SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES

ABOUT DEEP STRUCTURE OF THE SENTENCE

Khabipova Revanna Abdullaevna,
Karakalpak state university
Uzbekistan

http://dx.doi.org/10.26739/2573-5616-2018-8-4

Abstract: The notion of deep structure of the sentence in linguistics is mentioned in different ways. But our approach to the definition of the deep structure is differed from them. Our approach to the nation of deep structure of the sentence is based on revealing differential syntactic-semantic features of syntactical Units in the structure of the sentence.

The differential syntactic-semantic signs of lexical units in the structure of the sentence are substantiality, procceccuality and qualificativity which are considered as categorical signs, on the base of those categorical signs we can reveal non-categorial differential syntactic-semantic features of lexical units in the structure of the sentence. Those defined syntactic-semantic signs are proved by means of different ways of transformations. And then we can reveal paradigmatic rates of those defined non categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs.

Key words: Differential, opposition, substantial, qualitative, agentive, object, locative, temporal, transformation

The study of the deep structure of the language in the world linguistics has started to develop due to different approaches made by scientists since the appearance of N. Tomsky's "Transformational Grammar".

According to N. Chomsky's statement, "... deep structure which presents the propositional relations for each verb in a canonical form"knowing the syntax of any language consists of knowing a set of phrase structure rules that generate the underlying deep structure." [mcu.edu.tw/ssmith/1ing/fall2007syntax2.ppt].

Generally speaking, the idea that the beginning of each sentence makes up the surface structure, while the product that appears as a result of the transformation is the deep structure of the sentence is put forward.

Speaking about deep structure of the sentence is based on the linguistic methods which were worked out by A.M.Mukhin, U.U. Usmanov stated, "By analyzing a sentence dividing it into syntaxsemes or when the deep structure of the sentence is based on, the focus of the researcher should be revealed the differential syntactic -semantic signs of the defined components, their variants and their abilities to connect with other syntaxemes on the base of syntactic connection." [Usmanov, 2004].

So the deep structure of the sentence means that the differential syntactic - semantic signs of the defined components are identified in paradigmatic way, that is, with the help of opposition method. Before analyzing the components of the sentence by dividing them into syntaxemes, categorical differential syntactic - semantic signs are defined, and with the help of them, according to the syntactic position of the components in the sentence, the non-categorical signs are revealed.

When defining the syntaxemes the differential syntactic-semantic sign of the analyzed sentence is compared in comparison with the syntaxemes of another sentence. Here one of the most important issues is relying on one syntactic connection when dividing the syntactic units of the sentence both into components and into syntaxemes.

Speaking about this method of analyzing U. Usmanov mentioned:

"... not the analyzing of the syntactic units which participate in the structure of a sentence by dividing them into units of a sentence (primary and secondary parts), but analyzing them by dividing into components and syntaxemes which present a great opportunity to explain the form and the meaning of the syntactic units of the sentence. [Usmanov,1992, p.44]

True, if a chosen object is analyzed by using such linguistic methods correctly and reasonably, the following theoretical and practical opportunities will be created for the researcher:

1. There will be an opportunity to study forms and contents of the syntactic units of the sentence;

2. It will validate the classification of the sentence structures from the syntactic and semantic points of view;

3. In the process of analyzing the sentence elements by dividing them into syntaxemes, it is necessary to study systemic connections from the syntactic point of view, as each syntaxeme the content of a syntactic unit. This provides the researcher with a great opportunity to define the paradigmatic rates of syntaxemes;

4. On the basis of linguistic methods there will be sufficient opportunity for modeling (molding) the sentence structure and for using experimental methods;

5. The results of the research i.e. modeling the systemic connections of syntaxemes and their variants,

will serve as a main basis for comparative research of the deep structure of the sentence in the languages of different structure;

In order to clarify the idea of the deep structure of the sentence, we divide the syntactic units of the sentence into syntaxemes and analyze them, dwelling on the important features of some syntactic units which are used as subjects, predicates, attributes, objects and adverbial modifiers by dividing them into syntaxemes.

It should be pointed out that the main cause of critically approaching to the syntactic analysis of the sentence structure especially, the analysis of the sentence by dividing it into components by the majority of linguists, is mixed up the differentiating aspects of the levels the language. It is the result of researching the issues born during interrelations between syntax and semantics from the point of plan of expression rather than from the point of plan of content. On this issue, M. Giro-Veber wrote, "Namely, as a result of such inconsistency, very often absolutely different units are considered as one and the same member of the sentence, for example, the subject in the nominative case may equally mean: an active agent (the girl is singing), a passive object of action (the house was built), the carrier of the feature (He is handsome), a subject of state (The boy is ill), and even an object of possession (I have a new bicycle) where activity or

passivity of the connotation, his different features remain structurally unexpressed" Giro-Veber, 1979, pp. 66-67. Looking at the result of such unsuitable analysis G.A. Zolotova stated: "... that Syntax may be studied without dividing into members of the sentence" [Zolotova, 1973, p. 218].

