This research work which is about Homogeneous Sentences in Uzbek language intends to bring to other future scholars a clearer idea and a brief but very precise description. There are four specific sections that are covered within this research work, such as: introduction, new approach to the sentence structure and the problem of homogeneous sentences, conjunctive means of homogeneous sentences and the use of homogeneous sentence.

The first section of this research work is an introduction to the Uzbek language which has developed for many years based on grammatical structures of the Russian language influence which later on came into existence the Uzbek formal (traditional) linguistics due to the work of many prominent Uzbek linguists and scholars. Within this research work, the author touches the very substantial part of the Uzbek linguistics approach to the structure of simple sentence in the Uzbek language and also a pattern of small structure of the sentences was given.

As Uzbek is a Turkic language meaning that it is the first official and only declared national language of Uzbekistan, this theme of homogeneous sentences hasn’t been studied by far or very little was studied by any other scholar. The sentences being studied by this author appeared to differentiate from simple to complex by their structure. This can be seen from the study of their patterns, for example, simple sentence has a pattern [WPM], while the complex sentence has the pattern, such as: [{[W1Pm1RW2Pm2].n}], whereas homogeneous predicative simple sentence has the pattern [{W1RY2}.n Pm]. Such sentence unit which is called homogeneous takes a particular place in the Uzbek language and has the pattern, such as: [{S(W1RPW2,W2RW3].n}Pm].

According to the author, the existence of the homogeneous sentence in the Uzbek language derives and it is proven at the time of independence. Such sentence pattern is comprised of simple, complex sentences and texts, and it enables the writers and poets to describe the colorfulness and richness of Uzbek language as a mother tongue.

In the second section, the author describes the traditional approach to the sentence structure and the theoretical analysis criteria. According to this author, theoretical analysis criteria of Uzbek traditional syntax developed on the basis of Russian linguistics based on the following sentence patterns: a) Simple sentence consists of two principle parts – subject and predicate coordinated to each other; b) Complex sentence consists of two or more simple sentences coordinated to each other; c) Predicate reports about the subject; it follows only the subject; it sequences with the subject in person and number; d) Defining simple and complex sentences depends on the subject.
In Uzbek linguistics the interest to study the history of the syntax of sentence was studied on the basis of traditional, that is the tendency in which the phenomena of language and speech were not distinguished.

As the homogeneous sentences in Uzbek language differ from the simple sentences, they are completely different from the complex sentences as well. The smallest structure pattern of the complex sentences is made on the basis of the smallest structure pattern of the simple sentences, such as: [(АБ1, Кк1 АБ2 Кк2)]. On the basis of a homogeneous sentence the smallest structure pattern [АБКк] of a simple sentence was analyzed. Homogeneous sentences resemble simple sentences by having [АБ] and others. But having at least two [АБ]s and the [АБ]s forming each other by [Кк] distinguish homogeneous sentences from simple sentences.

While analyzing homogeneous sentences, the author presented some problems that need to be studied further. Such problems are as follows: the problem of the units in the element parts of homogeneous sentences. Expressing [Э] and [АБ] units in such parts, their possessiveness of expanders; element parts of [Кк] unit, putting them “out of the bracket”; from the element parts of [Кк] putting the linguistic unit in additional form, such as a word, a word combination “out of the bracket”; connection of the parts; the use of conjunctive means in them; distinguished features of homogeneous sentences from simple sentences; relation of homogeneous sentences with typical types of composite sentences; the question of homogeneous predicates in homogeneous sentences, and the use of homogeneous sentences.

Additionally, the author in this section informs readers about the use of homogeneous sentences which is very interesting and that they have particular features. According to the author, homogeneous sentences serve to represent mainly an event, a natural scenery, different aspects of human activity, life, and so on. Homogeneous sentences may also be used individually or in complex sentence. For example:

O’n to’rt kunlik oy O’rda ko’pringinig chap yonidagi baqaterak uchida oltin barkashday porlab turar, qoramtir tiniq ko ’kda sochilgan tarqoq yulduzlar chaqnardi. (X.G’ulom)

A fourteen-day moon was shining like a gold platter on the top of the black poplar on the left of the bridge Urda, the stars spread in the blackish clear sky were sparkling.

In the first part of the example shining of the moon, and in the second part sparkling of the stars are described and in order to express this description homogeneous sentences are used, no connecting conjunction is used between their parts. The ending –di is coordinating the two parts. Although I chose to present the analysis of this example of the most frequently used homogeneous sentences, also, there are still many other Uzbek derivatives like this that the autor of this monography presents.

Furthermore, when talking about the phenomenon of homogeneity, of course, the problem of coordinating unit should stand at the first place. Thus, the author in her study also elaborates the conjunctive means of homogeneous sentences.
For homogeneity of the sentence parts, the author says that there should be a coordinating unit. This coordinating unit is used in sentence parts and it appears in three forms: as an affix, as a word and also in the form of multiple word, e.g.: bo‘larekan, bo‘laremish.

