

Predicative Prepositions: Syntax-Semantics Interplay in Combinations

Gulnoz A. Ergasheva^a, Maxfurat K. Omonova^b and Saidova Dilfuza Ergashovna^c
Karshi State University, Karshi, Uzbekistan

Keywords: Syntactic-Semantic Feature, Predicative, Syntaxeme Analysis, Transformation, Deep Structure.

Abstract: This article explores the inherent structure of predicatively positioned prepositional combinations, each exhibiting unique syntactic-semantic features. It conceptualizes a syntaxeme as an unchanging syntactic unit expressed in a language through a range of interconnected options, constituting an equivalent paradigmatic series. In their predicative role, prepositional combinations function as tools for articulating a diverse array of syntaxemes outlined by a system of variants discerned through linguistic experimentation methods. This exploration sheds light on the intricate relationships between prepositions and their subsequent combinations within the realm of syntax, offering insights into the mechanisms underlying linguistic expression. The analysis involves a comprehensive examination of the syntactic-semantic nuances inherent in various prepositional combinations, revealing how they contribute to the construction of syntaxemes. Through this investigation, a deeper understanding of the syntactic structure and semantic implications of prepositional combinations positioned predicatively is achieved, enriching our comprehension of language dynamics.

1 INTRODUCTION

The task of syntaxemic analysis is to study the underlying structure of a sentence, i.e., its content. The main purpose of most sections of language science is directly or indirectly the study of the content plan. At the same time, the inner side of language is analyzed, as a rule, not in isolation but in unity with the material form of its expression, i.e., together with the outer side of language. So, the science of the plan of language content is called semantics (translated from Greek means "denoting"). The emergence of semantics as a science is connected with the name of the French

scientist M. Breal. Semantics is also called the science of meaning, but the concept of semantics is broader than the concept of meaning. The study of the deep structure of sentences implies the identification of syntaxemes in sentence combinations in the position of the predicative, i.e., in the position of the nuclear predicative component. Syntaxemes are characterized by differential syntactic-semantic features, defined by given syntactic relations.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Table 1: Exploring Syntaxemes: Cross-Cultural Views on Syntactic Structures.

| Author Name (Year) | Study |
|---------------------------|---|
| I. I. Meshchaninov (1940) | In Meshchaninov's view, syntaxemes refer to the word formations that dictate the syntactic order, revealing the semantics of the sentence. |
| I. F. Vardul (1964) | Vardul employs "syntaxeme" to denote the primary syntactic unit in Japanese, distinct from Russian syntax units. He defines it as a denominative word with adjacent service words. |
| A. A. Pashkovsky (1980) | Pashkovsky, focusing on the Japanese language, defines syntaxeme as a suffixal component of a sentence member. It's characterized by non-self-sufficiency, postpositionality, inalterability, and the ability to express relations. |
| G. A. Zolotova (1988) | Zolotova derives the notion of syntaxeme from the analysis of Russian case forms. It's defined as a minimal semantic-syntactic unit exclusive to Russian, carrying elementary meaning and functioning in complex syntactic constructions. |

^a <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8267-5527>

^b <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8298-0262>

^c <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2885-277X>

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study defines a syntaxeme as an invariant syntactic unit represented in a language through a system of variants, forming an equivalent paradigmatic series. Three distinct syntaxeme categories exist: substantive, denoting object features; procedural, denoting actions; and qualitative, denoting properties. In prepositional combinations in the predicative position, substantial syntaxemes dominate, except when expressed through adverbs or action-indicating words. Syntaxemic analysis distinguishes syntaxemes using three main approaches: means of expression, syntactic content of elementary units, and syntactic position, employing all three to establish various syntactic-semantic features.

