American Journal of Philological Sciences

Structural, Semantic, And Communicative-Pragmatic Characteristics of Introductory Parts of Sentences in English And Uzbek

Kosimova Khusnurakhon Oybek kizi

PhD at department of practice of the English language, ASIFL, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Introductory parts of sentences, also known as sentence prefaces or initial elements, play a crucial role in shaping meaning, emphasis, and flow in both English and Uzbek. This article explores their structural, semantic, and communicative-pragmatic functions, offering a contrastive analysis supported by authentic examples. By examining how these components operate across both languages, we gain insight into their impact on discourse, politeness strategies, information structure, and translation challenges.

Introduction: Introductory parts of sentences play a vital role in both language structure and effective communication. They offer contextual background, express the speaker's attitude, and guide the logical progression of ideas (Fraser, 1999). In Uzbek and English, these elements serve not only structural functions but also carry rich semantic and pragmatic meaning. Although they appear similar, the use of introductory elements in each language is governed by unique syntactic rules, cultural values, and communicative conventions (Salomov, 2007; Kenjaboev, 2015). Mastering their use is key to ensuring clarity, politeness, and coherence in discourse.

METHOD

Structural characteristics: Structurally, introductory elements in English include adverbials (e.g., "Frankly," "In my opinion,"), prepositional phrases ("According to the report,"), and clauses ("As is known,"). These elements typically precede the main clause and set the tone or context for the utterance. In written English, they are often followed by a comma to signal a pause (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Frankly, I don't think this is a good idea.

According to experts, climate change is accelerating.

As we expected, he failed the exam.

In Uzbek, similar structural elements include modal particles ("Aytishlaricha" – "Reportedly"), time expressions ("Bugungi kunda" – "Nowadays"), and clauses ("gapning rosti" – "you know"). Uzbek syntax allows for greater flexibility in the placement of these elements, depending on emphasis and stylistic preference (Namozov, 2020).

Aytishlaricha, u yaqinda chet elga ketgan.

To'g'risini aytganda, men bu fikrga qo'shilmayman.

U harakat qilgan bo'lsa-da, muvaffaqiyatga erisha olmadi.

Semantic features: Semantically, introductory parts frame the main clause by indicating how the main proposition should be interpreted. These elements can show contrast ("in contrast," "however"), cause or reason ("because," "that's why"), condition ("in any case"), or time ("meanwhile"). They can also reflect the speaker's evaluation or certainty ("clearly," "probably") (Crystal, 2003).

In Uzbek, similar semantic distinctions exist, but they often rely on context and intonation rather than fixed markers. For instance, "afsuski" conveys regret or disappointment, while "xayriyatki" expresses relief.

These introductory markers help set the tone for the following statement and influence how it is perceived (Namozov, 2020).

Afsuski, kechikdim. (Unfortunately, I was late.)

Xayriyatki, u sogʻ-salomat qaytdi. (Fortunately, he returned safely.)

Ehtiyot boʻlish kerak, aks holda xatolik yuz beradi. (One must be careful, otherwise a mistake will occur.)

Communicative-pragmatic functions: Introductory elements serve several pragmatic functions across both languages:

Hedging: Used to soften the assertion and show tentativeness or openness to other opinions.

English: To some extent, this may be true.

Uzbek: Ehtimol, bu toʻgʻri boʻlishi mumkin.

Politeness and softening: Employed to reduce the potential face-threatening act of disagreeing or criticizing (Levinson, 1983).

English: With all due respect, I disagree.

Uzbek: Hurmat bilan aytadigan boʻlsam, men rozi emasman.

Discourse management: Helps organize ideas in conversation or writing (Blakemore, 2002).

English: First of all, let me thank you for your time.

Uzbek: Avvalo, sizga oʻz minnatdorchiligimni bildirmoqchiman.

Frankly speaking, this proposal lacks feasibility. Toʻgʻrisini aytsam, bu taklif amalga oshishi qiyin.

To begin with, we should analyze the background of the issue. Avvalo, masalaning tarixini tahlil qilishimiz kerak.

Ehtimol, ular bu qarorni qayta koʻrib chiqadilar. They may reconsider this decision.

