JOURNAL	International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science
p-ISSN	2544-9338
e-ISSN	2544-9435
PUBLISHER	RS Global Sp. z O.O., Poland

ARTICLE TITLE	THE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE GRAMMATICAL VARIABILITY
AUTHOR(S)	Allahverdiyeva Feride Mahammad
ARTICLE INFO	Allahverdiyeva Feride Mahammad. (2022) The Linguistic Analysis of the Grammatical Variability. International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science. 2(34). doi: 10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30062022/7831
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30062022/7831
RECEIVED	03 June 2022
ACCEPTED	21 June 2022
PUBLISHED	30 June 2022
LICENSE	This work is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

THE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE GRAMMATICAL VARIABILITY

Allahverdiyeva Feride Mahammad,
Azerbaijan University of Languages (AUL), Baku, Azerbaijan

ABSTRACT

The actuality of the subject. Variability, optionality is observed at all levels of the language as a universal feature of language means. One of the key features for the contemporary linguistic research is the general typology of language means' variability and focusing on issues such as functional specifications of various variants in the text. In contrast to other levels of language, the problem of variability in syntax has been studied less. The complexity of the investigation of variability in the syntax field is conditioned by the dual nature of syntactic units, and their structure-content layout. The sentence as a syntactic unit changes the structural-content layout and functional aspect in the evolutionary process. Simple sentences the generally accepted communicative speech unit and generally accepted syntactic units has been widely studied in various aspects in modern linguistic studies and currently is being studied further. Simple sentence being a structural type of sentence had a long way of development in the modern English language as well like in other languages, and has come to the present situation having structural-semantic improvement through certain changes during the speech as a result of simplification in sentence models, expression means in sentences. Until now, there is no comprehensive description of the variativity features of all syntactic models of simple sentences in the studies where the syntactic structure of the English language has been described. Still, structural-semantic features, variations emerged in the historical development process can be underlined as an important issue because of the controversial issues in the syntax with a simple sentence and this proves the relevance of the topic. All of these brings to the agenda the comparisons by analyzing the structure-semantic layout of the simple sentence in different periods of English language, revealing the changes in the simple sentence models, sentence members, and their means of expression, word order, analyzing the causes of those changes as an actual lingvo-methodological issue. Many researchers (K.Abdullayev, S.Abdullayev, D.Yunusov, F.Veysalli and others) have examined the problem of variativity in different types of sentences in Azerbaijani linguistics and have shown valuable works in this area. The term "variativity" is applied to describe the functionality of different language units in modern linguistics and during the discovery of its unobserved aspects. In recent decades, the concept of enhanced variativity in phonology has also contributed to extensive research in other areas of linguistics, including syntax.

Introduction.

During syntactic studies in modern linguistics the sentence is approached structurally, pragmatic, communicative, and etc. positions. The interest in structural transformation of the sentence, its paradigms play an important role in modern grammatical and syntactic studies. Such attempts are explained by the fact that, in modern linguistics the key focus is oriented on the dynamic side of the

language. All of these actualizes analysis of similar syntactic structures, simple sentence invariant models and model variations, their minimal and maximum limits on the basis of modern English language materials and theories reflected in the current linguistic literature, evaluation of the obtained results and conclusions from the point of view of foreign language teaching methodology.

Scope of study.

The scope of study explores the research. The main purpose of the research is to define various variative, paradigmatic, derivative, synonyms and transformational variations and invariant models that occur in the structure of the simple sentence based on modern English language materials, to interpret the reasons for the changes in the structure of the simple sentence in the background of changes in the English language's historical development periods, to underline the basis of variativity as a general feature in the case of change of the sentence and its semantic structures change, to determine the reasons for the transformation and paradigmatic relationships of simple sentences from a syntactical point of view.

To achieve this goal, attention is paid to addressing the following tasks:

- to study the typical structural and semantic characteristics of simple sentences in separate historical development periods of English;
- to reveal changes emerged in typical simple sentence models for middle and early new English language eras;
- to have a look at changes in sentence members and their means of expression in simple sentence structures during separate historical development periods of English;
- to define syntactic versions of simple sentences and their types in modern English;
- to reveal the main factors that make the variativity of simple sentences in English;
- to attempt to give a systematic semantic-syntactic description of the basic invariant models of simple sentences in modern English;
- to attempt to create a typology of simple sentences in the modern English based on critical analysis of scientific and theoretical literature;
- to reveal the syntactic paradigms for simple sentence models in English;
- to consider syntactic derivation in similar syntactic structures of simple sentence in English;
- to review simple sentences in English based on different linguistic analysis models (transformation, transmitter or derivative);
- to give a description of the development models of sentence members in the structure of simple sentences in English;
- to have a look at the variative nature of the intonation structure and speech intonation of simple sentences in English;
- to explore the constants and variability issues in the intonation structure from the experimental point of view;
- to clarify the formal and functional aspects of the intonation of simple sentences in English.

