



**JOURNAL OF ADVANCED
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

ISSN: 0976-9595

Editorial Team

Editorial Board Members

Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.

Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.

Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

Specialization: Politics and International Relations.

Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh

Country: Mashhad Iran.

Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.

Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education

Dr. Muataz A. Majeed

Country: INDIA

Specialization: Atomic Physics.

Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan

Country: Egypt

Specialization: Agriculture and Biological

Dr. Subha Ganguly

Country: India

Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.

Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU

Country: India.

Specialization: Mathematics.

Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim

Country: Iran

Specialization: Structural Engineering

Dr. Malihe Moeini

Country: IRAN

Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology

Dr. I. Anand shaker

Country: India.

Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry

Dr. Magdy Shayboub

Country: Taif University, Egypt

Specialization: Artificial Intelligence

Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich

Country: Uzbekistan

Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University

Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

Specialization: Library and Information Science.

Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah

Country: Iraq.

Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.

Dr. Abdul Aziz

Country: Pakistan

Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.

Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkar - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara

Country: India

Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.

Dr. Neda Nozari

Country: Iran

Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.

Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Tashkent institute of finance

Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Namangan State University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamocharan Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

ON THE DIFFERENTIATION OF PARCELLATION AND SEPARATION IN THE MODERN GERMAN LANGUAGE

Oksana Maratovna RISAEVA

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences Department of German
Language and Literature Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Uzbekistan, Samarkand oksanarisaeva@mail.ru

140104, Uzbekistan, Samarkand, Bustonsaroy, 93., E-Mail: info@samdchti.uz

Home address: Uzbekistan, Samarkand, Sogdiana Street, House 22, Flat 17.

e-Mail: oksanarisaeva@mail.ru.

Abstract: This article is dedicated to the differentiation between parcellation and separation. The article contains an analysis of the relevant literature and the current theoretical approaches. The general characteristics of parcellation and separation as well as their specific features are described, allowing a clear distinction between these two phenomena.

Keywords: parcellation, parceled constructions, separation, connecting constructions.

Parceled constructions represent the division of a sentence into two or more segments (parcels), which are separated from each other by final punctuation marks - period, question mark and exclamation mark.

The main grammatical features of this construction are the following: 1) the presence of the base part and the parcel (one or more) in the parceled constructions; 2) Separation of each significant component (base part, parcel) with a final punctuation mark; 3) the presence of syntactic independence (both of the base part and the parcel) and at the same time maintaining a grammatical connection between them, which allows the parcel when tested «deparcellation», i.e. artificial restoration of a whole sentence, to stand in its composition as a member (main -, subordinate clause) or part of a complex sentence.

Although parcellation has been of interest to linguists for many years, the problem of distinguishing parcellation from segregation is not entirely clear. It has a long history, a large number of studies are dedicated to studying these phenomena. However, there is still no consensus among scientists as to whether parcellation and segregation are independent constructs and, if so, which structures they should include.

The understanding of separation, reflected in the works of Russian linguists of the 1950s and 60s, especially in the works of V. Sherba [8], V. Vinogradov [5] and found in some modern studies, is ambiguous. Thus, it is noted that separation is based on a different type of connection than association and subordination, and connect such constructions in which phrases often do not immediately fit into one semantic level, but form an associative chain of attachment. Separation is considered either as a special method of combining meanings, their unexpected juxtaposition and collision, leading to sharp breaks and shifts of expression within a syntagma or sentence, or as a principle of constructing an utterance, in which one of the parts has an independent receives communicative meaning and is appended to the main article in the form of additional information. As far as the connecting means of separation

are concerned, it turns out that, without exception, all coordinating and subordinating conjunctions can act «in the connecting function».

The problem raised is very relevant to the study of parcellation, since all types of parceled structures could be grouped under the definition of displaced structures; In addition, most detached segments have a «shadow of separation», especially when there is a conjunctive connection with the basal part. The «associative-additive» nature of such constructions has allowed many linguists to relate them to the number of secretion constructions. In the 1960s of the 20th century, the term «parcel» was introduced into linguistic circulation, and from the 1970s of the 20th century, two terms were used simultaneously in linguistics – «parcellation», «separation». The lack of a differentiated approach to the concepts under consideration has led some researchers to prefer to abandon both terms altogether.

Since the indistinguishability of parcellation and «parcellation», «separation» is still observed in a number of studies, it can be stated that the problem of their differentiation has not lost its relevance to this day.

In the study by P. V. Kobzev [10], parceled constructions often appear as illustrative material, in which both parts of compound sentences and members of simple sentences are contained in the parcels. The author classifies such «connecting constructions» as incomplete sentences.

N. S. Valgina is one of the few researchers who adhered to a broad interpretation of attachment in earlier work but later abandoned it. In the book «Theory of the Text» [4, 245] the author prefers to use the term «parcellation» and does not count the parceled constructions as similar structures such as «separation».

