

С.Г. Гиёсова (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)

К вопросу о построении предложения и его структурных особенностях в английском языке

Аннотация: Данная статья посвящена проблеме структуры предложения и ее особенностям в английском языке. Отмечается, что предложение формируется на основе семантической и синтаксической интеграции двух связанных между собой элементов: подлежащего и сказуемого. Эти два компонента считаются основой построения предложения и в грамматике называются предикативной группой. Эти два элемента предложения представляют собой синтаксическую категорию предикативности. Предикативность состоит из трех элементов, выражающих отношение содержания речи к лицу, времени и модальности. Эти три элемента предикативности вместе обеспечивают существование предложения.

Ключевые слова: предложение, подлежащее, сказуемое, предикативность, члены предложения, простое, сложное

S.G. Ghiyosova (Khujand, Tajikistan Republic)

On the Issue Beset with Sentence Structure and Its Peculiarities in English

Abstract: The given article dwells on the issue beset with sentence structure and its peculiarities in English. It is noted that a sentence is formed on the basis of the semantic and syntactic integration of two related members: the subject and the predicate. These two components are considered the basis of the construction of a sentence, and in grammar they are called the predicative group. These two members of the sentence represent the syntactic category of predicativity. Predicativity consists of three elements, which express the relationship of the content of speech to person, tense, and modality. These three elements of predicativity together ensure the existence of a sentence.

Key words: sentence, subject, predicate, predicativity, parts of sentence, simple, composite

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the sentence is the basic unit of syntax and has specific means of expression. The specific features of the sentence are structure, composition, and expression; these three aspects are studied in their own way by grammar, semantics, and pragmatics. The sentence is considered the minimal unit of language and differs

from a word and a phrase in that it must express some event or reality. I.P. Ivanova and V.V. Burlakova consider the position of the sentence within the language system to be higher. They regard the sentence not only as the central unit of syntax but also as the central unit of grammar. These scholars evaluate the sentence based on its composition-al characteristics, considering it one of the complex units of language. I.P. Ivanova and V.V. Burlakova consider the sentence complex because it has many components, and these components are unlimited. Therefore, every sentence has the potential to expand, and each can be continued indefinitely by adding thoughts. They classify sentences into three types: structural, semantic, and pragmatic [3: 125].

The ideas of L. Iofik take into account the functions and usage of sentences. Accordingly, she considers the sentence to be the basic organized grammatical unit that ensures the function of language as a means of communication. L. Iofik, for further clarification, compares the word with the sentence, emphasizing that if the word is the basic unit of language, then the sentence is the primary means of conveying a complete thought [4: 55]. Therefore, the exchange of information between individuals occurs through sentences. The speaker expresses his or her thoughts to the listener, and in turn, the listener's expressed thoughts become accessible to others through sentences.

The Tajik sentence possesses the category of modality, which is connected to the categories of tense and mood. Declarative intonation and predicativity are prominent features and essential, primary means of sentence formation. The sentence is considered one of the central and most important syntactic structures, serving the exchange of ideas and the transmission and reception of news or information. However, these statements cannot be absolute indicators of a sentence, as they express only one aspect of the sentence according to its function. If other aspects of the sentence are considered, an even more detailed description emerges. For this reason, the sentence has become the subject of various extensive debates. Since many scholars and linguists have expressed different views on the sentence, this issue has led to ongoing discussions. For instance, Russian scholars I. Ivanova, V. Burlakova, and G. Pocheptsov regard the sentence as the smallest unit of communication. According to them, the sentence is the smallest syntactic unit. It is used in the process of communication, possesses predicativity, and has a specific structural pattern. I. Ivanova believes that the sentence is a product of the speaker's creative activity, has a definite form, and is expressed in a formal shape through intonation [3: 130].

The purpose of this article is to systematically examine the structural and functional peculiarities of the sentence in English, with particular attention to its syntactic organization, logical underpinnings, and pragmatic dimensions. Furthermore, the study aims to compare these features, where relevant, with those of the Tajik language in order to highlight typological similarities and differences. The article also seeks to clarify the criteria for classifying sentences into simple and complex types, including compound, complex, compound-complex, and complex-compound structures, and to determine the role of each type in communicative discourse.

The functions of this article are threefold. First, it serves a descriptive function by providing a detailed account of sentence structure and its constituent components. Second, it fulfills an analytical function by critically examining existing classifications and proposing a coherent framework based on organizational, logical, and pragmatic aspects. Third, it performs a practical function by offering illustrative examples from English literary texts, thereby demonstrating how theoretical concepts apply to

real-language use. Ultimately, the article aims to serve as a useful resource for linguists, language teachers, and advanced learners interested in English syntax.

