ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

TYPES OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES AND THEIR MODES OF EXPRESSION IN FRENCH AND UZBEK

Sayfullayev Bakhshillo Nematulloyevich
Bukhara State University, Faculty of Foreign Languages,
The teacher of the french philology department
b.n.sayfullayev@buxdu .uz
Shahobova Maftuna
4th year student (French language)

Abstract: This article provides a comparative typological analysis of subordinate clauses in French and Uzbek, examining their classification, syntactic and semantic roles, and modes of expression in each language. French, an Indo-European language, primarily uses subordinating conjunctions (e.g. que, si, parce que, bien que) and relative pronouns (e.g. qui, que) to introduce subordinate clauses, including complement clauses, relative clauses, and various adverbial clauses. Uzbek, a Turkic language, employs markedly different strategies: instead of a generalized complementizer like que, it relies on non-finite verb forms (participles, converbs, and nominalized verbs) and a set of subordinating elements (e.g. agar 'if', chunki 'because', garchi 'although') to convey subordinate relationships. The syntactic behavior and semantic functions of these structures are analyzed with illustrative examples. We discuss how certain French subordinators arose via grammaticalization of prepositional phrases, and how Uzbek connective strategies have been influenced by morphological processes and contact (e.g. Persian loans like agar, chunki. Cross-linguistic comparison reveals substantial differences that pose challenges for translation: for instance, a French clause introduced by que ("that") may correspond to an Uzbek nominalized clause or participial phrase. By drawing on linguistic literature and examples, the article highlights how each language's typological profile shapes its system of subordination and discusses implications for linguistic theory and translation practice.

Keywords:text, author's speech, morphological device, syntactic device, narrative indirect speech.

Introduction

Complex sentences in both French and Uzbek are formed by combining an independent main clause with one or more subordinate clauses (also called dependent clauses). A subordinate clause is one that cannot stand alone and depends on a main clause for its full interpretation. Such clauses fulfill various syntactic roles (like noun clauses acting as objects, relative clauses modifying nouns, or adverbial clauses indicating time, cause, condition, etc.) and express a range of semantic relations (causality, temporality, purpose, concession, condition, etc.). This study aims to classify the types of subordinate clauses ("propositions subordonnées") in French and Uzbek and analyze how they are structurally and semantically expressed in each language. French and Uzbek belong to distinct language families (Indo-European and Turkic, respectively) and have different grammatical architectures: French is largely analytic with rigid word order and uses conjunctions and relative pronouns to mark

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

subordination, whereas Uzbek is agglutinative with flexible word order and often uses morphological means (suffixes on verbs, participles, and converbal forms) to link clauses. These typological differences offer a rich ground for comparison, shedding light on how languages encode complex propositional relationships in distinct ways.

In what follows, we first outline the typological classification of subordinate clauses in French, describing their formal markers and functions. Next, we do the same for Uzbek, highlighting the use of non-finite forms and specialized particles. We then provide a comparative analysis, including paired examples, to illustrate structural and functional differences between the two languages. We discuss relevant grammaticalization processes – for example, the historical development of French conjunctions from Latin sources and the emergence of Uzbek subordinate connectives through both internal development and Persian influence – and consider cross-linguistic implications, particularly challenges in translation between French and Uzbek. Through a well-referenced discussion, this article underscores the importance of understanding subordination in a cross-linguistic context, both for theoretical linguistics and practical translation.

Subordination in French: Types and Functions

French subordinate clauses can be categorized into three broad types: complement (noun) clauses, relative clauses, and adverbial clauses. Each type is characterized by particular subordinating elements and serves specific syntactic and semantic roles in the sentence. French subordinate clauses are usually introduced by a subordinating conjunction or a relative pronoun, and they contain a finite verb (or occasionally a non-finite verb in special constructions). The subordinate clause is syntactically dependent on the main clause, often functioning as an obligatory element such as an object or modifier. Below, we discuss each type in turn, with examples.