However, the confusion of terms still persists: so far, the phenomenon that we understand by «parcellation» is considered by some authors in a number of other cases of binding, interpreted differently, and mostly as a special type of syntactic connection, different from association and subordination. Even today, some linguists still adhere to a very broad understanding of binding that includes various constructions, including parceled ones. The question of the possible status of parceled constructions as independent structures is not addressed in the studies mentioned above. Accordingly, their inherent differentiating features and features of their functioning are not studied.

«Parcellation» and «separation» are independent phenomena. The need to distinguish between «Parcellation» and «separation» led to the search for compromise solutions to justify the right to exist. Works began to emerge in which «Parcellation» and «separation» and their constructive variants were viewed as independent phenomena. However, the reluctance to abandon the study of connecting structures as syntactic constructions and the inability to identify clear criteria for distinguishing them complicated attempts to distinguish them. A similar situation is observed in the work of V. V. Babaitseva [2].

O.P. Karkoshko also mentions other differences in his dissertation research: the connecting construction («separation») has the meaning of additional information, and the «Parcellation» is not an additional thought, but a detached part of an already existing structure [9, 11].

An interesting attempt to solve this problem was once made by linguists who studied parcellation in French. In these studies there is an uncharacteristic situation of «expansion» of the concept of «Parzelle». So, two types of parceled constructions are distinguished: separated (parceled construction fits into the logical-grammatical scheme of the sentence) and connecting (the isolated syntagma does not correspond to any member of the sentence, but is only semantically connected to this sentence through the spontaneous association). However, it should be noted that if the separated part is not identified as a member of the set or part of the complex, in the vast majority of cases it cannot be attributed to the «Parcellation».

The authors of the studies listed in this section neither specify the criteria by which one could consider connecting constructions as independent syntactic constructions, nor do they reveal their structural features that make it possible to distinguish them from a number of other syntactic constructions. The examined works do not indicate in which cases the structures should be classified as parceled and in which - as connecting.

L. Yu. Already in 1936, Maksimov [13] represented a position that until recently was shared by some linguists, namely: the term «parcellation» arose together with the term «separation» («connective construction») only in connection with the attempt to understand the constructions differentiated according to their structure and function. They only differ functionally. Parcellation is part of book language, and separation is a phenomenon of living, oral language.

The result of this approach has been the emergence of a significant number of studies in which the parceled constructions appear as illustrative material when the term «separation», is used. Thus, M. E. Shafiro [16], who relies on the traditional definition of connection construction by L. V. Shcherba [8], and builds the theoretical part of his work in accordance with his concept, nevertheless cites typical parceled constructions as actual examples. We believe that these terms reflect different aspects of a phenomenon: a point can mean an intonational fragmentation of a single organizational structure - a phenomenon called parcellation in linguistics; If one approaches this phenomenon from the point of view of synthesis, one can call it a communicative connection.

G.Ya. Solganik (2006) also uses the term «separation», when examining parceled constructions. Particular attention should be paid to the attribution of the constructions under consideration to «chopped prose», i.e. prose with a violation of syntactic connections in a sentence, strongly intoned and, as it were, broken into pieces in comparison with classical prose, where the sentence is presented as a single, well-organized alloy becomes. In addition, the researcher includes the connecting constructions under the title «New developments in modern syntax», which deal with expressive constructions that fragment a sentence.

Scientists study the structural and semantic features of the parceled constructions, the peculiarities of their functioning in texts of different genres. The peculiarity of their position is reduced only to the fundamental preference for the term «separation», over the term «parcellation».

«Parcellation» is a technique of expression syntax, «separation» is a semantic connotation of means of communication.

The widespread use of new expressive means in the syntax structure has significantly changed the structure of texts, which did not go unnoticed by specialists. A new terminology has appeared, new, modern classifications of such structures. And again the need for a clearer definition of «separation» and, above all, its differentiation and parcellation (especially considering that the latter is currently recognized by most researchers as an independent phenomenon, as a technique of expressive syntax with its own characteristics) has emerged.

In 1967, a monograph by V. A. Beloshapkova [3] was published, in which the author convincingly proves that parcellation belongs to the communicative-functional (dynamic) plan of the sentence, and separation belongs to the constructive (static) plan of the sentence (which logically- expressed in grammatical relations). This was the first time that the position was formulated that «separation» should be viewed as a semantic connotation of means of communication, but not as a construction. A similar view is held by A.P. Skovorodnikov [14, 15] and others.

Comparison of these syntactic phenomena makes it possible to draw the following conclusion: «parcellation» is a phenomenon of the communicative-functional plan of a sentence (dynamic aspect), while «isolation» is a phenomenon of the static aspect of a sentence and relates to one of the types of logical -grammatical relationships.

O. V. Aleksandrova also notes in her work the similarity of parcellation and connection structures «due to the similarity of their structures, intonation, nature of communication, information richness and expressiveness» [1]. However, it does not distinguish between these concepts and does not provide explanations for these phenomena.