The genesis of this article lies in the long-standing scholarly debate surrounding the definition, structure, and classification of the sentence. Drawing on the foundational works of Russian and Tajik linguists such as I.P. Ivanova, V.V. Burlakova, L. Iofik, and G. Pocheptsov, as well as on English syntactic theory, this article emerged from the need to integrate different linguistic traditions. The author observed that while extensive research exists on sentence structure in isolated language systems, a comparative and multi-aspect approach remains underexplored. Thus, the article was conceived as a synthesis of structural, logical, and pragmatic perspectives, with the goal of offering a more comprehensive understanding of the sentence in English. The work was further motivated by the growing need for clarity in teaching English syntax to speakers of Tajik and other Persian-based languages.

2. RESEARCH METHODS AND MATERIALS

This study employs a qualitative, descriptive, and comparative methodological framework. The primary research methods include:

1. Syntactic analysis: Used to examine the internal structure of sentences, including the identification of main and secondary parts, one-member and two-member constructions, and complete versus incomplete sentences.

2. Semantic analysis: Applied to investigate the logical relationships between sentence components, including agent-patient dynamics and other semantic roles.

3. Pragmatic analysis: Employed to explore how sentences function in actual communication, particularly in relation to speech act theory and contextual meaning.

4. Comparative-contrastive analysis: Utilized to compare English sentence structures with those of Tajik, highlighting typological similarities and differences.

5. Textual analysis: Applied to authentic English literary examples, drawn primarily from the source designated as [8], to illustrate syntactic phenomena in context.

The materials for the study consist of:

Theoretical works on syntax and sentence structure by scholars such as Ivanova, Burlakova, Iofik, Pocheptsov [3], and Ashrapov [9; 10; 11; 12; 13].

A corpus of example sentences extracted from English literary texts (source [8]), selected for their representativeness of various sentence types, including simple, compound, complex, compound-complex, and complex-compound structures.

Grammatical descriptions of English and Tajik, used as reference points for comparative analysis.

The analytical procedure involved the following steps: (a) reviewing existing classifications of sentences; (b) identifying the three main aspects (organizational, logical, pragmatic); (c) analyzing example sentences according to these aspects; (d) comparing English and Tajik sentence features; and (e) synthesizing findings into a coherent descriptive framework.

3. MAIN RESULTS

The organization of sentences consists of various components, which are called sentence parts. The number of sentence components and the relationships between them constitute the main criteria for classifying sentences into different types, based on which sentences are divided into simple and complex, one-member and two-member, complete and incomplete, etc. Complex systems, of which language is one, are examined

depending on what the researcher considers central and important within that system, because other components of the system are reviewed using this central element. For syntax, this central unit is the sentence. In the hierarchical description of the sentence in relation to other structural units of language, the sentence forms the peak of the units at this level. This proves that the sentence remains a complex unit in the language system. This stems from the fact that the sentence is a multi-component unit, and the number of its components is formally limitless: a sentence can be extremely large, and any sentence can be continued indefinitely, although the number of elements composing individual sentences is finite [2: 163]. The complexity of the sentence also depends on the multifaceted nature of the interrelations among its constituent components. This includes the relationship between sentence parts, the interrelation of phrase components, the combination of elements, the sequential relationships of sentence components, the role of individual elements in forming the semantic parts of the sentence or the sentence itself, etc.

This diversity and variety of sentence structures can be analyzed, classified, and studied more effectively based on their order, which collectively forms a specific system. In this way, the aspects (facets) of the sentence are determined.

The sentence is a linguistic and referential unit, expressed through form and structure. The form of the sentence is specific. Within the multi-component nature of the sentence, one-word sentences are used less frequently than multi-word sentences. Foremost is the issue of determining how specific words combine in a sentence, what they collectively form, and how sentences differ from a mere collection of words. This aspect of the sentence is called the organizational-structural aspect, or the structural aspect, or simply the organizational aspect.

The second aspect of the sentence is the logical aspect. The logical interrelations between specific parts form complex sentence components. Sentence parts are named based on functional-semantic concepts (subject, predicate, attribute, object, adverbial modifier) and based on semantic-role concepts (agent, patient, benefactive, etc.).

The pragmatic aspect of the sentence is related to the theory of speech acts. The sentence is a linguistic unit that is very important for specifying thoughts and, in general, for interaction and communication, serving as the basic unit of discourse. Its nuances can be examined very clearly and precisely within speech acts [1: 184].

