



## ANALYSIS OF THE THEORY OF ISOLATION IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

**Jumayev Orifjon Kilichbayevich**

*Researcher at the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

**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.*

**Key words:** *Modern linguistics, stylistics, phenomenon, linguistic terminology, rhythm*

### **Introduction.**

Analysis of the existing linguistic literature has shown that in the problem of separating the main and secondary members of the proposal, a number of questions can be addressed, from the study of which the general picture of this syntactico-stylistic phenomenon is revealed, namely: the essence of syntactico-stylistic isolation; Semi-representation of separate components; The relative permanence of separate components, both within simple and complex proposals; there are all sorts of separate components, both in the structure of the proposal and within the context. Depending on the emphasis on the linguistic nature of the phenomenon of isolation, it is possible to approach the phenomenon from different points of view.

The basics of the intonation approach to the analysis of the phenomenon are contained in the definition of the basis of the theory of the separate members of the proposal in the Russian linguistics of A. M. Peshkovskiy. It first established the linguistic term "separate secondary members of the proposal" - which was firmly included in the fund of linguistic terminology.

In the opinion of A. M. Peshkovskiy, the main and decisive criterion of isolation is his intonation and rhythm. Here is what he wrote about it: "A separate secondary member is a member who is likened (one or together with the other members, depending on him) in relation to melody and rhythm and in parallel - in the relationship of his with the surrounding members of a separate appendage" (A. M. Peshkovsky, 1938, with 306).

In fact, the relationship between the tone and the rhythm, on the one hand, and the isolated secondary member of the sentence, on the other, seems to us to represent a slightly different punishment. This point is reflected in the following statement by A.G. Rudnev: "... intonation and rhythm are only one of the multi-numbered means of isolation in pronunciation, not a condition of isolation. As a result, the grammatical means cannot serve as a decisive criterion for isolation" (A. G. Rudnev, 1959. p. 11). Indeed, intonation only expresses the rhythmic-melodic side of speech, i.e. raising or lowering, amplification or weakening, accelerating or slowing down the tone, and pauses serve as a means of obs pieces of the sentence, but this means is subject to the semantic side of the statement. The following statement by K. I. Petrovskaya serves as proof of this: "The selection of a second-rate member of the proposal is associated with a special meaning: its semantic role increases,

it acquires some semantic independence, and a predicative meaning; but it may be closer to a written or subordinate proposal. By such an attitude, isolation is a means of expressing special significance, expressiveness of the secondary captivity of the sentence" (K. J. Petrovskaya, 1953, p. 5). This thesis of K. Y. Petrovskaya finds its further development in the works of S.V. Krotevich and A.G. Rudnev. For example, A.G. Rudnev introduces the concept of "semantic-syntax function" by which he understands the syntax role and grammatical meaning of a member of a sentence. For example, the role of a predicative circumstance with the meaning of time, conditions, manner of action, etc. (A. G. Rudnev, 1959, p. II). Thus, the beginning of the "semantic-stylistic" approach was laid in the works of Russian linguists, such as E. V. Krotevich and A.G. Rudnev, who explore the semantic functions of separate components of different parts, and believe that the specifics of isolation, as it was, is conditioned by its semantic and stylized tasks.

Both morphologic and syntax were initially used in classifying separate members of the pre-ation. The classification of separate members of proposals on morphological grounds was subject to certain objections, as the separate members of the proposal on their nature are a syntax category. In this regard, the classification of separate components should be based on the syntax trait, and not a morphological expression of the dominant word in the sentence. On this occasion, it should be appropriate here to quote A. G. Rudneva: "After all, we separate (we do not separate, the isolation already exists in the language, that is, more precisely, in the text, we express only our attitude to it) not because it is a sacrament, adjective and noun, but because the sacrament, adjective and essential in this case in the sentence. , 1959, p. 15). In the initial studies devoted to the study of separate pre-regions, the classification was based on a morphological trait, so the isolated members of the proposal received the name mainly on the morfological grounds of the organizing center of the isolated speech turnover. Therefore, the morphological discharge of the dominant elephant's turnover was the only criterion in the classification of isolated components. As a result of this sub-similar, unified syntax category of separate turns, turns out to be according to many proponents of the theory of isolation, one of the torn syntax phenomena outside the necessary semantic connections and patterns. The meaning functions of the separate members of the proposal remained undisclosed and even ignored the syntax, style-styst and communication functions of separate components as part of both simple and complex proposals, although even then, in a number of studies on the problems of isolation, there was a question of syntax, semantic and stylistic functions of separate complexes (K. I. Petrovskaya, 1953, 5).

