The Principles Of Classification Of Composite Sentences

Makxbuba Nomanovna Raimjanova[1], Rano Kxudoyberdievna Alibekova[2]

Tashkent State Agrarian University[1]
Tashkent State Agrarian University [2]

Annotation
This article raises the question of how complex sentences are presented in university and school textbooks, what are the basics and principles of their classification, what types of connections exist between the components of complex sentences, are there ways to bridge the gap between school and university teaching. It also talks about the grammatical tradition characteristic of compound sentences of open and closed structures

Key words: sentence, structure, classification, union, intonation.

1. INTRODUCTION

A composite sentence is a higher-order syntactic communicative unit. It includes two or more predicative units, which are related in meaning, structure and intonation.There are two main approaches to classify complex sentences. The first approach is based on the way of expressing the connection between the clauses of a composite sentence: the most important criterion in this approach is the presence or absence of a conjunction as a means of expressing a connection. The second approach is based on the semantics (meaning) of the relationship between clauses and the features of their syntactic behavior that depend on this semantics.

The first approach traditionally dominates in Russian studies. It is generally accepted that if a composite sentence does not use a conjunction as a means of connecting between clauses, then such sentences are recognized as non-conjunction. If the conjunction is used, then the sentences are divided into compound and complex, depending on whether the given conjunction is included in the list of compositional ones как, например, и, а, но (like, for example, and, a, but) or subordinate как если, когда,потому что и др. (as if, when, because, etc.).
This approach is not completely universal, since not all languages use conjunctions as a means of connection of the clauses in the composite sentence. Moreover, such an approach does not always turn out to be coherent even in relation to the Russian language, since the recognition of a particular unit as a conjunction, as well as the classification of conjunctions as compound or subordinate, in any case relies on the properties of the sentence in which conjunction is included, also on the features of the syntactic behavior of the clauses of the sentence and the nature of the semantic relationship between them. This leads to the fact that formally and functionally similar types of composite sentences can be assigned to different classes, and, on the contrary, very heterogeneous types of composite sentences can be combined into one class. So, for example, words such as "therefore", expressing a cause-and-effect relationship in such composite sentences as *"У Наташи заболел ребенок, поэтому она не вышла на работу" (*Natasha's child fell ill, therefore she did not go to work).

Since the word "therefore" is not recognized as a conjunction, the above sentence is classified as non-conjunction in which the connection between the clauses is expressed only through intonation. This ignores the essential difference between sentences, which is that one of them contains a segment denoting a connection between clauses (the word therefore), while the other does not. On the other hand, the sentence is classified as complex, since "because" - unlike "therefore" - is considered a subordinate conjunction. Thus, they are assigned to different classes, in spite of the fact that the clauses of both sentences are connected substantially by the same relationship - cause-and-effect, and in both cases the indicators of this relationship are special segment units and, moreover, the obvious formal similarity of these units is ignored historically going back to the combination of the preposition by and the demonstrative pronoun.

In the second approach, based on the type of relationship between clauses, it is common to divide composite sentences into two main classes depending on whether there is a subordination relationship between its clauses, regardless of how this subordination is expressed.

The traditional typology of compound sentences is reduced to various groupings based on the functional and semantic properties of alliances: connecting, adversative and separating.
At present, a compound sentence is understood as such a complex structure that expresses the meaning of the "grammatical equivalence" of its clauses. However by characterizing compound sentence it is necessary to take into account not only the expression of relation between its predicative parts, but also the structural feature (the ratio of the species-temporal forms of predicates, the order of the parts, open/closed sentence structure, intonation).
The compositional connection, which characterizes the syntactic relations of the parts of a compound sentence, presupposes their equality, which is revealed only at the syntactic level. As for the semantic relationships of the parts, there can be a wide variety of options: both the relative independence of the individual parts, and interdependence.
Among the compound sentences there are connecting, separating and adversative sentences by the nature of the semantic relations between the clauses and in accordance with the semantic groups of alliances.