Complement (Noun) Clauses: These subordinate clauses function like nouns, most often as direct objects of verbs of saying, thinking, perception, etc. They are typically introduced by the complementizer **que** (“that”). For example, in Les invités pensent **que** le gâteau est délicieux (“The guests think **that** the cake is delicious”), the clause introduced by **que** is a complement clause expressing the content of what is thought. Such clauses are also known as propositions subordonnées complétives. They answer the question quoi? (what?) with respect to the main verb (les invités pensent **quoi** ? – que le gâteau est délicieux). French complement clauses nearly always use **que** (or variants like **ce que** in certain contexts) as the subordinator. In indirect yes-no questions, **si** (“if/whether”) serves as the complementizer (e.g. Je me demande **si** elle viendra “I wonder if she will come”). Importantly, French complement clauses are finite; the verb carries tense and often mood. In certain cases, especially after expressions of doubt, emotion, or necessity, the verb appears in the subjunctive mood, reflecting the subordinate clause’s non-assertive or dependent status (e.g. Je veux **qu**’il vienne “I want him to come,” where vienne is subjunctive). The use of subjunctive is a notable feature of French subordination, triggered by specific higher predicates or conjunctions, to indicate modality or attitude. This mood choice has no direct equivalent in Uzbek, as we will see, which can lead to translation challenges.

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

Relative Clauses: French relative clauses (propositions subordonnées relatives) modify a noun (the antecedent) in the main clause, specifying or describing it. They are introduced by **relative pronouns** or **relative adverbs** such as **qui** (who/which), **que** (that/which), **dont** (of which/whose), **où** (where), **lequel** (which, formal), etc. For example: Les invités ont adoré le gâteau **que** Fiona a fait ("The guests loved the cake **that** Fiona made"). Here, que Fiona a fait is a relative clause modifying le gâteau, with que functioning as a relative pronoun referring back to the cake. The relative pronoun not only links the clause to the noun but also indicates the role of the antecedent within the subordinate clause (in this case, que acts as the direct object of a fait). French relative clauses are usually finite and follow the main clause (post-nominal relative clauses are the norm in French). They are an essential mechanism for embedding descriptive information. By contrast, as we will explore, Uzbek does not use relative pronouns; it employs participial phrases to achieve a similar function. This difference can be seen as a typological distinction: Indo-European languages like French tend to use special pronouns for relativization, whereas Turkic languages like Uzbek use non-finite verb forms (participles) in an attributive role.

Adverbial Clauses: Adverbial subordinate clauses (propositions subordonnées circonstancielles) express circumstances such as time, cause, purpose, condition, concession, manner, etc., relative to the main clause. They are introduced by **subordinating conjunctions** (or multi-word conjunctional locutions) that specify the type of relationship. For example, a temporal clause may be introduced by **quand** or **lorsque** ("when"), a causal clause by **parce que** or **puisque** ("because/since"), a purpose clause by **pour que** or **afin que** ("so that, in order that"), a conditional by **si** ("if"), a concessive by **bien que** or **quoique** ("although"), etc. Adverbial clauses can often be repositioned (initial or final in the sentence) without changing the core meaning, and a comma is usually written if the adverbial clause comes first. For instance: Fiona doit retourner au supermarché **parce qu**'elle a oublié d'acheter du lait. ("Fiona has to go back to the supermarket **because** she forgot to buy milk.") contains a causal clause introduced by **parce que**. Similarly, Bien **qu**'elle **ait** dû repartir au supermarché, Fiona a terminé le dîner à temps. ("Although she had to go back to the store, Fiona finished the dinner on time.") is a concessive clause introduced by **bien que**, which notably requires the subjunctive mood (ait dû). French has a rich inventory of such conjunctions, including simple conjunctions (e.g. si, quand, comme, car) and compound or locutional conjunctions (e.g. alors que "whereas/while", à condition que "provided that", à moins que "unless", jusqu'à ce que "until", pendant que "while", etc.). Many of these are products of grammaticalization; for example, **pour que** comes from pour + que (literally "for that"), **afin que** from à fin que, and **jusqu'à ce que** from jusque à ce que. The structure **parce que** ("because") originated from Old French par ce que (literally "by the fact that"), illustrating how a prepositional phrase combined with the complementizer **que** evolved into a single causal conjunction. In usage, French adverbial clauses often convey nuanced logical relations; for example, **puisque** ("since") tends to introduce a cause assumed to be known or obvious, whereas **parce que** introduces new information explaining a cause. These subtleties are important in translation, as choosing the wrong conjunction can slightly alter the pragmatic meaning of a sentence.

