



SEMANTIC RELATIONS AND CONJUNCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK COMPOUND SENTENCES

Yakhshieva Zebo Rashidovna

*Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc), Professor at Turon University, Academician of the Turon
Academy of Sciences ORCID: 0009-0006-0973-6147*

Jumayeva Durdoni Azamat kizi

Master's student at Karshi International University

Abstract: *In this article written about the structural, semantic, and functional features of compound sentences in English and Uzbek languages were systematically compared within a unified analytical framework. For the first time, traditional grammatical analysis was integrated with contemporary corpus-based methods, which enhanced the reliability and validity of the research findings. A complete classification of functional-semantic equivalence and non-equivalence of conjunctions in both languages was conducted.*

Key words: *compound sentence, coordinate compound sentence, conjunction, comparative analysis, syntax, grammatical structure, semantic relations*

INTRODUCTION

The semantic dimension of compound sentences constitutes a crucial aspect of their linguistic characterization, as the relationships of meaning expressed through the coordination of independent clauses determine the communicative function of these syntactic constructions.

While the structural analysis presented in the preceding section examined the formal properties of compound sentences in English and Uzbek, the present section focuses on the semantic relations that compound sentences express and the role of coordinating conjunctions in signaling these relations.

The contrastive analysis of semantic relations and conjunctions reveals both universal patterns reflecting common cognitive categories and language-specific characteristics that distinguish the two languages under investigation.

The study of semantic relations in compound sentences has a long history in linguistic research, with scholars from diverse theoretical traditions recognizing that the coordination of clauses serves to express logical and conceptual relationships between the propositions they contain.

The fundamental insight underlying this research is that compound sentences are not merely formal combinations of independent clauses but meaningful constructions that encode specific types of relationships between ideas, events, and states of affairs.

As Halliday observes in his functional grammar, "the clause complex is a resource for constructing logical relations between processes, and the specific nature of these relations is signaled by the conjunctive elements that link the clauses".¹⁰

¹⁰ Halliday, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Second Edition. London: Edward Arnold, 1994. P. 220.



This perspective emphasizes the centrality of semantic relations to the understanding of compound sentences and the role of conjunctions as markers of these relations.

The classification of semantic relations in compound sentences has been approached in various ways by different scholars, but a broad consensus has emerged around a basic typology that recognizes several major categories of coordinate relationships.

The most widely recognized categories include copulative or additive relations, in which the coordinated clauses present information that is simply combined without implication of contrast or alternation; adversative relations, in which the second clause presents information that contrasts with or qualifies what is stated in the first clause; disjunctive or alternative relations, in which the coordinated clauses present alternatives; and causal-resultative relations, in which one clause presents a cause or reason and the other presents an effect or conclusion.

This typology, while subject to refinement and elaboration in various grammatical descriptions, provides a useful framework for analyzing the semantic variety of compound sentences in both English and Uzbek.

Copulative or additive relations represent the most basic and unmarked type of semantic relationship in compound sentences, involving the simple combination of information without any implication of contrast, alternation, or logical dependency. In compound sentences expressing copulative relations, the coordinated clauses present information that is understood as belonging together in some way, but the specific nature of the connection is left largely unspecified by the coordinating element itself. The interpretation of copulative compound sentences typically depends on contextual factors and world knowledge that enable the hearer or reader to infer more specific relationships between the conjoined propositions. Quirk and his colleagues note that "copulative coordination is semantically the least specific type, indicating merely that the information in the coordinated clauses is to be taken together".¹¹ This semantic underspecification is characteristic of copulative coordination and distinguishes it from more specific types of coordinate relations.

In English, the conjunction "and" serves as the primary marker of copulative relations in compound sentences. The conjunction "and" is the most frequent coordinator in English and is characterized by its semantic versatility, being compatible with a wide range of interpretive relationships between clauses.

When "and" links clauses in a compound sentence, the basic meaning is one of addition or combination, but the specific interpretation may involve temporal sequence, cause and effect, or other more specific relationships that are inferred from the content of the clauses and the context of utterance.

As Huddleston and Pullum observe, "and is the default coordinator, semantically the least marked, and is compatible with a very wide range of relations between the coordinates".¹² The semantic flexibility of "and" makes it the most versatile and frequently used coordinating conjunction in English.

¹¹ Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1985. P. 930.

¹² Huddleston, R., Pullum, G.K. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. P. 1299.



