THE QUESTION OF THE CURRENT MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENTENCE IN THE AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGE

Ellada Mamedova

Baku State University, Senior Teacher of Japanese Language at the Department of Far Eastern Languages and Literature, PhD student

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14604198

ANNOTATSIYA

Ozarbayjon tilshunosligida murakkab gapning shakl va semantik tuzilishi bilan bog‘liq masalalar hali to‘liq hal etilmagan. Bunday holat, ma'lum ma'noda, ob'ektiv sharoitlarni kuzatishdir. Ozarbayjon tilshunosligida murakkab gaplarning grammatik mohiyatini to‘liq va har tomonlama o‘rganish bo‘yicha muayyan ishlar amalga oshirilgan bo‘lsa-da, sintaktik hodisalarning ichki va tashqi semantik xususiyatlarini, ularning ishlash mexanizmini o‘rganuvchi chuqur saviyadagi tadqiqotlarga hali ham katta ehtiyoj sezilmoqda. . Ma’lumki, ozarbayjon tilshunosligida murakkab gaplar sohasida jiddiy ilmiy yutuqlar mavjud. Biroq, butun sintaktik tizim fonida murakkab jumlaning tabiatiga oid umumiy nazariy masalalar hali ham uning izchil va tizimli tadqiqini kutmoqda. Bu masalalarning barchasi o'rganish uchun muhimdir. Bundan tashqari, funksional so‘zlashuv nutqini o‘rganish nuqtai nazaridan alohida qiziqish uyg‘otadigan murakkab gap tuzilishiga aktual bog‘lanish tamoyillari va usullarini qo‘llash ham uning o‘rganish momentini kutayotgan nazariy va amaliy masalalardan biridir.

KALIT SO‘ZLAR

Ozarbayjon tilshunosligi, murakkab gap, semantik tuzilish, aktual a'zolik.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В азербайджанском языкознании вопросы, связанные с формально-семантической структурой сложного предложения, до сих пор не получили полного разрешения. Такой случай, в определенном смысле, является наблюдением объективных условий. Несмотря на то, что в азербайджанском

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

Азербайджанское языкознание, сложное предложение, семантическая

языкознании были проделаны определенные работы для полного и всестороннего изучения грамматической природы сложных предложений, все еще существует большая потребность в глубоких исследованиях, изучающих внутренние и внешние семантические особенности синтаксических явлений и механизм их работы. Известно, что в области сложных предложений в азербайджанском языкознании имеются серьезные научные достижения. Однако общетеоретические вопросы, касающиеся природы сложного предложения на фоне всей синтаксической системы, еще ждут своего последовательного и систематического исследования. Все эти вопросы важны для изучения. Кроме того, применение фактических принципов и методов соединения к структуре сложного предложения, что представляет особый интерес с точки зрения изучения функциональной разговорной речи, является одним из теоретических и практических вопросов, ожидающих своего момента изучения.	структура, актуальное членство.
ABSTRACT	**KEY WORDS**
In Azerbaijani linguistics, the issues related to the formal and semantic structure of the complex sentence have not yet been fully resolved. Such a case, in a certain sense, is an observation of objective conditions. Even though certain works have been done in Azerbaijani linguistics for the complete and comprehensive study of the grammatical nature of complex sentences, there is still a great need for deep-level research that studies the internal and external semantic features of syntactic phenomena and their working mechanism. It is known that there are serious scientific achievements in the field of complex sentences in Azerbaijani linguistics. However, general theoretical issues regarding the nature of the complex sentence against the background of the entire syntactic system still await its consistent and systematic	*Azerbaijani linguistics, complex sentence, semantic structure, actual membership.*

investigation. All these issues are important to study. In addition, the application of actual joining principles and methods to the complex sentence structure, which is of special interest from the point of view of studying functional conversational speech, is one of the theoretical and practical issues waiting for its learning moment.

Introduction

The actual parting of the sentence differs from all other possible parts by its functional essence and direction. Actual membership, which is one of the main research objects of functional syntax, as a principle, does not evaluate the sentence only from its structure, the research in this direction goes beyond the boundaries of the sentence structure. The directions of this deviation are different. A wide range of psychological-logical and functional-grammatical points can be attributed to this, starting from the relationship between the information giver and the information receiver, and ending with the penetration of neighboring sentence boundaries in the speech process of sentences.