Compositional conjunctions qualify typical relationships in the compound sentences. This is how the conjunction formalizes the connecting relations, the conjunction "a" - comparative, the conjunction "но" - opposing, conjunctions "или (иль), то-то, не то-не то" (ili (il'), to-to, ne to - ne to) - separation relations (Russian grammar, 1980, vol. 2, p. 616).
The semantics of compositional relations is formed from the interaction of the meanings of compositional conjunctions and the morphological-lexical content of the predicative parts of the compound sentence. Compositional conjunctions, connecting parts of the compound sentence, express the most abstract meaning, actualized meanings arise on the basis of the interaction of the morphological-lexical content of the component parts.
In addition, two more were added later to the traditionally distinguished three classes of compound sentences: explanatory sentences in which parts are connected by relations of clarification (specific exponents of these relations are conjunctions "to est", "a imenno", and other means functionally close to them), and connecting sentences in which the second part contains an "additional message" about the content of the first part. (The classification of compound sentences in grammatical descriptions of other Slavic languages is also based on the same principle.)

With such an exclusive focus on the semantic side of the sentence, even the sharpest formal differences between the classes of compound sentences turned out to be completely not notable.

The grammatical tradition is characterized by a lack of distinction among compound sentences of open and closed structures. Meanwhile, sentences of open and closed structures are completely different types of composite sentences, differing in their quantitative composition and a number of related features; cf.:*И утро выдалось отменное, и рыба клевала, и впереди был долгий свободный день.— Утро выдалось отменное, и поэтому у всех было хорошее настроение (*And the morning was excellent, and the fish were pecking, and there was a long free day ahead. - The morning was excellent, and therefore everyone was in a good mood).

The position of these two formal types in the composite sentence system is also different, in particular, their relationship with complex sentences.

Compound sentences of a closed structure, the minimum constructions of which are a combination of necessarily two predicative units, according to this distinctive feature are of the same type with complex sentences (the latter are opposed on the basis of composition ~ subordination) and together with them oppose compound sentences of an open structure, the minimal constructions of which are combinations an indefinite number of predicative units.

The criteria for the selection of semantic classes of compound sentences in the syntactic tradition are vague. The semantic classification of compound sentences is based on the general content of complex sentences, created both by conjunctional means and by the lexical content of the sentence. At the same time, it is possible to single out the semantic classes of compound sentences, taking into account only the meanings inherent in sentences with one or another conjunctional means, regardless of their lexical content.

The classification of a compound sentence, based on the semantics of conjunctional means, makes it possible to distinguish within two formal types (open and closed structures) formal-semantic categories (and sub-categories). The classification based on the meanings created by the lexical content of the clauses makes it possible to single out the semantic varieties within the individual formal-semantic categories.

A certain type of grammatical relationship is developed between the predicative clauses of the sentence, i.e. each compound sentence has a certain grammatical meaning.

The terms compound sentences of an open structure and compound sentences of a closed structure have common and minor distinctive features. So, N.S. Valgina notes that "parts of a compound sentence of an open structure represents an open row, which are built of the same type, have the meaning of simultaneity, which is expressed by the correspondence of the species-temporal forms of predicate verbs."

Open-structure sentences can have an unlimited number of predicative parts (only lexical limitations arise). "In sentences of a closed structure, the parts represent a closed series, these are always two parts, structurally and semantically interdependent, connected. N.S. Valgina also points out that with auto-semantics, clauses of a compound sentence are relatively independent. With synsemantics, the semantic independence of the predicative clauses in a compound sentence is violated and the entire compound sentence is characterized by semantic-syntactic integrity. Elements of dependence appear between the parts: anaphoric pronouns, common secondary members of the sentence, etc. V.V. Babaytseva distinguishes compound sentences of homogeneous and heterogeneous composition according to their structural features and grammatical meaning.

