



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

Teshaboyeva Nafisa Zubaydulla kizi

Jizzakh branch of the National University of Uzbekistan
named after Mirzo Ulugbek

The Faculty of Psychology, the department of Foreign languages

Philology and foreign languages

Scientific advisor

nafisateshaboyeva@jbnuu.uz

Sanakulova Rakhima Shavkat kizi

Student of group 404-22

sanakulovalora@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18029568>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 21st December 2025

Accepted: 22nd December 2025

Published: 23th December 2025

KEYWORDS

taxeme, composite sentence, collotaxeme, paratexeme, hypertaxeme, cumuleme, occurseme, Functional Sentence Perspective, sentence pragmatics, discourse analysis, punctuation.

ABSTRACT

Speech and sentence structure are best understood not only as arrangements of words but as systems of taxemes — analytically useful units that describe how clauses and sentences combine, interact, and function inside larger stretches of discourse. This article examines the taxemic approach to composite sentences (including collotaxeme, paratexeme, hypertaxeme and related metaterms such as supertaxeme, architaxeme, ultrataxeme, binome and polynome), and situates those ideas alongside suprasentential units used in textology (discourseme, cumuleme, occurseme). It then links the taxemic perspective with Functional Sentence Perspective and sentence pragmatics (how sentences package information and speaker intentions), and shows how contemporary discourse analysis (textology/textics) and modern punctuation practice dovetail with — and sometimes complicate — the analysis of composite sentences. The treatment is theoretical but practice-oriented, intended for linguists, teachers of English, and discourse analysts who need an integrated view of form, function and punctuation in the analysis of extended language.

Introduction

The unitary sentence studied in traditional grammar gives way, in real texts, to a complex of interacting units — clauses, clause-chains and supra-sentential patterns whose classification calls for finer-grained notions than simply “compound” or “complex.” One fruitful tradition — often found in post-Soviet and Central Asian syntactic scholarship — is the taxemic or taxonomic approach to composite sentences. This approach replaces crude binary labels with a string of metaterms (taxeme, politaxeme/polytaxeme, collotaxeme, parataxeme, hypotaxeme, hypertaxeme and larger combinatory names such as super-/archi-/ultrataxeme) that describe not only structure but the particular combinatory relations and discourse capacities of constituent clauses; the terminology and examples are extensively presented in regional syntactic literature and overviews of composite-sentence typology. Taxemic and related classifications: At the heart of the taxemic view is the notion of the taxeme as a clause or sentence unit with one subject–predicate structure (i.e., a unit that excludes internal homogeneous (coordinated) parts). Composite sentences are then described as polytaxemes (multi-taxeme structures) whose internal relations are characterized by more specific labels: a collotaxeme often denotes an asyndetic (asyndetic or loosely linked) composite sentence; a parataxeme denotes a syndetic (conjunction-linked) compound sentence; a hypotaxeme is a clause related by subordination (a complex sentence in the familiar sense); and a hypertaxeme labels mixed structures that incorporate both paratactic and hypotactic relations — for example, a subordinate clause embedded in a coordinate frame. Beyond these primary distinctions scholars who adopt taxemic grids name longer chains by counting components: supertaxeme (four components), architaxeme (five), ultrataxeme (six or more), while binome and polynome serve to note two-part and many-part combinatory patterns. This vocabulary makes it possible to classify fine differences in textual rhythm and clause linkage that traditional “compound/complex” pairs tend to obscure. Collotaxeme, parataxeme and allied notions in practice: The borrowed label collotaxeme (related by name to “collocation”) draws attention to loose, often paratactic juxtaposition where semantic and pragmatic links — rather than an overt coordinating conjunction — hold the clauses together (e.g., “He closed the door; she said nothing.”). Parataxeme (syndetic) emphasizes explicit coordinating devices (“and”, “but”, “or”) and typical coordination patterns. Hypertaxeme highlights internal structural complexity: clauses inside the polytaxeme show mixed subordination and coordination, and thus the unit must be read simultaneously as a compound and as a complex construction. Treating texts with these labels encourages analysts to look for recurrent combinatory habits (binomic pairings, polynomic chains) and to relate them to rhetorical effect (accumulation, contrast, suspension, rapid listing). Empirical descriptions of these categories and examples appear in comparative syntactic studies and conference papers that introduce the taxemic terminology and show its diagnostic power for typologically diverse languages. Suprasentential units: discourseme, cumuleme and occurseme: Parallel to clause-level taxemes, textology/textics traditions (especially in Eastern European and Russian linguistics) posit supra-sentential building blocks. A discourseme is sometimes proposed as a minimal meaningful unit of discourse analysis; more operationally defined are cumulemes and occursemes. The cumuleme refers to cumulative, one-directional sequences typical of monologic texts (stories, expositions) — sequences whose components add information linearly. The occurseme describes dialogic exchange units that presuppose turn-taking and mutual orientation — they structure conversations and interactive texts. Recognizing these categories helps analysts separate narrative accumulation from exchange dynamics and link punctuation choices and clause-linking strategies to discourse type (monologue vs. dialogue).

