

TYPES OF SENTENCES AND THEIR CLASSIFICATION IN ENGLISH

Asadova Rukhsora Ergash qizi
Student, Pedagogical University

ANNOTATION

The sentence is the immediate integral unit of speech built up of words according to a definite syntactic pattern and distinguished by a contextually relevant communicative purpose. Any coherent connection of words having an informative destination is effected within the framework of the sentence. Therefore the sentence is the main object of syntax as part of the grammatical theory.

Key words: *sentence, one-word sentence, substance-naming, or nominative function; second, reality-evaluating, or predicative function.*

The actual existence of oneword sentences, however, does not contradict the general idea of the sentence as a special syntactic combination of words, the same as the notion of oneelement set in mathematics does not contradict the general idea of the set as a combination of certain elements. Moreover, this fact cannot lead even to the inference that under some circumstances the sentence and the word may wholly coincide: a wordsentence as a unit of the text is radically different from a word-lexeme as a unit of lexicon, the differentiation being inherent in the respective places occupied by the sen-tence and the word in the hierarchy of language levels. While the word is a component element of the word-stock and as such is a nominative unit of language, the sentence, linguistically, is a predicative utteranceunit. It means that the sentence not only names some referents with the help of its wordconstituents, but also, first, presents these referents as making up a certain situation, or, more specifically, a situational event, and second, reflects the connection between the nomi- nal denotation of the event on the one hand, and objective reality on the other, showing the time of the event, its being real or unreal, desirable or undesirable, necessary or unnecessary, etc. Ex.: I am satisfied, the experiment has succeeded. I would have been satisfied if the experiment had succeeded. The experiment seems to have succeeded why then am I not satisfied? Thus, even one uninflected word mak ing up a sentence is thereby turned into an utteranceunit expressing the said se mantic complex through its concrete contextual and constitutional connections. By way of example, compare the different connections of the wordsentence "night" in the following passages:

1) **Night.** Night and the boundless sea, un der the eternal stareyes shining with promise. Was it a dream of freedom coining true?

2) **Night?** Oh no. No night for me until I have worked through the case.

3) **Night.** It pays all the day's debts. No cause for worry now, I tell you. Whereas the utterance "night" in the first of the given passages refers the event to the plane of reminiscences, the "night" of the second passage presents a question in argument connected with the situation wherein the interlocutors are immediately involved, while the latter passage features its "night" in the form of a proposition of reason in the flow of admonitions. It follows from this that there is an other difference between the sentence and the word. Namely, unlike the word, the se nce does not exist in the system of language as a readymade unit; with the exception of a limited number of ut terances of phraseological citation, it is created by the speaker in the course of communication. Stressing this fact, lin guists point out that the sentence, as different from the word, is not a unit of lan guage proper; it is a chunk of text built up as a result of speechmaking process, out of different units of language, first all words,

which are immediate means for making up contextually bound sentences, ecomplete units of speech. It should be noted that this approach to the sentence, very consistently exposed in the works of the prominent Soviet scholar A. I. Smirnitsky, corresponds to the spirit of traditional grammar from the early epoch of its development'. Traditional grammar has never regarded the sentence as part of the system of means of expression; it has always interpreted the sentence not as an implement for constructing speech, but as speech itself, a portion of coherent flow of words of one speaker containing a complete thought. Being a unit of speech, the sentence is intonationally delimited. Intonation separates one sentence from another in the continual flow of uttered segments and, together with various segmental means of expression, participates in rendering essential communicative-predicative meanings (such as, for instance, the syntactic meaning of interrogation in distinction to the meaning of declaration). The role of intonation as a delimiting factor is especially important for sentences which have more than one predicative centre, in particular more than one finite verb. Ex.: 1) The class was over, the noisy children filled the corridors. 2) The class was over. The noisy children filled the corridors. Special intonation contours, including pauses, represent the given speech sequence in the first case as one compound sentence, in the second case as two different sentences (though, certainly, connected both logically and syntactically). Other hand, as we have stated elsewhere, the system of language proper taken separately, and the immediate functioning of this system in the process of intercourse, i.e. speech proper, present an actual unity and should be looked upon as the two sides of one dialectically complicated substance the human language in the broad sense of the term. Within the framework of this unity the sentence itself, as a unit of communication, also presents the two different sides, inseparably connected with each other.

