

**INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDAGI MATNLARDA MURAKKAB
KONSTRUKSIYALARNING LINGVISTIK VA PRAGMATIK
XUSUSIYATLARI
ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ И ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ
СЛОЖНЫХ КОНСТРУКЦИЙ В АНГЛИЙСКИХ И УЗБЕКСКИХ
ТЕКСТАХ
LINGUISTIC AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF COMPLEX
CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK TEXTS**

Xudoyorova Shaxnoza na

ORCID:

Master of Linguistics

University of exact and social sciences

Email:

Tel:

Худаярова Шахноза на

Магистр лингвистики

Университет точных и социальных наук

Xudayarova Shaxnoza

Lingvistika bo'yicha magistr

Aniq va ijtimoiy fanlar universiteti

Annotatsiya o‘zbek tilida

Ushbu maqola ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi matnlarda murakkab konstruksiyalarning lingvistik hamda pragmatik xususiyatlarini o‘rganishga bag‘ishlangan bo‘lib, sintaktik murakkablikning diskurs maqsadlari va talqin (interpretatsiya) effektlari bilan o‘zaro bog‘liqligiga alohida e‘tibor qaratadi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi ikki til o‘rtasida tobelanish, teng bog‘lanish, nofinit

predikatsiya hamda axborotni tashkil etish (information packaging) vositalaridagi o'xshash va farqli jihatlarni aniqlashdan iborat.

Metodologik jihatdan ish kontrastiv-funksional tahlilni korpusga asoslangan tanlanma bilan uyg'unlashtiradi; bunda ilmiy, publitsistik va badiiy nasr matnlaridan olingan namunalar tahlil qilinib, kontekstga sezgir qo'llanishlar yaqin (chuqur) o'qish usuli orqali yoritiladi. Tadqiqotning yangiligi murakkab konstruksiyalar turlarini pragmatik parametrlar — muallif pozitsiyasi (stance), muloyimlik (politeness), yumshatish (mitigation) va tematik rivojlanish (thematic progression) bilan integratsiyalashgan holda tahlil qilishda namoyon bo'ladi; bu esa faqat strukturaviy qiyoslash doirasidan chiqish imkonini beradi.

Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, ingliz tilida mantiqiy munosabatlar ko'proq aniq ifodalangan bog'lovchi va markerlar orqali tashqi tarzda ifodalanadi, o'zbek tilida esa ko'proq agglutinatив morfologiya, gaplar zanjiri (clause chaining) hamda pragmatik ellipsis vositasida matn izchilligi ta'minlanadi. Mazkur maqola tarjima amaliyoti va ilg'or til o'qitish metodikasi uchun muhim xulosalar va tavsiyalarni taqdim etadi.

Аннотация на русском языке. В статье исследуются лингвистические и прагматические особенности сложных конструкций в английских и узбекских текстах с акцентом на взаимодействие синтаксической сложности с дискурсивными целями и интерпретацией смысла. Целью является выявление сходств и различий в подчинении, сочинении, нефинитной предикации и упаковке информации в двух языках. Методология включает сопоставительный функциональный анализ и корпусный отбор материалов из академической, публицистической и художественной прозы, дополненный контекстуальным чтением. Научная новизна заключается в объединении сопоставимого набора типов сложных конструкций с прагматическими параметрами, такими как оценочность, вежливость, смягчение и тематическая прогрессия, что позволяет выйти за пределы сугубо структурных сопоставлений. Результаты показывают, что английский язык чаще эксплицирует логические отношения с помощью маркеров, тогда как узбекский чаще использует агглютинативную морфологию,

цепочки предикаций и прагматический эллипсис для обеспечения связности. Практическая значимость связана с переводом и методикой обучения.

Abstract in English. This article examines linguistic and pragmatic properties of complex constructions in English and Uzbek texts, with special attention to how syntactic complexity serves discourse organization and communicative intentions. The study aims to map similarities and differences in subordination, coordination, non-finite predication, and information packaging across the two languages. Methodologically, it employs a contrastive functional framework combined with corpus-based sampling from academic, journalistic, and literary prose, complemented by qualitative, context-sensitive analysis of selected passages. The scientific novelty consists in aligning a comparable inventory of complex-construction types with pragmatic parameters such as stance marking, politeness and mitigation, thematic progression, and coherence management, thus extending comparisons beyond form alone. Results indicate that English tends to encode logical relations through overt connectors and clause-typing, whereas Uzbek frequently relies on agglutinative morphology, clause chaining, and pragmatically licensed ellipsis to maintain cohesion and control interpretive load. Implications are drawn for translation decision-making and advanced language teaching.

