



Comparative syntactic devices as an object of language study

Anvar IBAEV¹

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received July 2021

Received in revised form

20 July 2021

Accepted 15 August 2021

Available online

15 September 2021

Keywords:

composite syntactic

constructions,

complex syntactic integers,

period,

super phrasal unity.

ABSTRACT

Analyzed the composite syntactic constructions in the structions. Also, a phrase, a sentence and complex syntactic wholes are considered as a text, i.e. the above syntactic constructions, depending on the circumstances, which are considered as the text. In addition, some judgments were noted that complex syntactic wholes can also be called the terms period and over-phrasal unity.

2181-1415/© 2021 in Science LLC.

This is an open access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Қиёсий-синтактик мисоллар тилшуносликнинг ўрганиш объекти сифатида

АННОТАЦИЯ

Калит сўзлар:

мураккаб синтактик

конструкциялар,

компоратик синтактик

бирликлар,

давр,

ўта катта ибора бирлиги.

Мазкур мақолада қиёсий-синтактик конструкцияларнинг тилшуносликда ўрганилиш ҳолати ҳақида фикр билдирилган. Жумладан, сўз бирикмалари, гап ҳамда мураккаб синтактик конструкцияларнинг тилшуносликнинг ўрганилиш объекти эканлиги, улар ҳам вазиятга қараб матн мақомида кела олиши айтиб ўтилган. Мураккаб синтактик конструкцияларнинг давр, жумладан ўта катта ибора бирлиги номлари билан ҳам айтилишига муносабат билдирилган.

¹ Lecturer, Department of Theory and Translation, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan.

E-mail: anvar.ibaev@mail.ru.

Сравнительно-синтаксические примеры как объект изучения языкознания

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ключевые слова:

компаративные синтаксические конструкции, сложные синтаксические целые, период, сверхфразовое единство.

В статье проанализированы компаративные синтаксические конструкции. Так же рассмотрены словосочетание, предложение и сложные синтаксические целые как текст, т.е. вышеуказанные синтаксические конструкции смотря по обстоятельствам рассматривается как текст. Кроме этого, были отмечены некоторые суждения о том, что сложные синтаксические целые могут так же именоваться терминами период и сверхфразовое единство.

Nowadays, the fact that language is a system is recognized by almost all linguists. Therefore, as in recent years in all disciplines, attention is paid to systematic research in linguistics.

In the history of linguistics, syntactic devices have been studied mainly from a formal point of view, and only occasionally has attention been paid to its semantic aspect.

Sentence was interpreted as a whole that was formally divided into certain elements and, at the same time, composed of the grammatical and semantic relations of certain elements. Apparently, even in traditional linguistics, the systemic nature of sentence is recognized, even intuitively. But not enough attention has been paid to the relationship between the elements that create the complete sentence.

Although the history of the study of syntax has its own centuries-old tradition, there are still differing opinions on the subject of its study.

Up the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, in syntactic theory, the focus was not on the whole (speech) but on its parts. As a result, linguists have focused on studying the functions of word groups and word forms in speech. Such a view (morphologism) arose as a result of increased attention to the formal side of grammatical analysis and the national identity of languages.

Criticizing of the syntax of the parts of speech, Reese condemns the inconsistency of the system of syntactic materials in the synthesis of parts of speech, the lack of a clear boundary in determining the status of the object of syntax. And he himself recommends that grammar can be divided on the basis of two interrelated principles. One is the syntactic opposition of word and phrase, and the other is the qualitative opposition between form and content. The subject of syntax, according to Y. Rees, should be a phrase, taking into account both the form and the content aspect.

The view of the object of syntactic examination also affects the Russian linguists F.F. Fortunatov, M.N. Peterson, A.M. Peshkovsky, and in their works this concept has found its lucent expression.

Academician V.V. Vinogradov, a well-known Russian linguist, struck at the idea that syntax is a doctrine of word order. He argues that the subject of syntax is the study of the rules and methods of combination of words and phrases, as well as the types of phrases and sentences, their structure, function and conditions of use, the laws of development.

