

# The Position Of The Determiner In Sentence Construction

Sh. Akramov<sup>1</sup>, A. Hasanov<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PhD, associate professor of the Kokan State Pedagogical Institute.

<sup>2</sup>PhD, associate professor of the Kokan State Pedagogical Institute.

**Abstract.** In this article, the issue of the determiner's word expansion, or more precisely, indeterminacy, is interpreted in light of the fact that the Uzbek language determiner is a traditional part of speech that is traditionally subordinated to a specific part of speech, possessor in the syntactic level of the Uzbek language, and the question of its position in the construction of the sentence is approached from the aspect of one-peak theory (valence).

## Introduction

By separating generality and possibility (linguistic unit), specificity and actuality (speech unit), a profound scientific-theoretical approach to language phenomena reveals that the syntax of the sentence in speech is quite different from the syntactic phrase on the linguistic level (linguistic level).

The linguistic syntactic sentence expanders [WpM] have the following structure.:

- a) modal expander;
- b) personal expander;
- c) condition expander.

These expanders are based on the terms and designations that are still used in Uzbek linguistics:

It is known to everyone that it is called a) introduction; b) subject; c) case.

Introductions, subjects, and cases vary depending on the words they include and the language used to convey them. A poorly handled car filler is another instance.

As previously established, a complement is a word expander that comprises the present complement without a strong control, outgoing complements with a strong reciprocal control, and subject complements with an accusative ratio. But in the sentence's form, these do not hold a distinct position. An entirely new reconstruction of the syntax of a simple sentence can be produced by

determining the position of the clauses in light of the aforementioned factors.<sup>1</sup>

Tradition holds that a sentence cannot exist without clauses. In actuality, they help to express meaning and sentence substance in addition to helping to build the phrase. When it comes to the relationship between the words in the sentence, the determiner, a second-order clause, is almost in the same place as the complement. In other words, the determiner is the expander of the word that follows the filler in the possessor position if the filler is the semantic expander of the word in the governing position. In other words, nouns acting as complement participles are the words in the definite possessive case that expand the unit. Therefore, when we discuss the deciding clause's position in sentence formation, we mean a clause that reflects both the object's sign and its subjectivity. In this instance, the sign is specified attributively rather than predicatively. The determiner's purpose is to convey an object's quality, attribute, amount, or attitude. The determiner is mostly attached to the noun, as it expresses. Although this noun may appear in various parts of the sentence, tradition indicates that this has little to no impact on how it is defined. In other words, all clauses—including the noun part—can have the determiner attached, but not the verb part. If the signifier becomes a determiner in one sentence, and in another sentence, the same word is connected to the participle, it can be used

as a case. For example: Singlim chiroyli ko'ylak sotib oldi. – U she'rni chiroyli o'qiydi. We can be sure of this when his words are compared. It seems that the determiner is mainly attached to the noun. When it is attached to a verb, it becomes a case.

Additionally, the determiner's role in the sentence is altered. When a determiner appears before a word, the word's meaning is made clearer and more specific. For instance, when we say "apple," the broad idea of a red apple comes to mind. However, when we use a determiner, just the red apple variety of apples is comprehended rather than all apples. is calculated using the distinct meaning facets. But in recent years, we've noticed that terminology like center of speech, word expander, sentence expander, or valence are utilized in our linguistics on a somewhat wider scale. The introduction of these words was primarily motivated by the study of language as a system or to distinguish between language and speech phenomena.

Similar to how the definition of the determiner presented in school textbooks reflects the specific description. Because a determiner is a sentence that expresses the behavior or attitude of something. In a sentence, nouns and adjectives are the principal subjects of the determiner. This definition makes it clear that a determiner is an adjective or noun extender. In particular, the word "clothing" can always be followed by the adjective "excellent" in the statement "everyone wants to wear nice clothes." The subordination of "good" is maintained, and the syntactic function is seen as a phrase following the word in this dominant position, as evidenced by the fact that even if the word "clothing" is described as other kinds of speech. For instance:

Hammaning yaxshi kiyimdan ko'zi qamashadi.

