

To the Problem of Delimitation of the Expanded Sentence as an Independent Syntactic Category in Modern Linguistics

Rishat Zhurkenovich Saurbayev, Kairat Muhamedhafizovich Tekzhanov, Adilbek Dautbekovich Amrenov, Kuanysh Sovetovich Ergaliyev, Nurlan Ramazanovich Omarov

Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, 140000, Pavlodar, Mira Street, 60, Kazakhstan

rishat_1062@inbox.ru

Abstract: The article deals with the problem of delimitation of expanded sentences from simple and complex ones. In modern linguistics, the problem of expanded sentence is disputable; some linguists trace the presence of expanding components in the structure of simple sentence, however, they hesitate to separate such type of sentence as an independent syntactic unit; the others consider, that such unit exists, and separate the third type of sentence, the expanded one, alongside with simple and complex sentences. The authors carry out the retrospective analysis of writings, devoted to the problem of this linguistic phenomenon under study. The article also deals with such notions, as expanded-coordinate and expanded-subordinate sentences in terms of the expanded sentence. The material of English and Tatar languages is used in the paper, as the study of languages, different in structure and system, provides interpenetration to the peculiarities of each language, what is not always possible, when studying only one particular language. At that, there is an opportunity to reveal and to describe one or another peculiarity of the compared languages, which can escape, when studying one particular language.

[Saurbayev R. Zh., Tekzhanov K.M., Amrenov A.D., Ergaliyev K.S., Omarov N.R. **To the Problem of Delimitation of the Expanded Sentence as an Independent Syntactic Category in Modern Linguistics.** *Life Sci J* 2013;10(12s):464-474] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 79

Keywords: Expanded sentence, predicative line, semi-predicative construction, expanded-subordinate sentence, expanded-coordinate sentence

1. Introduction

The notion of expanded sentence is obscurely developed not only in the syntax of Turkic languages, but in the whole syntax theory. There are different viewpoints on the nature of expanded sentence, but there are practically no special researches in the study of Turkic languages, devoted to this problem. The urgent character of the research is determined by the necessity to study the structural-semantic and the functional-communicative properties of semi-predicative constructions as syntactic units, appeared due to active processes in development of the syntactic structure of Turkic and English languages; by the tasks of further development of the syntactic theory, in particular, the description of structural-semantic and functional-stylistic properties of the expanded sentence; by the crudity of the expanded sentence analysis in contrastive-comparative presentation, and the lack of exact criteria of delimitation of the expanded sentence from the adjoining syntactic categories.

2. The level of knowledge of the expanded sentence problem.

The problems, connected with the sentence expansion, always attracted the attention of many researchers. The notion of expansion itself has a long scientific tradition of study. In the period of development of the expansion theory, it was studied from another aspect, than today, in the aspect of the

other syntactic phenomena. For instance, N.I. Grech and A.Kh. Vostokov considered the syntactic category under study as a contracted subordinate clause. However, the theory of contracted subordinate clauses in native linguistics was criticized severely. For instance, A.M. Peshkovsky, in his writing, refers all the clauses, admitted previously as the contracted subordinate ones, to the unattached secondary parts. His views on this matter found a firm lodgment in native syntactic science [1].

We find the term "expanded sentence" itself in writings of A.A. Shakhmatov in connection with the theory of sentences, both one-part and two-part. The linguists had a specific interest to the simple sentences, which correlated with poly-predicative constructions, compound and complex sentences. In native linguistics, the theory of "partial predicativity" dates back to the writings of A.A. Shakhmatov [2]. F.I. Buslaev considered a transition of full subordinate clauses into nouns, adjectives and adverbs. At that, the scientist named the "contracted sentences" as "the favorite clause of our language" [3].

A special study by A.G. Rudnev was devoted to the expanded sentence, as an independent syntactic category [4].

In this period, main attention was paid to the study of external structure of the sentence. Structural-semantic expansion of the sentence was connected with special constructions, included to the sentence:

unattached participle clauses, homogenous parts, vocatives, parenthesis and their constructions, comparative constructions etc. It was actively studied the formal-syntactic, and structural expansion of the simple sentence, connected with the specific type of syntactic relations, where enter the components of predicative unit.

Thus, A.F. Priyatkina [5] in her writing considers the expanded sentence as a grammatical phenomenon, which has a formal-syntactic character and represented by specific syntactic relations, reduced to two types: additional predicativity and in-row relations. A defined set of syntactic structures corresponds to each of them.

Apart from special syntactic relations, A.F. Priyatkina emphasizes the distinguishing features of the expanded simple sentence: the composition of syntactic positions, special type of syntactic relation, typical only of these sentences, formal means of structure. Her analysis of constructions, which were not studied previously, is of undoubted interest, although, in her opinion, they are the formal-grammatical means of expansion of the simple sentence. All the variety of relations, expanding the sentence, is reflected in them [5].

Thus, in Russian linguistics, the problems of sentence expansion have their own history. They were studied from different viewpoints, both formal-syntactic and structural-semantic, considered as a part of simple sentence and an independent category of syntax.

In the study of Turkic languages, the disputable problems of expanded sentences are mainly connected with the nature of one or another syntactic clause. The researchers of Turkic languages, the same as in Russian language, began to study thoroughly the nature of expanded sentences. Thus, G.A. Abdurakhmanov, considering this construction as an independent subject of research, writes: "... an expanded sentence is a peculiar syntactic construction, which has a special subject of investigation" [6]. The researcher refers the syntactic clauses to the number of unattached parts of sentence. Later G.A. Abdurakhmanov raises once again the question about urgency of the problem of expanded sentence and the necessity of its further study. He writes, that the expanded sentence is a peculiar syntactic construction, where, besides the main and subordinate parts of sentence, are the unattached parts, vocatives and parenthesis, which have a definitive meaning in the sentence and are included into syntactic (explanatory connection) with the other parts of sentence [7].

