BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

THE ROLE OF SUBORDINATIVE CONJUNCTIONS IN TEXT DERIVATION

Shaxnoza Berdikulova, English Teacher

Kattakurgan State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract: This article analyzes the role of postpositional constructions in the process of syntactic derivation, their operator status, and their linguistic nature based on Uzbek language materials. Furthermore, it is substantiated in this article that postpositional constructions as derivation operators serve to ensure connection not only within complex syntactic units but also between paragraphs (inter-paragraph connections).

Keywords: derivation, operator, subordinative conjunctions, complex syntactic units, operand, derivative.

It is well known that the components of complex syntactic units (CSUs) enter into syntactic relations using various connective means depending on their type. Traditional linguistics emphasizes that CSUs with equal components are connected by coordinating conjunctions, while CSUs with subordinate components are connected by subordinating conjunctions. Therefore, in existing literature, constructions such as shuning uchun, shu sababli have been included in the category of causal conjunctions [1.386].

However, another group of linguists interprets these constructions not as subordinating conjunctions, but as postpositional constructions [2.126]. In particular, according to N. Mahmudov, interpreting postpositional constructions as subordinating conjunctions is incorrect and is a consequence of copying from the Russian language [2.126].

One can agree with the scholar's opinion; indeed, since constructions like shuning uchun, shu tufayli consist of a pronoun + postposition, it will not be a mistake in our view to consider them postpositional constructions.

In some literature related to Russian linguistics, postpositional constructions like shuning uchun, shu tufayli (poetomu) are categorized under adverbs. It is stated in those sources that they are neither conjunctions nor postpositions, but adverbs. Complex syntactic units containing such words were classified as non-conjunctional compound sentences. For example: On ne prishyol, poetomu ya poshyol odin [3].

In our opinion, this view appears to require some clarification. Because even if there is no explicit postposition in Russian for constructions like shuning uchun, shu tufayli (poetomu), from the standpoint of Russian linguistics, it would be more appropriate to consider it a conjunction rather than an adverb. Naturally, the components of complex syntactic units containing such words enter into a subordinate relation, not an equal one. The above example serves as clear proof of this, because it is precisely due to the presence of the word poetomu that this CSU enters into a subordinate relation. If we remove this word from the structure of the CSU, only then can it transform into a CSU with equal relations: On ne prishyol, ya poshyol odin.

It should also be noted that postpositional constructions are considered morphological means that ensure the syntactic connection of macrotext components. Their syntactic function manifests in connecting the components of complex syntactic units, paragraph components, as well as in inter-paragraph connection. We can see the proof of our opinion in the following examples:

1. Saodat ko‘pdan beri ashula aytmagan edi, shuning uchun ham u jaranglagan ovozlarga qo‘shilib ashula aytgisi keldi (Ibrohim Rahim).

2. Shone’mat Rossiyadan ko‘chirib keltirilgan zavod qurilishida ishlay boshlaganida uni urushga olishmaganidan Shoikrom suyungan edi. Gap boshqa yoqda ekan. Ukasi sil ekan. Shuning uchun qoldirishgan ekan. Mana, uch oydirki, yerga yopishib yotibdi (O‘.Hoshimov. Urushning so‘nggi qurboni).

3. Bu hodisani bundan o‘n yil oldin mana shu Karamnasa bo‘yida otasi Bobur ham ko‘rganini va o‘z esdaliklarida yozib qoldirganini Humoyun bilardi. Bunaqa irimlarga ishonmaydigan Bobur Mirzo hozir Humoyun turgan joyni qo‘shinga qarorgoh qilib tanlab, bir hafta turgan va shu atrofdagi yovlarni yengib, Agraga g‘alaba bilan qaytgan edi. Shuning uchun Humoyun taqvodorlarning irimidan ko‘ra otasining tajrisbasiga ko‘proq tayandi. Uch tarafi daryo bilan to‘silgan baland tepaliklar uni dushmanlaridan asraydigandek tuyuldi. Beklar ham «faqat qarorgohning janubi-sharq tomoniga soqchilar qo‘yilsa, kechalar tinch uxlash mumkin» deyishdi (P. Qodirov. Avlodlar dovoni).

As can be seen, postpositional constructions serve to connect parts of complex syntactic units with subordinate components in the first of the cited examples, and paragraph components in the second example. In the third example, they ensure an inter-paragraph connection.

It is evident from the provided examples that postpositional constructions resemble conjunctions according to their function. They syntactically connect text components to one another and act as an operator in the derivation process:

Zamon notinch, kechalari ko‘chada yurish xavotirli edi. Shu sababli Hirot aholisi qosh qorayishi bilan ko‘cha eshiklarini ichidan zanjirlab olishar edi. Amaldorlar yashaydigan «Injil» yoqasidagi bu chekka mahalla ahli ham kechasi bosh suqib ko‘chaga chiqa olmas edi. Hozir ham ozoda ko‘chalar, sahniga gul va sarv ddaraxtlari o‘tqazilgan shinam hovlilar suv quygandek jim-jit (M.Osim. Zulmat ichra nur).

