

“LINGUISTIC - GRAMMAR OF THE TEXT” THE CONTENT AND CORRELATION OF CONCEPTS

Sadullaeva G.A. Email: Sadullaeva1147@scientifictext.ru

*Sadullaeva Guzal Alijon kizi – Teacher,
SECONDARY SCHOOL № 11 OF THE DISTRICT SYRDARYA, SYRDARYA N, REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN*

Abstract: *the article analyzes the problem of lexis and grammar correlation. Grammar is considered as a broader science comprising lexicology, morphology and syntax. The correlation between content and context determines the dynamic character of meaning as well as grammatical meaning. Grammar is cognitive and the choice of this or that grammatical form is specified by cognition. The analysis of grammar on the textual level is prominent in the theory of text interpretation as a means of adhering implicit meaning.*

Keywords: *grammar, grammar of discourse, grammatical form, grammatical meaning, context, implication.*

“ЛИНГВИСТИК - ГРАММАТИКА ТЕКСТА” СОДЕРЖАНИЕ И СООТНОШЕНИЕ ПОНЯТИЙ

Садулаева Г.А.

*Садуллаева Гузал Алиджон кизи – преподаватель,
Средняя школа № 11 Сырдарьинского района, г. Сырдарья, Республика Узбекистан*

Аннотация: *в статье анализируется проблема соотношения лексики и грамматики. Грамматика рассматривается как более широкая наука, включающая лексикологию, морфологию и синтаксис. Корреляция между содержанием и контекстом определяет динамический характер смысла, а также грамматический смысл. Грамматика когнитивные и выбор той или иной грамматической формы определяется познанием. Анализ грамматики на текстовом уровне занимает видное место в теории интерпретации текста как средства соблюдения неявного смысла.*

Ключевые слова: *грамматика, грамматика дискурса, грамматическая форма, грамматический смысл, контекст, импликация.*

УДК 81-13

It is known that the concepts of "linguistics" and "grammar" are used in many theories of language as complete synonyms. Grammar is "a structured inventory of conventional language signs" [1, p.57]. R. Muncha remarks to the notion of grammar as follow- this is a country without borders with vast areas not yet studied, always open for new discoveries and research; this science has a venerable age, noble origin and today it is still worth to work hard in order to possess.[2, p. 133-141].

In educational texts, the most common understanding of grammar is that it is contrasted with vocabulary and consists of two sections-morphology (where morphemic and word formation) and syntax are included. It is known, V. and L. Mathesius in practice have entered the lexicon in their grammar.

After V. Mathesius, V. P. Danilenko [3; 4] proves, on the basis of speech activity of the speaker, grammar is structured as understanding the disciplinary basement and it is divided into word formation (investigating issues related to the creation of new words) and phrasing, which in turn includes lexicology, morphology and syntax. The first of these disciplines is aimed to study the lexical period of phrasing, the token that is used to select the tokens for the proposal to be created. Morphology research problems associated with the new period of phrasing, in which the process of translation of lexical forms of the word (lexemes) selected by the speaker in the first period is carried out in its morphological shape. The syntax is studying the final period of phrasing; it emerges as the result of completed sentence. Thus, it turns out that in the disciplinary structure of grammar, lexicology receives a complete "organic place" that's connected with the period in the speaker's activity.

V. P. Danilenko opposes the well-known "metaphor of the box" (box metaphor): vocabulary and grammar are presented in the form of two boxes, and the process of transition to one or the other side – in the form of "shifting" things from one box to another. Such representation creates the illusion that it is possible to draw a strict boundary between vocabulary and grammar, dividing them into different boxes.

So, V. P. Danilenko relies on objectively existence of closed organic connection of vocabulary and grammar. No wonder many morphological categories in traditional grammatical descriptions are called lexical-grammatical (*such characteristic categories of numbers in many grammatical descriptions are given; also a generally accepted understanding parts of speech as lexico-grammatical classes of words, as well as groups within parts of speech – ways of verbal action, concrete and abstract names, etc*).

