Semantic peculiarities of conjunctions in English language

Khumora Teshaboyeva Numanjanovna
2nd year Master's degree student
Linguistics (English) major
Fergana State University

Dilshoda Mirzayeva Ikromjonovna
Head of English department, PhD
Fergana State University

Abstract : *This article studies semantic peculiarities of conjunctions in English language. In this article, conjunctions are classified into semantic groups according to the meaning they figure out in a sentence. However, this study is devoted to the comparative analysis of semantic aspects of conjunctions comparatively to the structural features.*
Key words: *conjunctions, semantics, compound conjunctions, complex conjunctions, copulative conjunctions, disjunctive conjunctions, adversative conjunctions, causative conjunctions.*

Introduction

In modern linguistics, the functional and communicative side phenomena are growing towards the pragmatic aspect of the language. However, the problem of the relationship between meaning and its expression still remains in the focus of linguists' attention. The problem of characterizing conjunctions in linguistics has not yet been analyzed semantically. This research is the first instance of a semantic study of conjunctions and ways of expressing in the language. The article is devoted to the structural-semantic description of conjunctions. The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that the analysis of semantic features of conjunctions has a unique scientific and theoretical significance.

Traditionally, the conjunction is one of the eight parts of speech in English. A conjunction, as reported by Malmkjar, is defined as an indeclinable part of speech that links other parts of speech, in company with which it has significance, by classifying their meaning or relations. According to Leung, conjunctions have been studied under various labels and have drawn much attention from various scholars in the field of English/Linguistics over time: Halliday and Hasan treat them as "linguistic devices that create cohesion", while Sanders and Maat describe them as a "semantic relation that is explicitly marked". According to Er, as cited by Aidinlou and Reshadi, conjunctions are a "semantic connection between two clauses". Furthermore, Leung cites four scholars in this regard. These are: Schiffrin, who treats conjunctions as "discourse markers", Fraser considers them as a "pragmatic class of lexical expressions", or simply, "pragmatic markers", while Rouchota states that conjunctions "encode different meanings, and that they can be a procedural device", and lastly, Caron conceives conjunctions simply as being used "to express various kinds of relations between utterances". Aside from the scholars mentioned above, others most generally conceive conjunctions as linkers or connectors that join two words, phrases, clauses or sentences together, either in speech or in writing. To this end, Leech and Svartvik note, "Clauses or phrases may be linked together (coordinated) by conjunctions". They further state that conjunction or coordination can also link two words of the same word class. Aarts says, "Conjunctions belong to a closed class of words that have a linking function".   According to Roberts, conjunctions perform the function of joining any two or more sentences together to form another coordinate sentence. Speaking from the same viewpoint, Lester states that conjunctions join words or groups of words. In the words of Eckhard-Black, "A conjunction stands between two words, phrases or clauses and links them". Similarly, Carnie says

that "Coordinate structures are constituents linked by conjunctions like and or". In addition, Kirkpatrick states that "A conjunction is a linking word used to join words, word groups or clauses". Again, a conjunction, in the words of Murthy, is "A word which joins together sentences or words and clauses". Furthermore, Baskervill and Sewel say that "Unlike adverbs, conjunctions do not modify but they are just solely for the purpose of connecting". As noted by Kirksten, "Conjunction is an indeclinable part of speech that links other parts of speech, in company with which it has significance, by classifying their meaning or relations".

There are traditionally basically three types of conjunctions, which are: coordinating, subordinating, and correlative conjunctions. Semantically, Halliday and Hasan on their part, propose four types of conjunction that ensure cohesion in English generally Additive Conjunctions act to structurally coordinate or link by adding to proposed item and are signaled by *and, also, furthermore, in addition,* etc. Additive conjunctions may also act to **negate** the proposed item and are signalled by *nor, and … no, neither*.

1. Additive conjunctions can be classified into the following semantic groups:

- *alternative*, e.g. *or, or else, alternatively;*

- *after-thought (or conjunct)*, e.g. *incidentally, by the way;*

- *expository*, e.g. *that is, I mean, in other words;*

- *exemplificatory*, e.g. *for instance, thus*;

- *comparing similarity*, e.g. *likewise, similarly, in the same way (*or *in the same vein);*

- *comparing dissimilarity*, e.g. *on the other hand, by contrast, on the contrary*.