Hamma yaxshi kiyim uchun astoydil ishlaydi  
Hamma yaxshi kiyinishga harakat qila boshladi.

Hamma yaxshi kiyina oladi.

It is clear that the word "good" is related to the meaning of the verb "to wear" and is always used as a partner to this word in sentences. The similar circumstance can also be seen in types where the pointer serves as an identifier. The fact that the

determiner is employed to link additional nouns with other nouns is a clear illustration of this.

At this point, one can point out a different issue with Uzbek linguistics. The following instances, in particular, serve to address the issue we are addressing despite the fact that the mother language of a general education school is only partially covered in the state education requirements:

1. Yaxshi qiz – yaxshi kelin.
2. yaxshi o'qigan – yaxshi o'qiydi.

As per our custom, the possessive and participle forms of the phrase "good girl" should be used in one sentence (good bride). The possessive, case, and participle are separated into grammatical sentence elements in the second sentence. The elements of the statement become disconnected if the word "good" used in the sentence is understood in one place to be possessive-partial or possessive, while in another it is called case. In order to more thoroughly and clearly convey its core, we believe that analyzing the word "good" in both statements as an expander of the associated words will be helpful. Before examining the word expander, it is important to comprehend what it means because it is a relatively new concept. In other words, "Word expanders" are part of the word's semantic valency. To put it more accurately, a lexeme's (word's) valency determines whether it establishes or widens a relationship with a certain kind of word or grammatical form. According to philosophy, there are connections between the language resources (words) that serve as these elements' names as actual connections between the components of objective reality: bahor – fasli bahor – mana go'zal bahor; yoki yoz – xatni yozmoq – xatni qalam bilan yozmoq – xatni akasiga yozmoq can be an example. The relationship between the former word as subordinate and the later as rulership is not negated by such a combination. In other words, the tradition's rule-subordination link between word combinations is maintained. However, the ideas of "word combination," "dominant word," and "subordinate word" clash with the idea of word expanders. This is not by chance. Since the word's syntactic connection (syntactic valence) in speech corresponds to its meaning connection

(semantic valence).<sup>2</sup> Combinations of words reflect the syntactic value of words. Due to their function as word expanders that help to clarify the meaning of specific words, conventional determiners have a specific place in the parts of speech.

Despite the fact that traditional linguistics concentrates on the study of the formal component of speech, there are still many issues that need to be resolved. Under the clauses column, the sentence's formal structure is examined. The subordinate link of syntactic elements has been the primary standard for commencing sentences in linguistics up until this point. A sentence fragment is the shortest syntactic form in a particular syntactic circumstance. The relationship between a specific syntactic form and another syntactic form is considered.

A sentence is a sophisticated literary construct that combines the distinctiveness of a language unit with the contrast and coherence of form and content. Although one cannot exist without the other, the form and content of the parts of speech are tightly related, and each has its own structure and structural components. Therefore, one of the main tasks of theoretical linguistics is to identify the structural characteristics of both of them as well as the relationship between the elements of form and content.

The noun with the same morphological form (singular infinitive) appears in two different syntactic contexts in the sentence "O'zbekiston – go'zal o'lka". One morphological form makes up the syntactic form in the possessive case (Uzbekistan), but two morphological forms make up the syntactic form in the participle case (beautiful country).

Because the morphological form serves as the foundation for the syntactic form, the morphological form dictates the syntactic form's internal content. It serves its purpose within the confines of the morphological form. Syntactic form is thus a necessary prerequisite for morphological form to function. In turn, the sentence is the syntactic form's condition of

functioning, and the syntactic forms determine the sentence's content.<sup>3</sup>

There is still no opposition to the tradition in Uzbek linguistics of studying the elements of a sentence, or the syntactic structure of a sentence. Professors A. Gulomov, G. Abdurahmonov, and M. Askarova are credited with developing the true syntax of the Uzbek language. The study of speech fragments benefits greatly from the expertise of A. Gulomov.

