

Aynur Elman HUMMETOVA
Doctoral student of Baku Eurasia University
ORCID: 0000-0002-6882

COMMUNICATIVENESS OF COMPOUND SENTENCES AND BRANCH SENTENCES

Summary

A simple sentence is a legitimate and complete representative of the class of syntactic units called sentences, but not the only one. In terms of structure, a simple sentence is the opposite of a complex sentence. The difference between them is that the first is monopredicative (that is, the predicative relationship characterizing the mutual relations of the subject and the predicate is presented once in the sentence), and the second is polypredicative. The above are the most general characteristics of a complex sentence and will be clarified in the following review. The components of a complex sentence are traditionally considered as sentences. Maybe it's just imperfect terminology. A dependent clause is not a sentence because it has no independent communicative significance. It is used in the process of speech communication and for its purposes only as a component of a larger syntactic unit - a complex sentence. Even parts of a complex sentence are inadequate as units of communication. Often, their interactions are semantic relations of cause and effect, certain time organization, etc. is related to and to break them means to separate, weaken or break each of the members of a complex sentence into an independent sentence.

Key words: Complex sentence, terminology, communication units, syntactic connection

UOT:80

DOI: 10.54414/XQZK5594

Intradaction

Polypredicateness of a complex sentence does not mean only that it contains multiple predicative relations. In the sentence "he waved his hand in the direction of the house and was silent" (A. Huxley), the predicative relation occurs twice, in connection with "waved his hand" etc., "was silent". Each of these groups is characterized by a predicative relationship with it, but there is no complex sentence here. Therefore, it is important to clarify the above characteristics of a complex sentence, it shows that a complex sentence has several predicative centers consisting of a subject and a predicate.

Two or more consecutive sentences are also collectively characterized by multiple centers, but again we know that this is not a sentence. The parts of a complex sentence form a complex sentence based on the syntactic relationship. In complex sentences, the syntactic relationship of their parts is clearly expressed in subordinate conjunctions. The situation with complex sentences is more difficult. Even if there is a

union (for example, oath, idol, etc.), the predicative structure can be a separate sentence: *Idol huh went ten scribbling soot disorganized thoughts swear feelings oath huh made a decision.* (4)

Analiz

If we talk about the functional side of the observed phenomenon, a communicatively complex sentence appears as a unit of the same order as a simple one. A complex sentence, like a simple sentence, is characterized by its communicative integrity. It has an intonation ending. Complex sentences can be declarative, interrogative, optional, and encouraging just like simple sentences in their communicative content.

A complex sentence seems to be more specific due to its structural features. Such a feature that makes up a sentence as predicativeness is implemented only at the level of components, not the sentence as a whole in a complex sentence. In contrast to a simple sentence, which is "combined" from qualitatively different units (word forms, words, word and word

combinations), a complex sentence is built from units close to the sentence, predicative constructions.

From this point of view, the analogy between a complex sentence and a phrase seems successful: both syntactic units (and unlike a simple sentence) are characterized by a significant commonality of the syntactic nature of the whole and its components. (3)

When considering a simple sentence, predicativeness was mentioned as its main feature. Is the position about the importance of predicativeness as a constitutive feature for a complex sentence still true? To answer this question, it is necessary to dwell on the concept of predicativeness. Predicativeness is a property of a syntactic unit that makes it communicatively actual, expresses the relationship of the situation reflected in the sentence to reality, and gives the language unit a communicative property in addition to the nominative property. Words and phrases that do not receive this second property remain mere nominative units. A complex sentence consists of several opposite situations. Each of the predicative units included in the composition of the complex sentence, describing a specific situation, has predicability. Through them, the complex sentence as a whole does not lack this property, but there is no general predicativeness for the whole complex sentence. In a complex sentence, predicativeness is a necessary feature of its components. (2)

Thus, a complex sentence is a structural-semantic unity consisting of two or more syntactic constructions, each of which has its own predicative center, formed on the basis of syntactic connection and used as a coherent unit with a simple sentence in speech communication.

Just as a simple sentence can theoretically be infinitely long (the result of adding more and more elements according to the action of syntactic processes), a complex sentence can be infinitely long and extremely complex. Possible combinations of composition and subordination within the limits of a complex (complex and compound) sentence are sometimes carried out in studies of the problems of studying the structure of the language, because the complexity and architecture of such constructions are determined. "factors beyond the structure of language. We

limit ourselves to citing one (far from the greatest) sentence from A Milne's Winnie-the-Pooh:

Then huh idol the paper in the jar, corked the jar as tightly as huh could leaned forward as headlamp as huh could so as not to fall into the windows swear threw the jar as headlamp as huh could--splash!--and then ten the surface. I reappeared swear watched dog float slowly into the distance until soot eyes hurt. Sometimes I thought dog was a bottle, other times dog was the wave of water huh was chasing. Watching dog again huh did everything to save himself.

