

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6345192>

Abdullayeva Visola Sherali qizi

Teacher of Samarkand State

Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: *Generative grammar was a true revolution in the linguistics. However, to describe language behavior in its semantic essence and universal aspects, generative grammar needs to have a much richer semantic basis. In this paper, we read a novel morpho-syntactic approach to the inflectional phrase to account for the very diverse inflectional phrase qualities in different languages. There are given main information about phrases and their derivational properties.*

Keywords: *phrases, language, syntactic, grammar, toponyms, morphemes, names, linguistics.*

Most formal syntactic theories propose either those syntactic representations are the product of a derivation that assembles words and phrases in a bottom-to-top and typically right-to-left fashion, or that they are not constructed in an ordered fashion. Both of these views contrast with the (roughly) left-to-right order of structure assembly in language use, and with some recent claims that syntactic derivations and real-time structure-building are essentially the same. In this article we discuss the mentalistic commitments of standard syntactic theories, distinguishing literalist, formalist, and extension list views of syntactic derivations. We argue that existing evidence favors the view that human grammatical representations are the product of an implementation dependent system, i.e., syntactic representations are assembled in a consistent order, as claimed by grammatical models that are closely aligned with real-time.

Standard generative grammars describe language in terms that appear distant from considerations of everyday, real-time language processes. To some this is a critical flaw, while to others this is a clear virtue. One type of generative grammar defines a well-formed sentence as a static, structured representation that simultaneously satisfies all relevant constraints of the language, with no regard to how the representation is assembled. Another type of generative grammar defines a well-formed sentence as a derivation, or sequence of representations, that describes how the sentence is gradually assembled, often including various transformations that move words or phrases from one position to another in a structure. In the most popular current version of the derivational approach, derivations proceed ‘upwards’, starting from the most deeply embedded terminal elements in the sentence, which are often towards the right of a sentence. Such derivations tend to proceed in a right-to-left order, which is probably the opposite of the order in which sentences are assembled in everyday tasks such as speaking and understanding. Since these theories make no claim to being accounts of such everyday processes, the discrepancy causes little concern among the theories' creators. Generative grammars are typically framed as theories of speakers’ task-independent knowledge of their language,



and these are understood to be distinct from theories of how specific communicative tasks might put that knowledge to use. Set against this background are a number of more recent proposals that various linguistic phenomena can be better understood in terms of derivations that incrementally assemble structures in a (roughly) left-to-right order. One can evaluate these proposals based simply on how well they capture the acceptability judgments that they aim to explain, i.e., standard conditions of 'descriptive adequacy'. But it is hard to avoid the question of whether it is mere coincidence that left-to-right derivations track the order in which sentences are spoken and understood. It is also natural to ask how left-to-right derivations impact the psychological commitments of grammatical theories. Are they procedural descriptions of how speakers put together sentences in real time (either in comprehension or in production)? Do they amount to a retreat from linguists' traditional agnosticism about 'performance mechanisms? These are questions about what a grammatical theory is a theory of, and they are the proverbial elephant in the room in discussions of left-to-right derivations in syntax, although the issues have not been explored in much detail. Here we summarize the current state of some of the evidence for left-to-right derivations in syntax, and how this relates to a number of findings by our group and others on the nature of real-time structure building mechanisms. Some of these questions have been aired in previous work, but we have come to believe that the slogan from that earlier work ("the parser is the grammar") is misleading in a number of respects, and we offer an updated position here.

In morphology, derivation is the process of creating a new word out of an old word, usually by adding a prefix or a suffix. The word comes from the Latin, "to draw off," and its adjectival form is derivational. Linguist notes that one criterion for distinguishing derivation and inflection "is that derivation may feed inflection, but not vice versa. Derivation applies to the stem-forms of words, without their inflectional endings, and creates new, more complex stems to which inflectional rules can be applied."

The derivational change that takes place without the addition of a bound morpheme (such as the use of the noun *impact* as a verb) is called zero derivation or conversion. "*Derivational morphology* studies the principles governing the construction of new words, without reference to the specific grammatical role a word might play in a sentence. In the formation of *drinkable* from *drink*, or *disinfect* from *infect*, for example, we see the formation of new words, each with its own grammatical properties." Morphology may be divided into derivation—rules that form a new word out of old words, like *duckfeathers* and *unkissable*—and *inflection*—rules that modify a word to fit its role in a sentence, what language teachers call conjugation and declension."

The distinction between inflectional morphology and derivational morphology is an ancient one. Fundamentally, it is a matter of the means used to create new lexemes (derivational affixes among other processes) and those used to mark the role of the lexeme in a particular sentence (accidence, inflectional morphology). It seems that although we probably can maintain a distinction between inflectional and derivational morphology relatively well in English—albeit with certain problematical cases which do not invalidate the fundamental notion—the distinction is not helpful to us in understanding any other aspects of the morphology of English. The classification might be



useful in terms of typology, but does not throw much light on the behavior of English morphological processes." "Word-formation is traditionally divided into two kinds: **derivation** and compounding. Whereas in compounding the constituents of a word are themselves lexemes, this is not the case in derivation. For instance, *-ity* is not a lexeme, and hence *taxability* is a case of derivation. The word *income tax*, on the other hand, is a compound since both *income* and *tax* are lexemes. Changing the word class of a word, as happened in the creation of the verb *to tax* from the noun *tax*, is called conversion, and may be subsumed under derivation. Morphological patterns that can be systematically extended are called *productive*. The derivation of nouns ending in *-er* from verbs is productive in English, but the derivation of nouns in *-th* from adjectives is not: it is hard to expand the set of words of this type such as *depth*, *health*, *length*, *strength*, and *wealth*. Researchers have observed some occasional coinings like *coolth* (after *warmth*) but notes that such word coinings are often jocular, and hence do not represent a productive pattern. If we want to coin a new English noun on the basis of an adjective, we have to use *-ness* or *-ity* instead.

Derivational prefixes do not normally alter the word class of the base word; that is, a prefix is added to a noun to form a new noun with a different meaning: Derivational suffixes, on the other hand, usually change both the meaning and the word class; that is, a suffix is often added to a verb or adjective to form a new noun with a different meaning:

- patient: **out**patient
- group: **sub**group
- trial: **re**trial
- adjective - dark: dark**ness**
- verb - agree: agree**ment**
- noun - friend: friend**ship**

There are, however, a number of findings in the psycholinguistics literature that have been taken to indicate divergence between the structures created on-line and those motivated by traditional grammatical analysis.

REFERENCES:

1. May, R., & Keyser, S. J. (1985). Logical form: Its structure and derivation (Vol. 12). MIT press.
2. Im, C. G. (2004). Derivational Economy and Multiple Sphere Hypothesis. *언어과학연구*, 30, 277-298.
3. Singh, R. (2018). Derivational Grammar Model and Basket Verb: A Novel Approach to the Inflectional Phrase in the Generative Grammar and Cognitive Processing. *English Linguistics Research*, 7(2), 9-18.
4. Fillmore, C. J. (1985, June). Syntactic intrusions and the notion of grammatical construction. In Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Vol. 11, pp. 73-86).



5. Gorter, D. (2006). Further Possibilities for Linguistic Landscape Research. *Linguistic Landscape (A New Approach to Multilingualism)*.

