STATE OF STUDY OF PHRASEMES IN SENTENCE MODELS IN FOREIGN LINGUISTICS

Shodiev San'at Ergashevich

Acting Professor of the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. *The article is devoted to the study of fixed combinations in the form of sentences, phrases, and their study in linguistics in foreign linguistics. It analyzes the specific features of fixed combinations, phrases, and freely constructed sentences in the sentence structure. Also, the interpretation of fixed combinations in the sentence pattern is discussed, and special attention is paid to the issue of determining the functional boundary between a fixed sentence and a sentence. The researcher presents their conclusions using the examples given in this article.*

Keywords: *phrase, idiom, fixed phrase, sentence phrase, communicative phrase, nominative phrase, syntactic phrase*

Introduction

The actual parts that serve as elements of the sentence, in our opinion, find their expression in the moneme. Indeed, the moneme is functionally and actualitatively inextricably linked with the issue of the real use of language elements in speech. Moneme, as the smallest unit of speech, is divided into autonomous, functional, semi-functional, dependent types and plays the main role in the formation of a sentence. A perfect description of Monema found its expression in the works of the French linguist A.Martine and the Uzbek linguist N.Turniyozov[138].

In Russian linguistics, the study of the structural scheme of a sentence was initiated by N.Yu. Shvedova. He understands the structural scheme of a sentence as a minimal construction object, filled with lexical material and intended to inform about reality. According to the scholar, this syntactic structure consists of a grammatical object and a grammatical predicate that make up the predicative basis. In turn, predicativity is inherent in the structural schemes of all types of sentences, and each structure has its own semantic weight. This semantics is based on the meanings of the components of the scheme, and if it is single-component, on the meaning of this component[139].

---

[138] See: Martinet A. La linguistique synchronique: Etudes et recherches. − P.: PUF, 1965; Martinet A. La langue et function. − P.: Gonthier; Denoel, 1969; Турниёзов Н., Турниёзова К. Функционал синтаксисга кириш. – Тошкент: Фан, 2003.

[139] See: Грамматика современного русского литературного языка (отв. ред. Н.Ю.Шведова). – М.: Акад. наук СССР, Ин-т русского яз., 1970. – С.62.

It should be noted that the element in the status of a minimal structural scheme of the sentence may not be filled with lexical material. The minimal construction object of the sentence, which informs about reality, initially begins with the root structure. Even when the underlying structure is incomplete, it remains a minimal scheme. The root structure serves as the basis for the derivational realization of the sentence. In other words, the root structure is an internal semantic structure that serves as the basis for the derivation of the syntactic structure of the sentence[140]. S.D. Katznelson correctly assessed the fundamental structure as the structure of thought[141]. Therefore, the scheme of the minimum construction object may not be as N.Yu. Shvedova emphasized, but may consist of a single composition. However, we observe that N.Yu. Shvedova also came to the same conclusion at the end of her opinion. We are surprised by the scientist's ambivalent attitude towards the minimal structural scheme. Moreover, for a certain structure to have a predicative status, it is not necessary that its constituents consist of a grammatical object and a grammatical predicate. Indeed, the analysis of language materials shows that the phenomenon of predicativity can be expressed within the framework of a single word[142]. Lekin bu so'z maxsus ohangda aytilishi shart, aks holda predikativlik xususida fikr yuritib bo'lmaydi.

Literature analysis

G.A. Zolotova calls the structural scheme of a sentence the term "sentence model." He defines it as a minimal combination of syntactic forms that form a communicative unit with a certain typical meaning. As an example, Pered domom palisadnik (Rock wall in front of the house); In the forest fungi (Fungi in the forest); In the room piano (In the room piano); Provides models representing the existence of an object or phenomenon, such as a meeting in the hall[143].

One can agree with G.A. Zolotova's interpretation of the structural scheme of a sentence as a "sentence model," but the concept of the minimal combination of syntactic forms that make up the communicative unit, explained by the scientist, seems to be expanded. After all, when we say Перед домом палисадник (Rock wall in front of the house), we see that the model of the sentence is based on derivation in the form of N+X1+V. In this process, we observe that the combination of elements that make up the sentence is a root structure, there is a palisadnik (shoxdevor bor) is a basic structure, that is, the minimal form of the sentence, before the house there is a palisadnik (Uyning yonida shoxdevor bor) is a derived structure, the operator is in the form of -om (-da). In this situation, we see that the root structures in all

---

[140] See: Турниёзов Б.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик қурилмалар деривацияси. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2008. – Б.30.

