

MAIN ISSUES OF THE THEORY OF COMPLEX SENTENCES IN COMPARATIVE (GERMAN-TURKIC) LINGUISTICS

Rakhat Sagyndykova

PhD. Associate Professor

Osh State University

Institute of Intercultural Communication

Osh, Kyrgyzstan

e-mail: rakhatsagyndykova@gmail.com

cell phone: +996777740002

Abstract: *In modern linguistic science in Kyrgyzstan, special attention is paid to the comparative study of the Kyrgyz and English languages. This is due, first of all, to the international status of the English language, as well as the fact that the Kyrgyz Republic is a member of the international community and issues of intercultural linguistic communication, theory and practice of interlingual English-Kyrgyz correlation are becoming relevant. The study of the sentence as the basic unit of communication is of particular importance for both linguistics and linguodidactics. The relevance of the research topic is determined by the lack of knowledge of complex sentences in the English and Kyrgyz languages in comparative and typological terms, the productivity and specificity of adverbial subordinate clauses in the English and Kyrgyz languages.*

Key words: *theory, linguistics, sentence, comparison, syntax, structure.*

The main questions of the theory of complex sentences, studied in comparative German-Turkic linguistics, seem to be the same as those studied on the material of one language. In this case, a complex sentence is considered as “the combination of two (or more) simple sentences (or their analogues) by means of conjunctions, allied words, or allied particles (in combination with a certain intonation, and often also with the support of vocabulary) into a certain new syntactic formation, parts of which enter into certain syntactic relationships” [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1990]. In this case, a complex sentence does not become a mechanical combination of two independent simple sentences, but acquires a new structural and semantic quality, forming complex sentences of complex and complex types. One of the parts of a complex sentence often undergoes significant changes, differing significantly from the formal grammatical analogue of a simple sentence. Such formal grammatical changes are more typical for complex sentences of a complex type.

Complex sentences are characterized by structural and semantic features of predicativity and modality, which are basic for simple common sentences. “Predicativeness is revealed in the opposition of affirmation and negation; modality finds its expression in two correlative categories: reality / invalidity (or potential-presumptive modality)” [Gulyga, 1971].

The theory of complex sentences is based on some well-established provisions (postulates):

1) A complex sentence has the linguistic qualities of auto semantics (independence, self-sufficiency) and synsemantics (non-independence, non-self-sufficiency), which are characteristic of its constituent parts, but the quality of synsemantics is always characteristic of the subordinate clause;

2) The synsemantic nature of the subordinate clause is expressed in the fact that this part of the complex sentence is capable of performing the function of the main member of the sentence, but at the same time exhibiting semantics dependent on the meaning of the main part of the complex sentence;

3) In a complex sentence, there are always several predicative centers (at least two), which are divided as subject-predicate structures of the main (main) and subordinate clause(s);

4) The main predicative center and the subordinate (subordinate) predicative center form in the semantic structure of a complex sentence two predicative lines, which up to a certain point run parallel to each other, and then merge into one, determining the formation of one complex semantic core. “A complex sentence with one semantic core is compared with a simple sentence due to the simplification of the modal plan and the merging of two predicative lines into one” [Gulyga, 1971].

Our review and theoretical study of the relevant scientific linguistic literature revealed that there is little research in the field of complex sentences on comparative material of Germanic and Turkic languages, only five titles of works [Umarov, 1973; Dzhumabaev, 1978; Sharshenova, 1991; Ergeshbaeva, 2006; Altynbaev, 2011].

Kyrgyz researcher Umarov K. studies subordinating conjunctions of the German language and their functional correspondences in the Kyrgyz language. The author establishes 9 groups of subordinating conjunctions in the original Germanic German, each of which consists of several function words; for example, the group of temporary subordinating conjunctions consists of 8 units: *nachdem*, *als*, *wenn*, *seit*, *bis*, *ehe*, *bevor*, and *solange*. Umarov K. reveals that 9 groups of German subordinating conjunctions in the Kyrgyz language correspond to 4 groups of conjunctions: causal, conditional, consequence, and comparative [Umarov, 1973].

