

PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLEX CONSTRUCTIONS

**Xudayarova Shaxnoza ,
Aniq va Ijtimoiy Fanlar Universiteti
Lingvistika bo'yicha magistr**

Annotatsiya

Mazkur tezis murakkab konstruksiyalarning pragmatik xususiyatlarini nutqiy maqsad, kontekst va adresat omili bilan bog'liq holda tahlil qiladi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi murakkab gaplarda presuppozitsiya, fokus, aktual bo'linish va illokutsiya ko'rsatkichlarining ishlash mexanizmlarini aniqlashdir. Metodologiya diskurs tahlili, funksional-pragmatik yondashuv va korpusga tayangan kuzatuvni uyg'unlashtiradi. Ilmiy yangilik murakkab konstruksiya turlarini pragmatik funktsiyalar bo'yicha sistemalashtirishdadir.

Аннотация

Тезис посвящён анализу прагматических характеристик сложных конструкций с учётом коммуникативной цели, контекста и адресатного фактора. Цель исследования состоит в выявлении механизмов функционирования пресуппозиции, фокуса, актуального членения и иллокутивных показателей в сложных предложениях. Методология объединяет дискурс-анализ, функционально-прагматический подход и корпусные наблюдения. Научная новизна заключается в систематизации типов сложных конструкций по прагматическим функциям.

Abstract

This thesis examines the pragmatic characteristics of complex constructions in relation to communicative intention, context, and addressee orientation. The study aims to explain how presupposition, focus, information structure, and illocutionary force are encoded and inferred in complex sentences. Methodologically, it integrates

discourse analysis, a functional-pragmatic framework, and corpus-informed observation. The novelty lies in a pragmatic typology of complex constructions based on recurrent discourse functions.

Keywords (Uzbek): murakkab konstruksiya; pragmatika; presuppozitsiya; fokus; illokutsiya; diskurs; aktual bo‘linish

Ключевые слова (Russian): сложная конструкция; прагматика; пресуппозиция; фокус; иллокуция; дискурс; актуальное членение

Keywords (English): complex constructions; pragmatics; presupposition; focus; illocutionary force; discourse; information structure

Main body of the thesis.

The pragmatic analysis of complex constructions proceeds from the premise that grammatical complexity is not merely a matter of formal subordination or coordination, but a resource for managing interpersonal relations, guiding inference, and packaging information in discourse. In functional-pragmatic terms, complex sentences are selected when speakers need to distribute epistemic responsibility, calibrate commitment, or create layered meanings that cannot be efficiently expressed through isolated simple clauses. For this reason, the pragmatic characteristics of complex constructions should be described not only via structural types (e.g., complement, relative, adverbial, coordinate), but also via the communicative work they perform in concrete interaction. A central claim developed here is that the pragmatic value of complex constructions emerges at the intersection of three planes: illocutionary design (what act is performed), informational design (how content is foregrounded/backgrounded), and inferential design (what is left for the addressee to reconstruct). This triadic perspective allows us to explain why formally similar constructions may produce different pragmatic effects across contexts and genres, and why different structures may converge on the same pragmatic function.

A complex construction typically enables the speaker to split a proposition into a main assertion and one or more dependent components whose status is pragmatically downgraded or re-profiled. This re-profiling is crucial for presupposition management.

The pragmatic literature emphasizes that presupposed content behaves as discourse-given or taken-for-granted information, thus shaping the common ground rather than competing for focal attention [1]. In complex constructions, presupposition often arises through subordinate clauses that encode backgrounded conditions, temporal frames, causes, or concessive settings. Importantly, presupposition here is not a purely semantic property; it is interactionally exploited. By embedding content into a subordinate domain, the speaker can advance assumptions with reduced risk of direct challenge, since disputing presupposed material requires the addressee to interrupt the default flow of accommodation. Yet this does not mean subordinate content is always immune to dispute. In adversarial or critical discourse, addressees can explicitly reject embedded assumptions, which suggests that the pragmatic force of presupposition depends on genre expectations and the degree of dialogicity. Therefore, a pragmatic description must capture both the enabling conditions for accommodation and the contexts in which presupposition becomes salient and contestable.

Information structure provides the second major lens. Complex constructions serve as a mechanism for distributing theme and rheme, topic and comment, or background and focus across clausal layers. The Prague School tradition treats actual division of the sentence as a functional organization of information relative to the communicative goal [2]. In complex sentences, speakers frequently place discourse-old or anchoring material into subordinate clauses to maintain topical continuity, while reserving the main clause for the increment that advances the discourse. Relative clauses are particularly illustrative: restrictive relatives typically contribute to reference resolution, whereas non-restrictive relatives can function as parenthetical commentary that modulates stance, evaluation, or evidential support. Pragmatically, this distinction is not merely syntactic; it indexes the speaker's assessment of what the addressee needs for identification versus what is supplied as supplementary guidance. Similarly, adverbial clauses can act as framing devices: temporal and conditional clauses establish a cognitive setting that narrows the interpretation of the main assertion. In this way, complex constructions create a guided path for inference by

controlling the order and hierarchy of information, with main-clause prominence frequently aligning with discourse focus, though not obligatorily so.

