

THE STYLISTIC ASPECT OF COMPOUND SENTENCES AS THE OBJECT OF MONOLINGUAL RESEARCH

Usarov I.K.

Associate professor of the Department of theory and methods of the English language,
National pedagogical university of Uzbekistan named after Nizamiy, Tashkent

Abstract. Monolingual research examines the stylistic potential of compound (complex/coordinate) sentences within a single language, mapping how formal options—conjunction choice (presence/absence or excess), clause sequencing, parallelism, and patterned repetition — shape expressive force without adding new propositional content. This article surveys monolingual treatments in English, Russian, and Uzbek traditions, systematizing core syntactic figures (asyndeton, polysyndeton, anaphora, epiphora, parallelism) and their pragmatic effects on tempo, emphasis, and rhythm. We integrate classic accounts (N.I. Formanovskaya, V.V. Vinogradov, I.R. Galperin) with the Uzbek school initiated by A. Mamajonov and later expanded in discourse- and corpus-informed studies. A comparative synthesis shows that while the surface inventories and norms differ across languages and genres, the communicative leverage of these figures is functionally convergent: they recalibrate pacing and salience in compound structures and thus serve as reliable resources for rhetorical design.

Keywords: monolingual stylistics; compound sentence; asyndeton; polysyndeton; anaphora; epiphora; parallelism; Uzbek stylistics

Introduction

Monolingual analysis addresses how a single language deploys the stylistic capacities of compound sentences—structures uniting two or more independent clauses. In this perspective, stylistic figures are patterns that intensify expression without changing truth-conditional content; they amplify, accelerate, or rhythmically organize what is already being said [N.I. Formanovskaya, *Stilistika slozhnogo predlozhenija*, Moscow, 1978, p. 17] [1]. Typical devices include asyndeton (omitting coordinators), polysyndeton (overusing them), anaphora and epiphora (edge-aligned repetition), parallelism, and related iterative constructions.

Within the English rhetorical tradition, these resources have long been catalogued as sentence-level style operators, shaping tempo (speed), profiling (which segment stands out), and rhythm (recurrence across clause boundaries) [I.R. Galperin, *Stylistics*, Moscow, 1977, p. 89] [3]. In Russian stylistics, N.I. Formanovskaya framed complex-sentence style as a functional system distributed across registers [1], while V.V. Vinogradov theorized how syntactic construction underwrites artistic speech [V.V. Vinogradov, *O teorii xudozhestvennoy rechi*, Moscow, 1971, p. 212] [11]. In Uzbek linguistics, A. Mamajonov authored the first monograph devoted to compound-sentence stylistics, establishing a national research line that later interfaced with discourse and corpus methods [A. Mamajonov, *Qo'shma gap stilistikasi*, Tashkent, 1990, p. 75] [2][6][12].

Our aim is to consolidate monolingual findings in these three traditions, formalize the device–effect mapping, and indicate methodological convergences that make results mutually interpretable across languages.

Methodology

We adopt a comparative-descriptive, monolingual-by-language design:

1. Corpus of accounts. Classic treatises and handbooks in each tradition: English (I.R. Galperin) [3]; Russian (N.I. Formanovskaya, V.V. Vinogradov) [1][11]; Uzbek (A. Mamajonov and successors: D.U. Ashurova, A.E. Mamatov, M.G. Hoshimov) [6][7][9][4][5].
2. Operational definitions. For each device we specify: (i) form (what changes in the compound structure), (ii) stylistic function (tempo/emphasis/rhythm), (iii) typical registers/genres.
3. Within-language focus. Examples and generalizations are language-internal; cross-language notes are used only to clarify contrasts in monolingual norms, not to conflate inventories.
4. Recent expansions. We incorporate selective modern work in translation and corpus-based stylistics to show how monolingual description scales to quantitative verification [2][12].

This design preserves each language's stylistic ecology while enabling a consolidated typology of effects.

Results and Discussion

1) What counts as a stylistic figure in compound sentences?

We treat figures as form-driven manipulations of clause linkage that re-weight discourse. They do not introduce new propositions; rather, they reshape salience and processing dynamics. Table 1 summarizes canonical devices as treated in monolingual studies.

Table 1. Core syntactic–stylistic devices in compound sentences (monolingual lens)

Device	Formal description (within a compound sentence)	Primary stylistic effect
Asyndeton	Coordinators are omitted; clauses juxtaposed via punctuation/intonation	Tempo ↑; dynamic, terse flow; decisiveness [3][1]
Polysyndeton	Coordinator repeated before each clause/item	Tempo ↓; cumulative emphasis; solemn/weighty cadence [3]
Anaphora	Successive clauses begin with the same word/phrase	Rhythmic coherence; foregrounding of new info after the repeat [3]
Epiphora	Successive clauses end with the same word/phrase	Closure emphasis; refrain-like final punch [8]
Parallelism	Identical/similar syntactic patterning across clauses	Balance & memorability; logical comparability [3]

Note: Uzbek scholarship additionally emphasizes intonation as a co-driver of effect in asyndetic coordination, given the role of prosody in uniting juxtaposed clauses [6].

2) English monolingual accounts (rhetoric-centric)

English stylistics classifies asyndeton and polysyndeton as tempo controllers in coordinate linkage [3]. Asyndeton's clipped parataxis produces urgency and decisiveness—a

staple of oratory and narrative acceleration. Polysyndeton, by contrast, slows reading, spotlights each conjunct, and installs a ritual rhythm useful in ceremonial prose and emotionally saturated narration. Edge-aligned repetition (anaphora/epiphora) is treated as a cohesion-through-recurrence mechanism that frames compound sequences, while parallelism ensures processing ease and mnemonic strength by keeping clause skeletons isomorphic [3]. Contemporary practice guides mirror these functions for academic and public writing, crystallizing the device–effect mapping for English usage [UHV Writing Center, “Polysyndeton and Asyndeton,” Victoria, 2024, p. 2] [5]; [Scribbr, “Anaphora,” Amsterdam, 2024, p. 3] [8].