Subordination in Uzbek: Types and Functions

Uzbek exhibits a substantially different strategy for forming subordinate clauses, reflecting its Turkic, agglutinative character. Rather than relying primarily on standalone

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

subordinating conjunctions or complementizers to introduce finite subordinate clauses, Uzbek tends to use **non-finite verb forms** (such as participles, verbal nouns, and converbs) that attach to the verb of the subordinate clause. These verb forms often carry suffixes indicating tense/aspect and sometimes specific subordinate meanings, and they allow the subordinate clause to function as a nominal or adverbial modifier within the larger sentence. Uzbek does have some conjunction-like words, including loans from Persian and Arabic, but their role is more limited compared to the ubiquitous **que/si** in French. In many cases, what would be a full subordinate clause in French is rendered in Uzbek by a participial phrase or a noun-like clause with possessive and case suffixes, **without any separate word meaning "that"**. We outline below the major types of subordinate expressions in Uzbek – complement clauses, relative clauses, and adverbial clauses – and their typical modes of expression.

Complement Clauses (Content Clauses): In Uzbek, the equivalent of a French complétive ("that"-clause) is usually expressed by **nominalization of the verb** in the subordinate clause. Instead of a complementizer like "que", Uzbek uses **verbal noun forms** often called factive nouns or simply nominalized clauses. A verb in the subordinate clause takes a suffix (commonly -gan for past/perfective, -adigan or -adigan for future/habitual, -yotgan for present continuous, etc.) to form a participle, and this participle is then treated like a noun: it can take possessive suffixes to agree with the subject of the subordinate clause, and case endings (like accusative -ni) to indicate its role in the main clause. For example, consider the sentence meaning "I understood that the teacher didn't go." In Uzbek this can be expressed as: O'qituvchining bormaganini tushundim. Here, the verb bormagan ("not having gone") is a participle in the perfective (-gan) form, and it carries the third-person possessive suffix -i (with the genitive subject o'qituvchining "of the teacher") and the accusative case -ni, resulting in bormaganini. This single word encapsulates the meaning "that (the teacher) did not go". Literally, the structure can be parsed as "the teacher's not-having-gone (acc.) I understood." The word deb (see below) is **not** used in this case; the nominalized clause itself functions as the direct object of tushundim ("I understood"). Another example is O'qituvchining bormagani aniq, which corresponds to "It is clear that the teacher didn't go." Here bormagani ("his/her not having gone") is a nominalized subordinate clause functioning as the subject of the copular sentence (aniq "clear"). Uzbek linguists refer to these nominalized clauses as factive noun clauses, especially when they report knowledge, perception, or communication verbs. The term "factive" here indicates that the subordinate clause is treated as a fact or proposition. Crucially, Uzbek does not ordinarily employ a free-standing complementizer like "that" (French que) in such sentences – using an explicit complementizer (like Persian ki, see below) is considered archaic or highly formal. Instead, subordination is indicated by the verb morphology itself. As one descriptive source succinctly puts it, "In Uzbek, this strategy [of using a conjunction like 'that'] is not employed outside of artificial and archaic literary language. Instead, Uzbek makes use of various noun forms derived from the verb of the subordinate clause.". This reflects a general Turkic pattern: subordinate content clauses are formed via **nominalization** rather than conjunction. The nominalized clause behaves like a noun phrase; for instance, it can be marked for accusative if it's a direct object, or it can stand in the nominative as the subject of a sentence, and it takes a possessive suffix to indicate its logical subject if that subject is different from the main clause's subject.

