



## **THE CONCEPT AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES: THE HISTORY OF THE ISSUE**

**Alisher Isomiddinovich Nabiyeu**  
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
Teacher of the department of English Philology

<b>Article history:</b>	<b>Abstract:</b>
<b>Received:</b> 26 <sup>th</sup> January 2022 <b>Accepted:</b> 26 <sup>th</sup> February 2022 <b>Published:</b> 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2022	This article provides with notions about concept and characteristics of syntactic structures. In addition, author explains the history of syntactic features and detects prominent linguist's ideas which are related to this issue.
<b>Keywords:</b> Syntax, Military System, Subject, Representation, Rheme, Actants, Sirconstants, Formatives, Isosemic, Non-Isosemic	

The changes observed in various languages' vocabulary in recent years are mainly related to socio-cultural changes taking place in society. These changes have led to significant transformations in the ratio of variants of the language norm. The rapid development of information technologies has put forward the problem of mass recodification of those layers of the dictionary (including phrases naming an object, a person, etc.) that relate to political, social, administrative, economic and other spheres. This process has already been called the "change of lexical paradigms". Old, lexically conditioned, syntactic connections are destroyed and new ones arise.

A characteristic feature of the modern linguistic and cultural situation is the predominance of informal codes, sets of non-literary language means, and in particular, the so-called profanity. They receive distribution - primarily through mass media - Anglicisms, Americanisms and their derivatives (rally, inflation, import, interview, dollar, consensus, consulting, coaching, stagnation, kidnapping, OK, browser and many others). The abundance of production, computer and monetary terms leads to incomprehensibility of the language: innovations and ambiguity of meaning have become part of the content of new words. In general, the positivity of speech has noticeably decreased, which cannot but cause concern to linguists, therefore, the number of publications on foreign borrowings is growing from year to year.

The tradition of scientific study of syntax dates back to the first experiments of classification and analysis of judgments undertaken by ancient Greek philosophers. The word "syntax" (other Greek *sintaxis* "building together", "military system") began to be used by Stoics (III century BC) to denote the logical structure of statements. In Apollonius Dyscole (II century AD), the subject of syntax is already the actual linguistic phenomena - the connections of words and their forms in a sentence.

Until the end of the XIX century in linguistics there was no clear division between syntactic, logical and psychological concepts. The grammatical analysis of the sentence was carried out in terms of a priori logical categories - for example, the logical "subject" (subject) and grammatical subject were not distinguished. Phonetics and morphology were considered as the study of language forms, and syntax as the study of ways of expressing logical units and relations in a language (in modern linguistics, this problem is attributed to the conduct of semantics). In the framework of a logical approach to language in the XVII century. French scientists A. Arno and K. Lanslo, the authors of the "Grammar of Por-Royal", made the first attempt to create an explanatory syntactic theory: linguistic facts are as we observe them, because they reflect certain principles of thinking. In the second half of the XIX century, under the influence of the philosophy of language by V. von Humboldt, a psychological approach to grammar, primarily to syntax (H. Steinthal, G. Paul, A.A. Potebnya), in which psychological categories took the place of logical categories (such as, for example, "representation") [1].

F. de Saussure undertook the separation of language - an abstract system underlying speech behavior, and speech - actualization, practical implementation of this system in the process of its use by people [2], Sh. Bally distinguished the syntax of language manifestation and speech manifestation, V.V. Vinogradov contrasted the "building material" for sentences (words and phrases) and the sentences themselves, i.e. units of the communicative level, with signs of predicativity and modality. This problem remains relevant to our time: the problem of distinguishing the nominative ("language") and communicative ("speech") aspects of the proposal is devoted, in particular, to the works of A. Gardiner, N.D. Arutyunova, V.A. Zvegintseva and other authors. In the syntactic concept of N.Y. Shvedova, the opposition of a sentence and a phrase was expressed in the form of a difference between abstract structural schemes that characterize sentences and verbal connections that determine the structure of the phrase.

V. Mathesius, developing the ideas of A. Weil, G. Paul and some other nineteenth-century linguists, showed that the syntax reflects two different types of speaker activity corresponding to two types of sentence division - grammatical (for example, division into subject and predicate) and actual - on the topic, i.e. the original the point of the message, and the rheme, i.e. the reported [3]. The author of the concept of "structural syntax" L. Tenier has developed a universal sentence model based on some fundamentally important postulates: universality and unidirectionality of syntactic communication; the presence in the sentence of one grammatical center (verb), the compatibility of which determines the structure of the sentence; the non-uniqueness of the way the structural hierarchy is displayed in a linear sequence of syntactic units; the difference between the participants of the situation (actants) and its "circumstances" (sirconstants).

