GRAMMATICAL-SYNTACTIC AND TEXT-TYPOLOGICAL FEATURES OF CRAFT DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Abdisamatov Akhrorjon Jalolkhon ugli
Basic doctoral student (PhD candidate)
Kokand State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract. The paper examines the grammatical, syntactic and text-typological organisation of craft discourse in English and Uzbek. Drawing on functional grammar, cohesion theory, genre analysis and functional sentence perspective, it analyses imperative forms, simple and complex sentences, ellipsis, cause-and-effect relations, cohesive devices, theme–rheme structure and genre moves in instructions, master–apprentice dialogue and artisan–customer communication. The study shows that craft discourse is universal at the macro level, where text type and genre structure are isomorphic in both languages, but language-specific at the micro level, where the agglutinative nature of Uzbek and the analytic nature of English produce systematic allomorphic differences.

Keywords: *craft discourse, imperative mood, ellipsis, cohesion, theme–rheme structure, instructive text, genre moves, agglutinative language, analytic language, isomorphism, allomorphism.*

Crafts such as pottery, woodcarving, embroidery and metalwork have always been passed on through language: a master explains, instructs, corrects and praises, while an artisan describes and justifies the value of a product to a customer. If the lexicon of craft discourse forms its content core, grammar and syntax determine how this content is arranged, sequenced and directed at the addressee. English and Uzbek belong to typologically different language types – English is analytic, Uzbek is agglutinative – and therefore realise the same communicative tasks of craft discourse through different grammatical means. A systematic contrastive description of these means is relevant for contrastive grammar, translation and foreign language teaching.

The study draws on M.A.K. Halliday's functional grammar, according to which grammatical forms perform ideational, interpersonal and textual functions [4]; on Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory [5]; on R. de Beaugrande and W. Dressler's standards of textuality [2]; on E. Werlich's text typology [13]; on V.K. Bhatia's concept of genre moves [1]; and on J. Firbas's theory of functional sentence perspective [3]. In Uzbek linguistics, N.M. Mahmudov's work on semantic-syntactic asymmetry and the text-linguistic studies of A. Mamajonov and M. Hakimov provide the national

methodological basis [7; 8; 6]. The aim of the paper is to identify the isomorphic and allomorphic features of craft discourse at the grammatical, syntactic and text levels. Descriptive, contrastive, structural, distributional and contextual-pragmatic methods were used.

Grammatical features: the dominance of the verb

In craft discourse the verb is not merely a word denoting action; it is a tool for managing the work process. Imperative forms, present-tense forms and active voice prevail, reflecting the direct link between speech and practical activity. In the workshop a master uses short commands such as *ol* ("take"), *qo'y* ("put"), *tekshir* ("check") and *qarab tur* ("watch"). These forms organise the process quickly and also encode the leading role of the master and the subordinate position of the apprentice, which confirms the dominance of the interpersonal function in this discourse [4].

The two languages differ in how the imperative and social distance are encoded. In Uzbek the imperative is formed morphologically by attaching suffixes to the verb stem: *ol – olgin – oling*, where *-gin* and *-ing* mark the degree of familiarity or respect. In English the imperative coincides with the base form of the verb (*take*), and social distance is expressed not by a grammatical marker but by additional words (*please, would you mind*) or intonation. Similarly, a softened request is formed in Uzbek through the conditional suffix and a modal predicate (*Buni olsang bo'ladimi?*), whereas English uses a modal auxiliary (*Could you take this?*).

Syntactic features: simplicity, ellipsis and causality

Simple sentences prevail in craft discourse because communication often accompanies physical work and must be quick and precise. Complex sentences are less frequent but functionally important: they are used to explain causes, generalise experience and give advice, thus strengthening the didactic dimension of discourse. Word order reflects a basic typological contrast: Uzbek is an SOV language with the predicate at the end of the sentence (*Sen buni tekshir*), while English is an SVO language with the verb in the centre (*Check this*).

Ellipsis is a key manifestation of grammatical economy. As N.M. Mahmudov shows, the omission of sentence parts in Uzbek leads not to loss of meaning but to context-based semantic-syntactic economy [7]. In Uzbek instructions the predicate is often omitted in the second sentence: *Birinchi qatlamni yotqiz. Ikkinchisini – ustiga* ("Lay the first layer. The second – on top"). In English such ellipsis is less common and the clause is usually completed with a pro-verb: *Lay the first layer. Then do the same with the second.*

Cause-and-effect relations are also coded differently. In Uzbek they are expressed by suffixes and converbial forms (*-gani uchun, -sa, -gandan keyin*) within a complex sentence: *Loy quriganidan keyin sirlash kerak*. English uses separate conjunctions (*because, since, after*) and subordinate clauses: *You should glaze it after the clay has dried*. Moreover, English instructions often leave the causal link implicit, relying on sentence sequence alone: *The clay is too wet. Wait before shaping it.*