In addition to the possibility of applying topical membership to sentence structures in all languages, it should be noted that depending on the syntactic type of each language, the realization of this membership may be specific. Among the factors that create this specificity are the regularities of word order, the richness of the arsenal of auxiliary parts of speech, the abundance of opportunities to create connections between sentences, etc. can be shown.

There is a rich linguistic literature on the history of the current clause membership. First of all, it is important to note that the approach to the sentence from the functional-communicative, psychological point of view existed long before the emergence of the actual membership history. At this point, it is enough to mention the names of the famous German scientist German Paul, the Russian scientist A. Potebnyan, and the French scientist S. Weil, who is one of the representatives of the school of young grammarians of the 19th century. In their research, they paid special attention to the functional-psychological layer of the sentence, looked at the word order as a means of regulating the compatibility between the sentence and the objective world, and in principle, of the 20th century, the actual membership of the sentence put forward by V. Matezius, the founder of the Prague Linguistic School term and idea, at the same time, they were able to be a solid, theoretical basis for the extensive literature that emerged in this area. When talking about the actual membership of a sentence in the Azerbaijani language, it

would be appropriate to start the issue by studying its various specific features from the concept of actual membership, to reveal the essence of this concept.

The concept of the actual membership of the sentence

Almost all researchers note the main two-level character of the sentence. These levels correspond to different membership methods. The syntactic level, thus, in addition to membership according to sentence members (that is, in addition to grammatical membership), also has a special level of membership. This special level of membership manifests itself as the actual level of membership of the sentence. Perhaps it would not be correct to call this membership a pure syntactic membership. So, here there is a very serious progress towards the logical layer of the sentence. The syntactic (grammatical) analysis conducted according to these sentence members differs from the subject-predicate membership at the logical grammatical level. The concepts of logical subject and logical predicate appear. As Russian linguist V. Z. Panfilov noted, it is necessary to distinguish and separate the syntactic level of the sentence from the logical level [Panfilov, 1971, 162].

Other Russian linguists also distinguish two stages, two stages. It's just that this difference is called differently. For example, I.P. Raspopov names these levels as constructive-syntactic and communicative-syntactic [Rasponov, 1979, 31].

I.F. Vardul also distinguishes two levels (levels) in the structure of the sentence in his work “Basics of Descriptive Linguistics”. Thus, he also distinguishes the syntactic level and the supra-syntactic level [Vardul, 1977, 172].

In general, as we said, the separation of two levels in the sentence structure naturally leads to the formation of two types of membership. One of these classifications is syntactical (grammatical) classification, that is, classification according to sentence members traditionally familiar with school grammar. The other membership is logical-syntactic membership that takes into account logical-psychological, functional-communicative possibilities, in other words, actual membership.

There is a rich scholarly literature on current membership, and we will not specifically address here the emergence of research related to this membership, the history of the formation of thoughts and ideas, as this would require a very broad and in-depth position to be presented and elaborated. The evolution of these or other ideas about the actual membership of the sentence is not our main goal. Here, based on the specific features and aspects of the Azerbaijani sentence, we will talk about the possibility of applying actual membership to its structure as one of the general membership methods and, in this regard, the compatibility of actual membership with the general law. [Abdullah 2016, 112].

At the same time, we will focus on tools (phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactic) that serve to become actual in the Azerbaijani language. Our main goal is to determine the principles of actual sentence structure based on Azerbaijani language materials with the help of these tools.

Although we do not specifically follow the history of the issue, it is necessary to pay attention to one or two points, even important ones. It is known that the problem of actual sentence structure has been comprehensively and systematically studied by members of the Prague Linguistic School [Lapteva 1967, 39]. Soon after they began to investigate this issue scientifically, the problem began to be studied by Soviet linguists. In this regard, Lomtev, Raspopov, Panfilov, Nikolayeva, Shevyakova, Krushelnitskaya, Lapteva, Slyusareva, and others can be mentioned among the Russian linguists mentioned in this book [Adilov 2019, 70].

When approaching the stated problem, first of all, it is necessary to answer such a question: is there a connection between the formal grammatical essence of the syntactic structure of the sentence and the actual structure of the sentence, in other words, can the formal and actual structure of the sentence be mutually related to each other? This question is very important and one of the main issues of the considered problem. Thus, as noted by V. Matezius, the relationship between actual and formal members is one of the most characteristic features that manifests itself in every language [Matezius 1967, 240].