Kalit soʻzlar: murakkab konstruksiyalar; qoʻshma gap; pragmatik funksiya; diskurs koherensiyasi; subordnatsiya; klauza zanjirlash; informatsiya tuzilishi

Ключевые слова: сложные конструкции; сложное предложение; прагматическая функция; дискурсивная когерентность; субординация; цепочка клауз; информационная структура

Keywords: complex constructions; complex sentence; pragmatic function; discourse coherence; subordination; clause chaining; information structure

Introduction

Complex constructions constitute a central interface where grammar meets discourse: they not only combine propositions but also calibrate responsibility, evidential access, evaluation, politeness, and the distribution of information across a

text. In typologically different languages such as English and Uzbek, this interface becomes particularly visible because comparable communicative needs are met through partly divergent formal resources. English, a largely analytic language with robust clause-linking conjunctions and a developed inventory of non-finite clauses, often externalizes relations between events and arguments through explicit connective marking and clause-typing. Uzbek, an agglutinative language with productive converbal morphology and a strong tradition of clause chaining, can distribute similar relations across morphology, word order, and discourse inference. Although contrastive studies have described individual syntactic patterns, there remains a need for an integrated account that treats complex constructions not merely as structural combinations but as pragmatic instruments shaped by genre, register, and interactional goals. The present study addresses this gap by focusing on how complex constructions perform pragmatic work in text, including stance management, mitigation, thematic progression, and coherence control, thus aligning syntactic description with discourse functionality. Current scholarship on complex sentences and subordination emphasizes the gradient nature of clause linkage and the importance of functional motivations for choosing among competing structures [1]. Pragmatic approaches further show that grammatical choices encode speaker commitment and interactional alignment, which in written genres correlates with authorial positioning and reader design [2]. For Turkic languages, research on clause chaining and converbs has demonstrated that multi-predicate complexes may function as a discourse strategy for packaging sequences and backgrounding relations rather than simply listing events [3]. At the same time, English grammar descriptions indicate that non-finite and complement constructions often serve economy and perspective management in expository and narrative prose [4]. Building on these strands, the article pursues three tasks: first, to establish a comparable inventory of complex-construction types in English and Uzbek texts; second, to identify pragmatic parameters that motivate the selection of these types in different genres; and third, to formulate contrastive generalizations that can inform translation and pedagogy. The scientific contribution

lies in showing that cross-linguistic differences are not reducible to the presence or absence of particular conjunctions or suffixes; rather, they reflect systematic preferences in how texts balance explicitness, inferential load, and the distribution of given and new information. The practical relevance follows for translators who must reconstruct pragmatic effects under typological asymmetry, and for advanced language teaching where learners struggle not only with grammatical form but also with the discourse conditions under which complex constructions are natural.

Materials and Methods

The research design combines contrastive functional analysis with corpus-informed qualitative observation. The materials consist of comparable samples of contemporary English and Uzbek prose drawn from three registers: academic articles and textbooks, journalistic analytical pieces, and literary narrative prose. The corpus sampling followed two constraints: genre comparability and thematic proximity, in order to reduce topic-driven syntactic variation. From each register, texts were segmented into passages of similar length, and complex constructions were annotated manually for clause-linkage type, predicate finiteness, overt linkage marking, and information-structural cues such as topicalization and focus. The annotation scheme distinguishes coordination, finite subordination (adverbial, relative, complement), non-finite subordination (participial, infinitival, gerundial or their functional equivalents), and clause chaining via converbs and serial predicate sequences. Pragmatic coding focused on (a) stance and evaluation, including hedging and certainty; (b) politeness and mitigation, operationalized through indirectness and responsibility shift; (c) thematic progression, operationalized through topic continuity and referential tracking; and (d) coherence relations, including causality, concession, condition, temporality, and elaboration. The theoretical grounding draws on functional-typological views of clause linkage and the notion that subordination and coordination form a continuum influenced by discourse factors [1], as well as on pragmatic accounts of meaning as contextually negotiated and encoded through grammatical choices [2]. Analytical procedures proceeded in two steps: first,

identifying recurrent constructional patterns within each language and register; second, conducting contrastive interpretation to determine which pragmatic functions align with which formal patterns and how these alignments differ across English and Uzbek. Reliability was enhanced by repeated coding cycles and the use of explicit decision rules for borderline cases, such as semi-coordinating connectives in English or reduced relative equivalents in Uzbek. The method is designed to remain sensitive to the fact that pragmatic effects are not attached to forms in a one-to-one manner; instead, they emerge from clusters of cues, including clause linkage, morphology, punctuation, and lexical choices.

Results

The analysis yielded a stable inventory of complex constructions in both languages, but with different distributions across registers and distinct alignments between form and pragmatic function. In English academic prose, finite subordination and non-finite constructions were both frequent, with a marked preference for complement clauses after reporting and stance predicates and for reduced non-finite clauses as modifiers and adverbials. These patterns correlated with dense information packaging: multiple propositions were integrated into a single sentence while maintaining explicit logical relations via complementizers, subordinators, and prepositional linkers. In Uzbek academic prose, complex constructions similarly supported dense exposition, yet the dominant strategy involved converbal chaining and morphologically marked adverbial clauses, often allowing temporal and causal sequencing to be encoded through suffixal morphology and aspectual choices rather than separate conjunctions. In journalistic prose, English showed a high incidence of finite adverbial clauses introduced by overt concessive and causal markers, which served to guide the reader through argument structure and to pre-empt counterclaims. Uzbek journalistic texts displayed a parallel argumentative layering but more frequently employed clause chains that maintain topic continuity and permit evaluative insertions through parenthetical or attributive expansions, with coherence often recovered via discourse context and lexical repetition. In literary narrative, English