2. Adversative Conjunctions are used to express comparison or contrast between sentences and they include *but, on the other hand, however, yet, though, only*. Kinds of adversative conjunctions make a semantic group including:

- *emphatic*, e.g. *nevertheless, despite this;*

- *contrastive avowal*, e.g. *in fact, actually, as a matter of fact;*

- *correction of meaning*, e.g. *instead, rather, at least;*

- *closed dismissal*, e.g. *in any case, in either case, whichever way it is;*

- *open-ended dismissal*, e.g. *any how, at any rate, however it is*.

3. Causal Conjunctions express the cause or reason of what is being stated. They include: *then, so, hence, therefore*. Kinds of clausal conjunction include the following semantic groups:

- *reason*, e.g. *for this reason, on account of this, on this basis, it follows;*

- *result*, e.g. *as a result, in consequence, arising out of this*

- *purpose*, e.g. *for this purpose, with this in mind, to this end;*

- *simple emphatic*, e.g. *in that case, in such an event, that being so*;

- *direct respective*, e.g. *in this respect, in this regard, with reference to this;*

- *reversed polarity*, e.g. *otherwise, under other circumstances, in other respects, aside from this*.

4. Temporal conjunctions represent sequence relationships between clauses and they include: *next, secondly, then, in the end*. Semantic groups of temporal conjunction include:

- **simultaneous**, e.g. *just then, at the same time;*

- **preceding**, e.g. *previously, formerly, before that;*

- **conclusive**, e.g. *finally, at last, in conclusion;*

- **immediate**, e.g. *at once, thereupon, forthwith;*

- **repetitive**, e.g. *next time, on another occasion, later;*

- **specific**, e.g. *next day, an hour later;*

- **durative**, e.g. *meanwhile, in the interim, for the time being;* **here and now**. This is divided into three – (a) **past**, e.g. *up to now, last time;* (b) **present**, e.g. *at this point, here, now* and (c) **future**, e.g. *from now on, henceforth* (or *henceforward*); **summarizing**, e.g. *to sum up, in short, briefly;* **resumptive**, e.g. *to resume, to return to the point.*

Moreover, Halliday, as cited by Saya and Fatemi, further classifies conjunction into three more abstract types: **elaboration, extension** and **enhancement**. **Elaboration** includes apposition like *in other words* and clarification like *rather*. **Extension** includes addition and variation like *alternatively*. **Enhancement** includes spatial-temporal like *there, previously* and causal-conditional like *consequently* and *in that case.*

According to Baskervill and Sewell, subordinating conjunctions are divided into following semantic groups. They include: time, consider them one after another: **I. Time.** These are subordinators that express consequence in time or succession in time between clauses. Examples include: *before, after, till, since, when, while,* etc. Sentential examples:

(a) Mary had left *before* my arrival.
(b) I began my work *after* they had gone.
(c) I have not seen Mercy *since* she was married.
(d) She will be happy *when* her mother returns from the market.
(e) He was speaking with his friends *while* I was trying to sleep.

II. Cause or Reason. These are subordinators that express causal relations in the simplest form that mean „as a result of this" or „because of this". Examples include: *because, since, as,* and *for.* Sentential examples:

(a) He travelled home *because* of the death of his mother.
(b) *Since* it is dark, take the torch with you.
(c) *As* she is my sister, I like her.

III. Result or Consequence. Result/consequence and cause/reason are closely related but the main subordinator here is *so* and *that*. These have the relation that is expressed to mean „for this reason" which leads to something else. Sentential examples:

(a) He talked *so* fast that I could not understand him.
(b) I was so tired *that* I could not eat after cooking.

IV. Purpose. Purpose and cause/reason are closely related and the subordinators involved have the sense of „for this reason" or „for this purpose". They include: *that, so that, in order that, lest,* etc. Sentential examples:

(a) We eat *that* we may live.
(b) I will help him now *so that* he can help me tomorrow
(c) Emeka travelled to Abuja *in order that* he could see his brother.

(d) He walked quietly *lest* he should wake the child.

V. Condition. According to Quirk and Greenbaum, conditional subordinators state the dependence of one circumstance or set of circumstances on another. The main subordinators in English are *if* and *unless*. The *if*-clause could either be a positive or a negative condition while the *unless*-clause is a negative one.