3) Russian monolingual accounts (functional–systemic)

Russian scholarship integrates complex-sentence style into a register-sensitive system. N.I. Formanovskaya delineates how бессоюзие (asyndeton) and многосоюзие (polysyndeton) pattern differently across official, journalistic, and artistic styles, with artistic discourse exploiting them for expressive pacing and heightened intonation [1]. V.V. Vinogradov frames these as resources of artistic speech, linking contrastive parallelism and repetition to the construction of narrative dynamism [11]. Russian descriptions also connect figures to intonational contouring, noting that punctuation + intonation substitutes for the absent coordinator in asyndeton, thereby densifying the clause chain and raising affect.

4) Uzbek monolingual accounts (school of A. Mamajonov)

A. Mamajonov established the Uzbek tradition of treating compound sentences as stylistic instruments: asyndetic coordination leverages intonation to forge a single rhythmic flow; polysyndeton creates solemn lists where each clause is singled out; parallel constructions and lexico-syntactic repetition stabilize the text’s macro-rhythm [6]. Subsequent work extends the lens:

- D.U. Ashurova – M.R. Galieva apply stylistic-pragmatic analysis to literary texts, relating clause-level patterning to discourse effects [7].
- A.E. Mamatov explores phraseological stylistics, but his observations on elliptic/parcelled clause patterning feed directly into complex-sentence style [9].
- M.G. Hoshimov contributes comparative and cognitive angles on slozhnovvodnoye/parenthetical coordination and its emphatic functions [4][5].
- Recent Uzbek-language articles (e.g., D.M. Yuldasheva et al.) document quantitative tendencies—device frequencies and genre distributions—signaling a turn toward corpus-assisted monolingual description [12].

These studies converge on a practical claim: in Uzbek, asyndeton + intonation + parallelism is a high-leverage triad for compactness and impact in both literary and publicistic prose.

5) Device–effect synthesis across monolingual traditions

Although English, Russian, and Uzbek differ in orthography, punctuation habits, and prosodic conventions, monolingual studies align on several stable mappings:

- Tempo control is the core function of coordination manipulation: Asyndeton ⇒ acceleration; Polysyndeton ⇒ deceleration [3][1][6].

- Edge repetition (anaphora/epiphora) is a salience framing tool: initial repetition elevates what follows; final repetition canonizes closure [3][8].
- Parallelism operates as a cognitive scaffold: by reducing syntactic variability across clauses, it enhances processing fluency and memorability [3].
- Intonation is indispensable in asyndetic compounds: Russian and Uzbek accounts explicitly bind expressive pay-off to prosodic binding of clause sequences [1][6].

Methodologically, older handbooks provide rule-like descriptions; newer work adds discourse and quantitative verification, keeping the analysis monolingual but making the claims measurable [2][12].

Conclusion

Monolingual research on compound-sentence stylistics shows remarkable functional convergence across English, Russian, and Uzbek: the same small set of structural levers (coordinator presence, repetition, parallelism) reliably reconfigures tempo, emphasis, and rhythm. Classic treatises—N.I. Formanovskaya, V.V. Vinogradov, I.R. Galperin — and the Uzbek school of A. Mamajonov give consistent, language-internal accounts that modern discourse and corpus approaches now extend. For pedagogy, editing, and translation, the implication is clear: stylistic control of compound linkage is teachable and transferable within each language’s norms. For research, future monolingual studies can profitably combine prosodic analysis with large-scale distributional evidence to calibrate device–effect mappings by genre and register.

References:

- [1] N.I. Formanovskaya, *Stilistika slozhnogo predlojenija*, Moscow, 1978, p. 17.
- [2] N. Dubnevych, *Ray Bradbury’s Stylistic Identity: The Use of Literary Devices*, Kyiv, 2024, pp. 57–71.
- [3] I.R. Galperin, *Stylistics*, Moscow, 1977, p. 89.
- [4] M.G. Hoshimov, *Strukturno-semantičeskie tipy slozhnovvodnogo predloženiya v raznosistemnyh jazykah*, Moscow, 2019, pp. 134–142.
- [5] UHV Writing Center, “Polysyndeton and Asyndeton,” Victoria, 2024, p. 2.
- [6] A. Mamajonov, *Qo’shma gap stilistikasi*, Tashkent, 1990, p. 75.
- [7] D.U. Ashurova, M.R. Galieva, *Badiiy matn stilistikasi*, Tashkent, 2013, p. 98.
- [8] Scribbr Writing Guide, “Anaphora: Definition & Examples,” Amsterdam, 2024, p. 3.
- [9] A.E. Mamatov, *Frazeologik stilistika masalalari*, Tashkent, 1991, p. 63.
- [10] O.D. Ponomariv, *Stilistika suchasnoyi ukrayins’koyi movy*, Ternopil, 2000, p. 54.
- [11] V.V. Vinogradov, *O teorii xudozhestvennoy rechi*, Moscow, 1971, p. 212.
- [12] D.M. Yuldasheva et al., “Qo’shma gap stilistikasi A. Mamajonov talqinida,” *Science and Innovation in the Education System*, Tashkent, 2024, pp. 27–31.