In Altaic language the syntax problem of expanded sentence is presented in the multi-author monograph by A.T. Tybykova and M.I. Cheremisina "The Expanded Sentence in Altaic Language",

contributed much to the theory of expanded sentence in Turkic languages. In the monograph the status of expanded sentence is determined, and the types of sentences, defined as the expanded ones by the researchers, are described. In the opinion of the authors of the monograph, the expanded sentence takes the intermediate position between the simple sentence, containing one predicative unit, and complex sentence. Such sentences comprise the expanding component, which is a result of reduction of the predicative part of the complex sentence [8].

Kh.M. Esenov, studying the expanded sentences in Kazakh language, considered them from the viewpoint of dependent constructions, to which he refers all subordinate components, both those, which possess the properties of sentence, and the ones without them, i.e. those components in the sentence have the character of subordination and semantically specify and clarify: in one case - the meaning of the main clause, in another case - one of the governing parts of sentence.

Studying the structure of complex sentences, Kh.M. Esenov comes to conclusion, that the expanded sentences deserve special study, followed by their arrangement and classification, as an independent category [9].

A.N. Kononov underlined that in the study of syntactic structure of Turkic languages "the task of clear delimitation of sentence types - simple, expanded and complex - is quite urgent" [10].

A.S. Safaev, speaking about the complex sentence, points to the existence of "difficult constructions", which are between simple and complex sentences. He separated the expanded sentence as a peculiar syntactic category. "Difficult constructions", in the opinion of A.S. Safaev, are the following: "...It is common knowledge that the problems of complex sentences in Turkic languages stir up a dispute until then. Here are met the constructions, which can be referred to the sphere of neither simple, nor complex sentence from the traditional point of view. Such constructions should be estimated in a different way, taking into consideration their specific character" [11]. S.I. Kyazimova in her research chooses the syntactic structure of sentences with homogenous parts as an object of study. In them, she reveals the sentences with homogenous predicates and compound sentences, specifies their borders and considers them as a structural and semantic expansion [12].

In Kazakh linguistics, the expanded sentence was not considered as a peculiar structural-semantic type. Separate issues on this problem were presented in writings of Kh.K. Zhubanov, S. Zhiyenbaev, N.T. Sauranbaev, S.A. Amanzholov, M.B. Balakaev and T.R. Kordabaev.

However, the sentences with expanded constructions were interpreted from the other positions, as a structural element of complex sentence.

M.B. Balakaev considered the sentences with homogenous parts (especially its homogenous predicates) as "the ones, expanded by the simple sentences, borderline between the simple and the complex sentences" [13].

M. Davletov studied the expanded sentence in the Karakalpak language. He considers verbal clauses, unattached parts, parenthesis and vocatives as the elements of structural-semantic expansion and suggests to consider the expanded sentence as "a special type of simple sentences" [14].

In Tatar language, the expanded sentences as a separate category were not studied. For the first time in the Tatar linguistics the researcher F.G. Galyamov considers simple sentences as expanded by homogenous and unattached parts, introducers (parenthesis, parenthetical and inserted constructions), vocatives, syntactic-constructive repetitions [15].

Recently, due to development of semantic syntax, studying the content and meaning of the sentence, as a complex and multiaspect phenomenon, the interest to the problems of expanded simple sentence increased. The study of polypropositive simple sentence produced a number of concepts and notions: condensation [16], summarization [17], inclusion of the sentence with loss of predication [18], interaction of models [20], predicative lines [21], compression of predicative units [22].

One of the important problems of structural-semantic expansion of the sentence is the study of regularities of the sentence essence formation. An attempt to solve this problem was made in the writing of N.A. Arutyunova "The Sentence and its Essence", which promoted to a large extent the study and arrangement of facts, resulting in polypropositive character of the simple sentence. In her research N.A. Arutyunova suggests an idea about the division of word meanings into identifying and predicative (propositive), i.e. ascending to the sentence semantics [23].

The problems of polypropositive character of the simple sentence were fully reflected in the syntactic theory of T.P. Lomtev, paying main attention to the study of sentence structure and its constituents. The sentence is considered as a multi-aspect system, where the semantic subjects enter into determinate relations. The analysis of these relations is of great importance in the theory for deep understanding of sentence structure. T.P. Lomtev found out, that substantive syntactic relations between the constituents are not homogenous. They can be primary and secondary. In his opinion, the part of simple sentences does not have the united predicative

structure, but presents a result of alignment of two predicative relations: primary and latent, secondary. The syntactic relations are primary, if they express one relation between subjects and do not imply the existence of the other one, hidden, latent relation. They are considered secondary mediated ones, if they express one relation between subjects on the basis of existence of another hidden, latent relation between some subjects [24]. Thus, in the sentence *He saw book on the table* the relation between the words *book* and *table* is secondary, as it is based on the existing hidden, latent relation *The book lies on the table*.

Thus, T.P. Lomtev in his theory delimitates the cases of mediated secondary connection between the subjects in the sentence structure and the cases of free connection, being the result of synthesizing of the simple sentence.

One of the foundational researches of the expanded sentences is the writing of M.Y. Blokh "Theoretical Bases of Grammar" [20], where the expanded sentences are considered on the material of English language. At the heart of M.Y. Blokh theory, the main link of sentence revelation as an integrate message unit is the predication, as the number of predicative centers "predicative lines" is a determining factor for separation of sentences as per their complexity. With this characteristic, M.Y. Blokh distinguishes the main structural types of sentence: simple, expanded and complex. The syntactic theory about the expanded sentence is based on the concept of predicativity and semi-predicativity. As per this statement, the notion of simple sentence is determined as mono-predicative; the sentences with the complexes of secondary predication (infinitive, gerundial, participial, verbless), and also the sentences with several coordinate predicates at one subject are excluded from the sphere of simple sentences [20, 25].

R.A. Vafeev is of the same opinion; in his syntactic theory, he considers the expanded sentence as a separate syntactic category, based on the notion of full-predicative construction (subjectival-predicative structure) and semi-predicative construction, including the attributive nonfinite complexes, which bear the additional information of the main content [22].

