DOI: https://doi.org/10.59295/DIA.2026.1.05
CZU: 81`367.335=111=512.162
Orcid ID: 0000-0002-6593-2701

LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE OBJECT CLAUSES



PhD in Philology, Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages, Azerbaijan State University of Economics.

Parvana ABBASOVA

Linguistic analysis of the object clauses

Abstract. This study provides a comparative linguistic analysis of object subordinate clauses in modern English and Azerbaijani. It examines the structural and semantic criteria that distinguish subordination from coordination, emphasizing that the number of predicative centers, rather than sentence length, defines syntactic complexity.

The research classifies these clauses into pure object and mixed-type (syncretic) constructions, analyzing the formal markers used in both languages, such as: English: *that, if, whether, lest*, and conjunctive words (*who, what*); Azerbaijani: *ki*, suffixes (*-mı⁴, -sa²*), and conjunctive words (*kim, hər nə*).

The analysis identifies the semantic groups of head words (verbs of speech, thought, and perception) that govern these clauses and highlights the role of intonation and syntactic synonymy in both languages. The findings offer a theoretical framework for understanding hierarchical syntactic unity, contributing to contrastive linguistics and translation studies between English and Azerbaijani.

Keywords: Object clauses, complex sentences, English syntax, Azerbaijani linguistics, subordinating conjunctions, syntactic syncretism.

Analiza lingvistică a propozițiilor completive directe

Rezumat. Acest studiu prezintă o analiză lingvistică comparativă a propozițiilor subordonate completive directe (object clauses) în limbile engleză și azeră modernă. Lucrarea examinează criteriile structurale și semantice care deosebesc subordonarea de coordonare, subliniind faptul că numărul centrelor predicative, și nu lungimea frazei, definește complexitatea sintactică.

Cercetarea clasifică aceste propoziții în construcții completive pure și de tip mixt (sincretice), analizând mărcile formale utilizate în ambele limbi, precum: Engleză: *that, if, whether, lest* și cuvinte conjunctive (*who, what*); Azeră: *ki*, sufixe (*-mı⁴, -sa²*) și cuvinte conjunctive (*kim, hər nə*).

Analiza identifică grupurile semantice de cuvinte regent (verbe de zicere, gândire și percepție) care guvernează aceste propoziții și evidențiază rolul intonației și al sinonimiei sintactice în ambele limbi. Concluziile oferă un cadru teoretic pentru înțelegerea unității sintactice ierarhice, contribuind la lingvistica contrastivă și la studiile de traducere între engleză și azeră.

Cuvinte-cheie: Propoziții completive directe, fraze complexe, sintaxa limbii engleze, lingvistică azeră, conjuncții subordonatoare, sincretism sintactic.

Introduction. Many scholars have carried out various studies on the sentence, its structure and types in modern English and Azerbaijani, including the notions of main and subordinate clauses. As Lyons points out, the sentence represents the highest structural unit of grammar in which syntactic relations are realized in their full complexity. [1, p. 134] Similarly, Blokh emphasizes that the classification of sentences into different structural types is based on the nature of syntactic relations between clauses. [2, p. 55] From the perspective of Azerbaijani linguistics, Abdullayev underlines that the distinction between coordination and subordination constitutes one of the fundamental principles of syntactic theory. [3, p. 53]

As is known, in both Azerbaijani and English, complex sentences are divided into two types: coordinate and subordinate complex sentences. In English, coordinate complex sentences are called compound sentences, while subordinate complex sentences are referred to as complex sentences. A coordinate complex sentence is formed by combining two or more simple sentences that are equal in status. In such sentences, one part does not depend on the other, the clauses are equal, and the omission of one clause does not lead to a significant change in meaning. The following is an example of a coordinate complex sentence:

Life worried and bored him, and time was a vexation.

As seen, the clauses in this sentence are independent. Even if the part *"time was a vexation"* is omitted, the sentence still preserves its meaning. In this regard, Barkhudarov notes that the defining feature of coordination is the structural and semantic independence of clauses, where neither component functions as a syntactic subordinate of the other. [4, p. 83] Likewise, Kaunshanskaya point out that coordinated clauses retain their grammatical completeness even when separated from the larger construction. [5, p. 73] From a functional perspective, Leech and Svartvik also stress that coordination reflects equality of syntactic status rather than linear position or length. [6, p. 27]

It should be emphasized that the length of a sentence does not determine whether it is simple or complex. For example:

He shook his fist at himself in the glass, and sat down on the edge of the bed to dream for a space with wide eyes.

