



FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF MULTICOMPONENT COMPOUND SENTENCES

Z. U. Mangitbaeva

*Doctoral student of Karakalpak Institute
of Humanitarian Sciences, Karakalpak
Department of the Academy of Sciences of
the Republic of Uzbekistan*

Annotation: In this article, the functional-semantic analysis of multi-component compound sentences is studied in general linguistics. From the linguistic point of view, the compound sentence connected in the traditional syntax is divided into types according to the functional-semantic relation of the language unit. The problem of functional analysis of connected clauses should be approached not from the predicativeness of clause parts and the function of clauses, but from the functional nature of the means connecting the clause parts.

Keywords: clauses, connected clauses, language, equal component, subordinate component, complex syntactic device, linguistic theory, multi-component clauses, functional-semantic analysis.

Introduction: Everyone knows that language is a tool of communication between people. However, it is a weapon with its own complex system and structure. The main task of speakers of a particular language is to be able to use this weapon in practice. Of course, in the process of speaking, we use language signs. Symbols are the main tool in the system of each language that ensures its reality.

In the linguistic theory of F. de Saussure, the phoneme is not included in the language sign sentence. Indeed, it independently expresses neither grammatical nor lexical meaning¹. However, in modern linguistics, some scientists interpret the phoneme as a language sign, and its distinguishing feature is taken into account².

In our opinion, interpreting the phoneme as a language sign has no scientific basis. If we consider its meaning-differentiating feature, this feature is realized not

¹ Сосюр Ф. де. Труды по языкознанию. - Москва, 1977. - С. 99-100.

² Березин Ф.М., Головин Б.Н. Общее языкознание. - Москва, 1979. - С. 149.



independently, but at the level of a specific sign. A phoneme can independently reflect only the expressive aspect characteristic of language signs, in which the expressed concept is not observed. In addition, some linguists take the concept of a sign in a broader sense. According to it, it is necessary to include the sentence among the language symbols³. In our opinion, we cannot agree with such reasoning. Because a sentence is a unit of speech, and therefore it is always presented in an actual way.

The issue of entering a word into a sentence is a very complex process, which primarily relies on the support of a unit smaller than itself - a morpheme⁴. Because without a morpheme (agreement, possessive affixes, etc.), words cannot be connected to each other, and even words entering into a relationship according to the method of conjugation are based on a morpheme with zero expression.

However, despite this, the laws of this phenomenon were not consistently followed until almost the present period of the development of our linguistics. This can be directly observed in the example of the concept of a compound sentence. It is known that in traditional linguistics, in the process of studying syntactic devices called conjunctions, the means connecting their components are called auxiliary elements. In our opinion, it is inappropriate to call such tools auxiliary elements. Even if we take into account the semantic aspects of the formation of a compound sentence, and if we take into account its realization from the structural-syntactic point of view, it is completely inappropriate to interpret connectives as an auxiliary factor. If we compare the compound with a multi-story building, we see that the connecting means has a dominant position in the area from its threshold to the top floor. Indeed, without their participation, neither the syntactic activation nor

³ Гак В.Г. Высказывание и ситуация // Проблемы структурной лингвистики. - Москва, 1973. - С. 353-354.

⁴ Хайруллаев Х. Предикативлик ходисаси ва унинг ифода объектлари. - Самарканд, 2002. - Б. 79.



interconnection of the components of the compound sentence, nor the character of polypredicateness and superpredicateness are formed.

B. Turniyozov, who conducted research on the syntactic derivation of complex syntactic devices with equal components, says the following about this: "There is a terminological imbalance in the study of complex syntactic devices with equal components in traditional linguistics as connected and non-connected clauses. In this case, we see that the law of hierarchical relationship of language units is not followed. Because the sentence is activated not within another sentence, but at the level of a larger unit - the text"⁵.

In fact, the use of the term "compound sentence" instead of the concept of text is contrary to the law of the systematic approach. Some opinions about this were expressed in Russian linguistics at the time. We can see the proof of opinion in the studies of M.N. Peterson, A.M. Peshkovsky. M.N. Peterson mentioned in his work "Essay on the syntax of the Russian language" that the ideas about the subordinate or subjunctive connection of the components of a compound sentence are extremely confusing and do not have a scientific basis, the concepts of subordination and equal connection have no linguistic meaning⁶. A.M. Peshkovskiy notes that the fact that several sentences are named as one sentence (compound sentence) causes various misunderstandings⁷.

Among Russian linguists of the next generation, we can see that opinions were expressed about the confusing aspects of the concept of "compound sentence". For example, M.V. In this regard, Lyapon writes the following: "If a compound sentence (complex sentence) requires the combination of two or more

⁵ Турниёзов Б.Н. Хозирги узбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик курилмалар деривацияси. - Самарканд, 2008. - Б.20.

⁶ Петерсон М.Н. Очерки синтаксиса русского языка. - Москва, 1923. - С. 32-35.

⁷ Пешковский А.М. Существует ли в русском языке сочинение или подчинение предложений // Родной язык в школе. Научно-педагогический сборник (кн. 11-12). - Москва, 1926; шу муаллиф: Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. - Москва, 1956. - С. 455-470.



(communicative weight) messages representing a complete idea, serious signs of textual expression are observed at its level"⁸. This opinion is also emphasized by Ye. P. Marchenko⁹.

According to I. F. Wardul, only syntactic structures with subordinate links can be called compound sentences. There are no equal conjunctions (conjunct and non-conjunct). Syntactic devices, which are called conjunctions with or without conjunctions, have no linguistic status at all. After that, there is no need for the concept of a conjunction with an adverbial clause. In other words, the term "conjunction" alone is sufficient¹⁰.

