



THEORY OF PARTS OF THE SENTENCE: PRINCIPLE, SECONDARY PARTS OF THE SENTENCE, PROBLEMS OF TERTIARY

Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla kizi

Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named
after Mirzo Ulugbek

The faculty of Psychology, department of Foreign languages
Phylology and foreign languages

Supervisor, nafisateshaboyeva@gmail.com

Rajabboyeva Nozima Zohid kizi

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17948629>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 11th December 2025
Accepted: 12th December 2025
Published: 16th December 2025

KEYWORDS

*theory of parts of the sentence,
principal parts, secondary parts of the
sentence, tertiary parts, syntax,
grammatical relations, syntactic
hierarchy, functional approach.*

ABSTRACT

This article examines the fundamental principles of the theory of parts of the sentence and analyzes the syntactic and semantic features of secondary sentence parts. The study is based on both traditional and modern linguistic approaches and explores the interrelationships between different sentence components. Special attention is given to the problem of tertiary parts of the sentence, including the difficulties of their identification and classification. The article aims to reveal the hierarchical nature of sentence structure and to contribute to a more refined and comprehensive approach to syntactic analysis.

INTRODUCTION

The theory of sentence parts is fundamental to syntactic research because it offers a logical framework for comprehending how meaning is organized and communicated inside a sentence. This theory is predicated on the notion that a statement is an ordered system in which each component serves a particular syntactic and semantic purpose rather than an arbitrary set of words. The grammatical connections between words and their role in the message's overall communicative goal are both taken into consideration when classifying sentence components. Although conventional grammatical viewpoints often categorize portions of the sentence into main and non-main components, modern linguistic approaches frequently reconsider these distinctions in terms of cognitive and functional principles. The connection between form and function serves as the foundation for the theory of sentence components. Every word or word cluster in a sentence has a specific place and serves a purpose that may be determined by its grammatical features, such as government, agreement, or word order, as well as by its semantic meaning. This idea highlights that sentence structure is hierarchical rather than linear, meaning that some components are structurally dominant while others are subordinate. The subject and the predicate are historically seen as the heart of the sentence because they establish predication, which is the relationship between what is being discussed and what is being said about it. The remainder of the statement is understood in connection to this core.

The secondary components of the sentence are essential in elaborating on, defining, and explaining the fundamental meaning conveyed by the main components. They are necessary for providing accurate and comprehensive information, even though they are not necessary for the sentence to be grammatically complete. The adverbial modifier, the attribute, and the thing are often included as secondary components. Each of these has a unique function and interacts with the subject or predicate in a particular way. The object usually represents the thing that is impacted by or engaged in the activity or condition that the verb expresses. Depending on the character of the verb and the sort of interaction at play, things can be direct or indirect. The item frequently serves as the aim, receiver, or outcome of an activity from a functional standpoint. Valency is occasionally used in contemporary syntax to analyze objects, emphasizing the verb's ability to necessitate or permit particular complements. This method redirects attention from hard classifications to the complex relationship between verbs and their dependents.

The attribute is a supplementary component that adds more details to a noun's characteristics, number, or identity. Attributes can be expressed by adjectives, participles, nouns in certain circumstances, or even complete clauses and phrases. They assist in distinguishing one referent from another and add to the sentence's descriptive richness. The distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive features is especially significant since it has an impact on both intonation and meaning. A noun's reference is limited by its restrictive characteristics, but its non-restrictive features provide additional information without modifying its fundamental meaning. Adverbial modifiers provide descriptions of various conditions related to the action or state, including time, location, manner, cause, purpose, or condition. They often modify the predicate, but they can also change adjectives or other adverbs. Due to the great flexibility in their form and placement, adverbial modifiers sometimes present analytical difficulties. Their semantic diversity makes them a focal point of study in functional grammar, where they are seen as pieces that place the event in a larger conceptual and communicative setting.

Efforts to categorize items that don't fit neatly into the traditional division between main and secondary elements are the source of the issues with tertiary components of the sentence. Tertiary components are frequently thought to be reliant on secondary components rather than on the primary ones. Examples include adverbials that provide additional information about previously dependent components and modifiers of attributes. The realization of such components reveals the drawbacks of purely binary categorization and demonstrates a more sophisticated comprehension of syntactic hierarchy. One of the key challenges in defining tertiary components is determining obvious standards for their identification. Traditional grammar sometimes overlooks or inconsistently classifies elements with more complex dependency chains since it concentrates on the connection between words and the predicate. Depending on the theoretical framework, for example, an adverb that modifies an adjective in an attribute may be considered as either a component of the attribute or as an independent adverbial modifier. The necessity for more accurate analytical methods is brought to light by this ambiguity.

