# Synonymy of Auxiliary Head Agreement Forms with Other Agreement Forms

**M.Embergenova**

Associate professor of the Department of "methodology of primary education" of the NSPI, candidate of philological Sciences

**Abstract**

A person who uses the language in the way of his goals uses not only lexical means, but also various grammatical elements. To express an idea clearly and colorfully, it selects the intended ones from word forms, combinations of words, sentences in mutual synonymous communication. Synonyms expressing such spiritual and methodological closeness are divided into grammatical and syntactic synonyms.

**Key words**: synonymous cases occur, productively in the language, grammatical attitudes and connections

## Introduction

The synonym for grammatical forms in Karakalpak has not been specifically studied in Karakalpak. Only the forms of agreement are synonymous with A.Studied by Bekbergenov.

The forms of agreement are used productively in the language, since they are conjunctions of words in a sentence, indicating different grammatical attitudes and connections. In connection with this, synonymous cases occur in their application. They are used in such a process with and without facilitators, and are close to each other in meaning.

This work has been presented on various occasions and in various stages of incarnation in Paris, Los Angeles. I wish to thank those in the audience who have helped me to bring out my ideas more clearly and who have pointed out numerous deficiencies of earlier versions. Thanks go to Katherine Demuth, Alan Dench, Jan van Eijck, Hans-Martin, Willi Geuder, Hubert Haider, Ed Keenan, Ben Keil, Hap Kolb, András Kornai, Anoop Mahajan, Gereon Müller, David Perlmutter, Ed Stabler, Markus Steinbach, Kees Vermeulen, Albert Visser and Ralf Vogel. I owe special thanks to Markus and Ralf for long discussions in Potsdam on argument structure and polyvalence. I am deeply indebted to Albert, András and Hans-Martin for their enthusiasm, without which such an endeavor is not possible. Above all, thanks to Johanna Domokos for her patience with me, for helping me with Finnish and Hungarian and her rich knowledge of languages about which I had never heard before.

The last 30 or so years have seen an enormous unfolding of formal semantics sparked off by Montague Grammar. Likewise, Generative Grammar for somewhat longer has been the major syntactic theory. Both have established themselves as something of a lingua franca in linguistics. Yet, there is a problem that besets both of them: they disregard agreement morphology. For both theories, structure is all that counts. A sentence is analyzed in structural terms and morphology often appears to be a mere luxury. Both Montague Grammar and Generative Grammar thus share a certain disregard for the surface. This is in sharp distinction to the earlier stages of linguistics where form was the primary target of study. Time has come for a synthesis.

## Materials and Methods

A.N.Gvozdev views the spiritual closeness of the prepositional and prepositional forms of the Russian language as morphological synonymy.

M.F.Palevskaya, on the other hand, considers them syntactic synonyms. According to the author, words of different agreement can be meaningless or synonymous with each other only in the composition of vocabulary. For this reason, such devices need to be considered only in syntax. We consider this idea quite businesslike.

True, the forms of agreement cannot be interchangeable absolute synonyms. Perhaps they are only in the meaning aspect, but they approach each other. Scientists believe that" to some extent, as The Shape of information changes, its content will also change", since they will have a built-in and methodological color.

The synonymy of present-day Karakalpak forms of agreement is a clearly visible phenomenon. To this, changes in the later periods of the Karakalpak language, extra linguistic factors (social changes in society, influence of Russian and other languages) gave a great impetus to change its internal construction. This issue is addressed by A.Bekbergenov paid a little attention.

In this article, we will dwell on the cases of coming into synonymy with other forms of agreement of the general forms of agreement used with the supporters of the current Karakalpak language.

2. Support head agreement-revenue agreement: I will tell you what you have done (T.Kaipbergenov). I will tell you what you have done. He is the one who is the one who is the one who is the one who is the one who is the one who is the one who is the one who is the one who is the truth.Kaipbergenov). Those who said remember Mirjiq Aytmurat red Betti ES.

Thus, words in the form of a head agreement in Karakalpak come in a synonymic relationship with words in other agreements. However, they, as we noted above, differ from each other in their methodological signs, even if they are somehow close in meaning. For this reason, they also require thorough study.

