

<https://doi.org/10.29013/EJLL-23-1-30-38>

Abduvaliyev Maxamatjon Arabovich
Candidate of Philological sciences, Professor,
Andijan State Institute of Foreign languages, Uzbekistan.

SYNTACTIC REPRESENTANTS OF THE CONCEPT OF CONCESSION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Annotation. The present article is devoted to the contrastive study of the so called simple and composite syntactic constructions, expressing concessive relations existing in the inner and outer world. Such syntactic representatives can be grouped into two groups: those expressing concession explicitly and those expressing concession implicitly. Each of the representants differs from others in regard with their functions, semantics, structures and stylistic use. Contrastive study of such problems give a chance to disclose isomorphic, allomorphic and specific features of the syntactic representants of word languages.

Key words: syntactic constructions simple and composite sentence, syntactic representants, concession, concessive, explicit, implicit, functions, semantics, structures, stylistic use, contrastive study.

Introduction

Concession as a universal product of mental activities of human being finds its linguistic objectification in all world languages. Actually, the concept of concession is the sum of knowledge on the existing relations among the objects of the inner and outer world. Concession, admittance, agreement, permission and others make up the most important characteristic features of the concept. They may be verbalized with the help of language and speech units and form the nominative field of concession.

The field is represented by the units belonging to different lexical morphological and syntactic levels. Syntactic constructions with simple and composite structure that express the concept of concession were the object of a great number of research works. But a number of issues related to semantic and structural, pragmatic and cultural problems are still remaining disputable in modern linguistics. Study of the problem in the materials of non-related languages is sure to bring essential theoretical conclusions to linguistic conceptology.

Even so, it should be noted that the scholars are not unanimous in the description and classification of predicative syntactic units expressing concession in world linguistics, in particular, non-predicative clauses with concessive the component. For example: in world linguistics, logical-grammatical (formal) and structural semantic directions can be observed regarding the classification of the complex sentences, for example, in the late 17th and early 18th centuries in English linguistics, approaching from the point of view of representatives of the logical trend, its dichotomous simple and compound classification was developed. This method of subordinating the language to the laws of logic, the speech was divided into simple and complex types. This can be described in the following models: N comcase +V=SJ (judgement); N comcase + N comcase or more +V+ V or more=CJ.

In the 70s of the last century, a structural-functional classification of complex sentences appeared in traditional English grammar. (R. Quirk and others, 1982: 269–302). R. Quirk and others

divide (Dependent clauses- DC) into three types (finite, non-finite, verbless clauses) according to their structure, and functional of the clauses into subject, object, compliment or adverb clauses (Quirk and others 1982: 269–271; 274–280).

In Russian linguistics, scientists who classified complex sentences from the point of view of logical-grammatical trend, scientists N.I. Grech, I.I. Davidov, F.I. Buslaev studied the language, in particular, parts of sentences as problems of logic. They tried to explain the laws of language based on the laws of logic. The description of complex sentences from the point of view of similarity to simple sentence parts can be found in the work of «General Comparative Grammar of the Russian Language (1852)» by I.I. Davidov and «Historical Grammar of the Russian Language (1858)» by F.I. Buslaev.

Against the idea that every part of the sentence is represented by a dependent clause, another, more precisely, formal-grammatical approach appeared at the beginning of the past century. A.A. Potebnaya, a bright representative of it, in his work «Correspondences on the grammar of the Russian language (1874)» emphasizes that in the study of the complex sentence, the main attention should be paid to the superordinate and dependent clause connectives (conjunctions and connectives). F.F. Fortunatov, A.A. Shakhmatov, V.A. Bogoroditsky and others focused on creating a classification of complex sentences by researching the structural-semantic relations between the superordinate and dependent clause parts of complex sentences.

Method

Alongside with semantic analysis, contrastive typological, observation and interpretation, comparative contextual analysis and modelling as well were used.

Discussion

The tradition of describing sentence structure based on logical approaches, which was leading in Western European linguistics until the middle of the 20th century, entered Turkology, especially Uzbek

linguistics, through Russian linguistics. Opinions were expressed that the main clause is part of any sentence, and they are equal to the subject and predicate elements of the sentence. In the syntactic theories of Turkic languages, various disputable points arose between the theoretical ideas and the features of the existing concrete syntactic constructions (Ўша асап –Ст.332–334.).

In languages such as English, German, and French, where the person-number category of verbs is not developed, main clauses appear as a necessary element of the sentence, while in Turkish languages where the person-number categories of the verb are developed, including Uzbek, the subject of the sentence acquires a facultative character.

