Academic leadership. ISSN 1533-7812 Vol: 21 Issue 3
http://academicleadership.org/
SCIMAGOJR H8

COMPOSITE SENTENCE WITH PARENTHETICAL CLAUSE AS AN INVARIANT TYPE OF SYNTACTIC UNIT IN LANGUAGE

M.G. Khoshimov,
PhD Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: The article touches upon the problem of the theory of invariant types of syntactic units, mainly of composite sentences which needs a unified approach, for there are a huge number of notions and terms, one way or another relating to various aspects of the latter indiscriminately treated and commented on. In the article an attempt has been made by the author to take inventory of the existing invariant types of syntactic units, which are traditionally considered to be five- fold, but the author reveals and establishes one more invariant type of composite sentence termed by him " composite sentence with a parenthetical clause of two subtypes: a) introductory; b) insertive, realizing the new introductory and insertive relations termed by the author accordingly:1)introduction; 2) insertion like syntactic relations "coordination" and "subordination", hence, as to the author, introductory and insertive clauses function like the other clauses as introductory and insertive parts of sentence.

Keywords: invariant types of syntactic units, composite sentence theory, syntactic relations "coordination" and "subordination", composite sentence with a parenthetical clause of two subtypes: a) introductory; b) insertive, introductory and insertive parts of sentence, introduction, insertion, introductory and insertive relations**.**

In modern linguistics many scientific investigations have been devoted to the study of problems of general theory of invariant structural-semantic types and subtypes of a large syntactic unit - a composite sentence (CS), but the question of the taxonomy of their invariant types and subtypes in language is still controversial, disputable, debatable and still remains open so far.

Our observations on the above types of syntactic units containing introductory words (Perhaps, he is tired.),, introductory phrases(Frankly speaking, they are not specialists.) and introductory clauses(As you know, we are very busy.) as well as insertive words(Тайсон (боксер) шу ерд яшайди; insertive phrases(Раҳим(акамнинг дўсти) яхши бола or even insertive clauses(Ахмад(у шофер) Кувада яшайди, etc.) in language(s) that function as introductory or insertive parts of the sentence show that modern linguistics is replete with notions and terms that are some way or other related to the above phenomena. They include such notions and terms as "introductory word", "introductory element", "introductory sentence", "introductory component", "parenthetical element", "paranthetical element"i in Russian linguistics, (Rudnev1959, 5-127: Studneva, 1967, 259; Valgina et al., 2002, 324; Russian Grammar, 1980, 236 et al.;); "introductory clause" (Khaimovich, Rogovskaya, 1968, 259; Hartmann, Stork 1972: 163; Kobrina and Korneeva 1976, 168), "parenthetical clause" (Quirk et al. 1985, 976,1032, 1112; Crystal 1991, 63; Halliday 1994: 83; Potts 2002, 623–689 ; Douglas Biber et al;

2007,99,137-138, 1067-1068; and others); "comment clause" (Leech, Svartvick, 1983, 196-197; Crystal, 1995: 229,450; "interpolated clause" (Quirk et al. 1985:1242); Barkhudarov, Shteling 1963:338; 1965:317-318; Ilyish 1965:317-318,338; Khaimovich, Rogovskaya 1968: 290-291); “composite sentence with introductory clause” (Khoshimov 2006a: 229-232, 2006: 95,2022: 12, etc.) in English linguistics or “kirish bo’laklar”, “kirish gap”, “izoh gaplar”, “izoh bo’laklar” (Abdurakhmonov 1996:105-122; Saifullaev 1972:79; Nematov 2011:14; Mengliev 2011: 208; Abdupattoev 2021: 32) “undalmali qo’shma gap” (Bozorov 2013:105); “ilova construktsiyalar” (Maskopov 1970:50), “kiritma gap” (Saidov, Zikrillaev 1973:260-262); “qo’shma gap” (Jamoliddinova 2011: 67-69; 2016: 67); “kirish gapli qo’shma gap” (Khoshimov 2006a: 229-232, 2006: 69-73; 2020:75; 2021: 216, etc.) in Uzbek linguistics, etc.