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

There is, however, an alternative strategy in Uzbek for embedding clauses, particularly in reporting speech or thoughts, which involves the particle **deb**. **Deb** is historically the converb (gerund) of the verb demoq ("to say"), and it functions as a **complementizer-like** element meaning roughly "saying/that". It is used after a fully finite clause to indicate an indirect quotation or content clause. For example: Hasan bozorga ketdi **deb** eshitdim means "I heard **that** Hasan went to the market," literally "Having heard (it) saying 'Hasan went to the market'". In this construction, deb follows the quoted clause (Hasan bozorga ketdi) and precedes the main verb (eshitdim "I heard"). The embedded clause remains finite (with its own tense and person marking) and deb marks it as reported content. This deb-clause strategy is common for verbs of saying, thinking, perceiving (e.g. o'yladi "thought", aytdi "said", eshitdim "I heard"). It is somewhat analogous to using "that" in English, but deb is more restricted in usage, often implying a direct or indirect quote. It is noteworthy that both strategies – nominalization (-ganini bilmoq "to know that X has...") and deb clauses (X deb bilmoq "to know (thinking) X") – can sometimes be used with similar meaning, though there may be subtle differences in formality or emphasis. The **choice** of strategy can depend on the verb and context: for many cognitive verbs like bilmoq ("to know"), the nominalized form is more typical (X-ni bilmoq), whereas for o'ylamoq ("to think"), a deb clause is common (X deb o'ylamoq, literally "think saying X"). The existence of two embedding strategies in Uzbek – a **head-final complementizer** (deb) vs. a **morphologically embedded nominalized clause** – has been noted in linguistic studies. Each has its syntactic constraints, but together they allow Uzbek to cover the functions of Indo-European "that"-clauses without needing a dedicated invariant complementizer word.

Relative Clauses: Uzbek does not use relative pronouns equivalent to French qui, que, dont, où. Instead, it employs **participial modifiers** to create what function as relative clauses. A relative clause in Uzbek is typically a **participle phrase placed before the noun it modifies** (since Uzbek is head-final and modifiers precede the head noun). The verb of the subordinate clause takes a participial suffix that agrees in tense/aspect and sometimes voice, and the subordinate clause usually omits the relative pronoun entirely (the role of the gap is indicated by word order and participle form). For example, men o'qigan kitob means "the book **that I read**" where o'qigan is a past participle of o'qimoq ("to read") meaning "having read" (with an implied "which I…"). Literally, men o'qigan kitob is "I-read book" – the person who did the reading (I) is indicated, and o'qigan modifies kitob. Similarly, u yozgan maktub would mean "the letter that s/he wrote" (yozgan "written (by him/her) letter*). Because participles like -gan can encode past tense relative clauses, -adigan for habitual/future relative meaning ("that [someone] will/would [verb]"), etc., Uzbek covers the gamut of relative clause meanings through morphology. There is no need for a word like "which" or "that" to introduce the clause; subordination is implicit in the participial form. If the head noun's role in the subordinate clause is, say, object, the participle alone suffices; if it's subject, similarly the participle agrees with it. This construction is very compact. An illustrative ambiguity arises from this compactness, as noted in Uzbek grammar: Qilganini bilaman could mean "I know **what she did**" or "I know **that she did (it)**", depending on interpretation. In one reading, qilganini is "what she did" (a free relative clause, object of know), and in another reading it's a nominalized factive ("the fact that she did it"). In speech, context usually clarifies this, and in writing, one might disambiguate by using the longer form with -ligini: qilganligini bilaman explicitly means "I know that she did it" (inserting the nominalizing complementizer -lig. The suffix -ligi (a form of -lik) can be

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

added to participles to form abstract nouns (roughly "the fact of doing"), which is used in more formal contexts or to avoid ambiguity. In essence, Uzbek relative clauses are structurally similar to other Turkic languages: participle-based, with the subordinate clause directly attached to the noun it describes. This means translation of French relative clauses into Uzbek requires transforming a clause with a relative pronoun into a participial phrase, often changing the word order significantly, and vice versa for Uzbek-to-French (one must supply an appropriate relative pronoun and finite verb form). Despite the structural difference, the semantic roles (subject, object, etc.) conveyed by French qui, que, dont are all expressible via the correct participial suffix and possessor marking in Uzbek.

