



## SEMANTIC AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF RELATIVE PRONOUNS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Saydaliyeva Dilfuza Zairjanovna  
English teacher, Tashkent State Transport  
University Department of Foreign Languages

Tulaboeva Gulorom Tulaboevna  
Senior teacher, Tashkent State Transport  
University Department of Foreign Languages

### Abstract

Pronouns differ from substantive, adjective and other categories of lexemes in that they determine the presence of special variants of syntaxes, individual, but their expressiveness (in this respect, pronominal and prepositional adverbs are close to them, as well as particles, which, like pronouns, receive individual reflection in the designation of variants of syntaxes.

**Key words:** syntaxes, pronouns, semantics, syntactic-semantic features.

Pronouns present the researcher with certain difficulties in relation to their classification, which, as we will try to show here, is fundamentally connected with syntactic semantics, especially with various non-categorical syntactic-semantic features. For example, the experience of A. M. Peshkovsky, who considered it inappropriate to single out a separate group of possessive pronouns in the Russian language, dissolving it in a large group of "personal pronouns." "Traditional grammar," he writes, "provides, as you know, a classification of pronouns according to meaning. Here we must we must make a number of corrections to this classification, since in traditional grammar here, as in other divisions, the meanings of roots are mixed with the meanings of the grammatical parts of words. True, the meanings of the roots here are also grammatical. But here it is important to separate the differences in them from the differences in the meanings of affixes (in the latter respect, pronominal words do not differ from non-pronominal words).

Traditional grammar violates this principle when it speaks, for example, of pronouns "personal" (I, you, he, we, you, they), "reflexive" (myself), and "possessive" (my, yours, mine, ours, yours).), since by the meaning of the roots



I, you, he, we, you, they, mine, yours, ours, vay are all personal, and myself, my own - returnable, by value the affixes I, you, he, we, you, they, yourself are nouns, and mine, yours, yours, ours, yours are adjectives. As for the shade "possessive" in these adjectives, then it is not particularly expressed in them and is due only to the pronominal meaning of the roots, so there is still the question of whether it should be emphasized. Based on this, A. M. Peshkovsky identifies the following "personal pronouns: I (me, me, me) <sub>T</sub> my, in my opinion, you, yours, in your opinion, he (she, it, him, him, her and etc.), egon (folk), eyny (folk), in his opinion, we (us, us, us), ours, in our opinion, you, yours, in your opinion, they (them, them <sub>g</sub> them ), theirs (almost literary), in their own way.

A. M. Peshkovsky laid the basis for the allocation of "personal pronouns" by the commonality of their roots, thus combining personal and possessive pronouns, as well as some adverbs (we do not touch on the latter here). At the same time, the morphological features of the combined pronouns, and their syntactic specificity, turned out to be aside, related primarily to their syntactic semantics. But it is precisely the consideration of the morphological characteristics of possessive pronouns in Russian language and especially their syntactic semantics encourages to single out these pronouns in a special group. According to their morphological structure, possessive pronouns in Russian (my, yours , etc.)

Distinctly different from the group of pronouns, which are traditionally assigned the name "personal pronouns" (I - me - me - me, you - you , etc.). And with this morphological difference are in according to the differences in the syntactic semantics of those and other pronouns, which cannot be ignored in the syntax analysis.

The theoretical and methodological issues that arise here are very closely related to the issues of syntax analysis, which is associated with the distinction between units of the morphological and syntactic levels of the language and taking into account their interaction. According to their systemic relations at the syntactic level of the language, possessive pronouns it is precisely as means of expressing syntaxemes and their variants in deeds that they clearly differ from personal pronouns. Compare, for example:

1) equivalence relations of possessive pronouns and possessive adjectives, as well as nouns in the genitive case when expressing various possessive syntaxes, in particular proper possessive: your house, father's house, father's house, etc.;



2) equivalence relations of personal pronouns and nouns in the form of the nominative case as a means of expressing agentive syntaxes, in particular the property-agentive: you came, father came etc. The syntactic semantics of possessiveness (possession) predetermined the very name of these pronouns, although this the name - "possessive, or possessive, pronouns" - does not mean at all that they cannot be carriers of another syntactic semantics. Similarly, in English, a group is distinguished possessive pronouns that are in equivalence relations with the genitive case of nouns (sometimes called "possessive case"), although they may also be carriers of other syntactic semantics.