Wide recognition of the multiple connections between vocabulary and grammar, which similar in the ways of conceptualization of the world brings the language to develop in detail with those lexical layers that are most

relevant to life, the life of native speakers; examples of rich synonymy related to snow in the languages of the Northern peoples or detailing legend of the desert in Arabic. And at the level of grammar, only those meanings are coded, which appear to be the most significant in the national language picture of the world. But this lexical and grammatical similarity does not prevent the differentiation of various language levels.

In concepts where the grammar is divided into morphology and syntax, the main task of morphology seen in the formulation of regular rules according to which it is possible to form a paradigm for any number of tokens. However, the use of forms one or another inflection category and its role in the semantic interpretation of the statement can be considered as a syntax competence. With this approach, it turns out, that morphology is a purely formal part of grammar, representing "inventory" for syntax. F. de Saussure wrote: "Separating morphology from syntax, refer to object - latter is the functions inherent in linguistic units, where morphology only considers form ... but this distinction is deceptive ... form and function they form a whole, and it is difficult, not to say impossible, to separate them. From the linguistic-morphological point of view, it is not different from the syntax of the discipline" [2.66], however actively objecting to the inclusion of lexicology in grammar, does not defend independence of morphology: sympathetically quoting the thoughts of F. de Saussure and C. D. Kaznelson about the "intelligence" of the morphology to the syntax, does not provide any arguments in favor of independence of morphology [3. 30]. Great linguist-theoretician of our time R. Dixon, in his latest synthesis work [5.98] defends the rigid division of grammar and lexicon: proclaimed in the first Chapter of the first volume, this opposition is consistently carried out in all other parts. Any morpheme of any language is interpreted by Dixon as either grammatical, or as a lexical, and the cases of intermediate, syncretic nature is not consider. In the concept of one of the leading experts in the field of morphology and general the theory of language, the new Zealand linguist Andrew Carstairs-McCarthy [4.85] distinguishes morphology and syntax acts as a principle. While among the English-speakers the works of widespread views, according to which the morphology is reduced to the syntax, morphological phenomena may be distributed between vocabulary and syntax, it is consistent protection of the independence of morphology (without denying, of course, its closest relationships with syntax and vocabulary).

If morphology is understood simply as the teaching of forms (in isolation from their semantic content and features of selection on the axis of selection), then, indeed, we can talk about full exhaustion of the morphological problems proper: the most complete lists of paradigms with all the formal modifications have long been the property of grammars and grammars dictionaries. However, cognitive-oriented morphology is based on that assumption, that the choice of form is determined by the peculiarities of human intelligence and communication, that is, the cognitive ability of a person: "a comprehensive description of the language cannot be given without a complete description of human cognition" [6. 63], and this is to the full extent true to such section of linguistics as morphology. V. A. Plungyan [8. 78] rightly calls the most important property of grammatical meaning "cognitive emphasis", which in turn determines such a fundamental quality of grammatical meanings as obligation.

References / Список литературы

1. *Langacker R.W.* Nouns and verbs // *Language*. 1987. № 63.
2. *Münch R.* Aneignung des fremdsprachlichen Wortschatzes in der Schule // *Die lebenden Fremdsprachen*. 1950. H. 11.
3. *Даниленко В.П.* Дисциплинарная структура грамматики // *Филологические науки*. 1992. № 3.
4. *Даниленко В.П.* Еще о грамматическом статусе лексикологии // *Филологические науки*. 2005. № 5.
5. *Бодуэн де Куртене И.А.* Языкознание, или лингвистика XIX века // *Хрестоматия по истории русского языкознания* / сост. Ф.М. Березин. М., 1973. Сосюр Ф. Курс общей лингвистики // *Сосюр Ф. Труды по языкознанию*. М., 1977.
6. *Виноградов В.В.* Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. М., 1972.
7. *Dixon R.M.W.* Basic linguistic theory. Vol. 1. Methodology. Oxford, 2010; *Dixon R.M.W.* Basic linguistic theory. Vol. 2. Grammatical topics. Oxford, 2010.
8. *Плунгян В.А.* Грамматические категории, их аналоги и заместители: дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. М., 1998.