Adverbial Clauses: Uzbek expresses adverbial relations (time, cause, purpose, condition, concession, manner, etc.) using a mix of **converb forms**, **postpositions**, and certain conjunction-like words. A **converb** is a non-finite verb form (sometimes called an adverbial participle) that indicates adverbial subordination. Uzbek has a rich set of converbs. One of the most common is -ib (or -b after vowels), which often corresponds to English "-ing" or "and" in sequence (it can mean "while doing X" or "and then did X" depending on context). For example, U uyga **kirib**, chiroqni yoqdi means "He entered the house **and** turned on the light," where kirib is a converb of kirmoq ("to enter"). Converbs can indicate temporal sequence (-gach or -gan zahoti for "after having done X"), simultaneity (-ib turib in some contexts, or -ayotib for "while doing X"), causality (certain converbal forms can imply "since/because" when combined with negation or other particles), etc. Another common strategy for adverbial relations is the use of **participial or infinitival clauses combined with postpositions** that have adverbial meaning. For time relations, Uzbek often uses phrases like -gach or -ganidan keyin ("after doing X", literally "after the fact that X has done"), and -masdan oldin ("before doing X", literally "before not doing X", since the verb is negated to form a "before" converb). For example, kelmasdan oldin means "before coming" (lit. "without having come before") and kelgandan keyin means "after coming". Purpose clauses are frequently expressed with the infinitive (verbal noun) plus the postposition **uchun** ("for (the purpose of)") – e.g. non sotib **olish uchun** do'konga bordi ("He went to the store **to buy** bread", lit. "for buying bread he went to the store"). Causal clauses can be formed with the pattern -gani uchun ("because (someone) did X"; uchun here means "because" when paired with a verb in nominal form). For instance, Men kechikkanim **uchun** uzr so'radim ("I apologized **because** I was late"). Alternatively, Uzbek has a true subordinating conjunction **chunki** (from Persian chonki) meaning "because". One could say Men kech keldim, **chunki** avtobus kechikdi ("I arrived late **because** the bus was late"). **Chunki** is used typically at the beginning of the subordinate clause (it can also start the sentence: Chunki avtobus kechikdi, men kech keldim – "Because the bus was late, I arrived late."). For conditions, Uzbek heavily relies on the **conditional suffix** -sa (attached to the verb) to denote "if". Often the word **agar** ("if", from Persian agar) is used in tandem with -sa for an explicit if-clause: Agar u kelsa, men ketaman ("If he comes, I will leave"). In spoken Uzbek, -sa alone can sometimes carry the conditional meaning without **agar**. Concessive meaning ("although/even if") can be conveyed by phrases like -sa ham or garchi ... -sa (where **garchi** = "although" of Persian origin). For example, Garchi u charchagan **bo'lsa** ham, u ishlashda davom etdi. ("Even though he was tired, he kept working."). The construction -sa ... ham literally means "if X also…," which functions as "even if/although X." There is also **lekin** or **ammo** for "but, however," but these are coordinating conjunctions for contrast, not subordinate. **Qachonki** (literally "when + the Persian complementizer ki") is sometimes used in

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

literary Uzbek for temporal clauses meaning "when", but in everyday usage a temporal subordinate clause is more often expressed with participial forms like -ganda. For example: Men seni ko'rganimda, xursand bo'ldim ("I was happy when I saw you"), where ko'rganimda combines ko'rganim ("my having seen", i.e. "that I saw") with the locative -da to mean "at the time of my seeing (you)". This -ganimda construction corresponds to a finite "when" clause in French (quand je t'ai vu). Similarly, -gach can serve as "after (doing)": Uyga kelgach, u dam oldi ("After coming home, he rested"). Another notable converbal construction uses **-ib**, which, in combination with words like turib or bo'lib, can yield meanings such as "even though" or indicate an action done immediately before another. For instance, uydan chiqmasimizdan **turib** ketishibdi (literally "before we left the house, they had already gone") – here turib (literally "standing") after a negative converb means "before even X happened". This illustrates how Uzbek can stack converbs and postpositions to fine-tune temporal and other relations.