Acquaintance with English, Uzbek, Russian, German and other language grammars, dissertations, scientific treatises and analysis of the collected language materials show that the relations of concessive can be expressed through different types of phrases, simple and compound sentences (Kimball L. G. Structure of English sentence, New York, Chicago, American book company 1900). Regarding the semantic types of complex sentences with adverbial clause of concession, the views of linguists are different, and it can be observed that their classification is based on different approaches. Jiri Nosek, relying on the semantics of subordinators connecting adverbial clauses of concession to superordinate clauses, divides adverbial clauses of concession into four main groups and they are complex sentences with pure concession; complex sentences with challenging concession, complex sentences with generalized concession; complex sentences with total concession.

According to J. Nosek, complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession with «though, although and albeit» express pure concession, while complex sentences with challenging concession have a stable and unchanging formula, which is the imperative form of the verb «be» from the pronominal subject «it» will consist of «it» It is followed by the

pronominal subject (it or that) connected by «as» and the modal verb may.

Generalized concession, according to J. Nosek, is expressed by complex sentences with adverbial clause of concession with however requiring an adverb after itself and its archaic form «howsoever». He believes that the main reason why other complex sentences with adverbial clause of concession with «soever, whatever, whoever, whichever» cannot belong to this group is that they come as an adverbial modifier of complex sentences with adverbial clause of concession with however.

The parts of the complex sentence with adverbial clauses of concession expressing total concession are connected by means of «even though, even if, even when». «The complex sentence with adverbial clauses of concession connected with «even though» indicates the maximum concession, the condition «even if» represents complete non-obstacle, the complex sentence with adverbial clauses of concession connected with «even when» has the meanings of temporality and concession, in which the meaning of the condition states that it has passed to a full concession.

Similarly, J. Nosek shows the existence of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession connected by the connectives «if, when, while» using the following examples: *I don't care if I lose; He walks when he might ride.*

He tried to prove that concession can also be expressed not only by «in spite of the fact that», but also by «for all», but also by the example of «For all he seems to dislike me, I still like him».

P.B. Zandvoort, taking into account the existence of contradictory relations between the components of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, calls such sentences concrete complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession. Although he did not comment on the semantic types of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, P.B. Zandvoort «when» time and concession, «if» condition and concession, «for

all» concession or restriction, «as» time, cause, comparison, manner and writes that concessive dependent clauses can come as superordinate clauses. (Zandvoort, 1996:220)

R. Quirk and others give the following definition to complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession: «Complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession express a contradiction between two situations (conditions), that is, the content of the main clause is unexpected from the point of view of the subordinate clause.» Although he hadn't eaten for days he (nevertheless) looked very fit. (Quirk, 1982: 282)

The authors of the modern English grammar consider complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession as complex sentences with adverbial clauses of alternative condition-concession and universal condition-concession, which contain the subordinators «weather ... or...», in their opinion, these subordinators serve to express the meaning of the condition together with the meaning of the alternative in the structure of connecting the dependent clause to the superordinate clause. They illustrate this in the following examples: *Weather they beat us or we beat him, we'll celebrate tonight; Whether or not he finds a job in New York, he's moving there.*

By complex sentences with adverbial clauses of universal condition and concession, the authors mean complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession connected by means of conjunctions with «Wh» content (whatever, whoever). This means that complex sentences with adverbial clauses of universal condition and concession belonging to this group freely choose one of several conditions: *She looks pretty whatever she wears.* The meaning of this category of adverbial clauses of concession is clearly distinguished by the meaning of time and place, which the following authors described through examples: *wherever you like, you can keep a horse.* The locative meaning of this sentence is “You can keep a horse at any place where you may live”, its meaning of condition and conces-

sion “It doesn’t matter where you live, you can keep a horse not a necessarily in that same place”. The sentences as “It doesn’t matter wh and no matter wh are divided into types of adverbial clauses of universal condition and concession: *No matter It doesn’t matter how hard I try, I can never catch up with him* (Quirk, 1982: 285).

