COMPOUND SENTENCE WITH A RESULTING VERB

Shavkatova Jasmina Shavkat qizi

2nd year student of "Uzbek language and literature",

Samarkand state institute of foreign languages

Scientific supervisor: ***Turniyazova Shaxnoza Nigmatovna***

Professor, SamSIFL

Abstract: This article explains general information about compound sentences with a consequent clause, their difference from other compound sentences, the means that connect the consequent clause to the main clause, the views of several scholars on this type of compound sentence, and the types of complex syntactic devices and examples thereof.

Keywords: result clause, main clause, grammatical formation, measure-degree clause, main clause affixes: -ki, -gan, was, definite and indefinite expression of thought, possessive, participial, determiner, complement and case clauses

Introduction

Complex sentences are an important aspect of syntactic analysis in linguistics, combining several independent sentences to express complex thoughts and ideas. We all know that, according to the information given in textbooks, a sentence with one punctuation mark, semantic and intonational completeness is a simple sentence, and a compound sentence is a whole consisting of two or more simple sentences with grammatical and semantic relationships.

Methodology of literature analysis

Despite the large number of scientific monographic studies devoted to the interpretation of compound sentences in linguistics, we can see that there are still many unsolved puzzles not only in science but also in this field. If we pay attention, all scientists conducting scientific work in this field openly express their thoughts and opinions on compound sentences. The study of the types of relations of the components of a compound sentence became one of the main topics in linguistics in the twenties of the 20th century, and this area gave rise to debates and discussions among linguists. In particular, the Russian linguist M.N. Peterson states that "The existing criteria do not serve as a basis for distinguishing a main clause from a subordinate clause, as well as a subordinate conjunction from an equal conjunction. Therefore, the concepts of subordinate and equal conjunction have no linguistic meaning," and notes the great confusion of opinions expressed by linguists regarding the subordinate and equal conjunction of the components of a compound sentence.[1]

A compound sentence is a syntactic device that is closely related to a simple sentence, but differs from it in terms of both structure and the amount and quality of the information transmitted. Therefore, the general linguistic essence of a compound sentence is revealed in its relationship with a simple sentence. In terms of linguistic structure, the difference between a compound sentence and a simple sentence is somewhat obvious. More precisely, if in a simple

sentence there is only one clause, then in a compound sentence there are more than one and it consists of a combination of more than one simple sentence in terms of content and grammaticality. Regarding the classification of compound sentences, it is worth paying attention to the ideas of R.R. Sayfullayeva that a compound sentence, as a linguistic unit, is also complex in nature, and this complexity is determined by its place at the linguistic level, the grammatical form and connecting means of the simple sentence in its composition, and the diversity of its semantic relationship [2; B 383]

As we all know, the hierarchical relationship, in which the sum of sounds forms words, the sum of words forms word combinations, word combinations form sentences, sentences form sentences, and sentences form texts, has been widely described in our linguistics [3]. However, as mentioned above, we will not be mistaken if we say that opposing views on the expression of the "compound sentence" included in the hierarchical relationship in this way cause controversy among scientists. In some sources, we witness that this unit is called a "complex syntactic whole". In particular, M.L. Loseva mentions the following 3 specific features of complex syntactic devices:

- Complex syntactic devices represent the largest syntactic unit in the text;
- Complex syntactic devices are a group of independently constructed sentences that are united thematically, as well as lexically, grammatically, and intonationally;
- Complex syntactic devices characterize any aspect of the described phenomenon.

According to G.Ya. Solganik, "prosaic stanza" (in our opinion, a complex syntactic device) is a group of sentences that are closely connected in meaning and syntactically, expressing the full development of thought in relation to a separate sentence" [4;B 95].

Discussion

We now consider it necessary to use the term "compound sentence" in our work, based on traditional grammar, despite the opinions of the above-mentioned scholars. The grammatical basis of a compound sentence is two or more sentences, the parts of which are connected in content and grammar, as well as intonation, and form a single whole.

1.   Quyosh jilmayib boqar va sarg'aygan ko'katlar kokilida shudring jilolanardi.(O'tkir Hoshimov)
2.   Sultonmurod o'zini chetga olishga tirishdi, xalq to'lqini uni surib ketdi.(Oybek)

If we consider in detail the subordinate clause, which is one of the types of compound sentences, it is preferable to get acquainted with its types in more depth. Subordinate clauses are divided into the following types according to their intended meaning, formation, and method of connection to the main clause: possessive clause, participial clause, complement clause, defining clause, and case clause. Among these, the case clause is also divided into several types:

1.   Comparison-like clause
2.   Causal clause
3.   Purpose clause
4.   Time clause
5.   Place clause
6.   Condition clause
7.   Unconditional clause
8.   Result clause

Among these, we will focus on the compound sentence with a result clause. So, what is meant by a compound sentence with a result clause and what are the means that form it?

Clauses that indicate the conclusion of an action or event in the main sentence are called compound sentences with a result clause.