The lack of subordinating conjunctions in the Kyrgyz language is compensated by other grammatical means that express subordinating connections in the structure of complex sentences. Firstly, these are the forms of predicate subordinate clauses, which simultaneously serve for the subordinate connection of the subordinate clause with the main one. Secondly, the subordinating conjunctions of the German language have in the Kyrgyz language their functional correspondences with postpositions and auxiliary names, “which follow the predicate of the subordinate clause, which is in an unconjugated form”. And thirdly, many subordinating conjunctions of the German language are transmitted in the Kyrgyz language using participial or other verbal impersonal forms of the predicative member of the subordinate clause [Umarov, 1973].

Kyrgyz researcher Dzhumabaev K. studies complex sentences with subordinate clauses of time and reason in modern German and their correspondence in the Kyrgyz language. The author selects from the entire variety of German subordinate clauses only the two mentioned above due to the fact that they are on different stripes of the semantic scale: one subordinate clause denotes temporal correlation, and the other – causal. It is noted that the Germanic German language has a developed and complex system of subordinating conjunctions, of which there are about 60-65 units; at the same time, the system of subordinating conjunctions in the Kyrgyz language is poorly developed. However, the underdevelopment of subordinating conjunctions in the modern Kyrgyz language is compensated by other grammatical means of communication that are not in the German language: impersonal forms of predicates, expressed by participles, gerunds and verbal-nominal forms, in combination with various case affixes, postpositions, and other function words. These non-finite forms of verbs perform a dual function in the structure of a subordinate clause: on the one hand, they are its predicates, and on the other, they subordinate it to the main clause [Dzhumabaev,1978].

Kyrgyz researcher Sharshenova R.N. studies the means of expressing conditional-consequential relations in English and Kyrgyz languages in the structure of complex sentences. The author defines 8 types of complex sentences in the original English language: 1) with conditional clauses, 2) with additional clauses, 3) with measure and degree clauses, 4) with comparison clauses, 5) with subject clauses, 6) with attributive clauses, 7) with clauses of place, and 8) with clauses of time. The researcher establishes that the first 4 types of complex sentences can express conditional-consequential relations in English. Sharshenova R.N. reveals that these 4 types of English complex sentences with conditional-consequential relations in the Kyrgyz language correspond to 15 syntactical-semantic constructions expressing conditional-consequential relations. These Kyrgyz syntactical-semantic constructions have a dual semantic characteristic:

- 1) they are complex sentences in their grammatical structure;
- 2) are also structural in their grammatical structure, expressing conditional-consequence relationships.

The main criterion for the functional correlation of English and Kyrgyz grammatical structures with conditional-consequential relations is the presence in their meanings of such semantic relations, which are a generalized reflection of the conditionality of the phenomena of the objective world [Sharshenova, 1991].

Kyrgyz researcher Ergeshbaeva N.A. conducts a comparative typological study of adverbial adverbs of place in the English and Kyrgyz languages.

The author focuses on a simple common sentence, which most fully expresses the semantic structure of adverbial adverbs of place in the English and Kyrgyz languages. Ergeshbaeva N.A. notes that in a simple common sentence, adverbial adverbs of place: back, up, down, where, home, etc. - artynda, aldy, tomon, oido, ich, etc. – distribute their semantics only within a given sentence. And, accordingly, in sentences of a complex type with a subordinate clause, the semantics of adverbial adverbs of place goes beyond the

subordinate clause and extends to the structure of the main sentence [Ergeshbaeva, 2006]. The author reveals that the use of adverbial adverbs of place in both compared languages: English and Kyrgyz has more similarities than differences.

