**International Conference on Developments in Education**
**Hosted from Bursa, Turkey**
**https**: econferencezone.org                                                    **June 20ᵗʰ 2023**

# THE ROLE OF ADDITION IN THE EXPANSION OF THE SYNTACTIC FORM OF SPEECH

Masharipova Adolat Odilbekovna
English teacher at "General philology" department,


Ro'zimboyeva Hilola Xusniddin qizi,


Xushvaqtova Kamola Alisherovna
Students of "Foreign language and literature" field,
Urgench State Pedagogical institute

**Annotation**
In this article addition is learned as way of the expansion of syntactic form of speech. The act of addition is crucial in the creation of complicated phrases. The two simple phrases that follow, for example, can be combined in at least three different ways to produce at least three distinct types of complicated structures that are not equally challenging for the reader.


**Key words:** *addition, substitution, adverbials, adverbial clause, deletion*

Addition is a necessary step in the creation of complicated sentences. For example, the two simple phrases that follow can be combined in at least three distinct ways, yielding at least three different types of complicated structures that do not present the reader with equal difficulties:

(1) *The snakes eat the frogs. The frogs pollute the water.*
(a.) *The snakes eat the insects, and the frogs pollute the water.*
(b) *The snakes eat the frogs that pollute the water.*
(c) *The snakes eat the frogs polluting the water.*

When we add sentences, the syntax may also entail the processes of rearrangement, substitution, or deletion, thus addition may not be the sole process involved in the construction of complex sentences. The more processes engaged in a syntactic structure, the more complicated the syntax, which implies the more difficult the reading. This statement is worth keeping as a guiding concept; nonetheless, while investigating syntactic complexity, notable exceptions must be noted.

***Coordinating Conjunctions.*** How are the following similar? What distinguishes them?

(2) *Fred left the party. Kate disappointed it.*
(3) *Fred left the party, and Kate disappointed it.*

Sentence (3) utilizes an addition procedure, but is it more difficult to read? This is not supported by evidence. Indeed, sentences united by the conjunction and are frequently found to be as simple as short phrases that are not coupled in this way. Editors who are misled by

**International Conference on Developments in Education**
**Hosted from Bursa, Turkey**
**https**: econferencezone.org
**June 20th 2023**

superficial perceptions of sentence length may "simplify" reading materials by deleting conjunctions, so reducing natural compound phrases to two short sentences. The normal effect, though, is a jagged, artificial feel to the string of lines; often, too, the conjunction creates a significant link between sentences, so its deletion makes reading harder, not easier.

Now we look through the similarities and differences of the following sentences:

(4) *Fred left the party. He never went again.*

(5) *Fred left the party and never went again.*

Note the deletion of he in sentence (5). Does the extra process make the sentence more difficult? According to Fagan, this type of deletion does result in more errors [2, 64]. For the beginning reader, at least, it reduces the clues to meaning; if there is a question in the writer's mind, he can help the child by keeping, rather than eliminating, optionally deletable redundancies.

The other coordinate conjunctions are but, or, so, for, and yet, and the reader might ask himself why these are ordinarily more difficult to process than and. For example, the adversative but is clearly difficult for young children [3, 506-507]:

(6) *Foerster flew to Florida and relaxed on the beach.*

(7) *Foerster flew to Florida but relaxed on the beach.*

*Adverbials.* The adverbial function may be carried out in much the same syntactical manner by words (simple adverbs), phrases (usually prepositional phrases), or clauses (subject + verb structures).

*Adverbial Words.* As we have seen in 1.4, simple sentences may have adverbs added to them without a change in basic structure:

(8) *Georgette got the answer easily.* (subject + verb + object)

(9) *He was a football player.* (subject + be + complement)

(10) *We hurried home.* (subject + verb)

*Adverbial Phrases.* Adverbial phrases (prepositional phrases) are, of course, structurally more complex than simple adverbs. Moreover, the meaning of some prepositions is not easily paraphrasable or analyzable, at least for primary grade children who will not precisely distinguish between:

(11) *We will be in Madrid around noon.*

(12) *We will be in Madrid by noon.*

Again, however, unless our objective is the skill of precise analysis or paraphrase, the difficulty of general comprehension may not be increased by a semantic subtlety like that in (12).

Many prepositions are commonly used terms, implying that the following examples of prepositional phrases indicating method, length, and location are no more difficult than single word adverbs:

(13) *George passed the exam **with ease.***

(14) *He was a taxi-driver **for a year.***

**International Conference on Developments in Education**
**Hosted from Bursa, Turkey**
https: econferencezone.org                                                    June 20th 2023

(15) *We run* **to the house.**

Although we have no way to properly measure semantics, we must certainly be aware of it in all aspects of reading. Different types of adverbials vary in semantic difficulty. For example, *causality* is evidently more difficult in meaning than time [4, 106-107]. Thus, even though the lexical item in (16) is easier than the lexical item in (17), the causal adverbial makes (16) more difficult.