It is also interesting that V. Matezius opposes this opinion in another part of his mentioned work (“On actual membership”) and writes that the actual membership of the sentence and its formal membership should be sharply contrasted. At the same time, some Soviet linguists who worked in this direction also defended this idea. In their research, they mainly started from such an interesting fact that each member of the sentence can, in principle, have a communicative load, that is, each member of the sentence, without losing its qualities at the level of syntactic membership of the sentence, in terms of actual membership, “new" and maybe "old". And it is this aspect, as V. Z. Panfilov noted, "the actual composition of the sentence indicates that it goes beyond the boundaries of syntactic composition" [Panfilov 1963, 38].

On the other hand, as noted by K.G. Krushelnitskaya, who called topical membership semantic membership, there is no reason to establish a sharp barrier between the grammatical membership of the sentence according to the sentence members and the meaning membership (topical membership), as shown by Matezius and several other researchers [Krushelnitskaya 1956, 59] .

It seems to us that this kind of opposition (if indeed it is real) should still be accepted as an event that happened within a whole object, i.e., a sentence. Of course, even in this case, it is impossible to take into account the active interaction and interaction between two different

members of the sentence. So, the nature of this comparison does not deny such relations. Thus, it can be noted that, and probably the most correct way out - the way out that connects the two opposite poles would be this: memberships carried out by different methods are not separated from each other by sharply drawn border lines. At the same time, it seems to us that it would be appropriate to use the concepts of "objective expression" and "subjective effect" when determining the relationship between these membership methods. The study of the communicative side of the sentence with the actual means of association, as a result, leads to the understanding of the formal aspect of the sentence, i.e., the deeper layer of its grammatical association. In this case, the importance of studying the grammatical structure of the sentence, its semantic structure, i.e., its communicative side, increases many times [Abdulla 2016, 114].

The relationship between actual and formal membership is also not in doubt because each sentence, when formed both formally and semantically, sets a clear goal in front of it - the goal of becoming an indispensable element of the communicative process as a whole. It is the communicative aspect of the sentence that is the most important and final level of the "epic" of the sentence. And, of course, neither formal nor semantic aspects can completely replace this communicative aspect separately. On the other hand, it is impossible to give priority to any of these aspects - formal or semantic aspect during a specific study. Thus, an internal change in any aspect causes a change in another aspect.

If we accept the word order of the sentence as a fact of the formal-syntactic aspect, then we have a reason to talk more about the relationship between topical and syntactic membership. Let's take this one fact - the fact that in the Turkish sentence, the news takes place in the last position, that is, in the post-position, according to the other members of the sentence in the syntactic plan.

All Turkologists note that the standard place of news in Turkish languages is at the end of the sentence. As a result of actualization, this news changed its standard place and “marched” into the sentence - to the middle and front positions, which is directly related to the effect of actualization opportunities in the formal syntactic layer. The connection is obvious. If for languages with free word order, the displacement of the message is not syntactically informative, then in Turkic languages, including Azerbaijani, due to the presence of fixed, determined syntactic positions of the sentence members, such a situation is highlighted in relief, and here the displacement (in our case - the displacement of the message) it becomes informative, in other words, it brings with it additional information. This information is both stylistic and communicative-situational.

It is known that the actual composition of the sentence is based on the logical base of the sentence, the extralinguistic process (potential) that regulates the normal functioning of the sentence in the speech process. The identification of separate categories of actual membership is related to the logical arrangement of the constituent components of the sentence. These components belong to two poles - subject and predicate poles, creating the

polarization in the sentence. In the process of development of syntactic thought, different researchers call the subject and predicate poles differently. The subject group is called theme, speech part, given part, main part, psychological-subject, and other names. The group of predicates is Rhema, new part, nucleus, psychological predicate, etc. they call, of course, their essence does not change.

In linguistics, psychologism shows its influence in this field of syntactic studies. Back in the 19th century, German Paul, one of the leaders of the school of young grammarians, separated two poles in the sentence by saying psychological-subject and psychological-predicate in his famous work [Paul 1960, 339].

Following him, the Russian linguist F. Fortunatov also distinguishes between the psychological messenger and the psychological message in the psychological judgment. According to Fortunatov, whatever first appears in the speaker's linguistic consciousness is a psychological subject, and a psychological predicate is what the speaker thinks about this subject [Fortunatov 1957, 449-450]. Researching the history of Russian linguistics, F.M. Berezin writes that Fortunatov's teaching on psychological judgment resonated with the main trends of syntactic thought at the end of the 19th century in Europe. These directions were finally formed as psychological syntax and were reflected in the teaching of K. Paul Fortunatov [Berezin 1968, 90]. Logical and psychological moments and factors in the actual composition of the sentence have always been mentioned in this or other periods.

