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Abstract: We use inversion in several different situations in English. Inversion just means putting the verb before the subject. We usually do it in question forms. The article discusses the inversion at compose with a separator do and a rhythmic do in English sentences.
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Nativist theories have argued that language involves syntactic principles which are unlearnable from the input children receive. A paradigm case of these innate principles is the structure dependence of auxiliary inversion in complex polar questions (Chomsky, 1968, 1975, 1980). Computational approaches have focused on the properties of the input in explaining how children acquire these questions. In contrast, we argue that messages are structured in a way that supports structure dependence in syntax. We demonstrate this approach within a connectionist model of sentence production (Chang, 2009) which learned to generate a range of complex polar questions from a structured message without positive exemplars in the input. The model also generated different types of error in development that were similar in magnitude to those in children (e.g., auxiliary doubling, Ambridge, Rowland, & Pine, 2008; Crain & Nakayama, 1987). Through model comparisons we trace how meaning constraints and linguistic experience interact during the acquisition of auxiliary inversion. Our results suggest that auxiliary inversion rules in English can be acquired without innate syntactic principles, as long as it is assumed that speakers who ask complex questions express messages that are structured into multiple propositions.

An alternative to nativist accounts of auxiliary inversion are constructivist, or usage-based, theories of language (Bybee, 2010, Goldberg, 2006, Tomasello, 2003). These theories argue that the input from which children learn is richer than has been assumed by nativists, and that children use powerful statistical learning mechanisms to gather information from this data (Gómez, 2007, Saffran et al., 1996). For example, Reali and Christiansen (2005) have suggested that word co-occurrence statistics suffice to render grammatical questions (4) more probable than their ungrammatical counterparts (5) and Pullum and Scholz (2002) have argued that complex questions other than (4) can provide evidence for the correct auxiliary inversion rule (see also Sampson, 1989). Thus, usage-based theories have shifted the explanatory burden away from innate syntactic knowledge and onto the learning mechanism and its input.

Although these approaches differ in where they seek relevant constraints on complex question formation, they both locate these constraints within the domain of language. English auxiliary inversion rules are either learned from linguistic input or preset by innate syntactic constraints. In the present work, we propose an alternative account where auxiliary inversion arises from constraints that are outside of language. In particular, we focus on the role of the message that is conveyed when complex questions are being produced. Our claim is that the message is structured into nonlinguistic propositions and this structure constrains the way grammars can develop in the language system. Critically, we argue that the message structure is available before children acquire the ability to produce complex questions. We provide a computational
model that is able to use the structure of meaning when learning to produce grammatical complex polar questions from impoverished input.

**The Main Part**

Word order is one of the most important issues in any language syntax. In his book *Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, G. Gleason wrote: "Word order is not only one of the most basic syntactic indicators in any language, but also one of the most complex."

The order of words in any language is determined by a number of factors, primarily the structure of the language - its typology, grammatical rules and traditions.

Nowadays, there are many cases in educational and linguistic literature that deviate from such strict word order and increase the effectiveness of speech.

*For example:* He opened the case. Inside was a microscope. (A. Cronin)

Let's compare sentences with the preposition "**do**" in front of the verb with sentences with a strict word order:

1. One chance Martin did have. (S. Lewis)

   Martinning bittagina imkon bor edi xolos.

2. Martin had one chance.

   Martinda bir imkoniyat bor edi.

If the first sentence answers the question, "How many chances did Martin have?" The second sentence, "Did Martin have a chance?" answers the question.

Another example:

"How do you like this show?"

"I do like it" (Priestley)

Judayam yoqadi.

"I like it" deyilsa

Yoqadi.

They did go (J. Priestley)

Nihoyat ketishdi.

They went deyilsa

Ular ketdi.

I did help Peter. Degan gapga

Did you or did you not help Peter? Deb savol bersak,

I helped Peter. Gapiga

Whom did you help? degan savol beramiz.

The prepositional verb “do” can be used in sentences to express the meaning of words such as “very much”, “earnestly”:

*I do ask you.*- O’tinib so’rayman.

*I do hope* hope- Qattiq ishonaman.

*I do recommend you.*- Sizga qat’iy tavsiya beraman.
In rhetoric and in oral speech, the prepositional “do” affirmation, when used in interrogative sentences, means “agree with me, confess”.

“This does seem to be your thesis, doesn’t it, Dr. Howard?” (Ch. Snow)

“Bu sizning dissertatsiyangiz-a, doctor Howard?”

When translated into Uzbek, meanings such as ”After all, isn’t it?”

“I suppose, I said, you did receive a letter from Crawford this morning?”

“Yes”, Jago replied. (Ch. Shaw)

Bugun Krouforddan xat oldingizku axir, shunday emasmi?

“You won’t admit the possibility...that in any circumstances Howard might be innocent?” – “No, I can’t be as positive as that.” – “Then you do admit the possibility.” (Ch. Shaw)

“Demak, bu odam begunoh ekanligini ehtimoldan xoli emas deb bilasanmi? – Bor yo’g’I ehtimol xolos.”

Consider the following examples:

“-It’s more a restaurant for men, isn’t it?
More men than women there, but women do go.” (J. Priestley)

Albatta u yerda ayollarga qaraganda erkaklarni ko’proq uchratasand. Lekin ayollar ham u yerga borishadi.

“Martin may not have learnt much in the matter of antibodies, but he did learn the secret of the Institute.” (S. Lewis)

Martinga antitellalarni o’rganish nasib etmagan bo’lsada, biroq u institutning sirini ochdi.

They did go. (Idem)

Nihoyat ular jo’nab ketishdi.

Fred does get noisy (Idem)

Fred to polon qilishni yoqtiradi.

It should be noted that when analyzing the materials of literary texts, the preposition "do" is not always reflected in the Uzbek translation.

For example: I really must entreat you to be reasonable and listen to what I did say and do say. (Ch. Dickens)

(to what I said and say)

Rhythmic "do" sentences do not have a rema. Maybe it’s an inversion (rarely, never) or just a sentence.

For example: 1. Only in special cases do the waves reinforce one another.
2. Not until Newton made his discovery did scientists realize the importance of the law of gravity.

The first sentence is “In what cases (or when) do the waves reinforce one another?” answers the question.

The second sentence is "When did scientists realize the importance of the law of gravity?" answers the question. The emphasis on logic is based on the rhyme dissociation.
It is important to note that when translating sentences with negative meanings, the forms should be separated and the cut should not be overlooked. **For example:**

*Rarely had Leora asked for anything!*

*Leora hadeb biror narsa so’rayvermaydi.*

**Conclusion**

In short, the inversion using the auxiliary verb "do" is done with two types of verbs.

*First:* The verb "do" is directly in the preposition with the verb. In this case, “do” represents a cut or an emotion.

*Second:* Sayings that are made with the help of "do" in front of the owner, which come in a limited or negative sense.

In general, language is a mirror of the nation. It takes a great deal of knowledge and skill to be able to express the specifics of one language in another.
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