Research methodology.

Research methodology of study consists of scientific and theoretical studies, ideas and considerations of foreign and country linguists (E. Koseriu, L. Tenyer, U. Cheyf, N. Khomski, Z. Harris, O. Yespersen, J. Layons, A.M. Mukhin, A.I. Smirnitski, V.M. Solntsev, B.A. Ilish, V.V. Rastorguyeva, N.A. Slusareva, K. Brunner, V.G. Gak, G. Glison, V.A. Zveginsev, K. Abdullayev, A. Rajabli, S. Abdullayev, F. Veysalli, A. Mammadov, D. Yunusov and others) regarding the communicative, functional, semantic, comparative syntax, universal and transformation-generative grammar, actual sentence synthesis, text syntax, and so on, including the grammar structure, syntactic structure, history, communicative, different languages, including English.

General linguistic analysis methods have been used in the study as an impact and comparison. Techniques and methods such as the definition analysis, component analysis, transformation, contextual analysis, modeling have been applied in the analysis of actual language material. The scientific-theoretical sources concerning the subject of the study have been referred to. The actual language material has been selected from contemporary English and American art literature.

The linguistic analysis of the grammatical variability.

Grammar is a science that learns whether or not the exchange of ideas between the speaker and the listener is based on the rules. In other words, grammar is the science that learns the forming rules or principles of the text.

History of linguistics shows that Aristotle, who founded the theory of grammar, developed theories of sentences and parts of speech. Grammar training was further developed by the Alexandria School. The grammar that existed during this period was later called "traditional grammar" by linguists of the 19th century.

English scientist C.M. Simpson writes: "The science that learns the grammatical structure of words is morphology, and syntax learns structures bigger than the word". [18, 103]

R.H. Robins talking about Grammar sections wrote: "Syntax is the most important part of grammar" [16, 67]. L. Bloomfield, founder of American structuralism, wrote that, morphology covers the improvement of words and phrases, syntax covers phrase forming [4, 295]. According to J. Greenwood, syntax examines the rules for the correct location and combination of words. [8, 124]

L. Bloomfield's ideas were later continued by C. Fris and Z. Harris. After N. Homski, the successor of Z. Harris, the goals and objectives of grammar, including syntax, were interpreted in another aspect. While talking about grammar, N. Homski understood grammar as the collection of all sentences having the ends in the language. He pointed out that, there are rules in language having ends in counting and with their help, innumerable sentences are generated. They call it a derivative or generative grammar. According to N. Homski, linguist's task is to define to select the correct sentences from the wrong ones. [6, 48]

Sentences can be studied in two ways. In Syntactic terms the sentence may be considered as words, in phonological terms it can be considered as phoneme sequences. The word sequence may both change and not change the meaning of the sentence, for example:

I had an idea on my way home. - On my way home I had an idea.

Sentence is a part of speech, and its classification, above all, should be carried out based on a communicative principle. Classification of the sentence in accordance with this principle is called the "purpose of communication" classification of the sentence in traditional grammar. Sentences traditionally are divided into following groups for their purpose in communication: 1) The Declarative Sentence; 2) The Interrogative Sentence; 3) The Imperative Sentence.