The modern linguistic science is characterized by the search for system in the language syntactic structure. It shall be underlined, that the comparative study of languages and system description of syntax and syntactic relations will be incomplete, if we do not take into consideration the interdependence and interrelations between two and more semantic structures, which are determined in semantic-syntactic process. This multidirectional interrelation of inter-model processes, which allow speaking about the presence in the language of unsolved problem of general system of relations,

referred to as either "hyperparadigm" or "the nest of syntactic structures" [16].

M.A. Kormilitsyna mentions, that "...it is clear the desire of the majority of researchers, attempting to create the typology of simple sentence, taking into account not only the structural characteristics, but also the informative ones, and to find a place for semantically expanded simple sentences, to represent the typology of the simple sentence as an hierarchical organized system" [23]. The expanded sentence is considered as a kind of semantic-syntactic derivative, located at the periphery of such system or taking the transition interval between the systems of simple or complex sentences.

The study of V.I. Chuglov deals with the consideration of semi-predicative and explanatory constructions, as the elements, expanding the sentence structure and semantics at the material of Russian language. The author distinguishes the expanded sentence as an independent syntactic unit [26].

Thus, the expanded sentences are considered differently in the linguistic literature: 1) as simple, 2) as complex, 3) as a special category (expanded sentence), 4) as a transition phenomenon from simple to complex. A.G. Rudnev was the first, who distinguished the expanded sentence as a transition between simple and complex sentences, and also reconsidered the traditional and formed the new criteria to the typology of simple sentence. These viewpoints of the scientist became a theoretical basis for comparative study of languages with typologically different systems [4].

In literature, devoted to the study of expanded sentences, there are two viewpoints about the problem of their status. G.A. Abdurakhmanov, L.K. Dmitrieva, A.F. Priyatkina, A.G. Rudnev, Kh. Esenov and R.A. Vafeev consider, that the expanded sentences are not included to traditional classification; they emphasize three phenomena as per structural criterion: the syntax of simple sentence, the syntax of expanded sentence and the syntax of complex sentence. They evaluate the expanded sentence as an independent syntactic category [4, 5, 9, 15, 23, 26].

The followers of the second viewpoint (N.A. Baskakov, A.G. Gulyamov, Z.G. Abdullaev, M. Davletov, M.Sh. Mamatov, M.G. Gazilov, K. Mamytbekov, G.A. Basyrova, D.S. Tikeev et al.) consider, that the sentences with the specified syntactic constructions are simple expanded sentences, and they are included to the system of simple sentences. We also consider that the expanded sentence presents a separate sentence type in modern syntactic science.

The researcher M.G. Gazilov considers the expanded sentence as a simple expanded sentence, makes its structural-semantic and functional analysis

in Avar language in comparison with French language. He reveals, that the proportion of expanded sentences takes an important place in syntactic system of Avar and French languages; they are characterized by structural complexity, peculiarity of syntactic means of construction, and also the whole complex of specific problems, connected with such expanding elements of the simple sentence, as homogeneous, participial and other constructions [27].

Syntactic studies, in the opinion of Kh. M. Esenov, should be carried out in three large sections: syntax of the simple sentence, syntax of the expanded sentence and syntax of the complex sentence. Each of these sentence types does not transfer into each other, but presents an independent section of general syntax [9].

In English linguistics the category of expanded sentence is not considered on purpose; so, as per syntactic traditions, there are distinguished simple, complex, compound sentences, and also combined compound and complex sentences at two independent and one independent subordinate clause [28, 29, 30, 31].

The authors of "The University Grammar of English Language", apart from three main types of sentence: simple, complex and compound, also distinguish the construction with additional predication, which is an intermediate type [32].

Some linguists, in terms of the simple sentence, distinguish the intermediate types of sentences, such as cumulative sentences, where the contracted subordinate clauses make one syntactic and semantic unity [33, 34].

B.A. Ilyish distinguishes the transition sentence type from simple to complex, which is represented by poly-predicative constructions: homogenous parts of sentence, dependent unattached clauses. However, the researcher does not distinguish this language phenomenon as a separate syntactic category [35].

A. Dauning and F. Lokk consider the sentence types, having the equipotent and non-equipotent character; in the first case, the relations are characterized as paratactic, in the second case - as hypotactic; they do not consider the independently expanded sentence, however, they trace some syntactic units, as intermediate ones, in the structure of complex and simple sentence [36].

E. Pavey in her study, based on French materials, analyzes the expanded constructions, and in terms of these units, she considers these constructions as the ones, expanding the sentence structure, but she does not distinguish the expanded sentence into separate or independent unit [37].

L. Freyzer, Ch. Clifton and J. Randol, analyzing the sentence structure with dependent

constructions, come to the idea, that the structure of each sentence has a complex character, which can be expanded by the dependent structures in terms of the utterance [38, 39].

A.M. Alduais in the paper considers the simple sentence from the viewpoint of structural and transformational grammar, distinguishing the base structure and hidden structures, which can be revealed during the sentence derivation. Thus, having the simple structure at the surface level, it turns out, that the simple sentence has a complex predicative nature and an ability to express hidden linguistic and cogitative units in compressive structures, creating the expanded sentence [40].

M.J. Butt, in his dissertation research at the material of Urdu language, comes to the idea that, despite the simple structure, the simple sentence has a complex hierarchy of intrasystem connections, expressed by predicative relations in terms of lexico-functional grammar [40].

The representatives of transformational grammar testify, that any sentence is considered from the position of surface and deep structures, and each syntactic unit is considered as a complex hierarchical system [41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46].

Despite the fact, that the thinking logic of native speakers of different languages is similar, common situations, reflected in thinking and communicated by language means, will be different in means of expression.

The research procedure of expanded sentences.

Based on some provisions of transformational grammar by N. Khomsky, the paradigmatic syntax of M.Ya. Blokh, the theory of universally-differential approach of Z.Z. Gatiatullina, and using the paradigmatic-semantic and contextual-functional approach, we considered the sentences as an independent syntactic unit, and not just the simple expanded sentence.

