



**TAXEMIC AND OTHER APPROACHES TO THE COMPOSITE
SENTENCES: COLLOTAXEME, PARATEXEME, HYPERTAXEME
(SUPERTAXEME, ARCHITAXEME, ULTRATAXEME, BINOME,
POLYNOME, DISCOURSEME, CUMULEME AND OCCURSEME).
FUNCTIONAL SENTENCE PERSPECTIVE. SENTENCE PRAGMATICS.
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (TEXTICS OR TEXTOLOGY). PUNCTUATION
IN MODERN ENGLISH.**

Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan

named after Mirzo Ulugbek

The Faculty of Psychology, the department of foreign languages

Philology and teaching languages

Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla qizi

[*nafisateshaboyeva@gmail.com*](mailto:nafisateshaboyeva@gmail.com)

Student of group 404-22: Abdug'ofurov Shohrux Sherali o'g'li

[*shohruxabdugafurov4@gmail.com*](mailto:shohruxabdugafurov4@gmail.com)

Telefon: +998930787304

Abstract: This article will focus specifically on the subject of composite sentences from the perspective of the taxemic model, comparing this methodology with other structural, functional, and discourse-based theories. The taxemic model considers the sentence as a universal unit called the 'taxeme,' and the classification of composite structures as polytaxemes: more specifically, the classification involves the use of collotaxeme, parataxeme, hypotaxeme, parentaxeme, hypertaxeme, and higher-component structures that use the terms supertaxeme, architaxeme, and ultrataxeme. Simultaneously, the article will attempt to combine the structural perspective with the theme-rheme structure that includes illocutionary forces related to the pragmatic functions of the sentence, the analysis



of the discourse that incorporates textics or textology as a whole, as well as the use of punctuation as a graph.

Key words: composite sentence, taxemic approach, taxeme, polytaxeme, collotaxeme, parataxeme, hypotaxeme, hypertaxeme, supertaxeme, architaxeme, ultrataxeme, binome, polynome, discourseme, cumuleme, occurseme, functional sentence perspective, pragmatics, discourse analysis, punctuation.

Introduction. The complex sentence represents this intersection in terms of grammar, as it does not solely consist of clause-linking. It represents, at one level, a certain configuration of predicative lines, as well as an enabler of reaching out to classify what's been stated, and as such, it represents in reality the go-to device writers use to connect extended meanings which consist of stretches of linguistic meaning in excess of the clause level. Additionally, in contemporary English, punctuation marks serve to underscore this kind of connection.

In this more varied environment, the taxemic method provides a concise framework: from the universal notion of taxeme - the subject-predicate unit - and the polytaxeme in regard to the complex sentence. In this framework, an asyndetic complex is therefore a collotaxeme, an asyndetic compound is a parataxeme, while in the syndetic complex it becomes a hypotaxeme. If it contains mixed compound-complex structures, then it deals with hypertaxemes; if it consists of larger structures with more length, then it progresses into supertaxemes (four-part), architaxemes (five-part), and ultrataxemes (six or more). However, taxemic terms do not cancel out other levels of interpretation. Although two statements can be similar in terms of their taxemic structure, they may differ from each other from the point of view: the same sequence of clauses and the same logical connections can have a different theme-rheme distribution, with a different element presented as given and a different element presented as the point. This Prague School-based approach explains why authors tend to use a specific arrangement of different graphic elements to tell a story, to deliver an argument, or to compose an article.



Composite sentences cannot be separated from pragmatics and discourse. In practice, sentences are more than grammar combinations. They become instruments of speech Acts and interaction - and request, promise, warn, evaluate. Their text-level properties interact with cohesion and text cohesion: pronouns, lexical repetitions, conjunctions, and other linkers join clauses and sentences into an overarching discourse, and punctuation markers help readers follow the syntactic dependencies to signal boundary strength and author's position.

Main part. In taxemic syntax, the term *taxeme* is used as a general name for the sentence unit, which allows the description of both *monotaxeme* (simple sentence) and *polytaxeme* (composite sentence) within one typological framework. The composite sentence is treated not only as a sum of clauses, but as a structured unit whose internal relations can be classified by the type of linkage (syndetic/asyndetic), the kind of dependence (coordination/subordination), and the degree of integration between predicative parts. In this approach, composite patterns are grouped into specific taxemic types that formalize how clauses are connected and how the whole construction functions in communication. A key set of taxemic terms distinguishes *collotaxeme*, *parataxeme*, and *hypotaxeme*. Collotaxeme is typically associated with close juxtaposition of predicative parts (often asyndetic linkage) where the relation is inferred from meaning, intonation, or context rather than expressed by a conjunction: *He opened the door, the room was empty*. Parataxeme corresponds to coordination, where clauses are equal in syntactic status and linked by coordinators (*and, but, or*) or correlatives: *She tried to call, but nobody answered*. Hypotaxeme represents subordination, where one clause is dependent and introduced by subordinators (*because, although, when, that, etc.*): *He stayed because the meeting was important*. These categories make clause linkage the central criterion for defining composite types, so the descriptive focus shifts from “compound/complex” labels to the linkage mechanism itself. Beyond basic linkage types, taxemic theory introduces broader composite



formations under the label *hypertaxeme* - structures where the clause complex is treated as a higher-order unit with internal hierarchy and expanded semantic organization. Within this frame, terms such as *supertaxeme*, *architaxeme*, and *ultrataxeme* are used to capture increasingly complex or overarching configurations (for instance, multi-clause constructions that behave like a single communicative whole, with layered dependence and discourse-driven segmentation). The value of these notions is that they describe how a multi-clause structure may function as one integrated message rather than a loose chain of clauses, especially in written academic and publicistic styles where subordination and embedding are frequent.