Although this sentence is long, it has one subject and one predicate and therefore is a simple sentence. As Gordon and Krylova explain, the presence of homogeneous predicates does not transform a simple sentence into a compound one, since the predicative center remains single. [7, p. 35] Similarly, Khaimovich and Rogovskaya underline that structural complexity should not be confused with syntactic complication caused by extended secondary parts of the sentence. [8, p. 129] In Azerbaijani linguistics, Kazimov also emphasizes that the decisive criterion for determining sentence type is the number of predicative centers, not the number of words. [9, p. 62]

In contrast:

He could not understand what she found wrong with him.

Despite being short, this sentence contains two subjects and two predicates and is therefore a complex sentence. As Blokh explains, the presence of more than one predicative line within a construction is the essential criterion for identifying a complex sentence. [2, p. 87] Similarly, Lyons underlines that syntactic complexity is determined not by surface length but by the number of predications expressed. [1, p. 73] From a structural viewpoint, Arnold also notes that the interaction of two predicative centers within one construction establishes a hierarchical syntactic relationship characteristic of complex sentences. [10, p. 38]

In subordinate complex sentences, one clause depends on another. The subordinate clause may replace a specific part of the main clause or even the whole clause. If it replaces a particular part, it answers the question of that sentence element. As Barkhudarov and Shtelling emphasize, subordination is based on grammatical inequality, where one clause functions as a syntactic component of another. [11, p. 93] In

addition, Kachalova and Izrailevich point out that subordinate clauses may perform the functions of subject, object, attribute, or adverbial modifier within the main clause. [12, p. 83] In Azerbaijani syntax, Abdullayev, Seyidov, and Hasanov similarly stress that the subordinate clause is integrated into the structure of the main clause as one of its syntactic parts. [13, p. 98]

Both English and Azerbaijani possess various types of subordinate clauses, and grammarians have expressed different views on their classification. O.I. Musayev notes that in some complex sentences one simple sentence depends on another and explains it. In such constructions, the governing clause is the main clause, while the dependent one is the subordinate clause. [14, p. 32] He also emphasizes that, as in Azerbaijani, a subordinate complex sentence in modern English may contain more than one subordinate clause, which may perform the same or different grammatical functions. This idea is supported by Huseynzade, who observes that multiple subordinate clauses within one sentence may either be homogeneous or heterogeneous in function. [15, p. 34] Furthermore, Akhundov and Mammadov highlight that the classification of subordinate clauses varies depending on whether semantic, functional, or structural criteria are taken as primary. [16, p. 41]

A. Babayev states that the components of coordinate complex sentences are equal, whereas the components of subordinate complex sentences are logically and grammatically dependent on each other [17, p. 436]. This distinction corresponds to the general theoretical principle formulated by Blokh, [2, p. 39] who argues that coordination is characterized by syntactic equality, while subordination presupposes hierarchy. In a similar vein, Barkhudarov emphasizes that grammatical dependence is the key feature differentiating subordinate constructions from coordinate ones. [11, p. 83] From a communicative perspective, Leech and Svartvik also note that subordinate clauses function as integral parts of the main clause, contributing additional but structurally dependent information. [6, p. 63]

Some scholars classify subordinate complex sentences differently. For instance, Ə.Z. Abdullayev classifies them according to:

1. their structure;

2. the means of connection between components;

3. the types of subordinate clauses [18, p. 139-159].