There are also such notions and terms as “composite sentence”, “compound sentence”, coordinate clause”, “complex sentence”, principle clause”, “subordinate clause“,”host clause”(here we can add even “guest clause” as opposed to the latter), “cleft sentence” “semi-compound sentence“, “semi-complex sentence”, especially “anchor clause”, “matrix clause”, “introductory clause”, “inserted clause”, etc., often found in the scientific use of the English linguistics, which are the most abstract and controversial phenomena due to their undifferentiated, indiscriminate and unintelligible definition and tuse in terms of their structural-semantic and communicative functional properties in the syntactic system of language. In these research works the scientific foundations of the theory of the syntax of composite sentence and other syntactic constructions related to it are founded on the material of the above mentioned languages, the object and methods of their research are defined, all of which are, as is seen from above mentioned, the terms that denote units of polytaxis as a syntactic level, with polytaxemeii functioning as its invariant unit.

Nevertheless, almost all of the above mentioned syntactic phenomena are the ones treated as the results of scientific studies carried out strictly in line with traditional structural - rather constructive linguistics, where the prime attention of researchers was focused mainly on their structural, formal-semantic organization and functional properties, i.e. the research was conducted on the basis of the principle of linguocentrism, and not of anthropocentrism. According to the latter the main factor - the main driving force in the structural-semantic, communicative-pragmatic, linguoculturological, and, in general, in the linguo-cognitive organization and functions of linguistic units, including composite sentences, there is a human factor, without strict consideration of which, as cognitive linguistics shows and proves, it is impossible to give exhaustive and sophisticated solutions and decisions regarding their place, status and use in everyday communication for verbalizing a certain communicative need and intention of those who speak or write in a particular language.

It should be noted that any linguistic phenomenon, including the CS, one way or another, is directly related to certain cognitive or conceptual semantics (contents), more precisely, “concepts” that are naturally verbalized to objectify a certain communicative intention of language speakers.

In this regard, from the point of view of speaker's world cognition and worldview, as well as of particular language picture of the world, hence from an axiological point of view, it is advisable to single out such communicatively important, necessary universal concepts as "attitude", "perception" , "feeling", and "evaluation", represented by: a)subjective-modal assessment; b) objective-modal assessment) manifested in the framework of such conceptually opposite evaluative phenomena of axiological character as "truthfulness / falsity", "emotionality / non-emotionality", "expressiveness / non-expressiveness", "probability / improbability", "obvious / non-obvious", "agitation / calmness", "confidence / uncertainty", "decisiveness / indecisiveness", "doubtfulness / undoubtfulness", etc., in what is expressed and percieved verbally when interlocution takes place with the help of such communicative types of units as "monotaxemes" and "polytaxemes"[iii].

However, the linguality(one's knowledge of language) as such may differ from language user to language user due to his/her competence or incompetence to conduct full-fledged communication with others in his/her daily life and activities due to certain capability formed by the user to some extent, and this, in turn, indicates either high or average or low level of knowledge of a particular language for the actualization of the interlocution necessary for the communicative and pragmatic needs and intentions of language users. Thus, "assessment" is considered by us as a macro-concept which can further be divided into the following micro-concepts: 1) "objective-modal assessment"; 2) "subjective-modal assessment".

From the point of view of linguo-cognitive, linguo-pragmatic and linguo-culturological analysis, the micro-concept "subjective-modal assessment" seems to be the most promising and fruitful for us to investigate, since this concept has a multidimensional nature, directly related to the modus (subjective content) and "dictum" (objective content) of sentences - statements (simple, complex ones), widely used in daily communication, which, in our opinion, is directly related to the actualization of the necessary communicative-pragmatic intention of a speaker of a particular language.

So, we can assume that the concept of "assessment" as an axiological linguo-cognitive phenomenon claims to have a universal existence in thinking – in humane mind, hence in the conceptosphere of each native speaker, and accordingly, in one way or another, it is obligatorily objectified by special verbal(even non-verbal) means in any language.

Based on the foregoing, it can be postulated that any communicative-pragmatically important concept, in our opinion, claims to be universal in the conceptosphere of any mature native speaker, and, accordingly, to one degree or another is obligatorily objectified by special verbal (and sometimes, if necessary, prosodic and paralinguistic) means of language due to necessary, normative, generally accepted structures of linguistic knowledge within the framework of the degree of linguality that is peculiarly formed by a native speaker throughout his life.

The concept of "assessment" is the most characteristic linguocognitive axiological phenomenon in the perception of the objective world and, accordingly, in the worldview, which is a picture of the world, hence any mature, adequately

thinking person - a native speaker cannot but evaluate what he really feels, experiences, hears, visually perceives what is discussed, said, explained, substantiated, as well as what is reported, addressed, referred to, etc., on his own part when he/she is communicating, and on the part of the communicants participating in the acts of speech.

