

About the Actual Division of the Sentence and Word Order

Sobirov Anvar Kuvandikovich¹

Abstract-This article explores the relevance and vocabulary of sentences in Russian and Uzbek linguistics. In the work, the actual division of the sentence and the order of the word are considered, and the actual division of the sentence has been studied in relation to the order of words as an important communicative-syntactic phenomenon. Adding to some linguists' arguments that the actual division of a sentence is like a division of a sentence (a division of a subject and a predicate) into a logical unit, the actual division is called a logical-grammatical division. Important topicals: prosodic actuator (logical accent and related speech pace and pause), emphatic-emotional emphasis (emotionally intense, vowel or consonant), lexical and grammatical actualization (only, alone, even; the words themselves, and only, -with, -with the addition).

Key words-Theme and rema, word order, topical division, syntactic arrangement, logical-grammatical division, prosodic actuarial, emphatic-emotional emphasis, lexical and grammatical actualization, actual structure.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1844 French philologist A. Weil presented his doctoral thesis on "The Interpretation of Ancient Order of Speech in Modern Languages." The thesis of this work is that the syntactic word order does not always coincide with the idea and purpose of the idea, but the expression of opinion is expressed in all languages, of course, by a particular sentence. It does not matter in the usual manner that the owner comes as a central focal point. It is possible that the same idea can be expressed by different syntactic means, but there is no doubt that there will be difficulties in translating these syntactic alternatives in another language [Tumpyansky, 1974: 23]. In our modern Uzbek language, as Weill points out, subject is not the center, predicate is the sentence. In this context, the syntactic arrangement of words in the usual order often determines the cross section.

Any statement doesn't only express a certain reality, but also reflects the purpose of the speaker's communication. For example, in the statement *A teacher comes to work*, it doesn't only mean the fact of teacher's coming to work, it also reflects the intent of the speaker to inform the listener about the teacher's whereabouts. So where did the teacher come from? The answer is yes. In the Uzbek language, accented words are placed just before the intersection. So the reality in this sentence is not about *where the teacher came*, but who the speaker is, and the purpose of the speaker is to inform the listener about the teacher's whereabouts. If we change the phrase as *a teacher comes to a job*, the reality is the same as in the previous sentence, but the narrator's purpose is *who comes*

¹ Doctorate student of Samarkand State University a-sobirov@samdu.uz

to work? through a survey. In the first sentence, the direction of the action, and in the second sentence, the action of the action - information. The structure of the statement from the point of view of the information function is called **actual structure**. Actual components are called topical components.

Because of the individual nature of speech, the order of words in the sentence is also free. However, this "freedom" will never go beyond the limits of general linguistic law. The purpose of the speaker is to have a general order based on the style requirement. [R. Sayfullaeva et al., P. 361]

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

I.P.Raspopov was one of the first to study the actual division of speech in Russian linguistics. He studied the expression of topical division in sentence construction, the conventional context of the actual division of the sentence in a monograph. In his view, the actual division of the sentence is one of the important problems of descriptive syntax, but the existing doctrine of syntactic construction is inconsistent. Externalities were taken into account, and their diversity was ignored. Finally, I.P. Raspopov did a serious study of these problems. [Raspopov, p. 39]

I.I. Koftunova wrote in her book "Modern Russian. The concept of the word order and the actual parts of the sentence" is a close-knit problem - the actual division of the word and the order of the word, and the actual division of the sentence as an important communicative-syntactic phenomenon.

III. MAIN PART

From the point of view of actual task, the elements that make up the sentence are divided into theme (known) and rema (new) parts. The rehearsal of the speech is important from the communicative (information) point of view. The question will be asked to determine that rema. The fact that the theme's theme is known is exactly what it is. The thematic-remedial (topical) division in the foregoing sentences is as follows (Table 1):

Table 1

| Тема Topic | Рема Rema |
|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Ўқитувчи</i> The teacher went to school | <i>мактабга кетди</i> |
| <i>Мактабга</i> The teacher went to school | <i>ўқитувчи кетди</i> |

The actual division of a sentence is like the division of a sentence (division into a subject and a predicate) which is a logical unit. For this reason, some linguists call the actual division a logical-grammatical division.

Abdurauf Fitrat's syntactic views "An experiment on the rules of the Uzbek language. Nahw ', the work follows the principle of the whole. In the 20s of the XXth century, Fitrat follows the ideas of the Prague School of Linguistics, explaining the logical parts of the story: It is also divided into sections, the first is the "subject" and the second is "mahmul." The subject is the owner, and the more the cross, the more important it is ”.

