

PROBLEMS OF GENERAL THEORY AND METALANGUAGE OF COMPOSITE SENTENCES WITH AN INTRODUCTORY CLAUSE

Muzaffar KHOSHIMOV

Master's Degree

Andizhan State University, Andizhan, Uzbekistan

КИРИШ ГАПЛИ ҚЎШМА ГАПЛАРНИНГ УМУМИЙ НАЗАРИЯСИ ВА МЕТАТИЛИ МУАММОЛАРИ

Музаффар Ғанижонович ХОШИМОВ

Магистр

Андижон давлат университети, Андижон, Ўзбекистон

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ОБЩЕЙ ТЕОРИИ И МЕТАЯЗЫКА СЛОЖНОВВОДНЫХ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ

Музаффар Ғанижонович ХОШИМОВ

Магистр

Андижанский государственный университет, Андижан, Узбекистан.

UDC (УЎК, УДК): 81'367.335

**For citation (иктибос келтириш учун,
для цитирования):**

Khoshimov M. Problems of general theory and metalanguage of composite sentences with an introductory clause// Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар. — 2021. — № 3 (38). — Б. 52–64.

<https://doi.org/10.36078/1624856974>

Received: April 25, 2021

Accepted: June 17, 2021

Published: June 20, 2021

Copyright © 2021 by author(s).

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Abstract. The article touches upon the problems of general theory and metalanguage of one more invariant type of the sentence, that is, a composite sentence with an introductory clause along with the three traditionally accepted structural-semantic (compound, complex and mixed /semi-composite/) types and the taxonomy of the latter in language. The main focus here is made on the so called parenthetical, rather introductory constructions represented by introductory words, phrases and sentences, specifically verbalizing the universal concept of subjective modal assessment” of the fact (action, quality, quantity, state, etc.) expressed in the main body of the sentences, to which the latter are canonically introduced. The author here makes an accent on the status of the so called simple sentences with an “introductory element”, expressed by a clause in language(s) which have been traditionally treated as “simple sentences of the complicated structure”, although they are characterized by their natural surface and deep structures like a composite sentence with at least two predicative units, each of which having its own grammatically expressed subject-predicate structure. Critically approaching the treatment of such composite sentences as “complex sentences with a parenthetical clause” in special literature, the author considers them to be “composite sentences with an introductory clause”, for the latter can’t be segmented into principle and subordinate clauses, and proves his own approach by illustrating them through convincing examples from fiction materials, which paves the way to four-membered taxonomy of composite sentences replacing the traditional three-membered one.

Keywords: sentence; invariant types of sentence; composite sentence; compound sentence; complex sentence; semi-composite sentence; composite sentence with an inserted clause; composite sentence with an introductory clause.

Аннотация. Ушбу мақолада қўшма гапларнинг анъанавий тан олинган турлари (тенг боғланган қўшма гаплар, эргаш гапли қўшма гаплар ва аралаш қўшма гаплар) билан бир каторда уларнинг яна бир инвариант тури, яъни кириш гапли қўшма гапларнинг умумий назарияси, метатили муаммолари ва таснифи ҳақида сўз боради. Бу ерда асосий эътибор шундай парентез конструкциялар, тўғрироғи сўзлар, сўз бирикмалари ва гаплар(клоузлар) билан ифодаланган кириш конструкцияларига қаратилган бўлиб, бундай конструкциялар ўз таркибига қираётган асосий гапнинг кесимидан англашилган фактлар (ҳаракатлар, сифатлар, миқдорлар, ҳолатлар)га бериладиган “субъектив модал баҳо” концептини воқеалантиришга махсуслашган. Бу ерда муаллиф кириш гапи(клоузи) билан ифодаланган, “кириш элементлари”ни ўз ичига олган, анъанавий “ёйик содда гаплар мақоми”га эга деб тан олинган турларига ургу берар экан, уларнинг юзаки ва ички таркиблари камида иккита предикатив бирликдан иборат бўлган, ҳар бири грамматик эга-кесим структурасидан ташкил топган қўшма гапдан мутлоқо фарқ қилмаслигини таъкидлайди. Айрим махсус адабиётларда “кириш(парентез) эргаш гапли қўшма гаплар” деб номланувчи конструкцияларга танқидий муносабат билдирар экан, муаллиф уларни “кириш гапли қўшма гаплар”дан ўзга нарса эмаслигини, чунки уларда “бош” ва “эргаш гаплар”ни ажратишнинг иложи йўқлигини эътироф этади ва ўз фикрини бадиий адабиётлардан келтирилган мисоллар билан далиллаштиради, натижада бундай ёндашув қўшма гапларнинг анъанавий парадигмаси уч аъзоли эмас, балки тўрт аъзоли эканлигига пухта замин яратади.

Калит сўзлар: гап; гапнинг инвариант турлари; қўшма гап; тенг боғланган қўшма гап; эргаш гапли қўшма гап; аралаш қўшма гап; киритма гапли қўшма гап; кириш гапли қўшма гап.