The fact that the Imperative Sentence was included in this classification or not has caused some controversy. The American linguist G.O. Kerm specially underlined this type of sentence and called it the oldest sentence type. He kept the Imperative Sentences beyond his classification [7, 96]. Many have noted that Exclamatory sentences do not constitute a separate type and that all types of sentences mentioned can be presented in two variants: variant expressed with a special intonation (exclamatory), variant not expressed with a special intonation (non-exclamatory). It can be noted that, exclamatory sentences can easily be transformed into declarative sentences. For example: *What lovely weather it is! – It is lovely weather.*

Exclamatory sentences in transformational grammar are called core sentences (kernel sentences). These sentences can be transformed into other types of sentences. Z. Harris noted that the language consisted of a group of core sentences and their transformations. He mentioned 7 types of core sentence: 1) N + V (John is reading); 2) N + V + P + N (John is reading about nature); 3) N + V + N (John is reading a book); 4) N + N (John is a student); 5) N + A (John is clever); 6) N + P + N (John is at home); 7) N + D (John is here). [9, 98]

I.P. Ivanova has stated that there are three models of simple sentences in ancient English: SP model, SPO and SPC model. Only double-member sentence type of the simple sentence can have these models. In the creation of each of these models, the main members of the sentence Subject (S) and predicate (P) are being used. [11, 244]

There are several variants of each simple double-member sentence in the ancient English language. Only one of these simple sentence models (SP model) is distinctive, while others (SPO, SPC) are broad double-member sentences. Characteristics of SP model is expressing the predicate with ineffective verbs and its lack of reconciliation with object. In this version of a simple double-member sentence consisting of subject and predicate, subject has a referent relationship with the goods and the person. This type of distinctive sentences is mainly found in poetic works. For example: *Strēāmas styredon* (Stream Strengthened). *Windas wēōxan* (Wind blew out).

In the sentences included in the SPO model, the verb is always entirely or directly interacting with complement. According to grammatical relevance of verb inside this model, we can distinguish three options:

Variant 1. simple double-member sentence (SPO$_1$) variant consisting of subject, predicate and indirect complement.

Variant 2. simple double-member sentence (SPO$_2$) variant consisting of subject, predicate and direct complement.

Variant 3. simple double-member sentence (SPOO) variant consisting of subject, predicate and both direct and direct complement more found in English: *Hī hine forbærnaþ* (they burn him); *Hē þā þās andsware onf enȝ* (he then received this answer). In these model sentences the complement is in direct case.

In ancient English in such simple sentences subject was sometimes dismissed. Even though subject does not take part in such incomplete sentences, verb was enough to express person and quantity. This can be explained by the fact that, in ancient English it was formal means of gender, person, quantity and case categories showing the relations between sentence members.

Compare with subsequent periods manifest that, consensus and management relations during this period has played a leading role among the components of word combinations as well as sentences members. Because the formal indicators are rich in Ancient English subject could not be used in the sentence. For example: *Ðā cwōm þær micel snāw* (Then there snowed a lot); *Norþan snȳwde* (It snowed in the north).

As the historical development periods of English are interchanging, different features have emerged in its phonetic, lexical, and grammatical system. At a later stage, the development of English syntactic structure was directly related to the changes in its morphological structure. A group of researchers have explained the change in the morphological structure of English throughout the history and the simplification of interaction with other languages. They called X-XIII centuries "Period of grammatical changes" in the history of English.

Other group see the reason for the changes in English grammar in changes in spoken voices (according to phonetic theory), another group (A. Hornby, H. Lehnert, and others) see it in loss of endings and the appearance of analytical forms (according to the functional theory). [10, 239]

O. Yespersen tries to explain the cause of grammatical changes in English history in his proposed "development theory". He has opposed the general interpretation of the grammar history of all Indian-European languages has been supporting the study of the English structural development separately. O. Yespersen's "development theory" was accepted by many linguists because it illuminated a number of reasons for the changes in English grammar. [12, 291]

In Medium and early New English, the predicate of SP sentence model manifested with indirect form of verb. During the Middle English era, since there was no change in the structure of the verb of these types the SP-model sentences have remained the same. In I variant of the SP model sentence (ie in sentences with subject and person) constructions with "Medial" meanings have disappeared and "directional case" was dismissed starting from the early Middle English.

In II variant of the SP model sentence (ie in sentences with subject and without person) the scope of the use of sentences starting with the "hit" (it) formal subject has been expanded. It should be noted that until the end of the period, sentences without subject could only be made with the help of some verbs (for example, *befeilen* (to become)).