In summary, Uzbek adverbial subordination often relies on **suffixal morphology and auxiliary particles** rather than separate conjunction words. Key subordinators in Uzbek include **agar** (if), **chunki** (because), **garchi** (although), **qachonki** (when), as well as Uzbek-specific structures like the conditional -sa, purposive -ishga/-(i)sh uchun, and temporal -ganda, -gach, -guncha, etc. The rich use of non-finite forms (participles, converbs) means that subordinate clauses in Uzbek are frequently **non-finite** and embedded, whereas French subordinate clauses are typically **finite** and introduced by conjunctions. This fundamental difference means that an Uzbek subordinate clause often looks like a part of the main clause (e.g. a noun phrase or an adverbial phrase), whereas a French subordinate clause is a clearly separate clause introduced by a conjunction. Despite this difference, the **semantic range** of subordination (the kinds of ideas that can be expressed as time, cause, condition, etc.) is fully covered in both languages – it is the form that differs.

To illustrate the difference, consider a simple cause and effect sentence in both languages:

- French: *Il est fatigué **parce qu'*il a beaucoup travaillé. ("He is tired **because** he worked a lot.")
- Uzbek: U juda ko'p ishlagani **uchun** charchagan. (literally, "He having worked a lot **for/because** [that], is tired.").

In the Uzbek version, ishlagani uchun is a nominalized clause (ishlagani = "his having worked") followed by the postposition uchun ("for") to mean "because of his having worked a lot", without a finite verb in a separate clause. The French uses a finite clause with the conjunction parce que. Both convey the same causal relationship, but via different grammatical paths.

Comparative Analysis: Structural and Functional Differences

The contrasts between French and Uzbek in expressing subordination highlight interesting typological differences. In this section, we compare how each language handles specific subordinate relations and discuss the implications for syntax and translation. We also address how these differences reflect deeper grammaticalization processes in each language.

Finite vs. Non-finite Subordination: One of the clearest differences is that French typically uses **finite subordinate clauses** introduced by conjunctions or relative pronouns, whereas

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

Uzbek often uses **non-finite constructions** (participles, infinitives, converbs) without an explicit conjunction. This means that in French, both the main and subordinate clauses have fully conjugated verbs (potentially with different subjects, tense, mood, etc.), explicitly linked by a subordinating word. In Uzbek, the subordinate clause frequently appears as a verb form attached with suffixes, looking more like part of the main clause rather than an independent clause. Syntactically, French subordinate clauses are separate constituents, while Uzbek subordinate constructions may merge into the main clause's structure. For example, a French complement clause que S is a separate CP (complementizer phrase) in syntactic terms, whereas an Uzbek nominalized clause S-gan-i is essentially a noun phrase embedded in the main clause. This structural difference can affect word order: French subordinate clauses can follow or (less commonly) precede the main clause, but in Uzbek, since subordinate material often functions as a modifier or argument, it usually comes **before the main clause's verb** (as per the head-final structure) to maintain proper scope and dependency.

Conclusion

French and Uzbek provide a striking case study in typological contrast with respect to subordinate clauses and their expression. French relies on a **conjunction-based, analytic** strategy: it has a variety of subordinating conjunctions and relative pronouns that introduce fully inflected subordinate clauses. These clauses are integrated into sentence structure through fixed word order and often marked by special verb moods (indicative vs. subjunctive) that clarify the nature of the subordination. The French system has been shaped by centuries of grammaticalization, turning lexical phrases into functional linkers (as seen with parce que, afin que, bien que, etc.), and retains complexity in choice of conjunctions to convey subtle distinctions of meaning and register.

Uzbek, on the other hand, exemplifies a **morphology-heavy, agglutinative** approach to subordination: it typically does without a general complementizer "that", instead embedding subordinate propositions as nominalized or participial forms within the main clause. Coordination between clauses in Uzbek can sometimes blur with subordination due to the frequent use of converbs that string actions together. Yet, Uzbek is fully capable of expressing the same array of logical relations – time, cause, purpose, condition, concession – through its own means: suffixes like -sa for condition, particles like agar, chunki (borrowed but nativized), and constructions like -gani uchun for causation. The historical development of Uzbek subordinators involves both **the preservation of ancient Turkic non-finite clause structures** and **the adoption of Persian conjunctions**, reflecting Central Asia's contact-driven linguistic evolution.

