



SYNTACTIC DERIVATION OF THE HYPOTHETICAL DEVICE

Zayniddin Kurbanov

Philological Sciences
doctor of Philosophy (PhD)



Annotation:

The syntactic derivation of the hypothetical device in the article is based on the scientific inextricably linked with the concept of the radical structure.

Keywords:

Hypotactic, derivation, radical structure, transposition, denotation, cignificate

Before talking about the syntactic derivation of a hypothalamic device, it is necessary to give a detailed explanation of the concept of *radical structure*. This is very important. This is because the phenomenon of derivation, especially syntactic derivation, is inextricably linked with the concept of radical structure.

The concept of fundamental structure in linguistics was introduced into consumption in structural linguistics in the 1960s. However, it should be noted that the views of linguists in this chapter are not the same. It is worth mentioning the following words of V.A.Zvegintsev: "In modern linguistics, it is difficult to find a concept that is as fundamentally structural and at the same time extremely abstract. Indeed, the concept of a deep structure is confused with the concept of a nuclear structure in some studies. In our view, the radical structure requires the smallest structure on which the syntactic structure of the sentence is based. It is often expressed by a word that comes in the form of a predicate in the sentence. Therefore, the radical structure is called the thinking structure. That is why it plays an important role in the formation of speech. In a hypothalamic device, although each of its components has its own radical structure, one of them is in the dominant position: *When Nasiba left, Buvisora mother slowly glanced at the bowl.* (S. Mahmudova).

In the example given, we see that the first component of the hypothalamic device is subordinate and the second is in the dominant position. At this point, when the first subjunctive appears in the sentence, the word *comes* in the form of a predicate, requiring its radical structure. It does not require an explanation that this was the case before the transformation took place. However, in the process of derivation, it loses its independence under the influence of the phenomenon of transposition (went out – when she went out), becomes a subordinate clause, and serves to interpret the sentence that comes after it in terms of time. That is why in the given hypotactic device the second component of it has a dominant position in terms of derivation of the radical structure. This suggests that the syntactic derivation of the hypothalamic device is formed on the basis of the dominant radical structure. For although the subordinate clause also has its primitive structure, it serves to fill the primordial structure of the dominant utterance with content, it is not for itself. Here is another example for proof: *Heavy snow melted and the grass turned green.* (Ch. Aitmatov).

The given hypoactive device consists of the interaction of the following statements:

1. *Heavy snow melted.*
2. *The grass turned green.*

In the process of syntactic derivation of the hypothalamic device, under the influence of the transposition phenomenon, the first sentence loses its independence (melted - melting). The main reason for this is that the second sentence represents the end result. In the same sentence, the consonantal form - b (-ib), which changes the syntactic position of the first part of the sentence, creates a transposition phenomenon and performs two functions at once. In other words, it acts as both a transposition and a syntactic derivation operator at the same time.

Of course, there is no need to explain that the fundamental structure of the second sentence plays an important role in this derivation process. Because through it the phenomenon of syntactic derivation takes place. At this point, both components of the hypothalamic device are inextricably linked to a specific situation. However, once the hypothalamus is fully formed, we see that behind it is a rounded form of events that exist outside of speech. We associate this phenomenon with the concept of denotation. Indeed, events that take place outside of speech, expressed through speech or hypothalamus, require a situation in an extra linguistic expression. According to N.N.Gridneva, the situation requires an extra linguistic reality, a product of thinking. Its verbalization is related to language. The situation, of course, is neither a language factor nor a speech factor. That's why we named it denotative. Where there is a denotation, there is also a significant (i.e., the semantic weight of the hypothalamus). Significant, unlike denotation, serves both language and speech. Let's look at another example: *Sweat dripped from his bloodless face, as if he had just got rid of a rabid dog.* (A.Mukhtor. Sycamore).

Apparently, behind this hypotactic device is a denotation associated with human fear and nervousness. We imagine the significant in relation to the language units that express the meanings of comparison. It should also be noted that even components of any hypothetical device rely on individual compositions. However, if we take the integrity of the hypothesis, then the individual components form macro positions by connecting the solutions themselves. Micro position is clearly expressed in the context of a separate sentence due to its action (the components of the hypothetical device are also included in this sentence), while macro position is abstract expressive. Because we can only imagine it. This is very important, after all, the concept of discourse, which is actively used in today's linguistics, including the syntactic derivation of hypothetical devices that come to us in the status of discourse, is also inextricably linked with the concept of macro position.

