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**ABSTRACT**

The article deals with the transformation of modern linguistics and its manifestations in the Uzbek language. It also analyzes the emergence of the transformational method not only at the syntactic level, which has become a tradition in world linguistics, but also at the lexical and morphological level. The transformation method is compared to the direct participants method, which is close to itself. The peculiarities of the Uzbek language are revealed with concrete examples.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The concept of transformation in linguistics was first introduced to the research agenda by American scholars in the 1950s. The concept of transformation was literally applied to structuralists in relation to syntactic structures, and even today this concept is mainly used

effectively in the analysis of the syntactic structure of a sentence.

The linguistic essence of the transformational method was first perfectly elucidated by the American scientist Z. Harris. The scientist calls the device on which the product is based in the process of transformation a nuclear structure. Z. Harris emphasizes that the lexical units of the derivative sentence, that is, the transformation and the nuclear sentence, must be the same. For example: The children broke the glass - The window was broken by the children.

At the same time, the preceding statement is the basis, and its transformation is the derivative statement. Apparently, almost the same lexical means are involved in both sentences. Moreover, the commonality of meaning is fully preserved in these sentences. However, Z. Harris also emphasizes that it is not easy to determine the semantic relationship between the transformation and the main sentence [1], [537]. The scientist, however, notes that the scope of transformation is only syntactic devices, because the specific environment of each unit must be characterized in terms of its relation to a particular device. In this case, the leading N (noun) and V (verb) play an important role in determining the place of use of words of other categories at the device level. At the same time, of course, the lexical units that come into the basic and derived structures undergoing transformation should not differ sharply [2], [542].

It should also be noted that during the subsequent development of generative grammar, there may be some instances of differentiation between lexical units of transformations. In other words, it is mentioned that some words in the main sentence can be replaced by syntactic means in the transformation. However, in this process, the meanings of the basic sentence must be the same as the transformation. We therefore have a relative understanding of Z. Harris’s view that the lexical units of the above-mentioned transformations do not differ sharply. In other words, in this case, the scientist implies that transformations can come in a circle of lexical units (sovmestnaya vstrechaemost). This is very important, as the transformation has already been formed as a continuation of distributive and BI methods.

**METHODS**

The transformation method was introduced to fill the weaknesses of the distributive method, which also includes the direct participant method (BI method). Indeed, the distributive method is based on the concept of siege. Examples of this are free exchange, complementary and contrast distributions of distributive analysis [3], [34], [35]. Each of these distributions is based on a specific environment. The concept of siege also plays an important role in the method of direct participants. In this case, on the basis of GN - nominal group, GV - verbal (verb) group, syntactic devices based on BI (direct participants) are formed. Therefore, this method of analysis is very close to transformation, and in certain transformational cases, these two methods intersect [4], [76], [82].

It should be noted that the distributive method, although it has contributed to the formation of the transformational method, is not directly applicable in the syntactic analysis of the sentence, its scope is much narrower. Therefore, in the next stage of development of descriptive linguistics, the BI method was introduced. Now it was possible to show clearly and distinctly how the components of speech given by the BI method interact with each other. We can easily see this in the example of BI analysis and BI synthesis, and based on this we can also argue about whether a sentence is grammatically correct or incorrect. In this respect, this method of analysis is very close to transformation. There is a reason for this, of course. Because sentences that are grammatically incorrect cannot be transformed. Therefore, we have found it appropriate to use BI analysis and synthesis below.

An introduction of the transformational method overcame the weaknesses of its distributive and BI methods and gained great prestige in world linguistics. However, this does not mean that the transformational method completely negates the methods of distributive and BI analysis. Because the transformational method fully covers all their positive aspects and in practice is considered a continuation of them.We see one of the peculiarities of the transformational veto in its use of elementary algebraic rules. We see this more in N. Chomsky’s transformational grammar [5], [136]. The fact that today the rules of transformational grammar are applied in areas such as mathematical linguistics, computer technology, indicates that transformation is still a much-needed theory. The main reason for this is that the formation of transformations in the process of transformation is based on the concept of invariance, and the question of whether each transformation is grammatically perfect is one of the main conditions. Of course, the transformation is dynamic, not static. The concept of dynamic character is much more complex than the concept of static character, because it requires not only the development of language, but also its practical application. This is very important. Because in the process of applying language in practice, all linguistic and extralinguistic factors intersect. It is in this process that the transformation of nuclear structures into derivative structures effectively serves for the formation of speech. This, in turn, reflects the creative (porojdayushchiy) nature of the transformation.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

The concept of primitive structure is also used effectively in structural linguistics. There is also the concept of basic speech. This situation will definitely cause inconvenience to the researcher. It would therefore be expedient if the opinions of linguists on this subject were the same. Especially in transformational analysis, there is a great need for this.