Syntax in craft discourse is predominantly dialogic, and sentence types themselves model social roles. Imperatives are characteristic of the master, whereas questions are characteristic of the apprentice, whose position is oriented towards learning: *Bu yerini qanday qilaman, usta? – How do I do this part?* Following A.A. Leontyev's view of speech as a form of social activity [10], the distribution of imperative and interrogative sentences can be regarded as a grammatical reflection of the social hierarchy of the workshop. In Uzbek the question is formed by the particle *-mi* or an interrogative pronoun with the verb remaining in final position, while English requires inversion with an auxiliary verb (*do*). Evaluative feedback is likewise built on a recurrent syntactic pattern of concession followed by advice: *Yomon emas, lekin bu joyini yana bir bor tekislash kerak – Not bad, but this section needs more smoothing.* The pattern is shared, yet necessity is expressed in Uzbek by the verbal noun with the modal predicate *kerak*, and in English by the semi-modal *need* followed by a nominal phrase. The functional distribution of the main grammatical and syntactic devices can be summarised as follows. The imperative mood manages the work process and reflects the master's leading role; present-tense forms describe the continuity of actions; simple sentences ensure rapid transfer of information in practical communication; ellipsis provides grammatical economy in context-dependent speech; questions serve to clarify knowledge and express the apprentice's position; and complex sentences generalise experience and explain causes. These devices are subordinated not to rigid norms but to functional needs, which is a defining property of discourse grammar.

Text type and cohesion

According to Werlich's typology, texts may be descriptive, narrative, expository, argumentative or instructive [13]. In craft discourse the instructive type is central in both languages, complemented by descriptive (product description) and argumentative (justifying value) types. Instructive texts follow a sequential structure: the initial material is introduced, actions are listed in order and the expected result is described. Here, too, the languages diverge. The Uzbek technical description *Loy avval suv bilan ishlov berish orqali yumshoq holatga keltiriladi. Keyinchalik ... ob'ekt qo'lda shakllanadi va qoliplanadi* links the stages through passive verb forms (*keltiriladi,*

shakllanadi, qoliplanadi) and the connector *keyinchalik*. Comparable English instructions present numbered steps introduced by imperatives and ordinal markers: *First, ensure that your elbows are stabilised…; Then….* Uzbek thus relies more on morphological means, English on lexical-discourse markers (*first, then, finally*).

Cohesive devices are distributed differently as well [5]. In referential cohesion English distinguishes *it, this, that* and personal pronouns, while Uzbek employs the general demonstratives *bu, u, shu*. In lexical cohesion Uzbek texts typically repeat the same term (*sir, qolip*), whereas English texts avoid repetition through synonymic variation (*glaze – coating – finish*).

Theme–rheme structure and genre moves

Information structure reveals another typological contrast. Owing to its relatively free word order, Uzbek shifts the focus by rearranging words: *Bu naqshni men solganman* (focus on *men*, "I") versus *Men bu naqshni solganman* (focus on the pattern). English, with its fixed SVO order, marks the rheme by intonation, stress or special constructions such as cleft sentences: *It was me who made this pattern* [3].

At the genre level, Bhatia's move analysis [1] reveals four typical moves in craft instructions: (1) introducing the material or tool; (2) describing preparation; (3) presenting the main process step by step; and (4) describing the final result. The number and order of moves are the same in both languages, but each move is filled with different means. For example, the preparation step is expressed in Uzbek by the conditional suffix *-sa* (*Agar loy quruq bo'lsa, suv qo'shiladi*) and in English by an *if*-clause and an imperative (*If the clay is dry, add water*).

Conclusion

The contrastive analysis shows that craft discourse in English and Uzbek has a two-level organisation. At the macro level – text type (predominantly instructive) and genre structure (four moves) – the two languages are isomorphic, since these features are determined by the communicative purpose of transferring knowledge and skills rather than by the language system. At the micro level – imperative and politeness marking, ellipsis, causal linking, reference, lexical cohesion and theme–rheme structure – systematic allomorphic differences arise from the agglutinative nature of Uzbek (suffixes, verb forms, free word order) and the analytic nature of English (auxiliary and modal verbs, conjunctions, discourse markers, fixed SVO order). These findings can be applied in contrastive grammar courses, in teaching English for specific purposes and in the translation of instructional and craft-related texts.

References

1. Bhatia V.K. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. – London: Longman, 1993.
2. De Beaugrande R., Dressler W.U. Introduction to Text Linguistics. – London; New York: Longman, 1981.
3. Firbas J. Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
4. Halliday M.A.K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. – London: Edward Arnold, 1985.
5. Halliday M.A.K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 375 p.
6. Hakimov M. O‘zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari. – Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2013.
7. Mahmudov N.M. O‘zbek tilidagi sodda gaplarda semantik-sintaktik asimmetriya. – Tashkent: O‘qituvchi, 1984. – 156 p.
8. Mamajonov A. Tekst lingvistikasi. – Tashkent, 1989.
9. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. – London: Longman, 1999.
10. Leontyev A.A. Yazyk, rech, rechevaya deyatelnost. – Moscow: Nauka, 1974.
11. Moskalskaya O.I. Grammatika teksta. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1981.
12. Schiffrin D. Discourse Markers. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 364 p.
13. Werlich E. A Text Grammar of English. – Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1976.