By function (the nature of the goal setting), functional types of a complex sentence are distinguished: functionally homogeneous sentences; syncretic, combining functionally

heterogeneous parts. It is traditional to divide sentences into exclamation and non-exclamation. These types of sentences differ in the presence / absence of emotional coloring in the syntactic structure and, thus, are associated with the reflection of the position of the speaker (the author of the statement), with the transfer of his emotions and assessments. The means of expressing emotions is primarily exclamation intonation, as well as particles, interjections and expressive vocabulary. In modern Russian studies, there are three main features that serve as the basis for a consistent multi-level classification of complex sentences: 1) the presence / absence of means of communication that combine the predicative parts. On this basis, the classes of union and non-union proposals are distinguished; 2) opposition of composition / subordination of predicative parts in the sphere of union constructions: union sentences are divided into complex and complex; 3) assignment of one predicative part to one word of another part or to the whole part as a whole (indivisibility / dismemberment). The last division applies only to complex sentences.

The typology of the complex sentences has a more complex history. It is known, initially the complex sentences were not an object of classification as integral units, but subordinate clauses, which were perceived as a means of expressing the same semantic relations that are expressed by the members of a simple sentence.

However, the grounds on which such a correlation is established are different. In some cases, the type of the subordinate clause is determined by the syntactic place of which member of the main clause is occupied by the subordinate clause. In others, the type of subordinate clause is established depending on which member of the main sentence is the pronominal-correlative ("demonstrative") word, the specific content of which is revealed by the subordinate clause.

Cf. Complex sentences with subordinate clauses and additional:
1. *Мне послышалось, что за стеной кто-то плачет.*
Тот, кто шел впереди, молчал.

2. *Я услышал, что за стеной кто-то плачет.*
Я догнал того, кто шел впереди.

1. I heard that someone was crying behind the wall.
The one who walked in front was silent.

2. I heard that someone was crying behind the wall.
I caught up with the one in front.

The main criticism was that the subordinate parts were classified, and not the complex sentences as integral units. And since the selection of the types of clauses was made on different grounds, as a result, complex sentences that were very similar in structure and semantics turned out to be in different classes. For example: *День был такой, что не хотелось выходить из дому* -The day was such that I did not want to leave the house (complex sentence with a subordinate predicative);

Был такой день, что не хотелось выходить из дому - There was such a day that I did not want to leave the house (complex sentence with a subordinate attributive);

День был такой холодный, что не хотелось выходить из дому -The day was so cold that I did not want to leave the house (complex sentence with subordinate measure and degree).

And vice versa: complex sentences, which are different in structure and semantics, belonged to the same class. Cf.:*Меня удивило, что брат бросил школу и Кто живет без печали и гнева, тот не любит отчизны своей.*

Both constructions are characterized as vomplex sentences with subordinate clauses. This approach to the complex typology existed for over a hundred years. It was also reflected in some textbooks for universities.

In the textbook by S.E. Kryuchkova and L.Yu. Maksimov's goal is to create a structural-semantic classification that would "make it possible to consistently - from more general formal and related semantic differences to more particular ones - describe the entire wealth of models of a complex sentence both in terms of their structure and in terms of their semantics "(1969, p. 48).

When describing the structure of complex sentences, the authors consider the following elements to be important: 1) the dependence of the subordinate clause on a certain word in the main sentence or on the whole main; 2) the presence or absence of a correlative word in the main sentence; 3) the main and subordinate clause is connected with conjunctions or conjunctional words; 4) the place of the subordinate clause in relation to the main; 5) the ratio of the forms of the predicate of the main and subordinate clauses. The structure of any complex sentence is considered as one or another combination of the above elements, on which the general nature of the relations expressed in the complex sentence depends. As a result, a rather complicated (multidimensional, according to L.Yu.Maksimov's definition) classification of complex sentences appeared, which, however, is based on Pospelov's division of sentences into one-term and two-term. Proposals of the type "Там, где кончается лес, протекает речка" (Where the forest ends, a river flows) are considered by the authors as an complex sentence with subordinate clauses spreading all the main things as a whole, while in V.A. Beloshapkova, they are classified as undivided pronominal-correlative.