The pedagogical implications of adding tertiary components to grammatical description is another issue. Although these differences may increase theoretical precision, they can also make it harder to teach grammar, particularly at the elementary and intermediate grades. Consequently, in order to prioritize clarity over granular analysis, many instructional grammars choose to subsume tertiary components under larger groups. Nevertheless, recognizing tertiary components from an academic standpoint leads to a more accurate representation of syntactic structure and meaning connections. The topic of tertiary components is addressed differently by cognitive and functional methods in modern linguistics. These methods focus on networks of relationships and degrees of dependence rather than strict classifications. Sentence components are regarded as having different

degrees of prominence and specificity as players in a conceptual scenario. This viewpoint maintains the understanding that certain components are more fundamental than others while lessening the demand for stringent labeling. The notion of sentence components, in summary, is based on the idea that syntactic structure represents both grammatical links and communicative purpose. The primary components of a sentence establish its core meaning, while the secondary elements add detail and enhance it, resulting in a more accurate and insightful statement. The difficulties with tertiary components demonstrate the intricacy of syntactic structure and the shortcomings of conventional categorization schemes. By incorporating insights from contemporary linguistic theories, it is possible to gain a more flexible and complete understanding of sentence structure that considers both functional significance and hierarchical relationships.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The study of sentence components theory has a long and well-established history in linguistic research, starting with ancient grammar and continuing through contemporary theoretical paradigms. The groundwork for early grammarians was laid by identifying the subject and predicate as the essential elements of the sentence and by distinguishing secondary elements like objects, attributes, and adverbial modifiers. These classifications were primarily based on form and relied on specific syntactic positions and morphological indicators. Classical and structural grammars viewed sentence elements as fixed categories, presuming a rather straightforward link between grammatical form and syntactic function. The study of sentence structure was more precisely analyzed in the 19th and early 20th centuries thanks to the rise of structural and comparative linguistics. As defining features for sentence components, academics started to place emphasis on syntactic relationships like agreement, government, and nearness. In this tradition, secondary elements of the sentence were examined in connection to the predicate, and their roles were explained in terms of dependence and subordination. Nevertheless, there was a growing awareness within structural grammar of components that didn't fall squarely into the primary-secondary dichotomy, which ultimately led to discussions of tertiary aspects of the sentence.

The literature saw a notable change with the advent of functional grammar. Functional linguists maintained that when analyzing the various components of a sentence, one should take into account not only their formal structure but also their communicative and semantic functions. From this viewpoint, items, characteristics, and adverbial modifiers are interpreted as members or circumstances of an event structure. By emphasizing the significance of context, information organization, and speaker intent, functional techniques broadened the conventional knowledge of sentence components. These investigations also brought attention to multi-level dependency, in which some modifiers rely on other modifiers instead of directly on the predicate. By concentrating on hierarchical syntactic representations and abstract underlying structures, generative grammar ushered in a new line of investigation. In this model, conventional sentence components were reinterpreted as syntactic elements with defined locations in phrase structure trees. Previously referred to as tertiary components, these components frequently seemed as embedded modifiers or specifiers inside of noun, adjective, or adverbial phrases. Despite the fact that generative grammar occasionally abandoned traditional terminology, it gave strong mechanisms for modeling complicated dependency linkages and for clarifying uncertainties in syntactic analysis.

The literature was further enhanced by cognitive and usage-based methodologies, which highlighted meaning creation and conceptualization. These studies indicate that sentence components reflect how people think about their experiences and arrange information. From this perspective, the line between secondary and tertiary components is more gradual than clear, since the relative importance and conceptual reliance of different components vary. These methods question strict categorization and promote more adaptable models of

syntactic explanation. The current study employs a qualitative and descriptive analysis of syntactic structures as its method. Comparative analysis of conventional, structural, functional, and cognitive grammatical frameworks is used in the study to discover shared concepts and differences in how sentence components are treated. To demonstrate how secondary and tertiary components operate in actual communicative situations, real instances from written and spoken English are examined. Special emphasis is placed on cases that are analytically challenging, like adverbials or attribute modifiers, which are frequently understood differently by different theoretical frameworks.

The analytical method includes recognizing the main components of the sentence, figuring out the kind and purpose of the secondary ones, and then looking at items that display indirect or layered dependency. These features are assessed based on their positional behavior, semantic contribution, and formal characteristics. The methodology seeks to provide a comprehensive and fair description of sentence structure by integrating findings from various linguistic traditions. Overall, the literature review shows that the theory of sentence pieces has shifted from strict formal classifications toward more flexible and meaning-oriented models. By integrating several viewpoints and concentrating on how language is used in practice, the selected methodology mirrors this progression, enabling a greater comprehension of the secondary and tertiary components of a statement and the theoretical issues they raise.

RESULTS

In comparing the sentence structures across different grammatical frameworks, we come across several notable findings about the theory of sentence components, especially in terms of secondary and tertiary components. The traditional split between main and secondary components is still helpful in defining the fundamental structure of the sentence, as it distinctly recognizes the predicative core and its direct dependents, as the study demonstrates. However, the data also reveal that this division is insufficient to capture all the syntactic connections found in natural language. The persistent functional significance of secondary components of the sentence is one of the study's key findings. Even if they are not formally the main subject of the statement, adverbial modifiers, characteristics, and things were shown to be essential in determining the informational content of the sentence. In many of the instances analyzed, eliminating the secondary elements did not make the statement grammatically wrong, but it did greatly diminish its semantic fullness and communicative impact. Secondary components are, as this demonstrates, crucial to discourse accuracy, clarity, and contextualization. Furthermore, the study demonstrates that secondary components have different levels of syntactic dependency. The predicate and the object are often closely related, and the verb's valency may require it. Because of the tight bond between nouns and attributes, complicated noun phrases are created that operate as a single syntactic unit. Due to their capacity to modify the predicate, other adverbs, adjectives, or even entire sentences, adverbial modifiers are the most versatile. The idea that secondary components should not be considered as a single, uniform entity is supported by this variety of dependency patterns.