3. The expanded sentence as an independent syntactic category.

It shall be noted that the functions and meanings of the expanded sentence, as an independent syntactic category, are close to another sentence types, although each of them is characterized by independence, the interconnection and interdetermination are observed between them.

The expanded sentence consists of the leading, matrix sentence and additional, semi-predicative essentially, which represents an additional element and determines the content of the main utterance from different angles. Herein is the essence of the expanded sentence.

The subject of study of the simple sentence is its main types: simple unexpanded sentence and simple expanded sentence. The sentences with

developed parts belong to the expanded ones.

For instance: *He cursed Strickland freely, then, calling for the waiter, paid for the drinks, and left.* (S. Maugham)

In the abovementioned sentence it is possible to point out several expanded sentence parts *calling for the waiter* - participle, *paid for the drinks, and left* - homogenous predicates with coordination.

Thus, on the surface layer there is one predicative center, expanded by semi-predicative complexes - participle, and expanded and added by the coordinate predicates. If to consider the deep structure of the analyzed sentence, it is possible to distinguish four propositions, four predicative lines in it.

He cursed Strickland freely → *he called for the waiter* → *he paid for the drinks* → *he left*.

In Tatar language:

Zhayga chykkach, bush vakkytyn gel shunda chokchynyp utkarde: bakchasyn tashtan aryndyrdy, almaagachlarnyn toben kabartty, botaklaryn kiste, su sipte...! (G. Ibragimov)

Such sentences in the majority of Turkic languages refer to the category of complex ones. At that, obviously, it is taken into account its semantic translation into Russian, which, in this case, presents the models of complex sentence or the structural composition of the similar construction. If to consider this sentence separately, we obtain *Zhay chykyt* (The summer has come), *bush vakkytyn gel bakchada chokchynyp utkarde* (in free time messed around the garden), *bakchasyn tashtan aryndyrdy* (took away the stones from the garden), *almaagachlarnyn toben kabartty* (scuffled under the apple-trees), *botaklaryn kiste*, (cut the branches), *su sipte* (watered).

However, the isolated consideration of components does not provide the right understanding of its content. In fact, the semi-predicative complex, expressed by adverbial participle, refers to fully-predicative center *bush vakkytyn gel bakchada chokchynyp utkarde* (he messed around the garden all his free time), acting, therefore, in the function of sentence opening construction, adverbial modifier of time *Zhayga chykkach* (As soon as summer has come). Tonally in the sentence, it is recorded as a unity.

We consider the sentences of similar construction as the expanded sentences with semi-predicative constructions, expressed by participial complex and homogenous predicates.

In the external surface structure, the abovementioned sentence is close to the simple sentence structure, especially in that the dependent part is not distinguished clearly, but is used in one syntagmatic range with the main, clarified part. The reason is that the verbal stems in the dependent part of

the construction do not act as predicates, but are considered as the words of additional, expanded supplementary action.

In the deep structure in the sentence we distinguish the fully-predicative line, represented by the subjectival-predicative relation *chokchynyp utkarde*, and the second line - dependent, is expressed by the semi-predicative construction *Zhayga chykkach* and homogenous parts *bakchasyntashan aryndyrdy, almaagachlaryntoben kabarty, botaklarynt kiste, su sipte*, which expand the sentence semantically and structurally, complicating it. In such sentence, as well as in the simple one, there is one predicative center and one subjectival-predicate base.

However, it shall be noted, that the structures of such type greatly differ from the simple ones. First of all, the expanded sentence communicates a complex situation, coming from the nature of sentence itself. According to G.N. Sanzheev, the similar construction is "the sentence in the sentence". It is not by chance that these sentences, when being translated to the Russian language, are presented by the structure of complex or expanded sentence. Kh.M. Esenov truly remarks, that "...of course, the matter is not in the translation, as the translation not always communicates the structure of the original. However, a complex thought is mainly communicated by the complex construction" [9].

The expanded sentence can be determined as polypredicative sentence with combined expression of predicative lines (coordinative or subordinative) [20].

The simple sentence is characterized by monopredicativity. As per this requirement, from the area of simple sentences there are excluded the sentences with secondary predication complexes (infinitive, gerundial, verbless for English language and infinitive, participial, adverbial participial and verbless for Tatar language), and also the sentences with several coordinate participles at one subject. Coordinative connection, including the homogenous one, if not add a new level of naming unit, but complicates the predication [22].

The complex sentence, as distinct from the simple and expanded, is defined as a polypredicative sentence with separate expression of predicative lines with subordinative or coordinative connection.

4. The expanded sentences

The expanded sentences are monosubject, but polypredicative syntactic constructions: they involve two or more predicative lines. The difference is in the independence degree of the predicative lines: in complex sentence the predicative lines are expressed separately, they are fully-predicative, each of these lines has its own subject and predicate, expressed by finite verb forms; in expanded sentence the predicative lines are expressed together, one of the

predicative lines is semi-predicative (secondary-predicative, potentially predicative). In other words, in the expanded sentence one predicative line is determined as a leading, dominant, and the others present semi-predicative expansion.

From the viewpoint of paradigmatics, the expanded sentence is polypredicative, as it is derived from two base sentences.

Let us consider it by the examples:

Sensing my dislike of the room, Lord Penross laughed. (J.W. Brown)

← *Lord Penross laughed, he sensed my dislike of the room* ← *Lord Penross laughed + He sensed my dislike + my dislike was provoked with the room.* Structurally on the surface layer this sentence consists of one fully-predicative construction *Lord Penross laughed*, the second one is represented by semi-predicative *sensing my dislike of the room*. However, in deep structure we see not the one, but three propositions, one of which is fully-predicative and two semi-predicative.

