

Expression of Averbial Sentence in Uzbek and French

Tuyboeva Shakhnoza

Teacher of French at the Department of Translation Studies and Language Education
Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

Annotation: This article discusses the syntactic analysis of expression of averbal sentences in Uzbek and the characteristics of different oppositions in simple sentences in French language. Examples from oral speech are taken as the object of analysis, and their translation is compared.

Keywords: model, verbal, averbal, syntax, actant, valence, speech product, predicate, pattern, opposition, interpreter, interpreter, verbal, averbal, core, negativity

Introduction. In general, the system allows to solve important questions and problems related to the syntax of the French and Uzbek languages from the linguistic point of view. In recent years, problematic issues at all levels of linguistics have been analyzed in depth based on the methodology of the deretic laws of linguistic phenomena and speech. In all spheres of the Uzbek language, a real "Turkish delicacy" is beginning to make itself felt, and it is thanks to our independence that serious efforts have been made to free it from "excessive grammatical burdens". Indeed, the relationship between language and speech, their content and form, is very complex. This theory is also important for the article we are studying.

Main part.

The structure of sentences in the Uzbek language along the same lines:

1. Grammatically formed sentences (abbreviated GFS),
2. Semantically Functionally Formed Words (abbreviated SFFW) were studied separately.

The main characteristics of the simple sentence can be: its syntactic structure formed by certain word forms (components of the predicative base) and the relationship of these components; its semantic structure; word order and tone; components of the predicative base or parts of speech that are extensions of the predicate base.

The main characteristics of the simple sentence can be: its syntactic structure formed by certain word forms (components of the predicative base) and the relationship of these components; its semantic structure; word order and tone; components of the predicative base or parts of speech that are extensions of the predicate base.

In French we divide into sentences 1. Typical and 2. Atypiques

The canonical model is used as an atypical phenomenon for the construction of discourse in modern French literary language, and it is contrasted with typical sentences. It is understood that the construction of sentences in French and Uzbek consists of two different patterns, and the two patterns have similarities and differences in the boundary area.

Moreover, such statements do not have the forms of inclination, person number, affirmation-denial: they do not lack the sense of cut-off, thought formation, momentary expression. of speech, of attitude towards existence. The -s alone do not form a paradigm. It has a predicate, but the predicative form is not expressed. This category is recognized as a sentence, and it is clear from textbooks and scientific literature that sentences are distinguished from typical sentences on the basis of the following characteristics:

1. Training with special route.
2. Appears in many dialogic speeches and monologues.
3. The importance of situation in context in their formation as discourse.
4. They do not have special grammatical characteristics that indicate the person, the time.
5. Equal expression of affirmation, denial, questioning, emotion, as in other words.
6. These sentences are modal, exclamation in French and Uzbek. affirmative-negative, suggestive-exclamation words and some nouns of the general consonant are distinguished by features as they are represented by prepositions.

Under the general term of atypical sentences, there are particular characteristics of the sentences that are combined. These are:

1. A sign of being able to speak independently.
2. A sign that a sentence cannot syntactically communicate with a part of the sentence,
3. A sign that it has a specific meaning.
4. A sign that it cannot be combined with conjunctions and therefore does not have tense forms of number of people.

Atypical sentences with these four general unifying signs are different. that is, it differs markedly from grammatically formed and typical sentences.

Atypical sentences are defined by two characteristics:

I. At the level of the “semantic” component, the lexical meaning of the phenomenon is considered and indicated: it shows the onological properties (two natural ones) of the lexemes that come to the center of the discourse.

II. In terms of the "functional" component, the syntactic function of such sentences is limited to

the fact that they can only function as the center of speech.

Since the occurrence of lexical units, which appear as atypical sentences, and the fact that they take on a definite form, content and function, is an unusual phenomenon, their causes can be attributed to the following.

1. The possibilities of meaning are limited.
2. Does not require grammatical form.
3. Lacks the ability (in a broad sense) to connect semantically with other words (including sentences).
4. Cannot be a part of speech and cannot be connected to parts of speech.

The canonical model is used as an atypical phenomenon for the construction of discourse in modern French literary language, and it can be contrasted with typical sentences. The canonical model is atypical: The canonical model is used as an atypical phenomenon for the construction of discourse in modern French literary language, and it can be contrasted with typical sentences. The canonical model is atypical:

1. Presentative sentences: *Voici (voila) la craie !*
2. Binary construction : *Vraiment, ce n'est pas possible.*
3. Words-proposals: *Comment vas-tu?*
4. Noun Phrases: *L'automne.*
5. Inserting a sentence:
 - a) Incidents of prepositions (Introduction): *Il viendra, j'espère.*
 - b) Incised prepositions (words of the author): *-Je vais à midi, dit Jacques.*

Atypical sentences in Uzbek can be compared to SFFW. In the syntactic framework, the characteristics of SFFWs are limited, such as the fact that they do not require a grammatical form, the inability to communicate semantically with other words (and parts of speech), the fact that the part of speech is not counted and not related to parts of speech. In French, however, these characters are not fully justified. Recent studies have also shown that non-presentative sentences, such as binary constructs, nominative sentences, author sentences, introductory words, and sentences, which do not appear in SFFWs, have a pattern canonical (separate specific construction). Due to the nature of the dichotomy of language and discourse, the minimal construction pattern of discourse differs sharply in French and Uzbek. The same situation is observed in the formal structure of sentences (subordinate passive form, binary constructions, single-term statements, emphasis, word-propositions in certain types of sentences).