Altynbaev N.K. conducted a typological study of grammatical adverbs in English and Kyrgyz languages. The researcher determines that in both languages being compared, adverbs as part of a simple general sentence are divided into six groups: 1) circumstances characterizing an action from the point of view of its course in space and time; 2) circumstances characterizing an action or sign in a qualitative sense; 3) circumstances characterizing an action or sign in terms of intensity; 4) circumstances characterizing the action from the point of view of its conditionality or purposefulness; 5) circumstances limiting action; and 6) circumstances, accompanying conditions.

According to Altynbaev, grammatical circumstances in both languages, English and Kyrgyz, correspond to the word being defined. In a complex sentence, the circumstance is transformed into an adverbial subordinate clause and is correlated with the word being defined as part of the main sentence. There are more similarities in the use of adverbs in the English and Kyrgyz languages than differences. The main similarities between English and Kyrgyz adverbs in terms of the content of both simple common and complex ones with adverbial clauses are manifested in the fact that in both languages the position of adverbials is filled with correlations between adverbs and adverbial words, participles, participial groups, and phrases [Altynbaev, 2011].

Our review and theoretical study also showed that there are comparative studies in the field of complex sentences conducted on the material of the German and Russian languages [Fedorov A.V., Kuznetsova N.N., Morozova E.N., Tsyganova N.A., Gorokhova I.M., Filippova N.A., Gurevich V.V., Valvakov R.M.]. Russian researchers Fedorov A.V., Kuznetsova N.N., Morozova E.N., Tsyganova I.A. compare complex sentences of Germanic German and Slavic Russian languages. They define complex sentences in both languages as grammatical complex structures consisting of heterogeneous, unequal parts. This inequality is due to the fact that this complex structure of a complex sentence is divided into two parts: the main clause and the subordinate clause.

The semantic subordinating connection between the main and subordinate clauses is determined by conjunctions and allied words. If a German complex sentence can often do without conjunctions and allied words, then a Russian complex sentence cannot be constructed without conjunctions and allied words. Word order plays an important role for the subordinate clause of a German complex sentence, in which the predicate verb occupies a fixed last place; and at the same time, the Russian subordinate clause has a free word order, the predicate verb occupies its characteristic second position after the subject, but in accordance with the semantic actual division it can move to another position in the structure of the subordinate clause.

The formal grammatical compositions of German and Russian complex sentences also often differ from each other. In accordance with the grammatical laws of the German language, both parts of a German complex sentence must have both a subject and a

predicate. In Slavic Russian, the subject of the subordinate clause can be omitted. Subjects of the same or similar meaning, named in the first sentence, are not repeated in the second as redundant. This often occurs in the subordinate clause following the main one, and is the norm of the modern Russian literary language (Fedorov A.V., Kuznetsova N. N., Morozova E. N., Tsyganova I.A.).

Russian researchers Gorokhova I. M., Filippova N.A. compare some types of original Russian and compared German complex sentences.

The authors first state the fact of structural and grammatical similarity of many types of complex sentences in the Russian and German languages, but then note that there are also facts of dissimilarity in the structures of such sentences in these languages.

Gorokhova I. M. and Filippova N. A., compare only Russian complex sentences with conjunctions “what, so that, when” with their functional equivalents in the German language. Applying the lexical-syntactic criterion, according to which “subordinating conjunctions perform not only the syntactic function of subordinating sentences, but due to their lexical meaning they usually express semantic-syntactic relations between the main and subordinate, the authors identify functional equivalents in the German language for Russian complex sentences with conjunctions “what, so that, when” [Gorokhova, Filippova, 1985]

The Russian complex sentences with subordinate clauses of purpose with the conjunction “that” in the German language are functionally corresponding to complex sentences: with subordinate clauses (with conjunctions: *das, als*), with subordinate clauses of consequence, measure and degree (*das, so das*), with clauses with attributive clauses (*was, der, die, das*), with subordinate clauses (*was...durch*), with clause distributive (*was*).