Well-known Russian experts in English syntax, N.A. Kobrina and E.A. Korneeva, give the following definition to complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, which are linguistic verbalizers of concessive relations: «There is a contrast between the superordinate clause and dependent clause of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, the actions expressed in the superordinate clause or the fact are carried out or happen regardless of the condition expressed in the dependent clause» (Kobrina, 1965:168). They are based on the relationship between complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession and superordinate clause. Accordingly, they distinguish 4 types of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, that is, recognized clauses of adverbial concession, clauses of open concession, disjunctive concession or alternative concession and hypothetical or rejected concession. (Kobrina, Korneeva, 1965: 168).

According to them, in the first type of sentences, although the content of the superordinate and dependent clauses contradict each other, they both refer to facts. In this type of complex sentence with adverbial clause of concession (abnormal\ word order, especially with however, as, though are observed. Joseph could always eat, however excited she was; Dark as it was getting, I could still see there changes (Bronte); It was very sad to look upon and hear them; Happy though their condition unquestionably was (Ch. Dickens).

According to N.A. Kobrina and E.A. Korneeva, in addition to the tasks of connecting subordinators «however, as, though», they also perform the function of adverbial modifier of degree and measure. At the same time, when scholars interpret the adverbial

clause of concession as a word or group of words in the main sentence, in the last cited examples «Could eat, however excited she was, could see, dark as it was getting dark», in their opinion the adverbial clause of concession applies to the entire superordinate clause is also noteworthy. (Kobrina, Korneeva, 1965: 169).

By complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, N.A. Kobrina and E.A. Korneeva understand complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, in which the action of superordinate clauses takes place despite the meaning of an unreal condition and in such cases they emphasize that the part of the adverbial clause of concession is in the subjunctive mood. This category of sentences includes «no matter what might happen, whatever may be». (Kobrina, Korneeva, 1965: 170).

The subordinator «Whether ...or» presents two possible choices, both of which give rise to unreal or future-tense clauses of concession or, alternatively, complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession. Such complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession type express relations between the meanings of the components of the conflict or the possibility or rejection of which is a fact. If she got no money from her brother-in-law, she got what was as good as many-credit (Thackeray).

The authors of the Uzbek language grammar write that complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession are similar to each other, and the content of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession is similar to a compound sentence connected by adversitive conjunctions. (Uzbek Grammar, 1976:447–448). The authors call the adverbial clause of concession, which is connected to the main clause through the imperative form of the verb in the negative form a generalized concessive dependent clause. They list 5 types of this category of complex sentences.

The lexemes қанча, қанчалик ва ҳар қанча, қандай, ҳар қандай, нима, қаерда, қаерга, кимнинг қачон, қай вақтда, қай томондан participating in

a dependent clause express quantity — degree or repetition, place, sign, person or object, summarizing the content of time: Қундузхон ўзини ҳар қанча тутишга уринмасин, оғир йўқотишнинг азоби уни қийнар, эзар экан. (Said Ahmad); У қаерга бормасин, иши ўнгидан кела беради. (ЎТИЛ, 1976; 450); Қачон қараманг, қўлида китоб. (ЎТИЛ, 1976: 450). Professor M. A. Abduvaliev classified complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession into two types: 1) Complex sentences with adverbial clauses of pure concession and 2) Complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession of the mixed type.

It predicate verb part of the generalized complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession can be doubled (one being in the conditional and the other in the imperative forms); Қаерга борса-борсин, уйга келмасин, Қачон келса-келаверсин, эшигимиз очик; Нима деса-десин, мен ундан воз кечмайман and others.

It is interesting to note that complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession can express not only two or three, but also several shades of meaning. For example, Ким қаерда, қай вақт, нимани ўқимасин, ўқишлар натижасида олинган билимлар ҳаётда асқотади. (Subject-place-time-object-concession;) Кимда — ким нима сабабдан, қачондир, қандай мақсадда, у ерда пайдо бўлмасин, у бизнинг назоратимиз остида бўлади. (Subject-place-time-cause-purpose-concession).

He determines, in turn, 6 types of complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession of the mixed type. They are attributive clauses with concession, object clauses with concession, subject clauses with concession, time clauses with concession, place clauses with concession and degree and measure clauses with concession and he described them with the materials of English and Uzbek: *I invited the simplicity of his happiness or his mystery, whichever it might be.* (G. Greene); Қандай санъат асарига кўзим тушмасин, доим уни болалик билан ўлагим келади. (А. Қобул);

