

The Grammar Function of Subject and Predicative Clauses In English And Karakalpak Languages

Khudaybergenova Z. O.

PhD associate professor, Karakalpak state University, Uzbekistan

Khudaybergenova M. M.

4th-year student Karakalpak state University, Uzbekistan

Received: 18 April 2026; **Accepted:** 04 May 2026; **Published:** 29 May 2026

Abstract: This paper investigates the grammatical roles of subject clauses and predicative clauses in English and Karakalpak languages that differ significantly in their typological structure. The main issue addressed is the lack of detailed contrastive studies on these types of subordinate clauses, even though they play a crucial part in building complex sentences and organizing information.

The importance of the topic lies in its practical value for contrastive linguistics, translation, foreign language teaching, and a better understanding of the syntactic features of Turkic languages.

Using a contrastive-descriptive method grounded in functional-semantic principles, the study compares how these clauses are structured, how they are linked to the main clause, their typical position, and the semantic weight they carry in both languages. The analysis draws on well-established English grammars as well as key syntactic sources on the Karakalpak language, with special attention to correlative constructions.

The findings show clear typological differences: English mainly uses finite clauses introduced by explicit complementizers and often applies extraposition, whereas Karakalpak tends to rely on analytic-correlative structures involving interrogative and demonstrative pronouns. These structural differences considerably influence clause positioning and the way information is conveyed. The study also offers practical suggestions for improving translation techniques and teaching English as a foreign language to Karakalpak-speaking students.

Keywords: Subject clause, predicative clause, contrastive syntax, Karakalpak language, complementation, functional-semantic analysis, Turkic language, correlative pronouns.

Introduction: The study of subordinate clauses occupies a central place in modern linguistics, as these structures allow speakers to express complex relationships within a single sentence. Among them, subject clauses and predicative clauses play particularly important roles in organizing information, establishing reference, and conveying communicative intentions. In English, an analytic language, these clauses typically appear as finite structures introduced by explicit complementizers such as *that*, *whether*, or *wh*-words. In Karakalpak, an agglutinative Turkic language, equivalent functions are often realized through

correlative constructions involving interrogative and demonstrative pronouns combined with specific word-order patterns (Huddleston & Pulluma, 2002).

Although such clauses exist across languages, their grammatical realization varies significantly according to typological characteristics. English relies heavily on positional flexibility and extraposition strategies, while Karakalpak employs analytic-correlative devices rooted in its functional-semantic classification of subordinate clauses (Ubaydullaev, 1976). This contrast creates both theoretical interest and practical challenges in translation, language teaching, and bilingual grammar

development. The present paper addresses the grammatical functions of subject clauses and predicative clauses in these two languages through a systematic contrastive approach (Quirk et al., 1985).

The research problem lies in the insufficient contrastive description of how subject and predicative clauses perform their syntactic and semantic roles in English versus Karakalpak. In English, subject clauses function as the grammatical subject of the main clause, often with anticipatory *it* to maintain end-weight principles. Predicative clauses typically serve as subject complements following linking verbs. In Karakalpak language according to the functional-semantic principle, these correspond to *baslawish bag'ının'qılı qospa ga'p* (subject subordinate clause) and *byanlawish bag'ının'qılı qospa ga'p* (predicative subordinate clause). The former explains or replaces the subject content via correlative pronouns, while the latter elaborates the predicative element using demonstratives such as *sol*, *sonday*, or *sonsha* (Dawletov A., Dawletov M., 2009).

This topic is particularly relevant today. Increasing academic and professional exchange between English-speaking and Turkic-speaking communities requires accurate contrastive knowledge to reduce translation losses and improve second-language pedagogy. For Karakalpak students learning English, differences in clause positioning and linking mechanisms often cause persistent errors. The study also contributes to the typological understanding of complementation strategies in agglutinative versus analytic languages.

The main aim of this paper is to provide a detailed comparative analysis of the grammatical functions of subject clauses and predicative clauses in English and Karakalpak, focusing on structural features, linking devices, positional behavior, and semantic-communicative load. To achieve this aim, the following tasks are set:

- To review theoretical foundations in English descriptive grammars.
- To examine functional-semantic classification in Karakalpak syntactic sources.
- To conduct a point-by-point contrastive analysis of form, position, and meaning.
- To identify practical implications for translation and English language teaching.

- To formulate conclusions on typological differences and future research directions.

The study draws on contrastive-descriptive methodology combining functional-semantic principles from Karakalpak grammar with established English descriptive frameworks. Materials include authentic examples from literary and journalistic texts in both languages.

METHODS

This study employs a contrastive-descriptive approach to examine the grammatical functions of subject clauses and predicative clauses in English and Karakalpak. The methodology is primarily qualitative, focusing on systematic comparison of syntactic structures, formal markers, positional behavior, and semantic-communicative roles (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). Due to limited digitized Karakalpak language corpora, no statistical analysis was conducted. The research relies on careful manual examination of authentic examples from grammatical descriptions and natural language usage.

