LINGUISTIC AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF COMPLEX CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK TEXTS

University of Exact and Social sciences
2nd year master's degree student
Khudayarova Shakhnoza Samadovna
E-mail:shahnozaxudayarova42@gmail.com

Abstract: Complex constructions serve as essential syntactic units that express hierarchical relations between propositions. This study examines the linguistic and pragmatic features of complex constructions in English and Uzbek texts, focusing on structural patterns, semantic functions, and discourse roles. Using a comparative-descriptive method supported by corpus-based examples, the research identifies several key contrasts between the two languages. English, as an analytical language, relies primarily on subordinating conjunctions, relative pronouns, and fixed word order; meanwhile, Uzbek employs morphological markers, participles, and flexible clause order due to its agglutinative nature. Pragmatically, both languages use complex constructions to convey coherence, emphasis, backgrounding, politeness, and textual organization. The study contributes to cross-linguistic syntactic theory and provides pedagogical insights for translation, teaching, and linguistic analysis.

Key words: complex constructions, subordination, clause embedding, participial clauses, English syntax,uzbek syntax, agglutinative language, analytical language, comparative linguistics, cross-linguistic analysis.

Introduction: Complex constructions—sentences containing more than one clause linked through subordination, coordination, or embedding—represent a critical area of linguistic study. They allow speakers to express logical relationships such as cause, condition, concession, time, and purpose.

Understanding their structure and use is essential for typological comparison, discourse analysis, and applied linguistics.In **English**, complex constructions typically rely on clear syntactic devices such as *because, although, when, who,* and *that*. The hierarchical relationships between clauses are expressed through fixed word order and explicit markers.In Uzbek, complex constructions (*murakkab gaplar*) are formed through a combination of conjunctions, participial suffixes, and verbal morphology [1-7]. The agglutinative nature of Uzbek allows clause relations to be marked morphologically, making subordination less dependent on conjunctions and more on verb forms such as -**gani uchun, -sa, -ganda, -ib,** and others.Previous research (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Jo'rayev, 2018; Normamatova, 2024) highlights structural differences between analytical and agglutinative languages, but limited work has addressed the pragmatic functions of complex constructions across these languages in a comparative context. This research aims to fill that gap.

Research Objectives: To define and classify complex constructions in English and Uzbek. To analyze their linguistic (structural and semantic) features and identify pragmatic functions performed by complex constructions in both languages also compare how the two languages encode interclausal relations.

Methods: This study employs a **comparative-descriptive method** supported by corpus-based observation. The dataset consists of: **English corpus**: 50 literary, academic, and journalistic texts (~200,000 words). Uzbek corpus: 40 literary and newspaper texts (~150,000 words).

Data Collection and Annotation:

Complex constructions were identified through the presence of:

subordinate clauses

participial clauses

relative clauses

multi-layered clause embeddings

Each construction was annotated for:syntactic type morphological markers semantic functionpragmatic role in context

Analytical Framework

The analysis follows:

Functional grammar (Halliday, 2014)

Generative syntax (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002)

Uzbek grammar tradition (Jo'rayev, 2018; Qosimjonov, 2001)

Results: Structural Features of English Complex Constructions

English, being an analytical SVO language, forms complex constructions mainly through:

Subordinating Conjunctions:

Examples: *because, although, since, if, when, while*

Example: *She left early because she felt tired.*

Relative Clauses : Introduced by *who, which, that*: *The book that you gave me is excellent.*

Complement Clauses: by *that, whether, if*: *He said that he would come.*

Clause Embedding :English frequently embeds clauses within noun phrases: *The man who lives next door that I told you about…*

Structural Summary (English):relies on explicit conjunctionsrigid word orderhigh use of relative pronouns

Structural Features of Uzbek Complex Constructions

Due to its agglutinative nature, Uzbek forms complex constructions mainly through **verbal suffixes and participles.**

Morphological Subordination

Common markers: **-gani uchun** (because-**sa**, (if) -**ganda** (when). -**sa-da** (although-**ib**,(sequential action)

Example: *U charchagani uchun uyda qoldi.*

("He stayed home because he was tired."

Participial Clauses

Uzbek uses participles extensively**:-ga ,-adigan ,-ayotgan**

Example: *Kitob oʻqiyotgan bola kirib keldi.*

Conjunction: Although less common than morphological methods:*ammo, lekin, chunki, agar*

Clause Chaining: Uzbek often connects clauses sequentially: *U oʻqib, uyiga qaytdi.*

(He studied and returned home.

Semantic Functions of Complex Constructions

Both languages use complex constructions to express similar semantic relations:

Function	English Marker	Uzbek Marker	Example (Uzbek)
Causal	because	-gani uchun	*U kelmagani uchun kuta olmadim.*
Temporal	when, while	-ganda, -ayotganda	*U kelganda, men uyda edim.*
Conditional	if	agar, -sa	*Agar vaqt boʻlsa, boraman.*
Concessive	although	-sa-da	*Yomgʻir yogʻsa-da, bordi.*
Purpose	so that	uchun	*Koʻrishi uchun yozdim.*

Pragmatic Functions of Complex Constructions

Complex constructions are used to achieve several pragmatic objectives:

Backgrounding Information

English: *Although he was tired, he continued working.*

Uzbek: *U charchagan bo'lsa-da, ishladi.*

Softening Commands and Requests

Uzbek frequently uses conditional clauses for politeness: *Agar imkon bo'lsa, ertaga kelasizmi?*

c. Emphasis and Focus

English uses cleft structures: *It was because of the rain that we stayed home.*

Uzbek uses participial emphasis: *Sen aytgan gap juda muhim.*

d. Discourse Coherence

Both languages use subordination to signal logical progression of ideas.

Discussion: The analysis reveals that:

English: Prefers syntactic subordination, depends on explicit linking words, uses embedded structures extensively ,maintains strict clause order

Uzbek: Relies on morphological subordinationUses participles instead of relative pronounsAllows flexible word orderPrefers clause chaining over embeddingDespite these structural differences, both languages show **functional similarity** in expressing causality, temporality, condition, concession, and background information.The pragmatic functions in both languages support coherence politeness ,strategies rhetorical nuance , textual organization.These findings support typological principles observed by Comrie (2013) and Nichols (2008), emphasizing that agglutinative languages encode interclausal relations morphologically.

Conclusion: This study examined the linguistic and pragmatic features of complex constructions in English and Uzbek texts. English expresses clause relations through syntactic devices, conjunctions, and relative pronouns, while Uzbek encodes these relations through participial and verbal morphology. Pragmatically, complex constructions in both languages serve to structure discourse, express logical relations, and convey politeness or emphasis.The

results offer insight into cross-linguistic syntactic behavior and provide a foundation for applied fields such as translation, teaching, and computational linguistics. Future research may expand the corpus, examine spoken language, or explore acquisition in bilingual learners.

References

1. Comrie, B. (2013). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford University Press.

2. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Functional Grammar*. Routledge.

3. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.

4. Jo'rayev, O. (2018). *Hozirgi O'zbek Tili Sintaksisi*. Tashkent.

5. Normamatova, S. (2024). *Murakkab Gaplarning Strukturasi va Semantikasi*. Linguistics Research Journal.

6. Nichols, J. (2008). *Linguistic Typology*. Cambridge University Press.

7. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.