The Russian complex sentence with a subordinate clause of purpose with the conjunction “so that” in the German language functionally corresponds to complex sentences:

- with subordinate clauses of purpose (*damit, um*);
- with subordinate clauses of consequence and manner of action (*das, als, das, um*);
- with a distributive clause (*damit, das, um*).

The Russian complex sentence with a subordinate tense with the conjunction “when” in the German language functionally corresponds to complex sentences:

- with subordinate clauses (*als, wie, da, wo, wenn*);
- with a conditional subordinate clause (*das, so das*);
- with attributive clauses (*da, wo, wenn*);
- with a clause attributive (*da, wo, an, in*);
- and with a clause concessive (*wann*).

Famous Russian researcher Gurevich V.V. undertakes a comparative typology of German-English and Slavic-Russian languages and touches on the problem of comparing complex sentences. In the class of complex sentences, the author distinguishes three types in both languages: complex sentences, complex sentences, and complex sentences. Gurevich identifies two main differences in the use of English and Russian complex sentences.

Firstly, this is the widespread use of pronominal-correlative connections between parts through correlative words in the Russian language: the one who; what; where; when, etc. An English complex sentence usually uses a pronoun in only one clause. Secondly, the syntax of English colloquial speech is characterized by the omission of conjunctions and allied words (He said he knew it; This is the book I was speaking about), which is not typical of Russian syntax [Gurevich, 2008].

Kyrgyz researcher Valvakov R.V. studies complex sentences with subordinate clauses in English and Russian languages in a functional-semantic aspect. The author reveals that, in contrast to the established classification of English subordinate clauses into subordinate clauses of time, place, comparison, conditions, reasons, concessions and purposes, these subordinate clauses are distinguished by a complex functional-semantic structure that combines two functional meanings. Thus, subordinate clauses with the meaning of time can include in their semantics additional meanings of condition, reason, concession, opposition. For example, a subordinate clause with the main meaning of time in the sentence “When Gerald wanted something, he got it by choosing the most direct path can acquire” the additional meaning of a condition only if the temporary conjunction when is replaced by the conditional conjunction if. The subordinate clause acquires the semantics of time and state.

In Russian, such a dual meaning can also be observed in subordinate clauses, but in it the meaning of space is often the main one. For example, in the complex sentence “Where there is no love, it is not customary to talk about money” two meanings are combined in the semantics of the subordinate clause: the main meaning of space and the additional meaning of state.

Valvakov R.V. shows that the main difference between adverbial adverbs in analytical Germanic English and inflectional Slavic Russian is that the adverbs of the first gravitate towards the temporal determination of their meaning, and the adverbs of the second gravitate towards the spatial determination of their meaning [Valvakov, 2011].

Also, our review and theoretical study showed that in comparative linguistics there are studies in which questions of the theory of complex sentences are studied on the material of two languages, one of which is the Turkic language (Kyrgyz) [Bayramova, 1966; Kulbaeva, 1995; Zhaparov, 2007].

Researcher Bayramova L.K., studying the translation into Tatar of Russian relative clauses with the relative word “which”, notes that Russian clauses with the relative word “which” represent a rather unique and difficult syntactic construction to translate into the Turkic Tatar language. She claims that “Tatar defining sentences, unlike other types of subordinate clauses (for example, subordinate clauses of reason, conditions) are very unique in their structure” [Bayramova L.K., 1966: 3].

Bayramova L.K. reveals that Russian attributive clauses with the relative word “which” are best translated into the Turkic Tatar language in three ways:

- 1) By the participial method of translation and the use of the participle into “- gan”;
- 2) Using correlative words “kaisy...shul (what...such); shundai...ni (such...or)”;

3) Analytically by decomposing a Russian complex sentence into two such sentences in the Tatar language.

The last analytical method seems to be the most adequate for translating Russian subordinate clauses with the relative word “which” into Tatar. “This analytical method of translation, dividing the structure of a Russian complex sentence with a subordinate attributive, helps to avoid, on the one hand, the complexity of semantic distortion of the original sentence, and on the other hand, the clutter of Tatar sentences that could arise, for example, when translating a participial construction structurally complicated sentences” [Bayramova, 1966].

