

---

# ON THE DERIVATIONAL FEATURES OF CORPORATE SMALL SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES

---

*Ibaev Anvar*

*Independent researcher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

---

**Annotation:** The article describes the derivational features of small syntactic structures based on the material of the English and Uzbek languages. In this case, special attention was paid to a number of phrases that were formed with the help of adjacency and their derivational features. In addition, the differences between phrases and sentences are investigated.

**Keywords:** Derivation, operator, operand, derivative, model, adjunction, phrase, sentence, nominative, predicative, semantics, unit of speech, syntactic structure.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Till this day, the problem of word combination has become one of the most important issues on the agenda of scientific research. Each research work highlighted the problems of the general issue of the problem and its peculiarities. Nevertheless, there are many explanations in this field. These include semantic analysis of word combinations, formal syntactical and functional analysis, and a number of issues related to these analyses.

It should be stated that the syntax of word combination has been globally investigated. In this case, The contribution of such scholars as V.V.Vinogradov, N.N.Prokopovich, V.N.Sukhotin, N.I.Filicheva (in Russian linguistics), V.Yung, O.Bexagel, J.Erbin (in German linguistics), A.Gulomov, M.Asqarova, A.Nurmonov, N.Mahmudov (in Uzbek linguistics) was enormous.

**Body Part.** It is known that to this day word combination is used as independent nominative and non-predicate language units. The issue of colloquial features and forms of combinations and the communicative tasks of them has gone unconscious. However, observations show that a phrase is not a unit of language, but a unit of speech, and that certain models can be used in speech to perform a communicative function and a predicative syntactic device.

It should be noted that the concept of "combination" is now understood broadly. Lexical and grammatical connections create new combinations at any time.

We can see in the literature that words which are independent and independent, as well as independent and non-independent, are considered a combination.

However, in our work we aim not to consider any compounds, but word combinations and their derivative-comparative peculiarities.

Clearly, speech is the intersection of all the signs of language. In other words, speech is a space for the activation of language signs. In this process, of course, there exists a hierarchical relationship, and each sign of the language achieves the figurative and semantic activation, which is greater than itself, and becomes its building material. In this way, the

elements of language are transferred to speech. It is characterized by a hierarchical relationship of phonemes, morphemes and words, as they are linguistic units.

An independent phrase cannot be both a speech and language unit at the same time. It is formed in speech and is considered the unit of speech. Therefore, it is not a forming element of the sentence. Because the forming element of a sentence is the word. The components of a word combination also perform a syntactic function independently in the sentence.

Phrases (word combinations) are an independent syntactic device because we observe free communication when its components interact. At the same time, word combinations are considered as a minor syntactic device. Below we analyze these devices from a comparative perspective in terms of derivation.

It is well known that "derivation" means to create and to form. If we apply the principles of lexical derivation for the compound words, we find it appropriate to translate the word derivation as "creation." However, in our opinion, it would be more appropriate to use translations such as "formation" rather than "creation" in relation to word combinations.

It should be noted that word combinations are a product of syntactic derivation as a small syntactic device, and when it is analyzed from the point of view of derivation, the terms operator, operand and derivative are used in relation to them. See, e.g.:

*Каламнинг учи*

In this compound, the words of *қалам* and *уч* are operands, and the affixes "*-нинг* and *-и*" is an operator. In this case, as we noted, we have confronted with the means of double operator means. In the study of the syntactic derivation of a phrase, the question of how the main component interacts with the subordinate component is important. This is what sets the point of the syntactic derivation phenomenon. The communication means acts as a syntactic derivation operator. The operator is the absolute dominant element of syntactic derivation.

It should be noted that the meaning of phrases depends in many ways on the meaning of the words in the phrase. If one of the components of a phrase changes, the meaning of the phrase also changes semantically:

**1. *гўзал табиат***

*гўзал қиз*

**2. *қора тулпор***

*учқур тулпор*

As can be seen, in the first of these examples, the dominant word is changed and in the second, the subordinate one is changed. This, of course, affects its semantic meaning. However, it does not affect the syntactic device. In terms of derivation, there is almost no change.