The core method is contrastive analysis, which juxtaposes parallel or functionally equivalent constructions. This is supported by the functional-semantic principle traditionally used in Karakalpak language syntax, according to which subordinate clauses are classified by the syntactic role they perform in the main clause (Dawletov et al., 2010). In English, the analysis follows descriptive frameworks emphasizing clause type, complementizer choice, and information structure.

Data collection was carried out in two stages. First, theoretical descriptions were reviewed from authoritative English reference grammars and Karakalpak syntactic works discussing *baslawish bag'ının'qılı qospa ga'p* and *byanlawish bag'ının'qılı qospa ga'p*. Second, concrete linguistic material was selected, including literary and journalistic examples in Karakalpak illustrating correlative constructions, parallel English sentences, and minimal pairs to highlight structural differences (Kononov, 1960).

Special attention was paid to avoiding repetition of examples. Each sentence demonstrates a distinct aspect of clause function such as linking mechanism, position, or semantic nuance. Karakalpak language examples were drawn from syntactic manuals, while

English examples represent typical patterns of that-clauses, wh-clauses, and extraposition.

The analysis follows interconnected steps: identification of formal markers, examination of linear order and positional flexibility, evaluation of semantic load and communicative function, and assessment of typological implications.

Reliability is ensured through cross-verification with multiple sources and consistent analytical criteria. Limitations include reliance on written sources and absence of spoken corpora or experimental data. These constraints do not undermine the descriptive validity of the contrast.

RESULTS

The analysis of subject clauses and predicative clauses in English and Karakalpak reveals both shared functional purposes and profound typological differences rooted in the analytic versus agglutinative character of the two languages (Baskakov, 1952). English tends to encode these clauses through finite structures with explicit complementizers and flexible positioning, while Karakalpak relies on correlative pronoun pairs and demonstrative elements to link the subordinate clause to its syntactic role in the main clause. The following sections present the findings separately for each clause type before highlighting key contrasts.

Subject clauses in English

In English, a subject clause occupies the subject position of the main clause, providing the content that the predicate comments upon. Finite subject clauses are commonly introduced by *that*, *whether*, or *wh*-words. When the clause is lengthy, speakers frequently use anticipatory *it* and extrapose the clause to final position to satisfy the principle of end-weight (Quirk et al., 1985).

Examples:

- That the team won the championship surprised everyone. (direct subject clause)
- It is obvious that climate change affects global agriculture. (extraposed with anticipatory *it*)
- Whether the project will succeed depends on funding. (yes/no interrogative clause as subject)
- What he said during the meeting shocked the audience. (wh-clause functioning as subject)

Subject clauses in Karakalpak language

In Karakalpak language the equivalent construction is realized through a correlative pattern where an interrogative pronoun in the subordinate clause is paired with a demonstrative pronoun (*ol*, *sol*) in the main clause. The subordinate clause typically precedes the main clause and explains or replaces the subject referent. This functional-semantic approach classifies the clause according to the role it fulfills rather than its internal structure alone (Dawletov A., Dawletov M., 2009).

Examples:

- Kim sizlerdin' usı turmısın'ızga qol suqsa, ol bizin' qılıshımızdan nabit boladı. Here, *kim* introduces the subordinate clause, and *ol* links it to the subject role.
- Qazang'a ne tüsse, sho'mishke sol ilinedi. The correlative pair *ne ... sol* establishes the subject content.
- Kimde-kim miynetti o'z ta'rtibi menen maqsetke muwapiq islese, ol miynet haqını da mol-molaqay aladı. The intensified form *kimde-kim* adds emphasis while preserving the subject function.
- Kim maldan ayrılса, baxttan, bag'-dawletten ayrıladı. In this case, the demonstrative is stylistically omitted when contextually recoverable.

Predicative clauses in English

Predicative clauses in English function as subject complements, typically following linking (copular) verbs such as *be*, *seem*, *become*, or *appear*. They identify, characterize, or specify the nature of the subject (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002).

Examples:

- The main problem is that we lack sufficient resources. (that-clause as predicative complement)
- The question remains whether the policy will achieve its goals. (whether-clause specifying the subject)
- The truth is what matters most in this situation. (wh-clause as predicative)

Predicative clauses in Karakalpak language

Karakalpak predicative subordinate clauses elaborate

the predicative element of the main clause, frequently using demonstrative pronouns such as *sol*, *sonday*, or *sonsha* as the predicative head, which the subordinate clause then explains. Both single- and double-correlative variants exist (Ubaydullaev, 1976; Baskakov, 1952).

Examples:

- *Bul ma'selede meniń pikirim sol, Tashkent texnika universiteti qasında kollydjler ushın oqıtıwshılar tayarlaytug'ın qosımsha fakultet sho'lkemlestiriw kerek.* The demonstrative *sol* serves as the predicative anchor
- *Qızıg'ı sonda, institut direktorının' orınbasarı esaplang'an jan'ashıl Savitskiy degen adamın' qay jerden kelgenin, onı direktor orınbasarı sıpatında kim belgilegenin bile almawı.* Here *sonda* links the explanatory clause.
- *Zaldın' saltanatı ha'm keńligi sonsha, Gulshehra bunın' haqıyqat ekenin isenbey, ertektiń ishinde júrgen shıg'arman dep oyladı.* The degree demonstrative *sonsha* intensifies the predicative description.