Obviously, V.V. Vinogradov admits that the object of study of syntax is the word combination and speech. Components of both phrase syntax and sentence syntax are explored under the heading of syntactic devices. Accordingly, we can also include complex syntactic devices in the list of syntactic devices. If we study these devices from a comparative point of view, we will have to consider the difference between exactly two languages (we have English and Uzbek) based on the principles of contrasting linguistics. In this case, similar aspects arise automatically.

Based on the given ideas, one can call phrases and sentences small comparative syntactic devices and complex syntactic devices large comparative syntactic devices.

It is obvious that, phrases have served as the object of linguistic research in world linguistics from past centuries to the present. The English and Uzbek languages we are studying are no exception, of course.

According to V.V. Vinogradov, phrases belong to the system of communicative category of speech. They can transmit certain information only within a sentence or through a sentence.

Phrases, like words, are among the nominative means of language, and at the same time serve as a building material used in the process of communication. The story consists of this material and informs about the reality.

I.P. Ivanova and V.V. According to the Burlakovs, a syntactic device known as a phrase is a group of words that is related to any group of syntactically formed groups or any existing type of syntactic connection such as disregard the remark, busy life, on the beach, under the net, in the corner. In our view, both views on the phrase are objectionable. Because the phrase V.V. As Vinogradov said, speech cannot be a building material. In this regard, NK Turniyazov rightly states:

“According to us, it is expedient to study both the interrelation of independent words with independent words, and the connection of two independent words on the basis of equality in the status of a phrase. Moreover, a phrase cannot be the building block of a sentence. Because it occurs at the same time as speech in speech. If phrases existed in the language, they could be interpreted as the building blocks of a sentence”.

Indeed, a phrase is a unit of speech, and it is not ready in language. Accordingly, his nominative status is also, in our view, objectionable. Indeed, when we look at verb phrases, it is clear that they have a predicative character.

In addition, I.P. Ivanova and V.V. The opinion expressed by the Burlakovs also seems to be interpreted. Because, as scientists point out, compounds like on the beach, under the net, in the corner cannot be phrases. The main reason for this is that although these compounds contain a connecting medium and a connecting word, the derivative structure is not formed. Accordingly, we cannot include them in the list of phrases.

At the same time, we see that in Uzbek linguistics, in the works of such scholars as A. Gulyamov, M. Askarova, N. Mahmudov, attention is also paid to the issues of wording. But even in these cases, the phrase is considered as a non-predicative device.

It should also be noted that in most of the available literature, when referring to phrases, only the subject-related phrases are mentioned. It would be wrong to say that equivalent phrases have not yet literally come to the research center. We can also witness that equally related phrases are referred to in the literature by the term phrases. However the use of this term, in our opinion, is controversial. Since there is almost no difference in the lexical meanings of the terms combinations and word combinations, we note that the use of the term combinations leads to an artificial reproduction of terms in the language. For this reason, we think it is appropriate to call phrases equally related and subordinate.

Above mentioned, sentence is also a syntactic device as the sentence elements. It is no secret that in the study of language there are different approaches to the study of sentence as a syntactic unit.

It should be noted that the study of sentence in linguistics is carried out through two different approaches: 1) the study of sentence through non-linguistic concepts (from a logical and logical-psychological point of view); 2) by studying the pure linguistic features of a sentence.

Representatives of different linguistic directions also interpret the essence of the sentence differently. It is observed that different grammatical concepts emerge in these views. This situation is explained by the fact that linguists have different theoretical views on this issue.

For instance, the Russian Linguist O. When Voloshina comments on the difference between a sentence and a word, she emphasizes that, unlike a word, we can change the location of the components of a sentence as we wish. In the word, of course, we do not have such an opportunity, says the scientist.

However, this idea, in our opinion, seems a bit ambiguous. Because if we think like that, we are limiting the content of the sentence. However, sentences consisting of one word are also present in our language. We will not take such statements into account.

When there is a talk about sentence, it seems necessary to mention the views of NK Turniyazov. The scientist rightly points out that speech is the object of application of language signs.