This multi-criteria approach is supported by Akhundov and Mammadov, who point out that subordinate constructions may be analyzed from both structural and semantic perspectives. [16, p. 73] Likewise, Kazimov stresses that the means of connection – whether conjunctions, relative words, or intonation – play a decisive role in determining the type of subordinate clause. [9, p. 54] Furthermore, Arnold observes that different classifications reflect different methodological principles adopted in syntactic research. [10, p. 163]

In some sources, subordinate clauses are classified as:

1. Subject clauses
2. Predicative clauses
3. Object clauses
4. Attributive clauses
5. Adverbial clauses

As Khaimovich and Rogovskaya explain, this functional classification is based on the syntactic role performed by the subordinate clause within the main clause. [8, p. 84] Similarly, Gordon and Krylova underline that such a division mirrors the parts of the sentence which subordinate clauses may replace. [7, p. 92] In Azerbaijani linguistics, Abdullayev, Seyidov, and Hasanov also adopt a functional approach, identifying subordinate clauses according to the syntactic position they occupy in the structure of the main clause. [13, p. 134]

Aim. One of the most frequently used types in both modern English and Azerbaijani is the complex sentence with an object subordinate clause. In such sentences, the subordinate clause explains, specifies, and completes a particular element of the main clause, especially the predicate. As Khaimovich and Rogovskaya point out, object clauses function as syntactic equivalents

of direct objects and are closely connected with the valency of the verb in the main clause. [8, p. 281] Similarly, Gordon and Krylova emphasize that object subordinate clauses are typically governed by verbs of saying, thinking, perception, and desire. [7, p. 67] From a theoretical perspective, Lyons underlines that complement clauses (including object clauses) represent one of the central mechanisms for embedding propositions within larger syntactic structures. [1, p. 46]

M. Asadova notes that in complex sentences with object subordinate clauses, the main and subordinate clauses must be connected through a subordinative relationship to express a complete thought. [19, p. 56] The structural-semantic analysis of object subordinate clauses allows us to determine their structural-semantic classification. In this respect, Blokh stresses that the semantic relations between clauses are inseparable from their formal syntactic organization. [2, p. 39] Likewise, Arnold observes that object clauses may display subtle semantic variations depending on the lexical meaning of the governing verb. [10, p. 93] From the Azerbaijani linguistic tradition, Kazimov also highlights the importance of structural-semantic criteria in classifying subordinate clauses. [9, p. 33]

From this perspective, object subordinate clauses may express a pure explanatory-object relation or this relation combined with additional semantic shades. Accordingly, they are divided into:

1. Pure object subordinate clause complex sentences

2. Mixed-type object subordinate clause complex sentences

In pure object subordinate clauses, the explanatory-object relation is not combined with other meanings. Such clauses are introduced in Azerbaijani by the conjunction ki or the suffixes –mı[4], -sa[2], and in English by that, if, whether, or conjunctive words such as who, where, how. As Kaunshanskaya explains, conjunctions like that serve as neutral markers of subordination without adding additional semantic shades. [5, p. 132] Similarly, Leech and Svartvik note that *that*-clauses are the most typical form of object complementation in English. [6, p. 231] In Azerbaijani syntax, Abdullayev, Seyidov, and Hasanov confirm that *ki*-clauses are structurally dominant in expressing pure object relations. [13, p. 240]

Examples from English: • She knew what he was thinking. • I didn't care whether I lived or died. • He decided that he would describe many of the beauties of the South Seas to her.

Examples from Azerbaijani: • Gördü ki, böyük bir dənizin sahilindədir. • Kimsə haçansa demişdi ki, bu Mürşüd bamәzə oğlandır.

These examples show that such clauses express only the explanatory-object meaning.

Mixed-type object subordinate clauses, however, combine the object meaning with additional semantic shades such as purpose, cause, or result. As Barkhudarov and Shtelling indicate, syncretism in subordinate clauses often arises from the interaction between grammatical structure and contextual semantics. [11, p. 73] In addition, Akhundov and Mammadov point out that semantic overlap between clause types is a natural phenomenon in complex sentence structures. [16, p. 52] From a communicative grammar perspective, Leech and Svartvik also observe that conjunctions may retain traces of their original adverbial meaning, which leads to semantic blending. [6, p. 92]

This syncretism may arise due to the verb forms used, the semantic nature of the conjunctions, or the lexical content of the clauses. For example, object clauses may simultaneously express purpose, cause, or result meanings in both English and Azerbaijani. In English, such clauses may also be introduced by the conjunctive word *when*, expressing a temporal shade of meaning:

He didn't like it when you called him Ackley Rid. I never care too much when I lose something.