The synonymy of such supportive and non-supportive forms of agreement in Karakalpak allows them to be used for various methodological purposes, replacing them in certain contexts.

This is not so unusual; we can interpret the variable handling in terms of X-bar rules, while the morphological component expresses the category of the item. This will of course be refined later; but it works as a rough guide for things to come. This theory assumes no syntactic structure and no movement. In addition, it does not even distinguish morphology and syntax. However, more realistically one should think of it as a lexica list theory on a par with categorical grammar. The combinatory of the words are encoded in the argument structure, and there is nothing beyond it that matters. The argument structure also contains information about string manipulations. One will inevitably find that such a theory meets a number of challenges. Verb second is a case in point. In German, the finite part of the verb occupies the second place in the sentence; however, it typically leaves behind the verbal prefix and all the other stuff that normally precedes it in a subordinate clause. The solution that I have adopted is to allow constituents to be discontinuous. This is in line with recent trends that also read the Minimalist Program as a theory of discontinuous constituents. Another important issue is computational complexity. Montague Grammar relies on the typed λ-calculus to do the argument handling and variable substitution. It is known that reduction of typed expressions is very expensive unless they are of the form that we assume here: a function being applied to several arguments, none of which is complex. Since Montague Grammar is quite inflexible in the way it handles its arguments a lot of argument shuffling is needed to assume correct processing. This constantly requires applying a function to a dummy variable and reinstructing it. The present framework deliberately makes variable handling more flexible and thereby achieves a flat type structure. The gain is an algorithm that processes sentences in polynomial time, the exponent being quite low.

Chapter 3 deals with the basics of Montague Grammar and how the composition of meaning is achieved in it. We shall briefly comment on the problematic aspects of it and introduce a new semantics based on Referent Systems,

Referent systems treat variables as anonymous; during the merge of two semantically representations, the names that they have in each representation cannot be shown to the outside. There is however an agreed set of so-called names, by which variables can be identified under merge. We shall assume that the names are principally form related; that is to say, they contain information about the morphological shape of the sign. Additional information is the sort of the variable and the direction where the sign is found. For example, the variable of the subject of a sentence in German is the one carrying nominative case, while in English, it is both case (for pronouns) and the fact that it is to the left of the verb. The collection of statements that tell us which variable is identified under what name is called argument structure. Chapter 4 introduces another novelty: parameters. It is claimed that in addition to making certain formal variables (referents) cross identify each each, there are plenty

of variables over specified domains (mainly time, world, person and location) that are taken along and are unified in tandem with the other referents. The mechanics of parameters is however somewhat different, as they consist mainly of contextual parameters known already from Montague's work on pragmatics. It is claimed here that parameters each induce sequencing effects, as are now well known from the literature. For example, property ascriptions typically are time dependent, in which case they are also called stage-level predicates. (We avoid using the terminology since it is of no further significance here and we want to avoid any commitment to an accompanying theory of such predicates.) One is the director of a company for a certain stretch of time only. On the other hand, the time dependency hardly shows up in the form of an argument. It does matter on the other hand in expressions like former or ex-. The time variable has a different behavior from typical argument variables simply because it is not identified by an overt property. Parameters therefore function differently. There is a small number of roles each of which address a context variable. For time variables, these are story time, predication time and reference time. Parameter statements link actual variables to these roles. They eventually get their values through the context. It is possible to relink variables to different roles, and this causes what is known as sequence of tense. This mechanism is not restricted to tense.

**References:**

1. Bekbergenov A. stylistics of Karakalpak "Karakalpakstan" 1990, 49-50-p.

2. Grammar of Karakalpak literature (word formation and morphology)., 1994, 137-138-p.

3. Gvozdev A. N. essays on the stylistics of the Russian language. M, 1955, P.153.

4. Palevskaya M. F. synonym in Russian language. M, Prosveshchenie, 1964, p.87.

5. Bragina A. A. synonyms in literary language. M, Nauka, 1986, p.113.

6. Bekbergenov A. analysis of the morphological structure of Karakalpak in the latest literature. - The problems of the development of the Karakalpak language. Nukis, "bilim", 1993, 70-71-p.

7. Bekbergenov A. stylistics of Karakalpak. Nukus, "Karakalpakstan", 1990, p.50.