

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 05 Volume: 73

Published: 25.05.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Shahnoza Aybekovna Aliyeva  
Andijan State University  
dpt. Uzbek Linguistics  
Senior lecturer  
[z.eshanova@mail.ru](mailto:z.eshanova@mail.ru)

SECTION 29. Literatur0065.

## ON THE NATURE OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL METHOD (INTERPRETATION OF THE NATURE OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL METHOD)

**Abstract:** The present article deals with the analysis of the existing the theoretical conceptions on the transformational method, interrelation of deep and surface sentence structures and the status of kernel sentence with all its transforms in expressing semantic-grammatical relations in speech.

**Key words:** transform, transformation, language layers, system, nominative, constructive, compressive, stylistic, derivation, paradigm, grammatical meaning, grammatical form.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Aliyeva, S. A. (2019). On the nature of the transformational method (interpretation of the nature of the transformational method). *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 05 (73), 273-276.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-05-73-38> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.05.73.38>

### Introduction

One of the specific features of the transformational method is seen in the use of elementary algebraic rules. Mostly we can observe this in N.Chomsky's transformational Grammar [6, P.136]. Today the usage of the rules of transformational grammar in such spheres as mathematical linguistics, computer techniques testifies that transformation is still remaining as an important theory at this moment. The main reason of this is that formation of transforms during the transformation process is based on the notion invariance and the issue that every transformation should have correct grammatical forms makes up one of the major terms. Of course, the transformation is of dynamic character but not static. The notion dynamic character is more complex than that of static character. Actually it stipulates for not only language development, but also its usage in practice [1, P.130]. Because in the process of language use linguistic and extralinguistic factors intersect.

### Materials and Methods

During this process turning of the kernel structures into derivative structures serves effectively to form the speech. This, in its turn, shows the creative feature of transformation. Serious attention is paid to the realization of surface syntactic structure on the

basis of kernel structure in the formation of the derivative structure in N.Chomsky's transformational grammar.

In this process not only grammatically correct, but also transformation of contentually weighty sentences should be in the focus of attention. From this point of view N.Chomsky's understanding differs from the conceptions of American structuralism.[7, P.27]

The force of N.Chomsky's transformational grammar is seen in the factor that every sentence structure, every word combination structure is analysed not within a separate vacuum, but with other neighbouring sentences and word combinations in close and organic interrelation. Its essence is great, because usage of the language system in speech is connected with that kind of condition" [4, P.131].

In fact, we can see the dynamic feature of the language first of all by means of the sentence. That is why N.Chomsky considers the sentence as the major unit of the language, but not the phoneme or the morpheme.

His view on the sentence, consisting of abstract units, formation of derivative structures based on concrete rules stood on the agenda of his investigations. That is why N.Chomsky's theory on the sentence was of algorithmic feature. In other words, it won't be an exaggeration if we say

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b> = 3.117	<b>SIS (USA)</b> = 0.912	<b>ICV (Poland)</b> = 6.630
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b> = 0.829	<b>PIHII (Russia)</b> = 0.156	<b>PIF (India)</b> = 1.940
<b>GIF (Australia)</b> = 0.564	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b> = 8.716	<b>IBI (India)</b> = 4.260
<b>JIF</b> = 1.500	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b> = 5.667	<b>OAJI (USA)</b> = 0.350

N.Chomsky's transformational grammar lies on the basis of mathematical linguistics.

Transformational grammar of N.Chomsky pays attention to semantic peculiarities of the components of the sentence too. Theme – rheme relations of the components of the sentence were also the object of analysis. In fact, semantic problems were not the object of the early research works of the American scientists of structuralism. But we witness N.Chomsky's serious attention to the issues of semantics in transformational grammar. N.Chomsky's generative grammar came into being in the second half of the past century. It was a great positive event in world linguistics. He could give full comments of the transformation rules alongside with dynamic character of transformation in the work.

According to him the following rules belong to them:

Specific rules on the wholeness of the sentence (phrase) structure formation and lexics.

The rule of transforming the deep structure into a surface.

Semantic component rule interpreting the amount of the content of the deep structure.

Phonological component rule interpreting the norms of the pronunciation of the surface syntactic structure [10].

This proves that semantics was taken into consideration in generative grammar. Besides, we can see the general rule of transformation also is not devoid of the notion semantics. In accordance with the meaning of the basic sentence it does not change in the transform of the given sentence.