I'll gladly pay whatever you agree to. (Th. Dreiser); Улар нимани гаплашмасин бари бир менга ёқмади. (Ў. Хошимов). *Whoever comes who the words to deal with the natives must use Indian fashions* (I. Cooper); Ваҳолангки, илму-урфон соҳасидаги нимани ихтиро ва кашфиёт бўлмасин, у охир одамлар манфаати йўлида ё бевосита, ё билвосита хизмат қилади. (Фан ва турмуш); *My father gets very emotional even when he reads the newspaper.* (I. Salinger); Қачон қараманг, Алишерни уриб бурнини қонатди. (Ў. Хошимов). *Wherever she want, no one seemed to want any help.* (Th. Dreiser); Қаерга бормасин доим, озода кийиниб юради; No matter how fast he runs, the wet feet will freeze the harder. (J. London); Кўтариб келаётган пахтаси қанчалик оғир бўлмасин, у кулиб, чеҳраси порлаб келарди. (N. Kobul).

Among the syntactic level units that verbalize the concept of concession, simple sentences with the concessive clause occupy an important place. In the compared languages, such sentences have a unique structure of lexical and grammatical means. The analysis showed that in English the adverbial modifier of concession is objectified through the following means:

- 1) Subordinator and non-finite forms of the verb expressing concession explicitly (with participle I and II, and gerund);
- 2) Through the combination of subordinators and lexical units (noun, adjective, number, adverb, etc.) that express concession explicitly;
- 3) Prepositional compounds
- 4) Concession implicitly through the combination of subordinators and non-finite forms of the verb.

R. Quirk and others call such sentences “non-finite and verbless clauses of concession (The component of complex sentence with adverbial clause of concession — adverbial clause of concession) [Quirk 1982; 284–285] R. Close calls it “shortened contrast clause”. In our opinion, it would be appropriate to call such sentences as simple extended

sentences with a concessive part. In such sentences, concessive part with a complex structure acts as an adverbial modifier of concession. Almost all pure concession subordinators of analysis (except for the subordinator «though, as» in the inversion case) appear as an important element of the adverbial modifier of concession: Ah! What are words to love like mine, Though uttered by a voice like thine [L. Byron 1966: 10]; Though marveling at the name of Magna Chorta, yet well he recollects the laws of Sparta [L. Byron 1966:29]; Though drinking deeply, thirsting still the more, yet when confinements lingering hour was done [L. Byron 1966: 97];

Such simple extended sentences express concessive relationships with one or two propositions like complex sentences with adverbial clause of concession: Even if everything bitterly, she did not forget eating; Although well-known in his country, he went on making success.

The usual place of the adverbial modifier of concession in the sentence is at the beginning of the sentence, and in some cases it appears in the middle and at the end of the sentence:

This type of adverbial modifier of concession is formed in the following models:

Concessive conj+VpI; Concessive Conj+VpII;
Concessive Conj+ Gerund

Concession and pure concession subordinators and combinations with nouns, adjectives, pronouns, numbers, and adverbs are common in English. Oh! Would it stone to lead me still, although death or deadliest ill! [L. Byron 1966.138]. Though few the members theirs the strige, hat neither spares nor speaks for life [L. Byron 1966.116]; Though soft it seemed the low prophetic dirge [L. Byron 1966.241].

This type of concession has the following basic models: Concessive Conj. +N; Concessive Conj. +Adj; Concessive Conj. =Prn; Concessive Conj. +Adv. They express the semantics of concession when the prepositions *in spite of, despite, irrespective of, for all, with all, notwithstanding* are linked with

nouns: I admire him, in spite of his faults; The lost the fight, for all his boasting.

It is worth noting that among them, «in spite of» is characteristic of all speech styles. The preposition «Despite» is typical to formal style, while «not with it standing» is more typical to legal texts. «For all» and «with all» are mostly used colloquially. This category of prepositions is based on the following models: Pred+ N; Part ing prep+P1

The interrogative pronouns used to express various adverbial and non-adverbial meanings together, and the «ever» adverb and connectives, which appeared from the adverbial combination, also serve to express concession in the structure of a simple sentence: Whatever your problems they can't be worse than mine; However great the pitfalls, we must do our best to succeed [Quirk 1982: 285]; Whater the weapon, cudgel, fist, or fail, non reach expertness without years of tail[L. Byron 1966.434].

«No matter and wh-, No matter how» also perform the function of a concessive part with a mixed meaning in a simple sentence: No matter how young, It is one of the things she wholly comprehends[Dreiser SC:25], If passion met not some reward -no matter how or where, or why, I did not warmly seek, nor sigh [L. Byron 1966: 133] No matter, throw your ornaments aside[L. Byron 1966: 447].

