

**ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURAL, SEMANTIC, AND COMMUNICATIVE-PRAGMATIC
TYPES OF COMPLEX SENTENCES WITH TEMPORAL SUBORDINATE CLAUSES IN
ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

Karimova Muslima Nurmuhammad kizi

Master's Student in Linguistics

Turon University, Andijan Branch

In the study of complex sentences with subordination in the Uzbek language, the scholarly works of G'. Abdurahmonov, M.A. Asqarova, and A. Berdialiev are of particular importance. The studies of Abdurahmonov and Asqarova primarily examine subordinate clauses in Uzbek from a formal perspective. For instance, M.A. Asqarova's doctoral dissertation entitled "Ways of Subordination and Types of Subordinate Clauses in Modern Uzbek" is devoted in its first chapter to the investigation of methods and forms of subordination, while the subsequent chapters analyze the linguistic means that participate in connecting the components of complex sentences.

Like any linguistic unit, a sentence, particularly a complex sentence, is a two-sided structure, consisting of both a form (expression) and a content (meaning) side. For a long period, research on complex sentences focused mainly on their formal and partially on their semantic aspects. In recent years, however, linguistic attention has increasingly shifted to the semantic dimension, referred to as semantics, and a new field known as semantic syntax has emerged. The studies of A. Berdialiev represent one of the earliest works in Uzbek linguistics in this field. In his doctoral dissertation, Berdialiev provides a deep analysis of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics of complex sentences with subordination. He convincingly resolves such important issues as syntactic homonymy, polysemy, and multifunctionality in subordinate complex sentences. In Russian linguistics, research in this area has also been initiated. Particularly valuable for semantic syntax is S.A. Shuvalova's monograph "Semantic Relations in Complex Sentences and Their Means of Expression." In this work, Shuvalova first classifies the semantic relations expressed in complex sentences and then presents comparative semantic models and their patterns of realization, covering almost all types of complex sentences.

According to G.A. Zolotova, the proportionality of syntactic properties can be explained through three main questions: What?, How?, and Why? Here, What? expresses the semantic content of syntactic units, How?—the means and constructions of expression, and Why?—the functional purpose of syntactic units. Studies of complex sentences show that most of them address only the How? or By what means? questions, while the What? question is rarely answered. This indicates that complex sentences have been traditionally approached from form to meaning, rather than the other way around.

For example, in the Uzbek linguistic tradition, scholars such as Abdurahmonov, Asqarova, and Berdialiev have approached complex sentences primarily from a formal viewpoint. In her research, M.A. Asqarova analyzed the methods and forms of subordination and the connecting devices used within such constructions. Later, in his doctoral dissertation, A. Berdialiev shifted focus to the

semantic aspect, examining the paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and semantic-significative characteristics of subordinate complex sentences, as well as syntactic homonymy, polysemy, and multifunctionality.

This shift from form to meaning has been noticeable not only in linguistic theory but also in language education. Traditionally, teachers explained grammatical topics, such as complex sentences, on the basis of formal principles—for example, determining where the subject appears—rather than emphasizing semantic relationships. In early linguistic studies, syntactic units were examined mainly from a semasiological (form-to-meaning) perspective rather than an onomasiological (meaning-to-form) one. This issue has become increasingly relevant today, as modern research requires a bidirectional approach—analyzing linguistic phenomena both from form to meaning and from meaning to form. Based on the above, it can be concluded that a complex sentence has two essential aspects—form and meaning.

Therefore, when studying the semantic syntax of subordinate complex sentences, it is appropriate to apply both methodological principles: “from meaning to form” and “from form to meaning.” The syntactic structure of a sentence is clear and well-studied, while the semantic level, although present, is more abstract and difficult to define. The meaning of a sentence depends on the event it describes; in complex sentences, the relationship between events is expressed more explicitly than in simple ones. The relationship between form and meaning is complex: sometimes they correspond, and sometimes they conflict. Such discrepancies have been studied mainly in simple sentences, but rarely in complex ones. In complex sentences, this inconsistency is often caused by a tendency toward redundancy. At present, the issue of structural semantics in sentence analysis has great importance. According to N.Yu. Shvedova, the main task of structural semantics is to determine the specific meanings of syntactic models. Two main approaches are distinguished:

1. The structural scheme of a sentence possesses its own semantic distinctiveness;
2. The semantic structure of a sentence can be described independently of its formal scheme. Across languages, the structural-semantic characterization of subordinate complex sentences is nearly the same.

Some Russian linguists have classified complex sentences with subordination based on three principles. This classification, which compares subordinate clauses to sentence parts, is widely accepted. According to it, subordinate clauses correspond to the parts of a simple sentence, resulting in subject, predicate, object, attribute, and adverbial types, the latter including place, manner, degree, quantity, time, cause, purpose, condition, and concession clauses.