A clear example of the structural possibilities of multiple representation is the last sentence of the famous poem "The House That Jack Built".(2)

Syntactic processes related to complex sentences have been little studied. It can be assumed that they are specific both in terms of their inventory and the laws of action. Just an illustration of the second aspect of the problem.

Matching at the sentence level, John asked some questions from the quiz book and Matty answered them can result in a sentence like The condition of the possibility of combination is the identity of the structure of some part of the predicative union in each of the sentences (the corresponding parts are preserved) and the complete identity of some syntactically dependent element or elements, including lexical filling. in the section described above (this element or elements are subject to compression). The sentence above can be seen as a combination of John asked some questions from the quiz book and Mary answered some questions from the quiz book.

The facts described in the literature show that all propositions satisfying the above condition cannot be combined. This is proven by the ungrammatical constructions such as John offered, and Harry gave, Peter a new journal.

The problem is particularly acute when a sentence has more than one compressible component (in the example immediately above, these are two objects). It should be assumed that the impossibility of combination is influenced by not one, but a number of factors, including those outside the structure and semantics of the language. Thus, the omission of the above sentence may be due to a known mental

difficulty in interpreting Peter as the complement of the addressee. The name Peter, which is lexically-semantically of the same type as John and Harry, arises during the initial perception, during the construction of the same type as the previous S - P structures (John offered, Harry gave, Peter ...), a certain mental to reinterpret the sentence requires effort. Such an assumption is shown when comparing the ungrammatical sentence marked * John proposed and Harry gave Peter a new journal with John offered, and Harry gave, a new journal to Peter.

The structural and semantic integrity of a complex sentence, taking into account its invariable multi-component composition, implies a certain organization of its constituent parts and the methods of such organization specific to a complex sentence. (In particular, we're talking about ways to combine predicative constructions, not word forms, words, or word groups, as in a simple sentence.)

The following features are important for the grammatical organization of predicative constructions into complex sentences:

a) type of syntactic relationship (composition or subordination);

b) the rank of predicative constructions (Color is the place of the predicative construction in the hierarchy of the components of a complex sentence. The hierarchy can be determined, for example, by analyzing the components themselves. For the nature and accordingly. , in determining the type of a complex sentence, it is not necessary to have only an essay or a subordinate .In the case of a plurality of predicative units (more than two), the rank of the predicative units combined on the basis of the corresponding syntactic relationship is also important. Complex and complex sentences are distinguished by the nature of the syntactic relationships of the predicative units, which are the highest in the hierarchy of the components of the complex sentence.

c) a sign of the structural and semantic necessity of the predicative construction (optional or mandatory),

d) presence / absence of binders and their nature;

e) the order of mutual arrangement of

predicative constructions.

For the most general division of complex sentences, the first two signs are the most important. Complex sentences are divided into complex and complex sentences, taking into account the sign of syntactic connection and the degree of predicative units.

In a complex sentence, the highest-order predicative constructions are connected by a coordination relation (A little boy with slanting black eyes was tending pigs, and a woman was standing in the porch and coming towards them. (J. Galsworthy), and in a subordinate complex sentence (He was the only boy on the island who didn't seem to have any hair (V. Golding)

The original concept of the complex sentence in English was developed by LLiofik. Perceiving a complex sentence as a syntactic unit is based on the desire to characterize it not as a quantity formed by adding simple sentences, but with terms specific to the object of these categories. Establishing four types of relationships of predicative units - composition, relative attachment, subordinate and connecting relationship, LLiofik defines the system of types of predicative units as including independent, semi-dependent, dependent and input predicative units, respectively. In contrast to the traditional trichotomy (simple, complex and complex sentence), the choice of simple (mono-predicative) and complex (poly-predicative) sentences as the main dichotomy fits well with the structural features of the respective units.

Conclusion

As for the complex sentence, it is difficult to talk about structural schemes, as with the simple sentence, because of the number of predicative units connected on the basis of the coordinative relationship, as well as some types of subordination. clauses can be infinitely large. The most common construction schemes - in addition to the original structure of compound and compound sentences - arise based on the ways of combining the composition and subordination of the first and second-order predicative units: subordinate complex sentences and complex sentences with composition.

