

З.Х. Бобоева (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)

Сравнительный анализ моносубъектных сложносочиненных предложений в таджикском и английском языках

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются вопросы, связанные с сопоставительным анализом моносубъектных сложносочиненных предложений в таджикском и английском языках. Отмечается, что основой такого подхода является описание различных действий, совершаемых одним субъектом. Каждое из сказуемых дает описание отдельного сегмента экстралингвистической ситуации. Поэтому применительно к предложениям данного типа следует говорить о нескольких предикативных признаках моносубъектных.

Ключевые слова: сопоставительный анализ, моносубъектные сложносочиненные предложения, таджикский и английский языки

Z.H. Boboeva (Khujand, Republic of Tajikistan)

Comparative Analysis of Monosubjective Coordinative Compound Sentences in Tajik and English

Abstract: The given article dwells on issues beset with the comparative analysis of monosubjective coordinative compound sentences in Tajik and English. It is noted that the basis for such an approach is the description of various actions performed by one subject. Each of such predicates provides a description of a separate segment of the extralinguistic situation. Therefore, in sentences of this type, we should talk about several predicative features of mono-subjective ones.

Key words: comparative analysis, monosubjective coordinative compound sentences, Tajik and English

INTRODUCTION

It is common-knowledge that compound sentences and their status in syntax are debatable, because the relevant topic began to be studied theoretically, starting from the 50-ies of the 20th century. Therefore, some of its aspects are considered controversial or in need of a more profound and more detailed consideration. Such aspects include such sentences in which there are several predicates with their complements and their constants with one subject. In reference to it, the status of such sentences is controversial

one, certain scholars in linguistic studies consider them simple sentence, and others – composite ones:

1) *Ana baro-i hamin holo kassobon-i musulmon honvare-ro kushtani shavand, avval kord-ro ba gul-i on se bor molida megirand, faqat bad-i in dam-i kord-ro durustar paxsh mekunand. Baro-i hamin ham dar in jo dar void-i muborak-i Mino dar se joy hai-kal-i shayton-i lain-ro soxta mondaand, to ki musulmonon har sol yak bor jam' shuda, se ruz intiqom-i Halilullo va pisar-i on hazrat-ro bisitonand* [4: 234].

2) *In hama jarohatu zaxmho-i xunfishon-i dil-i mardum va xarobiho-i ruzgor-ro party-i dar nabardho-i shadid obutobyofta-i mo chun dahoi xushtadbir va tabib-i hoziq davo kard. Shikastaho-ro payvast, durho-ro nazdik namud, shahru dehot-i zebo bunyod kard, hayot-ro farxundavu guvoro va diyor-i aziz-ro muattaru shahadbor namud, xalq-ro ba murod rasond, zamin-i muqaddasu ruzirason-ro gulpushu obod gardond* [5: 51].

1) *Just such an evening, six years ago, he had walked the towing-path with Fleur, had separated from her, waited to see her look back and wave her hand* [15: 94].

2) *Troy then came on towards his wife, stepped into the gig, took the reins from her hand, and without making any observation whipped the horse into a trot* [16: 261].

In the first Tajik example, with one subject “qassobon”, there are three predicates: *kushta meshavand, molida megirand, paxsh mekunad*. And in the second example, the predicates: “*payvast namud, nazdik namud, bunyod kard, shahd bor namud, rasond, obod gardond*” do not even have a subject. Their subject is given in the previous sentence.

In the first English example, the single subject “he” has the predicates *had worked, had separated, and waited*. In the second example, the subject “Troy” has four predicates: *came on, stepped, took, and whipped*.

MAIN RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The article under consideration dwells on sentences of the category in English and Tajik [3; 11; 12].

We have not found any information on the structural status of sentences of this type in either English or Tajik grammars, or in relevant scientific works on Tajik and English. Sentences of this type are most likely considered simple, in which homogeneous predicates are found. In particular, in the textbook *English Grammar*, the authors find homogeneous predicates in the following two sentences.

We start our discussion with the following examples:

1) *She took the vase of roses, and left the room* (15).

2) *At the edge of the wood the bluebells had flowed over into the field and stood there like flood-water* (17).

These sentences, consisting of one subject and two or more predicates, are called fused by scientists. They dwell on such sentences in the chapter devoted to homogeneous members of a sentence. Proceeding from the relevant assumption, it becomes clear that such formations, according to the authors of the specified textbook are not compound sentences.