The authors of Uzbek Language Grammar (Vol. II, 1976) state that they are similar to adverbial clauses in terms of intonation with adverbial modifier of concession. However, as they do not have a subject and predicate relation, they are not considered subordinate clauses, but detached parts: [Uzbek Grammar 1976: 154]

Adverbial modifier of concession is expressed by adding the particles «ҳам» or «ҳамда» to the conditional form of the verb, the form of the participle with the affixes «-(и)б» and «(а)й», by the construction with the participle and the suffix containing the words «билан», «-га қарамай, қарамасдан». У қўрқса ҳам ўзини кўрқмасликка

солди; У менинг овозимни эшитса-да, индамади; Кўра -била туриб бепарво бўлди; У ёш бўлгани билан жуда кўп китобни ўқиб чиққан; Қиш чилласининг совуғига қарамасдан, астойдил ишлаб бинони битказдик [“Тошкент бинокори”] [Uzbek Grammar, 1976: 153–154].

In the expression of the meaning of concession, the compounds with the auxiliaries “қарши, қарамай, қарамасдан, яраша” play an important role.

For example, the compounds with «қарши» represents an action, a situation that is concessive to the content understood through the part of the sentence. The auxiliary «қарши» governs a past participle or a noun: Қизни, унинг хоҳишига қарши, турмушга бериб юбордилар.

In combinations with auxiliaries “қарамай, қарамасдан” the governed part is usually expressed by a noun, a gerund, a past participle. The governed word is in the dative case: Эртаси кучли бош оғриғига қарамай, Амир Мўғул кучсиз ҳаракатга тушди [Ойбек]; У ёш бўлишига қарамай жуда ақлли; кийим боши эски бўлишига қарамасдан, озода эди.

As is seen from the last two examples, the governed word does not come with «бўлмоқ. In this case, when the conjunction expresses the past tense, it takes the form of the adjective, when it expresses the present tense, it takes the form —ш(–иш). Sometimes a possessive suffix (mainly in the 3rd person form) can appear in the conjunction. The combination of the demonstrative pronoun “шу (шундай, шунга) and “қарамай, қарамасдан” has the semantics of concession. Such conjunctions come as a separate part, the above conjunctions come as connecting devices that put two or more sentences into a meaningful and structural relationship with each other (instead of the previous sentence, the content is contrary to it) in the text. The combinations “шундай эса-да, шундай бўлса ҳам” also express concessive relations between two or more sentences: У жуда ёш. Шунга қарамай, катталардек

фикрлайди; У бетоб эди. Шундай эса-да, ўқишга борди.

Also, «яраша» *while* is used with a participle or a gerund expresses the meaning of concession. In such cases, the verb is in the dative case. Кўп ўқилганига яраша билими саёз; Тун-у- кун ишлаганига яраша у ночор яшайди.

The combinations with the auxiliary word “билан” (participle (II)+билан) may also express the meaning of concession: Бошқаларга хўмрайиб қарагани билан, ҳеч нарса айтмади. [ЎТГ, II 1976: 63]

Results

The word “қатъи назар” governs the noun, gerund and participle and expresses the meaning of concession: Лекин, бундан қатъий назар ҳукуматга ёрдам бериш бизнинг биринчи вазифамиз бўлиши керак. (Ойбек).

It should be noted that the meaning of concession, as in complex sentences with adverbial clauses of concession, is combined with the interrogative pronouns and words «қарамай, қарамасдан, билан, қатъий назар» and express mixed meanings of degree and measure, time, place, purpose, manner, object, subject, attribute. У ҳар қанча ҳаракат қилгани билан, ишни вақтида тугата олмади; У қачон келишидан қатъий назар, ишни бугун тугатишимиз керак; Қаерда, қай аҳволда эканлигидан қатъий назар, *майит хурмат эҳтиром билан дафн этилди.*

Қай бирини (қайтишини) танлашни билмагани билан энг яхшисини-танлаши аниқ эди. Ҳар қандай азобни енгишга тайёр эканлигига қарамай, шифокорлар буни хоҳламадилар; Буни ҳар ким билгани билан мен билмайман; Мақсадимиз эзгулик бўлгани билан буни ҳамма ҳам тушуниб етмайди.

Such simple extended sentences of mixed type implicitly express concession.