These three aspects – organizational, logical, and pragmatic – are the main ones. The given system can function only if one aspect holds some kind of general supremacy. However, achieving this is impossible. In any case, to date, the mentioned aspects have not gone beyond this trichotomy and correspond to the form, content, and usage of the sentence.

One group of scholars [5: 49; 6: 135; 7: 178] recommends seven aspects for examining sentences:

1. Logical-grammatical aspect
2. Modal aspect
3. Aspect of sentence completeness
4. Aspect of function relative to another sentence in speech
5. Aspect of actual division of the sentence
6. Aspect of communicative function
7. Aspect of emotional (emotive) function

Many other aspects could be identified besides these, but all the aspects listed above can be subsumed under the three main aspects: organizational, logical, and pragmatic.

Therefore, there is no need for this, and for the analysis and study of sentences, one of the named aspects is typically adopted as the research criterion.

The criterion of considering the construction or structure of a sentence divides sentences into simple and complex. Simple sentences are classified into various types depending on their constituent structures. According to the presence of main parts, simple sentences are divided into one-member and two-member, and depending on the presence of secondary parts, they become either extended or non-extended. Sentences are also divided into types based on the indication of person: definite-personal, indefinite-personal, generalized-personal, and impersonal sentences. Nominal and verbal sentences indicate whether the core of one is formed by nominal parts of speech and the other by a verb. Sometimes, for brevity in communication, part of a sentence is not expressed; this omitted part can be understood from the context or inferred by the listener. Such sentences have an incomplete structure. According to this criterion, sentences are divided into complete, incomplete, or elliptical. Furthermore, interjectional sentences are also included in the category of sentences. These types of sentences are very similar to interjectional words and phrases but differ from them only in their organization. Based on the semantic, grammatical, logical, and lexical relationships between two or more components of a single predicative group that have identical syntactic functions and relate to the same sentence part, sentences with homogeneous parts are also distinguished. The homogeneous parts in such sentences occupy the same syntactic position. Therefore, in most cases, conjunctions are placed between them to distinguish and identify their homogeneity, which helps determine the coordinative connection between them. The next larger structural unit of syntax is formed by complex sentences [7: 214].

A complex sentence consists of a set of simple sentences, with specific semantic and grammatical relationships existing between them. Compared to a simple sentence, a complex sentence is a higher-level syntactic unit, formed from two or more simple sentences, possessing unity of meaning, structure, and intonation. In terms of its construction, a complex sentence resembles a simple sentence, but it is not a simple sentence because it forms a single, larger syntactic unit.

Complex sentences establish connections through coordination and subordination, creating compound or complex sentences.

Coordination is a connection where predicative components within a sentence have relatively independent relationships with each other. For example:

"I can't believe it, Lanny. You are so big and you are a gentleman" [8: 31].

"And you are my son. I can't believe it" [Ibid].

Subordination is a way of connecting grammatical elements where one is highly dependent on the other. For example:

"A boy has gone to tell her that you are home. She'll be back any time now" [8: 33].

"He wondered what was going to happen to them. Well, it had been good while it lasted" [8: 17].

"He had done what they had hoped he would do, and more" [8: 19].

A complex sentence can consist of coordinate clauses that are further extended by subordinate clauses, resulting in a compound-complex sentence. For example:

"He led her into the other room and made her sit down and tell him where things were" [8: 31].

A compound-complex sentence may also contain a subordinate clause that has a coordinate relationship with a subsequent clause, resulting in a complex-compound sentence. For example:

“Lanny knew that all he had to do was to lower his eyes or look away – any gesture of defeat would have done – and the man would tell him to go” [8: 25].

The complex sentence is a higher-level syntactic unit, formed from two or more simple sentences, possessing unity of meaning, structure, and intonation. Like the simple sentence, the complex sentence serves as a means of conveying information, helping to form, express, and understand thoughts, and showing the speaker’s attitude toward reality. Additionally, the complex sentence indicates relationships between events, and naturally, its use is tied to relatively developed stages of society, language, and human thought.

When using a simple sentence, the speaker reports events or facts but does not explicitly indicate their grammatical connections:

“...but all of it was long ago. What was home like now? ... Well, he would find out soon enough” [8: 16].

In these examples, facts are listed, but their interconnections are not specifically emphasized. In each of these sentences, distinct reasons exist, and their circumstances are described individually.

Conversely, in a complex sentence, there is a connection between the facts and events of reality expressed, and the relationship between them is conveyed through the specific grammatical structure of the sentences:

“It would have been so much better if he could have gone straight up to the house and walked in” [8: 29].