Thus, the complex sentences of an undivided structure with a verbal connection is divided into five subclasses: inherent-attributive, pre-comparative-object, explanatory (with union and relative subordination), pronominal-correlative (those that are called identifying in the complex sentences the subordinate clause can take the syntactic place of not only the object, but also the subject. For example: Меня удивило (обрадовало/огорчило), что брат приехал один (I was surprised (made happy / upset) that my brother came alone).

If we compare the traditional classification of complex sentences (and in fact - clauses) with the structural-semantic classification of N.S. Pospelov and his followers, they appear as very different. However, they have one common feature: linguists' ideas about the structure of a simple sentence are extrapolated to the structure of a complex one.

The structural-semantic classification of the complex sentences also reflects the view of its creators on a simple sentence: in addition to the subject and predicate (or one main member), the sentence may contain either verbal distributors (that is, word distributors, usually based on agreement or control), or distributors of the entire main the predicative part as a whole. Hence the division of the complex sentences into one-term and two-term.

Of course, in each of the variants of the classification of subordinate clauses or complex sentences as a whole, something "precipitates", does not fit into the designated types. These

are three varieties of the above-mentioned subordinate clauses in the traditional classification, and comparative complex sentences with cojunctions "между тем как, в то время как, тогда как, если... то"(meanwhile, while, while, if ... then), considered as a group, transitional between compound and complex sentences (Kryuchkov and Maksimov, 1969 , p. 127).

Differences are also observed in the interpretation of sentences, the subordinate part of which opens with a combination of "relative pronoun + nor", characterized either as concessive sentences of a related structure, or as a kind of pronominal-correlative phraseological type: *Кого мы ни спрашивали, никто нам не мог ответить (*Whoever we asked, no one could answer us) (Krylova, Maksimov , Shiryaev, 1998, p. 203).

\

In modern textbooks on syntax in the description of the complex sentences there is some eclecticism, the desire to combine both approaches to typology. In the textbook by N.S. Valgina, for example, at the first level of articulation, theScomplex sentencea are divided into constructions with a verbal dependence and dependence on a sentence as an integral unit. When constructing the general classification, called by the author semantic-structural, the complex sentences with a subordinate adverbial and with a subordinate attributive are distinguished.

At the same time, the author refers to the qualifying sentences (albeit with the proviso "conditionally") of the pronoun-qualifiers of the type "Он шипел на тех, кто пел неверно" (He hissed at those who sang incorrectly) "with a subordinate clause referring to the pronoun (demonstrative or determinative) in the main part" (Valgina, 1991, p. 323).

The use of the terms adverbial and determinative complex sentences involuntarily forces the types of clauses to coordinate with the types of secondary members of the sentence.

At the second level of articulation, the constructions of the first type include complex sentences with subordinate determinants, explanatory, degree or mode of action. To the second type - complex sentences with subordinate clauses, time, conditions, reasons, goals, concessions, consequences, comparative and connecting.

The term attributive in relation to subordinate clauses is filled with a different content in comparison with the definition as a secondary member. For example, to the number of relative clauses answering the question "какой?" (what?) and referring "to a member of the main sentence, which is expressed by a noun or other word used in the meaning of a noun" (p. 164), the authors also include a group of pronoun-definitives that are "close" to definitives, but refer "not to nouns, but pronouns one, each, all, etc., used in the meaning of a noun. For example: *Все, кто побывал в Крыму, не могут его не полюбить; Не говори того, чего не знаешь (*Everyone who has been to Crimea cannot help but love it; Don't say what you don't know) (p. 164). If we determine the place of the named complex sentence in the structural-semantic classification, then they should be classified as pronominal-correlative. But the word pronominal-determinants involuntarily confuses students: the subordinate clause is associated with the definition as a member of the sentence, and the pronoun is interpreted as a definable word. But the function of the pronoun here is different: it takes the syntactic place of the subject or object, the specific content of which is revealed by the subordinate part, cf.: also pronominal-correlative containing (according to Beloshapkova): *День начался с того, что пригорела каша (*The day began with the fact that the porridge was burnt). The T-pronominal component in the main part cannot be eliminated. Following the logic of the authors of the textbook, the subordinate clause in this complex sentence should be called pronominal, but practice shows that students call them explanatory.

