



THE PROBLEM OF TEXT AND SYNTACTIC DERIVATION

Turniyazova Shakhnoza Nigmatovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Doctor of Philology (DsC)

ANNOTATION

The types of texts in the article are an example of the real use of linguistic methods in speech, which, in turn, is directly related to the concept of "system". theoretical views have also been shown to apply in practice. It is also argued that a macromat differs from a microtext in its semantic properties and syntactic nature, which can be seen primarily in the breadth of its semantic weight and the specificity of its syntactic formation.

KEYWORDS. *macrottext, microtext, syntactic derivation, system, structure, paragraph, derivative.*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of text is broad, and its expressive material can range from a simple grapheme to a large-scale work. Therefore, the use of the terms "micro" and "macro" in the linguistic interpretation of the text seems appropriate. In this case, the concept of "micro" can be used effectively in the interpretation of small texts, and the concept of "macro" in the interpretation of large texts.

It should be noted that the text, whether micro- or macro-, reflects an example of the actual use of language techniques in speech. This, in turn, is directly related to the concept of 'system', since the unit of language, whatever its size or appearance, is used in real speech, which at the same time indicates that the language system is also used in practice. Hence, we see that the language system is manifested in speech in any form of text. If the text format is small, the microsystem is active, and in large texts, the macrosystem is active in practice. All this is inextricably linked with the derivational features of the text event. In other words, the rules of derivation of microtexts are drastically different from the rules of derivation of macromatnas. In addition, when a microtext enters its composition as a component of a macromatne, it changes its status, and at the same time, the laws directly related to it also lose their practical force.

THE MAIN PART

It should be noted that a macromat differs from a microtext in its semantic properties and syntactic nature. We see this first of all in the breadth of its semantic weight and in the specificity of its syntactic formation. However, the concept of macromatn is also of a relative nature, since, from a paragraph of a text to a chapter and a specific work, lecture, project, article, and so on. k. All types can be considered macromatn according to their semantic and syntactic weight. Of course, we are not able to analyze all of these types of text at once. Therefore, in our work we are limited to paragraph analysis.

A paragraph is a unit of speech, which is formed at the request of the speaker (author of the work) in order to partially limit one semantic expression from another. M. As Hakimov rightly points out: "The division of any text into paragraphs marks the beginning of new messages based on a small topic. ... The author's correct division of ideas into paragraphs helps the reader to understand his emotional state"¹.

The formation of a paragraph and the expression of a particular semantic integrity are, of course, directly related to the chain connections of its constituent clauses and complex syntactic devices. In this case, each

¹ Hakimov M. X. Syntagmatic and pragmatic features of the Uzbek scientific text // Candidate dis. abstracts. - Tashkent 1993, 4 pages.



component of the paragraph, in addition to giving a specific idea, also serves for the general idea.

It should be noted that a paragraph is inextricably linked with the written form of the text and forms a certain part (part) of it. Even in the oral form of the text, it is possible to note semantically rounded passages bounded by pauses, but they cannot be equated with the semantic integrity conveyed by a paragraph. Because in the oral form of the text, the semantic boundary that occurs between two paragraphs is never observed.

According to the Czech scholar K. Gauzenblas, text is a category of speech, and this category is inextricably linked with the concepts of "speech process" and "product of the speech process." In this, K. Gauzenblas, as mentioned in part in the first chapter of our work, understands the speech process as oral speech, and the product of the speech process as written speech. However, the written form of the text (even the dialogic text) can meet the demand for scientific research. In its oral form, intermittent sentences, various repetitions (citation phenomenon), and incomplete sentences are undoubtedly causing more than normal difficulties in research work due to the frequent use of particle devices. However, this does not mean that the oral form of the text cannot be studied. Of course, a number of problems related to its oral form can be solved in the linguistic study of dialogic speech. Research has been done by our linguists in this regard as well. Today, when text linguistics is on the agenda, the issue is being taken more seriously.

It should also be noted that the paragraph we are currently focusing on is A. M. Peshkovsky and many other linguists understood it as a logical category, and as a result its linguistic interpretation has been largely ignored until now. However, in our modern linguistics, where text linguistics is a priority, the linguistic interpretation of the paragraph is legitimately on the agenda of our research.