Comparative overview

English subject and predicative clauses predominantly use finite verbs and optional or mandatory complementizers, with extraposition available for subject clauses to improve readability. Karakalpak equivalents favor preposed subordinate clauses linked by correlative pronouns (*kim ... ol/sol*, *ne ... sol*, *sonday*), reflecting a functional-semantic orientation rather than strict positional syntax.

While English allows the subordinate clause to directly occupy the subject or complement slot, Karakalpak language mediates the relationship through demonstrative anchors, reducing ambiguity in complex sentences but limiting positional flexibility. Semantically, both languages use these clauses for referential and explanatory purposes, yet Karakalpak constructions often blend subject or predicative roles with elements of condition or degree due to the multifunctional nature of correlatives.

DISCUSSION

The results highlight fundamental typological divergences in clause linkage and information packaging. English assigns clear syntactic slots through

word order and complementizers, while Karakalpak integrates clauses via explicit correlative anchors.

A major contrast concerns clause position. English frequently uses extraposition with anticipatory *it* for complex subject clauses. Karakalpak strongly prefers preposed subordinate clauses, with the correlative pronoun anchoring the content retrospectively. This reduces ambiguity but increases processing demands.

Linkage mechanisms also differ. English employs a closed set of complementizers that mark subordinate status independently. Karakalpak uses correlative pairs, creating tighter semantic bonds but blurring category boundaries. Multifunctionality is common, as *kimde-kim* can combine subject reference with conditional nuance.

Semantically, English predicative clauses often serve identificational purposes, while Karakalpak *bayanlawish* constructions frequently intensify the predicative element with demonstratives like *sonsha*. This produces vivid stylistic effects that may require restructuring in translation.

These asymmetries create challenges in translation and teaching. Translators must choose between preserving fronted position or applying extraposition. Karakalpak learners often transfer correlative patterns, producing errors such as "Who works hard, he will succeed." Explicit contrastive exercises help reduce such mistakes.

Typologically, Karakalpak aligns with Turkic tendencies combining analytic correlatives with non-finite forms. The functional-semantic approach in Karakalpak grammar complements the form-oriented English tradition and enriches understanding of embedding strategies.

Limitations include reliance on written sources. Future research could incorporate spoken corpora and experimental studies with bilingual speakers.

In summary, subject and predicative clauses fulfill similar needs but are shaped by each language's typological profile. English favors configurational clarity, while Karakalpak emphasizes explicit semantic anchoring. Recognizing these patterns advances contrastive linguistics and supports better translation and pedagogy.

CONCLUSION

This study has carried out a systematic comparison of the grammatical functions of subject clauses and predicative clauses in English and Karakalpak. In English, subject clauses either occupy the subject position directly or are extraposed using complementizers such as *that*, *whether*, and *wh*-words, while predicative clauses typically function as subject complements following linking verbs. In Karakalpak language these roles are realized through *baslawish bag'ının'qılı qospa ga'p* and *bayanlawish bag'ının'qılı qospa ga'p*, which depend on correlative pronoun pairs and a clear preference for placing the subordinate clause before the main clause.

The findings indicate that English places greater emphasis on configurational clarity and positional flexibility, whereas Karakalpak language highlights explicit correlative linking and semantic multifunctionality. These typological differences have direct practical consequences for both translation and language teaching. In particular, Karakalpak-speaking learners of English can benefit significantly from targeted contrastive exercises that draw attention to the shift from correlative constructions to English-style complementizer strategies.

Overall, the research helps bridge the descriptive tradition of English grammar with the functional-semantic approach commonly used in Karakalpak syntax. It also makes a modest contribution to the broader typological understanding of complementation strategies across analytic and agglutinative languages.

Although the present analysis is based mainly on written sources, future studies could usefully incorporate spoken language data and experimental methods with bilingual speakers. In conclusion, while subject and predicative clauses serve similar communicative purposes in both languages, they are expressed through fundamentally different grammatical means. A systematic contrastive approach not only enriches theoretical linguistics but also provides valuable insights for improving translation quality and foreign language teaching in the Karakalpak educational context.

REFERENCES

1. Baskakov, N. A. (1952). Karakalpak language (Grammatika karakalpakskogo yazyka). Moscow: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
2. Dawletov, A., Dawletov, M., & Qudaybergenov, M. (2010). *Házirgi qaraqalpaq ádebiy tili* [The modern literary Karakalpak language]. Nókis: Bilim.
3. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Kononov, A. N. (1960). *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka* [Grammar of the modern Uzbek literary language]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
5. Dawletov A., Dawletov M., "Ha'zirgi qaraqalpaq tili. Sintaksis" [Modern Karakalpak language. Syntax]. (2009). Nókis: Bilim.
6. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman.
7. Ubaydullaev, K. (1976). *Qaraqalpaq tili boyınsha tańlamalı miynetler* [Selected works on the Karakalpak language]. Nókis.