

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF A COMPOUND SENTENCE WITH CONNECTIVE RELATIONS IN THE RUSSIAN AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES

Masharipova Svetlana

*Lecturer of Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh***Article history:***Received: 19th January., 2022**Accepted: 20th January., 2022**Published: 22th January., 2022*

Abstract: *The article presents a comparative and typological analysis of compound sentences with connective relations of the Russian and Karakalpak languages, reveals the phenomena of similarity and differences of these constructions in the contacting languages, allowing determining possible manifestations of interference in the Russian speech of Karakalpak students.*

Key words: *connective relations, complex sentences of homogeneous composition, complex sentences of heterogeneous composition, connective unions.*

In modern linguistics, the problem of the functioning of incomplete words is relevant at the syntactic and hypersyntactic levels of the language. The peculiarities of the functioning of compositional unions in a sentence and text have been studied quite thoroughly and still continue to interest linguists.

According to researchers of Russian syntax, the problems of composition and subordination are interrelated. These are the two main elements that form such types of complex sentences as compound and compound sentences. In their opinion, compound sentences are two or more simple sentences in the composition of a complex, connected by means of compositional conjunctions. It should be emphasized that there are some differences in the classification of Russian compound sentences. Some (I.A. Popova, A.M. Peshkovsky, V.V. Vinogradov, V.V. Babaitseva, N.S. Valgina) believe that there are compound sentences in the Russian language with connective, adversative, disjunctive, comparative, connecting, gradational, explanatory unions. Others (V.A. Beloshapkova) believe that compound sentences can be open and closed structures. Still others (“Russian Grammar-80”, “Short Russian Grammar” by N.Yu.Shvedova) argue that the classification of compound sentences is based on the division of coordinating conjunctions on the basis of their ambiguity or unambiguity, i.e. by their ability to semantic differentiation.

In Turkology there is no single view on the classification of complex sentences. In the Bashkir language, for example, complex sentences are divided into two large groups: complex sentences and compound sentences. According to the type of connection, compound sentences are divided in turn into non-union and allied. The means of communication of predicative parts in complex sentences are unions, and in non-union - intonation [2. S. 495].

The same division of complex sentences is observed in the Yakut language [8, p. 380].

In the Tatar literary language, complex sentences are classified somewhat differently:

- 1) complex soldered;
- 2) compound sentences (allied and non-allied);

3) compound sentences (allied and non-allied).

The means of communication in allied complex sentences are subordinate unions, and in non-allied ones - the intonation of a warning. In allied compound sentences, the predicative parts are connected by compositional unions, and in non-allied ones - by the intonation of enumeration and opposition [Zakiev, 1971]. Conjunctive compound sentences are such complex constructions, the means of communication of the predicative parts of which are compositional conjunctions. Non-union compound sentences include complex sentences, the predicative parts of which are connected by intonation.

In Chuvash linguistics, in early grammatical works, complex sentences were divided into four classes:

1) compound sentences;

2) complex sentences;

3) unionless complex sentences;

4) complex sentences with a sentence with similar terms or complex sentences of a transitional type [3, p. 272].

In modern Chuvash linguistics, the term "complex sentences of a transitional type" is not used, but three types of complex sentences are distinguished: 1) compound sentences (complex sentences whose predicative parts are connected by compositional conjunctions and form a semantic or semantic unity in their combination); 2) complex sentences (simple sentences in the composition of a complex, which are syntactically dependent on each other, are interconnected by subordinate unions, allied words, inflectional affixes, postpositions and the order of the parts); 3) complex sentences with intonation connection (complex sentences in which the parts forming them are interconnected in meaning, intonation).

In our work, we would like to perform a comparative analysis of a compound sentence with connecting relations in the Russian and Karakalpak languages.

An effective system for teaching a compound sentence to Karakalpak students requires taking into account the interaction of the native and Russian languages, since in this case the linguo-methodological problem of preventing and overcoming semantic-syntactic interference is actualized as the most important condition for the formation and development of Karakalpak-Russian bilingualism in the process of working on a complex sentence in the classroom Russian language.

As you know, in both Russian and Karakalpak languages, the main grammatical means of communication between the parts of a compound sentence are coordinating conjunctions.

So, "structural-semantic classification relies, first of all, on the nature of coordinative conjunctions that connect predicative parts and have an extremely generalized meaning" [1, p.430].

Coordinating conjunctions in terms of their meaning and the semantic relations expressed by them in the Russian language are divided into: 1) connecting: and, yes (in the meaning of "and"), as well as repeating connecting unions (and ... and, neither ... nor, like...and); 2) adversative: but, yes (in the meaning of "but"), however, but, but; 3) dividing: or, either, then ... then, not that ... not that, or ... or; 4) connecting: moreover, yes and, also, etc.; 5) explanatory: namely, that is; 6) gradational: not only... but also, not that... but / but, not so much... as [1, p. 350].

Unlike Russian, the following types of compositional unions are distinguished in the Karakalpak language:

A) connecting conjunctions: Yes/de, ta/te, "and";əam "and", "also and"; menen (benen) penen "and", "together with"; zhane "and"; tagida "and also";əam de "and also".

B) Adversative conjunctions: Bira, Bira the "but", "however"; Galis-AK "but"; Lou, Lou Andy, "and", "but"; blki "but", "however"; Bolsa "and", "but only".

C) Dividing the unions: I, yaki "or", "or"; g h..... "then... then...",not... not... "no... no...".[9, p. 419]

The group of connecting unions in the Karakalpak language includes: single simple unions (ha'm - and; ha'mde - and, too, also,); single pair unions (barely ha'm - not only - but, eledeha'm - not only - but also, barely ha'mde - how - after all); When using connecting unions in both languages, connecting relations can be established between parts of compound sentences.