Based on the above, in this work we recognize the paragraph as a macromat and focus on its linguistic interpretation.

As a macromattext, a paragraph can include a variety of syntactic devices - sentence, complex syntactic device, elliptical sentence, particle and application devices. In this case, they all come in place as a paragraph component.

The syntactic devices that come in a paragraph (regardless of size) interact with each other in the first place according to the semantic plan. Therefore, in almost all existing literature on text analysis, the text, including paragraphs, is studied as a product of speech related in this context. However, the syntactic relationship of text components has not yet been literally addressed in the linguistic literature. However, there is no doubt that the study of the syntactic relationship of text components is also important.

It should be noted that any type of text (all micro- or macromatnas) has a predicative sign. While the text is semantically whole, expressing a complete idea, it cannot be imagined without the concept of predicative.

It should be noted that there are types of text represented by a complex syntactic device, sentence, phrase, single word, or even a simple grapheme, and in this study it is not possible to comment on all of them. we go out

Up to the present stage of development of the science of derivatology, research has been conducted in the field of syntactic derivation on the basis of materials of phrases, simple and compound sentences. In other words, the culmination of the application of the syntactic derivation theory is still a joint statement. The question of the study of the derivational properties of speech units larger than speech has only just begun to be put on the agenda. Therefore, this study is one of the first works in the field of text derivation.

We have already mentioned above that the Polish linguist Eji Kurilovich first commented on syntactic derivation. However, he understands syntactic derivation in a much narrower sense. In his view, a derivative always relies on the lexical meaning of the base sentence, and the lexical units in the derivative should not differ from it. However, the final product of a syntactic derivation (derivative) may also differ in content from the base sentence, because in transformation the derivatives formed on the basis of the applicative model differ in content, even if they are semantically the same.

At this point, it seems appropriate to refer to the research of VS Khrakovsky. According to VS Khrakovsky, syntactic derivation means a sentence formed on the basis of a particular sentence, so that the



sentence is legally different from the previous one in terms of its grammatical status and content (Lola read a book - Lola began to read a book).

According to VS Khrakovsky's linguistic concept, in the process of syntactic derivation, the question of whether a sentence formed on the basis of a certain semantic task can be the basis for the formation of a sentence performing a second semantic function is of paramount importance. It is emphasized that the preceding sentence is a basal device¹.

In our opinion, the main focus of VS Khrakovsky's theory is on the expansion of the semantic and syntactic structures of speech. In addition, the word is currently referred to mainly in the chapter on the study of the problem of simple sentence derivation. This theory is not very suitable for the material of a compound sentence (complex syntactic device), because it considers not only one sentence, but more than one sentence. At present, it is mainly assumed that a particular device receives derivative activity on the basis of two or more devices. True, the issue that Khrakovsky is focusing on is directly related to the phenomenon of syntactic derivation. However, we are talking about a single model (applicative model) that creates a syntactic derivation. However, syntactic derivation also occurs on the basis of a transformational model.

The research of IP Raspopov and SN Sychyova in the study of syntactic derivation of sentences also provides exemplary information. They understand the syntactic derivation of a sentence by the transformation of one device into another through a derivative-forming morpheme. In this case, the content integrity of the basal device must be preserved². At the same time, the phenomenon of syntactic derivation is equated to transformation.

In the derivation theory of IP Raspopov and SN Sychyova, the nominalization of transformation, substitution and the transformation of active devices into passive devices are of paramount importance. However, this does not mention the type of derivation associated with the expansion of the syntactic form of the sentence. VS Khrakovsky does not equate transformation with the

phenomenon of derivation, but studies it separately as a creative theory³.

It should also be noted that when we talk about transformation, of course, we focus on the phenomenon of syntactic synonymy and see it in separate transformations. However, in some research works, for example, "Modern Russian" (1989) it is noted that there should be no basal or invariant and derivative concepts within syntactic synonyms. In the above-mentioned work "Modern Russian", too, syntactic derivation means the formation of a second sentence on the basis of a particular sentence. However, it also states that the product structure may be semantically more complex than the basal structure⁴.

S.D. Katsnelson discusses lexical and syntactic derivation at the same time and notes: "If in other aspects of language structure derivation is a source of information about the role of paradigmatic series elements, in syntax it is a means of branching language elements in a syntagmatic sequence chain.