[141] See: Кацнельсон С.Д. Общее и типологическое языкознание. – Л.: Наука, 1986. – С.142-143.

[142] See: Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. – М.: Литературы на иностранных языках, 1957. – С.50-51.

[143] See: Золотова Г.А. Очерк функционального синтаксиса русского языка. – М.: Наука, 1973. – С.124.

sentences are hidden. Consequently, as G.A. Zolotova emphasizes, the above sentences cannot be considered the minimal form, since they all require derivative structures based on the supporting structure.

According to Z.D. Popova and G.A. Volokhina, a sentence is a sign of a separate syntactic concept, which is an expression of a judgment in the role of a subject or predicate, which is a component of a proposition[144]. Although this view of the sentence is based on the rule of logical syntax, one can agree with it. After all, every sentence has its own proposition. This is understood through the predicate of the propositional structure in it. The predicate of a propositional structure always has spaces and acquires abstractness. If its gaps are filled, the propositional structure begins to serve syntactic derivation[145]. But not every sentence expresses a judgment. For example, interrogative sentences are independent of sentence expression.

It should be noted that Z.D. Popova, assessing the proposition as a syntactic concept, comes to an erroneous conclusion. After all, in the words of N.D.Arutyunova, the proposition constitutes the concrete essence of the sentence[146]. Shu bois uni semantik kontsept sifatida talqin etish to'g'ri bo'ladi. Zotan, propozitsiya deganda gapning mazmuniy strukturasi tushuniladi.

A.O.Ifaturoti studies the sentence as a linguistic sign and puts forward the following idea: "A sentence, like a word, is a sign of language. Their difference is that while a word names an object or phenomenon without taking into account its specific meaning and morphological features, a sentence calls a complete thought regardless of its specific content"[147]. – "A sentence, like a word, is a sign of language. Their difference is that a word names an object or phenomenon without taking into account its specific meaning and morphological features. A sentence, regardless of its specific content, names a complete thought".

Results and discussion

In our opinion, as A.O.Ifaturoti emphasizes, the interpretation of communicative units as a linguistic sign seems to be a serious issue requiring clarification. After all, such thinking about language signs contradicts F. de Saussure's doctrine of "dichotomy of language and speech." Moreover, A.O.Ifaturoti asserts that a word names an object or phenomenon without taking into account its specific meaning and morphological features, while this assertion is unfounded, and when a word, as a nominative unit, names objects and phenomena, it also means the signification of that object or phenomenon. True, the connection between the denotatum and the signified is

---

[144] See: Волохина Г.А., Попова З.Д. Синтаксические концепты русского простого предложения. – Воронеж: Б.и., 2003. – С.8.

[145] See: Манаенко Г.Н. Предикация, предикативность и пропозиция в аспекте информационного осложнения предложения // Филологические науки, 2004. – №2. – С.59-68.

[146] See: Арутюнова Н.Д. Предложение и его смысл: логико-семантические проблемы. – М.: Наука, 1976.   – С.24.

[147] Ифатуроти А.О. Синтаксические теории простого предложения в современной лингвистике // Вестник ЮУрГУ. Серия «Лингвистика», 2020. – №3. – С.71-75.

relative, but it is completely inappropriate to say that the word that names the thing does not have a morphological indicator.

In addition, we observe that syntactic units are studied in linguistics as a language unit. For example, V.G. Gak, taking into account that a sentence consists of semiotic signs, calls it a minimal communicative unit of language, while A. Nurmonov interprets syntactic units as language units[148]. But in language, there is nothing but phonemes, morphemes, and words. A sentence, in turn, is the object of use of language units. Emil Benvenist notes: "One phrase is an indefinite formation, unlimited in its variations; it is the very life of language in action. With one phrase, we leave the world of language as a system of signs to enter another world, that of language as a means of communication, the expression of which is the word[149]. – ("A sentence is the use, functioning, and life of language. In speech, we move somewhat away from our understanding of language as a system of signs and enter another world - a reality that presupposes language as a means of communication. This reality finds its expression in speech.

In English linguistics, scientific views on the linguistic nature of speech began to be expressed in works created at the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries. The scientific views of English scholars were interpreted based on the ideas of the French linguists A. Arnault and C. Lancelot in the Grammar of Port-Royal. As a result, they studied the sentence from a logical point of view, dividing it into simple statements (a compound axiom) and complex statements (a simple axiom)[150].

