PHRASE THEORY: PHRASE TYPES AND SUBTYPES: COORDINATE, SUBORDINATE AND PREDICATIVE PHRASES

Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla qizi

Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek The faculty of Psychology, department of Foreign languages

Phylology and foreign languages

Student of group 302-21: Abirqulov Abdulla Ulug'bek o'g'li

Annotation: This article explores the relationship between sentence typology, clause types, and clause structure within the framework of Cognitive Grammar (CG). It highlights how Cognitive Grammar, developed by Ronald Langacker, challenges traditional syntactic theories by emphasizing the role of human cognition in language. The article defines and discusses the three primary clause types—declarative, interrogative, and imperative—showing how they align with different communicative intentions and cognitive processes. It also examines the cognitive underpinnings of clause structure, where the organization of subject-predicate relationships reflects conceptualizations of events and states. The article argues that cognitive grammar connects syntax to meaning by focusing on how mental representations shape linguistic constructions. Through this lens, sentence structures are seen not as rigid syntactic forms but as dynamic reflections of human thought and experience. This work contributes to a deeper understanding of the fluid, context-dependent nature of language, offering an alternative to formal syntactic theories by focusing on the cognitive aspects of linguistic expression.

Key words: Cognitive Grammar, sentence typology, clause types, clause structure, declarative clauses, interrogative clauses, imperative clauses, subject-predicate structure, cognitive processes, role and reference grammar, event structure, syntax and meaning, mental representations, communicative intent, cognitive linguistics.

Cognitive grammar (CG), developed by Ronald Langacker, represents a significant shift in linguistic theory by emphasizing the role of human cognition in shaping language. This approach rejects the rigid, formal distinctions found

in traditional generative grammar, instead focusing on the conceptual grounding of linguistic structures. Central to cognitive grammar is the idea that language reflects human cognitive processes, and sentence typology—specifically, clause types and clause structure—serves as a key area where cognitive principles can be observed in action.

In cognitive grammar, sentences are viewed as dynamic constructions that are shaped by both cognitive and communicative needs. Unlike in formal syntactic theories, where sentences are structured in a tree-like hierarchy governed by abstract rules, CG emphasizes the conceptual nature of sentence structures. This article explores how clause types and clause structure are understood within cognitive grammar, highlighting their cognitive underpinnings.

Cognitive Grammar and Clause Types

Clause types in cognitive grammar are not strictly categorized according to syntactic criteria but are instead defined by the speaker's communicative intent and the conceptual relationship between the elements of the clause. There are three primary clause types in CG:

1. **Declarative**
2. **Clauses**
   Declarative clauses express statements or assertions. They serve the function of providing information. In cognitive grammar, the declarative clause structure is seen as a conceptualization of a particular state of affairs that the speaker believes to be true or real. The subject of a declarative clause is typically construed as the "experiencer" or "actor," and the predicate often represents an event or state that involves the subject.

Example:*"The dog is barking."* Here, the speaker is asserting the state of the dog's action (barking), with the dog as the subject of the clause.

3. Interrogative Clauses Interrogative clauses are used to ask questions. In CG, questions reflect a cognitive shift in the conceptualization of the

clause, where the speaker seeks new information or clarification about the state of affairs. Interrogative clauses are generally marked by question words (e.g., who, what, where) or by inversion of the subject and auxiliary verb.

Example:*"Is the dog barking?"* The clause represents a shift in the speaker's cognitive focus, where the speaker is now seeking confirmation or further details about the dog's action**.**

4. Imperative Clauses Imperative clauses are used to issue commands, requests, or invitations. These clauses have a direct, action-oriented function, and in cognitive grammar, they are understood as an expression of the speaker's will or desire to influence the behavior of the addressee**.**

Example:*"Bark!"* In this case, the speaker is directing the addressee (implicitly understood) to perform the action of barking.

Each of these clause types reflects different cognitive and communicative intentions, with declarative clauses representing assertions, interrogative clauses involving a search for information, and imperative clauses signaling a desire for action.

Clause Structure in Cognitive Grammar

Clause structure in cognitive grammar is also tied to how concepts are structured in the mind. Instead of viewing clause structure as an abstract syntactic configuration, CG posits that it reflects how speakers conceptually organize their experience of events, states, and actions.

1. **Subject-Predicate** **Structure**

2. One of the core elements of clause structure in cognitive grammar is the subject-predicate distinction. The subject is conceptualized as the "figure" in the event, and the predicate represents the "ground" or the relational element that provides context to the figure. This dynamic reflects the

cognitive distinction between what is being talked about (the subject) and what is being asserted about it (the predicate).

Example:*"The dog (subject) is barking (predicate)."* Here, the dog is the subject, and the predicate (barking) describes an action or state related to the subject**.**

3. Role and Reference Grammar (RRG)
   A more refined view of clause structure within CG involves the distinction between arguments and adjuncts. Cognitive grammar emphasizes the idea that the core arguments (like the subject, object, etc.) of a sentence are central to the conceptualization of the event, while adjuncts provide additional, contextual information. The subject and object roles are cognitive constructions that correspond to different types of participants in an event, such as the "agent" (the one performing an action) or the "patient" (the one receiving the action).