Illocutionary force and stance are shaped by complex constructions through the distribution of responsibility and the possibility of strategic indirection. In speech act terms, complement clauses often function as vehicles for reporting, evidentializing, or hedging. When a speaker says that a claim is believed, reported, or assumed, the complex construction allows the speaker to assert a stance toward a proposition without fully asserting the proposition itself. This separation between commitment to the attitude and commitment to the embedded content supports fine-grained epistemic calibration. Russian and international pragmatic work highlights that such patterns are central to the linguistics of evidentiality and modality, where the form of embedding correlates with degrees of certainty and sources of knowledge [3]. The pragmatic characteristic here is not the presence of subordination per se, but the way embedding permits the speaker to relocate the burden of proof. For example, the speaker may commit to the existence of a report rather than to the truth of the reported content, thereby achieving communicative goals such as politeness, caution, or strategic ambiguity.

A further pragmatic dimension concerns discourse cohesion and coherence. Complex constructions provide explicit cues for rhetorical relations such as cause, contrast, concession, elaboration, and result. While coherence relations can be inferred across independent sentences, complex constructions grammaticalize these relations and thereby reduce processing load, especially in dense academic or institutional texts. However, this grammaticalization also allows speakers to steer interpretation. A concessive clause can pre-empt potential objections by acknowledging a counter-consideration and then reaffirming the main claim, which has the pragmatic effect of strengthening the speaker's position without appearing dogmatic. Likewise, causal clauses can be used not only to provide real-world explanations but also to justify speech acts, as when reasons are offered for requests, warnings, or evaluations. This aligns with the functional view that subordinate clauses often operate at different

levels: propositional (about events), epistemic (about reasons for belief), or interactional (about reasons for speaking). Such multi-level operation is a hallmark of pragmatic complexity and explains why formal clause types cannot be mapped one-to-one onto discourse functions.

From a methodological standpoint, a pragmatic study of complex constructions requires contextualized analysis rather than purely structural classification. Discourse analysis is necessary to observe how particular constructions recur in comparable communicative situations, while corpus-informed observation helps avoid intuition-driven generalizations and reveals frequency-based preferences across registers. The functional-pragmatic approach integrates these methods by treating grammatical form as a conventionalized solution to recurrent communicative tasks. In this perspective, the pragmatic meaning of a construction is a probabilistic association between form and function, stabilized through usage but adaptable to context. Uzbek linguistic scholarship emphasizes the importance of linking syntactic patterns to speech conditions and communicative intent, especially when describing complex sentence types in relation to style and discourse [4]. Bringing this insight into dialogue with international construction-based and pragmatic accounts enables a more explanatory analysis: instead of listing functions, one can model how addressees infer speaker intent based on structural cues, lexical markers, and discourse position.

A key analytical problem is the borderline between sentence grammar and discourse pragmatics. Complex constructions are often treated as self-contained units, yet in real texts they interact with surrounding sentences through anaphora, ellipsis, and topic chains. Pragmatic characteristics thus include not only intra-sentential hierarchy but also inter-sentential integration. A subordinate clause may pick up a discourse topic introduced earlier, thereby functioning as a bridge that maintains continuity, or it may introduce a new presupposed referent that becomes salient later. This forward-looking function is especially visible in academic writing, where authors use complex sentences to manage argument structure: they delimit claims, specify conditions, and signal the status of evidence. The resulting pragmatic effect is reader

guidance, achieved through controlled staging of assertions and qualifications. Functional stylistics, as developed in Russian linguistics, provides useful tools for describing how syntactic complexity correlates with genres and communicative norms, without reducing the analysis to mere counts of subordinate clauses [5].

The proposed contribution of this thesis is a pragmatic typology of complex constructions organized by dominant discourse function. The typology does not replace structural classification; rather, it overlays it with a functional grid that accounts for how speakers choose among available forms. The principal functional clusters can be summarized as follows in prose terms: first, constructions that background content to stabilize presuppositions and common ground; second, constructions that foreground a focal increment while relegating conditions, frames, or identifiers to subordinate domains; third, constructions that manage epistemic stance by separating commitment to an attitude from commitment to embedded content; and fourth, constructions that encode rhetorical relations to guide coherence and argumentation. These clusters are not mutually exclusive, and a single complex sentence may realize multiple pragmatic functions, but the dominant function tends to align with discourse position and genre. For instance, in argumentative prose, concessive and causal subordination frequently serves interactional justification, whereas in narrative prose temporal subordination often operates primarily as event structuring. This functional differentiation suggests that pragmatic characteristics are better understood as patterns of use constrained by discourse tasks.

Conclusion.

Complex constructions exhibit pragmatic characteristics that extend beyond formal subordination or coordination: they enable speakers to structure common ground through presupposition, to distribute focus and background via information organization, to calibrate commitment and evidential stance through embedding, and to guide coherence by grammaticalizing rhetorical relations. A functional-pragmatic and discourse-oriented analysis shows that the same structural type may yield distinct effects depending on genre, position, and addressee expectations, while different

structures may converge on similar communicative tasks. The synthesized typology proposed here clarifies how complex constructions serve as strategic resources for inference control and reader or listener guidance, thereby offering an explanatory basis for further corpus-based and cross-linguistic research in pragmatics and syntax.

References:

1. Levinson S. C. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. 420 p.
2. Firbas J. Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. 272 p.
3. Падучева Е. В. Высказывание и его соотносительность с действительностью. Москва: Наука, 1985. 272 с.
4. Ҳожиёв А. Ўзбек тили синтаксиси. Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1991. 256 б.
5. Виноградов В. В. О языке художественной прозы. Москва: Наука, 1980. 360 с.
6. Halliday M. A. K., Matthiessen C. M. I. M. Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar. 4th ed. London: Routledge, 2014. 808 p.