Professor A. Gulomov's syntactic theories were applied to Uzbek linguistics in a manner reminiscent of that of Russian linguists, particularly A. A. Potebnya, A. A. Shakhmatov, and V. V. Vinogradov. Professor A. Gulomov introduced the defining and complementing terms into the study of Uzbek linguistics. In addition, A. Ghulomov did not incorporate any elements (such as an impulse, an introductory word, etc.) outside of the subordination relation into the construction of the clauses. The complement and cases were interpreted as secondary parts, while the possessive and participle were considered the main part and determiner of the sentence based on their roles in the sentence's structure.<sup>4</sup>

The traditional study of interpretatives as a subset of determiners has led some authors to attempt to separate them out as their own sentence component. According to R. Saidova, a clause is deemed explanatory if it is expressed in nouns or substantive words and forms a subordinate relationship with another noun.<sup>5</sup>

Any secondary clause that provides an answer to a particular query in a subordinate scenario is simultaneously separated in the sentence structure in both Uzbek and Russian linguistics. For many people, such isolation becomes normal. A sensible person is a friend to smart, wise, noble, and honest people, for instance, is broken down into two primary components, person (owner) and friend (participle), as well as subsidiary parts smart, wise, noble, and honest (determiner) and people (complement). Prior to determining the secondary clauses for the analysis, the sentence's main clauses are first identified. The fact that they constitute a clause or part of a sentence is not

taken into account when determining secondary clauses<sup>6</sup>.

There is no doubt that certain Turkologists took note of these shortcomings in conventional linguistics and questioned whether the determiner serves a functional purpose in the sentence. For instance, according to A.N. Baskakov, each determined item has its own syntactic position in the sentence structure and is regarded as a part of the sentence along with the determiner, regardless of the amount of the determiner.

Traditional notions on the importance of secondary clauses in sentences are also contested by certain linguists in Uzbekistan. Professor Sh. Rahmatullaev specifically examined the existing theories regarding the division of speech components, including secondary parts, in the 1970s of our century. He specifically wrote the following: "... Be aware that we base the question we ask the qualifier on the non-qualifier. Thus, the qualifier's question is in a way an internal one. A compound that includes an adjective serves as a participle. Regarding the internal structure of the compound that is included, the qualifier is being questioned.

The adjective's syntactic structure is determined by the internal feature indicated above (lack of freedom of order and being an answer to an internal question). A clause within a clause, a clause within a clause, is what an adjective is.

The adjective was formerly referred to as a third-class clause since it has its own unique identity, but this idea and phrase was later dropped. Actually, the meaning of this phrase is not quite clear—it just describes the phenomenon. In our opinion, it is more accurate to refer to all different types of determiners as parts of a compound rather than a sentence if we interpret the adjective broadly.

If we concur with the aforementioned viewpoint, we can generalize that the adjective functions as a part of its qualification. This makes the sentence's syntactic analysis more simpler. The compound's role as a building block for the sentence (for the original part) has been acknowledged<sup>7</sup>.

Professor N. Mahmudov demonstrates the need for distinguishing between the roles of complements and cases in sentences without taking determiners into account. One predicate is primary and the rest are secondary when there are two or more predicates present, he claimed. However, regardless of whether it is main or secondary, every predicate is seen to be connected to a particular object relation. Simple phrases containing motion nouns, conditional verb devices, second-order predicate adjectives and adverbial positions (inflections), as well as structures made of predicative words, demonstrate this predicament (words like "yes", "no"). A phrase to describe the suffering of, for instance, has not yet been coined by a human child. The second-level predicate in the sentence that refers to (US. Ahmad) has an adjective that eases his suffering. There are two predicates in the sentence; the major one (in the participle case) is the one expressed by the form of the verb that cannot generate, and the secondary one (expressed by the form that can), is the one that makes it simpler. The primary predicate word is connected to the object relationship shown by the word's form, whereas the secondary predicate is connected to the indirect object relationship indicated by the word's form, which represents the suffering. However, even though these two things are identical in reference to predicates, it is illogical to entirely equate them with one another. Since one of these predicates is primary and the other secondary, they are not perfectly equivalent to one another in terms of position. Therefore, there is no scientific justification for the existence of two indirect complements with the same status in the syntactic structure of this sentence.