The key point in the development of the SP model is formation of III variant. The sentences that begin with *"ther"* and with the inversion of the main members have been included in here. For example: *Ther was a knight ful worthy in his lordes werre.*

In Middle and early New English, the variants of this sentence model began to develop. Complement with preposition or without preposition could be used in these sentences. In Middle English era, the scope of use of SPO sentence model with complement without preposition has been expanded. So that, flexion disappeared and the previous direct complement was transformed into indirect complement. The composition of II variant of the SPO sentence model was changed as a result of change of direct-indirect category was available in ancient English. At the beginning of the Middle English era, it is necessary to include in this variant all the sentences that contain the verb-object associations used with complement with preposition. For example: *they sent on the bishop of Lincoln.*

III variant (SPOO) of SPO sentence model has undergone considerable change. True, though, the changes here have not changed the model, but its composition has changed. Disappear of case suffixes of noun and broken management relations starting with the Middle English era resulted with limitation of this model to two variants:

1) combination of two indirect complement without preposition;
2) combination of two direct and indirect complement without preposition.

The SPC sentence model is the most changed model among models. Changes had two different types of affect over SPC sentence model: the first effect has changed the composition, while the latter enriched it with new syntactic units, i.e. with conjunctive verbs without changing composition.

The SPC sentence model of ancient English has been more ingenious for its composition during the Middle English era. At the same time its functionality was also limited. Changes, firstly has been linked to transfer of some syntactic forms to morphological forms, that is, it linked to transfer of subjective predicate to analytical forms of verb.

Subjective predicate consisting "to be" and past participle of direct verbs of the ancient English transformed to analytical form of unknown type. After this transformation in the SPC sentence model composition remained only "to be" and past participle defining condition. Subjective predicate formed with previously existed bēno (wesan) and past participle of indirect verbs generated analytical form of perfect tense verb. Later, these types of verbs generated perfect tense form combining with "to have". Subjective predicate formed with "to be" and present participle of indirect or direct verbs gave meaning of sustainability during the ancient English era, this meaning gradually disappeared in medium English. At the same time, the new form of subjective predicate - "to be + preposition and a noun created from verb" - appeared. This combination has the same meaning: for ex., *he was on hunting*. That form appeared in the fourteenth century. At the beginning of early English era this form already generated progressive tense forms of verb.

During the Middle English era, the one-member sentences begin to disappear slowly. So that, *him þuhte, mē þynkeð* type person-object one-member sentences transformed to double-member sentence type starting from the Middle English era. For this in this type sentences, "hit" (it) pronoun begins to be used as formal subject in singular III person. It should be noted that, according to the form of the subject, these types of sentences are closer to a group of indefinite sentences. In most cases, "hit" pronoun was able to provide information before the incident that will take place in the sentence. For example: *Hit me of þincð, forgyf hit him* (It seems to me, forgive him for it).

During this period, the new structure-semantic type also completes one-member sentence model, and unknown type of verb having indefinite meaning was standing on its base. The type category of verb was further developed in Middle English. During this period, unknown type of verb was generated only with *"ben"* auxiliary verb and past participle. For example: *and wascried loude* (and they cried loudly). An executor in sentence is not formally stated and it is believed that the executor is uncertain. As a result of the disappearance of "Man" pronoun close to the end of the Middle English era the role of such types of sentences began to increase. It should be mentioned that, at that time, the pronoun "one" did not mean indefinite person.

Such indefinite one-member nominal sentences as a special structural type of sentence disappeared in the eighteenth century only. Even within certain time, the functional parallelism of the indefinite individual meaning one-member and double-member sentence types were also used. [11, 164]

Let us have a look at the following example of Coser: *My God, me mette I was in swich mischief.* (My God, I dreamed I was in such grief.)

There are some changes in the structure of the communicative types of the double-member sentence during the Middle English and early New English era. In this period, the incomplete inversion cases associated with analytical forms of verb are increasing in the general and specific types of interrogative sentences. Fundamental changes in the creation of interrogative sentences typically were early new English era. Changes were related to the occurrence of a fixed word order in the sentence. From the first days of the period word order was the key expression means of the syntactic relations in the sentence. In this era, in accordance with order in the interrogative sentence, complement without preposition was used after verb. Namely this situation has become the main syntactic sign of complement without preposition. However, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, in the interrogative sentences, there were cases when subject was used between predicate and complement without preposition. For example: *Eat cats mice?* The confusion related to interrogative sentences in the middle

English has emerged when there was a complete inversion. During complete inversion, predicate in present or past tense without using auxiliary verb is being used at the beginning of the sentence. In the early 16th century, a complete inversion occurred while making both general and specific question to sentence in present or past indefinite tense. For example: *Call you? What find I here?*

The word "do" as an auxiliary verb starting from the 15th century, has begun to be used both in interrogative and negative sentences. The use of the "do" auxiliary verb in interrogative sentences has shown that the order of subject and predicate in the sentence are stabilized. At the end of the early new English, analytical form of "do" and "did" were used to form specific interrogative sentences. For example: *Why did you not speak to him?*

Questions with both "do" and special questions can be found in the works of Shakespeare, the famous figure of this era: For example: *What means this, my Lord?; How like you this play?; What do you call this play?* and etc.