It is interesting that the operator of the syntactic derivation of the hypothetical construction also forms a relationship between the compositions of its components and, through it, allows the formation (imagination) of macro posy: *Today he has been working like this since morning, if there was someone else, he could lie down in the stretched out.* (A.Mukhtor. Sycamore).

A given hypothetical device (stretching) is based on a radical structure that comes in the style of lying down and, at one time, on erosion. After filling in the gaps of this radical structure or composition (stretching), the syntactic structure of the dominant sentence is formed: *if someone else could lie down stretched out.* Through the operator (-ki), the syntactic derivation of the hypothetical device takes place, and after that it gives a verifiable expression in the language of the extra linguistic situation outside the speech.

As previously mentioned in part, transformation leads to syntactic derivation:

1. *Today he has been working like this since morning.*
2. *If there was someone else, he could lie down in the stretched out.*

Transformation is at the same time based on reasoning, already (-ki) transpositor puts an end to the independence of the sentence in which he participates, turning it into a subordinate clause. In hypothetical constructions, transpositor also acts as a one-time derivation operator. Accordingly, we consider transformation to be one of the main mechanisms of syntactic derivation. But it must also be said that transformation is not a single working mechanism of syntactic derivation at once. Because the syntactic derivation of the sentence in most cases relies on the applicative method. By

the way, when we say the applicative method, we understand such meanings as adding, patching, trailing. For example, *Shukurov recognized someone who spoke to Mahbuba.* (A.Yakubov.Faith).

The basic structure of the given sentence is expressed through the definition question, and after filling one of its empty spaces, a base or nuclear structure is formed in the form of the definition of Shukurov. This creates a very important situation. Because this structure acts as a semantic synonym for the syntactic derivation of a given sentence. Based on the above, the phenomenon of syntactic derivation can occur in two ways. If one of these methods is transformation, the other is an applicative method. However, it should also be noted that in some research work it is said that it is necessary to study the difference between transformation and derivational phenomena. In this regard, Sh. Alieva writes: "There is still no monographic study aimed at revealing that transformation and derivation are, on the one hand, a valid universal phenomenon within the framework of all meaningful units of the language, and on the other, mutually similar and different aspects of these two phenomena".

The point is that the description of the issue is partially superficial in this place. Because transformation is one of the main pillars of syntactic derivation, initially one of the founders of derivatology. It was said by L.N.Murzin still in 1984th year. Later this idea was called I. P. Raspopov and we also observe in the works of S.N.Sichyovas and other scientists.

In Uzbek linguistics, too, we can note that a number of monographic studies devoted to the description of the phenomenon of syntactic derivation have been carried out. The syntactic derivation of hypothetical devices, as we have already seen, consists in the introduction of at least two sentences into the relationship.

In conclusion, the syntactic derivation of hypo taxis relies on a certain radical structure. The derivation of hypo taxis is based on the radical structure of the dominant sentence. The dominant clause serves to explain, filling in the contents of the tub structure while the subordinate clause is the radical structure. It is natural that this happens, because the radical structure is expressed through the predicate of the sentence. In a word, the derivation of hypo taxis covers a lot of issues related to the transfer of language to speech.

List of references

1. Алиева Ш. Трансформация деривация масаласи // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти, №2, 2007, 12-бет.
2. Бобоев У.Н. Синтаксическая деривация придаточного предложения времени в современном узбекском языке (В сопоставление с французским языком// Канд. дис. Алма-ата, 1992;
3. Гриднева Н.Н. Основы семантики синтаксиса. – Санкт- Петербург, 2009. –С.8-9.
4. Дейк ван Т.А. Язык познание. Комуникация. – М; 1889. – С. 42.
5. Звегинцев В. А. Язык и лингвистическая теория. –М., 1973. -С. 480.
6. Кацнельсон Д. Общее и типологическое языкознание. – М., 1986. –С. 135-136.
7. Мурзин Л.Н. Основы дериватологии. – Пермь, 1984.
8. Расповов И.П., Сычева С.Н. Синтаксическая деривация и синтаксическая синонимия// Филологических науки, №3Б 1974.
9. Турниязов Н.К. Синтаксическая деривация гипотаксиса в современном узбекском языке. Докт. дис. – М., 1986;
10. Турниязов Н.,Турниязов Б. Турниязова Ш. Ўзбек тили деривацион синтаксиси. – Тошкент, 2011 ва бошқалар.
11. Яхшибоев Ғ.Х. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида содда гап синтактик деривацияси // Номзод. дис. – Самарқанд, 2006;