Contrastive Analysis: Although English and Uzbek share many of the same communicative goals in using introductory elements, they often differ in formality, fixed expressions, and reliance on cultural norms (Wierzbicka, 2003). English tends to employ a wide range of prefabricated expressions and complex subordinate clauses, especially in academic or formal contexts. Uzbek, however, relies more on modal particles and idiomatic phrases that are deeply embedded in the cultural and social context of communication.

For example, in English:

"It is believed, ..." is a formal impersonal structure.

In Uzbek:

"Aytishlaricha..." serves a similar purpose but also carries implications about the speaker's distance from the statement.

Another comparison:

English: Interestingly, most participants supported the new rule.

Uzbek: Qizigʻi shundaki, aksariyat ishtirokchilar yangi qoida tarafdori boʻlgan.

Challenges in translation: Translating introductory elements can be challenging because they often carry connotative and pragmatic meanings that are not directly translatable (Kenjaboev, 2015). Literal translations may obscure the speaker's intent or weaken the force of the utterance. For instance:

Honestly, I don't agree. Toʻgʻrisini aytsam, men rozi emasman"

It is said that he has left the country. Aytishlaricha, u mamlakatni tark etgan

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Other problematic areas include culture-bound expressions and differences in discourse expectations. In English, impersonal expressions create formality and objectivity, while in Uzbek, subjectivity and respect are often shown through modal expressions and indirectness (Namozov, 2020).

Morphologically, introductory words can be expressed by modal words, adverbs, numbers, verbs, verbal phrases, etc. Syntactically, in both languages, introductory parts may be expressed by exclamatory words, parenthetical parts expressed by words, parenthetical parts expressed by phrases, parentheticals expressed by clauses, or even composite sentences.

Additionally, in English, introductory parts can be expressed through adjective/participle phrases (in short, as usual, frankly speaking), pronoun phrases (after all, above all, as to me, besides this), and numeral phrases (numeral phrases: at first). Similarly, in Uzbek, introductory parts are conveyed using alternatives, for instance: "gapning qisqasi" (in short), "xullasi kalom" (in summary), "innaykeyin" (then), "gapning indallosi" (broadly speaking), "gapning poʻst kallasi" (essentially), "avvalo" (firstly), "odatda+gi+dek" (as usual), "har doim+gi+dek" (as always), "pirovardida" (ultimately), "oxiriga kelib" (toward the end), "oxiriga borganda" (as it concludes), "oxiriga kelganda" (upon conclusion), "va nihoyat" (finally), "dastavval" (initially), "hammasidan oldin" (above all), "oldidan" (before it), "menga qolsa" (if it were up to me), "menga kelsak" (as for me), "menga desa" (if you ask me), "bundan tashqari" (besides), qisqa qilsak(in short), qisqa qilib aytganda(briefly), bir soʻz bilan aytganda(in a word) and others.

Pedagogical and practical implications: For language learners and translators, a solid grasp of these introductory parts enhances both comprehension and production. In teaching English to Uzbek speakers, emphasis should be placed on understanding how introductory phrases influence tone and meaning. Activities might include:

Analyzing texts for introductory elements

Practicing paraphrasing and translation

Role-playing polite disagreement

Conversely, English speakers learning Uzbek should practice using appropriate modal particles and idiomatic expressions in the correct pragmatic context, guided by real-world dialogue and cultural explanations.

CONCLUSION

Introductory parts of sentences in English and Uzbek exhibit both universal functions and language-specific features. Their study enhances our understanding of communication, especially in intercultural and translation contexts. A thorough grasp of their structure, meaning, and pragmatic use is invaluable for linguists, educators, and translators. Further research using corpus-based approaches could yield more comprehensive insights into frequency and variation in different registers.

REFERENCES

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Pearson Education Limited.

Blakemore, D. (2002). Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.

Salomov, G'. (2007). O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.

Kenjaboev, J. (2015). Pragmatik tilshunoslik asoslari. Toshkent: Fan.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. Mouton de Gruyter.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? Journal of Pragmatics, 31(7), 931–952.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Namozov, B. (2020). O'zbek tilida muloqot madaniyati va pragmatik ko'rsatkichlar. Toshkent: Akademnashr.