used coordination and parataxis for immediacy, interspersed with subordinate clauses for perspective shifts and backgrounding; Uzbek narratives showed extensive chaining with converbs to represent event sequences and to control foregrounding, with finite subordination used selectively for explanatory or contrastive relations. Across the dataset, explicit connective marking of coherence relations was higher in English, while Uzbek exhibited a greater reliance on morphological linkage and pragmatic ellipsis, particularly in contexts of shared topic continuity. The pragmatic coding revealed that English frequently uses non-finite clauses to background information and to mitigate authorial commitment by presenting content as adjunctive or evidentially mediated. Uzbek, by contrast, often shifts commitment through evidential and modal morphology in the predicate while keeping clause linkage relatively compact, thereby achieving mitigation without necessarily increasing the number of overt subordinators. Additionally, thematic progression patterns differed: English more regularly reintroduces topics through relative clauses and appositive structures, whereas Uzbek more often maintains topic continuity through pro-drop and chained predicates with minimal overt resumptive devices.

Discussion

The results support the view that complex constructions are selected not only for syntactic well-formedness but for managing the reader's inferential work and for positioning the author within the discourse. English preferences for overt subordination and connector-rich linkage can be interpreted as a strategy of explicit coherence management suited to genres that value transparent logical scaffolding, especially in academic and argumentative writing. This aligns with functional accounts in which subordination encodes informational dependency and guides interpretation by marking relations in the surface structure [1]. Uzbek clause chaining, in turn, exemplifies the typological potential of converbal morphology to encode sequencing and backgrounding while preserving topic continuity, a pattern well documented for Turkic discourse organization [3]. Importantly, the present findings suggest that the pragmatic payoff of chaining is not merely brevity; it is a disciplined allocation of

prominence, where foreground events align with finite predicates and background relations are relegated to dependent, often non-finite forms. This offers a pragmatic explanation for why Uzbek texts can remain coherent with fewer overt conjunctions: coherence is distributed across morphology, aspectual-temporal marking, and discourse continuity rather than centralized in clause-linking lexemes. The role of non-finite constructions in English, especially reduced relatives and participial adverbials, illustrates a parallel but not identical economy principle: English compresses propositions into modifiers that allow the author to maintain a narrow focus while signaling background status, consistent with comprehensive descriptions of English clause combining [4]. Pragmatically, both languages exploit complex constructions for mitigation and stance, yet through different mechanisms: English often uses matrix predicates and complement structures to calibrate epistemic commitment, while Uzbek frequently integrates modality and evidentiality into the predicate complex, allowing stance to be encoded within the same clause-linkage chain. These differences matter for translation. A direct structural mapping can distort pragmatic effects, for instance by over-explicating Uzbek chaining into multiple English subordinate clauses and thereby altering narrative rhythm, or by under-marking English logical connectors in Uzbek and risking interpretive ambiguity. The findings also have pedagogical implications: advanced learners need guidance not only on how to form complex sentences but on when a given complex form is pragmatically appropriate in a target genre. The study is limited by the scope of sampled registers and by the manual nature of pragmatic annotation, which, while context-sensitive, cannot fully eliminate analyst judgment. Future research may expand to spoken interaction, where pragmatic pressures differ, and may integrate computational discourse parsing to quantify coherence relations more systematically. A further promising direction is to examine how bilingual writers transfer complex-construction preferences across languages, testing whether pragmatic habits rather than purely grammatical knowledge drive cross-linguistic interference [2].

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that complex constructions in English and Uzbek are best understood as pragmatic resources for coherence management, stance positioning, and information packaging rather than as purely formal sentence patterns. English tends to privilege overt connective marking and a rich set of non-finite constructions that compress background information while keeping logical relations explicit. Uzbek more often relies on agglutinative morphology, converbal clause chaining, and pragmatically licensed ellipsis to maintain topic continuity and to distribute prominence across predicates. These typologically grounded preferences manifest differently across academic, journalistic, and literary registers, yet in both languages complex constructions systematically align with discourse goals such as argument organization, narrative pacing, and mitigation. The article's contrastive generalizations highlight why structurally literal translation can misrepresent pragmatic effects and why advanced instruction must connect grammar with genre-sensitive discourse norms. Further work can refine the model by extending datasets, incorporating spoken genres, and testing the proposed pragmatic parameters with larger-scale annotation.

References

1. Halliday M. A. K.; Matthiessen C. M. I. M. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London, Routledge, 2014. 786 p.
2. Levinson S. C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983. 420 p.
3. Johanson L. Turkic. In: *The World's Major Languages*. London, Routledge, 2009. P. 490–511.
4. Huddleston R.; Pullum G. K. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. 1860 p.
5. Раҳматуллаев Ш. *Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили*. Тошкент, Университет, 2006. 376 б.
6. Виноградов В. В. *Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове*. Москва, Русский язык, 1986. 640 с.