

# Linguistic Methods in Sentence Analysis

<sup>1</sup>**Boltakulova Gulnoza Farruxovna**

<sup>1</sup>Doctor of philosophy in philology, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,  
Samarkand, Uzbekistan.

E-mail address: [gulnoz05@yandex.ru](mailto:gulnoz05@yandex.ru)

**Abstract:** The present article is devoted to an actual theme of modern linguistics – linguistic methods in sentence analysis. More attention is paid to the linguistic methods in syntactic analysis of a sentence, the basic principles of comparative study of languages at the syntactic level and linguistic methods used in the analysis of tenses. Theoretical parts of the article is proved by examples.

**Key words** method, sentence, syntactic units, subject, predicate, syntactical unit, component, linguistic, speech components, analyze.

## Introduction

It is well known that in the development of modern linguistics, there is a growing interest in the problems associated with the comparative analysis of language material. It is known that the correct use of specific linguistic methods in the study of any level of language and their application in comparative-functional research requires special attention from the researcher. If we focus on the processes of syntactic analysis of speech, in general linguistics, there are cases when the problems of syntactic content are derived from word forms, lexical meanings, and the opinions of linguists are contradictory. While some researchers recognize lexical meaning as the basis of grammar, others deny it; third groups of linguists do not recognize lexical meaning as a linguistic category.

## Materials and methods

In Roman linguistics, the syntactic analysis of a sentence is approached differently. In particular, in the analysis of a particular syntactic view, the component-by-component analysis itself has several views. For example, A. A. Hill is based on the principle that the definition of tag memes, the division of a sentence into tag memes into minimal functional segments, involves the division of the sentence into parts [3, p.285]. Z.S. Harris, on the other hand, prefers the use of chain analysis, that is, the method of dividing the sentence into elementary parts and dividing it into adjuncts based on distribution [4, p.302], R.E. Longacre performs chain analysis by analyzing it directly into participants [8, p.165]. Due to the ideas of transformational grammar in linguistics, methods of segmentation and distribution analysis have emerged and developed. N. Chomsky (1997) in the development of the mentioned linguistic analysis methods; R. E. Lees (1960); P. Roberts (1964); E. Bach (1964); A. Hathaway (1967); The efforts of scholars such as P. S. Rosenbaum (1967) had a significant impact.

Today, there are distributive analysis, direct participant separation method, several types of transformation, substitution, derivation, component and syntax separation methods in small syntax analysis, and analysis of them into components and syntaxes is common to our research goal. Distinguishing language layers from each other, the correct and effective use of analytical methods in determining their relationship will be important. For example, when using the distributive method, linguists focus on three aspects of it:

- a) Additional or complementary distribution;
- b) Distribution of comparative contrast
- c) Free exchange distribution [8, p.172].

The distributive method was mostly used at the morphological (additional, contrast) level of the language, while the free substitution distribution was used only in word combinations. When the indirect division method is used, this method is mainly analyzed by modeling the morphological expression of those participants at the syntactic level by first dividing the speech device into the

largest participants (Np + Vp) and then dividing them into smaller participants. This is just a synthesis of the external device of speech at the morphological level. This linguistic method returns speech analysis from the syntactic level to the morphological level of the language.

It is well known that in the development of modern linguistics, there is a growing interest in the problems associated with the comparative analysis of language material. In this case, the researcher's focus is on general linguistic research methods in the comparative analysis of the system of related and non-related languages. E.A. Shchebetenko argues that "... the method of linguistic analysis should theoretically be able to justify the commonalities and differences in languages when comparing the general and subsystems or microsystems of specific languages" [9, p.18]. Q. Yusupov clearly outlined the sections of comparative linguistics (comparative-historical, typology, comparative linguistics and comparative typology) and defined their main tasks. [12, p.115].

In our research, we replace the term transformation with the experimental method, because the linguistic experiment allows us to reveal the cases of relevance (proportionality) of the syntactic units in the sentences being analyzed.

**For example:**

*All the time we heard the cattle in the woods* [5, p.15];  
*I didn't think a long time about it* [5, p.18].

*How long did we hear the cattle in the woods?*  $\implies$  *We heard the cattle long in the woods;*  
*I didn't think a long time about it*  $\implies$  *I didn't think then about it*  $\implies$  *When didn't I think about it?*  $\implies$  *How long didn't I think about it?*  $\implies$  *I didn't think long about it;*

When the sentences are analyzed on the basis of the experimental method, it appears that the action represented by the syntactic units at the cut-off point has been continuous for a certain period of time.