Аннотация. В статье затрагиваются проблемы общей теории и метаязыка еще одного инвариантного типа предложения, а именно “сложновводного предложения” наряду с уже традиционно общепринятыми структурно-семантическими (сложносочиненными, сложноподчиненными и смешанными) типами сложных предложений и их таксономии. Здесь основной акцент делается на так называемых парентезных, точнее вводных конструкциях, репрезентированных вводными словами, словосочетаниями и предложениями (клоузами) в языке, специфично вербализующими универсальный концепт «субъективно-модальная оценка» имеющихся различных фактов (действий, качеств, количеств, состояний и т.п.), выраженных в основной части предложения, в которые они кононически и вводятся. Здесь автор делает акцент на статусе так называемых простых предложений с «вводным элементом», выраженным предложением (клоузом) в языке, которые традиционно рассматривались как «простые предложения осложненной структуры», хотя они по поверхностной и внутренней структуре сходны и ничем не отличаются от сложных предложений как минимум с двумя предикативными единицами, каждая из которых имеет свою грамматически выраженную субъектно-предикатную структуру. Критически подходя к трактовке так называемых сложных предложений как «сложноподчиненные предложения с придаточным парентезным (вводным)» в специальной литературе, автор рассматривает их как «сложновводные предложения». так как первые не могут сегментироваться на главное и придаточное предложения, и

доказывает свою точку зрения путем их иллюстрации при помощи убедительных примеров из художественной литературы, что и прокладывает путь к четырехчленной таксономии сложных предложений, заменяющей традиционную трехчленную.

Ключевые слова: предложение; инвариантные типы предложения; простое предложение; сложное предложение; сложносочиненное предложение; сложноподчиненное предложение; сложное предложение смешанного типа; сложновставное предложение; сложновводное предложение.

Modern linguistics is characterized by the ever growing interest of linguists in the systemic study of urgent questions relating to structural-semantic, communicative-pragmatic, linguo-cognitive, linguocultural and linguistic-stylistic properties of such syntactic units as simple sentences, simple sentences complicated by various “introductory” or “inserted” parts, complex sentences, polycomponential complex sentences and other types of monolithic units of a sign nature which are directly endowed with text-forming ability.

In this regard such most frequently used syntactic phenomena as “simple sentences of complicated structure”, more precisely – “simple sentences complicated by introductory parts”, are of great interest which traditionally belong to the category simple extended sentences in language(s), for example:

1) in English: *Frankly speaking*, I am extremely tired (E. Hemingway. A Farewell to Arms, p. 198);

in Russian: *Правду говоря*, я встретил его там (To tell the truth, I met him there);

in Uzb.: *Ганнинг рости*, мен сизни ёқтирмайман (Frankly speaking, I don't like you).

2) in English: *As every Forsyte knows*, rubbish that sells is not rubbish at all — far from it (J. Galsworthy. The Man of Property, p. 181);

in Russian: Мы с ним, *как вы догадываетесь*, уже договорились об этом (А.Чехов. Дом с мезонином, с. 187). (We, as you might guess, have already agreed on this);

in Uzb.: Бу одам, *ўзингиз кўриб турганингиздек*, нопокрок чикди (П.Қодиров. Қора кўзлар, 211 б.) (This man is, as you see, not that honest).

In modern linguistics the question of the study of introductory constructions”, in general, and “introductory sentences”, in particular, is of unflagging interest, since there are many unresolved and therefore incomprehensible aspects of considering and studying this issue, especially in terms of their linguo-cognitive and linguoculturological aspects and a number of other important problems related to them. This is primarily due to the fact that there is still no unanimity of opinion among scientists who, to some extent, have studied this linguistic phenomenon both in the special and general linguistic directions.

Our observations of the abovementioned syntactic units containing introductory parts (words, phrases and sentences) in language show that modern linguistics is teeming with notions and terms associated, in one way or another, with introductory parts. The latter include such notions and terms as «вводное слово» (introductory word), «вводный элемент» (introductory element), «вводное предложение» (introductory sentence),

«ВВОДНЫЙ КОМПОНЕНТ» (introductory component), «ПАРЕНТЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ЭЛЕМЕНТЫ» (parenthetical elements), etc. in Russian linguistics (29, 127; 33, 259; 21, 324; 18, 16; 30, 236) “introductory clause” (34, 259; 10, 163; 24, 168;), “parenthetical clause”² (14, 976, 1032, 1112; 3, 62; 13, 623–689; 1, 99, 137–138; 8, 83; 7, 152), “comment clause” (11, 196–197; 4, 229; 9, 67), “parentheticals” (5, 152), “parenthetical verb” (6, 49), “interpolated clause” (14, 1242) in English linguistics, and “кириш бўлақлар (introductory parts)”, “кириш гап”(introductory sentence), “ киритма гап”(inserted sentence), “изоҳ гаплар(comment clauses), “изоҳ бўлақлар” (comment parts) (31, 46; 16, 105–122; 32, 78) in the Uzbek linguistics.

