ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261, 2022-2.889, 2023-5.384, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

THE PROBLEM OF THE SEGMENTATION IN SENTENCE-STRUCTURE IN PRESENT-DAY ENGLISH AND UZBEK/RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

Qulto'rayeva Barchinoy
Uzbekistan state World languages
4th- year student

Abstract:This article explores the issue of sentence segmentation in modern English, Uzbek, and Russian. Sentence segmentation—defining where one sentence ends and another begins—differs significantly across languages due to syntactic, morphological, and pragmatic factors. Through comparative analysis, this paper aims to highlight the linguistic features that contribute to segmentation challenges and to provide illustrative examples that clarify these structural contrasts.

Keywords: sentence segmentation, syntax, sentence boundary, clause, comparative linguistics, English, Uzbek, Russian

Introduction

Sentence segmentation is the process of dividing a stream of speech or a written text into sentences. While it may seem intuitive to native speakers, segmentation is not always straightforward due to structural variations, implicit punctuation, and contextual dependencies. In this article, we analyze the complexities of segmentation in Present-Day English and compare them with those in Uzbek and Russian.

Main body

In linguistic terms, segmentation relates closely to syntax, especially sentence boundaries and clause structures. English generally relies on word order and punctuation to mark segmentation, while Uzbek and Russian, being agglutinative and inflected languages respectively, use morphology and syntactic patterns more heavily.

English:Relatively rigid SVO (Subject–Verb–Object) word order.

Relies heavily on punctuation (e.g., full stops, commas) for segmentation.Dependent clauses often require explicit markers (e.g., "that", "because").

Uzbek:SOV (Subject–Object–Verb) word order.

More flexible sentence structure; meaning often conveyed through suffixes and postpositions.Compound and complex sentences are frequently connected with conjunctions or participles.

Russian:Relatively free word order due to case system.

Often uses intonation in speech and punctuation in writing to indicate sentence boundaries.Heavy use of subordinate clauses and participles.

English Example:

> "She said she would come. He waited."

Here, segmentation is clear due to punctuation. However, in speech, without intonation, these could be perceived as one sentence or more.

Uzbek Example:

> "U kelishini aytdi, u kutdi."

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261, 2022-2.889, 2023-5.384, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

Literal translation: “She said that she would come, he waited.”

Depending on context, this may be one compound sentence or two independent ones.

Russian Example:

> “Она сказала, что придёт. Он ждал.”

Though syntactically clearer due to the conjunction "что", segmentation may still be ambiguous in spoken form.

English:“John went home. Mary, to the store.”

Here, the second sentence lacks a verb but is understood. This can cause parsing difficulties in segmentation.

Uzbek: “Jon uyga ketdi. Maryam esa do‘konga.”

The second part is elliptical and relies on prior context, causing similar issues.

Russian:“Джон пошёл домой. Мария — в магазин.”

Again, verb omission is acceptable but can confuse automatic segmentation tools.

Syntactic Structures and Segmentation

English: “Although it was raining, they went for a walk.”

A complex sentence requiring recognition of the subordinate clause.

Uzbek:“Yomg‘ir yog‘ayotganiga qaramay, ular sayrga chiqishdi.”

Participial and postpositional structures make segmentation dependent on verb suffixes.

Russian:“Несмотря на дождь, они пошли гулять.”

Segmentation here depends on the use of participial phrase “Несмотря на”.

Run-on Sentences and Coordination

In all three languages, the overuse of coordinating conjunctions may result in run-on sentences that complicate segmentation.

English:“He went to the store and he bought milk and he met his friend and they went out.”

Without proper punctuation or intonation, this could be misinterpreted as one long sentence.

Uzbek: “U do‘konga bordi va sut oldi va do‘stini uchratdi va ular sayrga chiqdi.”

Conjunction "va" makes segmentation fluid but also ambiguous.

Russian: “Он пошёл в магазин и купил молоко и встретил друга и они пошли гулять.”

Similar issues arise with "и" (and).

Computational Implications

In natural language processing (NLP), sentence segmentation is vital for tasks like machine translation and information extraction. English NLP tools typically rely on punctuation and capitalization, whereas for Uzbek and Russian, morphological analysis is crucial.For example, identifying whether “keladi” (Uzbek) or “придёт” (Russian) signifies sentence completion requires deeper morphological tagging.

Pedagogical Considerations:Language learners often struggle with segmentation, especially when their native language has different syntactic patterns. English learners from Uzbek or Russian backgrounds might:Misuse punctuation in English due to reliance on verbal morphology in their L1.Misinterpret sentence boundaries in English texts.

Translate compound sentences too literally.

Example of Error:

Uzbek student writes in English:

> “He said me he go to school he buy books.”

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261, 2022-2.889, 2023-5.384, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

Here, poor segmentation reflects transfer from Uzbek where multiple clauses may be joined with minimal syntactic markers.

Conclusion

Sentence segmentation remains a complex issue in cross-linguistic analysis. Present-Day English relies on syntactic rigidity and punctuation, whereas Uzbek and Russian lean on morphology and context. Understanding these distinctions is crucial for comparative linguistics, language teaching, and computational language modeling. Future work may involve deeper exploration of prosody and discourse factors influencing segmentation.

References

1. Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.

2. Comrie, B. (1981). Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. University of Chicago Press.

3. Xudoyberganov, A. (2009). Hozirgi o‘zbek tili sintaksisi. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.

4. Селиверстова, О. Н. (2008). Синтаксис современного русского языка. М.: Высшая школа.

5. Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2023). Speech and Language Processing (3rd ed.). Draft.

6. Manning, C., & Schütze, H. (1999). Foundations of Statistical Natural Language Processing. MIT Press.