Literature

1. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. - Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 2019. - 608 p.
2. Brandes M.P. Stylistics of the text. Theoretical course: Textbook. - 3rd ed., revised. and additional - M.: Progress-Tradition; INFRA-M, 2014. - 416 p.
3. Gulyga E.V. The theory of complex sentences in modern German. – London Higher School, 2011. - 206 p.
4. Kachalova K.N. Practical English grammar with exercises and keys. M.: UNVES, 2001.
5. Kaschnitz M. L. Stories: A book for reading in German. - St. Petersburg: KARO, 2016. 298 p.
6. Moskalskaya O.I. German grammar. - Moscow: Academy, 2004. - 352 p.
7. Remarque E.M. Three Comrades: A book to read in German. - St. Petersburg: KARO, 2015. 352 p.
8. Riesel E.G. Stylistics of the German language. = Stilistik der deutschen Sprache: Textbook. for ped. universities - M.: Higher School, 2013. - 487 p.
9. Zaretskaya E.V. Linguistic and stylistic analysis of the text. - Mn.: MSLU, 2015. - 89 p.
10. Zinder L.V., Stroeva T.V. A manual on theoretical grammar and vocabulary of the German language. - St. Petersburg: Uchpedgiz, 2012. - 168 p.

Aynur Elman HÜMMƏTOVA
Bakı Avrasiya Universiteti doktoranti
ORİCD: 0000-0002-6882

MÜRƏKKƏB CÜMLƏNİN VƏ BUDAQ CÜMLƏLƏRİN KOMMUNIKATIVLIYI**Xülasə**

Sadə cümlə cümlə adlanan sintaktik vahidlər sinfinin qanuni və tam nümayəndəsidir, lakin tək deyil. Quruluş baxımından sadə cümlə mürəkkəb cümləyə qarşıdır. Onların arasındakı fərq ondadır ki, birincisi monopredikativdir (yəni subyektlə predikatın qarşılıqlı münasibətlərini xarakterizə edən predikativ münasibət cümlədə bir dəfə təqdim olunur), ikincisi isə polipredikativdir. Yuxarıda sadalananlar mürəkkəb cümlənin ən ümumi xarakteristikasıdır və sonrakı nəzərdən keçirmə zamanı dəqiqləşdiriləcəkdir. Mürəkkəb cümlənin komponentləri ənənəvi olaraq cümlələr kimi də qəbul edilir. Bəlkə də, bu, sadəcə olaraq, qeyri-kamil terminologiyadır. Bağlı cümlə müstəqil kommunikativ əhəmiyyətə malik olmadığı üçün cümlə deyil. O, nitq ünsiyyəti prosesində və məqsədləri üçün yalnız daha böyük sintaktik vahidin - mürəkkəb cümlənin tərkib hissəsi kimi istifadə olunur. Hətta mürəkkəb cümlənin hissələri ünsiyyət vahidləri kimi qeyri-adekvatdır. Çox vaxt onların qarşılıqlı əlaqələri səbəb-nəticənin semantik əlaqələri, müəyyən zaman təşkilatı və s. ilə bağlıdır və onları pozmaq, mürəkkəb cümlə üzvlərinin hər birini müstəqil cümləyə ayırmaq, zəiflətmək və ya pozmaq deməkdir.

Açar sözlər: Mürəkkəb cümlə, terminologiya, ünsiyyət vahidləri, sintatik əlaqə

Айнур Эльман ХУММЕТОВА
Докторант Бакинского Евразийского Университета
ОРИКД: 0000-0002-6882

КОММУНИКАТИВНОСТЬ СЛОЖНЫХ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ И РАЗВЕТВЕННЫХ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ

Резюме

Простое предложение является законным и полным представителем класса синтаксических единиц, называемых предложениями, но не единственным. По структуре простое предложение противоположно сложному предложению. Разница между ними состоит в том, что первый является монопредикативным (т. е. предикативное отношение, характеризующее взаимоотношения подлежащего и сказуемого, представлен в предложении один раз), а второй - полипредикативным. Вышеизложенное является наиболее общими характеристиками сложного предложения и будет разъяснено в следующем обзоре. Компоненты сложного предложения традиционно рассматриваются как предложения. Возможно, это просто несовершенная терминология. Придаточное предложение не является предложением, поскольку не имеет самостоятельного коммуникативного значения. Он используется в процессе речевого общения и в его целях только как компонент более крупной синтаксической единицы – сложного предложения. Даже части сложного предложения неадекватны как единицы общения. Зачастую их взаимодействием являются смысловые причинно-следственные связи, определенная организация времени и т. д. относится к ним и разбить их означает отделить, ослабить или разбить каждый из членов сложного предложения на самостоятельное предложение.

Ключевые слова: Сложное предложение, терминология, единицы связи, синтаксическая связь.

Daxil olub: 02.11.2023