Actual division - pure speech phenomenon. But it is not wrong to say that actualization is completely disconnected from the linguistic structure. Just as any phenomenon is representative of a particular essence, actualization is not completely disconnected from the constructive-syntactic level. In the actuality, the communicative significance of the cross-section, possession, case, complement, or their extensions, which are elements of the linguistic structure of the sentence, is relevant. Therefore, the linguistic basis of actualization is the constructive-syntactic linguistic layer, and the actualization process is the communicative-syntactic layer.

The order of words in the sentence varies with the actual division requirement. I. Mirzaev argues that the actual division in poetry is explained by the fact that the whole structure of the poem is secondary to the subordinate weight, rhythm, rhyme and word order. [Mirzaev, p. 35]. According to K. Haitmetov, who studied the actual division of speech and position in Uzbek in the prose text, he concludes that the actual division of the sentence is a study of the content. It seems that the poetic and prose texts are controversial. When the prose is original in the text, it follows rhyme, weight and word order in poetry.

Constructive and non-constructive parts of the speech are placed differently. This has nothing to do with syntactic construction. With the change of order, the phrase does not undermine the syntactic structure. The word order is concerned with the actual division. The words in the sentence are arranged according to their access to the theme or rema.

Words that convey certain passages of information to a listener come to the fore. It provides information about the topic, but the rema comes at the end of the sentence, after the theme. This consistency is either a methodical dye, or a logical distortion. If the possession group is the theme, the cross-section is rema, the actual division is in harmony with the syntactic division:

The audience is excited (subject-predicate, theme-rem).

(Table 2): Compare the thematic-rematic division of the following statements

Table 2

| Тема Topic | Рема Rema |
|---|---|
| <i>Тадбиркорлар</i> Businessmen | <i>келгуси йил лойиҳадан кўпроқ фойда кўрадилар</i> the project will benefit from the project next year |
| <i>Келгусийил</i> Next year, <i>Лойиҳадан</i> | <i>тадбиркорлар лойиҳада нкўпроқ фойда кўрадилар</i> Entrepreneurs will benefit more from the project <i>тадбиркорлар келгуси йил кўпроқ фойда кўрадилар</i> entrepreneurs will be making more profits next year |

In the first sentence, the theme coincides with the owner of the sentence. In the following sentences there is a discrepancy between the actual and syntactic division. So it turns out that while the words in the sentence change, the syntactic structure does not change. In the actual division, however, it is important.

R.Sayfullaeva argues that there may be other means besides discipline. When they become a priority, the role of the order diminishes. The most important actualizers include the phonetic, lexical and grammatical actualizers:

1) a prosodic actuator. Such topical tools include logical emphasis and the pace of speech associated with it and pauses.

The number of independent words in the statement is the same. But no matter how pervasive or cruel the sentence may be, there is one logical emphasis. Whatever word that makes sense is the word, and the rest is a theme. The only thing that makes sense in the words that have and are cross-sectional is that they get rema status:

1. Guli came: *Guli* - theme, *came* - rema. **2. Guli came:** *Guli* - rema, *came* - theme. *Гули келди:* *Гули* – тема, *келди* – рема. **2. Гули келди:** *Гули* – рема, *келди* – тема.

Emphatic emotional stress. Emphatic accents also highlight a particular word in the sentence. In this way it sounds like a logical accent. However, unlike logical emphasis, emotion is stronger in emphatic accents. In English, the vowel or consonant in a word with an emphatic accent extends. For example: the air is clear. *Ҳаво т-о-за экан.* The beautiful girl came. : *Ч-и-ройли киз келди.* The repetition of the words is also expressed by an emphysema: If I go, I am. *Мен борсам, мен.*

In pausing words, logical and emphatic emphasizes pause as a contributing factor. Pauses often occur before a word is accented.

2) lexical and grammatical actualization tool. Various linguistic and grammatical forms in Uzbek are also included in the actualization of a particular word. These tools come with a logical emphasis and are an auxiliary actualization tool. These include only the words alone, only and even the words themselves, and [-gina], [-ok], [-yok]

- 1) Even Jawahir read
- 2) Sarvar also came.
- 3) Asliddin both read and wrote.
- 4) I say it myself.
- 5) Only Sherzod understands.

This piece, which comes with a lexicon-grammatical tool, becomes relevant - it becomes a remake.