«whether...or» expressing the meaning of generalized alternative concession also acts as an adverbial modifier in a simple sentence: whether (living)

in London or not, John enjoyed himself [Quirk 1982:285];

There are cases where «whether» is also dropped in colloquial speech style: Gentleman or no gentleman, Patsy what are your intentions? [B. Shaw 1972: 239] You see, sleep or no sleep, hunger or no hunger,

tired or no tired, you can always do thing ... [B. Shaw 1976: 30]

Syntactic means that express concessive relations have systemic relations with one another. One can observe the following rows of synonyms (13 in English, 11 in Uzbek) among syntactic constructions. For example:

I. Carrie shook her head in spite of her distress	N/prn+V+ in spite of +N
Carrie shook her head despite her distress.	N/prn+V+ despite +N
Carrie shook her head regardless of her distress.	N/prn+V+ regardless of+N
Carrie shook her head irrespective of her distress.	N/prn+V+ irrespective of+N
Carrie shook her head not with standing her distress.	N/prn+V+ not with standing+N
II. Келаман деб келмадинг	Vfut+деб+N/prn+Vneg
Келаман десанг хам келмадинг	Vfut +десанг+хам+Vneg
Келаман десангда келмадинг	Vfut +десанг+да+Vneg
Келаман деганинг билан келмадинг	Vfut +деганинг билан+Vneg
Келаман десанг хамки келмадинг	Vfut+десанг+хам+ки+Vneg
Келаман дединг, лекин (бирок, аммо) келмадинг	
Vfut+дединг+ лекин (бирок, аммо) + Vneg	
Келаман деганинга қарамай, келмадинг	Vfut+деганинга +қарамай+Vneg
Келаман деганинга қарамасдан, келмадинг	Vfut+деганинга+қарамасдан+Vneg

Conclusion

English, Uzbek and other world languages possess a wide set of syntactic constructions with simple and composite structures. To them belong simple sentences with concessive parts, adverbial clauses of pure concession, adverbial and non-adverbial clauses with mixed concessive component, compound sentences with adversative conjunctions and two

independent sentences at least with concessive relations.

They form the nominative field of the concept of concession, the constituents of which possess systematic relations with one another. They are formed in accordance with the language rules of the compared languages. Isomorphic, allomorphic and specific features help experts to develop general theory of linguistic conceptology.

References

1. Амосова Н. Н. Основы английской фразеологии. – Ленинград: Издательство Ленинградского университета, 1983. – 208 с.
2. Бабушкин А. П., Стернин И. А. Когнитивная лингвистика и семасиология. – Воронеж: ООО «Ритм», 2018. – 229 с.
3. Богородицкий В. А., Общий курс русской грамматики, Москва, -Л., 1935,-Ст.230
4. Влавацкая М. В. Типы концепта и понятие сочетаемости В сб. Язык и национальное сознание Вып. 14. – Воронеж: Истоки, 2010. – С. 14–26.
5. Влавацкая Марина Витальевна. Юбилейный библиографический указатель Книги, статьи и другие работы за 1998–2021 гг. Новосибирск 2021.

6. Колшанский Г. В. О природе контекста // Вопросы языкознания, 1959. № 4.
7. Махмудов Н. Эргаш гапли қўшма гаплар. Ўзбек тилининг мазмуний синтаксиси. –Т.: Фан, 1992.
8. Нурмонов А., Махмудов Н., Ахмедов А., Солихўжаева С., Ўзбек тилшунослигининг мазмуний синтаксиси, Т., Фан.,- Б. 222.
9. Новосибирский государственный технический университет научная библиотека им. Г.П. Лыщинского.
10. Kimball L. G. Structure of English sentence, New York, Chicago, American book company 1900;
11. Пименева М. В. Методология концептуальных исследований В. Антология концептов. Том 1. – Волгоград: Парадигма, 2005. – С. 7–19.
12. Попова З. Д., Стернин И. А. Когнитивная лингвистика. Учебное издание. Москва АСТ: «Восток-Запад» 2007.
13. Поспелов Н. С., О грамматической природе, сложного предложения. Сборник «Вопросы синтаксиса современного русского языка» М., 1950, -Ст.330
14. Sweet H. 1891, P. Goyen 1894, J. Nesfield 1954, T. Thompson 1956, Onions 1978, V. Pritian 1980
15. Топорова В. М. Методика исследования концептуальных блоков В.сб. Язык и национальное сознание. Вып. 14. – Воронеж: Истоки, 2010. – С. 40–48.
16. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати, ЎТИЛ, 1976, Тошкент, 1 қисм.