Exactly the same picture is observed in Tajik. In the sentence “*Harchi boshad, dil-i man tangi kard, yo yagon bazm kofta meravem va yo bargashta ba hujra mexobem*” (S. Aini) two homogeneous predicates are seen [3: 301].

Professor M.Ya. Blokh turned his attention to the status of such sentences. He analyzes sentences of the following type: *Philip ignored the question and remained silent*. In such sentences M.Ya. Blokh [13: 302] sees compound sentences, although there is one subject and two predicates. According to M.Ya. Blokh, such sentences cannot be

analyzed as simple sentences, since they contain more than one predicative group, although they are presented as one fused unit.

M.Ya. Blokh calls sentences of this type compound sentences with a simplified structure (concise composition), and CSSs (coordinative compound sentences) containing all the necessary structural components – CSSs with a complete structure (complete composition).

As a rule, compound sentences are divided into two groups: compound sentences with a complete structure and compound sentences with a defective structure. The former in question is classified by the following types of sentences as CSSs with a complete structure:

1) *She held the screen door open and the man came in...* [18: 179];

2) *There cracks in the cement on the main terrace, the winter garden is droughty, and one comes disconcertingly upon derelict bathchairs in the Moorish Court* [20: 106].

In the first two examples, there are two CSSs with a complete structure. In the example numbered one, CSSs consists of two simple sentences, each of which has its own subject (she, the man). These subjects have their own predicates (held, come in). In the example numbered two, CSSs has three predicative units.

Each of them has its own subject and its own predicate (there... *cracks* + *are*; *garden* + *is droughty*; *one* + *comes*).

The following syntactic formations can be attributed to the simplified structure of CSSs.

For example:

1) *Mr. Chollop was a man of roving disposition; and in any less advanced community, might have been mistaken for a violent vagabond* [14: 116].

2) *I went at it – kitchen all upset, had to open at least twenty tins to get the coffee* [17: 113].

In the second case, the first sentence consists of two predicative units.

The first predicative unit is *Mr. Chollop was a man of aroving disposition*, and the second predicative unit is a non-subject sentence: *might have been mistaken for a violent vagabond*. Here the subject is elliptical, but it is implied by the previous sentence, which has the subject *Mr. Chollop*. The predicates *was a man...* and *might have been mistaken* cannot be considered homogeneous, since the first predicate (*was a man...*) is nominal, and the second *might have been mistaken* is a verbal predicate.

In the second example, there are three predicative groups, two of which have an elliptical structure. In the formation of *kitchen allupset* the linking verb *was* is elliptical *kitchen was allupset*, and in the following sentence the pronoun *I* is omitted before the word *had*. The relevant sentence suggests the formation of the following structure: *I went at it, the kitchen was all upset, I had to open at least twenty tins to get the coffee*.

Therefore, in the first examples, CSSs with a complete structure function, and in the last two examples, one should see CSSs with a truncated structure.

The functioning of syntactic formations of this kind is also discussed in the dissertation research of L.V. Shubb [10: 6]. Studying this phenomenon on the material of the French language, the author comes to the conclusion that such constructions have those features that allow them to be considered as compound sentences. In such formations, she finds structural incompleteness, manifested in the absence of a formally expressed subject in the second and subsequent predicative components of this construction. Predicates of such formations can be connected with the help of coordinating conjunctions or without conjunctions. Predicative units of such formations have a uniform function.

T.V. Pankratova, studying the Russian conjunctions “a, i, no”, calls a sentence with one subject and two or more predicates a mono-subject compound sentence with an eliminated subject [6: 18].

The provisions of M.Ya. Blokh's theory are applicable to the material of the Tajik language:

1) *Shabtorik, barf meborid, loi, barf va yaxolud-i kuchahoi Dushanbe to miyon-i aspu odam mebaroyad* [1: 259].

2) *Asiri ba'ze satrho-ro takrorkunon mexondu chehra-i Yusufxon eshon toraft tiratar megardid* [9: 212].

The first CSSs contains three simple sentences, each of them has its own subject and predicate. In the second example, CSSs consist of two predicative units. Each of them has its own subject and predicate. According to M.Ya. Blokh, they can be called CSSs with a complete structure.