IV. COMMUNICATIVE INDISPENSABLE SENTENCE.

Not every talk has a theme - rematic division. There are such things that can be said as communicative indivisible. There is no theme (specific information) in such statements. The whole point is just a repair. The informational function of such statements is to express the presence or occurrence of an event: 1. Going to the stadium today. 2. Spring. 3. The heat has begun. 4. The next morning. 5. Thank you. 1. *Бугун стадионга борилади.* 2. *Баҳор.* 3. *Иссиқ бошланди.* 4. *Тез тонг отди.* 5. *Раҳмат.* Communicative integrity is associated with a greater complexity of discourse. In cross-sectional sentences, the two-word verb is associated with the semantics of the sentence: 1. Morning. 2. The evening fell. 1. *Тонг отди.* 2. *Шом тушди.* The semantic structure of such phrases is almost identical to the one-sentence statement.

N.A. Baskakov noted that the work on the syntactic structure of the sentence, i.e. actual division, attracted the attention of many. The main points of the statement - possession and cross sections of the thought expressed in the sentence - are not always compatible with the subject and the predicate.

Weil's theory was developed by linguists and scholars. Belgian philologist J. Ginnekn put forward the idea of the starting point and the ultimate goal of the idea. In his opinion, the study of consensus should take into account not only the form of the words, but also the degree of activity of the sentences. One of Weil's true followers is the Czech linguist and founder of the Prague Linguistic Circle (mid-XXth century). Matezius in his article "The Concept of Actual Separation of the Gap" states that the order of the words in the sentence creates a certain idea, that is, the meaningful construction of the sentence is reflected in its syntactic construction. According to him, the failure to use the passages in place is not the main purpose of language as a means of communication [Mathesius, 1967: 243].

"The Prague Linguistics Circle" contributed greatly to the development of the theory of topical division. It should be noted that there are some mistakes in this view. For example, V. Mathesius compares Czech and English, suggesting that the grammatical order of words in the Czech language can be freely used, while in English there is a conflict between the logical meaning of the thought and the grammatical formation of the sentence.

In researching the problem V. Z. Panfilov's research work on "Grammar and Logic" was important. This study first analyzed the views expressed by the Prague Linguistics Circle. V.Z. Panfilov thinks that "communicative load can fall into any part of the sentence, without compromising the quality of the syntactic structure of the sentence" [Panfilov, 1963: 137]. The scientist thus concludes: in each sentence there are two different devices, the first is syntactic (the sentence is formed according to the rules of language) and the second is logical and grammatical (the speaker creates the desired content by the order of the parts of the sentence). The logical-grammatical device is more universal than the syntactic device, because it is a logical expression of human thinking in words [Panfilov, 1963: 229]. The author's view that the idea is transmitted through logical grammar rather than syntactic construction has further enriched the theory of translation. The translator should always be able to identify the logic of the idea and give it its originality through the use of another language (although the syntactic structure of the languages is not compatible). Among the most popular linguists of the XXth century are N.A. Slyusareva, L.A. Chernyakhovskaya, N.L. Samoylova, M.E. Tipisheva, E.S. Troyanskaya, Z.D. Lvovskaya, I.V. Neshumaev, and T.V. Shmelev. All the scientific research is still relevant today, and the translation proves the importance of preserving the spirit of logical expression rather than the syntactic value of the words contained in the sentence.

The founder of the "Prague Linguistics Circle" V. Mathesius, in the actual division of the sentence, touches on the notions of "basis" and "core", which are typical of speech. The basis of thought is a well-known and familiar picture of the discourse, and the core of thought is the purpose of the statement [Mathesius, 1947]. In this binary view, the theme (T) and rema (R) differ. K. Boost, G. Amman interprets the pair of "theme" and "rema" as the subject matter of speech, the subject of the message, and the rema is the judgment of the word (Boost, 1955, 88).

I.P. Raspopov considers the actual division of the sentence as an important aspect of the nature of the language. "The word is a communicative unit of language, which also includes actual division as a grammatical character" [Raspopov, 1961, 48]. I.P. Raspopov in favor of the concepts and core of thought proposed by V. Mathesius, criticizes other terms are given and new (K. G. Krushelnitskaya), theme and rema (K. Boost), lexical subject and lexical predicate (A. Smirnitsky). Through these terms, *"passages are only introduced, but they do not show the constructive and syntactic significance of the actual division of the sentence."* (that source)

A change in the form of a statement causes a change in the meaning of the sentence. The commentary structure has a long history. Initially, the speech consisted only of rhymes and consisted of primitive short sentences. In the Russian language, inherited by the universal Slavic-additive style of speech, the sentence order has a semantic function: in modern Russian, the order of sentences is an actual means of separation. In the mid-medieval stage, when the English flew into disrepair, today's English discourse has adopted a logical and grammatical function.