Bethune walked back to the table, looking thoughtfully at the drawn face of the patient. (T. Allan, S. Gordon) ← *Bethune walked back to the table + He was looking thoughtfully + He was looking at the drawn face + the face was drawn + the drawn face belonged to the patient.*

Let us compare with the Tatar language:

Gafiyatulla babaynyn oe kechkene bulmaganlyktan, Gazinur, uzak uylamycha ati-anisenen rizalygyn alyp bashka chyky (G. Apsalov). ← *Gafiyatulla babaynyn oe kechkene buldy + Gazinur, uzak uylamycha ati-anisenen rizalygyn alyp bashka chyky.*

In Tatar language on surface layer we found one fully-predicative construction *ati-anisenen rizalygyn alyp bashka chyky*, however, in deep structure, the same as in English language, we have three propositions, consisting of one fully-predicative construction and two semi-predicative *Gafiyatulla babaynyn oe kechkene bulmaganlyktan* and *Gazinur, uzak uylamycha*. These constructions are expressed by the participle and noun in initial case.

Kaykach, mina aytersen ← *Sin kaytsan + Sin mina aytersen.*

I saw her entering the room. ← *I saw her. + She was entering the room.* The second kernel sentence was subject to adhesion process, it was transformed into participial semi-predicative complex (*her entering the room*) and joined with the first sentence. Two predicative lines intercross around the general component, *her*, which performs a function of complement in main, fully-predicative part.

In Tatar sentence, we also find the similar example:

Kaytkaç, mina aytersen ← Sin kaytasan+Sin mina aytersen.

The second kernel sentence *Kaytkaç*, expressed by adverbial participle, gives a full sentence *Sin kaytasan* during transformation, which is united around the general component *mina*, which, the same as in the example from English language, performs a function of complement.

Thus, the expanded sentence in compared languages can be defined as a syntactic construction, intermediate between the complex and simple sentences: in its "surface", syntactic structure the expanded sentence is similar to the simple one, as there is only one fully-predicative line; in its "deep", semantic structure and derivational basis the expanded sentence is similar to the complex sentence, as it is derived from two kernel sentences and reflects two dynamic situations.

From the viewpoint of semantics, the speaker, using the expanded sentence, evaluates the connection between two situationally joint events as more close, than between the events, described by means of the complex sentence: one of the events (frequently described in the semi-predicative part) presents a cocurrent event, contextual background in relation to the other, dominant event (frequently described in fully-predicative part).

5. The expanded-subordinate sentence

As per the syntactic theory of M.Y. Blokh, the expanded sentences, as well as the complex sentences of full composition (pleni-complex, fully complex), further fall into expanded-coordinate, based on the coordination principle (parataxis) and expanded-subordinate, based on the subordination principle (hypotaxis) [20].

In the expanded-subordinate sentence, one kernel sentence acts as a matrix, into which another kernel sentence is embedded; the embedded sentence is transformed into semi-predicative word combination and takes up the position of any sentence part in matrix sentence. The matrix sentence becomes a leading, main part of the expanded-subordinate sentence, and the embedded sentence becomes the subordinate semi-predicative. The adhesion of two predicative lines in the expanded-subordinate sentence can be executed in two ways: in the process of usage of sentence general part and in the process of direct linear expansion.

The expanded-subordinate sentences, based on joint use of words, fall into two types: with general subject and general complement. The expanded-subordinate sentences with general subject are formed from two base sentences, intercrossed due to one and the same subject, for instance: *They married young. ←They married. + They were young.* The predicate in such sentences is determined as "double predicate", as

it represents the adhesion of verbal predicate with nominal predicate. The expanded-subordinate sentences with double predicate express the simultaneity of two events, from which the more informative and important is the event, expressed in the expanding part; it can be shown by means of transformation of such sentence to the equivalent complex sentence, compare: *When they married, they were young.* Another type of the expanded-subordinate sentences with general subject are the sentences with so-called constructions of complex subject; in such sentences the verb in the main part is used in passive form, and the expanding part includes the semi-predicative complexes, expressed by the infinitive or participle, for instance: *Now the sideboard was beginning to be laden with many elaborate, covered dishes. (J.W. Brown)*

Once outside in the fresh air, I took a deep breath, relieved to be away from such a loathsome place, but heartsick about leaving Mrs. Johns there. (J.W. Brown)

It was once in the fresh air outside + I took a deep breath + a deep breath, relieved to be away from such a loathsome place.

The sentences with complex subject are the result of transformation of sentences with complex object into passive; they represent another type of expanded-subordinate sentences, based on joint use of words.

In the expanded-subordinate sentences in English language with general object, the component, around which the fully-predicative and semi-predicative parts intercross, performs the function of object in main, matrix part, and the function of subject in expanding semi-predicative part; for instance, in the sentences with complex object, which include semi-predicative infinitive or participial constructions, being the components of structural-semantic expansion of the whole syntactic complex: *I saw her enter / entering the room. ←I saw her. + She was entering the room.* Such sentences express the simultaneity of two propositions in one place, on condition that the verbs of perception or different mental relations are used in main, matrix part. The other expanded-subordinate sentences can communicate cause-and-effect relations, for instance: *The fallen rock knocked him unconscious. ←The fallen rock knocked him. + He became unconscious.* Some causative verbs are not practically used without the expanded-subordinate sentences with complex object; such sentences can be characterized as the sentences with general object of the "bound" type, and they are not expanded, for instance: *They made me leave; We made him a star; I had my hair done; I want the room done; I like my steaks raw.*

In Tatar language, such constructions were not found, because they are replaced with either complex subordinates, or simple sentences. For instance: *Саматов иптәш, мин сезгә изгелек теләм* (G. Akhunov).

The majority of expanded-subordinate sentences with general object, although not all, can be transformed into the sentences with the general subject, for instance: *I saw her entering/ enter the room.* → *She was seen entering / to enter the room; The fallen rock knocked him unconscious.* → *He was knocked unconscious by the fallen rock.* The abovementioned examples show, that the expanding part of the expanded-subordinate sentences with the general subject and general object can include verbals, infinitive and participle forms, nouns or adjectives.