In our view, the fundamental structure underlies the formation of any sentence. But the primordial structure is abstract in nature. For example, let’s focus on the word ... wrote. At this point, the word requires a primitive structure of abstract character. His abstraction seems to be that through him there is an opportunity for several sentences to be formed at the same time: he wrote a letter, wrote an application, wrote a book, wrote a poem, and so on. If any of these possibilities are realized, in our opinion, a nuclear structure is formed: wrote a letter. But at the same time, there is an abstraction from a communicative point of view. For although the syntactic field of the predicate has been formed at this point, its executor still remains abstract. When the executive subject is added to it, the message expression is fully formed, and such a structure can be called a nuclear structure that can be the basis for transformation: Rare wrote a letter. Now, on the basis of this nuclear structure, the phenomenon of transformation can take place: Nadir wrote a letter. The letter was written by Nadir. Nadir’s correspondence.

Based on this, we can conclude that any nuclear structure is formed on the basis of a fundamental structure. At the same time, it should be noted that the nuclear structure on which the transformation is based will have an invariant status. We see evidence of this in the formation of transformations. The arrival of a particular structure in invariant status is always adapted to the specific speech situation (situation) and the desire of the speaker. This is very important. After all, behind every statement there is a certain situation. In such a situation, in the broadest sense, in the status of a denotative (referent), verbal expressions, including invariant structures, transformations also serve as a signifier. In other words, if denotation is considered an extralinguistic factor, signifat is a semantic-syntactic factor. At the same time, since the primitive structure is expressed by a verb, it serves as a predicate that comes to the center of the propositive structure of the nuclear sentence, as well as its transformations.

Obviously, the primitive structure will always have gaps that need to be filled (as we saw above). Once the gaps are filled, there is an opportunity for the transformation of the sentence. If a broader opportunity for transformation is created, a paradigm of transformations is formed. Because at the same time there is a freedom for the speaker to choose syntactic structures.

It should also be noted that the syntactic structures that make up the paradigm of transformations may require not only elementary sentences, but also word combinations, complex syntactic devices. To prove the point, let us turn to the following example: Mankind has emerged and is puzzled by this question (U. Hoshimov. Inscriptions in the margins of the notebook).

The given example requires a complex syntactic device (traditional compound sentence). If we draw it into transformation, the following paradigm is formed:

1. Mankind has emerged, puzzled over this question.
2. Mankind has been puzzled by this question since its inception.
3. This question has puzzled mankind since its inception.
4. Mankind has been puzzled by this question since its inception.

Apparently, a given complex syntactic device is also being transformed into syntactic structures with the status of complex sentences, phrases, and more complex syntactic devices. Of course, behind each of these transformations there is a unique situation. In other words, each transformation is associated with a specific post-linguistic situation. But we see that transformations are semantically common. So, at the same time, all the transformations give a unique situational expression. If each of them were connected to a separate situation, the paradigm of transformations would not have arisen. Even in a contamination-based transformation, a single situation of this kind is important:

Bring the book. Bring the book that is on the table Bring the book that is on the table.

At this point, the first transformation (bring the book on the table) is based on contamination. The mixture of the previous two elementary sentences requires contamination. Elementary sentences, on the other hand, form an invariant structure. In other words, there are elementary structures in the status quo at the moment.

Transformations are also formed in any transformation process. This, in turn, allows the speaker to select syntactic structures to apply in speech. Each syntactic structure used will be based on a specific nuclear basis. As R. Rasulov rightly points out: “... the main purpose of the method of transformational analysis is to determine whether there are basic sentences that act as nuclei on the basis of different sentences that occur in our speech, and these sentences are derived from these core sentences, ... their semantic-grammatical relationship»[6], [254]. The following opinion of R. Rasulov is also exemplary: “So, the method of transformational analysis studies the syntactic level of the language system, its number of internal microsystems” [7].

It should also be noted that the concept of transformation applies to syntactic structures, as mentioned in the previous pages of our work. Rasulov's emphasis on this is important in guiding the researcher.

N.Z. Gadjieva’s monograph “The main directions of development of syntactic structures of Turkic languages” contains more positive views on the application of transformation in the material of Turkic languages [8], [212]. However, this work is not the first approach to the material of Turkic languages through the transformational method. This method was originally used as the main method of analysis in the dissertation of N. Turniyazov on the basis of the material of the Uzbek language, entitled “Conjunctions in the Uzbek and French languages” [9].However, while fully acknowledging the achievements of N. Gadjieva in this area, we found it appropriate to comment on some of the shortcomings in the work.

N. Gadjieva, thinking about the conjunctions with the following pronouns, calls their independent part a subordinate transformation. In our opinion, it is inappropriate to see a separate part of the compound sentence in transformative status. Indeed, as a general rule, a compound sentence as a whole requires a transformation. In this case, the initial appearance of the compound sentence obtained for analysis is the main variant, and other variants formed on this basis serve as its transformations.

In addition to the above, in the mentioned monograph of N. Gadjieva the names of the creators of the transformation Z. Herris, N. Khomsky are not mentioned at all, they are not even mentioned in the list of literature.

J.Buronov also comments on the transformation. The scientist rightly points out that transformation occurs in the process of applying syntactic structures in speech. It provides information about the internal and superficial structures of the sentence, and emphasizes the importance of this in the formation of the transformation phenomenon: “Every sentence has an internal (representing the unity of meaning), superficial structure. The internal structure is represented by various transformational variants of the surface structure. The internal structure used in descriptive linguistics means the meaning understood from the sentence, and the superficial structure represents the external formal structure of the sentence” [10], [39].