Such fillers also differ from one another in terms of functioning, as the author correctly notes. The subordinate position is occupied by second-order predicates. As a result, these devices are assessed as extended sentences or extended fragments in a particular syntactic situation.<sup>8</sup> According to Prof. A, the conditional verb wraps, adverbs, adjectives, and nouns of action share the same syntactic position in the sentence's structure and are assessed as a single unit. Also displaying

it was Nurmonov. Later, it is also claimed by other writers that these wrappers are transformational fragments that serve the same purpose as a sentence fragment. Some authors referred to these and comparable devices by the term "description," and they investigated and studied their syntactic placements and internal structures.<sup>9</sup>

It takes a completely different method for determiners and interpreters to determine the sentence's structural scheme in terms of the participle and its "spaces." Considering that these fragments are not able to be standalone fragments that complete sections. It creates a syntactic position, or propositional name, by filling in the "empty places" in the clause. For instance, *Dear Moments of Our Dear Age, Dear People* (G'. Gulom) comprises four phrases that interact with one another. With the addition of determiners, the first and second syntactic compounds in the roles of possessive and instrumental complement created a proposition.

The determiner in its content is unrelated to the sentence's overall structure and is a part of this whole's internal division.

Additionally, determiners can be used to enlarge the sentence's subject. For instance: **Sen Saidaning sevgan singlisi.**<sup>10</sup>

Determiners are regarded to only be used in the construction of propositional naming and to be a component of phrases that are in the syntactic positions of participle, possessive, complement, and case. Only when the proposition is in internal members are they separated from the unity content. Therefore, it is understood in contemporary linguistics that not all secondary clauses have a sentence structure. Therefore, it is unnecessary to distinguish between secondary clauses that are clauses and those that are not. The smallest syntactical form of a sentence in a particular syntactic context is recognized in the specialized scientific literature as a subordinating clause, which poses the question of further research in the area of dialectics of form and content. A sentence is a complicated language construction that contrasts and unifies form and content.

There are specific components in both the sentence's form and substance. Therefore, one of the key tasks of theoretical linguistics is to identify the formal and substantive structures of sentence fragments and the relationship between them.<sup>11</sup>

Any sentence fragment is made up of the opposition and unity of a morphological form for the material basis and a syntactic situation for the circumstance (syntactic form). The emergence of syntactic form is based on morphological form. However, the syntactic form created from the morphological form is a new and superior form with entirely different qualities. Since syntactic form is a higher unit built on the foundation of morphological form, it is crucial to syntax. A specific syntactic form's internal structure is revealed by the morphological form. The morphological form has the property of differentiation, whereas the syntactic form has the property of unification. In other words, a certain syntactic form is created by combining a number of morphological forms. The intrinsic characteristics of this syntactic form that make it distinctive are also based on the morphological form on which it is based. Because the morphological form serves as the foundation for the syntactic form, the morphological form dictates the syntactic form's internal content. A syntactic form serves as the vehicle for a morphological form's action. The morphological form is therefore a syntactic form. On the other hand, the syntactic form is regarded as a sentence, and syntactic forms dictate the sentence's content.

There is a system of morphological forms that are appropriate for a certain syntactic context, not just any morphological forms. A noun in the main agreement, an adjective, a numeral, a pronoun, and other morphological forms can all appear in the syntactic position "subject," for instance. One of these morphological form systems (paradigms) is more appropriate for a certain syntactic circumstance. The noun in the major agreement is more specific for the possessor's syntactic position from the system of morphological forms of the possessor. This ensures that the morphological form and the syntactic situation are somewhat correlated.

A part of speech is a complex whole consisting of several elements: on the one hand, it reflects existing things and events, actions and relationships between them, and on the other hand, it participates in the structure of the sentence and relates to another meaning. These meanings are named differently by different authors. For example, the first meaning (Ufimtseva), substantial (L. Elmslev), categorical meaning (Smirnitsky and others), and the second meaning is functional (Ne'matov, Bashmonov); syntactic meaning (Mukhin, Zolotova, etc.) is expressed by such terms. If the first meaning of the parts of the sentence is connected with the objective existence, it shows the reflection of the elements of the objective existence and the relationship between these elements in the human mind, and the second meaning reflects the function of the sentence (sentence) in the chain of relations between the meaning elements.