The expanded-subordinate sentences of direct linear expansion include the sentences with attributive, adverbial and nominal expansion. The expanded-subordinate sentences with attributive expansion are formed from two basic, matrix sentences, one of which is transformed into semi-predicative attribute in post position to the preceding component of the matrix sentence, for instance:

In English language: *The girl crying in the hall looked familiar to me.* ← *The girl looked familiar to me.* + *The girl was crying.*

General semantic component performs the function of subject in the embedded sentence, it is omitted in the process of depredication in the matrix sentence, this component can perform any substantive function, in the mentioned case it is the subject. The attributive semi-predicative constructions, being the direct linear expansion of the sentence, are easily reconstructed up the the relevant full attributive subordinates, for instance: *The girl crying in the hall looked familiar to me.* ← *The girl, who was crying in the hall, looked familiar to me; You behave like a schoolboy afraid of his teacher.* ← *You behave like a schoolboy who is afraid of his teacher.*

In Tatar language: *Zihangir Safargalin, kryk durtenche yashena chykkach, yazgy kyr ashlere togallanep, Saban tuyena nak ber atna kaldy diganda, kinat vafat buldy.* (A. Gylzhey)

In Tatar language the semi-predicative expanded construction *kryk durtenche yashena chykkach* performs the attributive function, expanding the main matrix sentence with semi-predicative constructions and being the direct expansion of the syntactic construction of expanded type.

The expanded-subordinate sentences with adverbial expansion are formed from two basic sentences, one of which, the embedded one, is subject to nominalization (loses a part of

predicative semantics) and takes a position of adverbial part of sentence in another basic sentence, the matrix one, for instance: *When asked about her family, she blushed.* ← *She was asked about her family.* + *She blushed.* The adverbial expansion can be either of attached type, or independent, absolute: if the subject of embedded basic sentence is identical to the subject of matrix sentence, it is omitted and there is formed the adverbial semi-predicative construction of the attached type, as in the abovementioned example; otherwise, the subject is kept, and there is formed the absolute adverbial construction, for instance: *The weather being fine, we decided to have a walk.* ← *The weather was fine.* + *We decided to have a walk; I won't speak with him staring at me like that.* ← *I won't speak.* + *He is staring at me.* A partial predicate in the adverbial semi-predicative construction can be expressed either by participle (in so-called participial adverbial constructions) or can be omitted, it is a copulative verb *to be* (excluding the impersonal constructions, where the verb *to be* is preserved), for instance: *A child of seven, he was already an able musician.* ← *He was a child of seven.* + *He was already an able musician; I can't sleep with the radio on.* ← *The radio is on.* + *I can't sleep.*

In Tatar language: *Suzsez gena chay ahtek* (G. Akhunov). When transforming the expanded sentence, we get two predicative lines, *Bez bir suz aytmicha, chay ahtek.* One is expressed by the semi-predicative participial adverbial construction *Bez bir suz aytmicha*, the second one - by full predication *chay ahtek.*

In the example *Bolay bulgach yashibez* (M. Mahdieyv), the participial adverbial construction *bulgach*, expressed by semi-predication, expands the simple sentence structurally and semantically. On the surface layer, we have two predicative lines, one of which is expressed by fully-predicative construction, the other one - by semi-predicative.

The expanded-subordinate sentences are the sentences with the expanded unattached objects.

In English language: *I looked over to the shut of Miss Marsden's room and tiptoed past it – not wanting to encounter her.* (J.W. Brown)

In the above example the basic matrix sentence with the predicative center is *I looked over to the shut of Miss Marsden's room and tiptoed past it*, the unattached object makes up

the semi-predicative complex *not wanting to encounter her*.

In Tatar language: *shulay da minem sezga aytase suzem bar, Golandam!*

Kiresencha, bik kzykly vakyt!

The analysis of examples in Tatar language shows, that the objects are being detached quite rarely. It is explained, first of all, by the unity of object and predicate in semantic and syntactic connection.

Thus, it is possible to state, that despite the different structure of two combined languages, we have general universal properties of structural-semantic peculiarities of the expanded-subordinate sentence.

The expanded-subordinate sentences with nominal expansion are formed from two basic sentences, one of which, the embedded one, is subject to partial nominalization (it is transformed into semi-predicative word combination with the infinitive or gerund in English and adverbial participle in Tatar) and takes the position of nominal part of sentence in the basic sentence. As well as the other types of linear expansion, the infinitive and gerundial nominal semi-predicative constructions are easily transformed into the relevant fully-predicative subordinates (nominal or adverbial), for instance: *I sent the papers in order for you to study them carefully before the meeting.* → *I sent the papers so that you could study them carefully before the meeting;* *We expected him to write a letter to you.* → *We expected that he would write a letter to you.* Special characteristics of infinitive and gerundial expanding semi-predicative constructions are connected with the peculiarities of infinitive and gerund as non-finite verb forms; in particular, the infinitive after the subordinating conjunction, implies modal meanings of obligation, possibility et al., for instance: *The question is what to do next.* → *The question is what we should do next;* or the gerundial nominal constructions can be introduced by means of conjunction and consist of the noun in the genitive or possessive pronoun, for instance: *I can't approve of his hiding himself away.*

In Tatar language: *Albbatta, ati-anine tynlamycha yaramyi, - dide Salikh, uychan gyna. (A. Eniki)*

The expanded-subordinate sentences with nominal expansion in Tatar language, as is seen from the example, are formed from two basic sentences, one of which, the embedded one, is subject to partial nominalization - *ati-anine tynlamycha*, the other, expressed by the adverbial participial complex, takes the position of nominal part of sentence in the basic sentence *yaramyi*.

Thus, we can make the conclusion, that the expanded-subordinate sentence, both in English and

Tatar languages, have similar traits, namely, one kernel sentence is fully-predicative, the other embedded one is transformed into semi-predicative subordinate construction, taking the position of any part of the sentence in the matrix sentence.