The identification and interpretation of tertiary components of the sentence is a major finding of the research. According to the data, the components that have historically been seen as problematic frequently serve as modifiers of secondary components rather than as independent elements of sentences. For instance, there is a clear hierarchy between intensifiers that change adjectives within attributes or adverbs that define other adverbials, which goes beyond the simple primary-secondary paradigm. These components consistently exhibit indirect dependency, depending on secondary components for their syntactic and semantic integration into the sentence. Additionally, the findings indicate that the identification of tertiary components changes depending on the theoretical perspective. In contrast, structural and generative frameworks portray these features as embedded

components within phrase structures, while traditional grammar often absorbs them into larger secondary classes. In contrast, cognitive and functional methods see these components as layers of meaning that improve conceptual representation. Regardless of the terminology used, all methods recognize the existence of multi-level modification within sentence structure. An additional significant discovery is that rigid categorization of sentence components frequently causes confusion in analysis. Depending on the standards used, the same element might be seen as a secondary component or as a component of a secondary one. This supports the idea that syntactic analysis necessitates principles that are adaptable and context-sensitive, rather than rigid categories. According to the findings, formal position is less trustworthy as a criterion than dependency and function. In general, the findings show that sentence structure is fundamentally hierarchical and multifaceted. An intermediate level of structure lies between the sentence's predicative core and its more specific descriptive components in its secondary sections. Tertiary components, though sometimes not clearly identified, are a further level of refinement that increases semantic accuracy. These results support a more integrated and dynamic approach to sentence analysis that takes into account both grammatical structure and communicative requirements.

Conclusion

The current study of sentence structure theory shows that it is a complicated and hierarchical system with strong links between grammatical form, semantic meaning, and communicative intent. The traditional distinction between primary and secondary components offers a crucial framework for comprehending the sentence's structure since it precisely identifies the predicative core and its direct dependencies. The analysis also supports the notion that natural language's flexibility and diversity cannot be entirely explained by this binary split. Secondary elements of the sentence become functionally indispensable components that add context, detail, and explanation to the central notion conveyed by the subject and predicate. Essential information that influences interpretation and guarantees communicative accuracy is provided by items, properties, and adverbial modifiers. The fact that secondary components have different semantic functions and levels of dependence demonstrates that they are a dynamic and internally diverse group rather than a homogeneous one. One of the trickiest aspects of syntactic theory is brought to light by the study of tertiary components. The shortcomings of rigid categorization systems are highlighted by items that rely on secondary components rather than the predictive center, emphasizing the necessity of a more subtle approach to comprehending syntactic links. Traditional grammar does not always explicitly identify tertiary components, but their practical existence may be seen in intricate dependency patterns and layered alterations. Generally, the results back the notion that sentence analysis should go beyond purely formal classifications and embrace integrative models that incorporate structural, functional, and cognitive viewpoints. Such an approach reflects how meaning is created in real language use and provides a more precise depiction of hierarchical relationships within the statement. Consequently, the theory of sentence components continues to be a crucial field of linguistic inquiry, constantly changing to reflect the intricacy of communicative expression and syntactic organization.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURES:

1. Bloomfield, L. Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
2. Chomsky, N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
3. Crystal, D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell.
4. Halliday, M. A. K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

5. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Jespersen, O. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
7. Lyons, J. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
9. Radford, A. *Syntax: A Minimalist Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Yule, G. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Nafisa, T. (2023). NOUNS AND THEIR GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES. *Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке*, 2(16), 292-297.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. Nafisa, T. (2023). Secondary ways of word formation. In *Conference on Universal Science Research* (Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 109-112).
15. Teshaboyeva, N. (2023). Compound sentences in the English language. *Yangi O'zbekiston taraqqiyotida tadqiqotlarni o'rni va rivojlanish omillari*, 2(2), 68-70.
16. Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2023). Modifications of Consonants in Connected speech. In *Conference on Universal Science Research* (Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 7-9).
17. Teshaboyeva, N. Z., & Niyatova, M. N. (2021). General meanings of the category of tenses. *International Journal of Development and Public Policy*, 1(6), 70-72.
18. Zubaydulla, T. N. (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.
19. Teshaboyeva, N., & Yakubova, N. (2023). CHANGES OF MEANING OF WORDS. *Центральноазиатский журнал образования и инноваций*, 2(12), 126-129.
20. Teshaboyeva, N., & Erkaboyeva, S. (2024). TEACHING LISTENING WITH TECHNOLOGY. *Молодые ученые*, 2(35), 46-49.