition of the dependent component in relation to the core,

3) the way of syntactic connection of both components of the phrase (coordination, control, contiguity))

A predicative connection is a connection between members of a grammatical basis in a sentence. In a subordinating phrase, one word is the main one, and the other is dependent (you can ask a question to it from the main word). There are three types of connections between words in a phrase:

Agreement is a type of connection in which the dependent word agrees with the main word in gender, number, case. The main word is always a noun; The subordinate clause can be: an adjective, a participle or a pronoun.

Examples: *chiroyli shlyapa*, *qiziqarli hikoya haqida*, under the same name; *blue sky, high building.*

Management is a type of subordinating relationship, where the dependent word is in the form of the main in the form of an indirect case.

Examples: *dushmanga bo'lgan nafrat, kitobni o'qimoq, vatanga bo'lgan muhabbat.*

Adjacency is a type of connection in which the dependence of a word is expressed lexically, by word order and intonation, without the use of auxiliary words or morphological changes. It is formed by adverbs, infinitives and adverbs, as well as possessive pronouns of the 3rd person, a simple form of the comparative degree of an adjective or adverb.

Examples: chiroyli kuylash, tinch uxlash, juda toliqish, shoshilmasdan yurish, katta bola, qattiq ishlash (sing beautifully, lie still, very tired, walked slowly, an older boy, to work hard)

In Uzbek, the usual neutral order of the components in the compound is based on the rule in the tone. Dependent word comes before independent word. The form of the Dependent word changes according to the demand of the dependent word. For example, to go to school, to come from school. So, the entry of a word into various morphemes depends on its relationship with other words - the lexical-grammatical features of this relationship.

However, any connection of independent words does not produce word combinations. For example. The connection between possessor and participle is also a combination of independent words. The connection between the components of the dependent system is based on the following connection, that is, one of the components is connected to the other by subordination, the character of the independent and subordinate members in it depends on the characteristics of the independent word. It is impossible to have a wrd combination without independent word. The type of syntactic relations in a sentence is much wider than the types of conjunctions. Because it has the syntax of a conjunction and does not include relations between clauses and equal conjunctions. Therefore, attributive, objective and objective relations are expressed by the connection of word combination.

For example, in the combination of mening vatanim(my countr), two types of modifiers are used: agreement and possessive. Possessive affixes show belongingness, show to whom the subject belongs, and are a tool in the structure of the nominative compound. This kind of combination is formed in the adaptation formula.

For example: *mening kitobim, sening kitobing, uning kitobi* (like *my book, your book, his book*). Conjunctions indicate the relationship between the action and the object. In this case, the noun in the function of the subordinate component is controlled in a broad sense in a certain form: like reading a book, going to the cinema. Subjects form a predicative conjunction by showing a participle relationship with the possessor. Word formulas in English are slightly different than in Uzbek. If two types of word modifiers are used in the above-mentioned combination of *mening vatanim*(my country), accusative and possessive, then it is not possible to give an exact English version of this combination.

In English, adjacency is the defining method of transferring syntactic links. In English, attributive relations in management arise when a noun acts as the core word, and the dependent word, which is in preposition to it, is usually expressed by a noun in the indirect case and denotes a) belonging to a person: my brother's book, mother's umbrella. A free attributive phrase is a binomial (less often a trinomial), in which both of its components - the core and the dependent - are connected using a syntactic (attributive) subordinating connection. (for example: *katta shahar - a large town, akamning velosipedi-my brother's bicycle,do'stimning uyi- my friend's house, qattiq ishlash- to work hard)*

Free object phrases - a binomial or trinomial, in which both components, the core and the dependent, are connected using a subordinate object connection

(for example: *xat olish- receive a letter,stantsiya bo'ylab haydash- drive through the station, tushunishga harakat qilish- to try to understand*)

In Uzbek, changing the order of words in a compound does not change the grammatical meaning in most cases. However, it is necessary to pay attention to two cases.

1. If the components of the phrase or sentence are formed by special morphological indicators, then the change of order cannot affect the syntactic state.

For example: *vatanim mening- mening vatanim, dostonim mening- mening dostonim.*

2. If the components of the combination are not formed by morphological indicators, the change of word order affects logical and grammatical situations; a construction with a different meaning is born. This situation often occurs in conjunctive constructions.

For ex: *Ona mehribon, olma qizil*. These are not words but sentences.

There is a grammatical relationship between the components of the word combination, they retain their lexical-semantic independence and have an accent, perform another syntactic function in the sentence. Due to this aspect, the word combination attracts the attention of linguists today.

Conclusion

In the languages being compared, substantive phrases are organized by a combination of a noun with another noun, an adjective, a pronoun, a numeral, an infinitive, a gerund, and an English adverb. The main method of connecting components of such phrases in the Uzbek language is izafet or adjoining technique. And in English the main means of communication are adjunction, control and prepositions. There are some cases of using the method of agreement here, which is not in the Uzbek language. There are also significant differences between these languages in terms of the location of the adjunct. For the most part, the adjunct in the Uzbek language is in postpositions, and in English in prepositions.

In the structure of sentences and phrases, words, first of all, are connected with each other in meaning, which is based on the relationships that exist between objects and phenomena of the

material world. Therefore, in the semantic-syntactic analysis of word combinations, one should take into account not only the grammatical compatibility of words, but also their semantic combinatorics. In this regard, the semantics of the components of the phrase also plays a significant role. Depending on this factor, different types of semantic relations appear between the components of substantive phrases.

References:

1. Mehmonova, У. (2022). LEXICO- GRAMMATICAL RESOURCES OF FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENCE IN THE TRANSLATION OF TEXTS FROM ENGLISH INTO UZBEK.

2. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(2), 349–353.

3. Chorikulovna, M. Y. (2022). Syntactic and semantic analysis of word combinations in the English and Uzbek languages. Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT, 2(5), 199-206.

4. Rabiyeva, M. (2022). THE PROBLEM OF EQUIVALENCE OF EUPHEMISMS. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(2), 354–358.

5. Рабиева, М. (2021). Дихотомия эвфемизма и фразеологизма: Дихотомия эвфемизма и фразеологизма. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 7(7).

6. Haydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjon qizi. (2022). Interdiscursivity and Intertextuality: Relation of Concepts. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 180–184. Retrieved from https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/1295

7. Tuyboeva , S. . . (2022). LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF SIMPLE SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION IN UZBEK AND FRENCH . Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(3), 184–187.

8. Zokirova Nargiza Savrievna. (2022). The Concept of Discourse as A Cognitive Phenomenon of Translation. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 207–211.

9. Nafisa K. Cognition and Communication in the Light of the New Paradigm //EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION. –2021. –T. 1. –No. 2. –C. 214-217.

10. Shakhnoza, T. . (2022). Expression of Averbal Sentence in Uzbek and French. Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT, 2(5), 133–138.

11. Shakhnoza, T. (2022). Learning the Polysemy of the French Noun "Souris" and the Verb "Battre". Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 3(6), 75-79.

12. Syntactic and semantic analysis of word combinations in the English and Uzbek languages https://scholar.google.

13. Mehmonova Y. C. Lexical And Grammatical Collocations in the English Sentences //Eurasian Research Bulletin. – 2022. – T. 8. – C. 43-47.

14. ДЕНОМИНАТИВНЫЕ И КОГНИТИВНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ:::::: http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journ

15. Mehmonova, Y. (2022). DEFINITENESS AND INDEFINITENESS OF NOUNS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz), 14(14).