Prepositional combinations in the predicative position serve as a means of expressing diverse syntaxemes, possessing features such as locativity, stativity, activity, temporality, objectivity, sociality, origin, and purpose. Additionally, they share the common syntactic-semantic feature of substantivity. The substantivity sign in these syntaxemes is identified through determinatives, including personal pronouns, indicative pronouns, articles, numerals, adjectives, and nouns in the possessive case. Identification of syntaxemes with different syntactic-semantic features relies on linguistic experiments involving transformations specific to the nature of the revealed feature, such as locative absolute, stative, or active transformations.

4 ANALYSIS

Each syntaxeme expressed by a prepositional phrase in the predicative position has its system of variants. However, the number of variants of syntaxemes is not equal; some have more variants, others have less, and some have only one single variant at all. Thus, the largest number of variants is possessed by the locative absolute syntaxeme, and the social syntaxeme has only one variant - with S.

The social syntaxeme represents the meaning of a certain aggregate, jointness. The only means of expressing the social syntaxeme is the preposition *with*. ("The preposition *with* is a means of expressing the attitude of associative or social connection" Reiman E.A. 1982 p.41).

Let us consider several examples that have the attribute of sociability:

1. I was with these guys in Austin (J.F.M.113) → With whom was I in Austin?
2. Louis was with Eileen in the church parlor (J.F.M.565) → With whom was Louis in the church parlor?
3. At this moment our thoughts and prayers should be with the families of the victims of this terrible crime. (D.N.1) → With whom should our thoughts and prayers be at this moment?

The social syntaxeme expressed by the prepositional combination in the predicative position is realized based on a noun or pronoun denoting only animate objects (guys, Eileen, families, you, etc.). Thus, the social syntaxeme expressed by the prepositional combination in the predicative position is represented by the variant *to be with S*.

Prepositional combinations in the predicative position most often express the locative syntaxeme which is determined by the substitution of its variants and the method of posing the question -Where?

The locative absolute syntaxeme is defined using the variants *near, in front of, at, in* (He's at the pool. /They were in front of door./I'll be in the city in the evening.); locative ablative - *from, out of* (The Nazi commandant of the camp was from my home-town./ That noise was out of the darkness.); locative illative - *within, inside* (The best place to bury a good is within your heart./ a splinter was still inside him); locative temporal - *during, at* (against which we were at war./ It was during the process when). The lexical base of the locative syntaxeme can be nouns denoting concrete objects, names of cities, villages, mountains, rivers, body parts, spatial phenomena, and living beings.

The most used syntaxeme expressed by the prepositional combination in the predicative position is the stative syntaxeme. The feature of stativity is revealed by the prepositional group in a state of. For example:

1. Jesus was in absolute safety. (C.M.nov.10-16. 95. p17) → Lesus was in a state of safety.
2. They're in a temporary crisis. (C.M.m. 96. p58) → They're in a state of temporary crises.

However, it is not possible to use this prepositional group in all cases. In the research work of S. Egamberdiev, we can see the identification of stative syntaxemes by replacing prepositional combinations with Participle II.

1. She was in remission. (R.D.apr. 91.p42) → She was remitted.
2. But the sheets were in disarray.(R.D.apr. 91.p74). → But the sheets were disarrayed.

The stative syntaxeme is expressed both by the verb *be* and by other verbs such as *come*, *stand*, *remain*, *appear* and others, which act as linking verbs.

1. The Iraqi treat remains at bay.
2. The section stood at ease.

The stative syntaxeme, unlike the active syntaxeme, can be combined with an adverb and an adjective.

Another syntactic-semantic feature is the feature of activity. The active syntaxeme is combined with words indicating the speed of action (rapid, quick, slow) and is determined by passivation. For example:

1. As soon as we got money our work was in quick progress. → As soon as we got money our work was quickly progressed.
2. From Brazil to New Zealand, a drive is on to rapidly boost the quality of screen-writing. → From Brazil to New Zealand, a drive is rapidly boosted the quality of screen-writing.