The above mentioned studies are characterized by one common feature that their authors consider and analyze the so-called “introductory” or “inserted sentences”(for us they are “clauses”) in isolation from the rest of the monolithic sentence structure that includes them, which seems to us unreasonable, because any unit, including a sentence with an introductory or inserted component (each of which is represented by a full-fledged, grammatically expressed subject-predicate structure) is such a monolithic language unit as, for example, a word is, for the latter is considered to be a monolithic whole that should be subjected to any analysis as a lexical type of a language unit.

The analysis of the special literature on this issue shows that, firstly, there is no unified systematic approach to the very existence of such constructions representing the notion, rather – microconcept of “subjective modal assessment”(субъективно-модальная оценка) in language in general, and in concrete languages, in particular, respectively, the fate of the so-called linguistic phenomena closely related to the introductory constructions as “introductory parts / introductory sentences” and “inserted parts/ inserted sentences” has not yet been fully determined, moreover, there is still no consensus among linguists regarding their syntactic status in the sentence structure as “having no grammatical relation to the main (matrix) part of the sentence”, not to mention their terminological apparatus, metalanguage, etc.

In both special and general linguistic terms scholars note the presence, existence and functioning of such syntactic constructions as:

1) in English: *Frankly speaking*, I am extremely tired (E. Hemingway. A Farewell to Arms, p.198);

in Russian: *Правду говоря*, я слишком устал;

in Uzbek: *Гапнинг рости*, мен жуда чарчадим.

2) in English: *As every Forsyte knows*, rubbish that sells is not rubbish at all — far from it (J. Galsworthy. The Man of Property, p.181);

in Russian: Мы с ним, *как вы догадываетесь*, уже договорились об этом (А.Чехов. Дом с мезонином, с.187);

in Uzbek: Бу одам, *ўзингиз кўриб турганингиздек*, сал нопокрок чикди (П.Қодиров. Қора кўзлар, 211 б.).

In addition, the constructions of the following type exist and function in languages:

1) in English: He is the man, who has been, unfortunately, living there for more than thirty years.

2) in Russian: Наш корабль подплыл к берегу и, к счастью, он не задел скалу (Our ship sailed to the shore and, fortunately, it did not hit the rock).

3) in Uzbek: Бизнинг кема қирғоққа сузиб келди, бахтимизга, қояга урилмади (Our ship sailed to the shore and, fortunately, it did not hit the rock).

It is also noteworthy that in languages very often there exist such syntactic constructions which are, as to all their linguistic parameters, higher than simple sentences in the syntactic scale and, accordingly, belong to the level of composite sentences, because judging by their specific construction — rather their linear organization, they should and are to be grouped into and considered among the composite sentences that have a minimum of bicomponential (subject-predicate) structure, for example:

in English: As you know, we are not natives here (E. Hemmingway, Selected Stories, p, 116).

in Russian: *Как вы знаете*, мы не местные здесь (As you know, we are not natives here);

in Uzbek: *Маълумингиздек*, биз бу ерлик эмасмиз (As you know, we are not natives here);

As is seen from the above, there are at least three syntactic constructions that are different in structure and, apparently, in semantics and function, although they are all in one way or another interconnected and, naturally, correlate with the so-called “basic /matrix sentence”, more precisely, “inclusive sentence”. There is another concept denoted by the term “inserted constructions”, which denotes both constructions with “inserted words” and “inserted phrases” and “inserted clauses”, along with which there are also such terms and concepts as “introductory words”, “introductory phrases” and “introductory sentences” (17, 38; 28, 362–367). This question, i.e. the question of the so-called “introductory elements” on the one hand, and the “inserted words”, “inserted phrases”, and “inserted clauses” on the other, which naturally exist and function in language and speech serving everyday communication between communicants, is of great interest and importance, and as a general linguistic phenomenon deserves a special scrupulous systemic linguo-cognitive and linguoculturological research, consistently proceeding from the anthropocentric approach to their study and description on the basis of strict principles and effective methods of linguistic analysis, perhaps only such an approach to them, ultimately, can provide an acceptable solution of them.

Our observations of the abovementioned syntactic phenomena show that the opinions of researchers-scholars on this issue are very scattered, vague and indiscriminate, and judging by their opinions and ideas, they can be divided into two large opposite groups: 1) researchers-scientists considering constructions with introductory words, phrases and sentences as simple extended sentences (20, 240; 29, 127; 33,529; 30, 236; 21, 324);

2) researchers-scientists who consider the abovementioned syntactic phenomena to be complex sentences with a subordinate parenthetical clause (19, 424; 23, 317–318, 338; 26, 198–201; 34, 290–291).

