



Analogs of the conjunctions in the compound sentences

Revista Publicando, 5 No 16. (1). 2018, 429-434. ISSN 1390-9304

Analogs of the conjunctions in the compound sentences

Dinara Rakhimova¹, Alevtina Chernysheva¹, Pavol Adamka²

1 Kazan Federal University

2 Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, info@ores.su

Abstract.

In the article such conjunction particles as *tak (so)*, *vse-taki (after all)*, *vse zhe (still)*, *vse ravno (all the same)*, *tem ne meneye (nevertheless)* the meaning of which are connected with a culturological tendency of modern Russian language are studied. Viewing the analogs of the conjunctions with the account of this aspect causes the relevance and novelty of work. The purpose of the research is to describe compound sentences with the analogs of the conjunctions in the light of current trends of changes in the language system. Drawn conclusions: 1) the category of uncertainty peculiar to the Russian mentality at the syntactic level is expressed by undifferentiated relations; 2) undifferentiated relations are marked by the analogs of the conjunctions (*tak (so)*, *vse-taki (after all)*, *vse zhe (still)*, *vse ravno (all the same)*, *tem ne meneye (nevertheless)*) appearing owing to the replacement of double clamps with single; 3) polypredicative formations with the analogs of the conjunctions (in many cases capable to be replaced with coordinate conjunctions) can't be referred to the sphere of the coordination as these analogs mark a post-positive part of the formations as dependent; therefore it is logical to define relations in such formations as being out of the opposition "coordination – subordination"; 4) one of the causes of undifferentiated relations are current trends of changes of the language system: a) the staticizing (fragmentary) prose leading to the destruction of subordinative constructions, b) emergence of the newspeak accompanied with "diffutisation" and "secretion" of new word formations and meanings of the known words and expressions.

Key words: analogs of the conjunctions, particles, compound sentences, undifferentiated semantic relations, category of uncertainty, neutralization of the opposition "coordination – subordination".



INTRODUCTION

The history of the development of a compound sentence is characterized by certain stages. The process of active development of subordinate relations proceeding in the XIX century was followed by the creation of the differentiated semantic relations. The main ways of differentiation of semantics of a compound sentence were: 1) the elimination of multifunctionality of constructions; 2) the elimination of a different design of the same meanings expressed by subordinate constructions (or the elimination of a syntactic doubling); 3) the development of differentiation of the syntactic design of the different meanings expressed by subordinate constructions; 4) the development of the synonymic relations between different types of subordinate constructions" [Ivanchikova 1964:252]. The differentiation of semantics of a compound sentence was promoted by double clamps. A vivid example of their emergence was the evolution of causative and consecutive subordinative relationship. It is known that in the XIX century the registration of structurally finished system of the expression of the cause and consecutive relations was completed by the constructions of a complex sentence. At the same time the correlative relations of transformation between complex sentences with a meaning of the reason and with a meaning of the consequence was established. It was followed by the fact that in each of the constructions contrasting each other owing to a possibility of partition of the adverbial conjunctions (potomu, chto; tak, chto) there were structural options with closer correlations between the main and additional part –either with the accented reason, or with the weakened consequence [Bogoroditsky 1935:237].

METHODS

In the work the descriptive method and such techniques as observation, generalization, and classification of material were used.

RESULTS

Nowadays the development of a complex sentence experiences the reverse process: the replacement of double indicators of the relations by single, leading to the undifferentiated relations. Compound sentences with such relations attracted attention of a number of the scientists who even offered the term neutralization of the opposition "coordination – subordination" [Kolossova, Cheremisina 1984]. We believe that one of the causes of such relations is the current trends of changes of the language system supported by the Russian mentality (by the category of uncertainty). Firstly, it is the staticizing (fragmentary) prose leading to the destruction of subordinate constructions. Secondly, emergence of the newspeak accompanied with "diffutisation" and "secretion" of new word formations and meanings of the known words and expressions [Sirotnina 2013, 98-104]. The conjunctive particle *tak* which is originally an element of conditional, causal and temporal



conjunctions is indicative in the light of these tendencies. In [Rakhimova, Chernysheva 2016] this particle was considered as the proof of less diffusal and more predictable undifferentiated semantics in the sentences with the analogs of the conjunctions, than in sentences without any indicators of relations. Without rejecting this thought, we will nevertheless emphasize that the emergence at a particle *tak* of qualitatively new, undifferentiated relations (conditional-temporal-causative-conjunctive and conditional-adversative) was promoted by the loss of correlation with subordinative conjunctions: *Van Vanych. Umeet li plakat ryba? Kto zh znayet? Ona v vode khodit, i zaplachet, tak mokra ne vidno.* (Can a fish cry? Who knows? Even if it cries, it goes in water, so it can't be seen). [...] (Astafyev).