6. The expanded-coordinate sentence

The expanded coordinate sentence is an expanded sentence, based on coordination (parataxis). Paradigmatically, the expanded-coordinate sentence is formed from two or more basic sentences with identical subject of predicate (or both); in the formation process of the expanded-coordinate sentence two predicative lines intercross due to general component, and the other main parts of the sentence are united by coordinative connections. For instance, the sentences with coordinate homogenous predicates are formed from two or more basic sentences with general subject; the expanded-coordinate sentences of poly-predicative type with general subject are formed as a result of subject elimination in other coordinate parts and in the process of adhesion of these parts, for instance: *Lord Penross entered the coach then pulled down the window and waved good bye to me. (J.W. Brown)*

Lord Penross entered the coach + he pulled down the window + he waved good bye to me.

In the similar example from Tatar language: *Albatta, kyz adaple da, tarbiyale da, unganda, zirak da bulyrge tiesh (A. Eniki).*

Albatta, kyz adaple da bulyrge tiesh+kyz tarbiyale da bulurda tiesh+kyz zirak da bulyrge tiesh.

In these examples, one of the basic sentences becomes the leading part of the expanded-coordinate sentence, and the second one is transformed into the subsequent coordinate subordinate part with semi-predicative construction, which correlates with the general subject.

Concerning the coordinate homogenous subjects, which refer to one predicate, in the expanded-coordinate sentences of polysubjective type with general predicate, they not always produce the separate predicative lines, but only when they are located distantly from each other, when there are adversative or contrastive relations between them, or when one of them is an a compartment.

Let us make an example:

Tom is participating in this project, and Jack too; Tom, not Jack, is participating in this project. ← *Tom is participating in this project. + Jack is (not) participating in this project.* The subjects, joint by the coordinate connections in terms of simple syntagmatic sequence (syndetic or asyndetic), do not produce the separate predicative lines with the predicate, but produce the predicative line with it as a joint group subject; it is proved by the

form of person and number of verb-predicate, compare: *Tom and Jack are participating in this project.*

The coordinate connections between the parts of the expanded-coordinate sentence are the same, as in proper compound sentences: unmarked coordination is transmitted only by copulative conjunction *and* or zero connector; marked coordination comprises the separating relations, consecutive, explanatory, adversative etc. For instance:

Chachmilar, urmyilar bu zhirde (A. Fayzi) Alar chachmilar bu zhirde + Alar urmyilar bu zhirde. Apdelbar, uynarga telasa da, bu fikerne kire kaktı (A. Fayzi). Apdelbar uynarga telıy+ Apdelbar bu fikerne kire kaktı.

The expanded-coordinate sentences can be transformed into relevant full compound sentences with common subjects or common predicates. However, similar transformations show functional differences of these two types of syntactic constructions; in particular, they have different actual division: the actual division of the compound sentence is a combination of two informative perspectives into one complex; the actual division of the expanded-coordinate sentence is one informative perspective with complex monorheme. Besides, the interchangeability of actions in the expanded-coordinate sentence makes it communicatively tense, emotionally accentuated syntactic construction.

For instance, in English language: *The monk understood and stepped away from the others, joining Petride at the side of the vehicle. (R. Ludlum)*

The two priests who were not restraining Fontine raced to the rented car and began the search. (R. Ludlum)

It was time to go downstairs for breakfast, and my meeting and talking with Lord Penross. (J.W. Brown)

In Tatar language: *Habir, shulay uzenen uylary belan kyzygyshyp, achulanyp kaharlanda oste-bashy buyalyp betkan Taugiz kaytyp kerde (Kh. Kamalov).*

Alar utilge tapshyrgan tege moges ber da kotmaganda, inde onytylyp bette diganda, birkonne kinat Taugizne "sozde" (Kh. Kamalov)

Thus, in Tatar language the expanded sentence with coordinate predicates creates an effect of tension, the interchangeability of state expresses the dynamism, concentrates the reader's attention on the state.

The expanded-coordinate sentences in the combined languages represent the expanded sentence, based on coordination. The coordinate connections between the parts of the expanded-coordinate sentence are transmitted by copulative conjunctions or

asyndeton, in Tatar language, the coordination is mainly transmitted by the asyndeton or connective words. The expanded-coordinate sentence either communicates the dynamism of action, or creates the effect of tension, concentrates the attention on the subject's state or action in two combined languages, acting as an expressive stylistic mean.

7. Conclusion.

The expanded sentence is still a disputable problem of the contemporary syntax. In Russian linguistics, this syntactic unit is distinguished into special category - the expanded sentence. However, there is no consensus among the linguists, some consider that the studied syntactic phenomenon represents a part of simple expanded sentence, as an embedded construction, expanding the structure and semantics of simple sentence, the others distinguish it as an independent syntactic category. In foreign linguistics this unit is not considered as a separate independent category, but as a part of simple sentence, unattached from the main one by means of punctuation and intonation. As a result, this phenomenon remains unstudied in terms of traditional syntax. The expanded sentence in compared languages can be defined as a syntactic construction, intermediate between the complex and simple sentences. In the character of syntactic connection, the expanded sentences fall into two syntactic types: the expanded-subordinate and the expanded-coordinate. The expanded-subordinate sentences in languages, different in structure, have the universal traits: one kernel sentence, expressed by fully-predicative line, the other, embedded one, is transformed into semi-predicative subordinate construction, taking the position of any part of the sentence in the matrix sentence.

The expanded-coordinate sentence in the compared languages is an expanded sentence, based on coordination. The expanded-coordinate sentence either communicates the dynamism of action, or creates the effect of tension and concentrates the attention of the subject's state or actions.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Saurbayev

Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, 140000, Pavlodar, Mira Street, 60, Kazakhstan

rishat_1062@inbox.ru

References

1. Peshkovsky, A.M., 1954. Russian Syntax in Scientific Presentation. Moscow: Uchpedgiz, pp: 512.
2. Shakhmatov, A.A., 2001. The Syntax of Russian Language. Moscow: URSS, pp: 624.
3. Buslaev, F.I., 1959. The Historical Grammar of Russian Language. Moscow, pp: 623.
4. Rudnev, A.G., 1959. The Syntax of the Expanded Sentence. Moscow, pp: 168.