In order to properly represent the linvisic essence of the isolated syntax elements, we need, first of all, to establish the closeness of the part of the speech and the members of the sentence.

Such affinity is due not only to their common lexical meaning, but also to the fact that parts of the speech and members of the proposal play a different syntactical role in the proposal. For example, adjectives tend to stand out from the names of nouns. As a moral indicator, they act as adjectives, and as a syntax indicator they are "definition. But still there is no complete identity between definition and adjective, in the chipping in connection with the development of the grammatical system of any language definition can be expressed not only adjectives, but also other parts of the region. On the other hand, the adjective can serve as a morphological expression not only of pre-logy, but also of the given. All this shows that such relationships exist not only between adjective and definition, but also other parts of speech, this provision gives us the right to say that there is a certain relationship between syntax and morphological categories, but not full correspondence. And the attempt to classify the separate members of the proposal according to their morphological expression cannot be considered as the movement of morphology and syntax, or in the expression of A.G. Rudnev as an attempt to morphologie syntax, ignoring the semantic and syntactical functions of the separate members of the proposal. Moreover, the living, effective

members of the proposal in modern Russian language are established on the basis of the proposal and the delineation of the functions of words and groups in the sentence system.

Such a statement suggests "that the methods of morphological expression and all other grammatical parameters in the study of the proposed members and separate structures should be taken into account, not as the basis of their classification, but only as a grammatical means of detecting certain semantic relationships and syntactical functions.

Separate members of the proposal and separate designs are the subject of discussion of a number of linguistic studies in which their various aspects are spent. In the foreground usually put forward in addition to intonation characteristics, and the order of words, punctuation and others. M. N. Peterson in his work "Essays of the Syntax of the Russian Language" wrote: "Under the name of isolated secondary members, the same second-rate members with other orders of words, pauses, intonation are edict. In essence, they do not represent a special way of expressing the relationship between words, and there is no need to allocate them to a special troupe" (M. N. Peyterson, 1923, with 22). If this statement is compared to the statement of A. G. Rudnev, an attempt to morfologize the syntax, ignoring the semantic and syn-taxi functions of the separate members of the pre-establishment, it becomes clear that in this thesis the aorence does not take into account the syntax category of separate complexes.

The definition of separate members of the proposed and separate structures as very important syntactico-semantic stylistic phenomena, is fully reflected in the following statement of the academician V.V. Vinogradov: "Separate members and separate structures represent a kind of semantic syntactical unity within the proposal, singling out by means of inversion and intonation... The isolated members of the proposal are usually filled with live expression, stressed logically or emotionally separate member acquires a relatively large syntax weight compared to the corresponding member of the proposal, not isolated, syntactically associated with its main predicative core" (V.V. Vinogradov, 1954, with 26). In this definition, the academician V.V. Vinogradov is particularly singled out not only in intonation points, but also the means of inversion, which are as if the basic conditions that contribute to the separation of both the main and secondary members of the proposal. The selection of inversion in the caicy of one of the general conditions conducive to isolation is explained as follows: In version (from the Latin word *inversio* - turn over), that is, an unusual order of words, which attracts the attention of listeners to the allocated compotes, as any deviation from the standard order of words inevitably draws attention to itself and acquires a certain stylistic value. This method of grammatical expression of new or additional shades of the meaning of a member of the proposal occurs mainly in separate members of proposals and in separate structures. Here there is a question about predicativeness and about the independence of separate proposals and separate structures. This question was first indirectly raised by A. M. Peshkovsky. In A.G. Rudnev predicative acts not only as a reason for isolation, but also as his sign, which the author puts in the basis of his classification. The predicative property of separate syntax elements is emphasized by A.A. Chess, linking it, ultimately, with the presence of applications in the language.