From this point of view, a systematic linguo-cognitive and linguo-culturological study of the entire conglomerate of monolithic linguistic units (lexical, syntactic and discourse), specialized for the representation of the universal micro-concept "subjective-modal assessment" in the typologically different modern (English, Uzbek and Russian) languages, seems to be very relevant, urgent and necessary for establishing their place in the subsystem of syntax and general linguistic status in language.

Based on the results of our observations on the types of multi-level verbalizers of the concept "subjective-modal assessment" (in modern English, Uzbek and Russian), we can assert that in languages there is a whole developed system of linguistic units specialized for verbalization of the above concept(which may be even creolized with non-verbal means).

As a comparative-typological analysis of specialized means - verbalizers of the microconcept "subjective-modal assessment" shows, for adequate verbalization of this microconcept such important types of language units are used : 1) simple sentences with introductory parts expressed by: a) introductory words (such as «Perhaps, he will help you», «Балки, у сизга ёрдам беради», «Наверно, он вам поможет»); б) word combinatons(phrasemes)(of the type: “To tell the truth, I do not like him”, “Ростини айтганда, мен уни ёқтирмайман”, “Правду говоря, я не люблю его”); 2) complex sentences with a parenthetical (introductory) component (such as «As you see, we are not working», «Как вы видите, мы не работаем», «Кўриб турганингиздек, биз ишламаяпмиз») the latter part of which, from our point of view, claims to be the most specialized and adequate means of verbalizing the above micro-concept in the compared languages.

Speaking about the status of a composite sentence with a parenthetical clause which may be represented by introductory or insertive clause, it should be noted that in the special literature devoted to the study of the paradigm of syntactic units, there is still a traditional approach and, accordingly, the old theory of the paradigm of syntactic units, which claims that at the level of syntax there are the following invariant structural types of language units:

1) a simple sentence (I have come);
2) composite sentence :

a) Composite sentence of asyndetic (earliest, becomponential) type; asyndetic compound type: CS=Cpn[iv](*Jack is a doctor, his wife is a teacher*) and asyndetic complex type:CS=Cpl;(*I know you were there);*

b) composite sentence of syndetic(bicomponential) type:

c) composite sentence of a compound type: CS=Cpn: *I came home and you stayed there;*

d) composite sentence of a complex type: (CS=Cpl): *When I came home, you stayed there)*
3) composite(bicomponential) sentence with proportional clauses(CSPrcl): *The more you learn, the more you know.*
4) semi- composite sentence of mixed type (syndetic):
a) semi-complex sentence(SCS= Cpn+sub.clause): *I came home and you stayed there when Nick waved to you*;
b) b) semi-compound sentence(SCS=Cpl+coor.clause): *When I came home, you stayed there and Nick waved to you);*
c) *semi*-complex-compound sentence (CS=Cpl+coor.clause): I came home and you stayed there when Nick waved to you.
5) hyper composite sentence: HCS=Cpl+*and*+Cpl; *When I came, you stayed there, and you were happy because you met me*.

As can be seen from the above, there is no mention of the real existence of such a widely functioning separate, universal invariant type of a complex sentence as a "composite sentence with a parenthetical clause(represented by introductory or intensive component)" in languages (compare: "As you see, I have come"-, Кўриб турганингиздек, мен келдим - Как видите, я пришел; "Jack(he is the policeman) is combing the city and surroundings" - Жек(у ўша полициячи) шаҳар ва унинг атрофларини тинтувдан ўтказяпти – Джек(он же тот полицейский) прочесывает город и окрестности).

Our observations on the syntax of such typologically different modern languages as English, Uzbek and Russian allow us to point out that the paradigm of syntactic units is not five-membered as it traditionally used to be, but rather six-membered, since there are also such types of syntactic units represented by a composite sentence with a parenthetical (introductory or insertive) clause that do not fit, and cannot, and should not fit, within the framework of the above distinguished types of CS in constructive - structural linguistics, compare, for example, the composite sentences with a parenthetical introductory clause(CSPIntC^{v}) *:*
in English: *As you know, the relations between them are not good;*
in Russian: *Как вы знаете, отношения между ними не хорошие;*
in Uzbek: *Улар ўртасидаги муносабатлар, ўзингиз биласиз-ку, яхши эмас.*
in English: *You are that man, if I am not mistaken, who lost his way;*
in Russian: *Вы тот самый человек, если не ошибусь (ошибаюсь), который потерял свою дорогу;*
in Uzbek: *Сиз, адашмасам, йўлини йўқотган ўша кишисиз*.