True, in modern English the possessive pronouns my, your, etc. are morphologically indivisible, unlike the corresponding pronouns in Russian, but this only the circumstance is emphasized that possessive pronouns are allocated to a special group of pronouns, taking into account their syntactic semantics. And the basis for the allocation of personal pronouns into a separate group on the material of the Russian language, in essence, is the consideration of syntactic semantics, as well as their morphological features. However, in their very name, syntactic semantics does not receive any reflection, and this is explained by the fact that personal pronouns have different case forms - nominative, genitive and other cases, each of which has a diverse syntactic-semantic content. Under these conditions, one can use only such a general and imprecise the name as "personal pronouns", which is largely conditional, since personal pronouns designate not only persons (non-personal pronouns can also designate persons). In modern English, however, where personal pronouns are actually devoid of case forms, it is possible to distinguish between two groups of personal pronouns, called above "subject" and "object" pronouns. These names already partly reflect the syntactic semantics, although, as in the case of possessive pronouns, their very name should not be interpreted in the sense that some of them designate only the subject of an action or state, others only an object. The subject pronoun serves as a means of expression and object syntaxeme in the position of the nuclear predicate component, and the object pronoun can represent the agentive syntaxeme in the dependent position (in combination with the preposition by); cf.: I was invited by them.

In terms of syntactic semantics, all and both are close to the last of the above mentioned groups of pronouns, which are also means of expressing both substantial and qualifying syntaxes; for example: a) All are present. All that I



remember is true (Christie). Both were punished; 6) ... and he had put all his clothes over him for warmth (Maugham). Have you never had a moment's regret for all the unhappiness you caused them? (I bid.). He lived here all his life. He sat up all night. Both sisters are doctors. Both his brothers are teachers. The proximity of these pronouns to the indefinite pronouns any, any, any), every, each, etc. considered above, is due to the fact that both of them are carriers of the syntactic-semantic sign of collectivity (collectivity), that is, both of them serve as means of expression collective syntaxemes - from the categories of substantial and qualifying. However, the question arises: is it possible, in relation to the pronouns all and both, to establish a syntactic-semantic sign of indefiniteness (uncertainty), the presence of which in the pronouns any, every, etc. justifies their very name as "indefinite pronouns?". If this meaningful feature is alien to the pronouns all and both, then, naturally, they should not be combined together with the indicated pronouns under the general name "indefinite pronouns". There is reason to believe that this is exactly the case with these pronouns, which, unlike indefinite pronouns, should be called "collective pronouns" in accordance with the presence of the mentioned syntactic-semantic sign of collectiveness, or collectivity.

In this conclusion can be reached by studying the paradigmatic series of variants of substantial collective syntaxes, in the expression of which the pronouns all and both participate. The equivalence relations of each of these pronouns differ significantly from the equivalence relations of the indefinite pronouns any, every, etc., and this is manifested not only in the fact that among the variants of substantial collective syntaxes expressed by means of the pronouns all and both, there are no complex pronouns on -body, - one, -thing, but also (mainly) in the fact that the functional equivalents of the pronouns all and both are syntactically indivisible combinations, which include two pronouns at the same time. We mean, in particular, complex, or composite, variants of syntaxes, the first element of which is a personal pronoun (subject or object), and the second is the pronoun all or both: They both went there. They are both gone. We all love him. They all came late I know it all. I see them both. We wrote to them both. Such combinations, which would serve as means of expressing indefinite syntaxes and would include indefinite pronouns any, every, some, etc., are impossible. In turn, the indivisibility of these pronominal combination representing variants of various substantial collective syntaxes, is emphasized by their equivalence to indivisible pronominal combinations,



the first the element of which is the pronoun both or all, the second is the personal (objective) pronoun with the preposition of: both of them, all of them, etc. Pronominal combinations of both kinds form pairs optional variants of the corresponding substantive collective syntaxes, as evidenced, for example, by the following replacement transformations:

They both went there → Both of them went there. They are both gone → Both of them are gone. We all love him → All of us love him. They all came late → All of them came late. I know it all → I know all of it. AT then same time such couples combinations like they both - they all or both of them, constitute connotative variants of the corresponding syntaxes, differing in semantic shades, which are introduced into them by the pronouns both and all. In a syntactically indivisible combination, representing a variant of one or another substantive collective syntaxeme, a noun can also be included as a variable S with the preposition of (options both of S , all of S); for example: Both of these possibilities must be taken into account. Such a variant can be replaced by a compound pronominal variant with the preposition of, which was discussed above; cf.: Both of these possibilities must be taken into account → Both of them must be taken into account. As the above example with the variant both of S shows , a noun in the latter can have a pronominal element (these), which is natural, since we are talking about substantive syntaxemes, which are characterized precisely by compatibility with pronominal elements .