Ancient structure type has been used for a long time in the general question forming. Until the middle of the eighteenth century, general questions were created with the help of complete inversion, i.e., with putting the verb to the beginning of the sentence without the use of auxiliary verbs. For example: *Seemed he a gentleman?; Know you to whom you speak?* The modern-day structure of general interrogative sentences only began to form after 1750. [11, 170]

A.R. Kroch tried to give a functional explanation of the issue while speaking about the auxiliary verb "do" and noted that, "do" having used in the sentence helps the listener to distinguish subject and complement. It distinguishes the "V+NP+NP" model sentence with the "Do+NP+V+NP" model sentence. A. Kroch argues that, it is not difficult to say that the first NP that is being used after "do" auxiliary verb with the help of it in the second model. [15, 137]

In Ancient English, two or more denial elements were used in the formation of negative sentences. In ancient period, "Ne" particle combined with verbs such as *bēōn* (to be), *habban* (to have), *willan* (to want), *witan* (to know) were used to mean negative: ne + is > nis; ne + wæs > næs; ne + wæron > næron; ne + hadde > nadde; ne + hað > nað and etc. [1, 90]

Near the end of the ancient English, *(noht)* the other stronger denial particle begins to be used in formation of negative sentences.

During the Middle English era, subject was different, both in terms of meaning and means of expression. It was its place in the sentence, which characterizes the subject much more. Subject was used before the verb with person. When it comes to expression means of subject, both in the medium and early new English it was expressed more by noun and pronouns. For example: *Hauelok was a full god gone* (Havelok was a very brave man); *He was be wichteste man at need* (He was the bravest man at need).

During this period, the subject could also be expressed by the genitive case constructions. That construction consisted of noun in nominative case, design consisted of a name, a genitive pronoun, and another noun. For example: *Edwald his mother* (Edwald's mother); *Thar were Arthur his men* (Arthur's men were there). At late early new English era, these types of constructions have not been used anymore. [11, 74]

Second chapter of the Dissertation is called "Variativity problem in modern English". It is noted here that in recent years a number of studies on variability in the world, including Azerbaijani linguistics have been conducted, monographs and articles have been written, and the scientific object of research has considerably expanded. Some linguists (G.P. Torsuyev, N.I. Krilova, A. Martine and others) propose to conduct research in this direction taking the problem of constantity in a dialectical unity. Investigation of problem from this aspect is widely used in the works of well-known representatives of the former Soviet linguistic science. G.P. Torsuyev writes that phoneme shades, linguistic harmony of variativity have a special place in the semantic structure of language. According to the scientist, multiplicity extends the frequency of processing in all areas of the communicative function of the language by developing. Optionality and integration of invariance also show itself in the language system based on specific language specifications as the process of differentiation of options of phonetic, lexical, syntactic and so on. language units is accelerating, and this is characterized by the stabilization of literary norms. The following notes of G.P. Torsuyev on variativity and constancy in the language structure are of interest: "The constancy and variativity are one of the main features of the language structure and the language without them can neither exist nor develop. Constancy and variativity can be demonstrated in all aspects and levels of the language, and it is characterized by unique characteristics of each level". [21, 3].

F.de Sössür approached the concept of meaning in the language system, the social and mental language signs as the factors determining the internal substance of the language. In fact, meaning is understood as the meaning of the sign of the optionality as the term of linguistics [17, 345]. Approach of the academician A. Akhundov on this issue is interesting. The scientist writes and scientifically justifies discretion of system of signs possessing both the content and the form of expression: "Language as a system of signs enters into a category with them (pictograms, writings, road signs, etc.), but differs with its importance and complexity. There is a need to clarify the essence of the language, generally the nature of its meaning as system of signs". [3, 84]

