

**SEPARATION AND JOINING**

Mitanova Shakhlo Nematullaevna
Teacher of Samarkand State University

ANNOTATION

It is known that separation is a phenomenon of the communicative-syntagmatic level of the language system, the level at which sentences of a certain composition are subjected to additional processing in accordance with the author's idea. Therefore, this article gives a brief explanation about the role of separation and joining in clauses.

Key words. separation and joining, syntactic relationship, syntagma, definition, appendix, circumstances.

In modern linguistic literature, there are different views on the essence of separation and attachment. The separation and the connection is functionally similar, but not identical syntactic and semantic phenomena related to the intonation-semantic articulation of speech.

Separation is a special technique for organizing combinations of words and their means of communication in a sentence, based on the discontinuity of agreement, management, and also adjunction. Moreover, Moreover, the break in the subordinate connection does not separate members of the sentence. Semantically separate members of a sentence are always associated with the dominant word of a given sentence. The connection of separation is characteristic only for sentences (i. I. Revzin, 1955, p. 163).

Is separation really a kind of syntactic connection? What is a syntactic relationship?

As known, words in a sentence are organized in a certain way and are in semantic relations with each other. The presence of relations between the words of the sentence allows you to say that there are connections. However, "syntactic relationship" and "syntactic relations" are not identical concepts. For example, attribute relationships can be established between components of substantive phrases, and they are related to each other either by the method of agreement or by the method of management. We judge the nature of relations between members of a phrase primarily by the syntactic role of the dependent component. For example, agreement is usually expressed by case forms of words, sometimes by word arrangement, and control is expressed by various inflections and prepositions. Thus, any syntactic relationship has its own universal forms of expression.

In separation, the subordinate form of communication remains, since the separate members of the sentence are subordinate to the dominant word itself (in other words, to the antecedent, as YU.S. MORARU) and depend on it, that is, they agree with the dominant word, are controlled by it, or are adjacent to it.

The subordinate relation between the dominant word and the separate members of the sentence is somewhat transformed. Separate members of a sentence receive additional predicativity, a certain semantic independence. There is a special syntactic "pause" between the dominant word and the separate members of the sentence. This

pause is caused by a certain punctuation, indicated in writing by a comma, colon, and dash. Thus, the intonation of separate members of the sentence serves only to emphasize, highlight the separate members of the sentence. They are separated from the dominant word by a comma, colon, and dash. These punctuation marks. C give the intonation of separate members of the sentence a distinctive character. The syntactic connection of separate members of a sentence with the dominant word is formed in various ways. Only some separate members of the offer have union indicators (unions auch, und, dann, and others). The syntactic relationship is universal for all typical sentence structures. The compositional and subordinate relationship combines not only the members of a sentence, but also simple, complex sentences, and complex syntactic integers. They are expressed by compositional and subordinate conjunctions, case, personal and generic endings. The syntactic connection of separate members of a sentence is not universal in comparison with the traditional syntactic connection, since the separation covers only some typical structures, and the means of its design are of the same type.

Separation is as if the result of syntagmatic articulation of the sentence (I. R. Zinder, t. V. Stroeve, 1957, p. 278). Separate members of the sentence, according to e. V. Krotevich, are the most pronounced syntagmas (explanatory, clarifying or additional) (e. V. Krotevich, 1941, p. 6). But syntagma, as v. M. Medvedkin justly notes, is not equivalent to a sentence member. syntagmatic division *"prepares the ground for singling out one of the links of the "speech whole" as a separate construction. However, the orientation to syntagmatic membership cannot be a universal factor of separation"* (v. M. Medvedkin, 1965, p. 8-9). To clarify the relationship of the separated member to the other members of the sentence and their role in the structure of the sentence, it is necessary to determine the essence of the separation itself and the known independence of the separated members of sentences.

Separation is a phenomenon of the communicative-syntagmatic level of the language system, the level at which sentences of a certain composition are subjected to additional processing in accordance with the author's idea. 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 a sentence are deliberately singled out and acquire a special semantic weight in the utterance, their functions and relationships are preserved unchanged. As a result of separation, the communication loads are redistributed between the separate members and other components in this offer.

Separation is considered by some linguists as the assimilation of a sentence member by method and rhythm, as well as syntactic-semantic relations with the surrounding members of this sentence. The external sign of separation is not sufficient to reveal the inner content of this syntactic-stylistic unity.

Linguists sometimes draw an analogy between separate members of a sentence and subordinate clauses. This analogy is only true in general. It is convincing about participial and infinitive turns, but it is questionable about appendices and definitions expressed by adjectives. Not all structural types of separation can be replaced by some subordinate clause. Sometimes the connection of a separate member of a sentence with well-known ones is generally denied. Therefore, it is appropriate to quote the following statement of e. V. Krotevich. In particular he writes: *"they cannot be considered as true members of the sentence, since they are functional equivalents of the sentence members, namely secondary ones"* (e. V. Krotevich, 1941, p. 36).

The offer members can only be separated within the boundaries of an already constructed offer. In other words, separation occurs within both a simple and complex sentence, meaning that the separate members of the sentence do not go beyond the sentence. Separate members, despite a certain semantic independence, do not receive complete separation.

As for the elements that are attached, they are attached to a ready-made, constructed basic structure or a decorated and intonationally completed main utterance. The elements that are attached are always postpositive with respect to the main statement, or to a certain component of it, which is not possible to speak of separate turns.