## REFERENCES

1. Amanov A.K. Principles of communicative competence and its practical reflection on homework. International Interdisciplinary research journal (GIIRJ), 480-484, 2021. <https://internationaljournals.co.in/index.php/giirj/article/view/724>
2. Amanov A.K. Cognitive and linguocultural Features of the English wedding ceremony. Zien journal of Social Science and Humanities, 2021. <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/zjssh/article/view/401>
3. Sheraliyeva Sh. Application And Importance of Transport Terminology. Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI) Volume 12, Issue 10, October 2023: 4742-4750 <https://itella.ee/ru/biznes-klijent/informacija-i-pomoshh/dogovory-i-uslovija/transportnaja-terminologija/>
4. Sheraliyeva Sh. Innovative technologies in transport. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal ISSN: 2249-7137 Vol. 12,



Issue 03, March 2022 SJIF 2022 = 8.252 A peer reviewed journal  
<https://saarj.com>

5. Sheraliyeva Sh. The benefits of using drama activities on language/ situation/ motivation. International Scientific Journal Published: 12.11.2021 p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online) <http://T-Science.org>
6. Ganieva M.G. Cognitive and linguacultural features of the English wedding ceremony. Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities . -Volume 3, 2021-yil. <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/zjssh/article/view/401>
7. Ganieva M.G. Principles of competence and practical reflection. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching, 2022.  
<https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejlat/article/view/484>
8. Ganieva M.G. Harlem Renaissance Literature Langston Hughes. Czech Journal of Multidisciplinary Innovations. -Vol.4 2022 CZJMI, 2022-yil. <https://peerianjournal.com/index.php/tpj/article/view/101>
9. Ishankulova D.A. Graves and the suspicious copy of Khayyam. Science and education. -2017-2024, 2022.  
<https://openscience.uz/index.php/sciedu/article/view/3261>
10. Ishankulova D.A. Исследования рубайята омара хайяма в англии. international Journal of Philosophical Studies and Social Sciences Том 2. -135-140,2022.  
<http://www.ijpsss.iscience.uz/index.php/ijpsss/article/download/190/175>
11. Ishankulova D.A. Opening Khayyam in England. Academia Globe: Inderscience research, 2022.  
<https://agir.academiascience.org/index.php/agir/article/view/>
12. Kiyasova R.M. Methods of teaching logistics terms to senior students using interactive classroom activities. Peerian journal, 2022.  
<https://peerianjournal.com/index.php/tpj/article/view/103>
13. Kiyasova R.M. English for specific purposes in the aviation. Peerian journal, 2022. <https://peerianjournal.com/index.php/tpj/article/view/110>
14. Saydaliyeva D.Z. Intelligent traffic flow management. American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development. -60x84, 2022-yil. <https://ajird.journalspark.org/index.php/ajird/article/view/149/142>
15. Saydaliyeva D.Z. The role of innovative technologies in the English Lesson. European journal of molecular and clinic medicine. -журнал, 2021-yil. 2021/8 [https://ejmcm.com/article\\_7254.html](https://ejmcm.com/article_7254.html)



16. Saydaliyeva D.Z. Forms of pronouns. Eurasian journal of learning and academic teaching, 2022.  
<https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejlat/article/view/2151>
17. Sidiqnazarova Z.M. Social problems raised in "Mother to son" Langston Hughes. Peerian journal, 2022.  
<https://peerianjournal.com/index.php/tpj/article/view/112>
18. Sidiqnazarova Z.M. Amy Tan and literary specification of her works. Academia Globe: Inderscience research, 2022.  
<https://agir.academiascience.org/index.php/agir/article/view/>
19. Shamuratova M.Sh. Literary identity of "the joy luck club" by Amy Tan. Academia Globe: Inderscience research, 2022.  
<https://agir.academiascience.org/index.php/agir/article/view/>
20. Shamuratova M.Sh. Developing diagnostic assessment, assessment for learning and assessment of learning competence via task based language teaching. Academia Globe: Inderscience research, 2022.  
<https://agir.academiascience.org/index.php/agir/article/view/>
21. Tulaboyeva G.T Mother-daughter relations in the novel "The Jou Luck club" by Amy Tan. Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Science. -60x84 1/8b/m12.5, 2022-yil. ISSN(E) 2795-7683. May 2022.  
<https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejhss/article/view/1496>
22. Tulaboyeva G.T Multicultural literature of the USA. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching . -60x84 1/8b/m12.5, 2022-yil. ISSN(E) 2795-739. May 2022.  
<https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejlat/article/view/1507>
23. Tulaboyeva G.T Grammar and utility functions of pronouns. Eurasian journal of learning and academic teaching, 2022.  
<https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejlat/article/view/2153>
24. Xusanova I.A. Methods of teaching logistics terms to senior students using interactive classroom activities. Peerian journal, 2022.  
<https://peerianjournal.com/index.php/tpj/article/view/103>
25. Xusanova I.A. Harlem renaissance in the USA. Peerian journal, 2022.  
<https://peerianjournal.com/index.php/tpj/article/view/106>
26. Xusanova I.A. Tasks of translating technical material from English into Russian. Peerian journal, 2022.  
<https://peerianjournal.com/index.php/tpj/article/view/114>