Structure and Meaning of Compound Sentences in German

Sagidullayeva Sh.
Karakalpak State University

ANNOTATION: In this article we are talking about the structure and meaning of complex sentences in German, about the signs of subordination in a complex sentence, the opinions of famous scientists on this topic are given.

KEY WORDS: feature, subordination, variety, non-elementarity, syntactic unit, semantic complexity, transformations, restriction, explanatory, differentiation.

In order to reveal the structural and semantic features of a complex sentence, to identify its features, it is necessary, first of all, to consider the concept of a complex sentence.

For example, Moskalskaya writes that a complex sentence (hypotaxis) denotes subordination relations between its immediate components (parts of the sentence) [4, p.302].

The signs of subordination in a complex sentence are the same as in a phrase: unequal variety and unequal rank of components of syntactic subordination, inconsistency of syntactic characteristics of subordinate components and an integral structure with different syntactic significance of parts [1, p.210].

According to the definition of O.S. Akhmanova, a compound sentence is a type of complex sentence characterized by syntactic inequality of its constituent sentences, syntactic dependence of the subordinate from the main one [2, p.429].

We see a more complete definition in the dictionary of V.N. Yartseva. In her opinion, a compound sentence is a syntactic construction formed by combining several (at least two) sentences on the basis of union relations of subordination or zero union connection - non-union. Traditionally, the term SPP focuses on the formal non-elementarily of syntactic units and is applicable only to a grammatically and/or intentionally designed combination of sentences; a sentence that functions outside of formal connection with others, no matter how semantic complexity it has, is defined in the syntactic tradition as simple. In the SPP, the components are unequal: one is the main (main sentence), the other is dependent (subordinate). The dependence of the subordinate clause on the main one is revealed only in functional terms from the analogy of its syntactic position of the position of the sentence member and from the practical possibility of converting the subordinate clause itself into a sentence member, cf.: Er versprach, dass er hilft uns/, uns zu helfen, seine Hilfe.

The semantic-syntactic connection coming from the main sentence and defining the position of the subordinate clause can be verbatim and non-verbatim. The subordinate that implements the verbal connection has a supporting component in the main sentence in the form of a noun (Ich kenne den Menschen, der dir hilft), a verb (Ich wieß, dass er dir hilft) and words of other parts of speech.

In the case of an unspoken connection, the supporting component is missing and the subordinate corresponds to the main sentence as a whole (Wenn das Wetter besser wird, wir

fahren ab).

By the nature of the connection of the parts of the SPP, they are classified into sentences with allied and relative subordination. Relative subordination is served by allied words, in the role of which are interrogative pronouns of all parts of speech that lose or transform their interrogative meaning (cf. "Wer ist gekommen?" and "Ich weiß, wer gekommen ist"; "Wer gekommen ist, der uns hilft"). Subordinate conjunctions and allied words are organically included in the structure of the subordinate clause, giving it freedom of placement relative to the main one and imposing certain restrictions on the grammatical design of the predicate to which they syntactically gravitate (the use of Konjunktiv). The connection of the main and subordinate clauses is often supported by demonstrative-excretory pronouns and pronominal particles such as "so", "zu", "genug", as well as correlates such as "deswegen", "deshalb". Such correlative words especially often accompany a verbal connection [7, p.479].

In the structure of the SPP, a wide variety of types of semantic relations are formally expressed: definitional, explanatory, comparative, temporal, causal and conditionally-consequential, concessional, targeted and some others. In addition to conjunctions, their identification and differentiation usually involves the forms of verb predicates of the main and subordinate clauses, as well as certain stable vocabulary elements (modal words, particles, pronouns, adverbs), and not only as part of the subordinate, but also as part of the main sentence [7, pp.471-472]. In German, many of them have developed union functions and, in combination with the unions themselves, have formed a kind of framework constructions. For example, the correlate so acts as a structural feature of the main sentence with a nominal predicate or a circumstance of the mode of action, on which the subordinate clause of the consequence with the conjunction daß or comparison with the unions als - als ob depends [3, p.22]. Once in the main sentence, so establishes its connection with the subordinate clause:

Er tut so, als ob er nicht bis drei zählen könnte.

Er tut so, als könnte er nicht bis drei zählen.

The correlative particle zu (genug) is a structural feature of the main sentence in the subordinate clause of the negative consequence with the conjunction als dass. Unlike so, the particle zu cannot be removed from the main sentence, since the subordinate clause of the negative consequence with the conjunction als dass is not able to function without a correlate in the main sentence. At the same time, the main members of the sentence by their nature form a complete predicative line and contain a semantic core [3, p.23]:

Das Wasser ist zu kalt, als dass man baden könnte.