It should be noted that in contrast to the opinions of research scientists of the first group, who unconditionally classify all types of the constructions with introductory units as simple sentences, the ideas of scientists of the second group are much more interesting and progressive, because they consider syntactic constructions with an introductory clause not to be “simple sentences of complicated structure”, but complex sentences, namely “complex sentences with a subordinate parenthetical clause” (19, 424; 23, 317; 26, 198; 34, 290).

In this connection the opinion of A.M. Mukhin is of great interest and importance, because along with the coordinative, subordinative and

sociative connections between parts of sentences (of the type: «В красивом лице ее чуть брезжил тот огонек, который, *Китти чувствовала*, когда-то освещал ее всю» (из Л. Толстого) (In her beautiful face there was a little glimpse of that light, which, Kitty felt, once illuminated her all); Буран, мне казалось, еще свирепствовал (из Пушкина) (Buran, it seemed to me, was still raging) (25, 198), he also distinguishes the introductory connection, which, as is seen, is present, for example, not only between the parts of sentence and even between sentences themselves, which suggests that A.M. Mukhin considers the whole construction not to be a “Simple sentence of a complicated structure” (where the complication occurs precisely due to the introductory component expressed by the introductory sentence), but a composite sentence (a period). It is noteworthy that here in the abovementioned syntactic constructions A.M. Mukhin treats their introductory component as an inseparable part of the former (25, 198).

We think that from this point of view A.M. Mukhin is absolutely fair, as he notes that “however, it seems obvious that, if under the same term “complex sentences” we combine and consider constructions with sentences linked with each other by such substantially different syntactic connections as “subordinative”, “sociative”, and also “introductory”, then the epithet of “subordinative” within the specified term completely loses its meaning (of subordination).

This indicates that “the framework of the traditional opposition of subordination and coordination of sentences turns out to be too tight and narrow to reflect all the really existing types of syntactic connections between sentences, that taking into account and considering conjunctions and connectives ceases to be a reliable measure of the specifics of external syntactic relations, as soon as we go beyond the opposition of subordination and coordination of sentences” (26, 201). This remark just testifies that composite sentences of the type: in Eng: “*As you see*, we work here” (in Uzb.: *Кўриб турганингиздек, биз шу ерда ишлаймиз* – in Russ.: *Как вы видите, мы здесь работаем.*) are not complex sentences with parenthetical subordinate clauses, as L.S. Barkhudarov and D.A. Shteling, B.A. Ilyish and others consider them as such, but on the contrary are, from our point of view, composite sentences with an introductory clause, which is never a subordinate part (clause) of the main sentence and the latter represents all well known traditional types of subordinate clauses in language, because any subordinate clause is aimed to serve the main clause as some kind of its syntactic part, which naturally occurs within the framework of the main clause, and the introductory clause, in our opinion, is not included in the structure of the main clause, because it modifies the entire main clause as a whole, remaining outside the structure of the latter.

Thus, in the 60s, there appeared “a decisive tendency to include constructions with “introductory sentences” into the sphere of study of composite (more precisely, complex) sentences, which began to be reflected even in both practical and theoretical textbooks in languages” (26, 198–201).

In their joint investigation L.S. Barkhudarov, D.A. Shteling note that along with other traditionally known types of complex sentences in the system of composite sentences there is also such a variety, which is accordingly called by the abovementioned authors “complex sentence with a parenthetical clause” (19, 424). B.A. Ilyish adheres to the same point of view (23, 317–318) and so does L. I. Iliya (22, 359–360), although they are the few of the scholars – syntaxists who see in such constructions not a simple sentence of a complicated structure, but a complex sentence. This can be regarded as a big step forward in syntactic science, although it has

remained completely forgotten or ignored until now. To such group of scholars one can refer B.S. Khaimovich and B.I. Rogovskaya, who also see in such constructions not a simple sentence of complicated structure, but a complex sentence with a parenthetical clause (34, 290–291).

In his works B.A. Ilyish considers a parenthetical clause to be one of the types of subordinate clause and the syntactic whole itself a complex sentence (consisting of the main and subordinate parenthetical clauses), which seems to us unjustified and scientifically ungrounded, because we think that this is not a complex sentence (since all types of subordinate clauses, as has already been pointed out above, are specialized to serve accordingly as a certain member of the main sentence (clause), but rather a composite sentence, between the introductory clause and the matrix sentence of which there are specific syntactic relations, namely, “introductory” ones, which are in contrast to the traditional coordinative and subordinative syntactic relations (connections). Moreover, the conjunctions (of the type “as, and, if, like, and, if, maybe, although and zero conjunction) combining the introductory clauses with a matrix one, are not subordinate (since there are no subordinative relations here and cannot be), but introductory ones (our term. — H.M.), that is, they are homonymous to subordinating conjunctions.