Sodda va qo'shma gaplar hamda ularda tinish belgilarining ishlatilishi haqidagi dastlabki mulohazalar K.Kuperning grammatikasida yoritildi[151]. But later, the syntax of simple and compound sentences was studied even more deeply by W.G. Lewis. He emphasizes that a simple sentence is based on a single verb, while a compound sentence consists of two simple sentences connected by conjunctions. In addition, the scientist dwells on the classification of compound sentences and divides them into such types as copulative, relative, declarative, final, comparative, disjunctive, interrogative[152]. Although the division

---

[148] See: Гак В.Г. Теоритическая грамматика французского языка. Синтаксис. − М., 1981. − С.58; Маҳмудов Н., Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. − Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995. – Б.8-9.

[149] Benveniste É. Mélanges linguistiques. – Paris: Éditions Peeters, 1975. – P.139.

[150] See: Butler Ch.S. The English Grammar, or The Institution of Letters, Syllables, and Words in the English Tongue Whereunto is Annexed an Index of Words, Like and Unlike. − Oxford: Printed by W. Turner, for the author, 1633; Brightland J.A. Grammar of the English Tongue: with the Arts of Logick, Rhetorick, Poetry, etc. Illustrated with Useful Notes; Giving the Grounds and Reasons of Grammar in General. − L.: Printed for J. Rivington and J. Fletcher, 1714.

[151] See: Cooper C. The English Teacher or the Discovery of the Art of Teaching and Learning the English Tongue (ed. by B. Sundby, Lund, Gleerup). − Copenhagen: Munksguard, (1687) 1953.

[152] See: Lewis W.G. A Grammar of the English Language, in which the Genius of the English Tongue is Consulted, and All Imitations of the Greek and Latin Grammars are Discarded, Adapted to the Comprehension of Persons Desirous of

of complex sentences into types in W.G. Lewis's research is noteworthy, we observe that this classification is mixed with the classification of types of sentences according to the purpose of expression. Nevertheless, this classification of the scientist was of great importance in its time.

In the 1920s, compound sentences became the main object of study in linguistics. In particular, in English grammar at the beginning of the 20th century, compound sentences began to be studied in two parts - compound sentences with (compound) conjunctions and compound sentences with (complex) subordinate clauses. However, the main features of these sentences were not clearly explained. For example, A.C.E.Vechtman-Vet writes the following about a compound sentence in his work "A Syntax of Living English" ("Syntax of Living English"): "In a compound sentence a kernel is a single statement, but one of the parts of the sentence has the form of the clause" − ("Although the core of a compound sentence with a subordinate clause means one expression, one of its parts comes in the status of a subordinate clause")[153].

In our view, Wechtman-Wet notices that the structure called a compound sentence represents a semantic and syntactic unity, but he cannot explain what name this device should be called.

By the 1960s, compound sentences were studied in connection with the concept of systematic grammar of the London school, founded by M.A.K. Halliday. It is substantiated that the system of grammatical units consists of a morpheme, a word, a phrase, a sentence, and that the smallest category is a morpheme, and the highest category is a sentence, but the sentence is in the lower category compared to the complex, which includes two or more units of the higher category. Thus, in the first stage of English grammar, the concept of a sentence was analyzed based on logical categories, and in the second stage, it was studied based on systemic-structural methods.

We observe that the study of sentences by structuralists has become widespread not only in English linguistics, but also in world linguistics as a whole. In fact, the creation of structural theory in linguistics is connected with the doctrine of F. de Saussure, which was aimed at solving the methodological problems of traditional linguistics. This new direction was intended to examine the internal relationships and connections of language components. Structuralists tried to apply research methods that yielded good results in phonology to grammar as well. Thanks to this, great successes have been achieved in the solution of syntactic problems in both Parisian functionalism and American descriptivism. From the

---

Teaching Themselves, and Intended for the Use of Schools and Young Persons in General. − L.: Printed and Published by T. Dolby, 1821.
[153] Vechtman-Veth A.C.E. A Syntax of Living English. Kemink and Zoom-Over Den Dom-Utrecht, 1928. – P.30.

point of view of the structural approach, the theory of studying parataxis and hypotaxis was founded by such linguists as S.Kartsevsky, N.Khomsky, Z.Harris, L.Tener, V.Bryondal, P.Dideriksen.