Indeed, speech is a unit of speech, a feature of which is manifested in the organization of linguistic units. This is the difference between it and the text. Oral text aggregates speech characters.

But some linguists, such as V.G. Gak, consider the sentence itself to be a unit of language. This view, of course, contradicts F de Saussure's view that a language sign must be virtual in nature and have expressive and expressive aspects. Moreover, the structural scheme of speech is not ready available in the language system. Because ready-made schemes live in the human mind.

In addition to Saussure, AI Smirnitsky, FF Fortunatov, AA Shakhmatov, V.V. It was also emphasized by Vinogradov.

It should also be noted that some scholars also analyze the sentence in the context of the text. Sh. Turniyazova noted that words that are used independently and have a complete purpose and completeness of meaning come in the form of a text. If, as the scholar says, it comes to the status of a text, then it is once again proved that it is a unit of speech. Since the text is a unit of speech does not require explanation.

It also should be noted that in such a case, the traditional syntactic analysis that is now in place for the sentence will no longer be valid. that is why we analyze the sentence from a derivative perspective in the following pages of our work.

There are different views in linguistics on the subject of syntax. In all the available literature on the syntax of the Uzbek language, two units of syntax are considered: the phrase and the sentence, and it is said that the syntax of these two units is the object of examination. Such a view came under the influence of Russian linguistics. AA Shakhmatov stated that there are two objects of study of syntax in Russian linguistics.

This idea was probably progressed by VV Vinogradov. According to VV Vinogradov, not only a phrase and a sentence, but also a compound sentence is recognized as a separate syntactic unit. According to this view, three units can be specified as syntactic devices: a phrase, a sentence, and a compound sentence.

But as we speak of them in conjunction, we see that complex syntactic devices have also entered the realm of speech. Because in most literatures we observe that complex syntactic devices are referred to by the term compound sentence. This indicates that the syntactic devices include phrases and sentences.

But this, according to our opinion, is an explanatory issue. After all, if we approach the issue in this way, complex syntactic devices will be left out. Therefore, it is more accurate to say that syntactic devices include not only sentences with phrases, but also complex syntactic devices.

The main reason why the term compound sentence is called a complex syntactic device is that it does not break the hierarchical relationship. Turniyozov also noted. This opinion of the scientist, in our opinion, is very true. Because any small unit is active within a unit larger than itself.

Also, the main reason why the concept of compound sentence in our linguistics does not meet the demand is directly related to the violation of the law of hierarchical relations in syntactic research.

The components of complex syntactic devices are drastically different from simple sentences. Although they resemble simple sentences in form, they are drastically different from independent simple sentences. At the same time, in linguistics, complex syntactic devices are used instead of the concepts of “including the whole whole”. In particular, academician G. Abdurahmanov describes the period as follows: “Since a certain content relationship is expressed in complex compound sentences, there is an intonational completeness, so these different constructions have a specific quality and they are called period. The period forms a whole in terms of structure, intonation and content. These same integers can be simple or complex: if they are composed of the same, one type of sentence (e.g., compound sentences with several subordinate clauses, compound sentences with or without conjunctions, etc.), a simple period is called if the whole is different. when it is made up of different sentences (such as a compound sentence with a preposition and a compound sentence without a conjunction), it is called a complex period”.

In general, complex syntactic devices differ in sentence structure and the amount of information transmission. For this reason, in identifying complex syntactic devices, we must first find its differences from the sentence. Complex syntactic devices consist of sentences. They form a mutual grammatical and intonational integrity. Hence, the size of the content capacity of a sentence from complex syntactic devices differs from the specificity, complexity of the semantic syntactic structure

Of course, although sentence is also a complex syntactic device as an expression of a particular sentence, the most important function of language as a means of communication between people is directly reflected in syntactic devices. in each of them is absolutely unique. From the point of view of the science of logic, sentences are mostly simple sentences, and complex syntactic devices are complex sentences.