The units comprising the chain of homogeneity may be formed grammatically in two different ways. First, when the coordinating unit may join each part, and second when the coordinating unit comes with the last part. According to the author, this feature has been widely studied by Turkologist scholars and Uzbek linguists. No matter how grammatical formation of the parts of homogeneous chain could be, they should be approached as an entirety.

This phenomenon is clearly seen when it comes after the last part of the coordinating unit, in this case the author mentions A.N. Kononov’s opinion when saying that: “Морфологический элемент может быть присоединен только к последнему члену, когда перечисляющиеся члены как бы сливаются в один сложноорганизованный член предложения”. This opinion was encouraged by A.G. Gulomov and other Uzbek linguists, too.

The coordinating unit coming together with the last part is mainly a stylistic feature of the Uzbek language. This phenomenon comes out from the point of view of syntactic economy and doesn’t allow repetition. The coordinating unit coming together with the last part does not depend only on the above-mentioned phenomena. The use of organizing unit may change the meaning of some derivatives. For example: u yozayotgan, ukasi televizor ko‘rayotganedi. (He was writing, his brother was watching TV). In the example the coordinating unit –edi is added to the next part, it is uniting the two parts. If we use this unit after each part, U yozayotgan edi. (He was writing) Ukasi televizor ko‘rayotgan edi. (His brother was watching TV) we will have two sentences which can be used independently. Aholisi ham, maydoni ham Moskvadan, Leningraddan, Kievdan keyin to‘rinchi o‘rinda turar ekan. (Both its population and territory stand in the fourth place after Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev).

Usually, when talking about homogeneity, it is meant that a unit coordinates around something. But this coordinating unit is not always used. In the example above –dan is general for three parts and coordinates them. The parts Aholisi ham, maydoni ham have all the features particular to homogeneous parts, therefore, they are considered to be as homogeneous parts (in these sentences – the subject). Though a coordinating unit is not used in these parts, we explain them as homogeneous subjects. It should be mentioned that when one talks about homogeneity it cannot be the same for all parts of the sentence and that is normal.

In the final section of this monograph, the author concludes that the problem of homogeneous sentences hasn’t been studied as an individual theme. This phenomenon is called “a middle third”, and one should study it specifically. Homogeneous sentences have been out of analysis up to the present time, such structures are used very often in Uzbek language, though.

Subsequently, the author adds that homogeneous sentences were studied on the basis of the patterns taken from Russian language, same as simple and complex sentences. The phenomenon in Russian called “однородные предложение” was translated into Uzbek as “uyushgangaplar” or
“uyushiqgaplar”. The term “однородные” used in Russian is correctly used for the parts of the sentence, but not sentences. The term “Homogeneous parts or homogeneous sentences” in Uzbek is correctly used for both phenomena. Homogeneity means to be coordinated, united around any unit/element. Homogeneous sentences are distinguished from the simple and complex sentences by the existence of this coordinating unit. The smallest structure pattern of homogeneous sentences is defined from the [АБКк] taken for the basis of simple sentences [{(Э1–АБ1), (Э2–АБ2)}Кк].

Homogeneous sentences can neither be studied in simple sentences, nor in complex sentences. This derivative resembles with simple sentences on one side, and with complex sentences on the other. The common side is using the predicate in both homogeneous sentences and simple and composite sentences, too; but, the difference is the necessity of using the subject.

It is not necessary to use the subject individually as a part of sentence in simple and complex sentences. In such sentences the subject is analyzed together with all the other parts of the sentence. We can see the common and distinguished sides of them in the following patterns, too: [АБКк] – Simple sentence; [{(Э1–АБ1), (Э2–АБ2)} Кк] – homogeneous sentences; [АБ1 Кк1 РАБ2 Кк2] – composite sentence. In traditional linguistics these derivatives were studied on the basis of the following patterns: [ S ←P] – Simple sentence; [S1←P1], [ S2 ← P2], [S3←P3] – Homogeneous sentences; [S1←P1]: [ S2 ←P2], [S3←P3] and other forms; (S1 ←P1), ( S2←P2) – complex sentence.

Homogeneous sentences are very often met in the typical type of complex sentences, such as: [АБКк, АБКк], and in the typical type of sentences such as: [АБКкАБКк] are met less. In homogeneous sentences generalized words and sentences are also met. Their analysis needs a special study commitment.

Finally, the author accentuates that the derivative of homogeneous sentences is frequently used in the literary style of the Uzbek language. The writers use homogeneous sentences, mainly, to describe human life, its mental state and other various events. It is not a simple description, but it includes the expression of different events, too.