Prof. A. Nurmonov and Prof. N. Mahmudov use the terms morphological for the first of these two meanings, and syntactic meaning for the second.<sup>12</sup>

Morphological meanings serve as the foundation for syntactic meaning. The syntactic meaning's substance is determined by the morphological meaning. The syntactic meaning of the sentence is developed in relation to other syntactic meanings.

For instance, the predicate's meaning, which is regarded as having a syntactic meaning, is defined in relation to the meanings of the subject and object, and it combines a variety of morphological meanings, including the meanings of action (the stork came, the student wrote), state (the baby slept, the poet thought), and quantity (he is one, he has a thousand eyes), among others. As a result, the content of the predicate is defined by a system (paradigm) of morphological meanings.

One of the morphological meaning paradigms is more focused on syntactic meaning. For instance, the predicate is more specifically defined by the first of the morphological meanings listed above (action-state meanings).

Although one cannot exist without the other, syntactic meaning and morphological meaning are

two sides of the same phenomenon, and each of them has a degree of independence within the whole. This is the reason why these two meanings are in conflict with one another. When compared to the morphological meaning, the syntactic meaning is more general (invariant), and the morphological meaning is more specific (variant). Syntactic meaning is expressed through morphological meanings in a manner similar to how invariant variants express syntactic meaning. On the other hand, morphological meanings are combined invariantly by syntactic meaning. At the same time, the word group itself has a meaning that is a fusion of opposing meanings.

A word group's general categorical meaning is created by fusing the individual meanings of the words that make up the group. This demonstrates the tension between word group specific meaning and their broader categorical meaning. For instance, the word "subject" is highlighted twice in the word book:

- a) by its membership in a certain word category (a noun group);
- b) in its precise sense (expressing the meaning of a specific subject).

Syntactic meaning, or the meaning that combines morphological meanings, is significant for syntax. When displaying several syntactic meanings, morphological meaning is crucial. From the foregoing, it is clear that the sentence's components, which comprise a unity of form and meaning, have a double character, just like the form and meaning elements they contain. Similar to how a sentence's form is made up of morphological and syntactic units, its meaning is made up of morphological and syntactic units as well. The relationship between the whole and the part is demonstrated by the first of these elements (morphological form and syntactic meaning), whereas the sequential relationship between wholes is demonstrated by the second (syntactic form and syntactic meaning).

In most cases, the form and meaning of sentence fragments refer to the syntactic form of the fragment as a whole. Therefore, the relationship between the syntactic form and the syntactic meaning is actually the relationship

between the form and content of the sentence's constituent parts.

These two sentences' two components work together to become a whole. Each of them also has a certain level of independence. Because of this, there are instances of inconsistency between these two construction blocks, despite the fact that they share some characteristics (the subject is the possessor, the predicate is the participle, the object is the complement, etc.). For instance, the possessive syntactic form (I came), the determining syntactic form (my arrival), and the participle syntactic form can all be used to convey the subject's meaning (I came). This is the sentence's most extreme form. All other modifiers (complements and determiners) combine with the following clauses to form a single possessive, participle, case clause. In some sources, it is determined through analysis that the participle is an absolute dominating participle and that even the possessor is subordinate to it due to sufficient evidence. In particular, the French linguist L. Tener's theory makes it quite clear. According to this view, the phrase is the major clause since it belongs to the predicativeness category and serves as the sentence's structural node. In this theory, relational logic is used. The predicate is located in the middle of the sentence in accordance with relational logic. Arguments with a countable possessor and a complement that is equal to and subordinate to it are considered substantive clauses.