Thus, the possibility and even the need to study the sentence from the point of view of its actual membership once again confirms the fact that the logical, psychological, and purely linguistic structures are very tightly mixed in the speaker's linguistic consciousness.

In analogy with the structure of the logical sentence, the structure of the meaning base of the sentence is established, and this, in turn, creates a very favorable condition for actual membership. At the speech level, the subject of the sentence is the same as the subject of the sentence, and the predicate of the sentence is the same as the rhyme of the sentence. Here and later, we will mainly use the terms theme and rheme in connection with this point. First, let's talk about their essence.

The theme is a special syntactic background of the speech, which serves to reveal and highlight the other, rhematic part of the speech. In principle, the theme is always directed to the previous context and the language situation in general, it is related to it, and it arises from it. At the logical grammatical level of the sentence, its thematic part is considered a known part. So, this knowledge is for both the information transmitter and the information receiver. At the same time, this part is directed to the context before it, and at the same time, it appears in the situational structure around the sentence and does not differ from the logical point of view within the sentence.

The theme is the common knowledge base of both the speaker and the receiver. Without this general knowledge background (presupposition), in principle, it is impossible to

take a step forward within the text from the point of view of transmitting information. It is such a general background of knowledge as a springboard that underlies and prepares the further development of the in-text idea.

Rhema, on the other hand, constitutes the core and soul of information. The theme, which is representative of what is said in the speech, is subjected to a certain degree of actualization and special consideration during the speech activity. This type of actualization is carried out by various language means and methods. We will talk about this in more detail later.

It should be noted that the theme in the sentence is actualized with the help of both prosodic-extralinguistic means and formal-grammatical means, it is especially noticeable. Rhema is an unknown part of a sentence addressed specifically to the addressee, with the help of which it is intended to eliminate a certain entropy, in other words, the goal is to reduce (remove) the lack of information on the part of the information recipient. The interrelationship and mutual agreement of the theme and the rheme determine the strengthening of the logical-semantic grammatical basis of the sentence.

It should be noted that both theme and rheme do not contain constant syntactic members of the sentence in their composition, their composition is not constant, it is not always filled with the same members. In other words, more precisely, the theme is not always the message, and the theme is not always the message. Just as the composition of the theme includes subtext, completeness, and news, so the composition of the Rhema can include subtext, news, and completeness. The instability of the grammatical composition of the actual membership components, in turn, raises another difficulty.

As researchers have noted, sometimes it is simply not possible to sharply distinguish the content of the theme from the content of the rhema. This situation can often be attributed to stylistically complicated sentences loaded with secondary members and various components [Abdulla, 2019, 115].

Together, theme and rhyme cover the entire content of information. At the beginning of the information, they usually name the theme, define the theme, and then "revolve" around the theme again: again, this time they refine the theme through rhyme. Thus, the theme can also be called as a specified theme.

Thus, it is possible to equate the information as a whole to the sum of the schema specified by the theme. This case can be the main point of departure in determining predicates in any language.

It should be noted that in individual Turkic languages and Turkology in general, the issue of actual sentence structure has been touched upon to one degree or another in studies of functional syntax or preparation for functional syntax. In the works of M.Z.Zakiyev, G.P.Melnikov, A.Javadov, S.A.Sokolov, A.S.Safayev, Z.R. Karimova,

and others, issues related to the actual, functional semantic grouping of the sentence were discussed. In Azerbaijani linguistics, unfortunately, neither the issues of functional syntax, nor the issue of actual membership of the sentence, which is part of it, and the two-level characteristic of the sentence layer have been systematically followed. In any case, it is impossible to name a serious research written in this direction. Separate articles have been written in which Russian Soviet linguists (in particular, I.R. Raspopov) as well as Czechoslovak linguists, mainly V. Matezius, have tried to give opinions about actual membership in general. Unfortunately, these considerations were not original. However, the original syntactic structure of the Azerbaijani language, especially the sentence structure, could lead to several valuable results based on the materials of this language in the study of actual membership.

At the same time, it should be noted that some elements of the actual membership methodology were written by the great Azerbaijani linguist A. Demirchizade in 1947 in "Modern Azerbaijani Language. It can be seen in his work "Sentence Members". Although he did not set himself the goal of studying the actual structure and the functional level of the sentence, the author intuitively noted the special importance of the word order, its relationship with the sentence order, and their special role in expressing ideas. In addition, A. Javadov's doctoral work "Classification of language units" (based on Azerbaijani language materials) can be mentioned. Although the main goal here is not to study actual membership, in any case, it is impossible not to see the importance of this research in the study of functional syntax in a broad plan [Demirchizade 1947, 80].