According to Ergant, based on their connective means, subordinate complex sentences fall into two structural types:

1. Relative subordination (without explicit conjunctions);
2. Conjunctive subordination (with explicit subordinators).

N.S. Pospelov classified complex sentences with subordination into one-member and two-member types according to their structural-semantic composition. In two-member sentences, the subordinate

clause relates to the main clause as a whole, whereas in one-member sentences, the subordinate clause modifies a single word in the main clause, elaborating or specifying it.

N.A. Baskakov divides subordinate complex sentences into three groups:

1. Clauses connected to substantive parts of the main clause (complement clauses);
2. Clauses connected to attributive parts (predicate and attribute clauses);
3. Clauses connected to adverbial parts (cause, result, condition, purpose, time, comparison, and concessive clauses). A temporal subordinate clause specifies the time when the action, state, or feature expressed in the main clause occurs or does not occur.

Example: When I got home, it was too late, and I did not see Miss Barkley until the next evening.

(Uyga qaytganimda, vaqt allamahal bo'lgan edi, va Barkli xonimni faqat ertasi kuni ko'rdim.)

From a structural-semantic perspective, temporal subordinate clauses in English and Uzbek are formed differently, depending on the typological characteristics of each language. In agglutinative Uzbek, temporal subordinate clauses are usually formed through converb constructions combined with case suffixes or adverbial words expressing time. In contrast, in synthetic English, temporal subordination is expressed syntactically through subordinating conjunctions.

These include: A) Subordinating conjunctions: as, as soon as, as long as, when, whenever, while, now that, till, until, after, before, since.

B) Conjunctive adverbs and phrases: till the morning, the day (that), the moment, the instant, the next time, every (each) time, directly, immediately, instantly, once.

Researcher R. Quirk, who studied the structural-semantic features of temporal subordinate clauses, classified the linguistic means used to form them into four groups:

Simple means: after, before, till, until, when, while, since

2. Complex means: as soon as, as long as, now that

3. Correlative means: no sooner...than, hardly...when, scarcely...when, while...yet, when...then

4. Additional adverbial expressions: the moment (that), every time (that), until such time as, during the period when. Unlike Quirk, M. Stevenson classified the means of expressing temporal subordination based solely on a semantic approach, dividing them into:

1. Conjunctive adverbs: next, then, later, subsequently, after that, afterwards, at the same time, secondly, at the end, etc.

2. Subordinating conjunctions and phrases: when, the moment that, as soon as, while, after, before, until, from the time, up to the moment, etc.

3. Prepositional phrases: during, after, until, before, up till, since, subsequent to, prior to, previous to, following.

A temporal subordinate clause indicates the time at which the action or event in the main clause occurs. In complex sentences with temporal subordination, events or actions may take place simultaneously or sequentially. Both types may carry subtle nuances of meaning.

Examples:

A) I wore one when we went up to the posts and carried an English gas mask.

→ Men o‘zimiznikini postlarga borganda kiyib yurardim, bundan tashqari, mening ingliz protivogazim ham bo‘lgan.

B) It was nearly dark when we came down and turned onto the main road that ran beside the river.

→ Biz pastga tushib, daryo bo‘yidagi katta yo‘lga chiqqanimizda qorong‘i cho‘ka boshlagan edi.

C) We drove fast when we were over the bridge and soon we saw the dust of the other cars ahead down the road.

→ Ko‘prikdan o‘tgach, mashinani tezroq haydadik va ko‘p o‘tmay oldinda boshqa mashinalarning changini ko‘rdik.

D) Then you could have light exercise. Then when it was encysted we would operate.

→ Avval yengil mashqlar qilasiz, so‘ng o‘sha joy bitgach, operatsiya qilamiz.

The first two examples (A and B) illustrate simultaneous actions, whereas the latter two (C and D) represent sequential actions occurring one after another.

References

1. Abdurahmonov, G‘. (1977). Hozirgi o‘zbek tilida qo‘shma gaplar sintaksisi. Toshkent: Fan.
2. Asqarova, M. A. (1980). Hozirgi o‘zbek tilida ergash gapli qo‘shma gaplar. Toshkent: Fan.
3. Asqarova, M. A. (1972). Ways of Subordination and Types of Subordinate Clauses in Modern Uzbek [Doctoral dissertation]. Tashkent State University.
4. Berdialiev, A. (1998). Ergash gapli qo‘shma gaplarning paradigmatic va sintagmatik xususiyatlari. Toshkent: Fan.

5. Shuvalova, S. A. (1982). Semanticheskie otnosheniya v slozhnopodchinennykh predlozheniyakh i sredstva ikh vyrazheniya. Moskva: Nauka.
6. Zolotova, G. A. (1988). Kommunikativnye aspekty russkogo sintaksisa. Moskva: Nauka.
7. Pospelov, N. S. (1952). Ocherki po sintaksisu russkogo yazyka. Moskva: Uchpedgiz.