S.Kartsevsky, reflecting on parataxis and hypotaxis, emphasizes that the speaker can change interlocutors one after another in his consciousness during a single communication, and the structure of paratactic constructions arising in the expression of thought in this process is replicated (replica - from the French réplique - "refutation," "objection")[154] and the structure of hypotactic devices is evaluated as an informational dialogue. According to the scientist, parataxis is explicit (explicit - from the French explicite "clear," "expressed in one sense"), its components interact with special signs - conjunctions, and in hypotactic constructions, the relationship between two components is often carried out without conjunctions. Instead of this, pronouns and adverbs are often used[155].

Although S.Kartsevsky paid attention to the structural organization of paratactic and hypotactic constructions, for some reason it is surprising that he interprets them as a replica and an informational dialogue. After all, such an approach to the essence of the issue is discursively correct. In other words, a replica in discourse is a statement of the thought of each participant in the dialogue. The replica is the main component of the dialogue, and the formation of the situation of the replicas constitutes the dialogic whole. Therefore, we believe that there is no linguistic meaning in studying paratactic and hypotactic constructions by dividing them into such types as replica, informational dialogue. Indeed, the existing concepts are characteristic of both types of devices. Moreover, it is incorrect to study it as explicit or implicit, depending on the presence or absence of a conjunction in a syntactic device. Because in both types of syntactic devices, depending on the situation, the connecting tool can be omitted by the speaker. However, this does not completely negate its role, since it can be restored to its place at any time. Therefore, one cannot agree with S. Karsevsky's opinion that the relationship of two components in hypotactic constructions is often realized without conjunctions. In this reasoning, we also observe that the concepts of syntactic connection and syntactic relation are not differentiated. Since the components of a syntactic device are activated with the help of conjunctions, this process is called not a syntactic relationship, but a syntactic connection. From the analysis of paratactic and hypotactic constructions, it becomes clear that, in fact, paratactic constructions are formed

---

[154] Розенталь Д.Э., Тельникова М.А. Словарь-справочник лингвистических терминов. – М.: Просвещение, 1985. – С. 237.

[155] See: Николайчук А.С. Структуралисты о паратаксисе и гипотаксисе // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики, 2013. – №4(22). Часть 2. Изд-во: Грамота. – С. 125-126.

in many situations without conjunctions: It was cloudy, it didn't rain; Felix is not really talkative, he likes solitude.

S.Kartsevsky cites the case of the absence of a conjunction in hypotactic constructions using the example of the Russian language. However, in Russian, its function is performed by a pronoun or adverb. Consequently, it cannot be assumed that the connector in these devices has a zero indicator. For example, let's pay attention to the sentence "I don't imagine where my pencil went" (I can't imagine where my pencil case went). In this case, the adverb "kuda" acts as a conjunction.

It should be noted that this situation often occurs in colloquial speech. Therefore, the omission of conjunctions in hypotaxis leads to a grammatical defect between the components. Although used in spoken language in the above manner, it is necessary to pay attention to the preservation of the complete form in written speech.

The sentence was structurally analyzed literally by representatives of the theory of transformational-generative grammar. In this analysis, the statement as the object of research was interpreted in a new way, differing from other analyses. Generative grammar requires a set of grammatical rules that determine the structure of a sentence. This concept was introduced into linguistics by Noam Chomsky, who borrowed it from mathematics. According to Chomsky, the human brain has a mental matrix designed for learning grammar. A child relies on an innate grammatical module when learning their native language[156]. This theory is also known as transformational grammar. Linguists engaged in generative grammar are not interested in traditional grammatical rules. They strive to determine the principle of expression, which forms the basis of any language. Generative grammarians formulate rules for the real use of language based on the grammatical correctness or incorrectness of a certain sentence by native speakers. In other words, generative grammar is a "theory of competence." It is a psychological model of subconscious knowledge based on the speaker's ability to express their thoughts in their own language[157].

Since generative grammar is a "theory of competence," one of the methods for verifying its correctness is the "grammatical task." For this, a number of sentences are presented to the speaker of a particular language, and it is necessary to determine whether they are grammatically correct (acceptable) or incorrect (unacceptable). For example:

The man is happy (This man is happy).

---

[156] See: Ибботсон П., Томаселло М. Язык в новом ключе // В мире науки. Лингвистика, 2017. − [03] март. – С. 103-109.