The following two examples show a different picture:

1) *Yodgor aknun ozod shuda bud va ozodona ba har taraf megasht, ammo ba kujo raftanash-ro namedonist...* [1: 232].

2) *Man bo yak-e az muovinonho-i director ba didani dastgoh-i avtomati raftam va pas az in ba fabrika-i seyum-i kombinat omadam* [9: 200].

Hence, with one subject *Yodgor* there are three predicates *ozod shuda bud* – *freed*, *ozodona megasht* – *walked freely*, *namedonist* – *did not know*, and in the second example with one subject there are two predicates *raftam*, *omadam*.

According to M.Ya. Blokh's theory, these two sentences should be considered as CSSs with a simplified structure.

Following Professor M.Ya. Blokh, we classify sentences of this type as compound sentences. We support this idea with the following facts:

Firstly, each predicate can have different types of complements and circumstances. Into the bargain, one predicate can have a direct complement and an adverbial clause of place, while another predicate can have an indirect complement and an adverbial clause of time. Or one predicate can have an adverbial clause of manner, while another can have an adverbial clause of comparison. Given the different types of complements or circumstances in each predicate of sentences of this category, it is impossible to speak of their homogeneity. We can speak of homogeneous predicates only in cases where the predicates do not have their own complements. Or the complements of the predicates are of the same type, i. e., both predicates have a direct complement or an adverbial clause of time.

For example: *Piramard payola-i choi-ro ba dast giriftu pora-i non-e ba dahon kard* [7: 23], *Ba oshxona meraftamu rah to rah xudo-xodo meguftam* [8, II: 246]; *Arthur signed the receipt, took his papers, and went out in dead silence* [19: 71], *Val nodded, and sighed* [15: 158].

In these two examples, in the comparative languages one can see homogeneous subjects, but in the following two sentences one cannot speak of homogeneous subjects: *Enrico shrugged, his shoulders moved on again* (E. Voynich, 70); *Hidoyat aknun serkor ast. Qishloq ba qishloq megardadu ba kasalho nigohubin mekunad* [8, II: 253].

Secondly, the time plan of the verbs-predicates related to one sentence can be heterogeneous and in such a case it is impossible to speak about homogeneous predicates, since each predicate describes events that occur in different situational conditions. For example: *They have gone with the mistress to an evening party, and will not be back till nearly twelve* (E. Voynich, 73); *Arbob Kamol ba shunidan-i in mojaro misl-i sher-i daranda ghurridan girift va dar zer-i lab-i xud meguft* [2: 13].

Thirdly, each predicate with its complements in mono-subject sentences serves to describe a separate fragment of an extralinguistic situation. For example: *Hazrat kam ne, ziyod ham ne bistudu nafar zanu kaniz doshtand, to oxir-i umr az xizmat-i*

zanu kanizakho-i sershumor rozi budand, bo vujud-i in dar qonun va qoidaho-i kashfkardaashon nazar ba jonvar-i oddi-i xonagi qadr-e balandtar guzoshtan-i martaba va qadru qimmat-i zanho-ro joiz nadonistand. Xud-i hazrat ham az modar tavallud yoftand, ammo dar Quron-i sharif bo xat-i zarin navishtaand, ki "zan az jins-i past buda, dar nazd-i ilohi qurbu manzalat-e naradad" [4: 273]; He sealed this up, addressed it to her at Dorking, and, pulling on his boots, again stole out and posted it. When he got back he felt so tired, that, wrapped in an old coat, he fell asleep in an armchair. The moonlight played tricks through the half-drawn curtains, the old clock ticked, but Jon slept, dreamless [15: 228].

The Tajik example indicates the following predicative peculiarities of the subject *hazrat* meaning *honorable*: 1) *Hazrat* had twenty-two wives (servants). 2) He was content with serving his wives and the work of his servants. 3) He did not value the merit and value of a woman higher than the price of animals.

If we take into account that the relevant sentence provides heterogeneous peculiarities of the specified subject, then there is no reason to consider the syntactic formation in question as a simple sentence with homogeneous predicates. Here we have a compound sentence, since each predicate invokes a separate predicative feature of the subject *hazrat*.

At the same time, in English, four predicative peculiarities of mono-subject are presented, and one of them is expressed by dint of the participle I (*pulling on his boots*). Each of these predicates characterizes the subject differently. Therefore, both English and Tajik examples should be considered as compound sentences.