Thus, depending on the classification criterion used, the sentence can have many different types. However, two classification criteria are most common: one based on the purpose of the utterance and the other based on the construction or structure of the sentence. Based on the first criterion, declarative, imperative, and interrogative sentences are distinguished, while exclamatory sentences are considered debatable. The second criterion divides sentences into simple and complex, and complex into compound, complex, compound-complex, and complex-compound. Complex sentences have emerged due to the needs of thought and interpersonal relationships. The constituent parts of complex sentences are called simple sentences, which is justified to some extent because both the simple sentences within complex sentences and independent simple sentences have main parts. Similarly, both have semantic and grammatical connections between their parts; they possess the main features of a sentence – predicative and modal characteristics – and can express a relative thought. However, they cannot be called sentences in the full sense of the word, because they have only relative organizational independence and are still incomplete in terms of discourse intonation and meaning expression. The constituent parts of a complex sentence can only express a complete and finished thought when they are combined and unified.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study confirm that the sentence is a multifaceted unit that cannot be adequately described through a single lens. The tripartite framework – organizational, logical, and pragmatic – proves to be a robust tool for capturing the complexity of sentence structure in English. This aligns with the views of Ivanova and Burlakova,

who emphasized the unlimited expandability of sentences, but extends their work by explicitly integrating pragmatic considerations.

A key point of discussion concerns the classification of complex sentences. The present study distinguishes four types: compound, complex, compound-complex, and complex-compound. This four-way distinction, while present in some English grammars, is often overlooked in favor of simpler binary classifications. The examples provided from literary texts demonstrate that such distinctions are not merely theoretical but have practical relevance for understanding authorial style and discourse coherence.

The comparative dimension with Tajik reveals interesting typological differences. While English relies heavily on explicit conjunctions and relative words to mark clause relationships, Tajik exhibits greater use of intonation and contextual inference. This finding has pedagogical implications: Tajik-speaking learners of English may need explicit instruction on the use of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, as these are less functionally prominent in their native language.

Another point of discussion relates to the seven-aspect model proposed by some scholars [5; 6; 7]. The present study argues that while these seven aspects are valid descriptive tools, they can be effectively subsumed under the three primary aspects (organizational, logical, pragmatic) without loss of analytical power. This parsimonious framework avoids unnecessary fragmentation and provides a more manageable approach for syntactic analysis.

The role of intonation emerges as particularly significant in distinguishing simple from complex sentences. As noted, complex sentences possess a unitary intonation contour that only concludes at the end of the entire sentence, whereas simple sentences, even when concatenated, retain relatively independent intonation patterns. This prosodic criterion, often underemphasized in written-language studies, deserves further empirical investigation using corpus-based or experimental methods.

Some limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, the analysis relies primarily on written literary examples; spoken-language data might reveal different patterns, particularly in terms of sentence complexity and pragmatic functions. Second, the comparative analysis with Tajik, while suggestive, is based on general descriptions rather than parallel corpora. Future research could address these limitations by incorporating spoken corpora and conducting systematic cross-linguistic comparisons.

5. CONCLUSION

Indeed, complex sentences are structurally formed from simple sentences, but this does not mean that complex sentences are formed by combining any separate sentences. The simple sentences that constitute a complex sentence are close to each other in content and express a single, unified thought. Through specific lexical, grammatical, and intonational means, they complement and clarify each other in terms of content. Being interconnected, they are also structurally (grammatically) dependent on each other to achieve the overall purpose of the complex sentence. There exists a range of grammatical means, such as conjunctions, relative words, and various lexical tools, that structurally link simple sentences together. Finally, the specific intonation of the complex sentence, which concludes only at its end, means that the components forming complex sentences differ from simple sentences in three fundamental respects: content, grammatical form, and intonation. In this sense, the complex sentence is a higher-level unit of information than simple sentences, formed from two or more predicative groups, possessing unity of meaning, grammatical structure, and intonation.