According to various semantic and stylistic qualities of conjunctions, as well as according to different ratios of aspectual-temporal and modal forms of predicates, in Russian compound sentences with a common connecting meaning are divided, according to the classification of N. A. Nikolina, into connective-enumerative, connective-distributive, connective-resultative, conditional-investigative, connective-identifying, connective-gradational, connecting inconsistencies [7, p. 435-437], according to the classification of N. S. Valgina, into temporary (simultaneity and sequence of actions in predicative parts, the latter can be used with a hint of the meaning of the consequence), causal, adversative, negative enumeration and mutual exclusion, sentences with an additive connotation of meaning [5, With. 420421]. In this regard, in the Russian language there is a division of compound sentences with connective unions into two groups: 1) homogeneous composition; 2) heterogeneous composition.

In a homogeneous compound sentences, predicative parts are connected by conjunctions and, yes (in the meaning of "and"), neither...ni, and...andand express connective-enumerative relations, i.e. homogeneous events occurring simultaneously or following each other (simultaneity or sequence of actions) are enumerated. Relevant for these constructions are such additional means of communication as the correlation of species-time forms, a common secondary member of a sentence or a common predicative part, in some cases, parallelism of structure, uniformity of lexical content of parts of a complex sentence, including the use of words of the same thematic series, lexical and syntactic repetitions.

In compound sentences of heterogeneous composition, predicative parts are joined by connective conjunctions and, yes (in the meaning of "and") and express connective-distributive, connective-productive, conditionally-consequential, connective-identifying, connective-gradational, connective mismatch sentences (i.e., these sentences are only binomial). Additional means of communication in these sentences can be a fixed word order, the correlation of modal plans of parts of a complex sentence, syntactically specialized words, the so-called second allied elements [6, p. 213], which are adverbs, introductory words, particles.1

In the Karakalpak language, a similar division of parts of the compound sentences into sentences of homogeneous and heterogeneous composition is not observed, however, sentences with connective conjunctions can also express connective, sequential-connective, causal, temporal and comparative-contrastive relations.

The most common element of a compound in compound sentences with connective relations in both languages is the union and—ham. Both in Russian and in the Karakalpak language, this conjunction is used in the compound sentences with the meaning of uniformity, enumeration of equivalent and independent events of the same type. For example: Patma tez uyine kaitti, akesin ham, anasin ham katti saginganin tusindi. (DM) Patma quickly returned home, she missed both her father and mother.

In both Russian and Karakalpak, the order of the parts may depend on the semantic relations between the parts of the compound sentences. So, with simultaneous actions, the sequence of actions can be changed, with a sequence of actions it cannot be violated. For example, the rearrangement of parts in the sentence: Alty shopan bagana koylardi jayip ketti de, Erpolat darka ruajlerdi alip, keinin jetpekshi bolip kalip edi.(MD)- impossible due to the device and their location in accordance with the sequence of events that occurred.

To express connective-enumerative relations in Russian, repeated conjunctions and ...and; neither ...nor are used. In Karakalpak they correspond to the conjunctions ham...ham, yes...yes, birese....birese and others. In the analyzed languages, the repeated amplifying conjunctions are neither...No-yes...yes, they serve to connect the predicative parts of the SSP, expressing a negative enumeration or mutual exclusion of phenomena. For example: Menin kishkentayimdy barkhulla anamda, akemde korgashalaydy - My younger brother is always cradled by both mother and father; Galina yes, men de hesh narseni eske ala almadyk. - Neither Galina remembered her young years, nor I could remember anything; Kun birese ashlyyp, birese bultlasyp, birese shahmaksha gyp, birese guldurmama gurkildededi (Because) - The day was either clear or cloudy, then lightning flashed, then a thunderstorm thundered.

In the Karakalpak language, repeated connective conjunctions in the meaning of Russian ni...neither can enter into various combinations with each other. For example: Men tauga da ketpedim, aulda da shopanbolmadim — I did not go to the mountains, nor did I get a job as a shepherd in the village; Adamlarga otynda zhetpedi, ham ol zhaksylap zhanbady yes. - The firewood burned badly, and people didn't have enough.

So, as a result of the study of the theoretical material of the Russian and Karakalpak languages, a comparative typological analysis of the compound sentence of the contacting languages, phenomena have been identified that make it possible to determine the possible manifestations of interference in the Russian speech of Karakalpak students, which makes it possible to eliminate stable and typical causes leading to syntactic errors.

REFERENCES:

1. Beloshapkovav. A. Modern Russian language.Syntax. M.: Higher School, 1977. 248 p.
2. Grammar of the modern Bashkir literary language. - M.: Nauka, 1981. 496 p.
3. Gorsky S.P. Comparative grammar of the Russian and Chuvash languages. Cheboksary: State Publishing House of the Chuvash ASSR, 1959
4. Zakiev And Z.. Modern Tatar literary language: Syntax. M., 1971.
4. Karakalpak - Russian dictionary. Edited by N.A.Baskakov.M., 1958.
5. Modern Russian language / Edited by N.S.Valgina. M.: Logos, 2006. 528 p.

6. Modern Russian language. Theory. Analysis of language units / Edited by E. I. Dibrova: In two parts. Part 2. M.: Academy, 2006. 624 p.
7. Modern Russian language / Edited by P. A. Lekant. M.: Bustard, 2007. 557 p.
8. Ubryatova E. And Research on the syntax of the Yakut language: A simple sentence. M-1976 .
9. Umarov A.U. Comparative grammar of the Russian and Karakalpak languages. N., 1992.
10. Khoshchanov B.H. Spatial and temporal relations in multi-system languages.N., 1992.