According to B. A. Ilyish, asyndetic parenthetical (introductory) sentences do not fit here, as they should be considered in the chapter on asyndetic complex sentences (23, 317–318). So, B. A. Ilyish classifies complex sentences with a parenthetical clause (CSPC) into two structural types, namely: 1) syndetic type; 2) asyndetic type. But the scholar does not give any information about the CSPC of subject and subjectless structural types (23, 318).

So, pushing off from the aforesaid, we can assume that the modern syntactic paradigm of the invariant types of composite sentences, in our opinion, does not seem to be three-membered (compound, complex and mixed), as some researchers traditionally believe, but most likely it is four-membered:

1. Asyndetic composite sentence:

a) asyndetic compound sentence: You are a nurse, he is a doctor. S. Maugham. *The Happy Man*, p.124; — transl.: Сен — хамширасан, у доктор. — Ты медсестра, он доктор.

b) asyndetic complex sentence: I think they are equal. E. Hemingway. *The old Man and the Sea*, p.5; — transl.: Мен ўйлайман, улар тенг, Я думаю, они равные.

c) asyndetic composite sentence with an introductory clause: ”They say his father was, you know, a fisherman. E. Hemingway. *The old Man and the Sea*, p.5; — transl.: Маълумингиздек, унинг отасини балиқ овчи бўлган дейишади — Говорят, что его отец, знаете, был рыбаком;

asyndetic composite sentence with an inserted clause:

You may notice stories that (you think) are biased (S. Maugham. *Theatre*, p. 198); — transl.: Сиз (ўйлайсизки) ҳақиқатга тўғри келмайдиган ҳикояларни кўришингиз мумкин. — Вы можете заметить истории, которые (вы думаете) являются необъективными;

2. Syndetic composite sentence:

a) syndetic compound sentence (with conjunctions); (The old man opened his eyes and for a moment he was coming back from a long way away. E. Hemingway. *The old Man and the Sea*, p. 4; — transl.: Чол кўзларини очди, бир дақиқа ўзини узок йўлдан келаётгандек хис қилди. — Старик открыл свои глаза и на мгновение ему показалось, как будто он возвращался из дальней дороги.

b) syndetic complex sentence (with conjunctions): You keep it if you want it (E. Hemingway. The old Man and the Sea, p. 36); — transl.: Ҳохласанг сенда бўлсин. — Пусть у тебя будет, если захочешь.

c) syndetic complex sentence (with connectives): It is what a man must do (E. Hemingway. The old Man and the Sea, p. 6); — transl.: Бу шундай ишки, уни эркак киши қилиши керак. — Это то, что мужчина должен делать.

d) syndetic composite sentence with an introductory clause (As you guess, you're with a lucky boat (E. Hemingway. The old Man and the Sea, p. 29); — transl.: Кўриб турганингдек, сен омадли қайикдасан. Как видишь, ты в счастливой лодке.

e) syndetic composite sentence with an inserted clause (The Constitution (or so I believe) gives the Congress power to declare war (<http://www.criticalreading.com/inserts.htm>); — transl.: Конституция (ёки мен ишонаман) Конгрессга уруш эълон қилиш ҳуқуқини беради; Конституция (или я так считаю) дает Конгрессу право объявлять войну.

3. Polycomponential composite sentence of mixed type: polycomponential semi-compound sentence: When the boy came back the old man was asleep in the chair and the sun was down (E. Hemingway. The old Man and the Sea, p. 4); — transl.: Бола қайтиб келганда, чол креслода ухлаётган эди, қуёш эса ботган эди. — Когда мальчик вернулся, старик спал в кресле и солнце уже вошло (село).

a) polycomponential semi-complex sentence: The door of the house where the boy lived was unlocked and he opened it (E. Hemingway. The old Man and the Sea, p. 6); — transl.: Бола яшаб тургануйнинг эшиги қулфланмаган эди ва у уни очди. — Дверь дома, в котором проживал мальчик, не была закрыта на замок и он открыл ее.

b) Polycomponential composite sentence with an introductory clause:

c) polycomponential composite (compound) sentence with an introductory clause: As you noticed, we came and they left (E. Hemingway. The old Man and the Sea, p.19); — transl.: Сизганингиздек, биз келдик, улар кетди(лар). — Как вы заметили, мы пришли, они ушли.

d) polycomponential composite (complex) sentence with an introductory clause: As you guessed, we came in when they had left for the capital (E. Hemingway. The old Man and the Sea, p. 32); — transl.: Фахмлаганингиздек, улар пойтахтга жўнаб кетганда, биз ҳовлининг ичкарасига кириб келдик. — Как вы заметили, когда они выехали в столицу, мы вошли во двор.