The greatest uncertainty (blurring) of semantics is noticed in this modification of a particle *tak* in the informal conversation (IC) where the speaker by his aspiration to express the maximum of thoughts at the minimum expense generates adequate to the Russian mentality implicitness of logical relations as well as of grammatical relations. As the example we could take a sentence from [The Russian informal conversation. Texts. M, 1978]: B. (to S. *Sasha tebe ...te stulya vzyali / tak ty stal ... stal... kreslo raskahivat//*, where it is difficult to find an exact equivalent of a particle *tak* what is the evidence of the existence in this sentence of qualitatively specific complex of the semantic relations, irreducible to the sum of separate meanings.

Relations out of opposition "coordination – subordination" are also traced in many sentences with concessive clamps. The inconsistency of the relations in the sentences with the conjunctions *khotya, pust, puskai* attracted attention long ago. Convergence of semantics expressed by them with the relations of internal conditionality, on the one hand, and on the other with the adversativeness, issued by means of coordination leads to a paradox in the solution of a question of the place of concessive sentences in the classification of compound sentences. They are considered as comprised by either subordinating, or coordinating relations. The last point of view is stated by I.N. Kruchinina: clamps *pust, (puskai) – no* are recognized as the means of expressing of the restrictive relations, and clamps — *pust, (puskai)- a* the means of expressing of the distributive relations [Kruchinina 1988, 92, 154].

The syntactic relations in the sentences with *vse-taki, vse zhe, vse ravno, tem ne meneye* are even more ambiguous. In constructive combination with the coordinative adversative conjunctions (*a, no*) in the main clause they are combined with the concessive conjunctions (or conjunctive particles) in an additional part, joining together with them double indicators of relations (*khotya – a ve taki, khotya – no ve zhe, puskai – a ve ravno, pravda – no ve taki*): *Khot i nikogda ona ne zaiskivala i ne lebezila pered etoy staroy lisoj, a vse taki i ona v Letovke rodilas* [...] (Abramov).



In addition to the conjunctions limiting an action / state with a certain external limit, particles *vse-taki*, *vse zhe*, *vse ravno*, *tem ne meneye* act as specifiers expressing modus-evaluating meaning of inefficiency of this action / state concerning consequences ensuing it. The modus semantics of inefficiency expressed by particles differentiates the concessive relations and by denotation of the spontaneous – not set nature of restrictive relations a possibility of the development of an action / state in the direction of the detection of its internal properties. In cases of lack of a coordinative conjunction the particles are used as independent components of a double indicator of relations (*khotya – vse-taki*, *khotya – vse zhe*, *pust – vse zhe*, *puskai – vse ravno*, *pravda – vse zhe*) or in connection with a process of destruction of subordinative relations as a single indicator: *Khotela pozanimatsya, vse ravno ne dali*.

The syntactic relations in the sentences with the analogs of the conjunctions are interpreted in different ways. Traditionally many sentences with the analogs of the conjunctions (*zato*, *odnako*, *tolko*, *nakonets*, *naprotiv*, *naoborot*, *verneye*, *tochneye*, *skoreye*, *vse zhe*, *vse-taki*, *tem ne meneye*) were considered as asyndetic. T.A. Kolosova and M.I. Cheremisina, however, consider such approach inadequate. From their point of view, even the term "asyndetic", opposed in the system of syntax of a compound sentence to the concept of conjunction is illegal as the analogs of the conjunctions mark the part of the sentence introduced by them as dependent, and therefore, they are the indicators of relations [Kolosova, Cheremisina 2000: 28].

The Russian grammar refers such sentences to the system of compound sentences with explanatory, opposing, facultative-and-commenting, cause-and-effect and graded meanings [The Russian grammar, 630-633]. However neither the mentioned particles, nor their combinations with coordinating conjunctions are capable to express actually coordinating relations. As E.N Shiryayev has shown, the function, general for all coordinating conjunctions, is the "expression of an identical attribution including potential, of two components connected by this conjunction to the third" [Shiryayev 1980, 51]. Therefore, according to E.N. Shiryayev, the conjunction *no* in the sentence "Bylo kholodno, no lyzhi scolzili khorosho." is coordinating because on the basis of this construction it is possible to construct the multicomponent sentence with homogeneous subordinate clauses *On skazal, cho kholodno, no chto lyzhi scolzili khorosho*. Let's notice that *no* in this sentence can't be replaced by a combination *no vse taki* or *vse taki*: * *On skazal, cho kholodno, no vse taki/ vse taki chto lyzhi scolzili khorosho*.

On this basis we suppose that sentences with clamps *vse zhe*, *vse-taki*, *vse ravno*, *tem ne meneye* express a syntactic relation which is beyond both the composition and submission because



the concretizing particles modify coordinating relations in the direction of the dependent – subordinative character.