Fourthly, in sentences of the specified type, the process of elliptical subject occurs due to the fact that elliptical subjects constitute the topic of the given utterance, and predicates constitute its rheme, and each subsequent rheme-predicate is more relevant than the previous one.

The following example can be given of the process of elliptical subject: 1) *Troy heard the dull determination in Boldwood's voice, looked at his stalwart frame, at the thick cudgel he carried in his hand. He remembered it was past ten o'clock. It seemed worthwhile to be civil to Boldwood [16: 227].*

As we can see, in this sentence the subject *Troy* has two predicates – *heard* and *looked*, and in the third case there is also a predicate *carried in*, which has its own subject *he*, which is in an anaphoric relationship with the subject *Troy*. Therefore, it is possible to put the same anaphoric subject before the predicate *looked*. Based on this, we believe that in the second predicate (*looked*) the carrier of the predicative feature is truncated due to its irrelevance.

In Tajik, there are numerous cases when a sentence with two or more predicates does not have a subject at all. It can be restored from the previous context: *Navbat ba taftish va koftukov-i borho omad, kulvor va xurjinho-ro yagon-yagon kushodand, har mato-e, ki ba nazarashon xubtar menamud, yake-ro-in savghoti-i mo, digare-ro-in ba janob-i mir-i hokim munosib ast va on-i digar-ro-in baro-i begijon bisyor muvofiq ast gufta megiriftand [2: 60].*

There are several predicates in this sentence. Only the first predicate has a subject, *navbat* (*queue*), while the predicates *kushodan* (*to open*) and *giriftand* (*to take*) lack a subject. To find this subject, we had to read one and a half pages of text placed before this sentence. It turned out to be the word *zakotchi* (*collector of zakat*) and *navkaron* (*assistant, military servant*).

The former in question indicates that the presence of a subject in Tajik poly-predicative sentences is not a mandatory condition, since the inflection of the person and number of the predicate verb informs about the bearer of the predicative feature.

CONCLUSION

Thus, we are inclined to expand the boundaries of compound sentences by such sentences, which have two or more predicates with their complements with one subject in the comparative languages or without any subject in Tajik. The basis for such an approach is the description of various actions performed by one subject. Each of such predicates provides a description of a separate segment of the extralinguistic situation. Therefore, in sentences of this type, we should talk about several predicative features of one subject.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Айнӣ С.* Дохунда. Душанбе: Ирфон, 1984. 429 с.
2. *Айнӣ С.* Одина. Душанбе: Маориф, 1967. 167с.
3. Грамматикаи забони адабии ҳозираи тоҷик. Ҷумлаҳои мураккаб. Ҷ.3. Душанбе: До-ниш, 1989. 245 с.
4. *Муҳаммадиев Ф.* Куллийет. Ҷ.3. Душанбе: Адиб, 1990. 387 с.
5. *Насриддинов Б.* Саодат ёратон бод. Дар китоби Лолаҳои кӯҳсор. Душанбе: Адиб, 1987. 328 с.
6. *Панкратова Т.В.* Сочинительные союзы «а», «но» («and» «but») в русских и англий-ских синонимичных и изоморфных синтаксических конструкциях: Автореферат дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Ростов н/Д, 2007. 30 с.
7. *Толис П.* Ҳикояҳои даҳсол. Душанбе: Адиб, 1957. 398 с.
8. *Ҷалил Р.* Асарҳои мунтахаб. Ҷ.2. Душанбе: Адиб, 1988. 303 с.
9. *Ҷалил Р.* Маъвои дил. Душанбе: Ирфон, 1972. 449 с.
10. *Шубб Л.В.* Моносубъектные сложносочиненные предложения в современном фран-цузском языке: Автореферат дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 2000. 23 с.
11. *Ashrapov B.P.* Comparative Analysis of Morphological Peculiarities and Level of Usage of the Nominal Suffix *-zor* in the Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th and 20th centu-ries // *Stephanos*. 2023. № 5(61). P. 33–38. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2023-61-5-33-38; EDN RVPRET.
12. *Ashrapov B.P.* Word-Building Potential and Morphological Peculiarities of the Suffix *-ča* in Modern Tajik Literary Language // *Stephanos*. 2024. № 3(65). P. 72–76. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2024-65-3-72-76
13. *Блох М.Я.* Теоретическая грамматика английского языка: English Grammar. A course in theoretical English grammar. М.: Высшая школа, 1983. 382 с.
14. *Dickens Ch.* Martin Chuzzlewit. Vol. II. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1951. 448 p.
15. *Galsworthy J.* Modern Comedy. Book 3. Moscow: Progress, 1976. 327 p.
16. *Hardy Th.* Far from the Madding Croud. London: Press Publ., 1967. 423 p.
17. *Leacock S.* Perfect Lover's Guide and other Stories. Moscow: Foreign Language Pub-lishing House, 1963. 406 p.
18. *Steinbeck J.* The Grapes of Wrath. Moscow: Progress, 1978. 437 p.
19. *Voynich E.* The Gadfly. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1954. 435 p.
20. *Waugh E.* Prose Memoirs Essays. Moscow: Progress, 1980. 322 p.