Based on the abovesaid, in our opinion, one can naturally feel the rising need and urgency to develop a general and comparative typological theory of the abovementioned constructions, which consequently allows the creation of a metalanguage of their systemic research. In this connection it seems to us necessary to solve the following urgent tasks to reveal their general linguistic nature and establish their status as specialized types of syntactic structures of often text-generating functions, verbalizing the conceptual semantics of “subjective-modal assessment”:

1) definition of the range of notions and terms associated with the study of the syntactic nature of “introductory elements”: a) words; b) phrases; c) sentences, in special literature;

2) establishing the formal and semantic features of the “introductory elements” in language(s);

3) establishing and describing the general linguistic status of “introductory elements” in sentence;

4) establishing and disclosing the types of connections(links) of the “introductory elements” with the main sentence — including the former in the light of such generally recognized types of syntactic connections as: a) coordination; b) government; c) adjoining, on the one hand, and coordination, subordination, collocation and as well as “introduction”, on the other.

5) disclosure of the specific nature of the syntactic connection of the “included” (introductory and inserted) constructions with the matrix sentence and working out their corresponding terminology in the paradigm of already existing types of syntactic connections;

6) establishing the similarities and dissimilarities of the included (introductory and inserted) constructions, using the transformational method, indicating their intersection in the field in cases of neutralization of syntactic relations between the specified members of the sentence;

7) neutralization of these structures(i.e. mutual reversibility(of “introductory elements” into “inserted” ones , and visa versa: “inserted elements” into “introductory” ones) and the need to designate such elements and constructions with general and unified notions and terms, which would facilitate their general and comparative-typological study in principles and terms of linguo-cognitive investigations from the point of view of their following aspects: a) psycholinguistic; b) linguocognitive (structural-semantic, cognitive-conceptual, linguopragmatic); c) linguoculturological(linguostilistic, sociolinguistic, gender, etc.).

8) revealing the linguoculturological features of composite sentences with an introductory clause extensively functioning in everyday communication as linguocultures verbalizing the concept of “subjective-modal assessment of the fact (action, state, quality, quantity, etc.) expressed in the main part of the sentences used by various sociuses of certain socium;

9) disclosure of the specific nature of introductory constructions (as constructions expressing the concept of “subjective-modal assessment (of the type:” As you might guess, we are leaving now”) on the one hand, and inserted constructions (as constructions expressing the concept of” objective modal assessment” (объективная модальная оценка) and other additional conceptual semantics (of the type: “Nick (he is my neighbour) is a good doctor”), on the other.

Thus, we consider it advisable to study the composite sentence with an introductory clause(CSIC) in the paradigm of composite sentences and constructions with the so called “introductory/inserted elements” based on our following general linguistic definition of it as one of the invariant types of composite sentence along with the three traditionally accepted invariant ones (compound, complex and mixed): “CSIC is one of the really existing communicatively and pragmatically important invariant types of composite sentence, canonically consisting of at least two components (each of which strictly having a subject-predicate structure) that are connected with each other not only by traditional “coordinative” or “subordinative” or even mixed (co-subordinative/sub-coordinative) relations, but also by “introductory” ones”.

Pushing off from the aforesaid, we can summarize that the linguo-cognitive and linguocultural approaches to the study of the types of syntactic units, in particular, composite sentences as one of the invariant means of the syntactic way of verbalizing the conceptual semantics of “subjective-modal assessment” has, along with syndetic, asyndetic composite sentences of compound, complex and mixed types, also another subtype – composite sentence with an introductory clause, which, like the other invariant types,

canonically has a bicomponential organization, strictly composed of subject-predicate structure and endowed with the ability to objectify one of the communicatively important semantics — namely, the conceptual semantics of “subjective-modal assessment” in language.

List of used literature

1. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S. & Finegan E. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. — London: Longman, 1999. — 1204 p.
2. Charles M. Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses used in citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines. // English for Specific Purposes, — 2006. — No.25. — P. 310–331
3. Crystal D. A dictionary of language. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2001. — 390 p. — URL: https://openlibrary.org/books/OL6796848M/A_dictionary_of_language
4. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English language. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. — 491 p.
5. Dehe N., Kavalova Y. Parentheticals. Monograph, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2007, — 24 p.
6. Elouazizi N. The formal syntax for licensing parenthetical verb clauses. Phd dissertation in Linguistics. — Kanada: Simon Fraser University. 2020. — 177 p.
7. Griffiths J. Speaker and quote reduced parenthetical clause. Parenthetical verbs. — Berlin: Berlin Mouton de Gruyter. 2014. — 557 p.
8. Halliday M.A.K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. — London. 1994. — 434 p. — URL: https://openlibrary.org/books/OL1224020M/An_introduction_to_functional_grammar
9. Hamzah N.J. Comment Clauses in English and Arabic: A Comparative Analysis.//[Journal of University of Babylon for Pure and Applied Sciences](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31323149) — 2017. — No.25(6). — pp. 3132–3149.
10. Hartmann R.R., Stork F.C. Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. — London: Applied Science Publishers. 1972. — 302 p.
11. Leech G, Svartvik J. A Communicative Grammar of English. — Longman, 1975. — 304 p. — URL: https://www.studmed.ru/leech-geoffrey-svartvik-jan-a-communicative-grammar-of-english_a840f4187ce.html.
12. Maastricht L. v. Reporting and Comment Clauses in Romance// Conference: TaBu Day 32nd Linguistics Conference. Radboud University June 2011. — pp. 237–258. — URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272785339_Reporting_and_Comment_Clauses_in_Romance.
13. Potts C. The Syntax and Semantics of As-Parentheticals.// Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. — 2002. — No. 20(3). — pp. 623–689.
14. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leach G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. — New York: Longman 1985. — 1776 p.
15. Schneider S., Glikman, J., Avanzi M. Linguistische Arbeiten. — Berlin: Boston de Gruyter, 2015. — 557 s.
16. Абдурахмонов Г. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. — Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1996. — 246 б. — URL: https://openlibrary.org/books/OL20218651M/%C5%ACzbek_tili_grammatikasi_A
17. Акимова Г.Н. Новое в синтаксисе современного русского языка. — Москва: Высшая школа, 1990. — 168 с.