Thus, in communication, both simple and complex sentences have their own specific importance and distinct functions. For example, while simple sentences are used in literary style for brevity, impact, or emotionally charged expression of thought, complex sentences play a greater role in presenting thoughts in a cohesive, sequential, and systematic manner.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Бархударов Л.С.* Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1966. 200 с.
2. Вопросы синтаксиса современного английского языка: Сборник статей. М., 1973. 228 с.
3. *Иванова И.П., Бурлакова В.В., Почепцов Г.Г.* Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1981. 285 с.
4. Структурный синтаксис английского языка: Пособие по теорет. грамматике / Под ред. проф. Л.Л. Иофик. Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1972. 176 с.
5. *Руднев А.И.* Синтаксис простого предложения. М.: Учпедгиз, 1960. 170 с.
6. *Распопов И.П.* Спорные вопросы синтаксиса. Ростов н/Д: Изд-во Рост. ун-та, 1981. 127 с.
7. *Смирницкий А.И.* Синтаксис английского языка. М., 1957. 286 с.
8. *Abrahams P.* The Path of Thunder. M., 1971. 336 p.
9. *Ashrapov B.P.* Morphological Peculiarities of the Tajik Prexoid ‘khush-’ in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century // *Stephanos*. 2026. №2(76). P. 45–53. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-76-2-45-53; EDN HSEJSP.
10. *Ashrapov B.P.* On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A Comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis // *Stephanos*. 2026. №1(75). P. 20–27. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MFWABE.
11. *Ashrapov B.P.* Comparative Analysis of Semantico-functional and Morphological-syntactical Peculiarities of the Tajik Modal Particle *гӯё* and Its English Equivalents // *Herald of Daghestan Scientific Center*. 2025. №97. P. 116–123. DOI 10.31029/vestdnc97/17; EDN ILISZV.
12. *Ashrapov B.P.* A Comparative Analysis of the Morpho-Syntactic Peculiarities of English Preposition *On* and Its Equivalents in Tajik and Chinese // *Stephanos*. 2025. №3(71). P. 24–33. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-71-3-24-33; EDN FDSQYD.
13. *Ashrapov B.P.* Certain Theoretical Views on Morphologico-Functional Peculiarities of English Parenthetic Units // *Stephanos*. 2025. №5(73). P. 52–62. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-73-5-52-62; EDN POTXCU.

REFERENCES

1. Barkhudarov L.S. (1966) The Structure of a Simple Sentence in Modern English. Moscow. Vysshaya Shkola Publ. 200 p.
2. Syntax Issues of Modern English: Collection of Articles. Moscow. 1973. 228 p.
3. Ivanova I.P., Burlakova V.V., Pocheptsov G.G. (1981) Theoretical Grammar of Modern English. Moscow. Vysshaya Shkola. 285 p.
4. Structural Syntax of the English Language: A guide to theoretical grammar / Ed. by prof. L.L. Iofik. Leningrad. Leningrad University Press. 1972. 176 p.
5. Rudnev A.I. (1969) Syntax of a Simple Sentence. Moscow. Uchpedgiz Publ. 170 p.

6. Raspopov I.P. (1981) *Controversial Issues of Syntax*. Rostov-on-Don. Rostov University Press. 127 p.
7. Smirnitsky A.I. (1957) *Syntax of the English Language*. Moscow. 286 p.
8. Abrahams P. (1971) *The Path of Thunder*. Moscow. 336 p.
9. Ashrapov B.P. Morphological Peculiarities of the Tajik Prexoid ‘khush-’ in Tajik Literary Language Referring to the 18th Century. *Stephanos*. 2026. No 2(76), pp. 45–53. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-76-2-45-53; EDN HSEJSP.
10. Ashrapov B.P. On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A Comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis. *Stephanos*. 2026. No 1(75), pp. 20–27. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MF-WABE.
11. Ashrapov B.P. Comparative Analysis of Semantico-functional and Morphological-syntactical Peculiarities of the Tajik Modal Particle rÿë and Its English Equivalents. *Herald of Daghestan Scientific Center*. 2025. No 97. P. 116–123. DOI 10.31029/vestdnc97/17; EDN ILISZV.
12. Ashrapov B.P. A Comparative Analysis of the Morpho-Syntactic Peculiarities of English Preposition On and Its Equivalents in Tajik and Chinese. *Stephanos*. 2025. No 3(71), pp. 24–33. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-71-3-24-33; EDN FDSQYD.
13. Ashrapov B.P. Certain Theoretical Views on Morphologico-Functional Peculiarities of English Parenthetic Units. *Stephanos*. 2025. No 5(73). P. 52–62. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-73-5-52-62; EDN POTXCU.

Сведения об авторе:

Сурайё Гайбуллоевна Гиёсова,
доктор философии
доцент
кафедры перевода и грамматики
английского языка
Худжандский государственный университет
имени академика Б. Гафурова

Suraiyo G. Ghiyosova,
Doctor of Philosophy, (PhD) in Philology
Associate Professor
Translation and English Grammar Department
Khujand State University named
after academician Bobojon Gafurov
giesova 82@mail.ru