It should be noted that some linguists point out that text has a status in complex syntactic devices. This is because complex syntactic devices, like text, have polypredicative, and thus superpredicative. Even in the communicative context, complex syntactic devices are characterized by the transmission of a wide range of information, such as text.

I will help you. If you want. I will definitely come. But later.

In the example given, the text consists of four simple sentences. We call it text without a doubt. But if we remove the dots between the components of the text and change its shape a bit, we encounter the following situation:

I will help you if you wish; I will definitely come, but later. In this case, we are faced with a complex syntactic device. It seems that in such a situation, neither the volume nor the content of the information conveyed in the speech changes. For this reason, we can give text status without hesitation to a complex syntactic device. If we only look at the content of the text, in the first case we encounter a four-component (four simple sentences) text, and in the second case we encounter a text in a complex syntactic device template.

Hence, a complex syntactic device is formed in speech and contains two or more sentences. This proves once again that he has a greater level of speech than the sentence.

Although such devices share a common linguistic status, they differ from each other in semantic aspects: complex syntactic devices with equal components and complex syntactic devices with subordinate components. However, regardless of the name, the weight of the microtext in each of them is noticeable. Of course, it is necessary to have a relative understanding of the concept of microtext. Because there are types of text that are represented by an independent sentence, a phrase, a word, and even a specific grapheme, they are also the smallest texts.

The presence of text symbols in complex syntactic devices is also found in the work of V.M. Lyapon. In this regard, the scholar writes: "While a compound sentence requires the result of a conscious combination of two or more relatively complete (communicative) parts of speech, we must derive and acknowledge that there are serious textual features in its structure".

In linguistics, the problem of complex syntactic devices and their nature has been studied for decades. It should be noted that the importance of research on formal syntax created in traditional linguistics is enormous. Scientifically based ideas in the work on complex syntactic devices and their structural features have laid a legitimate solid foundation for the emergence of new views on the nature of complex syntactic devices and their semantic-structural features in modern linguistics.

REFERENCES:

1. Общее языкознание. Внутренняя структура языка. М., 1972.
2. Нурмонов А.Н. Гап ҳақидаги синтактик назариялар. Тошкент, 1988.
3. Виноградов В.В. Основные принципы русского синтаксиса в грамматике русского языка. – Изб. Труды «Исследования по русской грамматике». М., 1975.
4. Виноградов В.В. "Вопросы синтаксиса современного русского языка". – Москва, 1950.
5. Иванова И.П., Бурлакова В.В., Почепцов Г.Г. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка: Учебник. / М.: Высш. школа, 1981.
6. Турниёзов Н.К. Сўз бирикмаси ва гап бўлаклари ҳақида баъзи мулоҳазалар // Роман-герман тилшунослигининг долзарб масалалари. – Тошкент, 2009.
7. Н. Турниёзов, Б. Турниёзов, Ш. Турниёзова. Ўзбек тилининг деривацион синтаксиси. Тошкент, 2011 йил.
8. Гак В.Г. Высказывание и ситуация // Проблемы структурной лингвистики – 1972 – М., 1973.
9. Ф. де Соссюр. Труды по языкознанию. – М., 1977.
10. Синтаксис современного русского языка. – СПб., 2008.

11. Турниязова Ш.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида матн шаклланишининг деривацион хусусиятлари. Номз. дис. Тошкент, 2010.
12. Абдурахмонов Ғ., Сулаймонов А., Холиёров Ҳ., Омонтурдиев Ж. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили (синтаксис), Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1979.
13. Маҳмудов Н. Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. Синтаксис. Тошкент. – 1995.
14. Золотова Г.А. О перспективах синтаксических исследований. Серия литературы и языка. Том 45. – № 6, – 1986.
15. Хайруллаев Х.З. Нутқ лингвистикасининг ўрганиш объекти хусусида. Хорижий филология. №2. – 2019.
16. Турниязова Ш.Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида матн шаклланишининг деривацион хусусиятлари. Номз. дис. автореф.
17. Ляпон М.В. Смысловая структура сложного предложения и текст. – М.: Наука, 1983.