18. Антонова В. В. Парентетические конструкции современного русского языка в лингвокультурологическом аспекте: автореферат дис. ... кандидата филологических наук. — Москва, 2015. — 18 с. — URL: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01005569713>
19. Бархударов Л. С. Грамматика английского языка. — Москва: Высшая школа, 1963. — 428 с. — URL: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01005959467>
20. Богородицкий В. А. Общий курс русской грамматики. — Москва: Соцэкгиз, 1935. — 354 с. — URL: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01005269672>
21. Валгина Н.С., Розенталь Д.Э., Фомина М.И. Современный русский язык — Москва: Логос 2002. 528 с.
22. Илия Л.И. Синтаксис современного французского языка. — М.: литературы на иностранных языках, 1962. 383 с. — URL: <https://www.libex.ru/detail/book166284.html>
23. Ильиш Б.А. Строй современного английского языка. — Москва: Просвещение. 1965. — 378 с. — URL: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01006209695>
24. Кобрина Н.А., Корнеева Л.В. Обзор современного английского синтаксиса. — Ленинград. 1976. — 212 с.
25. Мухин А.М. Синтаксисный анализ и проблема языковых уровней. — Ленинград: Наука, 1980. — 303 с.
26. Мухин А.М. Структура предложений и их модели. — Ленинград: Наука. 1968. — 230 с.
27. Нурмонов А., Махмудов Н., Ахмедов А., Солихўжаева С. Ўзбек тилининг мазмуний синтаксиси. — Тошкент: Фан, 1992. — 298 б. — URL: <https://www.twirpx.com/file/3052398/>
28. Розенталь Д. Э., Голуб И. Б., Теленкова М. А. Современный русский язык. — М.: Айрис-пресс, 2005. — 443 с. <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01002677204>
29. Руднев А. Г. Синтаксис осложненного предложения. — Москва: Учпедгиз, 1959. — 198 с. <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01008361274>
30. Русская грамматика: 2. Синтаксис. // Е. А. Брызгунова, К. В. Габучан, В. А. Цикович и др. — М.: Наука, 1980. — 709 с.
31. Сайфуллаев А. Р. Замонавий ўзбек тилида кириш кисми. Тошкент: Фан, 1972. — 80 б.
32. Сайфуллаева Р. Р. Замонавий ўзбек тилида композицион жумлаларни сезиларли таҳлил қилиш. — Тошкент: Фан, 2007. — 257 б.
33. Студнева А.И. Из наблюдений над функционально-семантическими отношениями вводных и вставных предложений. — Москва, 1967. — 268 с.
34. Хаймович Б.С., Роговская Е.И. Курс грамматики английского языка. — Москва: Средняя школа, 1967. — 299 с.

References

1. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S. & Finegan E. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, London: Longman, 1999, 1204 p.
2. Charles M. *English for Specific Purposes*, 2006, No.25. — pp. 310–331
3. Crystal D. *A dictionary of language*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001, 390 p., available at: https://openlibrary.org/books/OL6796848M/A_dictionary_of_language
4. Crystal D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 491 p.