Besides the view given above, it's worth pointing out one more fact that it has become a tradition to define one of the transforms as a kernel sentence during the transformation analysis. The simplest with the fewest grammatical morphemes of transforms get the status of a kernel sentence. However deep structure notion is being effectively used in structural linguistics. Besides that, there exist the notion "basic sentence". This condition, of course, may cause inconveniences for the researcher.

It would be desirable if linguists shared the same view regarding this problem. Especially, transformational analysis is in need of this.

We think that the deep structure lies on the basis of formation of any sentence. But the deep structure is of abstract character. For example, let's pay attention to the word "... ёзди" (wrote). This word requires the deep structure with abstract character. Its abstractness is seen in the fact that there is a chance to form a number of sentences with the help of it at the same time: хат ёзди, ариза ёзди, китоб ёзди, шеър ёзди etc. If one of the chances gets realized, in our opinion, the kernel structure is formed: хат ёзди. At the same time one can observe abstractness from the communicative point of view. Because, despite the formed syntactic field of the predicate in this position,

its doer is still remaining abstract. When the doer, the subject, is added, expression of the statement is fully formed and we consider this structure as the kernel structure transformation: Нодир хат ёзди.

Now transformation phenomenon gets realized on the basis of the kernel structure: Нодир хат ёзди, хат Нодир томонидан ёзилди, Нодирнинг хат ёзиши.

On the basis of this fact we conclude that any kernel structure appears on the basis of a deep structure. The basic kernel structure for transformation is of invariant status. We can see the proof in the formation of transforms. Invariant status of a certain structure always adapts to concrete speech situation and the will of the speaker. It is very important. Actually, there is a definite situation behind any sentence. This situation in the widest meaning of it serves as the denotatum (referent), verbal sentences, particularly invariant structure, transforms serve as significats. In other words, if the denotatum is considered to be an extra linguistic factor, while the - a semantic-syntactic factor.

At the same time as the deep structure is being expressed by the verb, it performs the function of the predicate standing in the centre of the kernel sentence, as well as propositive structure of transforms.

As is known, deep structure has always empty places to be filled in (we have spoken about it above). After empty places have been filled there appears a chance for sentence transformation.

If chances are wider for transformation paradigm of transforms come into being because the speaker has the freedom of choice of syntactic structures at this moment.

We'd like to point out the fact that syntactic structures that constitute paradigm of transforms may require not only elementary sentences, but word combinations, composite syntactic constructions also. Let's address to the following sentence to prove our view: Инсоният пайдо бўлибдики, шу савол устида бош қотиради (Ў.Хошимов. Дафтар хошиясидаги битиклар)

The given example requires a composite structure (traditional composite sentence). If we involve it in transformation, the following paradigm is formed:

1.Инсоният пайдо бўлибдики, шу савол устида бош қотиради

2.Пайдо бўлгандан буён, инсоният шу савол устида бош қотиради.

3.Шу савол инсониятнинг бошини у пайдо бўлгандан бери қотиради.

4.Пайдо бўлгандан бери инсониятнинг шу савол устида боши қотиши.

As is seen, the given composite syntactic structure has been transformed into a composite sentence, a word combination and syntactic structures having the status of a composite syntactic construction. Of course, there is a special situation

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 3.117</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.156</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

behind each transform. In other words, each transform is linked with a back language situation. But we see transforms to be general from the point of view of content. So, at the moment all the transforms are expressing a single situation. If each of the transforms had a connection with a certain situation, the paradigms of the transforms would not come into being. A single situation is a significant even in the transformation based on contamination: Китобни келтир. У стол устида, Қайси китоб стол устида турган бўлса, ўша китобни келтир.

In this case the first transform (Стол устида турган китобни келтир) is based on contamination. Mixture of the first two sentences causes contamination. Elementary sentences are forming invariant structures. In other words, elementary structures acquire the status of a kernel sentence.

Transforms are formed in any transformational process. This, in its turn, gives the speaker a chance to select syntactic structures. Every syntactic structure in use is founded on a certain kernel.

As R.Rasulov points out correctly: "... the main objective of the method of transformational analyses is to perform the task of determining the existence of basic sentences which perform the function of the kernel on the basis of different sentences which get realized in our speech, that they originate from kernel sentences, ... their semantic-grammatical relations"[8, P.254]

The following idea of R.Rasulov is worth paying attention too "So, the method of transformational analysis studies the syntactic level of the language system, its several microsystems as well."[8, P.254]

The notion of transformation is used with regard to syntactic structures in our work. R.Rasulov's special accent to this is very important for the researcher to take a right direction.