In the concepts of individual scientists, an unconnected combination of sentences remains outside the framework of a complex sentence, as a "primary, dogrammatic" phenomenon, where everything is based not on syntax, but on the "fact of a simple sequence" [7, p.89]. The argument in favor of such an understanding of the nature of unionless constructions is the ungrammatical nature of the unionless connection itself in most cases, the universal means of expression of which is intonation. However, signaling that several sentences have entered into some kind of connection, the intonation does not indicate either the nature of this connection or the relationships that are created on its basis. Therefore, an objective differentiation of the categories of composition and subordination is impossible in the

conditions of a non-union connection. The relations that develop within a non-union construction can be identified and differentiated based on stable elements of its structure, schemes for constructing sentences-parts, the order of their arrangement, regular relations of verbs-predicates; various kinds of lexical indicators; however, grammatical significance is equal to the significance of the union, none of these means has [7, pp.471 - 472].

In order to clearly show the syntactic relations in the SPP, we will first focus on the main type of the SPP, which consists of two subject-predicate compounds.

The subordinate component of such a SPP (the main sentence) is the structural foundation of the entire sentence, according to Glinz's definition, "this sentence is a carrier that carries the whole." But the main characteristics coincide with the characteristics of an independent offer. Subordinate components, on the contrary, have the syntactic value of a sentence member expressed like the sentence itself, therefore they (subordinate members) are also called subordinate clauses, with the attributive relation of the supply part of the sentence. The subordinate clause consists in a direct syntactic relation to the members of the main sentence and is connected with this sentence through them, i.e. mediocre.

The structural difference between the main and subordinate clauses is clearly shown by the expanding and reducing information. The unfolding transformation with a simple sentence consists in the fact that one of the members of the sentence develops into a subject-predicate structure. This is manifested in the fact that all the members of the sentence, except for the common one, after the transformation created an independent main sentence, while the common term becomes a subordinate clause.

Er zitterte vor Angst. → Er zitterte, weil er Angst hatte.

Reducing (folding, contraction) transformation is performed in the SPP and shows that always a subordinate clause, in no case the main thing, can be transformed to a simple member of the sentence:

Wer jung ist, kann wirklich das Leben genießen. → Der Junge kann wirklich das Leben genießen.

The correspondence of the grammatical characteristics of the sentence member and the whole sentence allows us to examine them in all important categories of the sentence plane, and even in the category of communicative intention on the negative meaning of the sentence, on the category of predicativity (sentence modality, temporal relations and reality).

A subordinate clause may contain only an indirect order or an indirect question [6, p.74]. Nevertheless, the communicative intention of the integral sentence is expressed in this case by the form of the main sentence.

The whole sentence is narrative (the subordinate has the meaning of an indirect question):

Geschke wusste nicht, ob er rechtzeitig vom Friedhof zurück sein werde.

The whole sentence is imperative (the subordinate expresses an indirect question):

Erkundigen Sie sich, ob er rechtzeitig zurück sein wird.

The whole sentence is narrative - narrative (the subordinate clause has the meaning of an indirect order):

Unser Klassenlehrer sagt, ich soll vorerst nicht mehr zur Schule kommen.

As for the affirmative or negative form of a sentence, it is always determined by the corresponding meaning of the main sentence, cf.:

A complete sentence has an affirmative meaning (with an affirmative main and negative subordinate):

Sie versprach der Tochter, dass es nie wieder vorkommen werde.

A complete sentence has a negative meaning (with a negative main and an affirmative subordinate):

Hans traute sich nicht mehr in das Haus, in dem die Emmi mit ihrer Familie gewohnt hatte.

The modality of the main and subordinate clauses may also differ. In this case, the modality of the whole sentence coincides with the main sentence:

Es ist, als hätte die Rose keine Seele.

Der Wald wurde gelb-grün, als lüge die Sonne darauf [4, p.312].

In conclusion, it should be said that the main and subordinate clauses cannot be equivalent also from the point of view of the temporal meaning of the integral sentence. Only the modifiable verb form of the main sentence has an absolute temporal meaning, this meaning is also characteristic of the modifiable verb of a simple independent sentence.

Complex syntax does not reduce the simplicity of style, on the contrary, it enhances it by showing the process of thought formation, reproducing the complexity of the situation, the order of logical movement of thought and speech, establishing an internal connection between phenomena.

REFERENCES

1. Abramov B.A. Theoretical grammar of the German language. Comparative typology of German and Russian. - Moscow: Vlados, 2001. - 242s.

2. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. - Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1969. - 608s.

3. Gulyga E.V. Theory of complex sentences in modern German. - Moscow: Higher School, 1971. - 206s.

4. Moskalskaya O.I. Grammar of the German language. - Moscow: Academy, 2004. - 352s.

5. Tagil I.P. Grammar of the German language. - St. Petersburg: KARO, 2003. - 392s.

6. Shishkova L.V., Meiksina I.I. Textbook on the theoretical grammar of the German language

7. Yartseva V.N. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1990. - 682s.