An associative model of the semantic variants of components has been the focus of many experts on critical crucial evidence. Homski's comments on this subject are of interest. The probability of switching from one word to another in the chain of speech does not depend on the grammatical accuracy of the words in that sequence. He brings this example: *Colorless green ideas sleep furiously*. Another example: *Buildings along the street were slowly flinging into the sky*. This sentence is grammatically correct, but it is not semantically correct; there is grammatical interconnection of the words, not the semantic. The number of such examples can be increased. Thus, the component model of semantic variants is not adequate to the grammatic theory. [5, 98]

Generative grammar has two important differences from previous traditional and structural grammar. First of all, derivative grammar is implicit, i.e., shows possible sentences available in the language secretly, implicitly. According to these rules, it creates all the sentences, but in that case, it is possible that these rules are entirely implicit, does not grant anything to the responsibility of reader, does not compromise his/her linguistic knowledge. Secondly, derivative grammar is not associated with the actual network of syntax sentences, but it is associated with a possible sentence network.

After N. Homski, starter to study sentence model and its expression capabilities by defining the rules that form the basis of the syntax sentence. There are different opinions in linguistics on the relations between the members of the sentence. In Russian linguistics, the predicate is completely dependent on the subject. They also consider subject and predicate coordination related members. According to this concept, the predicate is key, the center. According to the synthetic theory of L. Tenyer, the verb means subject and predicate being the center of the sentence and these are called "actants". Auxiliary words accompanying verb are "circonstants (adverbial)". [20, 121]

The sentence is more complex unit in the language system. Its complexity, first and foremost, depends on the abundance of its components, and their quantity is structurally unlimited. The sentence can be as big as possible, and every sentence can be continued as much as desired. But the elements that constitute the part of the sentence are not infinite. The complexity of the sentence is not that its components is infinite, on the contrary, the multiplan interaction of the elements constitute it.

When it comes to the expression and content of the sentence, its semantic aspect is considered. Semantic aspects include the elements of the sentence, in other words, branch sentences and sentence members. The least studied areas of the language are semantic and pragmatic aspects in syntactic level. Structural, semantic and pragmatic aspects are considered as key aspects as they cover the three major aspects of language - form, content and manifestation.

Though variativity or optionality and its associated terms such as "variant", "invariant", "variation" and their derivatives have close syntactical meaning, each of them has a specific linguistic meaning and it is required to clarify the content of each one when applying in linguistic science. According to O.S. Ahmanova, *variativity* term expresses the diversity of the definition of the speech, its different varieties with differences in different working conditions, as well as in the social and territorial identities of the speakers. [2, 75]

The concept of variativity in linguistic literature is interpreted in three ways: First, any modification resulting from any kind of volatility, evolution process, or other reasons, different language means used to express similar or close events.

The propagation of variativity in this way does not require the optionality-invariant opposing discrepancy, it limits the content of the variativity to only one optionality. A.K. Kamchatnov treats concept of variativity like this. [13, 122]

Second, they believe that changes in language are a distinctive feature, and the optionality is one of the clear features of speech. [14, 77]

Third, the term variativity is used as a character of language units and action means in synchronous background [19, 31]. In this case, the concept of variativity, especially in phonological

studies, used in the background of the concept of invariance. Here the term "variant" is accompanied by the term "invariant."

The term of invariant in linguistics is understood as "An abstract element of the language system, which is far from concrete realization" [2, 176]. Concrete objects that form any group or class and objects that can be extracted as invariants on their basis are considered as variant. Such understanding of the invariant and variants means that they demand each other, and the existence of one another apart is not possible.

Each option as a member of any variant range has common and distinctive signs since it has properties that belong to the general class, has optionality and invariant qualities, it is possible to avoid comparison of the optionality and invariant under certain conditions. In many linguistic studies, avoiding the comparison of invariant and variant apparently, as we have said above, can be explained with that possibility. However, the problem of variativity remains with its whole sharpness in the following cases:

a) while learning the mechanism of the language structure, which can be called variant-invariant;

b) while learning the language activity, defining transition from speech to the language;

c) while learning interlanguage changes and developmental factors (variativity and variant having new meaning);

d) while clarifying the different appearance and shape of the same language unit;

e) the social-linguistic study of language and others have great importance in order to apply the variations of norms and different styles of the same units, expressive and normative purposes.

The presence of the same language unit in different forms constitutes the specific feature of language variativity. The existence of separate units of language is its variativity, existence of its innumerable variants together. In optionality circle of the language units variant-invariant manifested in the whole language system within the range of language units.