J.Buronov envisions the transformation as follows, and we fully agree with this opinion: “The method of selecting a secondary structure or pattern based on the main core structure is called transformation. This method is based on the relationship between the semantic and formal structures of the sentence” [11]. Here we see that the scholar is commenting on the ideas of the representatives of American structuralism. Through this, it is possible at any time to prove that the views and opinions expressed about transformation are valid. In addition, J. Buronov had a great contribution to the application of the theory of transformation in the material of the Uzbek language. We can see this especially in the incorporation of transformation into grammatical rules.

The comments of T.Bushuy and Sh.Safarov on the influence of transformational grammar on the science of grammar in general can be a proof of our opinion: “The direction of transformational grammar completely changes the attitude to the grammatical system. The science of grammar no longer consists of a simple descriptive analysis of the collected material, but rather of its universality. As a result of incorporating the rules of transformation into grammatical analysis, it is possible to describe syntactic structures in a much simpler way than other theoretical directions” [12], [116].

It seems that transformation is a very topical issue in today's linguistics, as all its forms are actively used in the speech process. The theory of invariants is also directly related to transformation. M. Abuzalova expresses valuable ideas on the definition of invariants of simple sentences in the Uzbek language [13]. He admits that in systematic linguistics, speech is considered a product of speech, and as a unit of language is recognized not its speech but its model (construction pattern). A sentence pattern is an abstract device that includes the basic grammatical and structural (construction) features of a sentence. It expresses the relationship between the structural elements of a sentence and incorporates its general grammatical meaning.

Because the words in a speech are structurally different, the patterns are also very different. The various utterances uttered in speech can be summarized in several forms on the basis of external construction patterns. In order to determine the smallest syntactic pattern of a sentence, it is necessary to exclude the manifestations of non-syntactic events from the sentence one by one [14], [8]. The part of speech that is free from non-syntactic phenomena such as the purpose of expression, tone, modality, parts of speech remains. The author considers this part to be the smallest pattern of the sentence.

In addition to these ideas about the smallest pattern of speech, we object to the idea that it is considered a non-syntactic phenomenon. The ideas expressed under syntactic and non-syntactic phenomena, in our view, do not reflect reality. Because all the signs specific to the sentence are syntactic events and are contrasted with other events not specific to the sentence, in particular, morphological, lexical, phonetic events.

Although fundamental research on word formation has emerged in Turkology, particularly in Uzbek linguistics, since the 1950s, both word formation and word change in textbooks and manuals have been studied in the morphology department of linguistics until the 1970s [15]. In the process of word formation, change, certain views on the nature of transformation have emerged [16].

Academician As A. Khodzhiev rightly points out, the reason why the phenomena of word formation and form formation have been studied so far in the morphological debate is that morphemes are involved in both of them.

Lexical transformations in Uzbek language are formed by affixes and auxiliary words. Synthetic transformations are formed using affixation, analytical transformations are formed using auxiliary words. For example, lexemes, such as field, field side, are different transformations of the word field, the first being formed by affixation and the second by composition: hence the first transformation is considered a synthetic and the second an analytic lexical transformation. In a morphological transformation, the lexeme, or rather, the lexical morpheme, serves as the transformant that forms the transformations.

**CONCLUSION**

Transformation is universal it is not limited to a single level. In the dynamic aspect of language, all processes such as transformation, derivation, transposition are specific to all levels of language except the phonological level. The transformation method was introduced to fill the weaknesses of the distributive method, which also includes the direct participant method (BI method). The distributive method, although it has contributed to the formation of the transformational method, is not directly applicable in the syntactic analysis of a sentence, its scope of influence is much narrower. Therefore, in the next stage of development of descriptive linguistics, the BI method was introduced.

Transformation consists of the interaction of three structural units as the transformation of linguistic units from one form to another by certain means: the base part for shape change (This part is called the operand), the transformation tool (U is the transformation operator) and the derivative form (U is the transform). Hence, any transformation is generated from an operand using a specific transformation operator, and there is an inherent connection between the transform and the operand. This is because, regardless of which transformation operator is added to the operand, the operand with the transformation represents the same essence, i.e., it does not form a new linguistic unit.

Lexical transformation encompasses all phenomena other than the phenomenon of word formation. That is, it involves the formation of the word. In other words, the transformation occurs as a result of a change in the second component of the word forms in the W + Mgr pattern.

The smallest pattern of a sentence is an operand, and all the appearances formed on the basis of this smallest pattern are its transformations.

Particle devices are transformations, not derivations, because the content of the base structure is also preserved in the particle device.

Any nuclear structure is formed on the basis of the primordial structure, the nuclear structure that is the basis for the transformation has an invariant status. Such a nuclear unit is a predicate for syntactic level units, a basic part for morphological units. The base part expands with specific morphological forms to form morphological transformations, while the predicate expands with specific syntactic forms to form syntactic transformations.
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