A real breakthrough in the study of syntax occurred after the publication of N. Chomsky's work "Syntactic Structures" in 1957 [4]. Chomsky's name is associated not only with a certain linguistic theory - generative grammar, but also with a whole revolution in views on language learning - the transition from a predominantly descriptive methodology to an explanatory methodology, that is, theory-oriented.

In Chomsky's first monograph, the idea of language as a mechanism for generating an infinite set of sentences using a finite set of grammatical means was realized, for which he proposed the concepts of deep (hidden from direct perception and generated by a system of recursive, i.e., rules that can be applied repeatedly) and surface (directly perceived) grammatical structures, as well as transformations describing transition from deep structures to surface ones.

The model of "Aspects", or the standard theory set forth in Chomsky's book "Aspects of the Theory of Syntax" (Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, 1965, Russian translation, 1972), is primarily an attempt to introduce into the formal model of the semantic component of the so-called rules of semantic interpretation, attributing meaning to deep structures [5].

N. Chomsky distinguished two concepts: language ability (competence) and language activity (competence). Language ability is something like a potential knowledge of a language. Language activity is the processes that occur during the realization of this ability in speech activity. It is significant that, according to N. Chomsky, language ability is primary, it determines language activity, and not vice versa.

The central thesis of transformational grammar, its distinctive feature is that an adequate grammatical theory should distinguish between the basic structure and the surface syntactic structure, deep grammar and surface grammar.

The syntactic component of grammar, or language theory, is a system of rules that allow or prescribe the performance of certain actions on elements of a certain type. These terminal elements are thought of as minimal units of meaning, atoms that the language structures through syntax. Chomsky calls these minimal units *formatives*.

Chomsky's point of view is quite common, but not generally accepted. The most important syntactic theories, along with generative grammar, include: the theory of principles and parameters, categorial grammar, functional syntactic typology and syntax in the "meaning text" model, which cannot be analyzed within the framework of this work.

Nowadays, the view of any sentence as a unit that is a member of several overlapping paradigms - syntactic, actualization, transformational (interpretative) - is becoming increasingly widespread. Formal and semantic discrepancies between the members of the syntactic paradigm are associated with differences in the expression of categories:

- time,
- modalities,
- affirmative-negative,
- non-interrogative-interrogative,
- grammatical perspective of the sentence (activity, demiactivity, passivity, demipassivity).

The components of the sentence paradigm may also differ in the way of representing the semantic subject, the actual division and some other characteristics that do not violate the identity of the semantic invariant. G.A. Zolotova proposed the term *syntactic field of the sentence*. She also developed the concept of the syntactic field of the sentence [6]. The initial, nuclear field proposal represents the structure of the situation in a neutral and economical way. Core proposals, according to G.A. Zolotova should be distinguished by the "unity of syntactic, morphological and semantic in their structure" Such sentences include only words of isosemic subclasses. Introducing the concept of isosemy into syntactic theory, G. A. Zolotova writes: "On the basis of the correspondence / inconsistency of the semantics of the subclass to the main semantics of this part of speech, we distinguish isosemic and non-isosemic subclasses of words. Words of isosemic and non-isosemic subclasses serve as means of direct and indirect nomination of referents, respectively. *Isosemy* in syntax refers to the correspondence between the categorial values of the structural components of a sentence and the categorial values of their denotations in real reality.

Unlike G.A. Zolotova, who assigns the subject status to a number of forms of indirect cases, I.A. Melchuk identifies *zero subjects* both in constructions with an unnamed subject and in constructions with a pronounced subject. Among the types of Russian unsubstantiated sentences traditionally referred to as "*impersonal*", there are none that would be characterized by a complex of features postulated for the initial, nuclear syntactic structures. The null subject is a semantically significant structural feature, indicating that the construction is marked [8].

Thus, it is obvious that there is no unity in the literature on the issue of the concept of syntactic structure. We believe that *the syntactic structure in general should be understood as a system of speech units consisting of each other in various syntagmatic (linear) and paradigmatic (nonlinear) relationships, united on the basis of a variatively invariant principle*. This formula allows us to reveal the functional value of language elements on the basis of the most important methodological principle of the interpretation of language as a social phenomenon.

### LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Berezin F.M. History of linguistic teachings.- M., 1975.
2. Saussure F., de. Works on Linguistics.- M., 1977.
3. Mathesius V. About the so-called actual reading of the sentence / Prague Linguistic Circle: Collection /Comp. M.A.Kondrashova.-M., 1967.
4. Chomsky N. Syntactic structures. - In: New in Linguistics. Issue II. M., 1962
5. Chomsky N. Aspects of the theory of syntax. M., 1972.
6. Zolotova G. A. Essay on the functional syntax of the Russian language. M., 1973.
7. Zolotova G. A. Communicative aspects of Russian syntax. M., 1982, p. 178.
8. Melchuk I. A. On syntactic zero // Typology of passive constructions: Diatheses and pledges. L., 1974.