Parallel to taxemic labels, other approaches offer alternative naming for composite structures by focusing on the number of predicative centers. In this line, *binome* and *polynome* are used for clause complexes with two or more clauses: a binome corresponds to a two-clause composite, while a polynome refers to extended multi-clause constructions; the implied contrast is with a one-predicate sentence sometimes described as a mononome. These terms are helpful when the analyst needs a purely quantitative model that can be combined with linkage-based classification: for example, a *binomic hypotaxeme* (two-clause subordination) versus a *polynomic hypertaxemic* pattern (multi-clause hierarchical complex). Text-oriented grammar expands the description further by introducing units that connect sentence structure to discourse organization. The terms *dicteme* and *discourseme* are associated with viewing the sentence-in-text as part of a higher-level communicative system, where meaning is built not only inside the sentence but across sentence sequences. In this perspective, the smallest text-forming unit is not always the isolated sentence, but a functional segment that contributes to the unfolding of the message in context (topic development, evaluative framing, transitions). For dialogic speech and interactional contexts, additional units are described: *cumuleme* as a cumulative supra-sentential formation (a cluster of



sentences functioning together), and *occurseme* as an interactional unit tied to dialogue exchange and “meeting” moves in communication. These concepts link syntax to discourse dynamics, explaining why composite constructions often extend beyond a single sentence boundary in real texts.

Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP) provides a different axis of analysis by explaining how information is distributed inside the sentence and how this distribution shapes syntactic form. Developed in the Prague School tradition, FSP models the sentence as a communicative progression from *theme* (what is contextually given or anchored) toward *rheme* (what is new or focal), with intermediate transitional elements when needed. The key idea is that sentence elements carry different degrees of *communicative dynamism*: elements closer to the communicative goal contribute more to the completion of the message. In composite sentences, FSP helps explain clause ordering (why a subordinate clause may precede the main clause to establish theme), as well as why writers choose coordination versus subordination depending on what they want to foreground as new information.

Sentence pragmatics shifts attention from structure and information flow to communicative action. A sentence is treated as an utterance with an intention: asserting, requesting, promising, warning, persuading, and so on. Speech act theory distinguishes the literal content (locution) from the intended act (illocution) and the effect on the hearer/reader (perlocution). Composite sentences are pragmatically powerful because they allow speakers to package reasons, conditions, concessions, and conclusions into one communicative move: *If you submit today, we can process it immediately* functions as more than a conditional - it performs a directive with a supporting justification. Thus, pragmatic force often determines which composite pattern is selected and which clause is placed in focus. Discourse analysis (textics/textology) studies language above the sentence level, focusing on how texts achieve coherence, cohesion, and communicative purpose in real contexts. It



examines how sentences connect through grammatical devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction) and lexical repetition or semantic chaining, producing cohesion that supports overall coherence. From this viewpoint, composite sentences are not only internal clause systems but also tools of discourse management: they signal causality, contrast, expansion, stance, evaluation, and transitions that organize a text as a meaningful whole. Discourse analysis therefore complements taxemic and FSP descriptions by showing how composite patterns work in genres such as academic writing, media texts, and institutional documents.

Punctuation in modern English is inseparable from the grammar of composite constructions because it marks boundaries, clarifies relations between clauses, and controls reading rhythm. Commas are widely used to separate dependent clauses, set off non-restrictive elements, and prevent misreading in long clause chains; semicolons can link closely related independent clauses or structure complex lists, functioning as a stronger boundary than a comma but weaker than a full stop. Dashes are common in informal and semi-formal writing to signal breaks, insert afterthoughts, or highlight parenthetical information; style guides treat them as a flexible device whose effect depends on genre norms. Recent commentary on contemporary writing also notes a visible decline in semicolon use in published English, often connected to changing stylistic preferences toward shorter, less punctuationally dense sentences.

Conclusion. The article has shown that the taxemic model offers a compact and systematic way to classify composite sentences by treating them as polytaxemic formations and differentiating clause-linking types such as collotaxeme, parataxeme, hypotaxeme, and hypertaxeme, as well as higher multi-component formations (supertaxeme, architaxeme, ultrataxeme). However, the grammatical description becomes fully explanatory only when taxemic classification is integrated with functional sentence perspective, sentence pragmatics, and discourse analysis, because real composite structures



simultaneously encode information distribution (theme–rheme), communicative intention (speech-act force), and text-building mechanisms (cohesion and coherence). Composite sentences in modern English should be treated as multi-level units: structural (clause relations), functional (information focus and progression), pragmatic (illocutionary goals), and textual (discourse organization). Within this unity, punctuation functions as an essential graphological system that signals boundary strength, hierarchy, supplementation, and interpretive guidance for the reader, especially in extended written discourse where clause chains and embedding are frequent.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
3. Blokh, M. Y. (1994). *A Course in Theoretical English Grammar* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
4. Blokh, M. Y. (2000). Dikeme in the level structure of the language. *Voprosy Yazykoznaniiya*, 4, 56–63.
5. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Firbas, J. (1992). *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
9. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



10. Ivanova, I. P., Burlakova, V. V., & Pocheptsov, G. G. (1981). *Theoretical Grammar of Modern English*. Moscow: Высшая Школа.
11. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
13. Ubaydullayeva, D. R. (2022). Different approaches to the composite sentences in modern linguistics. *Proceedings of ICARHSE (Berlin)*, 91–95.
14. Hoshimov, G'. M. (2025). Taxemic and other approaches to composite sentences. *Central Asian Journal of Modern Research in Management Studies*, 1–8.