Differential syntactic features of syntactic units are distinguished on the basis of defined syntactic relations, and their morphological expression is visually described in component models. This method allows to analyze the syntactic relations of units representing the state of time, as well as their component composition, without going beyond certain limits in clarifying the deictic states of temporality in the microtext.

**Compare:** *He read the book for hours.* [10, p.25];  
*He read the book occasionally.* [10, p.28].

*He read the book for hours*  $\implies$  *He read the book then;*  
*He read the book for hours*  $\implies$  *When did he read the book?*

In this syntactic unit, the elements long or how long can be used instead of the element for hours:  
*He read the book for hours*  $\implies$  *He read the book long*  $\implies$  *How long did he read the book?*

*He read the book occasionally* by replacing the occasionally syntactic unit in the sentence with, sometimes from time to time, day after day, etc., or by questioning,

*He read the book occasionally*  $\implies$  *He read the book sometimes;*  
*He read the book occasionally*  $\implies$  *How often did he read the book?*

When these sentences are compared with the sentence *He read the book throughout the night*, it is clear that there is both temporality and continuity in the content of the compound *throughout the night*. In experiment method syntax in this syntactic unit throughout the night combination **when?** By putting an interrogative pronoun or replacing this compound with an adverbial element **then:**

*He read the book throughout the night*  $\implies$  *When did he read the book*  $\implies$  *He read the book then.*

In order to determine the continuum syntax, *the long or how long compounds replace the out through the night combination:*

*He read the book throughout the night*  $\implies$  *He read the book long*  
 $\implies$  *How long did he read the book?*

Linguists focus on only three aspects of the method of distributive analysis:

1. The addition distribution,
2. The contrast distribution,
3. The free exchange distribution.

However, if suffixes and contrast distributions are widely used at the morphological level of any language, that is, if the lexical units in a sentence are limited to comparing the meanings of form-forming suffixes, free-exchange distributions are the same in meaning or content, different in form. At the syntactic level, distribution is determined by the syntactic position of the syntactic units representing the object selected for research in the sentence structure based on the defined syntactic relationships, and the languages are compared according to the same syntactic position in the sentence structure. That is, the differential syntactic features of syntactic units and their morphological features are determined using the method of modeling, as well as differential syntactic-semantic features of components, which opens a wide way to distinguish isomorphic and allomorphic cases in their system relations and their comparative-functional study.

## Conclusion

We all know that the linguistic methods used in the analysis of sentences in modern linguistics are of great importance. In the process of analyzing sentences in the system of related and non-related languages, we analyzed them using several different linguistic methods. Today, there are distributive analysis, direct participant separation method, several types of transformation, substitution, derivation, component and syntax separation methods in small syntax analysis, and analysis of them into components and syntaxes is common to our research goal. Distinguishing language layers from each other, the correct and effective use of analytical methods in determining their relationship will be important.

It is well known that in the development of modern linguistics, there is a growing interest in the problems associated with the comparative analysis of language material. In this case, the researcher's focus is on general linguistic research methods in the comparative analysis of the system of related and non-related languages.

## References

1. Boronov J.B. Comparative grammar of English and Uzbek languages. T.: Teacher, 1973.-284p.
2. Chomsky N. Current issues in Linguistic Theory. Le Haye, 1964.-261p.
3. Hill A.A. Introduction to Linguistic structures from sound to sentence in English. New York, 1958. - 396p.
4. Harris Z.S. String analysis of Sentence structure. The Hague, 1964. – 358p.
5. Jerome K. Jerome. Three Men in a Boat. – Penguin Books, 1978. -185 p.
6. John Steinbeck, James Jonies, Reynolds Price, John Updice, American short novels. – Moscow: Raduge publishers, 1987. – 495 p.
7. Longacre R.E. String Constituent Analysis. Language, 1960. v. 36, w1, P.-163-189.
8. Shchebetenko E.A. Chastnost vremennykh konstruktsiy raznogo morfologicheskogo tipa i printsipy ix vybora v russkom yazyke / Avtoref. diss... kand. filol.nauk. M.: 1974. -22s.
9. SM- Somerset Maughham. The Magician. –Australia: Penguin Books, 1967. – 199 p.
10. Whitehall H. Structural Essentials of English. New York. 1956.-394 p.
11. Yusupov U.K. Teoreticheskie osnovy sopostavitel'noy lingvistiki.-T.: Fan, 2007.-126p.
12. Zandvoort R.W. A Handbook of English Grammar. Croningen, 1998.-436p.