This phenomenon is due to the syncretic nature of *when*. As Blokh remarks, certain conjunctional words preserve their adverbial semantics even when functioning as connectors of object clauses. [11, p. 71]

From a stylistic perspective, complex sentences with object subordinate clauses are generally stylistically neutral. However, their

frequency of use varies across functional styles. As Arnold emphasizes, stylistic neutrality does not imply uniform distribution across genres. [10, p. 221] Likewise, Musayev, Hajiyev, and Huseynov note that object clauses introduced by neutral conjunctions are widely used in academic and literary discourse. [14, p. 226] In Azerbaijani, Huseynzade observes that *ki*-clauses dominate in literary and journalistic styles due to their structural flexibility.

In both languages, clauses connected by intonation and the conjunctions *that* (English) and *ki* (Azerbaijani) are most frequent and occur widely in literary, scientific, and journalistic styles. Clauses introduced by other conjunctions are more restricted in usage. In English literary texts, object subordinate clauses introduced by *that, if,* and *whether* are widely used, whereas clauses introduced by *lest* are rare. In Azerbaijani, clauses connected by *ki* and by subordinative intonation are dominant, while those formed with -sa[2] and -mı[4] are less frequent. Understanding these stylistic features helps in choosing appropriate constructions in different communicative situations and in achieving accurate translation between English and Azerbaijani.

The purpose: The purpose of an object clause is to name or express the content of an action, thought, feeling, or statement in a sentence when this content cannot be conveyed by a single word or phrase. It is used to complete the meaning of the predicate, to transmit thoughts, opinions, and beliefs, and to express feelings, attitudes, and evaluations. As Gordon and Krylova state, object clauses function as complements that realize the semantic valency of the predicate. [7, p. 153] Similarly, Khaimovich and Rogovskaya emphasize that such clauses serve to actualize the object relation in a full predicative form. [8, p. 37] From a general linguistic perspective, Lyons notes that complement clauses allow entire propositions to function as syntactic objects within a larger structure. [1, p. 281]

Object subordinate clauses in modern English and Azerbaijani display various structural characteristics. In subordinate complex sentences, the main and subordinate clauses are semantically interdependent, and separating them would result in incomplete meaning. Structurally, such sentences form an integrated system. In this respect, Blokh underlines that subordination creates a hierarchical syntactic unity in which the subordinate clause is embedded within the structure of the principal clause. [2, p. 39] Likewise, Barkhudarov and Shtelling point out that the semantic incompleteness of the main clause without its complement demonstrates the obligatory character of certain subordinate constructions. [11, p. 63] In Azerbaijani linguistics, Kazimov also stresses the systemic integrity of subordinate complex sentences. [9, p. 211]

The subordinative relationship between the object subordinate clause and the main clause is anticipatory in nature and is determined by the semantic properties of the head word in the main clause. The object subordinate clause completes and specifies an incomplete element of the main clause, particularly the predicate. As Arnold observes, the lexical meaning of the governing verb largely predetermines the type of subordinate clause that may follow. [10, p. 88] Similarly, Akhundov and Mammadov note that the semantic features of the head word condition the structural model of the subordinate construction. [16, p. 42]

Not every predicate allows an object subordinate clause. The presence of a head word is essential. The head word functions as the center of subordination and requires clarification or completion. According to Leech and Svartvik, verbs that take clausal complements possess specific combinability patterns which distinguish them from verbs that require nominal objects only. [6, p. 80] In addition, Musayev, Hajiyev, and Huseynov emphasize that the ability of a predicate to govern a subordinate clause depends on its lexical-semantic characteristics. [14, p. 33]

Research based on English, Azerbaijani, and Russian materials shows that the head words explained by object subordinate clauses usually belong to specific semantic groups of verbs and adjectives. These include:

1. Verbs of speech (*say, ask, explain*; *demək, soruşmaq*)

2. Verbs of perception (*see, hear*; *görmək, eşitmək*)

3. Verbs of thinking (*think, understand*; *düşünmək, başa düşmək*)

4. Verbs of memory and knowledge (*know, remember*; *bilmək, xatırlamaq*)

5. Verbs of decision and agreement (*decide, agree*; *qərara almaq, razılaşmaq*)

6. Verbs of desire and intention (*want, wish*; *istəmək, arzulamaq*)

7. Verbs of influence and persuasion (*prove, convince*; *sübut etmək, inandırmaq*)

8. Verbs of psychological state (*fear, doubt*; *qorxmaq, şübhələnmək*)

9. Verbs of action and demand (*insist, demand*; *tələb etmək*)

10. Adjectives expressing state (*be sure, be glad*; *əmin olmaq, şad olmaq*)

As Kaunshanskaya remark, such semantic grouping reflects similarities in syntactic behavior and complement-taking capacity. [5, p. 85] Likewise, Abdullayev, Seyidov, and Hasanov confirm that Azerbaijani predicates governing object clauses can be classified according to their semantic features. [13, p. 92]