Again, it should be noted with regret that this direction of our linguistics was not continued towards this goal, the silhouette of which began to appear, and as a result, a very important area of syntactic research remains in the form of "raw soil" of our linguistics until today [Ibrahimov 2020, 34]. Failure to study the logical grammatical level of the sentence, failure to determine its working point in the speech process, and failure to clarify the methods of connection with other sentences lead to the fact that in the syntactic studies of the Azerbaijani language, the principles of sentence semantics, the various semantic layers of the sentence, and the context of the sentence, as well as the situation, are completely forgotten and not taken into account. This, in turn, slowed down the logical and natural transition from the separate study of sentence structure to the study of the structure of complex syntactic entities. And that is why complex syntactic units, which are naturally the basis of functional syntax, specifically text syntax, have not been the object of special and comprehensive research in the Azerbaijani language.

Result

Actualization of the sentence is based on the principle of mutual adjustment of the actualized and non-actualized components of the sentence. Actualization of certain

components of the sentence is its special selection and separation from other components. Special selection is carried out by special means. And this selection is to emphasize that the component of the sentence has a special role in the communicative process of the sentence. Naturally, the selection or actualization of certain components of the sentence in the speech process serves to adequately decipher the meaning-content structure of the sentence by the recipient, that is, the receiver. The principles of actualization in spoken language and written language are in many cases compatible with each other. But these or other methods in different spheres of speech activity can be less important or very important, primary or secondary. V. Matezius and other researchers also paid attention to this situation and noted that the picture of actual membership in the spoken language is richer than in the written language. Let us add that the intonation and other extralinguistic factors specific to the spoken language deepen this richness.

Actualization in spoken language is mainly based on intonation, stress, speech rate, speaking tone, and other prosodic phenomena. Formal grammatical signs that contribute to actualization play the role of an auxiliary factor in spoken language, and even word order in many cases cannot go beyond playing an auxiliary role. As for the written language, here, first of all, formal signs of actualization come to the fore, as well as word order and other factors that give a special impetus to actualization.

It seems to us that it would be appropriate to systematize various methods that create conditions and cause the actualization of this or that sentence component (member) in the Azerbaijani language.

REFERENCES

1. Abdulla, K. 2006. *Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri*. Bakı.
2. Adilov, M., Verdiyeva. Z., F. Ağayev. 2019. *Dilçilik problemləri*. Bakı.
3. Berezin, F. M. 1968. *Essays on the history of linguistics in Russia (late XIX - early XX centuries)*. Moscow.
4. Dəmirçizadə, Ə. 1947. *Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Cümlə üzvləri*. Bakı.
5. Fortunatov, F. F. 1957. *On teaching Russian grammar in secondary school.* Selected works. vol. 2. Moscow
6. İbrahimov, E. 2020. *Bağımsız Türk Cumhuriyetlerinde Dil Politikası (Azerbaycan Örneği)*. Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi.
7. Krushelnitskaya, K. G. 1956. *To the question of the semantic division of the sentence* - "Issues of Linguistics". Moscow
8. Lapteva, O. I. 1963. *Czechoslovak works of recent years on the actual division of the sentence.* – "Issues of linguistics" Moscow.
9. Lomtev, T. P. 1972. *The sentence and its grammatical categories*. Moscow.
10. Mamedova, E. 2021. *Actual articulation at the junction of paradigms*. Alatoo

Academic Studies.
11. Mathesius, V.1967. *On the so-called actual division of the sentence.* – "Prague Linguistic Circle". Moscow.
12. Melnikov, G.P. 1969. *The syntactic structure of the Turkic languages and the positions of systemic linguistics*. - Peoples of Asia and Africa. Moscow.
13. Pal, G. 1960. *Principles of the history of language*. Moscow.
14. Panfilov, V. Z. 1963. *Grammar and logic (grammatical and logical-grammatical articulation of a simple sentence).* Moscow.
15. Panfilov, V. Z. 1971. *Relationship between language and thinking.* Moscow.
16. Raspopov, I. P. 1970. *The structure of a simple sentence in modern Russian*. Moscow.
17. Vardul, I. F. 1977. *Fundamentals of descriptive linguistics*. Moscow.