And this is not surprising, since clauses are called explanatory clauses that "answer case questions" (p. 167). As an example, the following phrase is given: *Докладчик говорил о том, что надо повышать производительность труда (*The speaker spoke about the need

to increase labor productivity). As you can see, the criteria for distinguishing between pronoun-definitive and explanatory are blurred.

As it could be seen, the approach to the analysis of simple and complex sentences from different positions leads to an obvious eclecticism in the description of the classes of complex sentences. Without abandoning the traditional typology of secondary members of the proposal, the authors have retained the terms of the determinant and adverbial when considering the types of complex sentences, filling them, however, with a different content.

There was no place in the named classification with a connecting clause. They are considered in the note to the paragraph on subordinate consequences, where it is said that "many of the clauses with subordinate clauses are close in meaning to sentences with subordinate consequences." It is unlikely that such a characteristic of the complex sentences with subordinate clauses reflects the main feature of these constructions: the conjunctional word in the subordinate clause always "contains" the content of the main part as a whole, and the semantic relations of the consequence are not typical for all sentences of this type. Cf.: *Манилов все время сидел и курил трубку, что тянулось до самого вечера (*Manilov sat all the time and smoked a pipe, which lasted until the evening).

Thus, in the textbooks of the Russian language, the unity of the approach to the study of simple and complex sentences is violated. This led to difficulties in teaching not only Russian, but also foreign languages. For example, a university student studying, for example, German, encounters for the first time the terms subordinate, predicate, additional, but a foreign language teacher often does not even suspect that the student is unfamiliar with these terms.

Literature

[1]   Babaytseva V.V. Russian language. Theory. 5-9th grades. M .: Bustard, 1997.
[2]   Babaytseva V.V., Maksimov L.Yu. Modern Russian language. Part 3. Syntax. Punctuation. M., 1997.
[3]   Babaytseva V.V., Chesnokova L.D. Russian language. Theory. M., 1989.
[4]   Barkhudarov S.G., Kryuchkov S.E., Maksimov L.Yu., Cheshko L.A. Russian language: Textbook for grades 7-8. M .: Education, 1982.
[5]   Beloshapkova V.A. A complex sentence in modern Russian. Some questions of theory. M., 1967.
[6]   Beloshapkova V.A. Complex sentence and phrase (to the question of isomorphism in the syntactic system) // Grammatical description of Slavic languages. Concept and methods. Moscow: Nauka, 1974.
[7]   Beloshapkova V.A. Modern Russian: Syntax. M., 1977.
[8]   Beloshapkova V.A. Syntax // Beloshapkova V.A., Bryzgunova E.A., Zemskaya E.A. and others. Ed. Beloshapkova V.A. M., 1989.
[9]   Bogoroditsky V.A. General course of Russian grammar. M., 1935.
[10]   Bulakhovsky L.A. Russian literary language course. Kiev, 1952.
[11]   Buslaev F.I. Historical grammar of the Russian language. M., 1991.
[12]   Valgina N.S. Syntax of the modern Russian language. M., 1991.
[13]   Grammar of the modern Russian literary language. Moscow: Nauka, 1970.
[14]   Ilyenko S.G. Problems of the theory of complex sentences in modern Russian. ADD. L., 1964.