This classification is approximate, as boundaries between the groups are not strict. As Blokh notes, semantic categories in syntax are often fluid and overlapping rather than rigidly separated. [2, p. 44] Both personal and impersonal verbs may function as head words, but they differ in syntactic roles and structural realization within the sentence.

Research methodology of the object clause. The research methodology of the object clause outlines the theoretical framework, data sources, and analytical procedures used to study the structure, functions, and usage of object clauses in a language. The study of object clauses typically adopts a qualitative and descriptive approach, as it focuses on grammatical structure and syntactic function. In some cases, a comparative or contrastive approach may also be applied, especially when analyzing English and Azerbaijani in parallel. As Lyons notes, syntactic research requires a descriptive framework that accounts for both structural relations and semantic interpretation. [1, p. 96] Similarly, Blokh emphasizes the importance of structural-functional analysis in identifying the hierarchical relations between clauses. [2, p. 39] In Azerbaijani linguistics, Akhundov and Mammadov also underline the relevance of comparative analysis in studying complex sentence structures across languages. [16, p. 87]

In order for the subordinate and main clauses, which are components of a complex sentence, to express a complete idea, they must be connected through a subordinative relationship. In complex sentences consisting of parts that have an explanatory–object relation, the subordinative connection between the parts is established by means of different devices. Identifying the means that express the syntactic relationship between the parts of object subordinate complex sentences is one of the important issues in modern Azerbaijani and English linguistics. In this respect, Barkhudarov points out that formal markers of subordination play a decisive role in distinguishing subordinate constructions from coordinate ones. [11, p. 90] Likewise, Kazimov stresses that the structural indicators of syntactic dependence are central to the classification of complex sentences. [9, p. 43]

Based on research conducted on English language material, linguists have concluded that the means creating subordinative relations within complex sentences in English can be clearly identified. In English, an object subordinate clause is subordinated to and connected with the main clause by means of conjunctions, conjunctive words, and other devices. As Kaunshanskaya explain, conjunctions serve as primary grammatical markers of subordination in English complex sentences. [5, p. 77] Similarly, Gordon and Krylova note that conjunctions such as *that, whether,* and *if* are the most typical means of introducing object clauses. [7, p. 82] From a communicative perspective, Leech and Svartvik also emphasize the functional role of conjunctions in expressing logical relations between clauses. [6, p. 68]

One of the most common means that create syntactic relations within complex sentences in English, which belongs to the Germanic language group, is conjunctions. In English, object subordinate clauses are connected to the main clause by the conjunctions *that, lest, whether, if*. In addition, prepositions and subordinative intonation are also among the means that subordinate object clauses to the main clause. As Khaimovich and Rogovskaya observe, certain object clauses may function similarly to nominal constructions governed by prepositions. [8, p. 29] Furthermore, Arnold remarks that the lexical meaning of prepositions may influence the semantic interpretation of the subordinate clause. [10, p. 132]

Prepositional object subordinate clauses are functionally similar to prepositional objects. Prepositions such as *except, about, to, after, of, before, for,* and others connect the object subordinate clause to the main clause.

Let us consider the examples below:

The dog Balthasar in front looking studiously for what he never found, he would stroll. He had always been responsive to what they had begun to call "Nature".