One of the main reasons for I. F. Vardul to come to such a conclusion is based on the concept that the main and subordinate clauses are absolutely connected to each other in the usual adverbial clauses, and none of them can be used separately. Wardul even sees the preposition as part of a complex device rather than a sentence. In our view, it is difficult to agree with Wardul's opinion at this point. For example, in all types of syntactic structures called adverbial clauses in Uzbek, the main clause can be considered as relative independent:

1. Uni xirurgiya bo'limiga joylab endi tinchiganda, yana ikki kishini keltirib qolishdi (O'. Hoshimov. Nur borki, soya bor).
2. Aql va vijdonim qaysi yo'lga boshlasa, o'sha yo'lga yuraman (Oybek. Nur qidirib).
3. Yuragim dukkilashidan to'xtamasa ham, o'zimni yengil sezardim (O'. Usmonov. Nomus).
4. Qizlarki, ko'rib og'zing ochilib qoladi (D.Nuriy. Osmon ustuni).

⁸ Ляпон М.В. Смысловая структура сложного предложения и текст. -Москва, 1986. - С. 8.

⁹ Марченко Е.П. Полипредикативные сложные предложения как единицы текста // Вопросы языкознания.-Москва, 2003. - №5. - С. 43.

¹⁰ Вардудль И.Ф. Основы описательной лингвистики (синтаксис и суперсинтаксис). - Москва, 1977. - С. 222-223.



The above sentence is an example of different types of traditional conjunctions. In the first example, a compound sentence with an adverb clause is given, the main clause of which is interpreted as the second component. In the second example, a clause with a determining clause is given, and its main clause is the second component, and in the third example, a clause with an unobstructed clause is given, and its main clause is the last component. Each of these main clauses can be interpreted as a relative independent clause. Even in the last example, the main clause of the clause with the determining clause expressed by this word is elliptical, but has a full predicative sign¹¹. In our opinion, I.F. Vardul's comments about the compound sentence and its types cannot be considered scientifically valid. Only when the description of the problem is approached from the point of view of the system, it is possible to abandon the concept of a conjunction not only with an equal component, but also with a subordinate component. Already, such devices have the status of a text without any doubt. However, the text can be represented by a grapheme, a word, a phrase, a sentence, or a paragraph. If we call a traditional compound sentence a microtext, then there are also smaller texts. Therefore, it is appropriate to use the term "complex syntactic device" in this place.

A complex syntactic device can have an equal component and a subordinate component. Both of them consist of the introduction of at least two sentences into a syntactic relationship. But the main syntactic relation of the components to them is different.

¹¹ Хайруллаев Х. Предикативлик ходисаси ва унинг ифода объектлари. - Самарканд, 2002.



Each of the components of a complex syntactic device with equal components relies on a separate basic structure¹², and the structural relationship is also based on it:

Temur Qur'oni Karimni olib, mehr bilan uch bor o'pdi va bundan o'n yillar oldin bo'lib o'tgan bir voqea esiga tushdi (M.Ali.Sarbadorlar).

The given complex syntactic device has two components, the first component of which is based on the basic structures represented by the verbs to kiss and the second component to remember.

Therefore, each of these components enters into a systematic relationship with a complex syntactic device independently. When the components of a complex syntactic device are subordinated, the following sentence is important in the formation of a systematic relationship. In other words, with a compound device, the conjunction that follows first, and then the subordinate clause, forms a stepwise relationship. Because the subordinate sentence enters into a syntactic relationship with the sentence in the dominant position and through this is systematically connected to a complex syntactic device: Bir mahal qaragam, yonimdan Tursunboy o'tib qoldi (S.Ahmad. Ufq).

It is possible to imagine that the components of complex syntactic devices with equal and subordinate links form a systematic relationship with the macro object as follows:

- Complex syntactic devices with a subordinate component;
- Complex syntactic devices with equal components;
- Dominant component;
- Subordinate component.

¹² Турниёзов Б. Хозирги узбек тилида тенг компонентли мураккаб синтактик курилмалар деривацияси. - Самарканд, 2008. - Б. 34-35.



Conclusion: Thus, in the syntactic structure of an independent sentence, we see the syntagmatic relationship of words, and in complex syntactic devices, we see the syntactic relationship of sentences. It is on this basis that the systematic relationship of independent sentences and words, and in complex syntactic devices, is formed between them and sentences. But these systemic relations are broad in character. In fact, each of the components of both independent sentences and complex syntactic devices is surrounded by a systematic relationship with internal characteristics. In other words, the more syntagmatic relations there are in the horizontal line, the more different the structural relations are.

REFERENCES:

1. Israilova , S. (2023). THE PRAGMATIC OCCURRENCE AND MENTAL PROPERTIES OF COLOR COMPONENT UNITS IN CONTEXT. Interpretation and Researches, 1(5). извлечено от <http://interpretationandresearches.uz/index.php/iar/article/view/96>.
2. Israilova Saodat Turapovna. (2023). TIL BIRLIKLARNING SEMANTIK XUSUSIYATLARI. INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCES WITH HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, 1(14.04), 238–241. Retrieved from <https://www.myscience.uz/index.php/issue/article/view/285>.
3. Turapovna, I. S. (2021). Semantics of the lexeme " green". ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11(9), 440-448.
4. Андреева С.В. Типология конструктивно-синтаксических единиц в русской речи // Вопросы языкознания. -Москва, 2004. - №5. - С. 33.
5. Хайруллаев Х. Нутк бирликларининг погонали муносабати. - Самарканд, 2008, - Б. 26-45.