



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.01407.5**

DIFFERENT VIEWS ON THE ESSENCE OF SEPARATION AND ACCESSION

Jumaev Orifjon Kilichboevich* ; Mitanova Shakhlo Nematullaevna**

^{1,2}Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Samarkand State University,
UZBEKISTAN

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the analysis of existing linguistic literature. The problem of separating the main and secondary members of the proposal is considered and a number of questions are highlighted, from which the study creates the general picture of this syntactico-stylistic phenomenon, namely: the essence of syntactico-stylistic isolation.

KEYWORDS: *Separated Parts, Complex Sentences, Syntax, Logical Emphasis, Communicative Functions, Semantic Partners, Structural Groups, Syntactic Constructions.*

INTRODUCTION

Separation is a special technique of organizing combinations of words and means of communication of them in a proposal based on the break of coordination, management, and abutment. Moreover, the rupture of subordinate communication is not a separation of the separate members of the proposal. Semantically separate members of the proposal are always associated with the dominant word of the proposal. The connection of separation is characteristic only for proposals (I.I. Revzin, 1955, p. 163).

Is isolation really a kind of syntax connection? What is a syntax bond? The words in the sentence are organized in a certain way and are in a semantic relationship with each other. The relationship between the words of the sentence allows us to talk about the existence of connections. However, "syntax relationship" and "syntax relationship" are not identical concepts. For example, attribute relationships can be established between the components of substantive phrases, and they are connected to each other either by the way of alignment or by the way of management. We judge the nature of the relationship between the members of the phrase primarily on the syntax role of the dependent compote. For example, alignment is usually expressed by the felleable forms of words, sometimes by the word disposition, and management is

expressed by various flexions and pretexts. Thus, any syntax connection has its own universal forms of expression.

In isolation, the subordinate form of communication remains, as the separate members of the proposal are subordinate to the most dominant word (in other words, the antecedent, in the words of J.S. Morar) and depend on it, that is, consistent with the dominant word, managed by it, or adjacent to it.

The subordinatin link between the dominant word and the isolated members of the proposal is somewhat transformed. Separate members of the proposal receive additional predicativeness, known semantic independence. There is a special syntactical pause between the dominant word and the isolated members of the sentence. This pause is caused by a certain punctuation, denoted in the written speech by a comma, colon and dash. Thus, the intonation of the separate members of the proposal serves only to emphasize, to single out separate members of the proposal. They are separated from the dominant word by a comma, colon and dash. These are punctuation. With give the intonation of the detached members of the proposal a distinctive character. The syntax connection of the separate members of the proposal with the dominant word is formalized in various ways. Only some isolated members of the proposal (unions *also*, *and*, *then*, and others) have union indicators of communication. Syntax is universal for all model supply structures. Writing and subjucent communication unites not only members of the proposal, but also simple, complex sentences, and complex syntax whole. They are expressed by writing and subordinate unions, cases, personal and ancestral endings. The syntax connection of the separate members of the proposal is not universal in comparison with the traditional syntax connection, as the isolation covers only some typical structures, the means of its design are the same.

Separation is as if the result of a syntagmatic membership of the proposal (L.R. Sinder, T.V. Stroeva, 1957, p. 278). Separate members of the proposal, according to E.V. Krotevich, are the most pronounced syntagms (explainable, clarifying or additional) (E.V. Krotevich, 1941, p. 6). But syntagma, as V.M. Medvedkin rightly observes, is not equivalent to a member of the proposal, the syntagmatic membership "sets the ground for the selection of one of the parts of the "speech whole" as a separate consignment. However, the orientation to syntagmatic membership cannot be a universal factor of isolation" (V.M. Medvedkin, 1965, p. 8-9); In order to clarify the relationship of the member to the rest of the proposal and their role in the proposal structure, it is necessary to determine the essence of the separation itself and the known autonomy of the separate members of the proposals.

Separation - a phenomenon communicative - syntagmatic level of the language system, the level at which the proposals of a certain composition are subjected to additional processing in accordance with the author's plan. According to I.P. Raspopov, the reason for the separation of secondary members "lies entirely in the communicative plane" (I.P. Raspopov, 1967, p. 103) Separate members of the proposal are singled out intentionally and gain a special semantic weight in their utterance, their functions and connections remain unchanged. As a result of the isolation, the communication loads between the separate members and other components of the proposal are redistributed.

Separation is seen by individual linguists as likening a member to a proposal on technique and rhythm, as well as syntactico-semantic connections with the surrounding members of the proposal. The external sign of isolation is not enough to reveal the inner content of this syntactico-stylistic unity.

Linguists sometimes draw an analogy between separate members of the proposal and appendage proposals. Such an analogy is true only, in general. It is persuasive about the relevant and infinite revolutions, but it is questionable with regard to the applications and definitions expressed by the adjectives. Not all structural types of isolation can be replaced by some appendage. Sometimes the connection of a separate member of the proposal with the well-known is denied at all. Therefore, it is appropriate here to cite the following statement by E.V. Krotevich. In particular, he writes: "They cannot be considered as true members of the proposal, as the functional equivalents of the members of the proposal, namely the secondary" (E.V. Krotevich, 1941, p. 36).

Separation of the members of the proposal is possible only within the boundaries of the already constructed pre-existing pre-existing. In other words, the isolation takes place within both a simple and complex proposal, that is, the separate members of the proposal do not go beyond the proposal. Separate members, who are not responsible for the known semantic independence, do not receive complete isolation.

As for the attached elements, they join the finished, structure-designed, structure-designed or framed and intonationally completed main statement. The elements attached are always post-positive in relation to the main statement, or to a specific component of it, which cannot be said about separate turnovers.