DISCUSSION

In modern Russian language the problem of realization of cultural norms by linguistic means stay still relevant [Vierzbicka, A., 2006. Vereshchagin, E. 2013]. One of such means are particles which in view of their unique modus semantics successfully show the main "manifestations" of the Russian mentality, in particular the category of uncertainty [see Arutyunova 1999, 814 –829]. The uncertainty in the language and in the speech which goes back to a person's perception of life as the unknowable world, full of riddles, illustrate many Russian particles (or complexes of particles) expressing the meaning of uncertainty, ambiguity, assumption: *chto li, chut li ne, yedva li, kak bi, vrode, slovno, tochno, budto, vrode bi, vrode budto, vrode kak, vrode kak bi, slovno kak bi, kak budto, tochno tak, tochno slovno, kak rovno bi* (a kind of *perhaps, as if*) etc., which are the signs of simulacrum – a subjective impression of what has seemed, has come in dream, has seemed to be heard. At the syntactic level uncertainty is equivalent to the undifferentiated relations which are shown by many means of connection in a compound sentence. Though the main types of compound sentences are defined, the problem of their syntactic links marking the category of uncertainty is still far from the final decision and needs correction. This testifies novelty and relevance of this research.

The purpose of the research – to describe compound sentences with the analogues of the conjunctions in the light of the current trends of changes of the language system.

CONCLUSIONS

1) the category of uncertainty peculiar to the Russian mentality at the syntactic level is expressed by undifferentiated; relations 2) undifferentiated relations are marked by the analogues of the conjunctions (*tak (so), vse-taki (after all), vse zhe (still), vse ravno (all the same), tem ne meneye (nevertheless)*) appearing owing to the replacement of double clamps with single; 3) polypredicative formations with the analogues of the conjunctions (in many cases capable to be replaced with coordinate conjunctions) can't be referred to the sphere of the coordination as these analogues mark a post-positive part of the formations as dependent; therefore it is logical to define relations in such formations as being out of the opposition "coordination – subordination"; 4) one of the causes of undifferentiated relations are current trends of changes of the language system: a) the staticizing (fragmentary) prose leading to the destruction of subordinative constructions, b) emergence of the newspeak accompanied with "diffutisation" and "secretion" of new word formations and meanings of the known words and expressions.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Aroustunova N.D. Predlozhenie i ego smysl: Logiko-semanticheskie problem. – Nauka, 1976. – 383 s.
- Bogoroditskii V.A. Obschiy kurs russkoi grammatiki. M.; L., 1935. s. 352
- Ivanchikova E.A. Razvitiye podchinitelnykh konstruksii funktsionalnykh tipov // *Izmeneniya v stroe slozhnopodchinennogo predlozheniya: Ocherki po istoricheskoi grammatike russkogo literaturnogo yazyka XIX v. M., 1964, Izd-vo "Nauka", S.83-256.*
- Kolosova T.A., Cheremisina M.I. O pritsipakh klassifikatsii slozhnykh predlozhenii // *Voprosy yazykoznaniya. 1984. № 6, S.69-80*
- Kolosova T.A., Cheremisina M.I. O znachimosti ponyatii "souznost" i "bessouznost" v tipologii russkikh slozhnykh predlozhenii // *Slozhnoye predlozheniye: traditsionnye voprosy teorii i opisaniya i novye aspekty yego izutcheniya. Bypusk 1. Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii. – M.: Russkii uchebnyi tsentr. 2000, - S.24-32.* Kruchina I.N. Structura i funktsii sochinitelnoi svyazi v russkom yazyke. M., 1988. – 212 s.
- Russkaya grammatika: nauchnye trudy / Rossiiskaya akademiya nauk. Institut russkogo yazyka im. V.V.Vinogradova / E.A.Bryzgunova, K.V.Gabuchan, V.A.Itskovich, I.I.Kruchinina, M.V. Lyapon, A.F.Priyatkina, I.P.Svyatogor. N.U. Shvedova / - Reprintnoye izdanie - M., 2005, v.2, – 712 s.
- Sirotnina O.B. Russkii yazyk: systema, uzus i sozdavaemye imi riski / Saratov, izd-vo Sarat. un-ta. 2013. – 116 s.
- Shiryaev E.N. Differentsiatsiya sochinitelnykh i podchinitelnykh souzov na sintaksicheskoi osnove // *Nauch. Dokl. Vysshei shk. Filol. nauki. – 1980. №2 – S. 49-54.*
- Vierzbicka, A., *English Meaning and Culture* Oxford University Press. 2006.
- Vereshchagin, E., *Modern Bible in popular form.* Lada. 2013.
- Rakhimova, Dinara Irekovna; Chernysheva, Alevtina Yurevna PROBLEMS OF STADYING A COMPOSITE SENTENCE OF HIGH SCHOOL // *Modem Journal of language Teaching Methods* 2016. – Special Issue, pp. 102-105.