Variant-invariant relationships describe paradigmatic relationships (such as paradigmatic relationships of objects that have important common properties) such as all classes and all members of that classes, as well as characterizes their relationships with different paradigms according to the volume (including smaller paradigms into larger paradigms).

Paradigmatic relationships exist as variant-invariant connections. The relationship between members of a paradigm means a relationship between variants. Relationships of the paradigm with a paradigm as a whole is relationships of invariant and variants.

Similar syntactic structures and their specific features. Linguistic studies are based on aspects, levels, each one or one of them being studied as a source of speech. One or another criterion in each aspect has parameters that allow for the identification of key aspects of language phenomena. A set of parameters serves to determine the structure of the studied linguistic object.

Relationships of diachronic-synchronous, language-speech, form-content, paradigmatic-syntactic, and so on. are traditional aspects of identifying syntactic structures, differential features, relative structural differences and sense of meaning. In recent years, one more aspect of linguistics has been identified and it is called a derivation aspect. Though derivation, which covers all aspects of language, is not new in linguistics, its spreading to syntactic research is comparatively new and it has a major importance while identifying similar syntactic structures.

Syntactic derivation. In the "Dictionary of linguistic terms," the term derivation is associated only with word creativity and "the creation of new words with the help of affixes in accordance with word creation models". As it can be seen, there is no information on the concept of synthetic derivation. But linguistic development in recent decades has substantiated the synthetic analysis of the derivation and certain studies have been conducted in this area.

Let us pay an attention to the compatibility of the derivation aspect of the language with general-dichotomic aspects:

G.G. Silnitski offers to distinguish grammatical and lexical-semantic levels of the sentence, as well as grammatical and lexical-semantic levels of syntax while talking about derivation.

The syntactic level considers such a derivation that a sentence is converted to another sentence like the derivative sentence here (in other words, a sentence with derivation) differs from the original sentence according to its grammatical status and meaning. For example, the following sentences combine with derivation relationships to one another: 1. Jane opened the window. - Grandmother made

Jane open the window. 2. The child is sleeping. - The child wanted to sleep. 3. The hostess washed the floor. - The hostess began to wash the floor.

The following two types of sentences can be observed in English as well as in any language:

1. The sentences from the first type at the level of sentence members are consist of predicate and subject, but at the level of parts of speech (from morphological point of view) it consists of verb acting in the function of predicate and called a situation, and a noun acting in the function of subject and called a subject of the situation. For example: Jenny lay down; The lamp was stirring, and etc.

2. The sentences from the second type at the level of sentence members are consist of predicate, subject, and complement, but at the level of parts of speech it consists of verb acting in the function of predicate and called a situation, a noun acting in the function of subject and called a subject of the situation, a noun (name) acting in the function of complement and called an object of the situation. For example: The grandmother cleaned fish. The boy split wood and etc.

Let us keep on the derivation relations that occur in these two sentences. Compared to any sentence with first sentence, which differed according to the meaning of the initial sentence typically records the formal changes in the derivation that occur in the expression plan - the meaning of the internal meaning. For example, The boy split wood. The boy wanted to split wood.

This derivation chain consists of predicate and subject at the level of sentence members, at the speech parts used as the verb used and called the situation, a noun used as a subject. It does not differ from the structure of the initial sentence in the level of the derivation chain and the level of speech at the level of the meaning of the internal meaning. At the level of internal meaning status, it does not differ from the structure of the initial sentence in the derivation chain and the speech parts. The difference in the level of internal meaning status is that such an element is included in the sentence structure which expresses the elementary meaning, and this meaning is the meaning operator of the derivation. Determines the difference between the meaning of the initial and derived sentences. The structure of the derivation at the level of the sentences is not different from the structure of the initial sentence. However, there are already differences in the level of sentence members.

If there is one verb with a person in the structure of the initial sentence, there are two verbs in the structure of the derivative sentence: a verb with a person and a verb in the infinitive form, and they are interrelated with each other both formal and meaning point of view. The differences between them in the case of internal meaning statues are the element in the elementary meaning of "modality" is included into the meaning structure of the sentence, and it is the meaning operator of the derivation of the sentence. The formal operator of the derivation is the "to want" verb with a person and the infinitive form of the main verb.