To prove the abovementioned thoughts let us pay attention to dividing into syntaxemes and analyzing some syntactic units, which is in the position of subject and predicate in the sentence:

1. She reads. 2. She is happy. 3. She is twenty.

The subject of these sentences is expressed by the personal pronoun "She," when they are analyzed by means of syntaxemes, "She" is revealed in the position of nuclear predicative 1, and expresses the categorical sign of substantiality (sb), in respect to reads (NP2) it expresses a non-categorical sign of (Ag- the substance, carrying out activity) the agentive. As the syntactic unit, used instead of NP2 "reads" - expresses the categorical sign of procceccuality, and expresses the non-categorical sign the actional (Ac- action) and its syntaxeme model is: SbAG.PrAc.

In the second sentence, "She" means substantiality, while "is happy" means the categorical sign of qualification (Q1f), and also expresses state (status - St) among non-categorical signs. "Is happy" is an expressed non-categorical sign, while stative condition is transferred to "She -substantiality which

substitutes NP1. The stative condition expressed by "is happy" may be explained with the help of experimental method (additional transformation) "in the state of" and its transformation to syntactic unit "She" may be proved as follows:

(2) She is happy ? She is in the state of happiness. According to syntaxseme analysis of the sentence, the deep structure can be explained by the following model: StSt. PrSt.

In the last sentence, "she" expresses substantiality. "Is twenty" expresses qualificativity quality, and among non-categorical signs expresses quantitativeness

(Qun -number), and this non-categorical sign transferred to the quantitative "she" - substantiality, as a result, the "she" - quantitative is a loaded substantial syntaxeme. So the deep structure of the sentence "She is twenty" consists of SbQun QlfQun syntaxeme model.

It is clear from syntaxeme analysis of the component in only three sentences in which it expresses the subject. They differ from each other semantically in a syntactic level, but in the traditional analysis, they do not differ from each other.

Certain syntactic units in the function of attributes differ from each other in syntaxeme analysis.

1. The young man opened the door.

2. I heard a woman's cry.

3. The people in the line were smiling.

In the first sentence, the word "young" expresses the qualificative qualitative syntaxeme. "Man - substantial" expresses the agentive in relation to the predictive, "opened" expresses the procceccual actional structure, "the door expresses - substantial the object syntaxeme. The deep structure of the sentence, that is, the syntaxeme model may be explained as follows:

(1)   The young man opened the door.

QLfQLt.SbAg.PrAc.SbOb.

In the second sentence "I heard a woman's cry," the syntactic unit "I" expresses the substantial agentive syntaxeme, "heard"- expresses procceccual actional syntaxeme, "a woman's" expresses substantial possessive syntaxeme (genitive), "cry" expresses the substantial object syntaxeme. So, the deep structure of the sentence is as follows:

(2) I heard a woman's cry-SbAg.PrAc.SbPs.SbOb.

(3) To identify as "attribute" the syntactic unit "in the line" in the last sentence is far from reality. Since this sentence enters the following transformations of adding and changing: The people in the line were smiling. The people had been in the line who were smiling, or The people who were in the line they were smiling. In this sentence "The people" is expressed as a substantial syntaxeme loaded with stative meaning, while "in the line" as a substantial locative syntaxeme, and "were smiling is expressed as a procceccual stative syntaxeme".

Hence, the deep structure consists of the following syntaxemes:

The people in the line were smiling-SbSt.SbLc.PSt. Here we see that the syntactic units called attributes differ from each other on syntactic level.

A further issue, if we dwell on the issue of the complement objects in the traditional theoretical and practical grammars, they are divided into four kinds.

1. I saw him come.

2. I consider him to be clever.

3. I allowed the letter to be sent.

In the traditional grammar the units "him come, him to be clever, the letter to be sent" are considered as complex objects. According to J. Buronov and others: "The complex object consists of two components, the second being in predicative relation to the first" [1974, 316]

Exactly in this textbook, it was said, "The complex object forms an undividable unit and is considered a part of the sentence." [1974.317]. The description "a part of the sentence" in the last sentence does not correspond to the definition "in the predicative relation to the first component." One of the main causes of this is that the syntactic relations among those units identified as complex object, and the composition of their components and their differential syntactic semantic signs are not studied perfectly. When we analyze above-mentioned sentences by dividing them into syntaxemes, we notice that the syntactic units identified as components have semantic differences from each other.

I saw him come. I - substantial agentive, saw-proccedual actional, him-substantial object in relation to the element "saw", and agentive in relation to the element "come", come expresses -procceccual actional syntaxemes. So, him-SbObAg, come - PrAc. The deep structure of this sentence is: SbAg.PrAc.SbObAg.PrAc. In the second sentence the syntaxemes expressed by "I" and "consider" are like the syntaxemes expressed in the first sentence. "Him" - substantial object syntaxeme in relation to the element "consider", as the qualificative "to be clever" expresses qualitative syntaxeme, its qualitative role is transferred to the component "him". As a result, "him" expresses substantial object syntaxeme loaded with qualitative syntaxeme.

The deep structure of this sentence can be demonstrated in the syntaxeme model as follows: SbAg.PrAc.SbObQLt.QLfQ1t.