**1. *Гўзал, табиат*** – an operand, an inner meaning operator.

*Гўзал, қиз* – an operand, an inner meaning operator.

**2. *Қора, тулпор*** – an operand, an inner meaning operator.

*Учқур, тулпор* – an operand, an inner meaning operator.

It should be noted that we cannot say that there is no operator, because without the operator there is no derivation. In our examples, the operator is in the form of "zero operator» Turniyozov N. K used the term "zero operator" in such cases. However, the concept of "zero operator" is relative. Because syntactic derivation does not occur without an operator. At the

same time, the attribute-attributive relationship is formed directly on the basis of the internal rules of language and the requirements of speech.

However, it should be noted that in both versions of the above examples, although the semantic meaning is considered to be an operator from the outside and there seems to be no change in it, in fact there is a difference in their internal meaning. After all, if we analyze the first example, we are talking about nature in the first place, and the girl in the second place. This is very important. Because when it comes to adjunction word combination, we have to talk not only about syntactic derivation, but also about semantic derivation. Therefore, in the first case, as a derivation operator, we can take the inner meaning of the compounds, that is, the beauty of nature, and in the second case, the beauty of the girl as the operator. It seems that in these cases the internal semantic meaning of the compounds is the operator.

In our second example, we see that the subject is changing. In this example, as in our first example, the derivation operator is its internal meaning. In this case, although in both cases we are talking about the horse, the difference in the internal meaning is reflected in the characteristics of the horse. Therefore, the status of the internal operator is determined by these features. In other words, in the first case, the blackness of the horse, in the second case, the speed of the horse, is the derivation operator. As we have seen, the derivation of small syntactic devices in the adjunction model requires both syntactic and semantic derivation.

A similar situation is found in English:

beautiful, nature - operand, inner meaning operator.

beautiful, nature - operand, inner meaning operator.

running, foal - operand, internal meaning operator.

black, foal - operand, internal meaning operator.

When the subordinate components of the adjective + noun are expressed by derivative adjectives, the syntactic derivation of the compound is inextricably linked with the adjectives that make up the adjective. These affixes primarily serve for lexical derivation and perform the function of an operator. It is characteristic that the grammatical elements, which are the means of lexical formation of derivative adjectives, also act as a syntactic derivation operator:

*Aql-hushim joyida, odobli bolaman (H. Tokhtaboev. Sariq devni minib).*

In this example, the suffix -li is a lexical derivation operator for a compound word "odobli bola" and a syntactic derivation operator for the word. However, there are differences between them in terms of syntactic derivation. This is because a subordinate component of an adjectival compound is creating zero operators.

In addition to the above, it should be noted that the small syntactic devices in the adjunction model become predicative as the position of the dominant and subordinate components changes. In this case, we observe the subject and verb relationship:

1. *Гўзал табиат – табиат гўзал;*

*Гўзал қиз – қиз гўзал;*

2. *Қора тулпор – Тулпор қора;*

*Учқур тулпор – Тулпор учқур.*

Apparently, when a phrase becomes a sentence, it is only a matter of syntactic derivation. This view of the product structure no longer requires semantic derivation. In other words, if a

phrase in an adjunction model requires both syntactic and semantic derivation, sentence derivation is only a product of syntactic derivation.

It should be noted that in the above examples, as the phrase becomes a sentence, its analysis will be different. It is necessary to refer to the derivation of speech:

*Табиат гўзал. Қиз гўзал.*

*Тулпор қора. Тулпор учқур.*

*Nature is beautiful. The girl is beautiful.*

*The foal is running. The foal is black.*

Each of the resulting simple sentences is in the N + V model. In this case, V requires a primitive structure, and N + V require a base structure. According to Professor N.K. Turniyozov, the N + V model does not form a derivative structure. This model provides the basic structure for the derivation process. The scientist suggests that if there is no X in the sentence, then there is no derivation.

In our opinion, this idea seems a bit ambiguous. Because we can't say that no structure is formed in the N + V model. Of course, we do not want to completely deny the scientist's opinion. There is no doubt that the N + V model serves as a basis for the derivative structure. However, as we have already mentioned, we cannot say that no syntactic structure is formed by the sentence while the basic structure creates a derivative, it also creates a kind of invisible derivation. Because, if it is possible, in this case we can also take the suffix -dir as a means that comes in the means of an operator.