Here are examples for composite sentence with a parenthetical insertive clause(CSPInsC):

In English: Jack(he is the doctor you want) does not work on Saturdays. In Uzbek: Жек (у сиз ҳохлаган доктор) шанба кунлари ишламайди.

In Russian: Джек(он тот доктор, которого вы хотите)по субботам не работает.

The above types of syntactic units are apparently characterized by a specific structural-semantic (as well as linguo-cognitive and communicative-pragmatic)

organization, which is not typical either of CS, or Cpns, to say nothing of Cpls or mixed types of CS, since they have specific syntactic connections and, accordingly, such syntactic connections are completely different than those of traditional types of CS in language, not to mention their linguo-cognitive, linguo-pragmatic and linguo-culturological properties and aspects.

All this requires a clear-cut statement of the question of determining the status of such types of CS and those ones adjacent to their already known types and subtypes, revealing their linguo-cognitive, linguo-pragmatic and linguo-culturological nature as specific types of CS which function as verbalizers of certain conceptual semantics, as well as components of linguistic pictures of the world, which testify to the inseparable connections of linguo-cognitive, linguo-pragmatic and linguo-culturological components in such syntactic phenomena as CS.

All this will make it possible, we hope, to clearly disclose and establish the real nature of syntactic relations and the types of syntactic connections between the components of such CS as a complex sentence with a parenthetical (introductory or insertive) clause, and, accordingly, the other invariant types of structures under study, endowed with the ability to represent one or another grammatical concept subject to verbalization. Moreover, all these questions that have to be considered from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics, will undoubtedly allow the researcher, in our opinion, to reveal the cognitive-conceptual, pragmatic and cultural essence of syntactic means, including CS in general, and a complex sentence with a parenthetical (introductory or insertive) clause, in particular.

Thus, the need for this kind of scrupulous study is determined by the fact that the system of verbal and non-verbal means representing the universal micro-concept "subjective-modal assessment" or “objective-modal assessment" in languages of different systems has not yet been established and disclosed, the general linguistic status of syntactic constructions with introductory or insertive parts has not been yet revealed, and such real types of CS as a complex sentence with a parenthetical (introductory or insertive) clause (for example: “As is known, there are seven continents in the world; Как известно, в мире семь континентов; Дунёда, маьлумки, етти қитъа бор”(или же: These questions, I think, are very important for your work; Эти вопросы, думаю, очень важны для вашей работы; Бу масалалар, ўйлайманки, сизнинг ишингиз учун жуда муҳим», or: “Jack(he is the doctor you want) does not work on Saturdays” in particular, which are intended for detailed verbalization of the specified microconcepts. In addition, a linguo-cognitive and, accordingly, linguo-culturological approach to syntactic constructions with parenthetical parts (SCWP) in general, and to a complex sentence with a parenthetical (introductory or insertive) clause, in particular, as one of the invariant types of complex sentence that most adequately represent the microconcept "subjective-modal assessment" or “objective-modal assessment" has not yet been implemented, which naturally belongs to the category of universal linguocognitive concepts that are subject to obligatory verbalization and objectification in any particular language.

The above constructions undoubtedly refer to such syntactic categories as CS in language, which requires the creation of theoretical foundations that allow the elaboration of an appropriate terminological apparatus, metaconcepts, metaterms and a metalanguage for studying all the possible types of CS in general, and of composite sentence with a parenthetical (introductory or insertive) clause(CSWPC), in particular. For convenience, the latter can be conventionally referred to as composite parenthetical sentences along with such types of CS that have long been used in scientific researches as compound and complex sentences in the language.

So, we can say that CSWPC as a full-fledged invariant type of CS (containing at least two predicative units, each of which is equal to a simple sentence with a subject-predicate core) and a conceptually and culturally significant language unit also requires working out effective principles and methodology for their linguo-cognitive and linguo-culturological analysis, which directly contributes to the establishment of its invariant type and place in the paradigm of universal types of syntactic units in language(s).

Thus, in this work, under the CSWPC, we understand such an invariant type of CS as an integral linguistic sign, which canonically consists of two asyndetically/ syndetically related components (each of which is equal in structure to a simple sentence with its own subject-predicate core), between which are realized, not the usual coordinating and subordinating relations, but “parenthetical ones(represented by : a)introduction; b) insertion”), for the sake of verbalizing the communicative necessity and the intention of speaker/writer about the “subjective-modal assessment” or “objective-modal assessment" of what is being verbalized in the main matrix part of the CSWPC in one language or another, in which the parenthetical clause can occupy one of the three possible positions as to the matrix part: preposition, interposition and postposition and is separated from the rest of the sentence always by commas, brackets, dashes, etc.