In the word creation process unlike the process of form correction, the lexical meaning of the word varies, i.e. its internal meaning varies. The change of the lexical meaning of the word often leads to a change in the formal status of the word. Changes occurring in the word creation relate clearly to the lexical level, and thanks to this the word creation morphology can be called a lexical morphology. It is not so difficult to observe that the relationship between the members of the word creation morphological paradigm synonymous with the relationship between the members of the derivation syntactic paradigm, because in both cases the basic essence is that, the internal meaning status varies considerably and prevails over the considerable formal status changes of the formal status changes. If the accuracy is correctly defined, then we can talk about the syntactic word creation considering the derivation paradigm of the sentence.

The above mentioned is consistent with the perspective of O. Yespers: "Transformation of the syntax with traditional linguistic terms means transfer of paradigmatic relationships to morphology; in other words, that means the settlement of these syntactic constructions and their paradigmatic set up". The obtained result is from the classification of changes in the syntax of the sentence in the derivation process. Firstly, the derivative sentence differs from the initial sentence both at the level of sentence members and in the formal grouping of sentence members, ie one of the elements in the initial sentence changes the grammatical position in the derivative sentence. (1) Water boils. (2) My mother boils water.

Secondly, the number of sentence members in a derivative sentence is less in comparison with the initial sentence. Such cases are typical for passive derivations. For example: (1) Mother cleaned fish. (2) Fish was cleaned.

Thirdly, the derivative at the level of sentence members does not differ from the original sentence, but differences in the level of parts of speech are observed. During such a derivation all sentence members in derivative sentences are equal to the number of sentence members of the initial sentence.

It is also important to note one problem with syntactic transformation and syntactic derivation that, syntactical structure of concrete sentence results in derivative processes we talk about.

Conclusion.

The results gained from discussed issues in the separately-taken branches of study can be generalized as follows:

Every linguistic model that is familiar to Homski's and his followers' research directly links with syntactic structures associated with the creation of sentences and word combinations. According to N. Khomsky, it is subject to a particular syntactic pattern that fulfills the function of the model in constructing a sentence.

However, in order to understand the role of the modeling and model in all these linguistic processes, it is important to give a general explanation of the model concept first. The model is a specially created object that holds the properties of a real object existing as a means of scientific understanding. Modeling is the process of creating and expressing the model. A specially created object during modeling is understood to be an object that is similar to the newest prototype and serves the image tool or predicts the behavior of the prototype.

REFERENCES

1. Abdulrahimov E.H. The ABC of the history of the English language. Baku: Mütərcim, 2005. 384 p.
2. Ahmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. 2nd ed. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966, pp. 75.
3. Akhundov A.A. Phonetics of Azerbaijani language. Baku: "Maarif", 1984, pp 84.
4. Bloomfield L.S. Language. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD, 1933, pp. 295.
5. Chomsky N. Logical Structure in Language. "American documentation", v. VIII, No. 4, 1957, p. 98-122.
6. Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge. Mass., 1965, 257 p.
7. Curme G. Syntax. Boston – New York, 1931. 308 p.
8. Greenwood J.H. Essays in Linguistics, Chicago, 1957, 312 p.
9. Harris Z.S. Structural Linguistics. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1963. pp. 98
10. Hornby A.S. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Part II. 1982. 604 p.
11. Ivanova I.P. History of the English language. M .: Higher School, 1976, pp. 244.
12. Jespersen O. Progress in Language with Special Reference to English. London – New York, 1894. 383 p.
13. Kamchatnov A.M. Lexical variativity and lexical meanings. // VY, M.: Science, 1983, №4. Pp. 122.
14. Koseriu E.Synchrony, diachrony and history .. in the book: "New in linguistics", Vol. 3, M.: Science, 1963. pp. 77.
15. Kroch A.R., Taylor A.C. Verb movement in Old and Middle English: dialect variation and Language contact. Cambridge: Cambridge Uni. Press, 1997, 394 p.
16. Robins R.H. General Linguistics: An introductory survey. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1964, 412 p.
17. Saussure F.K. Works on linguistics. M .: Progress, 1977, pp.636.
18. Simpson C.M. A first course in Linguistics. Edinburgh, 1979. 216 p.
19. Solntsev V.M. Variativity as a general property of the language system. // VY, M.: Progress, 1984, №2. pp. 31-42.
20. Tenier L. Basics of structural syntax. M .: Progress, 1988, pp. 312.
21. Torsuyev G.P. Constancy and variativity in the phonetic system. M .: Science, 1977, pp. 3.