O. B. Sirotina in her "Lectures on Russian Syntax" expresses her opinion on the actual fragmentation of the sentence and the separation of ideas into themes and remedies. The actuality of the phrase (the formation of an idea) may change the location of the components of the phrase, not only by the content of the sentence, but also by the communicative value of each word. A change in the usual pattern of speech can either increase or decrease the communicative value of a word. In the beginning of a word (theme) or at the end of a sentence (rema), there is a mechanism of expression (dye): the occurrence of the word makes it more important. Sirotina also emphasizes that

the main means of actual division in oral speech is tone, and in written speech the order of sentences [Sirotna, 2006: 24].

The communicative function controls the positioning of the primary and secondary parts of a sentence, that is, any sentence can become a communicative component. Usually, having - the "theme" comes before the cut, the owner - "rema" is at the end of the sentence. Rema is the main communicative component of the sentence, so it is imperative to use the rema. At the same time, the theme may have come up with a request for context. In the order of the words, the transition from theme to remake is correct (in Mathesius's view, objective), and the transition from remake to subject is a different one (in Mathesius's view, subjective). As the meaning of the words in the English language remains unchanged, the grammatical construction of the sentence must be considered. Before the cross section with a typical sentence sequence, the section follows the filler. However, the section does not have a special place (depending on the type and meaning of the speech).

For example: Christopher Columbus sailed east to India and discovered a new (unknown) land. As he sailed east to India, Columbus discovered a new land. Columbus discovered a new land while traveling east from India. *Христофор Колумб Ҳиндистонга шарқий томондан сузиб борар экан, янги (нотаниш) ерни аниқлади. Ҳиндистонга шарқ томондан сузиб борар экан, Колумб янги ерни кашф қилди. Колумб Ҳиндистонга шарқий томондан сузиб бораётиб янги ерни кашф қилди.*

At this point the question arises about the relationship between the syntactic and grammatical construction of the sentence, or rather the contradiction of the thesis. The theme and rema can be expressed in different parts of the syntax within the syntax, and in this case the content system must match the template → rema and reflect the logical development of thought. This issue has been repeatedly investigated by linguists. Therefore, the order of sentences in Indo-European languages can be both a syntactic means of expressing parts and a logical form of expression, and in these cases both the correct and altered order of elements are shown: $t \rightarrow r$, altered $r \rightarrow t$.

V. CONCLUSION

In the Uzbek language, it is possible that all independent words can serve as parts of speech. When speaking of order in the Uzbek language, it should be noted that the intersection is at the end of the sentence, and in Turkic languages the end of the sentence plays a major role in the formation of the syntactic structure.

In the absence of morphological means in the section of the sentence, the grammatical means, which indicate the cross-function of the word, are the order. [Baskakov, p. 93]

If logical emphasis and order play a major role in the expression of syntactic units in the Russian language, in the case of Uzbek, the Turkic languages are used. The interchangeability of parts of speech can be clearly seen in the types of words.

REFERENCES

1. Baskakov N.A. et al. General linguistics. - Tashkent, Uqituvchi, 1979, - p.186
2. Mirzaev I.K. Problems of lingvopoetical interpretation of poetic: abstract of diss. - Tashkent, 1991. - 52 p.
3. Raspopov I.I. Actual information and syntactic types of declarative sentences in Russian language. ADD, M., – B.1964.
4. Mathesius, V. About actual parts of speech [Text] I V. Mathesius // Prague linguistic circle: collection of articles. - M.: Progress, 1967. –497 pp.
5. Kovtunova I. Modern Russian language. Word order and actual division of the sentence. –M., 1976.

6. Panfilov VZ, Grammar and Logic, 1963. - 137 p.
7. Sayfullaeva R., Mengliev B., Bakieva G., Kurbanova M., Abuzalova M. Modern Uzbek Literary Language. - Tashkent: Science and Technology, 2010. - 414 p.
8. Sirotinina O. B. Lectures on syntax of Russian language – M., 1980. - 126 p.
9. Tumpyansky A.L. Reading and translation of English scientific and technical literature, M. 1974. - 23 p.
10. Hayitmetov K. Inversion in Modern Uzbek Language: diss. Phil science. doc. Tashkent, 1967. - 156 p.