Perhaps, one of the topical issues related to the linguo-cognitive nature of CSWPC is also the question of their taxonomy into communicative-pragmatic types. Based on what modus setting is embedded in the parenthetical component of the CSWPC, the latter can be classified into a number of communicative-pragmatic types:

CSWPC, the parenthetical part of which can verbalize and represent the microconcept of “subjective-modal assessment”, expressed in its following manifestations: 1) surprise; 2) regret; 3) joy; 4) amazement; 5) confidence; 6) assumption; 6) opportunity; 7) impossibility; 8) sequence of thoughts, actions, states; 9) clarification; 10) message:, notification (of the type: they say, report); 11) confirmation (of the type: see, understand, believe, etc.); 12) underlining assessment(without exaggeration); 13) pardon; 14), agreement; 15) permission; 16) justification (such as: in truth, in conscience, except for jokes); 17) approval, confirmation; 18) doubt, uncertainty; 19) conviction, confidence; 20) regret, sadness; 21) joy; 22) satisfaction; 23) conclusion; 24) proof, alibi, etc. What concerns the CSWPC verbalizing canonically the microconcept of “objective-modal assessment” represented by insertive clause, they are aimed at objectifying such concepts as

“apposition”, “additional information”, “addition/supplementation”, “emphasis”, “irony”, “grotesque”, “comment”,”description”, etc.

As can be seen from the above mentioned communicative-pragmatic types of CSWPC, expressing the cognitive, modus-dictemic content of the latter, simultaneously objectify their linguocultural features, which is most clearly reflected in their types and varieties, such as, for example: «Гапнинг пўст калласини (индаллосини) айтсам, ...», «Не кўргиликки,….», «Не бахтиқароликки, ….», айланай,…, ўргилай,….., онанг ўргилгир,…., онанг айлансин,…., барака топгур, …., умринг узоқ бўлгур,…., дийдоринг ўчкур,…., тилинг кесилгур,…., яшшамагур,….., онанг қоқиндиқ,…., онанг гиргиттон,…., отанг бўйингдан ….., as far as I guess,…., as far as I fancy,,…, as the sailors say,….., if my memory doesn’t fail me, ……, as is known,….., as he chanced to be,….., as she should have,….., само собой разумеется, ……, должно быть, ….., кажется,…., стало быть,…., что называется,…., вы вообразите,….., скажите на милость,….., не в укор будь сказано,….., между нами будь сказано,….., сколько я помню,……, как выражаются моряки ,….., если память мне не изменяет,,.., если на то пошло, …, and many others, as well as in CSWInsC: “ Jack(he is a driver)..., The boys (the naughtiest ones I have ever seen)....., Tyson(he is a champion boxer) ....., etc.

As can be seen from the examples, in the above parenthetical (introductory or insertive) clauses of the CS, interesting linguocultural semantics (phenomena) are verbalized which is directly related to the original, inimitable life activity and national culture of peoples who speak the compared languages and practice their national cultures, therefore, such sentences can be considered as “linguoculturemes: «Сиз, гапнинг индаллосини айтсак, бизга халақит беряпсиз”;”Оғайни, гапнинг пўст калласи, сиз бу ишларни қила олмайсиз”; Анна, зуб даю , он тебя не любит”.

There are also linguo-pragmatic semantic features of the parenthetical components of CSWPC, which are widely and strictly verbalized by phraseological units in certain contexts for their adequacy in use and proper understanding by communicants.

Thus, CSWPC is a cognitively significant, communicatively and pragmatically important type of such a syntactic-semantic unit as CS, functioning in languages as the most significant and specialized verbalizer of the microconcept of “subjective-modal assessment” or “objective –modal assessment, the semantics of which actually contains knowledge structures of linguistic, cognitive, cultural, communicative-pragmatic and stylistic nature, each of which deserves being scrupulously studied and scientifically described.

References:

1. Abdurakhmonov G. A. Fundamentals of the syntax of a complex sentence in the modern Uzbek language. Tashkent, 1960.
2. Admoni V. G. Syntax of the modern German language. L. 1973.
3. Admoni V. G. Complex sentence in Turkic languages// ST. 1982. No. 3.