[157] See: Нордквист Р. Генеративная грамматика: определение и примеры. Elektron manba: https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-generative-grammar-1690894, Статья обновлено 29.09.2024 (Sahifaga 2025.07.02 da murojaat etildi).

Happy man is the (He is a happy man).

A native speaker considers the first sentence acceptable and the second unacceptable. From this, we can draw certain conclusions about the rules that determine the order of sentence parts in English sentences. For example, the verb to be, which connects a noun and an adjective, comes after the noun and before the adjective.

It should be noted that, although it is impossible to find the internal root structure from a syntactic point of view through other grammatical analyses and to show its significance, and if a sentence in the active form is given, to reveal its connection with a structure in the passive form, with the help of the transformational grammar method, it will be possible to clarify these issues and, with its help, to illuminate the syntactic formation of word combinations and sentence structure in close connection with other sentences and combinations[158]. However, due to the rapid development of cognitive grammar in recent years, Chomsky's grammar has become incapable of studying the dynamics of the potential of human logical thinking. Because transformational grammar studied the syntax of language through mathematical modules and acquired the status of "machine grammar" and added the language to the ranks of exact sciences. Since the human factor prevails in language, N. Chomsky's views cannot always be approved. For example, further research shows that a child does not rely on an innate grammatical module in learning their native language, but can approach it through concepts that have nothing to do with language, using different ways of thinking. For example, a child's perception of surrounding objects by categorizing them, classifying them to a certain extent, and distinguishing them by taste can serve as evidence of our point. These abilities help children understand what others are trying to say. Or take the Varlpiri language, which is used by the indigenous tribes of Australia. In this language, nouns and verb groups are not arranged in the same order as in Chomsky's theory. In some sentences, the verb group is completely absent[159]. Therefore, as F. de Saussure emphasized, language can occur not as a system of signs expressing thinking, but, on the contrary, as a factor developing thinking. As an example, we can cite the research of famous professors and educators L.S. Vygotsky, I.A. Sokolyansky on teaching blind and deaf children to communicate[160]. In their research and experiments, they widely use the theoretical views of A. Potebna and have achieved unprecedented success. The language the children learned was the "language of feeling." Having mastered the

---

[158] See: Turniyozov N.Q. Lingvistik nazariyalar. – Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2022. – B.93.
[159] See: Legate J.A. Warlpiri and the theory of second position clitics // Nat Lang Linguist Theory, 2008, 26. – P.3-60.
[160] See: Басилова Т.А. О Соколянском и его методах обучения глухих и слепоглухих детей, так интересовавших Выготского // Культурно-историческая психология, 2006. – №3. Том 2. – С.8-16.

"language of intuition," children began to feel like full-fledged members of society, because thanks to this miracle, children now know how to "speak."

Conclusion

"The smallest changes in the structure of the eye and the activity of the optic nerves inevitably provide different reflections, and this affects the entire worldview of a person, therefore each element in the structure of language, even without our knowledge, causes a specific combination of elements of thinking. The influence of the language element on thinking has its own peculiarity and cannot be replaced by anything," - said A. Potebnya[161]. Indeed, we must acknowledge this opinion of A. Potebnya. After all, a person does not learn their language based on grammatical modules for communication. If language is studied with the help of grammatical modules, it is considered a theoretical science, even if it is necessary for communication. In other words, it is now considered linguistics. Therefore, the role of thought, labor, and society in the formation of language is invaluable. However, we do not want to refute N. Chomsky's theory with this reasoning. The scientist's theory serves as a basis for the development of such fields as mathematical linguistics, computer linguistics, which is rapidly developing today. His linguistic doctrine remains unique in the purely grammatical study of language. However, there is a description of the issues of language, speech, and thinking, the coverage of which cannot be viewed one-sidedly. Therefore, it is necessary to study different aspects of language based on different approaches.

Literature

1.   Martinet A. La linguistique synchronique: Etudes et recherches. − P.: PUF, 1965; Martinet A. La langue et function. − P.: Gonthier; Denoel, 1969;

2.   Benveniste É. Mélanges linguistiques. – Paris: Éditions Peeters, 1975. – P.139.

3.   Brightland J.A. Grammar of the English Tongue: with the Arts of Logick, Rhetorick, Poetry, etc. Illustrated with Useful Notes; Giving the Grounds and Reasons of Grammar in General. − L.: Printed for J. Rivington and J. Fletcher, 1714.