In fact, if we remove the non-main clauses from the sentence construction process using the segmentation method, only one stable clause—the clause that keeps the sentence's main sign—remains. The participle serves as the primary building block of a sentence, according to renowned Polish linguist E. Kurilovich. The sentence's organization also serves as the basis for the participle. Predicative base (predicative minimum) and nominative base are the two bases on which B. A. Beloshapkova divides sentences. The predicative minimum forms the sentence's core. The predicative minimum includes both sentence fragments that are included in the predicative minimum and those that are not. The first stage in breaking a phrase into pieces is determining the predicative minimum parts,

which are regarded as the most crucial elements in sentence building. The two types of sentence fragments that make up the predicative base are further separated based on their purpose: There are two types of fragments: those that reflect the predicative category and those that do not. A predicative category-reflecting fragment is counted as one and is considered the peak of the structure. The possessor participates in the formation of the predicative base and enters it, but it is unable to reveal the predicate itself. The second stage of classification consists of fragments that are not part of the predicative basis.

Although the participle with the possessor is acknowledged as the major component in linguistic literature, it is clear that the participle takes precedence in sentence formation and classification. In Turkic languages, the participle plays a particularly prominent role in sentence formation. The infinitive is practically seldom used in Turkic languages. In other words, nominative or non-participle clauses are participles in and of themselves. The essence of these ideas allows for the following deductions:

- the investigated source was taken into account as a whole, comprising of specific system-structural relations, in the process of scientific knowledge;
- The integrative aspect emphasized the philosophical-dialectical and philosophical-grammatical sources of relationships between the components of this systematic totality.
- it was understood in a way that made it clear that in order to establish the grammatical status of system and structural notions, one must rely on philosophical-dialectical categories like generality-specificity, essence-phenomenon, and possibility-reality;
- it was underlined that the system and structural relationship is a universal relationship that applies at all levels and not just at certain levels of the language;
- It was regarded as a sentence structure that included two or more syntactic components as a whole.
- The possessive, complement, and first-degree case are the other parts of the sentence that are graded according to how they relate to the participle, which is the substantive and

constructive center of the sentence in Turkish languages. Determining the second-degree position of the participle was considered on the basis of current Uzbek language sources.

It is specially emphasized that the determiner and its system-functional description are the form indicating the sign or affiliation of the parts. For example: Yo'lakning qoq o'rtasida, devor tagidagi yig'ma krovatda ikki bukilib o'tirgan, rangi sarg'ayib ketgan mushtdekkina chol Sherzodning ko'z o'ngiga keldi (O'. Hoshimov). A predicate is not dealt with by a determiner as its argument. The predicate and its base, which fills up empty space, are expanded to create a complicated name and description of the object. In the overall structure of the sentence, the determiner and the determined relationship occupy a certain syntactic situation. The third level of sentence segmentation is hence the determiner. As in the previous example, the clauses that fill the spaces left by the predicate and are thus related to it are defined first. The predicate, which is the substantive and structural center of the sentence and is Sherzod came to his eyes, is separated first. In particular, there is the following clause that completes the subject valence: In the middle of the corridor, on a folding bed under the wall, the old man, the size of a yellow fist, sitting on a folding bed, is divided into pieces within himself. For example, the old man in the possessive syntactic position fills the valence of the subject and expands adjectives such as the old man is as yellow as a fist, sitting on a folding bed in the middle of the corridor, and forms a description of the complex name of the subject. Therefore, in the third stage of division, the description is divided into components.

It seems that the determiner is not the structure of the sentence, but the internal structure of the description, which functions as an element in the structure of the sentence.<sup>13</sup> This component, which is thought of as a link between the predicate and its arguments, is therefore non-functional for the sentence's structure.

The determiner cannot be a clause because it is a part of the description structure, which is the compound name of the predicate, rather than the

clause structure, which is where clauses are considered to be when constructing a sentence.