5. Dehe N., Kavalova Y. *Parentheticals. Monograph*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2007, 24 p.
6. Elouazizi N. *The formal syntax for licensing parenthetical verb clauses*, Phd dissertation in Linguistics. — Kanada: Simon Fraser University, 2020, 177 p.
7. Griffiths J. *Speaker and quote reduced parenthetical clause. Parenthetical verbs*, Berlin: Berlin Mouton de Gruyter, 2014, 557 p.
8. Halliday M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London, 1994, 434 p., available at: https://openlibrary.org/books/OL1224020M/An_introduction_to_functional_grammar
9. Hamzah N.J. *Journal of University of Babylon for Pure and Applied Sciences*, 2017, No.25(6), pp. 3132–3149.
10. Hartmann R.R., Stork F.C. *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*, London: Applied Science Publishers, 1972, 302 p.
11. Leech G, Svartvik J. *A Communicative Grammar of English*, Longman, 1975, 304 p., available at: https://www.studmed.ru/leech-geoffrey-svartvik-jan-a-communicative-grammar-of-english_a840f4187ce.html.
12. Maastricht L. V. *Reporting and Comment Clauses in Romance*, Conference: TaBu Day 32nd Linguistics Conference. Radboud University June 2011, pp. 237–258., available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272785339_Reporting_and_Comment_Clauses_in_Romance
13. Potts C. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 2002, No. 20(3), pp. 623– 689.
14. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leach G., Svartvik J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, New York: Longman, 1985, 1776 p.
15. Schneider S., Glikman, J., Avanzi M. *Linguistische Arbeiten* (Linguistic works), Berlin: Boston de Gruyter, 2015, 557 p.
16. Abdurakhmonov G. A. *Uzbek tili grammatikasi* (Uzbek language grammatics), Tashkent: Ukituvchi, 1996, 246 p., available at: https://openlibrary.org/books/OL20218651M/%C5%ACzbek_tili_grammatikasi
17. Akimova G.N. *Novoe v sintaksise sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* (New in the syntax of the modern Russian language), Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1990, 168 p.
18. Antonova V.V. *Parenteticheskie konstruksii sovremennogo russkogo yazyka v lingvokul'turologicheskom aspekte* (Parenthetical constructions of the modern Russian language in the linguoculturological aspect), Extended abstract of candidate's thesis, Moscow, 2015, 18 p., available at: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01005569713>
19. Barkhudarov L.S. *Grammatika angliiskogo yazyka* (Grammar of the English language), Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1963, 428 p., available at: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01005959467>
20. Bogoroditskii V.A. *Obshchii kurs russkoi grammatiki* (General course of Russian grammar), Moscow: Sotsekgiz, 1935, 354 p., available at: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01005269672>
21. Valgina N.S., Rozental' D.E., Fomina M.I. *Sovremennyi russkii yazyk* (Modern Russian language), Moscow: Logos, 2002, 528 p.
22. Iliya L.I. *Sintaksis sovremennogo frantsuzskogo yazyka* (The syntax of the modern French language), Moscow: literatury na inostrannykh yazykakh, 1962, 383 p., available at: <https://www.libex.ru/detail/book166284.html>

23. Il'ish B.A. *Stroi sovremennogo angliiskogo yazyka* (The structure of the modern English language), Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1965, 378 p. <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01006209695>
24. Kobrina N.A., Korneeva L.V. *Obzor sovremennogo angliiskogo sintaksisa* (Review of modern English syntax), Leningrad, 1976, 212 p.
25. Mukhin A.M. *Sintaksemnyi analiz i problema yazykovykh urovnei* (Syntaxemic analysis and the problem of language levels), Leningrad: Nauka, 1980, 303 p.
26. Mukhin A.M. *Struktura predlozhenii i ikh modeli* (The structure of proposals and their models), Leningrad: Nauka, 1968, 230 p.
27. Nurmonov A., Makhmudov N., Akhmedov A., Solikhuzhaeva S. *Uzbek tilining mazmunii sintaksisi* (Meaningful syntax of the Uzbek language), Toshkent: Fan, 1992, 298 p. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/3052398/>
28. Rozental' D. E., Golub I. B., Telenkova M. A. *Sovremennyi russkii yazyk* (Modern Russian language), Moscow: Airis-press, 2005, 443 p. <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01002677204>
29. Rudnev A. G. *Sintaksis oslozhnennogo predlozheniya* (Syntax of a complicated sentence), Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1959, 198 p. <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01008361274>
30. *Russkaya grammatika: 2. Sintaksis* (Russian grammar: 2. Syntax), E. A. Bryzgunova, K. V. Gabuchan, V. A. Tsikovich i dr. Moscow: Nauka, 1980, 709 p.
31. Saifullaev A. R. *Zamonavii uzbek tilida kirish kismi* (Introduction to the modern Uzbek language), Toshkent: Fan, 1972, 80 p.
32. Saifullaeva R. R. *Zamonavii uzbek tilida kompozitsion zhumlalarni sezilarli tahlil kilish* (Significant analysis of complex sentences in modern Uzbek language.), Toshkent: Fan, 2007, 257 p.
33. Studneva A.I. *Iz nablyudenii nad funktsional'no-semanticheskimi otnosheniyami vvodnykh i vstavnykh predlozhenii* (From observations on the functional-semantic relations of introductory and insertion sentences), Moscow, 1967, 268 p.
34. Khaimovich B.S., Rogovskaya E.I. *Kurs grammatiki angliiskogo yazyka* (English grammar course), Moscow: Srednyaya shkola, 1967, 299 p.