The elements you join are not only an integral, dependent part of a simple or complex sentence, but often components of a complex syntax whole. As well as writing and submission, joining is a special kind of syntax connection because it covers all model sentence structures. In other words, not only all members of the proposal can join, but all types of complex proposal (complex and complex subordinated). Separation, on the other hand, does not have such versatility. The main and secondary members of the proposal are separated:

Subject: They were firm in faith in the Redeemer, these Galilean men (L.Feuchtwanger. The Jewish War, p. 126).

Verb: But the palace was rightly famous, the most beautiful building of Galilee (L.Feuchtwanger. The Jewish War, p.138).

Definition: Because on Belnitzer Straße there are two rows of blue yellow and rose houses, two-storey, fun (A.Seghers. Trust, p. 122).

Addition: She visited Martin's wife, the citizen Jeanne Catrou (L. Feuchtwanger. The Fools Wisdom, p. 407).

Circumstance: Dozens of his people stood there, soaked and miserable (B.Brecht. Dreigroschenroman, p.458)

An analysis of the above examples shows that almost all members of the proposal are isolated. However, as our obsessions over the artistic source show, the degree of the disparate members of the proposal is not the same. Some are more isolated, and others are less frequent. There are differing views on the frequency and infrequency of the separate members of the proposal. Here is what E.V. Krotevich writes about it: "Only secondary members of the proposal (definition, annex, circumstances) are separated; Yes, and that's not all. There are no indisputable cases of separation of the supplement. Turnovers with except, except, instead, wrongly considered separate additions" (E.V. Krotevich, 1941, p. 37). We find a similar statement in L.R.

Sinder, and T.V. Stroevea. In particular, they argue that less often than other minor members, the supplement is isolated, both indirect and direct" (L.R. Sinder, T.V. Stroevea, 1957, p. 291) However, as our observations have shown, additions, both indirect and direct, are isolated at least as often as other secondary members of the proposal. The prevalence or non-proliferation of members of the proposal seems to us to be determined not by the syntax, as is the case in a number of works, but only by stylistic means. Separation is, first of all, a purely stylistic phenomenon and therefore its representation and unrepresentation is conditioned only by the individual style of a writer.

Both the main and second-degree members of the proposal, simple and complex proposals, and complex syntax wholes join.

To be: They saw his weaknesses abundantly, they did not forgive them. Anna Tirschenreuth. Kate (L.Feuchtwanger. The Lautensack brothers, p. 198)

Verb: She called Oskar. She told him her decision___mit (L.Feuchtwanger. The Lautensack brothers, p.196)

Addition: She desperately wants to have three children. Two girls and a boy (H. Otto.For example, Joseph, p. 162)

Circumstance: But I was with her in Berlin.In East Berlin and West Berlin (A. Seghers.Trust, p.250).

Definition: No, that was human hair. Long, chestnut-brown (L. Feuchtwanger, The ugly Duchess MargareteMaultasch. p. 101)

Writing style offer: The emperor was there, Agrippa, Berenike, the chief of staff of Titus, Fiber Alexander. Josef and Dorion were also invited (L. Feuchtwanger. The Jewish War, p.329).

Suggestion of a subordinate nature: Lord of Schenna dodged. By chance, from a maid, she learned the reason. Because they were ashamed of their ugliness (L.Feuchtwanger.The ugly Duchess MargareteMaultash.p.42)

If you compare the separate members of the proposals with the elements attached, you will notice that they have different educational conditions. Joining is possible even when the attachment is complicated, and when it is uncomplicated. The separation of members is influenced by the prevalence of the sentence. Offer members or entire proposals can join. Only members of the proposal can be separated. Therefore, it is necessary to strictly differentiate: joining ties within one sentence; connections created within a complex syntax whole. Only the postposition of the attached elements is possible in the joining structures. But this postposition is of a special kind. It is irreversible because it cannot be replaced by a preposition. Separate members of the proposal, on the other hand, may occupy a dominant word, pre-, inter- and postposition.

Preliminary observations we have made on syntactico-stylistic phenomena, both over isolation and accession, will allow us to formulate the following conclusions:

1. Separation and accession are different syntactico-stylistic phenomena. They are close to each other functionally, but not identical. Separation is the reception of the organization of words in the pre-ance. If separated, the subordinate bond will remain. Joining is a special kind of syntax

connection, universal for all members of the proposal, and for all types of offer. The intonation of isolation is a distinctive character, and the intonation of accession is intermittent.

2. Separation is only possible within the boundaries of the proposal. The elements that are joined are formed by singling out words, phrases and sentences into an independent communicative unit.

3. All members of the proposal can be separated. Not only all members of the proposal can join, but all types of offers can be joined.

4. Separation and accession are stylistic phenomena, so the degree of their prevalence in artistic texts is due only to the individual style of a writer.

LITERATURE

1. Sinder L.R., Stroeva T.V. Modern German. - M.: Literature in Foreign Languages, 1957. - 420 s.
2. Krotevich E.V. Separation of secondary members of the proposal in the modern Russian language, Alma-Ata. 1941. - 72 s.
3. Medvedkin V.M. Separate inconsistent definition; Autoref.dis... candidate -Voronezh, 1965. - 19 s.
4. Moraru J.S. C. Clymatist constructions semantic following with verb-type anticedentation / Sat.: Pragmatic-functional study of languages. -Kishinev: "Tiinza," 1987. -S. 58-63.
5. Raspopov I.P. To the question of isolation / "Russian language at school," 1967, No.4. - S. 102-107.
6. Revzin I.I. Problem of isolation / Scientists of the first Moscow notes. In-tainnoster. Yaz., 1955, t.7. - S.163-180.