Syntactically, French subordinate clauses are clearly delineated parts of a sentence, whereas Uzbek's often merge into the sentence as modifiers or noun-like entities. This results in **different surface structures** that require careful handling in translation and contrastive analysis. We have seen that to translate a subordinate clause from one language to the other often means **changing its form** (finite ↔ non-finite) while preserving its function. Despite these differences, neither language is "better" or "worse" at expressing complex ideas – they simply illustrate two different solutions that human languages have developed.

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

From a theoretical perspective, comparing French and Uzbek underscores the importance of not taking concepts like "subordinating conjunction" or "relative pronoun" as universal. Uzbek shows that subordination can be indicated without an invariant conjunction, using morphology and context. Meanwhile, French shows how a language can elaborate a rich set of linking words through grammaticalization to manage complex syntax. Any comprehensive linguistic theory or typology must account for both patterns. Indeed, the study of **converbial subordination** (common in Turkic, Mongolic, etc.) versus **conjunctional subordination** (common in Indo-European) has been a fruitful area for understanding the balance between syntax and morphology in language design.

In conclusion, the study of subordinate clauses in French and Uzbek reveals how deeply syntax is intertwined with morphology and historical development. French's subordinate clause system is the product of internal evolution and grammaticalization of Latin elements into new forms suited to the French sound system and syntax. Uzbek's system reflects a continuity of an older Turkic strategy of nominalization, supplemented by strategic borrowings for clarity and literary style. Both languages achieve the expressive goal of embedding one proposition inside another – a cornerstone of complex thought and communication – but they map this functionality to different grammatical devices. Understanding these types of subordination enriches our appreciation for linguistic diversity and provides valuable insights for translation, language learning, and linguistic theory.

References:

1. Haßler, G. (2008). Les conjonctions de causalité et leur grammaticalisation en français. **Linx**, 59, 95–114.
2. Gribanova, V. (2013). Copular clauses, clefts, and putative sluicing in Uzbek. **Language, 89**(4), 798–833.
3. Turkolog.ist (n.d.). "Factive" Subordination in Uzbek. Retrieved from Turkolog.ist/uzbek. (A pedagogical grammar note explaining how Uzbek expresses English "that"-clauses with nominalized verb forms and possessive suffixes, providing clear examples.)
4. Lawless, L. (2023). French Subordinating Conjunctions. In **Lawless French** (online grammar resource). (Lists common French subordinating conjunctions and their uses, highlighting types like time, cause, and condition conjunctions.)
5. TheLanguages.com (2025). Uzbek Conjunctions. (Overview of Uzbek coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, with examples of usage in sentences; useful for basic reference on agar, chunki, garchi, etc.)
6. WordReference Forums (2012). Discussion on "chunki" (Persian/Uzbek). (User greatbear notes that Uzbek chunki and Turkish çünkü are Persian loans meaning "because", illustrating cross-linguistic influence in subordinators.)
7. Lingolia French Grammar (2023). Complex Sentences: Subordinate, Relative, and Adverbial Clauses. (Provides definitions and examples of French subordinate clause types and how to recognize them, helpful for contrasting with Uzbek structures.)

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23
American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 06,2025
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

8. Universal Dependencies (2022). Uzbek Grammar Overview. (Notes the categories of Uzbek conjunctions and the use of suffixes in complex sentences; mentions that Uzbek subordinate clauses are often nominalized or marked by particles like agar, chunki.)

9. Nedjalkov, V. P., & Nedjalkov, I. V. (1987). On the typological characteristics of converbs. In **Symposium on Language Universals** (Tallinn). (While not specific to Uzbek and French, this work provides a typological backdrop for understanding Uzbek converbs in contrast to languages like French which lack them.)

10. Sodikova, F. M. (2005). Syntax of the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi. (In Uzbek, provides a comprehensive description of Uzbek sentence structure, including subordinate clauses formed by participles and verbal nouns. Useful for in-depth reference on native terminology and analysis of Uzbek subordination.)