The temporal syntaxeme revealed in prepositional combinations in the predicative position is determined by means of the question-when? and the replacement of the word *then*. For example:

1. This bullish was in October 1987. → When was this bullish? -This bullish was then.
2. And it was on Monday afternoon. → When it was? - It was then.

Along with the temporal syntaxeme there is a temporal locative syntaxeme defined by replacing the prepositional combination with the words *there*, *here*. For example:

1. That's all in the past. → That's all there.
2. The twenty-first century is almost upon us. → The twenty-first century is here.

Genitive syntaxeme or syntaxeme of origin expressed by a prepositional phrase in the predicative position is revealed by the variants from *S*, out of *S*. For example:

1. Those words are from the book *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*.
2. We're out of Harvard Geophysics.

According to some dictionaries, the following prepositions are the means of expressing the genitive syntaxeme: *from* (BARS, I:557; Hornby, I:346), *through* (BARS, II:626), *out of* (BARS, II:146; Hornby, II:91), *by* (BARS, I:204), *on* (BARS, II:128), *off* (BARS, II:122). But in our studies, the means of expressing the genitive syntaxeme in the predicative position is the preposition *out of* and with great advantage the preposition *from*. Thus in the examples:

1. The roses are from Richard. (B.T.Gr.275)

2. His vision comes from his political hero Konrad Adenaver, the first chancellor of postwar Germany. (N.nov.4.96. p.4)
3. This was just from our class. (J.F.M.199)
it is impossible to replace the preposition *from* with other variants of the genitive syntaxeme.

Let's try to replace the variant from *S* with another variant of this syntaxeme – *by S*:

1. The sappy tale is from the pen of Anita Leung Fung-yee (N.p.48) → The sappy tale is by the pen of Anita Leung Fung-yee.
2. The third western account came from the pen of Maurice Collis → The third western account came by the pen of Maurice Collis.

In these examples, the substitution experiment leads to a distortion of the grammatical correctness of the sentence. The most appropriate option would be to combine the preposition *by* with the words *Anita Leung*, *Maurice Collis*, and not the word *pen*. But our task is to consider exactly that material which is in the predicative position as a prepositional combination. So, as the above sentences show, the genitive syntaxeme expressed by the prepositional phrase in the predicative position is represented by the variant –*from S* and the nouns of this syntaxeme are realized by means of the following words: *books*, *reference books*, *devices*, *natural resources*, *buildings*, *proper names*.

There are 4 variants of the objective syntaxeme - *for S*, *to S*, *of S*, *about S*.

Let us consider the objective syntaxemes expressed by the prepositional combination in the predicative position, denoting the person or object to which the action is directly transferred, i.e. denoting the object of action, or the actor, or the instrument of action, etc.

The most common variant of the objective syntaxeme is *to be for S* and the syntactic-semantic sign of objectivity is proved by posing the question - *for whom?* For example:

1. It was only for the little children (N. p.16) → For whom was it?
2. That victory would be for us. (N.p.57) → For whom would be that victory?
3. Democrats were for poor people (D.N.p.19) → For whom were democrats?

Close in meaning to the preposition *for* is the preposition *to*. But when the preposition *for* is replaced with *to*, the meaning of the sentence changes.

The preposition *for* in the prepositional phrase for the little children is used when we talk specifically about the thing being transferred (*bags*, *dress*, *sweats*, etc.) and the lessons.

The preposition *to* is used when referring to information being conveyed, events, etc. For example:

1. The reference was *to* my movie "JFK" (N.nov.4.96. p105)
2. But his first call was *to* the Harvard University switchboard. (J.F.M. p97)

The objective syntaxeme is expressed by the preposition *about*:

1. It's *about* developing national pride. (N.may.26.97. p48)
2. My response is more *about* myself (C.M. p.11) 3 that was *about* winning (J.F.M. p.246)

In rare cases, we can see the objective syntaxeme expressed by the preposition *of*:

1. The only talk is *of* the Bible and family. (N.march 26.97.p45)
2. My personal and strongest impression... was *of* a man who told the truth. (C.M.p14)

It is possible to replace the preposition with the preposition *about* and the meaning of the sentence does not change. The correctness of the examples is confirmed with the help of the experiment:

1. The only talk is *about* the Bible and family. → What is the only talk *about*?
2. My personal and strongest impression... was *about* the man who told the truth. → Who was my personal and strongest impression *about*?