(16) *The old man died of poisoning.*

(17) *The old man died in the afternoon.*

*Adverbial clauses* (subordinate clauses) involve the same semantic questions with the additional complexity of adding a whole sentence (clause). For example, use the conjunctions after, because, if, since, when, where to add the two sentences in (18). What are the differences in meaning? Which conjunctions make the sentence addition harder to read?

(18) *The snow fell all night. The streets were covered with snow.*

Adverbial sentences are unquestionably more difficult to write than adverbial words and phrases. But the difficulty is not only in the length and sentence structure of the addition, it is also in the meaning of some of the subordinate conjunctions. As an example, research does not offer definitive answers on the relative complexity of if or because as opposed to *when* or *where* but in clauses, as well as in phrases, conditionality and causality must be more difficult than time and place [1, 125].

(19) *The girl bought a bag. She had money.*

One of the ways is, *The girl who had money bought a bag*, the device of a relative clause. When adding two sentences. the condition for forming a relative clause is the presence of noun phrases having identical reference in the two sentences. In (19), for example. *The girl* and *she* have identical reference, permitting a relative to substitute for one noun phrase and attach to the other noun phrase. The relationship between the noun phrase and verb then indicates the relative pronoun choice: *who, whom, whose, that, which*. If the noun phrase is the subject (and human), the form who is chosen:

(20) *A girl told me your story. She saw you.* ↔ *A girl who saw you told me your story.*

If the noun phrase is the object, then (in formal English) the form whom is chosen:

(21) *A girl told me the story. I saw her.* ↔ *A girl whom I saw told me the story.*

If the verb, the relative clause is in the *be* form, different deletion and rearrangement processes are possible. Study the addition and deletion processes in (22):

(22) *The cow got stuffed. The cow was eating the grass.*

   (a) *The cow that was eating the grass got stuffed.*

   (b) *The cow eating the grass got stuffed.*

(23) *Baroqvoy catches the chick. Baroqvoy is the cat.*

(24) *The cat catches the chick. The cat is there.*

(25) *The cat catches the chick. The cat is mean.*

**International Conference on Developments in Education**
**Hosted from Bursa, Turkey**
**https**: econferencezone.org
**June 20ᵗʰ 2023**

Deletion produces acceptable sentences in (22-24), although (23) requires a particular kind of adjustment to be acceptable:

(26) *Baroqvoy, the cat, catches the chick.*

In speech, the adjustment is pause intonation and it is matched in writing with commas. Now notice what happens in (25), which is renumbered here as (27):

(27) *The cat catches birds. The cat is mean.*

(a) *The cat that is mean catches the chick.*

(b) *The cat mean catches the chick.*

(c) *The mean cat catches the chick.*

The asterisk in (b) indicates that the sentence is not grammatical; a further rearrangement step is required to make (b) acceptable (c). According to transformational grammar theory. *The mean cat* is more complex in grammatical structure than any of the other relatives (for example, compare *The cat there*) because of the extra process needed to produce it. Yet it is surely easier to process. No doubt this because *The mean cat* is perceived as a single unit.

*Present Participle Phrases.* In the last section, sentence (22) reduced to a participial phrase: *The cow eating the grass got stuffed.*

But in the following sentence there is no *be* to be deleted:

(28) *The child ran to home. He didn't see the helicopter.*

Identical noun phrase permit not only substitution of *who* for one of them but deletion of one (with a change of the verb to *–ing*, the participial form);

(29) *Running to home, the child didn't see the helicopter.*

Often, ether sentence may become a participle:

(30) *Karim laughed. Karim thought he'd won the argument.*

(a) *Laughing, Karim thought he'd won the argument.*

(b) *Karim, laughed, thinking he'd won the argument.*

(c) *Karim, laughing, thought he'd won the argument.*

The options provide stylistic opportunity for emphasis.

The process of adding is essential in the construction of complex expressions. For instance, the next two short phrases can be joined in at least three different ways to create at least three different sorts of complex structures that are not all equally difficult for the reader to understand.

**REFERENCES:**

1.      Ervin S. M., Miller, W. R. Language development. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963 – P. 108–143.

2.      Fagan W. T. Transformations and Comprehension. // Reading Teacher, 1971. – P. 56-75

**International Conference on Developments in Education**
**Hosted from Bursa, Turkey**
**https**: econferencezone.org                                    **June 20ᵗʰ 2023**

3.      Katz E. W., S. B. Brent. Understanding Connectives. // Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1968. – P. 501-509

4.      Vygotsky, L. S. Thought and Language. – Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1962. – 344 p.