Example:*"The dog (agent) chased the ball (patient)."* Here, "dog" is the agent, the one initiating the action, and "ball" is the patient, the entity undergoing the action.

4. Cognitive Models of Event Structure
   Cognitive grammar posits that the structure of the clause mirrors the structure of events as conceptualized by speakers. Event structures typically involve participants (e.g., agents, patients), actions (e.g., chasing, eating), and relations (e.g., cause-effect, location). The way these elements are ordered in a clause reflects how the speaker mentally organizes them.

In addition to these basic structures, cognitive grammar recognizes that clauses can be expanded with various modifications, including adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases, and relative clauses. These elements modify the conceptualization of the event or state and can add further cognitive detail, such as time, manner, or location**.**

Cognitive Underpinnings of Clause Structure

The cognitive foundations of clause structure in CG are rooted in the idea that the mind does not create abstract syntactic structures independently of the world. Instead, it organizes and represents experience through symbolic constructions. The structure of a sentence mirrors the mental processes involved in encoding an event or state. In this sense, cognitive grammar connects syntax to meaning by showing how human cognition shapes the way we talk about events and relationships.

For example, the subject-predicate distinction reflects how we mentally separate the "actor" (subject) from the "action" or "state" (predicate). The flexibility in clause types, such as in questions or commands, highlights the dynamic nature of conceptualization, where the speaker's intent governs the way elements are structured and combined.

Conclusion

Sentence typology in cognitive grammar, with its focus on clause types and clause structure, provides a robust framework for understanding how language reflects cognitive processes. By emphasizing the conceptual and communicative motivations behind different types of clauses and the structural organization of sentences, cognitive grammar offers insights into the mental representations that underlie linguistic expression. Rather than viewing sentence structures as rigid syntactic patterns, cognitive grammar highlights the dynamic, flexible nature of language as a reflection of human thought and experience. In conclusion, cognitive grammar's approach to sentence typology and clause structure offers a nuanced perspective on how language reflects cognitive processes. By focusing on the conceptual motivations behind clause types—such as declarative, interrogative, and imperative—cognitive grammar emphasizes the speaker's communicative intent as the driving force behind sentence construction. Furthermore, the flexibility in clause structure, where elements like subject and predicate represent the cognitive organization of events, underscores the deep connection between language and thought. This perspective not only enriches our understanding of syntax but also demonstrates how language is a tool for

organizing and conveying our experiences, thoughts, and intentions. Ultimately, cognitive grammar highlights the fluid, context-dependent nature of language, challenging traditional formal approaches and offering a more holistic view of the relationship between cognition and linguistic expression.

REFERENCES

1. **Langacker, R. W. (1987).** *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Volume 1: Theoretical Perspectives*. **Stanford University Press.**

2. **Langacker, R. W. (2008).** *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. **Oxford University Press.**

3. **Croft, W. (2001).** *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. **Oxford University Press.**

4. **Taylor, J. R. (2002).** *Cognitive Grammar and the Construction of Meaning*. **Oxford University Press.**

5. **Goldberg, A. E. (1995).** *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. **University of Chicago Press.**

6. **Talmy, L. (2000).** *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Volume 1: Conceptual Structure, Grammar, and Event Structure*. **MIT Press.**

7. **Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006).** *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. **Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.**

8. **Teshaboyeva, N., & Mamayoqubova, S. (2020). COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH TO LANGUAGE TEACHING. In МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ (pp. 409-414).**

9. **Teshaboyeva, N. (2020). LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY, ITS STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS IN THE NEW PERSPECTIVE DIRECTIONS. In МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ (pp. 415-420).**

10. **Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2019). TEACHING ENGLISH THROUGH LITERATURE INTESL AND TEFL CLASSROOMS. In**

СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ, ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ И ИННОВАЦИИ (pp. 82-84).

11. Хидирова, Д., & Тешабоева, Н. (2022). Pedagogical conditions for the development of the healthy thinking in students. Zamonaviy innovatsion tadqiqotlarning dolzarb muammolari va rivojlanish tendensiyalari: yechimlar va istiqbollar, 1(1), 120-122.

12. Gaybullayeva, N. D. K., & Kizi, T. N. Z. (2022). THE ROLE OF INNOVATIVE METHODS FOR LISTENING COMPREHENSION IN TEACHING LANGUAGE LEARNERS FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND MAINLY ENGLISH. *Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS)*, *2*(10), 8-10.

13. Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla qizi, Jurayev Muhammadrahim Murod o'g'li, & Mamirova Munisa Rajab qizi. (2021). Language Learning Culturally and the Role of Literature in Teaching Process. *Central Asian Journal of Theoretical and Applied Science*, *2*(3), 1-5. Retrieved from **https://www.cajotas.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJOTAS/article/view/84**

14. Teshaboyeva, N. (2023). THE IMPORTANCE OF TOURISM IN PRESENT DAY. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).