4.   Butler Ch.S. The English Grammar, or The Institution of Letters, Syllables, and Words in the English Tongue Whereunto is Annexed an Index of Words, Like and Unlike. − Oxford: Printed by W. Turner, for the author, 1633;

---

[161] See: Безлепкин Н.И. Язык как психологический феномен: философско-лингвистическая теория А.А.Потебни // Философия языка в России. К истории русской лингвофилософии. – СПб: Искусство – СПБ, 2002. – С. 130-150.

5. Cooper C. The English Teacher or the Discovery of the Art of Teaching and Learning the English Tongue (ed. by B. Sundby, Lund, Gleerup). − Copenhagen: Munksguard, (1687) 1953.

6.   Halliday M.A.K. Categories of the Theory of Grammar // Word. 1961. − №17(3). − P.241-292.

7. Legate J.A. Warlpiri and the theory of second position clitics // Nat Lang Linguist Theory, 2008, 26. – P.3-60.

8. Lewis W.G. A Grammar of the English Language, in which the Genius of the English Tongue is Consulted, and All Imitations of the Greek and Latin Grammars are Discarded, Adapted to the Comprehension of Persons Desirous of Teaching Themselves, and Intended for the Use of Schools and Young Persons in General. − L.: Printed and Published by T. Dolby, 1821.

9. Turniyozov N.Q. Lingvistik nazariyalar. – Samarqand: SamDCHTI, 2022. – B.93.

10. Vechtman-Veth A.C.E. A Syntax of Living English. Kemink and Zoom-Over Den Dom-Utrecht, 1928. – P.30.

11. Арутюнова Н.Д. Предложение и его смысл: логико-семантические проблемы. − М.: Наука, 1976. − С.24.

12. Басилова Т.А. О Соколянском и его методах обучения глухих и слепоглухих детей, так интересовавших Выготского // Культурно-историческая психология, 2006. − №3. Том 2. – С.8-16.

13. Безлепкин Н.И. Язык как психологический феномен: философско-лингвистическая теория А.А.Потебни // Философия языка в России. К истории русской лингвофилософии. – СПб: Искусство – СПБ, 2002. – С. 130-150.

14. Волохина Г.А., Попова З.Д. Синтаксические концепты русского простого предложения. – Воронеж: Б.и., 2003. – С.8.

15. Гак В.Г. Теоритическая грамматика французского языка. Синтаксис. − М., 1981. − С.58; Махмудов Н., Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. − Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995. – Б.8-9.

16. Грамматика современного русского литературного языка (отв. ред. Н.Ю.Шведова). – М.: Акад. наук СССР, Ин-т русского яз., 1970. – С.62.

17. Золотова Г.А. Очерк функционального синтаксиса русского языка. – М.: Наука, 1973. – С.124.

18. Ибботсон П., Томаселло М. Язык в новом ключе // В мире науки. Лингвистика, 2017. − [03] март. – С. 103-109.

19.   Ифатуроти А.О. Синтаксические теории простого предложения в современной лингвистике // Вестник ЮУрГУ. Серия «Лингвистика», 2020. – №3. – С.71-75.

20. Кацнельсон С.Д. Общее и типологическое языкознание. – Л.: Наука, 1986. – С.142-143.

21. Манаенко Г.Н. Предикация, предикативность и пропозиция в аспекте информационного осложнения предложения // Филологические науки, 2004. – №2. – С.59-68.

22. Николайчук А.С. Структуралисты о паратаксисе и гипотаксисе // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики, 2013. – №4(22). Часть 2. Изд-во: Грамота. – С. 125-126.

23. Нордквист Р. Генеративная грамматика: определение и примеры. Elektron manba: https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-generative-grammar-1690894,   Статья обновлено 29.09.2024 (Sahifaga 2025.07.02 da murojaat etildi).

24. Розенталь Д.Э., Тельникова М.А. Ko'rsatilgan lug'at. – B.351.

25. Розенталь Д.Э., Тельникова М.А. Словарь-справочник лингвистических терминов. – М.: Просвещение, 1985. – С. 237.

26. Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. – М.: Литературы на иностранных языках, 1957. – С.50-51.

27. Турниёзов Б.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик қурилмалар деривацияси. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2008. – Б.30.

28. Турниёзов Н., Турниёзова К. Функционал синтаксисга кириш. – Тошкент: Фан, 2003.