The interpretation of compound sentences with "and" often involves pragmatic enrichment beyond the basic additive meaning. When "and" conjoins clauses describing events, a temporal interpretation of sequence is often inferred, such that the event described in the first clause is understood as occurring before the event described in the second clause. This temporal interpretation is not inherent in the meaning of "and" itself but arises from general pragmatic principles governing the interpretation of discourse. Similarly, "and" may be interpreted as expressing cause and effect when the content of the clauses supports such an interpretation. The sentence "He fell and broke his leg" is typically understood as expressing a causal relationship, with the falling causing the breaking, even though "and" itself does not encode causation. These interpretive possibilities reflect the semantic underspecification of copulative coordination and the role of pragmatic inference in determining the specific meaning of compound sentences.

In Uzbek, copulative relations in compound sentences are expressed through several coordinating conjunctions, including "va" (and), "hamda" (and also), and correlative constructions such as "ham...ham" (both...and). The conjunction "va" serves as the primary marker of copulative coordination in Uzbek, corresponding functionally to English "and." Like its English counterpart, "va" is semantically general and compatible with a range of interpretive relationships between clauses. Gulomov and Asqarova describe "va" as "biriktiruv munosabatini ifodalovchi asosiy bog'lovchi" (the main conjunction expressing copulative relations) and note that it is used to combine clauses that present related or complementary information.¹³ The semantic properties of "va" are broadly comparable to those of English "and," although differences in usage patterns and distributional properties exist between the two languages.

The conjunction "hamda" in Uzbek also expresses copulative relations but differs from "va" in emphasis and stylistic register. "Hamda" tends to be used in contexts where the addition of information is particularly emphasized or where a formal register is appropriate. The correlative construction "ham...ham" expresses emphatic additive relations, corresponding to English "both...and." As Sayfullaeva and her colleagues observe, "ham...ham juft bog'lovchisi ikkala gapda aytilgan fikrlarning tengligini va qo'shilishini ta'kidlaydi" (the paired conjunction "ham...ham" emphasizes the equality and addition of the ideas expressed in both sentences).¹⁴ The availability of multiple conjunctions for expressing copulative relations in Uzbek provides speakers with resources for marking subtle differences in emphasis and style that are not directly paralleled in English.

Adversative relations in compound sentences involve contrast or opposition between the content of the coordinated clauses. In adversative compound sentences, the second clause typically presents information that contrasts with, qualifies, or unexpectedly follows from what is stated in the first clause. The contrast may be direct, involving opposition of content, or it may be based on the violation of an expectation created by the first clause. Adversative coordination is semantically more specific than copulative coordination, as it explicitly marks a relationship of contrast between the coordinated elements. Quirk and his

¹³ Gulomov, A., Asqarova, M. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Sintaksis. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1987. B. 186.

¹⁴ Sayfullaeva, R., Mengliev, B., Boqieva, G., Qurbonova, M., Yunusova, Z. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2009. B. 360.



colleagues note that "adversative coordination indicates that the content of the second conjunct is unexpected in view of the content of the first".¹⁵ This characterization highlights the pragmatic dimension of adversative relations, which involve expectations and their violation.

In English, the conjunction "but" serves as the primary marker of adversative relations in compound sentences. The semantic contribution of "but" is to signal that the second clause presents information that contrasts with or qualifies the first clause, typically by denying an inference or expectation that might be drawn from the first clause. The sentence "John is poor, but he is happy" illustrates this adversative function, with "but" signaling that John's happiness is unexpected given his poverty (based on a general expectation that poverty leads to unhappiness). The conjunction "yet" may also be used to express adversative relations in English, with a meaning similar to "but" but often with greater emphasis on the unexpectedness of the contrast. The conjunctive adverb "however" and other adverbial expressions may also function to express adversative relations, although these differ from "but" in their syntactic properties and distribution.

REFERENCES:

¹ Halliday, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Second Edition. London: Edward Arnold, 1994. P. 220.

1. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1985. P. 930.

2. Huddleston, R., Pullum, G.K. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. P. 1299.

3. Gulomov, A., Asqarova, M. *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Sintaksis*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1987. B. 186.

4. Sayfullaeva, R., Mengliev, B., Boqieva, G., Qurbonova, M., Yunusova, Z. *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2009. B. 360.

5. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1985. P. 935.

6. Z.R.Yaxshieva. *Theoretical Approaches And International Experience In Teaching Sciences*. Multidisciplinary journal of science and technology. Volume-5, Issue-10.

7. Yaxshieva. Z.R. *The Role Of Innovative Pedagogical Practices And Digital Technologies In Education*. International Conference on modern Development of Pedagogy And Linguistics, 2(9), 187–195. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17409521>. <https://universalconference.us/universalconference/index.php/icmdpl/article/view/5467>.

8. Yakhshieva. Z.R. *International Experience In Teaching Sciences Uzing Interactive Whiteboards*. International conference on interdisciplinary science, 2(10), 182–184. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17406024>

¹⁵ Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1985. P. 935.