

THE PROBLEM OF INPUTS AND OUTPUTS AT THE SYNTACTIC LEVEL

RAKHMONKULOVA NARGIZA ZAMIRJON QIZI,

2nd year student of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literature,
Uzbek State University Of World Languages One of the Most Complex and Distinctive
Levels of Language is Undoubtedly its Syntactic Level

ABSTRACT:

The essence, nature, interrelationships, and mechanisms of interaction of units at the syntactic level are studied as central issues in the science of language, in particular syntax. Although most of the units in the syntactic structure and their interrelationships have been agreed upon in linguistics, the issue of parentheses, which occupies a special place at this level, has not yet been resolved in Uzbek linguistics, as in other linguistics. However, it is impossible to bypass the phenomenon of parentheses in order to perfectly describe and describe the communicative-syntactic structure of language, and more precisely, the syntax of text.

INTRODUCTION:

Parenthesis units also have a special place in the syntax of artistic speech. Naturally, the perfection of the language of a work of art, in which the artistic and aesthetic purpose is fully embodied, depends not only on the use of lexical means, word choice, but also on the syntactic structure of speech, the ability to fully reflect the peculiarities of syntactic construction. Bracket units, on the other hand, have a unique value as one of the syntactic tools that create very rich artistic image and aesthetic impact possibilities for writers.

The study of the semantic-grammatical and lingvopoetic features of parenthesis units in artistic speech allows to clarify certain problems in the field of microsyntax (speech) and macrosyntax (text).

The true role and importance of parentheses, that is, units that are not grammatically directly related to parts of speech, in language construction has not been sufficiently focused in the early stages of the development of linguistics. This phenomenon has led to the emergence of different ideas in many syntactic theories to date. Observations show that the term "parenthesis" appeared relatively later. The input phenomenon is studied as a very broad concept, and the input constructions are also evaluated as a "input" category.

In Russian and Uzbek linguistics, the study of parenthesis constructions can be divided into two periods: 1) the period from the first half of the XIX century to the 40s of the XX century and 2) the period from the 40s of the XX century to the present.

Initially, in studying the linguistic nature of parenthesis constructions, linguists put forward various theoretical views. This, in turn, led to the emergence of diversity of opinion. In particular, in Russian linguistics in the first half of the XIX century, the input and output constructions were not specifically separated. The fact that information about it is given in the description of the rules for the use of punctuation marks, especially parentheses, is also proof of our opinion. In MV Lomonosov's pamphlet "Russian Grammar", in Chapter IV, entitled "On Symbols", the introductory constructions are also described in detail.

MAIN PART:

N.I. Grech's "Applied Grammar" gives a correct description of the input constructions. However, the author evaluates the entries

within the framework of the entries and does not use the term "input" in the construction. While acknowledging that there is some construction in a language, that it is related to the content of a sentence, the entry does not recognize that sentences are an independent syntactic construction. Inputs with inputs are understood as an event.

A.Kh. Vostokov, in support of the scientific views of N.I. Grech in "Russian Grammar", agrees that entries and entries should be considered as a phenomenon. But in contrast, it also provides information about the type of special constructions that are separated by an additional character and serve to determine the meaning of unintelligible words.

Evgraf Filomafitsky's scientific views, on the other hand, can be said to be, in a sense, an attempt to prove that entries exist as an independent category. In particular, the scholar emphasizes that there is a special connection between the main sentence and the introduction, and at the same time acknowledges that the parentheses are the result of methodological weakness while acknowledging the presence of parentheses in the speech. Through this idea, the scholar ignores the fact that the parentheses are pre-planned by the writer and introduced as a realization of his artistic intention.

AM Peshkovsky's pamphlet "School and Scientific Grammar" contains noteworthy theoretical views on the concept of "input". The scientist finds that the inserts have a specific tone in pronunciation. By quoting this idea, the scientist is able to determine that the inputs and outputs are separate syntactic constructions.

In some Russian grammars, however, introductions are divided into two types. While introductory words are interpreted as a means of expressing subjective relations, the definitions of introductory sentences state that they are simply inserted into other sentences without any grammatical connections. This

proves that entries are seen not as a separate syntactic category, but as a type of entries.

Special constructions consisting of words and phrases that explain the meaning of scientific terms and dialectal words, sources given after quotations, parentheses in the dramatic work are described in some manuals on punctuation. However, nothing is said about the fact that they are input constructions.

Thus, the problem of input constructions in Russian linguistics from the first half of the 19th century to the 1940s was not solved. No serious idea has emerged that fully reveals the nature of the contributions. The input event was interpreted as a mixture of inputs. However, it should be noted that the different views of scholars on inclusions serve as a basis for the next period of linguistics.

Beginning in the 1940s, the debate around input construction in Russian linguistics began to find its solution. There is a growing interest in distinguishing entries from input events, looking at them as independent syntactic constructions. In particular, research and the scientific views expressed in various grammars have proven that there are many aspects that distinguish entries from entries. In particular, for the first time, Professor AB Shapiro puts forward a strong opinion on the need to delimit prefabricated structures as a special category in the review of the work of SI Abakumov "Methods of punctuation." The professor acknowledges the following as peculiarities of entries: "Words, groups of words, sentences, or groups of sentences with a special function come as additional explanations which are not intended to be included in the main text of the sentence." He emphasizes that the need that arises during the speech process into the grammatically formed speech tissue, that something is added suddenly to the main idea, that it is abruptly introduced for comment, and that it cannot come at the

beginning of a sentence, is a key factor in distinguishing entries from introductions.

CONCLUSION:

It should be noted that this firm conclusion expressed by A.B. Shapiro led to the emergence of new interpretations in Russian linguistics, and many linguists supported his theoretical views. There has been a growing desire to study the phenomenon of input and output units, which has led to the emergence of many monographs, a number of scientific articles, and dissertations.

REFERENCES

- 1) Ломоносов М.В. Российская грамматика / Ломоносов М.В. Полн. собр. соч. в 11-ти томах. Т.7. –М. -Л., 1952. -С. 562.
- 2) Щеболева И.И. Общая характеристика вставочных конструкций в современном русском литературном языке / Учен. зап. Ростов-на Дону гос. пед. института. Вып.4. 1955.- С.97.
- 3) Востоков А.Х. Русская грамматика. 12-е изд. -СПб., 1874. -С. 216.
- 4) Пешковский А.М. Школьная и научная грамматика. -М., 1914.- С.54.
- 5) Абраменко А. Практический синтаксис русского языка. -М., 1915. -С.92; 6. Земская А.М., Крючков С.Е., Светлаев М.В. Русский язык. Часть 2. изд. -М.: Учпедгиз, 1963.
- 6) Шапиро А.Б. Рецензия на работу С.И.Абакумова «Методика пунктуации» / Русский язык в школе. 1948. № 3.