This complicated predicative pattern does enter the system of language. It exists on its own level in the hierarchy of lingual segmental units in the capacity of a "linguistic sentence" and as such is studied by grammatical theory. Thus, the sentence is characterized by its specific category of predication which establishes the relation of the named phenomena to actual life. The general semantic category of modality is also defined by linguists as exposing the connection between the named objects and surrounding reality. However, modality, as different from predication, is not specifically confined to the sentence; this is a broader category revealed both in the grammatical elements of language and its lexical, purely nominative elements. In this sense, every word expressing a definite correlation between the named substance and objective reality should be recognised as modal. Here belong such lexemes of full notional standing as "probability", "desirability", "necessity" and the like, together with all the derivationally relevant words making up the corresponding series of the lexical paradigm of nomination; here belong semifunctional words and phrases of probability and existential evaluation, such as perhaps, may be, by all means, etc.; here belong further, word-particles of specifying modal semantics, such as just, even, would be, etc.; here belong, finally, modal meanings which are actually turned into elements of predicative semantics in concrete, contextually bound utterances. As for predication proper, it embodies not any kind of modality, but only syntactic modality as the fundamental distinguishing feature of the sentence. It is the feature of predication, fully and explicitly expressed by a contextually relevant grammatical complex, which identifies the sentence in distinction to any other combination of words having a situational referent. The centre of predication in a sentence of verbal type (which is the predominant type of sentence structure in English) is a finite verb. The finite verb expresses essential predicative meanings by its categorical forms, first of all, the categories of tense and mood (the category of person, as we have seen before, reflects the corresponding category of the subject). However, proceeding from the principles of sentence

analysis worked out in the Russian school of theoretical syntax, in particular, in the classical treatises of V.V. Vinogradov, we insist that predication is effected not only by the forms of the finite verb connecting it with the subject, but also by all the other forms and elements of the sentence establishing the connection between the named objects and reality, including such means of expression as intonation, word order, different functional words. Besides the purely verbal categories, in the predicative semantics are included such syntactic sentence meanings as purposes of communication (declaration interrogation inducement), modal probability, affirmation and negation, and others, which, taken together, provide for the sentence to be identified on its own, proposemic level of lingual hierarchy. From what has been said about the category of predication, we see quite clearly that the general semantic content of the sentence is not at all reduced to predicative meanings only. Indeed, in order to establish the connection between some substance and reality, it is first necessary to name the substance itself. This latter task is effected in the sentence with the help of its nominative means. Hence, the sentence as a lingual unit performs not one, but two essential signemic (meaningful) functions: first, substancenaming, or nominative function; second, realityevaluating, or predicative function. The terminological definition of the sentence as a predicative unit gives prominence to the main feature distinguishing the sentence from the word among the meaningful lingual units (signemes). However, since every predication is effected upon a certain nomination as its material semantic base, we gain a more profound insight into the difference between the sentence and the word by pointing out the two-aspective meaningful nature of the sentence. The semantics of the sentence presents a unity of its nominative and predicative aspects, while the semantics of the word, in this sense, is monoaspective. Some linguists do not accept the definition of the sentence through predication, considering it to contain tautology, since, allegedly, it equates the sentence with predication ("the sentence is predication, predication is the sentence"). However, the identification of the two aspects of the sentence pointed out above shows that this negative attitude is wholly unjustified; the real content of the predicative interpretation of the sentence has nothing to do with definitions of the "vicious circle" type. In point of fact» as follows from the given exposition of predication, predicative meanings do not exhaust the semantics of the sentence; on the contrary, they presuppose the presence in the sentence of meanings of quite another nature, which form its deeper nominative basis. Predicative functions work upon this deep nominative basis, and as a result the actual utterancesentence is finally produced.

REFERENCES

1. Бархударов Л. С Штелинг Д. Л Грамматика английского языка. М., 1965, 580с.
2. Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. М., 1966. 250с.
3. Воронцова Г.И. Очерки по грамматике английского языка а. М., 1960. 460с.
4. Иванова И.П. Вид и время в современном английском языке. М., 1961. 360с.
5. Смирнийкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. М., 1966, 360с.
6. Смирнийкий А.И. Морфология английского языка. М., 1955, 480с.
7. Allen R. L. The verb system of present-day. American English, 1966, 230p.
8. Bryant M. Current American Usage. N-Y. 1968, 380p.
9. Curne G. O. Grammar of English Language, Nevv York, 1935, 412p.
10. Eries, C. The structure of English. London. 1951, 248p.