15. Teshaboyeva, N. (2023). THE MODERN INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).

16. Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2023, November). Adjective word group and its types. In " Conference on Universal Science Research 2023" (Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 59-61).

17. Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2023, November). Modifications of Consonants in Connected speech. In " Conference on Universal Science Research 2023" (Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 7-9).

18. Teshaboyeva, N., & Rayimberdiyev, S. (2023, May). THE IMPORTANCE OF USING MULTIMEDIA TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING ENGLISH CLASSES. In Academic International

Conference on Multi-Disciplinary Studies and Education (Vol. 1, No. 8, pp. 149-153).

19. Nafisa, T., & Marina, S. (2023). TEACHING AND LEARNING OF ENGLISH VOCABULARY IN TESL AND TEFL CLASSROOMS. International Journal of Contemporary Scientific and Technical Research, 465-469.

20. Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla kizi, & Akramov Ibrohimjon. (2023). WORD FORMATION. COMPOUNDING. "XXI ASRDA INNOVATSION TEXNOLOGIYALAR, FAN VA TA'LIM TARAQQIYOTIDAGI DOLZARB MUAMMOLAR" Nomli Respublika Ilmiy-Amaliy Konferensiyasi, 1(12), 109–113. Retrieved from https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/itfttdm/article/view/3187

21. Teshaboyeva, N., & Yakubova, N. (2023). CHANGES OF MEANING OF WORDS. Центральноазиатский журнал образования и инноваций, 2(12), 126-129.

22. Sharifova Dinora Tohir qizi, & Teshaboyeva Nafisa. (2023). " NOUNS AND THEIR GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES". Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке, 2(16), 292–297. извлечено от http://nauchniyimpuls.ru/index.php/noiv/article/view/13128

23. Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla kizi, & Akramov Ibrohimjon. (2023). WORD FORMATION. COMPOUNDING. "XXI ASRDA INNOVATSION TEXNOLOGIYALAR, FAN VA TA'LIM TARAQQIYOTIDAGI DOLZARB MUAMMOLAR" Nomli Respublika Ilmiy-Amaliy Konferensiyasi, 1(12), 109–113. Retrieved from https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/itfttdm/article/view/3187

24. Qodirova Aziza Yunusovna, & Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla qizi. (2023). "VERBS AND THEIR GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES". Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке, 2(16), 280–283. извлечено от http://nauchniyimpuls.ru/index.php/noiv/article/view/13126

25. Tuxtayeva Aziza Ilhom qizi, & Teshaboyeva Nafisa. (2023). Word Formation: Compounding . "Conference on Universal Science

Research 2023", 1(12), 113–115. Retrieved from https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/cusr/article/view/3185

26. Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla, & Iskandarova Sarvinoz Shukurullo qizi. (2023). THE CLASSIFICATION OF SYNONYMS AND THEIR SPECIFIC FEATURES. "XXI ASRDA INNOVATSION TEXNOLOGIYALAR, FAN VA TA'LIM TARAQQIYOTIDAGI DOLZARB MUAMMOLAR" Nomli Respublika Ilmiy-Amaliy Konferensiyasi, 1(12), 126–131. Retrieved from

https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/itfttdm/article/view/3191

27. Тешабоева, Н. (2023). Teaching writing as a major part of productive skills in mixed ability classes . Информатика и инженерные технологии, 1(2), 652–656. извлечено от https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/computer-engineering/article/view/25759

28. Teshaboyeva, N., & Yakubova, N. (2023). WORD FORMATION. COMPOUNDING. *Development of pedagogical technologies in modern sciences*, *2*(12), 187-192.

29. Teshaboyeva, N. (2023). Compound sentences in the English language. *Yangi O'zbekiston taraqqiyotida tadqiqotlarni o'rni va rivojlanish omillari*, *2*(2), 68-70.

30. Nafisa, T. (2023). THE USA ECONOMY, INDUSTRY, MANUFACTURING AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF GREAT BRITAIN. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RECENTLY SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHER'S THEORY*, *1*(9), 94-97.

31. Nafisa, T. (2023, December). Secondary ways of word formation. In *" Conference on Universal Science Research 2023"* (Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 109-112).

32. Nafisa, T. (2023). VOWELS AND THEIR MODIFACATIONS. *Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке*, *2*(16), 298-305.

33. Nafisa, T. (2023, December). Secondary ways of word formation. In *" Conference on Universal Science Research 2023"* (Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 109-112).

34. Nafisa, T. (2023). THE EDUCATION SYSTEM OF THE USA: PRESCHOOL EDUCATION, SECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION, SCHOOL FORMS. *The Role of Exact Sciences in the Era of Modern Development*, *1*(6), 53-57.

35. Qizi, T. N. Z., & Umedovich, M. Y. (2023). AMERICAN-BASED PRONUNCIATION STANDARDS OF ENGLISH. *Scientific Impulse*, *2*(15), 563-567.

36. Nafisa, T. (2023, December). Word Formation: Compounding. In *"Conference on Universal Science Research 2023"* (Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 113-115).

37. Nafisa, T. (2023). NOUNS AND THEIR GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES. *Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке*, *2*(16), 292-297.