5. Priyatkina, A.F., 1983. The Expanded Simple Sentence. Vladivostok, pp: 95.
6. Abdurakhmanov, G.A., 1971. The Syntax of Expanded Sentence: to Some Doubtful Problems of Syntax of Turkic Languages. Structure and History of Turkic Languages. Moscow: Nauka, pp: 138 - 147.
7. Abdurakhmanov, G.A., 1970. The study of syntax of Turkic languages. Soviet Study of Turkic Languages, 1(1): 45-49.
8. Tybykova, A.T. and M.I. Cheremisina, 2009. The Expanded Sentence in Altai Language. Novosibirsk: Nauka, pp: 198.
9. Esenov, Kh.M., 1992. The Syntax of Expanded Sentence in Kazakh Language. Alma-Ata: Mektep, pp: 206.
10. Kononov, A.N., 1984. The urgent problems of Turkic linguistics. The Problems of Linguistics, No. 6, pp: 3-13.
11. Safaev, A.S., 1977. The Semantic-Syntactic Division of Sentence in Uzbek Language. Tashkent: Fan, pp: 142.
12. Kyazimova, A.I., 1984. The Expansion of Simple Sentence by Homogenous Parts in Modern Azerbaijani Language, PhD Thesis, Institute of Languages, Academy of Science AzSSR, Baku.
13. Balakaev, M.B., 1959. Modern Kazakh Language. Syntax. Alma-Ata: Nauka, pp: 234.
14. Davletov, M., 1989. Structural Types of Simple Expanded Sentence in Modern Karakalpak Language, PhD Thesis, Institute of Languages, Academy of Science UzSSR, Tashkent.
15. Galyamov, F.G., 2006. Structural-Semantic Expansion of the Simple Sentence in Tatar Language, PhD Thesis, Language, Literature and Art Institute, Academy of Science RT, Kazan.
16. Alisova, T.B., 1971. The Outlines of Syntax of Modern Italian language. Moscow, pp: 293.
17. Moskalskaya, O.I., 1981. The Problems of Syntax System Description. Moscow: High School, pp: 173.
18. Barkhudarov, L.S., 1973. About several syntactic phenomena at sentence nominalization (nominal transformation). Scientific Reports of High School, Philological Sciences, 6, pp: 57-64.
19. Zolotova, G.A., 1973. The Outline of Functional Syntax of Russian Language. Moscow: High School, pp: 350.
20. Blokh, M.Y., 2004. Theoretical Bases of Grammar. Moscow: High School, pp: 238.
21. Arutyunova, N.D., 2002. The Sentence and its Essence. Moscow: URSS, pp: 384.
22. Vafeev, R.A. and R.Zh. Saurbaev, 2002. Communicative Division of Expanded Sentence in English and Tatar Languages. Suleimanovsky Readings. Tyumen: TSU Publisher, pp: 15-21.
23. Kormilitsyna, M.A., 2003. The Semantically Expanded (Polypropositive) Simple Sentence in Oral Speech. Moscow: URSS, pp: 151.
24. Lomtev, T.P., 1979. The Structure of Sentence in Russian Language. Moscow: Prosveshenie, pp: 198.
25. Blokh M.Y. 2004. Theoretical Course of English Grammar. Moscow: High School.
26. Chuglov, V.I., 2012. The Expanded Sentence: Semi-Predicative and Explanatory Constructions in Modern Russian Literary Language: Structural-Semantic Aspect, PhD Thesis, YSU, Yaroslavl'.
27. Gazilov, M.G., 2003. The Expanded Sentence in Avatar language in Comparison with French Language, PhD Thesis, The Institute of Linguistics of the RAS, Moscow.
28. Fodor, J.A. and M.F. Garette, 1967. Some syntactical determinants of sentential complexity. Percept. Psychologies, 2, pp: 289-296.
29. Brington, J.L., 2000. The Structure of Modern English. A Linguistic Introduction. Philadelphia-Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp: 311.
30. Kruisinga, E. 1932. A Handbook of Present-Day English, Croningen.
31. Drazdauskas, G. and G. Mikaeljan, 1973. An Outline of English Syntax.
32. Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvic, 1982. A University Grammar of English. Moscow: High School, pp: 391.
33. Irtenyeva, N.F., O.M. Barsova, M.Y. Blokh and A.P. Shapkin. A Theoretical English Grammar (Syntax). Moscow, pp: 143.
34. Alexandrova, O. and S. Terminasova, 1987. English Syntax (Collocation Colligation and Discourse). Moscow Univ. Press, Moscow, pp: 185.
35. Ilyish, B., 1971. The Structure of Modern English. Moscow, Prosveschenye, pp: 365.
36. Downing, A. and F.A. Locke, 1992. A University Course in English Grammar. Prentice Hall, International.
37. Pavey, E., 2001. Information Structure in Acadian French. A Thesis for Degree of MA, Grand Forks, North Dakota.
38. Fraiser, L., Ch. Clifton and J. Randall, 1983. Filling gaps: decision principles and structure in sentence comprehension. Cognition, 13: 187-222.
39. Fraiser, L., 1985. Syntactic Complexity. Natural Language Parsing: Psychological, Computational and Theoretical Perspectives. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
40. Alduais, A. M. C., 2012. Sentence analysis from the point of view of traditional, structural and transformational grammars. Informational Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2(12): 214-219.
41. Butt, M.J., 1993. The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu. Dissertation for the Degree PhD, Stanford Univ., pp: 250.
42. Jackendoff, R., 1972. Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge, M.A. MIT Press.
43. LaPalombara, L.E., 1976. Introduction to Grammar: Traditional, Structural, Transformational. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers.
44. Jeffries, L., 2006. The Structure of Modern English. Palgrave, Palgrave Macmillan.
45. Johnson, K., 2004. Introduction to Transformational Grammar. University of Massachusetts at Amherst, pp: 355.
46. Stanley, P. and R.W. Richie, 1973. On the generative power of transformational grammars. Informational Sciences, 6: 49-83.

11/29/2013