A parceled construction has its own distinctive features: a two-component structure (consists of two parts: base part and the parcel) (regardless of the number of parcels); the dependent part is intonationally isolated and separated from the base in writing by a punctuation mark at the end of the sentence; both simple and compound sentences can be divided; unchanging postposition of the isolated element, intonational independence of the plot with close grammatical and semantic dependence on the base part; the presence of conjunctions and related words at the absolute beginning of the plot when dismembering complex structures; the plot is a new rhema center; the main function of the plot is the function of expressive highlighting, which ensures greater expressiveness of the statement; Plots should not be mixed with connecting structures (separations); the inability of the plot to function independently.

Therefore, we note that parcellation and separation are two different phenomena that have their own distinct characteristics and belong to different levels of language.

Literature

1. Aleksandrova O. V. Problemy ekspressivnogo sintaksisa: na materiale anglijskogo yazyka: uchebnoe posobie. Izd. 2-e, ispr. [Problems of expressive syntax: based on the material of the English language: textbook. Ed. 2nd, rev.] – M.: Knizhnyj dom «Librokom», 2009. – 216 p.

2. Babajceva V.V. Sinkretizm parcellirovannyh i prisoedinennyh substantivnyh fragmentov teksta // Filologicheskie nauki. [Syncretism of parceled and attached substantive fragments of text // Philological Sciences] – M., 1997, № 4.
3. Beloshapkova V.A. Sovremennyy russkij yazyk [Modern Russian language] – M., 1997.
4. Valgina N.S. Teoriya teksta [Text theory]. – M., 2004.
5. Vinogradov V. V. Russkij yazyk : Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove [Russian language: Grammatical teaching about the word]. – M., L.: Gos. ucheb.-ped. izd-vo, 1947. – 783 p.
6. Gulyga, E.V. Funkcionirovanie pridatochnyh predlozhenij v kachestve samostoyatelnyh [Tekst] / E.V. Gulyga // Filol. nauki [Functioning of subordinate clauses as independent clauses [Text] / E.V. Gulyga // Philol. Sciences]. – 1960. – № 4. – P. 37–48.
7. Devkin V.D. Nemeckaya razgovornaya rech: Sintaksis i leksika [German colloquial speech: Syntax and vocabulary]. – M., 1979.
8. Sherba L. V. Izbrannye raboty po russkomu yazyku [Selected works on the Russian language]. – Moskva: Yurajt, 2022. – 192 p.
9. Karkoshko O. P. Parcellyaciya: struktura, semantika, funkcii (na materiale russkogo i nemeckogo yazykov): avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk [Parcellation: structure, semantics, functions (based on the material of the Russian and German languages): abstract. dis. ...cand. Philol. Sci.]. – Majkop, 2011. – 19 p.
10. Kobzev P.V. Nepolnye predlozheniya prisoeditelnogo tipa v sovremennom russkom literaturnom yazyke: Avtoref. diss. ...kand. filol. nauk [Incomplete sentences of the connecting type in the modern Russian literary language: Author's abstract. diss. ...cand. Philol. Sci.]. – L., 1966. – P. 3-24.
11. Konstantinov L.N. Raschlenennye konstrukcii s podchinitelnymi soyuzami, sootnositelnye s formuloj slozhnopodchinennogo predlozheniya, v sovremennom russkom literaturnom yazyke: Avtoref. diss. ... kand. filol. nauk [Dissected constructions with subordinating conjunctions, correlative with the formula of a complex sentence, in the modern Russian literary language: Author's abstract. diss. ...cand. Philol. Sci.]. – Novosibirsk, 1969. – P. 4-25.
12. Kustova G.I., Mishina K.I., Fedoseeva V.A. Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazyka [Syntax of modern Russian language]. – M., 2005.
13. Maksimov L.Yu. Prisoedinenie. Russkij yazyk v shkole [Joining. Russian language at school]. – 1996, № 4.
14. Skovorodnikov A. P. O sootnoshenii ponyatij «parcellyaciya» i «prisoedineniya» // Voprosy yazykoznanija [On the relationship between the concepts of “parceling” and “attachment” // Questions of linguistics]. - 1978. № 1. – P. 118-130.
15. Skovorodnikov A. P. Ekspressivnye sintaksicheskie konstrukcii sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka: Opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya [Expressive syntactic constructions of the modern Russian literary language: Experience of systemic research]. – Tomsk: TGU, 1981. – 255 p.
16. Shafiro M.E. Prisoedinenie kak yavlenie rechevogo sintaksisa: Avtoref. diss. ... kand. filol. nauk [Attachment as a phenomenon of speech syntax: Author's abstract. diss. ...cand. Philol. Sci.]. – Saratov, 1965. – P. 3-25.

17. Cyganova K.L. Prisoedinenie i parcelljaciya v sovremennyh slavyanskih yazykah // II Slavisticheskie chteniya pamyati prof. P.A. Dmitrieva i prof. G.I. Safronova: Materialy mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii [Accession and parcellation in modern Slavic languages // II Slavic readings in memory of prof. P.A. Dmitrieva and prof. G.I. Safronova: Materials of the international scientific conference]. – SPb., 2001.