N.Z.Gadjiyeva's monograph "Major directions of the development of syntactic structures in Turkic languages"[5, P. 212-327]. A lot of positive views have been told on putting into practice transformation with regard to materials of Turkic languages. But that was not the first approach to Turkic languages through transformation method. This method was used to the materials of the Uzbek language by N.Turniyazov in his candidacy dissertation "Attributive clauses in Uzbek and French languages"[9] as the main method of analysis. Appreciating N. Gadjiyeva's achievements in this field, we would like to point out shortcomings of the work. While expressing her views concerning composite sentences, N. Gadjiyeva calls dependent parts as subordinates of transforms. In our opinion, it is not desirable to consider a part of the

composite sentence to have the status of a transform. Actually, in accordance with the general rule, the whole composite sentence should be a transform. In this case the first form of the composite sentence taken for analysis is considered to be the main variant and other variants formed on this base perform the functions of its transforms.

Besides that, N.Gadjiyeva did not mention the names of the creators of transformation Z.Harris and N.Chomskiy in her work, nor in the bibliography.

J.B.Buranov also expresses his views on transformation. He points out correctly that transformations occur in the process of syntactic structures in speech. The scholar gives information about the inner and surface structures and says that this plays an essential role in the formation of the transformation phenomenon: "Every sentence has inner, surface structures. The inner structure is expressed by means of different transformation variants. The inner structure used in descriptive linguistics expresses semantics of the sentence, while the surface structure - the formal structure of the sentence" [3, P.283].

J.Buranov understands transformation in the following way and we fully agree with him: "Model (pattern) selection method or secondary structure based on the main kernel structure is transformation. This method happens on the basis of mutual relation of the meaning and formal structures of the sentence [3, P.283]." One can see that scholar's views are based on the ideas of the representatives of American structuralism. Well-groundedness of the views can be proved at any time. Besides, J.Buranov's contribution was great in applying transformation theory to the language materials. It is clearly seen in introducing transformation to grammar rules.

T.Bushuy and Sh.Safarov speak of the influence of the transformational grammar as a science: "The direction of the transformational grammar is fully changing attitudes towards the grammatic system.

Nowadays grammar as a science is not only a simple descriptive analysis of the collected material, but at the same time a demand to elucidate the universal features of it is being put on the agenda.

As a result of the introduction of transformation rules into grammatic analysis gave a chance to describe syntactic structures in the simplest way than other theoretical directions [2, P.116].

## Conclusion

As is seen, position of transformation in present day linguistics is high enough, actually, all types of it are being actively used in the process of speech.

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA</b> (India) = <b>3.117</b>	<b>SIS</b> (USA) = <b>0.912</b>	<b>ICV</b> (Poland) = <b>6.630</b>
<b>ISI</b> (Dubai, UAE) = <b>0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI</b> (Russia) = <b>0.156</b>	<b>PIF</b> (India) = <b>1.940</b>
<b>GIF</b> (Australia) = <b>0.564</b>	<b>ESJI</b> (KZ) = <b>8.716</b>	<b>IBI</b> (India) = <b>4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b> = <b>1.500</b>	<b>SJIF</b> (Morocco) = <b>5.667</b>	<b>OAJI</b> (USA) = <b>0.350</b>

## References:

1. Alekseyeva, L. M., & Mishlanova, S. L. (2015). Teoriya derivatsii. *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta*, vip. 3(31), p.130.
2. Bushuy, T. A., & Safarov, S. S. (2007). *Til qurilishi: tahlil metodlari va metodologiyasi*. (p.116). Toshkent.
3. Bo'ronov, J. B. (1973). *Ingliz va o'zbek tillarining qiyosiy grammatikasi*. (p.283). Toshkent.
4. Baxudarov, L. S. (1970). *Struktura prostogo predlojeniya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika*. (p.131). Moscow.
5. Gadjiyeva, N. K. (1973). *Osnovniye puti razvitiya sintaksicheskoy strukturi tyurkskix yazikov*. (pp.212-327). Moscow.
6. Zaslina, L. N. (1974). *Vvedeniye v strukturnuyu lingvistiku*. (p.136). Moscow.
7. Iliya, L. I. (1966). *Ocherki po grammatike sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika*. (p.27). Moscow.
8. Rasulov, R. (2013). *Umumiy tilshunoslik*. (p.254). Toshkent.
9. Turniyazov, N. K. (1971). *Opredelitelnye pridatochniye predlojeniya v uzbekskom i fransuzkom yazikax*. Aftoref.kand.dis. Tashkent.
10. Xomskiy, N. (1957). *Sintaksicheskiye strukturi*. *Novoye v lingvistike*, vip. II. Moscow.