Functional Sentence Perspective and sentence pragmatics: The taxemic descriptions concern formal combinatorics; the next step is to read these combinations functionally. Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP), developed in the Prague School tradition and synthesized in English by Jan Firbas, studies how sentences distribute information between theme and rheme and how degrees of communicative dynamism fall across sentence elements. From the FSP standpoint, any taxeme's role in discourse depends on theme/rheme relations, focus placement, and information flow: the same syntactic configuration — for example, a collotaxemic asyndetic pair — may be used to foreground new information or to background given information depending on word order, intonation and pragmatic context. Thus taxemic labels and FSP complement each other: taxemes locate combinatory form; FSP explains informational packaging and the predicted interpretive prominence of particular clauses. Sentence pragmatics and speech acts: Sentence pragmatics picks up where FSP and taxemes meet communicative intent: sentences are not only carriers of propositional content but perform acts (constatives, directives, commissives, expressive acts) and generate implicatures via conversational cooperativity. The speech-act tradition (Austin; Searle) and Gricean pragmatics give the tools to explain how composite sentences negotiate illocutionary force across clauses (e.g., a main clause that issues a directive and a subordinate clause that supplies mitigation), and how coordination or punctuation influences perceived politeness, certainty or sarcasm. Pragmatic analysis of composite constructions thus unites taxemic form, FSP information structure, and pragmatics of action in discourse. Discourse analysis / textology implications: Modern discourse analysis (from Halliday & Hasan's cohesion work to van Dijk's socio-cognitive Critical Discourse Analysis) attends to how sentence combinations create coherence, manage reference, and project ideology. Halliday and Hasan's taxonomy of cohesive ties (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, lexical cohesion) gives concrete mechanisms by which taxemic and supra-sentential units bind text; van Dijk's approaches remind us that the structuring of clause chains—whether as cumulemes or hypertaxemes—can itself be a site of social meaning and power. Combining taxemic description with cohesion analysis and critical discourse perspectives allows analysts to move from micro-syntactic labelling to interpretations of rhetorical and ideological effect.

Punctuation in modern English and its interface with taxemes: Punctuation is not an arbitrary ornament; it mediates the reader's parsing of taxemes and supra-sentential sequences. Contemporary descriptive treatments (notably *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* and standard style manuals such as *The Chicago Manual of Style*) treat punctuation marks as signals of syntactic grouping, prosodic boundary and pragmatic nuance. Commas, semicolons and dashes often mark internal boundaries inside polytaxemes: a semicolon can suggest parity between two cumulated taxemes, a dash can indicate sudden transition or parenthetical insertion (parentaxeme-like behavior), and a full stop projects finality for a discourseme. Punctuation decisions therefore change the perceived combinatory type (asyndetic vs. syndetic reading), the scope of hypertaxemic embedding, and the distribution of theme-rheme prominence — which in turn affects sentence pragmatics and discourse coherence. For careful analytic work, CGEL and CMOS remain indispensable descriptive and normative references.

Conclusion

Reading composite sentences through a taxemic lens yields a rich typology that interacts naturally with functional sentence perspective, sentence pragmatics and discourse analysis. The taxemic terms (collotaxeme, parataxeme, hypotaxeme, hypertaxeme and more) give analysts a vocabulary for fine structural distinctions; cumuleme and occurseme remind us that different macro-textual genres impose distinct

clause-combining habits; FSP and speech-act/pragmatic theory explain why the same combinatory pattern serves different communicative ends; and punctuation — the visible script of clause-linking — bridges reader parsing with intended prosodic and pragmatic contours. For applied linguistics and teaching, the payoff is concrete: teaching learners to recognize taxemic patterns (asyndesis vs. syndesis, accumulation vs. exchange, embedding patterns) together with theme-rheme cues and punctuation conventions improves both comprehension and production of natural, genre-appropriate English.

References:

1. Hoshimov, G. M. *Типология сложных предложений разносистемных языков*. Tashkent: Fan, 1991. unilibrary.uz
2. Ubaydullayeva, D. R. "Different approaches to the composite sentences in modern linguistics." *Conferencea* (2022). (overview article describing taxemic terminology).
3. Firbas, J. *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
4. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976. Taylor & Francis
5. Van Dijk, T. A. *Discourse studies / Critical discourse analysis (selected essays)*. London: Sage (various dates)
6. Austin, J. L. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. PhilPapers
7. Grice, H. P. "Logic and Conversation." In P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech Acts* (1975). Summer School on Law and Logic 2023
8. Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press, 2002 (Ch. 20: Punctuation). Cambridge University Press & Assessment
9. The Chicago Manual of Style, 17th ed. University of Chicago Press, 2017 (online at chicagomanualofstyle.org). Nafisa, T. (2023). *NOUNS AND THEIR GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES*. *Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке*, 2(16), 292-297.
10. Nafisa, T., & Marina, S. (2023). *TEACHING AND LEARNING OF ENGLISH VOCABULARY IN TESL AND TEFL CLASSROOMS*. *International Journal of Contemporary Scientific and Technical Research*, 465-469.
11. Nafisa, T. (2023). *THE USA ECONOMY, INDUSTRY, MANUFACTURING AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF GREAT BRITAIN*. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RECENTLY SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHER'S THEORY*, 1(9), 94-97.
12. Nafisa, T. (2023). *Secondary ways of word formation*. In *Conference on Universal Science Research* (Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 109-112).
13. Teshaboyeva, N. (2023). *Compound sentences in the English language*. *Yangi O'zbekiston taraqqiyotida tadqiqotlarni o'rni va rivojlanish omillari*, 2(2), 68-70.
14. Teshaboyeva, N. Z. (2023). *Modifications of Consonants in Connected speech*. In *Conference on Universal Science Research* (Vol. 1, No. 11, pp. 7-9).