Attached elements are not only an integral, dependent part of a simple or complex sentence, but often components of a complex syntactic whole. Just like composing and subordination, joining is a special kind of syntactic connection, since it covers all typical sentence structures. In other words, you can join not only all members of the sentence, but also all types of complex sentences (compound and compound). Separation, on the other hand, does not have such universality. The main and secondary members of the sentence are separated:

Subject: *sie waren fest im glauben an den erlöser, diese galiläischen männer (l. Feuchtwanger. Der jüdische krieg, s. 126).*

Predicate: *es war aber der palast mit recht berühmt, das schönste bauwerk galiläas (l. Feuchtwanger. Der jüdische krieg, s/138).*

Definition: *denn auf der belnitzer straße entstanden zwei reihen blauer gelber und rose häuser, zweistöckige, vergnügliche (a. Seghers. Das vertrauen, s. 122).*

Supplement: *sie suchte martins frau auf, die bürgerin jeanne catrou (l. Feuchtwanger. Die narren weisheit, s. 407).*

Circumstance: *dutzende seiner leute standen dort, durchnäßt und elend (b. Brecht. Dreigroschenroman, s.458).*

Analysis of the above examples shows that almost all members of the sentence are separated. However, as our observations of the artistic source show, the degree of separable members of the sentence varies. Some are separated more often, and others less often. There are different opinions about the nature of frequency and infrequency of separate members of the sentence. Here is what e. V. Krotevich writes about this: "*only the minor members of the sentence (definition, appendix, circumstances) are separated; and even not all of them. There are no undisputed cases of the supplement being separated. Turns with except, in addition to, except for, instead of, it is wrong to consider separate additions*" (e. V. Krotevich, 1941, p. 37). We find a similar statement in l. R. Zinder and t. V. Stroeva. In particular, they claim that less often than other minor members, the complement is separated, both indirect and direct" (l. R. Zinder, t. V. Stroeva, 1957, p. 291). However, as our observations have shown, additions, both indirect and direct, are separated not less often, but more often, like other minor members of the sentence. The degree of prevalence or non-proliferation of the separation of sentence members, as it seems to us, is determined not by syntactic means, as is observed in a number of works, but only by stylistic means. Separation is, first of all, a purely stylistic phenomenon, and therefore its representation and non-representation is due only to the individual style of a particular writer.

Join both the main and secondary members of the sentence, simple and complex sentences, and complex syntactic integers.

Subjects: *sie sahen seine schwächen überdeutlich, sie verzeihen sie nicht. Anna tirschenreuth. Kate (l.feuchtwanger. Die brüder lautensack, s. 198).*

Predicate: *sie rief oskar an. Teilte ihm ihren entschluß___mit (l.feuchtwanger. Die brüder lautensack, s.196).*

Supplement: *sie will unbedingt haben drei kinder. Zwei mädchen und einen jungen (h. Otto. Zum beispiel josef, s. 162).*

Circumstance: *ich war aber mit ihr in berlin. In ostberlin und in westberlin (a. Seghers. Das vertrauen, s.250).*

Definition: *nein, das war menschenhaar. Langes, kaschtanienbraunes (l. Feuchtwanger, die häßliche herzogin margarete maultasch. S. 101).*

Sentence of the composing type: *der kaiser war da, agrippa, berenike, der stabschef des titus, fiber alexander. Auch josef und dorion waren eingeladen (l. Feuchtwanger. Der jüdische krieg, s.329).*

Subordinate clause: *herr von schenna wich aus. Durch zufall, von einer magd erfuhr sie den grund. Weil sie sich ihrer häßlichkeit schämten (l.feuchtwanger. Die häßliche herzogin margarete maultasch. S.42).*

If you compare the separate members of sentences with the attached elements, you will notice that they have different formation conditions. Joining is possible both when the joining clause is complicated and also uncomplicated. The distribution of members is affected by the popularity of the offer. Members of a sentence or entire sentences can join. Only offer members can be separated. Therefore, it is necessary to strictly differentiate: connecting links within a single sentence; connecting links created within a complex syntactic whole. In connection structures, only the postposition of the attached elements is possible. But this postposition is of a special kind. It is irreversible, since it cannot be replaced by a preposition. The separate members of a sentence, on the other hand, may occupy a pre -, inter-, and postposition in relation to the dominant word.

Our preliminary observations on syntactic-stylistic phenomena, both on separation and on joining, will allow us to formulate the following conclusions:

✚ *Separation and joining are different syntactic and stylistic phenomena.* They are close to each other functionally, but not identically. Separation is a technique for organizing words in a sentence. When you separate, the subordinate relationship will remain. Joining is a special type of syntactic connection that is universal for all members of a sentence, and for all types of sentences. The tone separation is secretory in nature and the tone of the connection to be intermittent.

✚ *Separation is only possible within the boundaries of this offer.* The connecting elements are formed by the separation into an independent communicative unit of speech, phrases and sentences.

✚ *All members of the offer can be separated.* Not only can all offer members join, but all offer types can also join.

✚ *Separation and attachment are stylistic phenomena,* so the degree of their prevalence in literary texts is

determined only by the individual style of a particular writer.

REFERENCES:

1. Zinder L.R., Stroeve T.V. Modern German language. - M.: Publishing House "Literature in Foreign Languages", 1957. - 420 p.
2. Krotevich E.V. Separation of minor members of a sentence in modern Russian, Alma-Ata. 1941 .-- 72 p.
3. Medvedkin V.M. Separate inconsistent definition; Abstract of thesis ... Candidate of Philosophy Voronezh, 1965 .-- 19 p.
4. Moraru Yu.S. Connecting constructions of semantic following with verb type antecedent // Sat .: Pragmatic-functional study of languages. -Kishinev: Publishing house "Tiintsa", 1987. -C. 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. The problem of isolation // Scientific notes of the First Moscow. Institute of Foreign Affairs Yaz., 1955, v. 7. - S.163-180.