Analyzing the determiner's expressive and structural aspects. The determiner does indeed take on different meanings throughout the sentence. The determiner's substance and, consequently, its syntactic relationship with the expanding word vary depending on the degree of definition specificity. The defining adjective, adjective, and occasionally words from the noun groups are used to express the nature of the object, its color, characteristic, taste, shape, nature, etc. A qualifying noun or a word used in place of a noun is used to express belonging to a person or an object when it is necessary. As a result, there are two types of determinant:

1. Determinant (adjective) defining the sign.
2. Determinant (pointer) specifying the attitude<sup>14</sup>.

An attributive determiner is expressed as follows:

1. with adjective: A'lo mamlakatning a'lo farzandi, bilib qo'yki, syeni Vatan kutadi.
2. with participle: Oqar daryo oqmasdan qolmas.
3. with adverb: Kechagi nohush manzarani bir umr unutmasa kerak.
4. with number: O'ninchi yillarning sargardonligi.
5. With a character identifier number: Anor yuz, oltin kuz.
6. With a pronoun: Qaysi yuz bilan unga qarayman?

A demonstrative determiner is expressed by the following words:

1. Noun or a word in place of a noun:
  - 1) Ona yerning otash qaridan, o'g'lim degan nido keladi. (E.Vohidov)
  - 2) Mening ikki onam bor.
2. with noun: Ko'pning duosi ko'l bo'lur.

As mentioned, the determiner is essentially of three types: qualifying, referential and explanatory<sup>15</sup>.

Adjective. The subordinate member (adjective) of the adjectival combination defines a characteristic of the governing member and is linked to it by the conjunction of the subordinate



clause. There are two circumstances in which the adjective should be used:

1. Specifying the adjective's meaning in more detail:

Oq ilon, oppoq ilon, oydinda yotganing qani. In this case, the adjective represented by the word "oq" performed the task of separating and differentiating the concept underlying the adjective (qora ilon, sariq ilon).

2. Fulfilling the emphasis of the adjective. There is no task of separation and identification: oppoq qor, oq sut byergan ona, oq paxta.

Despite the fact that this situation fits the standard in terms of rhetoric, it is unnecessary linguistically. There is no need to repeat snow, milk, and cotton with a fixer because they are naturally white. When an adjective is an extension of a referential compound, there are two scenarios that can be identified. The adjective may be a part of the referent compound as a whole or may only be present from urn to the referent. The relationships between the adjective expander and the expander are contrasted in the lines the new farm manager - the new farm manager. The word new farm is an expander in the first phrase, while the word governor necessitates the nominative case. In the following conjugation, the new adjective acts as the expander of the compound head of the household.

A chain of adjectives is formed when adjectives follow one another. When an adjective is joined, it is unclear if it belongs to all organized compounds or just one of them. In this instance, it is obvious that the sign belongs to the unit based on the text, the valence possibilities of the attachment, and other speech factors.

Compare: Aqlli bolalar, qizlar – qizlar bolalar aqlli.

Adjectives and adjectives can take the form of adjective-adjective in the form of addition: Majnuni gumroh, devonai Mashrab, oynai jahon and etc.

From the standpoint of Uzbek speech, these compounds shouldn't be viewed as adjective compounds.

Because it is impossible to introduce a word between an adjective and another adjective to

separate them from one another, the placement factor is engaged, and the syntactic location is crucial in this context. The spiritual component of the merging takes precedence. The fact that the spiritual compatibility of the linking factors is always significant determines its superiority to the location factor.

A determining demonstrator. The thing is believed to belong to the first person in the indicative combination in the sense of belonging. The word's linguistic connotation, derived from the meaning of the subject, the vacant position of the focus is facultative, exploratory<sup>16</sup>. As a result, possessive suffixes are used to form the subject, necessitating linguistic openness.

The topic and the subject have a reciprocal connection. The governing member is formed with or without a possessive suffix, and the first member (referent) is formed with either the main case or the nominative case:

1. Formation of the subject with the subject agreement: olmaning shoxi, ammanning daftari, Salimaning kitobi; mart oyi, bozor kuni, nafrat hissi.