In other words, syntactic derivation is a dynamic structure, not a static concept that determines the position of this or that unit in the language system⁵.

It is possible to fully agree with this consideration that, unlike lexical derivation, syntactic derivation is dynamic. This feature distinguishes syntactic derivation.

O.I. Moskalskaya understands the complexity of the grammatical structure of speech as a result of the introduction of new semantic elements in addition to syntactic derivation, and concludes: tools have not been well studied so far"⁶.

In the research of L.N. Murzin, the phenomenon of syntactic derivation is also studied in comparison with the transformation. At the same time, serious attention is paid to the issue of creating a product structure on the basis of a specific statement. The

³ See Khrakovskiy V.S. Transformation and derivation // Problems of structural linguistics -1972.- M.: Nauka, 1973.P. 489-507.

⁴ See: 78. Modern Russian language. - M.: Higher School, 1989. P. 674-675.

⁵ Katsnelson S.D. Typology of language and speech thinking. L.: Nauka, 1972. P. 8.

⁶ Moskalskaya O.I. Semantics of the text // Questions of linguistics, 1980, No. 6. P.32-42.

¹ . See Khrakovskiy V.S. Transformation and derivation // Problems of structural linguistics -1972.- M.: Nauka, 1973.P. 489-507.

² . See. Raspopov.



scientist interprets syntactic derivation as a formal phenomenon and emphasizes the following: "Syntactic derivation belongs to the formal (explicit) type of derivation. Its product differs from the original unit not only semantically, but also formally¹.

This view of L.N. Murzin, in our opinion, seems quite controversial. Moreover, this consideration of the scientist does not take into account the applicative model, which has creative power such as transformation. Of course, derivatives are also formed within the application model. But at the same time the derivative always differs from the basal structure in the breadth of its content.

Although L.N. Murzin's concept of derivation focuses on the principle of "product from product", it refers mainly to derivative devices that are the result of transformation. In our opinion, the primary product structure is formed from the base structure, and the base structure is formed from the primitive structure. Nevertheless, it is also necessary to take into account the expansion of the syntactic form of the sentence when deriving from the product. At the same time, in contrast to the transformation, the resulting structure differs in the breadth of the content of the basal structure.

Although L.N. Murzin acknowledges that the derivation process is relatively infinite, in his research he speaks only of the phenomena of contamination, conversion, and compression, which are manifestations of transformation. This, of course, begs the question. If compression requires a certain form of syntactic derivation, then why cannot the expansion of the form of speech have such a status? It is also possible to create infinite derivatives by expanding the form of speech.

It should also be noted that by compression or shortening the syntactic form of a sentence, we submit to the reverse method. In other words, in compression we move from the superficial syntactic structure of the sentence to the base structure, and from the base structure to the primitive structure. As a result, the smallest nuclear structure, not a derivative, is formed in the operation. In the form of a compression method, the derivation process ends when the base structure is reached. In our view, the derivation process should

¹ Murzin L. N. Fundamentals of derivatology. – Prem, 1984, p. 26.

always be associated with the formation of a derivative structure.

It should be noted that the study of the structure of the text, the main categories, as well as the process of its formation, in other words, the study of derivational features, is as important for text linguistics².

Approaching the structure of the text in terms of complex syntactic devices and the integration of other major components of the text along a horizontal line requires the study of its syntactic structure, in other words, the syntactic relationship of text components. This, in turn, is inextricably linked to text derivation. After all, a derivative approach to the text allows it to be studied as a structure-based, semantically shaped system. In general, each component of the text continues to activate its syntactic and semantic connection in sequence. The text forms a system that binds them together, forming an integral whole with respect to its constituent component.

The specificity of macromatnas is reflected in their size. We can expand the text as much as we want according to its size, but even so, it is not infinite, since the text will eventually be complete anyway.

It should also be noted that some linguists emphasize that there is no need for text linguistics to study the theoretical aspects of a text. In particular, T.B. Bulygina writes in this regard: "Despite some peculiarities in the connection of sentences in the text, in my opinion, the text does not form a special structure. At the same time, the features of the text do not go beyond the sum of the features of the sentences in it"³.