REFERENCES

1. Aini S. (1984) Dokhunda. Dushanbe. Cognition Publ. 429 p.
2. Aini S. (1967) Odina. Dushanbe. Enlightenment Publ. 167 p.
3. Grammar of Modern Tajik Literary Languages. Compound Sentences. Vol. 3. Dushanbe. Knowledge Publ. 1989. 245 p.
4. Muhammadiyev F. (1990) Kulliyot. Vol. 3. Dushanbe. Man-of-Letters Publ. 387 p.
5. Nasriddinov B. (1987) Saodat yoraton bod. Gift of Kitobi Lolahoi kugsor. Dushanbe. Man-of-Letters Publ. 328 p.
6. Pankratova T.V. (2007) Coordinating Conjunctions “a”, “но” (“and”, “but”) in Russian and English Synonymous and Isomorphic Syntactic Constructions: Author’s abstract. diss. ... candidate of philological sciences. Rostov-on-Don. 30 p.
7. Tolis P. (1957) Ten-years Stories. Dushanbe. Man-of-Letters Publ. 398 p.
8. Jalil R. (1988) Selected Works. Vol. 2. Dushanbe. Man-of-Letters Publ. 303 p.
9. Jalil R. (1972) Heart’s Haven. Dushanbe. Cognition Publ. 449 p.
10. Shubb L.V. (2000) Monosubject Compound Sentences in Modern French: Author’s abstract. diss. ... cand. philological sciences. Moscow. 23 p.
11. Ashrapov B.P. Comparative Analysis of Morphological Peculiarities and Level of Usage of the Nominal Suffix *-zor* in the Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th and 20th centuries. *Stephanos*. 2023. No 5(61), pp. 33–38. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2023-61-5-33-38; EDN RVPRET.
12. Ashrapov B.P. Word-Building Potential and Morphological Peculiarities of the Suffix *-ča* in Modern Tajik Literary Language. *Stephanos*. 2024. No 3(65), pp. 72–76. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2024-65-3-72-76
13. Blokh M.Y. (1983) English Grammar: A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow. Vysshaya Shkola Publ. 382 p.
14. Dickens Ch. Martin Chuzzlewit. Vol. II. Moscow. Foreign Language Publishing House. 1951. 448 p.
15. Galsworthy J. Modern Comedy. Book 3. Moscow. Progress Publ. 1976. 327 p.
16. Hardy Th. (1967) Far from the Madding Croud. London. Press Publ. 423 p.
17. Leacock S. (1963) Perfect Lover’s Guide and other Stories. Moscow. Foreign Language Publishing House. 406 p.
18. Steinbeck J. (1978) The Grapes of Wrath. Moscow. Foreign Language Publishing House. 437 p.
19. Voynich E. (1954) The Gadfly. Moscow. Foreign Language Publishing House. 435 p.
20. Waugh E. (1980) Prose Memoirs Essays. Moscow. Progress Publ. 322 p.

Сведения об авторе:

Зайнуро Хомитжоновна Бобоева,
канд. филол. наук
доцент
факультет иностранных языков
Худжандский государственный университет
имени академика Бободжона Гафурова

Zaynura H. Boboeva,
PhD
Associate Professor
Faculty of Foreign Languages
Khujand State University named
after academician Bobojon Gafurov

z.boboeva@mail.ru