



STYLISTIC FEATURES OF COMPLEX SYNTACTIC CONSTRUCTIONS (BASED ON UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES)

Xamrayeva Zebiniso Xaydarovna

Senior teacher at SamSIFL

destiny-xzx@mail.ru

Abstract: This article explores the stylistic characteristics of complex syntactic constructions in the English and Uzbek languages. Drawing on comparative analysis, it identifies how these constructions contribute to expressiveness, clarity, and nuance in both languages. The study examines literary texts, academic writings, and conversational examples to determine the aesthetic and functional differences. Findings reveal that while English heavily relies on subordination and concise coordination for stylistic effect, Uzbek often uses parataxis and rich conjunctive patterns to enhance rhythm and clarity. This contrast underscores the influence of linguistic structure on stylistic choices.

Keywords: complex syntactic constructions, stylistics, English language, Uzbek language, comparative analysis.

The concept of complex syntactic constructions has garnered significant attention in linguistic research. These constructions, which consist of multiple clauses or phrases intertwined through various syntactic and semantic relationships, are critical to conveying intricate ideas and stylistic effects. Crystal defines complex syntactic constructions as structures that contain one main clause and at least one subordinate clause¹. These constructions allow for the detailed expression of relationships, such as causality, condition, and temporal sequence, which are vital for nuanced communication. Similarly, Halliday and Matthiessen emphasize the functional aspect of these constructions, arguing that they play a pivotal role in organizing information hierarchically². This hierarchical arrangement helps establish logical and rhetorical relationships, making them indispensable in academic, technical, and literary discourse.

In Uzbek linguistics, Xo‘jiev highlights that complex constructions often rely on participial phrases and agglutinative markers to express dependency. Unlike English, which depends heavily on conjunctions and relative pronouns, Uzbek uses participles (-ib, -gan) to form subordinate clauses, preserving the rhythm and fluidity characteristic of Turkic languages³. Complex syntactic constructions consist of one main clause and one or more subordinate clauses, serving to convey intricate ideas. In English, these structures are typically hierarchical, emphasizing logical relationships, such as causation, condition, or purpose⁴. Uzbek constructions, by contrast, often achieve complexity through participial forms and coordination⁵.

Quirk describe the structure of English complex sentences as predominantly hierarchical, with explicit markers such as “because”, “although” and “if” to denote relationships⁶. These markers ensure clarity,

1 Crystal D. “The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language”. Cambridge University Press. 2008. – 516 p.

2 Halliday M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Routledge, 2014. – 808 p.

3 Хожиев А. Н. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992. – 256 б.

4 Crystal D. “The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language”. Cambridge University Press. 2008. – 516 p.

5 Хожиев А. Н. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992. – 256 б.

6 Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman, 1985. – 1775 p.

which is a hallmark of analytical grammar of English. Conversely, Nazarov observes that Uzbek complex constructions often employ chaining strategies, relying on participial forms rather than conjunctions⁷. This approach reflects agglutinative grammar of Uzbek, which allows for compact and rhythmically balanced sentence structures. In Uzbek, Nazarov argues that parataxis—combining clauses of equal importance—dominates, lending an oral and lyrical quality to texts⁸. This stylistic preference aligns with the rich oral traditions of Uzbek, where rhythm and cadence are paramount.

Stylistic features in language arise from structural and functional elements, reflecting cultural and linguistic idiosyncrasies. Complex syntactic constructions are pivotal in shaping style, providing depth, rhythm, and clarity to communication⁹. English, with its analytical nature, and Uzbek, with its agglutinative characteristics, offer a rich ground for comparative analysis. This study investigates the stylistic potentials of complex syntactic constructions in these languages to uncover their linguistic artistry and pragmatic functions.

The stylistic role of complex constructions varies across languages. According to Crystal¹⁰, English leverages subordination to achieve stylistic precision and clarity. For instance, sentences such as "While the rain poured, the children continued to play indoors" effectively juxtapose contrasting ideas, enhancing the rhetorical impact.

Complex syntactic constructions consist of one main clause and one or more subordinate clauses, serving to convey intricate ideas. In English, these structures are typically hierarchical, emphasizing logical relationships (e.g., causation, condition, or purpose). Uzbek constructions, by contrast, often achieve complexity through participial forms and coordination. Stylistics examines how language choices impact meaning and reader perception. In English, subordination lends precision and logical clarity, while parataxis is in Uzbek often fosters fluidity and poetic resonance.

Subordination for emphasis: "Although she was tired, she continued to work," creates a focus on the subordinate clause for dramatic effect.

Ellipsis and anaphora: These devices streamline complex constructions for stylistic economy.

Coordination for rhythm: "He came, he saw, he conquered" showcases balanced coordination that enhances readability and impact.

Uzbek syntax reflects a reliance on parataxis and agglutination:

Chained participial phrases: "U kelib, kitobni olib, qaytib ketdi" (He came, took the book, and left) produces a rhythmic flow.

Redundant conjunctions for emphasis: Words like "va" (and) are often used for stylistic reinforcement.

Poetic structures: Uzbek literary texts often intertwine clauses to reflect lyrical traditions.

The comparative studies by Halliday and Matthiessen reveal that while English complex constructions prioritize analytical logic¹¹, while Uzbek constructions reflect a more holistic approach, emphasizing the overall rhythm of discourse. This contrast underscores the influence of typological and cultural factors on syntactic choices.

English favors explicit markers like "because", "although" and "if", creating clear logical connections. Uzbek, however, often uses implicit cues or participles (-ib, -gan). Uzbek constructions frequently reflect oral traditions, prioritizing rhythm over strict logic, whereas English prioritizes analytical clarity.

Both languages use complex constructions to achieve stylistic goals, but cultural contexts influence their use. For instance, English academic writing demands precision, favoring complex subordination, whereas Uzbek favors stylistic diversity, especially in artistic contexts.

Complex syntactic constructions in English and Uzbek reveal significant stylistic and functional differences rooted in their linguistic and cultural frameworks. English employs subordination to achieve

7 Назаров Н. Ўзбек тилининг услубий қоидалари. – Тошкент: Фан, 2005. – 323 б.

8 Назаров Н. Ўзбек тилининг услубий қоидалари. – Тошкент: Фан, 2005. – 323 б.

9 Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman, 1985. – 1775 p.

10 Crystal D. "The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language". Cambridge University Press. 2008. – 516 p.

11 Halliday M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Routledge, 2014. – 808 p.

clarity and logical precision, while Uzbek relies on parataxis and rhythm to foster expressiveness and coherence. These findings highlight the adaptability of syntax to stylistic demands, emphasizing the need for further exploration of language-specific and universal stylistic mechanisms.

References:

1. Crystal D. "The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language". Cambridge University Press. 2008. – 516 p.
2. Halliday M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Routledge, 2014. – 808 p.
3. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman, 1985. – 1775 p.
4. Назаров Н. Ўзбек тилининг услубий қоидалари. – Тошкент: Фан, 2005. – 323 б.
5. Хожиев А. Н. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992. – 256 б.
6. Хамраева З. Х., Ulug'bek qizi Saidazamova M. Improving students reading comprehension by using literary texts //World of Scientific news in science. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 1. – С. 257-263.
7. Хамраева З., Saidazamova M. TRANSFORMING EDUCATION. THE POWER OF THE FLIPPED CLASSROOM APPROACH //Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit. – 2024. – С. 60-63.
8. Хамраева З. Complex syntactic whole: prose stanza //Международная конференция академических наук. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. 11. – С. 83-86.