The provided text consists of four components, and each component is considered a derivation operand. Each of these operands acts as a derivative structure. The sum of these derivative structures gives rise to a derivative of derivatives-a macro-derivative, namely the text. The foundational structure of the text is formed by its first component, because the semantic weight of this sentence is higher than the others. We can also observe this in the fact that the remaining components of the paragraph follow it and complement its meaning. The means that syntactically connects the foundational structure of the text with other operands is the postpositional construction shu sababli included within the second component of the text. Therefore, in this situation, the

postpositional construction acts as a derivation operator. We can illustrate this in the following diagram:

1. Derivative (foundational) structure = D1 (derivative)
2. Derivative structure = D2 (derivative), (operator – shu sababli)
3. Derivative structure = D3 (derivative)
4. Derivative structure = D4 (derivative)
5. Derivative of derivatives (D1 + D2 + D3 + D4) = D (text).

It should also be emphasized that, as observed above, postpositional constructions, like other examined means, are capable of ensuring not only the connection of components within a paragraph but also inter-paragraph connections. In such a scenario, the weight of postpositional constructions as a means ensuring text syntactic connection rises another level. This is because in this case, sentences no longer act as syntactic derivation operands; instead, paragraphs begin to play an active role. The syntactic connection of operands as a derivation operator is provided by postpositional constructions:

Ayniqsa, mahalla bolalari ila fanor orasida anglashilmas dushmanlik uyg'ondi. To'planishib, avvalo bir-birimizning do'ppimizni otishar, fanorga do'ppi kiygizgan o'rtoq merganligi ila kerilar edi. Keyincha bu ham bizni zeriktira boshladi, chunki piston qadalgan yoki har turli ipaklar bilan bezalgan do'ppini kiyib olib, fanor chiroyli bir tus olar, bizni xafa qilgandek bo'lar edi. Shuning uchun ham qo'limizga tosh, kesak olib fanorga hujum qilishni o'rgandik. Bunda u juda kuchsiz edi: kichkina bir kesak yoki tosh parchasi bechora fanorning oyna ko'zlarini o'pirib tushirardi (Oybek. Fanorchi ota).

In the cited example, it goes without saying that the postpositional construction shuning uchun provides the syntactic connection of derivation operands. We can observe that this means, acting as an operator, connects two paragraphs at the same time. Hence, this exact function of the postpositional construction activates it as an operator at that moment. Put differently, if we analyze these paragraphs separately, this means cannot function in the status of an operator.

It should also be noted that in macrotext derivation, the formation of a derivative structure with the help of postpositional constructions resembles complex syntactic units with subordinate components according to its syntactic structure. However, despite their similar qualities, the inter-paragraph connection formed with the help of postpositional constructions cannot be deemed identical to the connection of parts of complex syntactic units with subordinate components. This is because the alignment of a series of syntactic features does not imply that these syntactic units share structural-semantic identity. The main difference, as examined above, appears in identifying operators and operands in their derivational analysis.

One of the distinctive features of postpositional constructions is that they do not possess a nominative function. In this regard, they resemble other morphological means forming text derivation, such as conjunctions and particles. However, the lack of a nominative function does not hinder postpositional constructions from forming the syntactic relationships of text components. This characteristic of theirs clearly demonstrates the nature of semantic connection between structural parts of a text. Speaking of the syntactic and semantic role of postpositional constructions

in text derivation, it is necessary to emphasize that the role of context in this situation is also significant. This is because context noticeably affects the nature of syntactic relations. The pragmatic relationships of text components also become clearly visible precisely within the context.

References:

1. N. Mahmudov, A. Nurmonov. O‘zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. – Toshkent, 1995. – 129-bet
2. Запятые при слове “поэтому”. - gramatik.ru.
3. Turniyazov, B. N. (2008). Derivation of complex syntactic constructions with equal components in Present day Uzbek language. Samarkand, Uzbekistan.
4. Турниязов, Б. Н. (2021). FAKTIVLIK ASOSIDAGI KAUZATSIYA. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 4(1-1).
5. Turniyazov, B., & Saidova, S. (2020, December). ACTIVITY IN CAUCASUS. In Конференции.
6. Хайруллаев, Х. (2018). Нутқ бирликларининг иерархик муносабати хусусида айрим мулоҳазалар. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, 3(1 (66)), 43-49.
7. Хайруллаев, Х. (2017). Яна нутқнинг минимал бирлиги ҳақида ёки гап ва жумла масаласи хусусида. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, 2(4 (65)), 25-29.
8. Хайруллаев, Х. З. (2012). Иерархические отношения единиц фонематического уровня с единицами морфематического уровня. Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: Лингвистика, (4), 29-35.
9. Mamirova, D. S. (2022). ADVERTISING IS A SOCIO-LINGUISTIC STUDY AS AN OBJECT. ВЕСТНИК МАГИСТРАТУРЫ, 109.
10. Mamirova Dilnoza Shirinboyevna (2022). FEATURES OF ACCOUNT WORDS IN ADVERTISING TEXTS. Science and innovation, 1 (JSSR), 151-154. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7299742
11. Туробов, А. (2016). Қўшма сўз компонентлари хусусида. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, 1(4), 55-57.
12. Турниязов, Н., & Туробов, А. (2017). Тил бирликларининг нутққа ко'чирилиши масаласи билан боғлиқ баъзи мулоҳазалар. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, 2(3 (64)), 5-9.