2. Formation of the subject without a possessive suffix: our house, your porch.

Different meanings can be understood from the interrelationship of the words coming from the indicative compound in this task.:

1. Dependency: Azizaning kitobi, mening onam.

2. Property: olmaning bargi, piyozning po'sti.

3. The whole piece: stolning oyog'i, uyning eshigi.

4. Species: olmaning yaxshisi, odamning aqllisi.

5. Executor and action relationship: bolaning yig'isi, itning xurishi.

These interactions are all derived from the semantic relationships of words rather than the directive-reflective pattern [Noun.k+Noun.k]. It is clear who the subject belongs to from the possessive prefix in the subject. Because of this, the focus may not always be utilised, as in the case of your book or your brother. A key factor in this is emphasis. It is undoubtedly used when the

referent needs to be emphasized. Other times, the use of the referent results in redundant rhetoric.

In general, the focuser is not used in the following cases:

1. When a personal pronoun must be used as a demonstrative: Salim o'rtoqlariga xat jo'natdi.

2. In order to avoid methodological redundancy, if the meaning understood from the referent is known from the previous sentences:

A) (Men) Syevgan qizimga uylandim.

B) (Mening) Xotinimning otasi traktorchi edi.

It is important to comprehend the extended forms of determiners, which are composed of multiple words rather than just one, while discussing the structural types of these words. Additionally, it has been noted that the clause that serves as a sentence's determiner enlarges with subsequent clauses. As previously noted, it is acknowledged that the determiner in this instance is connected to some fragments, specifically through word expanders. The returned determiner in the sentence "returned to bed" is an extended determiner and cannot be taken individually due to exhaustion from the sun.

The improvement of the next new linguistics, new theoretical interpretations will generally be aided by a more thorough study of parts of speech, particularly determiners, in the systematic theoretical aspect.

#### References:

1. Akramov Sh.T. Complement and case in sentence construction of the Uzbek language ([WPm] in valence aspect). ND. Tashkent. 1997.
2. Lomtev T.P. Sentence structure in modern Russian. M. MGU. 1979, p. 60.
3. Nigmatov Kh.G., Abdullaev K.M., Nurmonov A.N., Saifullaeva R.R. Methods of syntactic connection and topical issues of Turkic syntax. ST 1988, No. 4
4. Rahmatullaev Sh. Speech attractiveness. T. 1970
5. R. Rasulov. Status verbs in the Uzbek language and their obligator valences. Tashkent: Science, 1989.
6. Sayfullaeva R. and others. Modern Uzbek literary language. Syntax (study guide) T: University, 2006 p. 104
7. Mahmudov N. About functional and non-functional fillers. EXCESSIVE. 1981. Issue 1. 43-46 p.
8. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. Syntax. T. Teacher. 1995. p. 232.
9. Mengliev B. Structural syntax of the Uzbek language (manual) Karshi, Nasaf. 2003.
10. Nabieva D. Manifestation of the generality-specificity dialectic at different levels of the Uzbek language. T. East. 2005.
11. Nabieva D. Manifestation of the generality-specificity dialectic at different levels of the Uzbek language. T. East. 2005.
12. Nurmonov A. Syntactic theories about speech (special course). T. TDPI. 1988. Page 100.
13. Nurmonov A. Some controversial issues of systematic language learning and syntax. FIRE 1988. 6- son. pp. 22-26
14. Usmanova H.Sh. Positional study of sentence fragments in the Uzbek language (monograph) Tashkent Science. 2005
15. Usmanova H. Description and its place in the sentence structure. NDA. T. 1994. 25 p.
16. Ghulomov A., Askarova M. Modern Uzbek literary language. Syntax. T. Teacher. 1987. Page 256.
17. Toxtasinovich, Akramov Shukurjon. "Valency-nodeterminantity." ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal 12.5 (2022): 699-703.
18. Hasanov, Akbarjon. "Linguopoetics of Means of Imagination in Literary Text." EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION 2.6 (2022): 224-226.
19. Nasirov, Muslimjon. "Verbal Associations in the Story of Nazar Eshanqul." EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION 2.6 (2022): 161-162.
20. Tukhtasinovich, Akramov Shukurjon. "Problems of Studying Speech Parts in Linguistics." European Journal of Life Safety and Stability (2660-9630) 12 (2021): 275-280.
21. Khasanov, Akbarjon. "Artistic Repetition and Artistic Meaning." Eastern European Scientific Journal 6 (2018).