Very often the objective syntaxeme is expressed by the prepositional phrases *one of*, *kind of*, *part of*:

1. The lawn was *one of* those familiar suburban places (J.F.M.p.94) → What was the lawn *one of*?
2. It's *one kind of* music (J.F.M.p.169) → What is it *kind of*?
3. The Wroclaw factory is *part of* a trend. (N.aug.25.97. p33) → What is the Wroclaw factory *part of*?

From the above examples, we can conclude that the means of expressing the objective syntaxeme in the predicative position are various prepositions (*for*, *to*, *about*, *of*) in combination with a noun, which represents the object of action. The prepositions *of*, *about* are interchangeable, which we cannot say about the first two. When the preposition *for* is replaced by the preposition *to*, the semantic correctness of the sentence is violated.

The prepositional combinations in the predicative position have the syntactic-semantic feature of purpose. The final syntaxeme is the syntaxeme of purpose, the concept of which is connected not only as a fact of human activity but also as an objective

fact of nature. "The relation of expediency acts as a specific form of interaction, which makes it possible to discover a certain directionality of processes, their conditionality by final results appearing as goals." (VSE.M.1987 vol. 28.p.473)

The final syntaxeme represented by the prepositional phrase in the predicative position has only one variant to be *for* S. Here are examples indicating the sign of purpose:

1. The novel was *for* reading in the parking garage. (J.F.M.30)
2. The study tapes are *for* active learning at home (C.M.5)
3. It was *for* protection (MT.A.286)

To prove that these sentences contain the sign of purpose, let's turn to the experiment with question - 1. For what purpose was the novel? 2. For what purpose are the study tapes? 3. For what purpose was it? - According to the experiment, we can say that the prepositional combinations in the position of predicative possess the sign of finality.

5 CONCLUSION

The prepositional combinations in the predicative position exhibit diverse syntactic-semantic features. Each syntaxeme revealed by these combinations possesses its system of variants. The examination of syntaxeme variants, which are functional equivalents of prepositional combinations in the predicative position, enables us to infer that beneath an outwardly identical expression—i.e., behind a prepositional combination in the predicative position—there can exist entirely different units of the deep structure of the sentence in terms of their syntactic-semantic content.

When differentiating syntaxemes, their formal-distributive features, such as combinability, location, positional possibilities, as well as lexical filling, play a crucial role. The syntaxemes we investigated are expressed through combinations with various prepositions. The free interchangeability of variants of one syntaxeme indicates the commonality of their syntactic-semantic content. However, it should be noted that not all the syntaxemes we have identified have interchangeable variants.

The study of prepositional combinations in the predicative position was conducted using methods of linguistic analysis.

REFERENCES

- Functional-semantic aspects of grammar. (1987).
Linguistic Research, 50-59, 183-190.
- Jumayev, G. I. (2023). "Audiomanuscript" – a project on the study of oriental manuscript sources. Journal of Social Research in Uzbekistan, 50-52.
- Jumayev, G. I. (2022). History and etymology of the study of the ethnonym "Turk." In ICESER 5th International Congress. Rome, Italy.
- Jumayev, G. I. (Year). Oq qo‘yunli etnonimining etimologiyasi. Scholar Scientific Journal, 1(34), 85-90.
- Nizomova, M. B. (2022). Classification of pedagogical terms in international relations. Academic Research in Modern Science, 1(1), 252-256.
- Nizomova, M. B. (2023). Expansion of social functions of pedagogical terms in various spheres of society. Oriental Journal of Philology, 3(02), 8-13.