4. Askarova M.A. Ways of subordination and types of subordinate clauses in the modern Uzbek language: Abstract of the thesis. disc…doc. philol. Sciences. - Tashkent. 1963.- 86 p.
5. Beloshapkova V. A. A complex sentence in modern Russian: Abstract of the thesis. dis. ... doc. philol. Sciences. M., 1970.
6. Kolosova T. A. On the principles of classification of complex sentences. VYa. 1984. No. 6.
7. Mukhin A. M. The Structure of sentences and their models. L., 1968.
8. Sayfullaeva R.R. Ҳozirgi ўzbek tilida қўshma haplarning substantial (zoti) talqini. Tashkent, 2007
9. Khashimov G. M. Typology of complex sentences of different system languages. Tashkent, 1991. 108 pages.
10. Khoshimov G.M. Typology of a complex sentence in multisystem languages. Abstract diss. Doctor of Philology Sciences, Tashkent, 2002, 49 pages.
11. Khoshimov M.G. Composite sentence with an introductory clause and its communicative-pragmatic types in multi-system (English, Russian and Uzbek) languages .//Questions of Philological Sciences, No. 6(23), ISSN 1728-8843, Moscow, 2006, p.69-73
12. Khoshimov M.G. Structural-semantic types of composite sentences with an introductory clauses in languages of different systems.// Questions of the Humanities, No. 6 (27). ISSN 1684-2618, Moscow, 2006, p. 229-2322
13. Cheremisina M. I., Kolosova T. A. Essays on the theory of complex sentences. Novosibirsk, 1984.
14. Yusupov U. K. Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek complex sentences with conditional clauses: Abstract of the thesis. dis. ...cand. philol. Sciences. T., 1971.
15. Yusupov U.K. Problems of comparative linguistics: Abstract of the thesis. dis. ... doc. philol. Sciences. M., 1983.

[i] Parenteza (parenthesis, insertion) (from the Greek parentesis - insertion) - a figure of word order, insertion of one input phrase without grammatical connection. Parenteses are separated on both sides with brackets or a splint. Nevertheless, we tend to believe that within any unit any inclusion of a certain phrase does not violate its structural and semantic organization, but only expands it, while the connection between the inclusive and included figures is different, not traditional: neither coordinative, nor subordinative, but parenthetical in its refraction into: 1)introductory connections (according to A.M. Mukhin (Mukhin 1968: 87) and 2) insertive connections (according to G. M. Khoshimov(G.M.Khoshimov 2002:16).

ii Хошимов Г.М. Типология сложных предложений разносистемных языков,Т.: «Фан», 1991, 108 с.; Хошимов Г.М. Типология сложного предложения в разносисстемных языках,Ташкент, автореф. дисс. докт.филол.наук, Ташкент, 2002. 49 с ; .Г.М.Хошимов . Принципы и методы типологического сопоставления сложных предложений. Андижан, из-во «Хаёт», 159 с.

iii Г.М.Хошимов . Принципы и методы типологического сопоставления сложных предложений. Андижан, из-во «Хаёт», 159 с.

iv Conditional abbreviations in the models mean: CS=Cpn – composite sentence represented by a compound sentence; CS=Cpl – composite sentence represented by a complex sentence; CSPrcl – composite sentence with proportionate clauses; SCS= Cpn+sub.clause – semi-composite sentence with subordinate clause attached to a full compound sentence at the end; SCS=Cpl+coor.clause - semi-composite sentence with coordinate clause attached to a full complex sentence at the end; HCS=Cpl+and+Cpl – one complex sentence and one compound sentence joined by a coordinating conjunction; CSPIntC –composite sentence with an introductory clause; CSPInsC -–composite sentence with an intsertive clause

v For detailed information on composite sentences with parenthetical(introductory or insertive) clauses(CSPIntC, CSPInsC) see: Хошимов М.Г. Лингвокогнитивная природа сложнопарентезного предложения как одного из

инвариантных типов предложения// Фарғона, //The 2nd online International Conference on “Interdisciplinary issues of applied linguistics and actual problems and solutions in distance education”// Collection of articles and conference materials, Ferghana, , 2021, cc.175-178 ; Его же: Сложновводное предложение и его коммуникативно-прагматические типы в разносистемных(английком, русском и узбекском) языках .//Вопросы филологических наук, № 6(23), ISSN 1728-8843, Москва, 2006, с.69-73; Его же: Структурно-семантические типы сложновводного предложения в разносистемных языках.// Вопросы гуманитарных наук, №6(27). ISSN 1684-2618, Москва, 2006, с. 229-2322