In the last sentence the components "the letter to be sent," "the letter" expresses substantiality while expressing object syntaxeme both in relation to the components "allowed" and "to be sent". As a result, "the letter-substantial" twice object syntaxemes by itself. "To be sent" expresses procceccual actional directive syntaxeme. The deep structure of the sentence is:

SbAg.PrAc.SbObOb.PrAcDr.

To prove the syntaxemes that were expressed by the components used as complex objects above, we can omit them and use the

verbalization - transformation methods as follows:

(1) I saw him come → .... him come → he came;

(2) I consider him to be clever → ....him to be clever → he is clever,

(3) I allowed the letter to be sent → .... The letter to be sent → the letter was sent.

In traditional grammar, the adverbial modifier is also considered as the secondary part of a sentence with plenty of disputable issues. However, in defining the deep structure of the sentence, we shall not dwell on all kinds of adverbial modifiers; however, we dwell, to some extent, on the research of the syntaxemes of the components expressing modifiers of place and time.

If we pay attention to three cases representing the adverbial modifier of place, we can see the difference of non-categorical syntactic-semantic signs in their substantial circle although their categorical deferential syntactic- semantic sign is the same.

1. I live in Nukus.

2. I go to Nukus.

3. I came from Nukus.

In the first, sentence "in Nukus" expresses the substantiality, while among non-categorical signs it expresses locativeness (place, residence, seat) and adessiveness (person's or thing's whereabouts). Thus, "I" expresses the substantial agentive, "live" expresses procceccual stative, and "in Nukus" expresses the substantial locative adessive syntaxeme. The deep structure of this sentence can be interpreted as follows: SbAg.PrSt.SbLcAd.

The syntactic unit "to Nukus" functioning as a modifier of place and in the second sentence expresses the categorical sign of substantiality while expressing the locative and the allative syntaxemes (A1 - the direction of the activity to a certain object or place) of non-categorical differential syntactic-semantic signs. So, "I" expresses the substantial agentive whereas "go" expresses procceccual actional syntaxeme. The syntaxeme model of the deep structure of the sentence is as follows:

(2) I go to Nukus. SbAg.PrAc.Sb LcA1.

In the last sentence "from Nukus" expresses the locative and the ablative syntaxeme (Ab1 - remoteness of the action from the object or place) based on the substantial categorical sign. In the structure of the sentence, "I" expresses a substantial agentive, while "came" expresses a procceccual actional syntaxeme.

The syntaxeme model of the deep structure of the sentence: (3) I came from Nukus. SbAg.PrAc.SbLc Ab1.

It is clear form the analysis conducted according to the linguistic methods that the functional difference of the syntactic units functioning as modifier of place can serve as a proof of our opinion that they are not yet investigated enough.

According to traditional theoretical and practical grammar, the adverbial modifier of time is the secondary part of the sentence when the action in the sentence structure will be finished. In other words, the adverbial modifier of time means the time when the activity takes place, and is limited to demonstrating its methods of expression.

When the sentences having the adverbial modifier of time are divided into syntaxemes and analyzed, it is called temporal (Tm) syntactic-semantic sign or temporal syntaxeme.

1. Real temporality: He visited us on Monday. To prove this syntaxeme the adverb "then" may be used to replace it:

He visited us on Monday → He visited us then.

2. Temporal identified: Today is Christmas holiday. In this sentence, the element "today" can be replaced by the adverb "now", however it cannot be replaced by "then": Today is Christmas holiday → Now is Christmas holiday.

3. Temporal syntaxeme of manner (TmMn):

Television was left on from morning until night. In this sentence to prove the existence of manner in the sphere of temporality, it can be replaced according to transformation-interrogation (with "in what way" or the adverbial modifiers of time such as, "thus" and "then"):

Television was left on from morning till night ? In what way was television left on → Or: Television was left from then on. Or Television was thus left on.

Proceeding from the abovementioned analyses, we can say without doubt that the other forms of adverbial modifiers need exactly the same analysis.

In short, the way, which demonstrates the deep structure of the sentence, is analyzing syntactic units by dividing them into syntaxemes.

References

1. Meu.edu.tw/_ssmith/ling/fall2007syntax2.ppt.

2. Usmanov,U.U. A New Approach to the Analysis of the Sentence//International scientific and theoretical conference (dedicated to the 10th anniversary of SAMSIFL) - Samarkand, 2004. pp, 105-108.

3. Usmanov, U.U. Componental and Syntaxeme Analysis of the Incomplete Sentences and Their Usage in Comparative Typology//General linguistic problems Roman and German languages. Scholarly works of SamSU. - Samarkand: 1992. - pp. 213-216

4. Giro-Veber M. Classification of the simple tense in the modern Russian language//Voprosy Yazykoznaniya, 1979, #6. - pp. 63-75

5. Zolotova, G.A. The outline of the functional syntax of the Russian language. - Moscow: Nauka, 1973. - p. 351.

6. Buronov, J. Khoshimov, U. Ismatullaev, Kh. English Grammar. Tashkent: Ukhituvchi, 1974. -p. 352