Conclusion

Conjunctions contribute to discourse structure by indicating the semantic meaning or relationship between what has been said and what is to come. As reported by Schleppegrell, this they do by creating cohesion in texts, either spoken or written, by indicating linkages across varying spans of discourse, and by signaling transitions and displaying the purpose or direction of development of the discourse. Note that there are instances where, though a conjunction "stands" between two words, phrases, clauses or sentences, it is strikingly and unusually far from being used as performing a linking function. Such an instance involves the most frequently used conjunction (or coordinator) and. According to Lang, as cited by Hertwig, Benz and Krauss, its commonness and plainness as the most general connective in English language do not mean that it lacks the ability to convey a wider range of relationships between the state of affairs described by the conjuncts.   In fact, one reason for linguists enduring fascination with and is that among all coordinating conjunctions, e.g. or, but; it has the least semantic and syntactic limits, the least specific meaning, and the highest context dependency.

References

1. Ilyish B. The structure of Modern English, - L.: Prosveshcheniye, 1971. – 365p.

2. Kaushanska V.L. English Grammar, - L.: Prosveshcheniye, 1963. – 311 p.

3. New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English language. Devicon Publications, Inc. Danbury, CT 1993. - 1149p.

4. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English // Editor Jonathon Crouther. Oxford University Press, 1995. - 393p.

5. Mirzayeva, D. (2019). PROVERB AS A KIND OF PAREMIOLOGICAL FUND AND AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC AND METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH. *Мировая наука*, (11), 33-36.

6. Mirzayeva, D. (2019). THE CONCEPT OF" FRIENDSHIP" IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LINGUISTIC CULTURE. *Мировая наука,* (11), 29-32.

7. Mirzayeva, D. (2020). OCCURRENCE OF PRAGMALINGUISTIC FEATURES OF PAREMIAS. In *ФИЛОСОФИЯ ИННОВАЦИЙ И СОЦИОЛОГИЯ БУДУЩЕГО В ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ КУЛЬТУРЫ: НАУЧНЫЙ ДИАЛОГ* (pp. 233-235).

8. Mirzaeva, D. (2021). THE ROLE OF PAREMIA IN THE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL CULTURAL HERITAGE. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, *2*(3).

9. Mirzayeva, D. (2021). PROVERBS AND SAYINGS AS A PRODUCT OF THE NATION'S COGNITIVE THINKING. In *Multidiscipline Proceedings of Digital Fashion Conference* (Vol. 1, No. 2).

10. Mirzayeva, D. I., & Ergasheva, N. T. (2021). A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS VERBALIZING THE CONCEPT OF" LOVE" IN ENGLISH

AND UZBEK. *CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758)*, *2*(11), 117-123.

11. Nasriddinovna, S. Z. (2022, April). CLASSIFICATION OF SYNTACTIC RELATIONS IN COMPOUND SENTENCES. In *International Conference on Research Identity, Value and Ethics* (pp. 121-123).

12. Nasriddinovna, S. Z. ional Study of Syntactical Relations o pound Sentences in Uzbek Linguistics.

13. Ulugbekovich, R. A. Formation of Styles of Managerial Thinking as a Factor in the Preparation of a Future Specialist for Managerial Activities in the Field of Physical Culture and Sports. *JournalNX*, *7*(03), 172-176.

14. Khakimov, M. K. (2021). VISUAL POETIC TEXTS AS MULTISEMIOTIC SYSTEM. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (8), 185-188.

15. Maxmudova, O. (2022). ONA TILINI ZAMONAVIY TEXNOLOGIYALAR ASOSIDA O 'RGANISH. *Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS)*, *2*(Special Issue 4), 97-104.

16. Usmonova, D. (2022). TO STUDY THE IMPORTANCE OF TRANSPOSITION OF WORD CATEGORIES IN ENGLISH. *O'ZBEKISTONDA FANLARARO INNOVATSIYALAR VA ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI*, *1*(10), 128-131.

17. Shodieva, G. (2022). TO STUDY THE IMPORTANCE OF TRANSPOSITION OF WORD CATEGORIES IN ENGLISH. *Science and innovation*, *1*(B5), 506-509.

18. Toxirjonovna, O. M. (2021, October). SOZ TURKUMLARINI TASNIFLASHDA INTERFAOL METODLARDAN UNUMLI FOYDALANISH JARAYONIDA KOMPETENSIYAVIY USULLARNING QOLLANISHI. In *" ONLINE-CONFERENCES" PLATFORM* (pp. 219-224).

19. Khakimov, M. K. (2021). VISUAL POETIC TEXTS AS MULTISEMIOTIC SYSTEM. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (8), 185-188.

20. Юнусова, X. (2022). Verbo-visual figures in poetic texts. *Globallashuv davrida tilshunoslik va adabiyotshunoslik taraqqiyoti hamda ta'lim texnologiyalari*, *1*(1), 73-76.