Kyrgyz researcher Kulbaeva G. B. studies ways of expressing cause-and-effect relationships in Slavic Russian and Turkic Kyrgyz languages. Such relations in both languages being compared are manifested in three types of sentences:

1 - in simple common; 2 - in simple complex; 3 - in complex.

The choice of one of these three types of sentences depends in both languages on the amount of causal semantics embedded in the statement.

Cause-and-effect relationships of a wide scope, expressed in Russian and Kyrgyz languages in complex sentences, differ in the degree of specification. Thus, in the Kyrgyz language, where there are few subordinating conjunctions, the degree of specification seems weak, general cause-and-effect relationships take place, without indicating specific motives. Moreover, at the same time, a wide network of conjunctions, allied words, and allied phrases like “because, because, since, because, because, due to the fact that, in view of the fact that, due to the fact that, due to the fact that” and others contribute to an accurate and specific indication of the causes of causal semantics.

Russian subordinate clauses expressing cause-and-effect relationships are distinguished by differentiation and specification of causal meaning, while their Kyrgyz analogues with the conjunctions “antkeni, sebebi, emne uchun desen, nege desen” are more universal, freer in their arrangement in relation to the main thing” [Kulbaeva, 1995].

So, we have identified common and distinctive features of adverbial constructions in two languages and characterized the ways of transmitting NGN from the English language into the Kyrgyz language. Adverbial clauses are universal in all non-isolating languages. They convey situations (place, time, reason, conditions, etc.) that determine and motivate the content of the main sentence. English adverbial clauses of manner of action and comparison (Adverbial Clauses of Manner and Comparison) and their Kyrgyz equivalents have a dual classification, both in English and in Kyrgyz linguistics. We have joined the point of view that considers the phenomena “mode of action” and “comparison” together, since they are the essence of related phenomena that transform into each other when considering their semantics according to the degree of stepwise intensity of the attribute.

The prospect of this study, in our opinion, is to apply the conclusions we have outlined regarding complex sentences in English and Kyrgyz languages when studying syntactic phenomena in the language

REFERENCES:

1. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, Moscow. “Soviet Encyclopedia”. 1990.
2. Gulyga E.V., The theory of complex sentences in modern German. - M.: Higher School, 1971. 206 p.
3. Umarov K. Subordinating conjunctions of the German language and their functional correspondences in the Kyrgyz language. Frunze, 1973. 25 p.
4. Dzhumabaev, K. Complex sentences with subordinate clauses of time and reason in modern German and their correspondence in the Kyrgyz language. Frunze, 1978. 36 p.
5. Sharshenova R.M. Means of expressing conditional-consequential relations in English and Kyrgyz languages. Tashkent, 1991. 15 p.
6. Ergeshbaeva, N. A. A comparative-typological study of locative adverbs in English and Kyrgyz languages. Bishkek, 2006. 24 p.
7. Altynbaev, N. K. Typological study of grammatical adverbs in English and Kyrgyz languages. Bishkek. 2011. 24 p.
8. Gorokhova I.M., Filippova N.A. A guide to comparative German grammar and Russian languages. Moscow, Higher School, 1985. 191 p.
9. Gurevich, V.V. Theoretical grammar of the English language. Comparative typology of the English and Russian languages: textbook. 5th ed. Moscow . Flinta. Science, 2008. 168 p.
10. Valvakov, R. V. Complex sentences with subordinate adverbial clauses in English and Russian languages in the functional-semantic aspect. Bishkek, 2011. 19 p.
11. Bayramova, L. K. Translation into Tatar of Russian subordinate clauses with the relative word “which”. Leningrad, 1966. 16 p.
12. Kulbaeva, G. B. Methods of expressing cause-and-effect relationships in the Russian and Kyrgyz languages. Bishkek, 1995. 24 p.