In addition to the question of predicativeness, the question of the independence of the isolated syntax elements in the proposal, which also has a ambiguous interpretation in linguistic literature, is raised. The difficulty lies in the fact that the concept of "self-reliance" is summed up as the structural, syntactical and semantic self-sufficiency of the isolated syntax elements, which leads to its relative independence from the ossina part of the sentence. The structural, syntax and semantic autonomy of the isolated syntax elements, as noted in a number of works, is expressed in the following aspects: the sweetness of the syntax connection of separate elements with the surrounding components within the sentence; The degree to which the isolated groups are isolated from the

existing components within the proposal; The self-reliance of separate syntax elements in comparison with other components in the proposal, etc. So, for example, K. I. Gailums, exploring the separate definition in modern Latvian literary language about the meaning of the self-reliance of the separate elements, writes the following: "Separate members of the proposal in the dissertation are members of the proposal, who have a well-known semantic independence, their own intonation and which in the speech from the rest of the members of the proposal are separated by a pause, and in the letter of the corresponding signs. (K. I. Gailums, 1956, with 5). This thesis of the author repeats the same known factors that contribute to the separation of syntax elements: 1) semantic independence; 2) intonation; 3) punctuation.

Considering the reasons for the isolation of the syntax elements of the proposal, almost all proponents of the theory of isolation, especially state the presence of cases of mandatory use of commas (in isolation used in addition to the comma dash and colon) in the proposal, which is facilitated by a number of factors. These factors include: the size of the groups of words belonging to the isolation; The nature of the information transmitted; The presence of a pause between the separate components and the rest of the sentence; inversion of the order of words, in which the separate components of the sentence are placed in an unusual place for them in the sentences (here we mean the pre-positive, interpositive, post-positive position of the separate members of the proposal in relation to the separate components of the proposal). In addition, the determining factor is considered to be a stylistic factor.

A review of linguistic literature shows that the research of linguists deepens and expands our understanding of the basic, significant and structural characteristics of the phenomenon of isolation, that is, as a syntax stylistic phenomenon. But since this phenomenon has its own characteristics in each individual language, it should be talked about its essence and volume only on the basis of the structure and functioning of a particular language.

#### Literature:

1. V.V. Grapes Some tasks of studying the syntax of a simple sentence / Issues of linguistics, 1954, No.- p.26.
2. Gailums K.Y. Separate definition in modern Latvian literary language / Autoref. Dics. Soyk. Scientist. Step. Kand. It's a philol. Sciences. Riga, 1956. 5 p.
3. Petrovskaya K.Y. Separate secondary members of the proposal in modern English. Autoref. Dics. On. soy. Scientist. Step. Kand. It's a philol. Sciences. L., 1953. 5 p.
4. Rudnev A.G. Syntax complicated offer. M., 1959. 11 p.
5. Fayzullayeva, M. B. (2021). USING TECHNOLOGIES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING. *ResearchJet Journal of Analysis and Inventions*, 2(5), 1-5.
6. Fayzullayeva, M. B. (2022). THE PROBLEMS OF USAGE INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES (ICT) IN ENGLISH CLASSROOM. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 2(2), 725-730.
7. Fayzullayeva, M. B., Sattarova, I. B., & Makhmudova, M. A. (2021). The effect of teaching vocabulary through ICT on EFL learners. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(4), 1632-1637.
8. Zubaydova, N. N. M. (2020). THE ROLE OF COUNTRY STUDIES IN TEACHING ENGLISH. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 310-312.
9. Зубайдова, Н. (2019). Стилистический потенциал и коннотативные признаки фразеосем английского языка. *Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование*, 4(1 (70)), 79-82.
10. Исматова, Ю. Н., & Худойбердиева, А. Х. ФАКТОРЫ, ВЛИЯЮЩИЕ НА ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЕ ПЕРЕВОДА. *Zbiór artykułów naukowych recenzowanych.*, 62.