We find a similar idea in the views of Daskal and Margalit. In their view, there is no need to shape text theory. Because the grammar of a sentence, as long as it is fully developed, can also express all the features of the text⁴.

In our opinion, it is impossible to agree with these views, of course. Such an approach to the issue can lead

² See: Turniyozov N., Yuldashev B.- Textual linguistics.- 2006, pages 29-30.

³ Bulygina T.V. about the boundaries between a complex unit and a combination of units. - In the book: Units of different levels of the grammatical store of the language and their interaction. M., 1967.

⁴ Dascal M., Margalit A. A New Revolution in Linguistics! Texts-Grammars' vs «Sentence-Grammars». - In: Theoretical Linguistics, 1974, v.1, N 1/ 2.



to the misconception that the sentence structure and the text structure are exactly the same. In fact, just as the whole and its parts never have the same position, it is also incorrect to assume that the text consists only of the sum of the properties of the sentences it contains.

It should also be noted that the text, whether small or large, is subject to a general rule in the form of a system. In other words, any type of text also consists of a set of elements that interact as a specific system.

Although the system is a rounded object of interconnected language elements, it is, in turn, discrete (divisible). This reality is one of the most basic and important aspects of any system¹.

Importantly, an integral connection is formed not only between the structures of the text components and the macrostructure, but also between the macrosystem in the text template and the microsystems of its components. So, while one of the concepts of system and structure is real, the other is required to exist as well. Therefore, it is difficult to imagine them in isolation. In the words of Prof. Yu. Stepanov, a system is a whole made up of interconnected elements. The interrelationships between these elements form the structure of the system. In other words, the structure of language means the reality that consists of the relationship between a phoneme, a morpheme, a word, a phrase, and a sentence.²

In our opinion, it is possible to agree with Yu. Stepanov's comments on the system and structure. But the inclusion of phrases and sentences in the set of means that make up the structure of language is controversial, since both of them are formed in speech. The concepts of system and structure within the context of the text discussed above also find expression in speech. In other words, at the text level we see a new expression of the concepts of system and structure that arise as a result of the transfer of language to speech. The concepts of system and structure are used in language in the same way as in speech. However, the material of their expression changes in speech.

CONCLUSION

As we studied text derivation, we encountered many difficulties, of course. These include, first of all, the definition of the derivation operator, the definition of the basic structure, the study of the principles of syntactic formation of the text, the identification of aspects of text derivation as opposed to the derivation of speech. The interpretation of all these issues has to be approached independently.

REFERENCES

1. *Hakimov M. X. Syntagmatic and pragmatic features of the Uzbek scientific text // Nomzodlik dis. abstracts.- Tashkent 1993, 4 pages.*
2. *Hausenblas K. Věstava jazykových projevu a styl.- Praha, 1972.- C.67.*
3. *Khrakovsky V.S. Transformation and derivation // Problems of structural linguistics -1972.- M.: Nauka, 1973. P. 489-507.*
4. *Modern Russian language. - M.: Higher School, 1989. P. 674-675.*
5. *Katsnelson S.D. Typology of language and speech thinking. L.: Nauka, 1972. P.8.*
6. *Moskalskaya O.I. Semantics of the text // Questions of linguistics, 1980, No. 6. P.32-42.*
7. *Murzin L. N. Fundamentals of derivatology. – Prem, 1984, p. 26.*
8. *Turniyozov N., Yuldashev B.- Textual linguistics.- 2006, pages 29-30.*
9. *Bulygina T.V. about the boundaries between a complex unit and a combination of units. - In the book: Units of different levels of the grammatical store of the language and their interaction. M., 1967.*
10. *Dascal M., Margalit A. A New Revolution in Linguistics! Text-Grammars' vs «Sentence-Grammars». - In: Theoretical Linguistics, 1974, v.1, N 1/2.*
11. *Solntsev V. M. Language as a system-structural education.- M., 1971.- P. 11.*
12. *Stepanov Yu.S. Fundamentals of General Linguistics.- M., 1975.-P.228.*

¹ Solntsev V. M. Language as a system-structural education.- M., 1971.- P. 11.

² Stepanov Yu.S. Fundamentals of General Linguistics.- M., 1975.-P.228.