1) Otimni bu buyuk odam shunday mehr bilan aytadiki,uning ojizona yotganiga achinib, ko'zimdan yosh chiqib ketdi. (Asqad Muxtor)

2) Shunday zarb bilan urildi…Zarbidan ketiga chalpak bo'lib yiqildi. (Tog'ay Murod "Ot kishnagan oqshom" asaridan)

3) Mingboshini shunday tasvir qildiki,endi uning o'rniga – kuyov rolida – bir dev kirib kelsa,Zebi "jon!" derdi.(Cho'lpon "Kecha va kunduz" asaridan)

4) Menga shunday ko'zlarini multiratib qaradiki,yuragim "jig'!" etib ketdi….(Cho'lpon "Kecha va kunduz" asaridan)

Although the result clause is similar in content and grammatical formation to the compound clauses with a partially defining, measure-degree clause, they differ from each other as follows:

- The explanatory words in the first clause of the compound sentences with a defining adverb (for example, shunday) are connected to the subject;

- The explanatory words in the first clause of the compound sentences with a measure-degree adverb (shunday, shunchalik) are connected to the part expressed by the adjective, adverb - a word expressing a sign, quantity;

Compare:

a) Shunday odam haqida xabar keltirdimki, uning har bir so'zi gavhardir – a compound sentence followed by a determiner when it says "I brought news about a man whose every word is precious."

b) U shunchalik go'zal ediki, falak bunday jamolni ko'rmagan edi – Her beauty was beyond compare. (compound sentence with adverb of degree)

Based on the above information and the examples given, the difference between a compound sentence with a result clause and a compound sentence with a result clause should be expressed as follows.

"The explanatory words in the components of compound sentences with a result clause (for example, so, so much) are connected to the action expressed by the clause of the main clause. In other words, the defining clause indicates the sign of a part in the main clause, the quantitative clause indicates the sign-characteristic of the action in the main clause and its degree in terms of volume and quantity, while the consequent clause expresses the conclusion arising from the action in the main clause." As we all know, there are means of connecting parts of the main clause, and compound sentences with a result clause are an exception. In summary:

1. -ki:

a) Qor shunday yog'diki, yer bir pastda oppoq bo'ldi.

   b) Olov shu darajada baland yondiki, tafti bir necha metr uzoqdagi odamga   ham yetib borardi.

2. -gan edi. The associative tone also plays a role in this:

   a) Zumrad belini siqib tugmalangan kalta nimchasining cho'ntagidan xil-xil ipak turlangan koptokni chiqarib yerga bir urgan edi, u bo'y barobar sapchib ketdi.(Oybek)

  b) Hamidullo stolning ustida turgan grafinni olib yerga urgan edi, uning mushtday keladigan shisha tiqini otilib ketib, qimmatbaho bufetining toshoynasini chil-chil qildi. (Abdulla Qahhor)

   As a further note, it should be noted that in the subordinate clause of compound sentences with the word result, words such as "as a result" and "as a result" can be used to emphasize the meaning of the result. However, there are cases in our language where, although the above

sentences do not contain such means as "as a result", "as a result", we still sense its place in the sentence structure through its meaning. For example:

1) O'tdilargina emas, hatto menga shunchaliq ta'sir etdilarkim,go'yo malikasining g'azabiga uchrag'an qul qay darajada es-hushidan ayrilsa, qilar ishidan, o'ylar o'yidan yanglishsa, maning-da hozirgi holim buning yuz daraja yuqirisig'a yetdi. (Abdulla Qodiriy "O'tkan kunlar")

2) Nizom ham kulib turar, lekin butaloqnikiga o'xshagan yuvosh ko'zlari shunday samimiy va beg'araz boqar ediki, Hamida to suzishni o'rganguncha undan biron marta seskanmadi va biror nojo'ya qilig'ini sezmadi. (Pirimqul Qodirov "Avlodlar dovoni")

3) She'rini kuyga solib aytsa eshtgan jonzot shunday ta'sirlanar ekanki,Kabirning irodasiga qarshi biron ish qilolmay qolarkan. (Abdulla Qodiriy "O'tkan kunlar")

4) U shunday kinoyali harakatlar ko'rsatdiki, odamlar kulgidan ichaklari uzilayozdi. (Oybek)

Results

As can be seen from the above information, although the result plays an important role in the connection of both components of the subordinate clause, it can be distinguished from the semantic parts expressed in the sentence even in cases where they are omitted. In the process of distinguishing a subordinate clause with a result from other subordinate clauses, it was found that the connection of words such as this, so much, so much, with certain parts plays the main role, and serves to distinguish the subordinate clauses from several types in their internal state.

It should also be noted that in the ongoing debates about the subordinate clause, in the works devoted to its study, as mentioned earlier, some scholars consider it a mistake to call it a subordinate clause and prefer to call it a "complex syntactic whole or complex syntactic device". And we are witnessing that they give sufficient explanations for this opinion.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, the result clause is primarily explained by the fact that it means the conclusion of the action or event in the main clause, and the means involved in it differ depending on the part of the sentence they are connecting. When we talk about the result clause, when we say that the basis is a compound sentence, I think it would not be wrong to say that, in addition to all the points made about the compound sentence, the sum of word combinations is not a compound sentence, but a complex syntactic device. There are many unresolved aspects of this issue. Of course, it cannot be shown in one article. After all, this topic will serve as the subject of a large monographic dissertation research in the future. It is not surprising that these studies will reveal more unexplored aspects and new situations.

REFERENCES:

1. Peterson,Mixail Nikolayevich.Ocherk sintaksisa ruskava yazika / / M.N.Peterson. – Moskva; , Petrograd: Gos.izd – vo, 1923. – 130

2. Peterson,Mixail Nikolayevich.Ocherk sintaksisa ruskava yazika / / M.N.Peterson. – Moskva; , Petrograd: Gos.izd – vo, 1923. – 130

3. N.Turniyozov, B.Turniyozov, Sh.Turniyozova, Sh.Turniyozov. Lingvistik nazariyalar. O'quv-uslubiy qo'llanma. Samarqand: "SamDCHTI" nashriyoti, 2021. – 129 bet

4. Loseva L.M. Kak stroitsiya tekst.M.,1989.94 s.

5. Sayfullayeva R.R., Toshkent – "Fan va texnologiya" – 2010 383b

6. Solganik G. Ya. Sintaksicheskaya stilistika. M., 1973.214 s.