Semantics - functionally formed sentences usually consist of modal words, exclamation, affirmation-denial, suggestion-exclamation. These are indicated in the symbol (W), as opposed to the GFS stereotypes, i.e. (W_{Pm}). Indeed, there are also lexical units that have the ability to be spoken between the French lexicon and syntax. Their lexico-semantic and syntactic properties have not yet been scientifically defined. However, recognizing that the ontological characteristics of SFFWs mentioned above are also reflected in the canonical model of antity sentences, we want to try to provide scientific information on the lexico-semantic and functional characteristics of presentative sentences in binary construction. Analysis of the French language suggests that many sentences can consist of two relatively independent parts. Such fragments create opposition at the level of speech. But with them the logical judgment which is characteristic of speech is not singled out. Conversely, the content of the first part of the opposition is interpreted in relation to the content of the second part (piece), and the connection of this content is equivalent to a complete idea. The main reason for this is to stand in the binary opposition of a simple sentence. In other words, the simple sentences of French form relative (independent) two-component sentences when they change to the binary opposition. Even when the components in them appear to be two, the logical judgment becomes one and loses the indices of intersection.

Let's Compare: Binary Opposition of Simple and Normative Sentence Construction

1. *Belles , les filles! - Les filles sont belles.*

2. *Interessant, ce livre - Ce livre est interessant.*

3. *Detective, ce film ! - Ce film est detective.*

Conclusion. Thus, in speech, the above simple sentence patterns are gradually enriched with particles of categories that are necessary for speech to exist in speech, but are essentially non-syntactic, and are complicated by units and particles of dozens of syntactic, morphological, lexical, stylistic categories in our speech. occurs in a decorated form. In our view, binary constructions can be evaluated as a separate view of a single sentence, and studying its boundaries and appearances separately is also important for comparative linguistics.

References:

1. Ramazonovna T. S. On binary structured speech products in french //Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research. – 2021. – T. 10. – №. 10. – C. 381-386.
2. Shakhnoza T. Binary Construction in the Speech //EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION. – 2021. – T. 1. – №. 2. – C. 210-213.

3. Туйбоева, Ш. (2022). Роль учителя в продвижении изучения французского языка. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/4747
4. Tuyboeva, S. (2022). LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF SIMPLE SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION IN UZBEK AND FRENCH. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(3), 184–187. извлечено от <https://www.in-academy.uz/index.php/ejar/article/view/141>
5. Qosimova, N. (2021). Tarjima jarayonida diskurs tahlilining roli. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 1(1). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/2164
6. Zokirova, N. (2021). Badiiy she'riy tarjimada g'ayrilisoniy jihatlarni saqlashda ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik tamoyillari: Tarjimada ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 6(6). Извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/3496
7. Khaydarova, L. (2022). Classroom Activities that Best Facilitate Learning. European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science, 6, 377–380. Retrieved from <https://emjms.academicjournal.io/index.php/emjms/article/view/415>
8. kizi, M. M. I. (2021). Numbers and similarities in their use in English and Uzbek Folklore. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 175-177. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/536>
9. Irgasheva, F. (2022). Представление лингвокультур в переводе и их структурных компонентов (на примере немецкого и узбекского языков). ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/4070
10. Haydarova, N. (2021). INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDAGI ANTISEMIK MUNOSABATDA BO'LGAN TIBBIY FRAZELOGIZMLARNING LINGVOKULTUROLOGIK XUSUSIYATLARI. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 1(1). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/2158
11. Imamkulova, S. (2022). Интенсивность как стилистический инструмент. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/5462
12. Fayziyeva Aziza Anvarovna. (2022). CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR UNIVERSALS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. JournalNX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, 8(04), 54–57.

13. Nurullayevna, S. N. (2021). The techniques of explicit grammar instruction. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 281-284.
14. Ruzieva, N. X., and F. E. Yuldasheva. "The use of mingles in the communicative way of teaching." *Міжнародний науковий журнал Інтернаука* 1 (1) (2017): 138-139.
15. Olimova D. Z (2020) The effectiveness of implementation of ICT in learning process . *European Scholar Journal (ESJ)* Vol.1 No. 4. Pp. 9-11.
16. Rabiyeva, M. G., & Asadova, Z. (2022). Methods of Using Lexical and Grammatical Transformations in the Translation of Literary Texts. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, 5, 492-494.
17. To'rayeva Fazilat Sharafiddinov. (2022). Analysis Of Modal Words and Particles in German and Uzbek Languages. *Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3, 151–154.
18. Narzullayeva, F. (2021). ВЫРАЖЕНИЕ СЛОВА «ГОЛОВА» В АНГЛИЙСКИХ И УЗБЕКСКИХ ФРАЗАХ. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 3(3).
19. Tashpulatovich, B. M. . (2021). Using Multimedia Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 64-67.
20. Yulduz, M. (2021). Lexico-grammatical Parts of Speech Expressing the Indefiniteness of the Subject. *JournalNX*, 7(1), 323-327.
21. Djalolov Furqat Fattohovich. (2021). Causes of Low Assimilation of Knowledge at General Secondary Schools. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.11.472>
22. Otabekovna, S. M., & Ibragimovna, G. M. (2022). Expression of ethnic and cultural identity in english and uzbek proverbs. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(1), 171-175.
23. Sobirovich, S. R. (2021). Ethymological Doublets Between French Verbs And Their Use. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 13.