The proof of our point can be clearly seen in our English examples.

*Nature is beautiful. The girl is beautiful.*

*The foal is running. The foal is black.*

In the given examples, in contrast to our examples in Uzbek, we can show the interjection form as an operator. As we have already mentioned in our examples in the Uzbek language, we cannot deny that the -dir creates an invisible derivation.

However, the process of derivation takes place after the N + V model, as the scientist said, in which we can now expand the form of speech as we wish. In the process, we can observe the emergence of new operators.

Conclusion: In general, although the interpretation of phrases has been studied in both linguistics, the study of some explanatory and problematic issues in this area is still relevant. First of all, it is necessary to include in their classifications and definition of phrases, because in world linguistics these issues are interpreted differently. In addition, the relationship of word combinations to the concepts of nominative and communicative, predicative and non-predicative is also clarified.

#### References:

1. Ғуломов А.Ш. Ўзбек тили синтаксиси баъзи масалалари. // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти, № 2, 1969, 13 бет.
2. Шарипов М.К. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида сўз бирикмаси синтаксиси масалалари. Тошкент, 1978.
3. Турниёзов Н.К., Турниёзов Б.Н., Турниёзова Ш.Н. Ўзбек тили деривацион синтаксиси. Тошкент, 2011.

4. Четин М. Ҳозирги ўзбек ва турк тилларида сўз бирикмаси синтактик деривацияси. Номз. дис. Самарқанд 2002.
5. Турниёзов Н.К. Ўзбек тили деривацион синтаксисга кириш. – Самарқанд, 1990, 8-бет..
6. Аззамов, Ю. Р. (2021). ГАСТРОНОМИК КОМПОНЕНТЛИ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИК БИРЛИКЛАРНИНГ ЛИНГВОМАДАНИЙ ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 4(5).
7. Ugli, A. Y. R. (2021). Gastronomic discourse: linguoculturological and translation aspects. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(8), 62-66.
8. Аслонов, Ш. Ш. (2020). КОМПЬЮТЕРНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ: ПРОБЛЕМЫ И РЕШЕНИЯ. *Гуманитарный трактат*, (84), 17-19.
9. Аслонова, Ш. И. (2020). ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИХ ТЕХНОЛОГИЙ В ОБУЧЕНИИ МОЛОДЁЖИ В ВЫСШИХ УЧЕБНЫХ ЗАВЕДЕНИЯХ. *Интернаука*, (21-1), 59-60.
10. Madaminovich, T. I. (2017). THE LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES AND APPROPRIATE METHODS OF TRANSLATION. *Восточно-европейский научный журнал*, (12-4 (28)), 52-53.
11. ШВАЧКО, Е. В. (2017). Научные школы. Молодежь в науке и культуре XXI в.: материалы междунар. науч.-творч. форума. 31 окт.–3 нояб. 2017 г./Челяб. гос. ин-т культуры; сост. ЕВ Швачко.–Челябинск: ЧГИК, 2017.–394 с. ISBN 978-5-94839-629-3.
12. Madaminovich, T. I., Khusanovich, K. B., Akhatovna, K. O., & Kholmamatovna, V. L. (2019). Features of the system of formation of compensatory competence among agricultural students as a means of filling in professional terminology. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(11), 2202-2206.
13. Тухтасинов, И. М. (2014). НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНАЯ СПЕЦИФИКА СЛОЖНЫХ СЛОВ, ВЫРАЖАЮЩИХ ВНЕШНОСТЬ И ХАРАКТЕР ЧЕЛОВЕКА (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И УЗБЕКСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ). *Paradigmata poznání*, (3), 74-78.
14. Тухтасинов, И. М. (2011). Сопоставительный анализ описания внешности человека в английском и узбекском языках (стилистический ракурс). *Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета. Гуманитарные науки*, (630), 105-110.
15. Тухтасинов, И. М. (2010). Продуктивные модели сложных слов, обозначающих внешние признаки человека в современном английском языке. *Молодой ученый*, (5-2), 47-50.