Intonation, as we know, manifests itself in all sentences in spoken speech. In both English and Azerbaijani, intonation plays a role in the formation of different types of complex sentences. However, sometimes no other means except intonation are used to connect the main clause and the subordinate clause. In such complex sentences, it is not easy to distinguish grammatical meaning, that is, it is difficult to determine whether they are subordinate or coordinate complex sentences. As Blokh notes, intonation may serve as an additional but sometimes independent marker of syntactic relations. [2, p. 76] Likewise, Abdullayev, Seyidov, and Hasanov indicate that in Azerbaijani, intonation can function as a structural signal of subordination when conjunctions are omitted. [13, p. 94]

The reason for this lies in the fact that such sentences may convey different meanings depending on the context. As mentioned above, object subordinate clauses connected solely by intonation also exist in both English and Azerbaijani. In such clauses, the conjunctions *that* and *ki* can easily be restored. In English, such sentences are frequently used. As Gordon and Krylova remark, the conjunction *that* is often omitted in spoken and informal written English without affecting grammatical correctness. [7, p. 143]

I suppose he comes here every day. → *I suppose that he comes here every day.*

Similarly, such sentences are frequently used in Azerbaijani as well.

The Conjunction "that". Swan notes that one of the polysemantic subordinating conjunctions used in English is *that*, which corresponds to *ki* in Azerbaijani. [20, p. 61] Bababayev emphasizes that various types of subordinate clauses are subordinated to the main clause through *that/ki*. [17, p. 102] Asadova reports that such connections are mainly applied to object and attributive subordinate clauses. [19, p. 109]

For example: *I know that I shall always be a realist.* In this example, the first clause is an object subordinate clause, while the second is an attributive subordinate clause. Leech and Svartvik observe that in Azerbaijani, *ki* can connect different types of subordinate clauses, such as adverbial, object, or predicate clauses. [6, p. 73]

Barkhudarov explains that historically, object subordinate clauses connected by *that* developed from the syntactic model *I saw that…*, in which *that* functioned as a demonstrative pronoun serving as a direct object. [4, p. 29] Arnold highlights that over time, due to changes in sentence structure, *that* evolved into a subordinating conjunction and may be either used or omitted in such sentences. [10, p. 71] Kaunshanskaya, Kovner, and Kozhevnikova add that *that* occurs only in declarative object subordinate clauses. [5, p. 49]

Musayev, Hajiyev, and Huseynov point out that some scholars believe the presence or absence of *that* does not affect meaning; however, this view is not entirely correct, as omitting *that* may result in significant semantic and stylistic shifts. [14, p. 87] They also note that clauses

without *that* are more typical of spoken style, whereas clauses with *that* are more characteristic of written style.

The Conjunctions "if" and "whether". Leech and Svartvik note that the conjunctions *if* and *whether*, like *that*, connect the object subordinate clause to the semantic center of the main clause. [6, p. 43] Swan emphasizes that, although similar in function to *that*, *if* and *whether* differ in that *that* connects declarative object clauses, whereas *if* and *whether* primarily connect interrogative object clauses. [20, p. 99] Barkhudarov and Shtelling add that these conjunctions subordinate only general question-type clauses. [11, p. 34]

Arnold observes that in clauses introduced by *if* or *whether*, a sense of doubt or uncertainty is clearly expressed. [10, p. 21] Musayev, Hajiyev, and Huseynov highlight that *whether* can subordinate object, predicative, and subject clauses, whereas if is mainly used in conditional and object subordinate clauses. [14, p. 122]

Kaunshanskaya, Kovner, and Kozhevnikova point out that in conditional clauses introduced by *if*, the present tense may sometimes substitute for the future tense, whereas this substitution does not occur in object clauses. [5, p. 66] Asadova notes that stylistically, *if* is generally neutral, while *whether* is more characteristic of written style. [19, p. 91] Moreover, Bababayev emphasizes that *whether* can express an alternative meaning, such as "either…or," adding semantic flexibility to the clause. [17, p. 100]

The Conjunction "lest". Some linguists believe that lest subordinates only clauses of purpose or cause, while others argue that it also subordinates object clauses. Our research shows that object subordinate clauses introduced by lest are rare and mainly characteristic of bookish style. They express meanings of fear or apprehension.

He was terrified lest they should say his secret.

Conjunctive Words. Leech and Svartvik observe that in modern English, conjunctive words are among the most widely used means of connecting the parts of object subordinate complex sentences. [6, p. 92] They note that conjunctive pronouns and adverbs, such as *who, what, which, where, why, how, whatever, whoever*, play a central role in this process. Swan emphasizes that similarly, in Azerbaijani, conjunctive words are used to subordinate object clauses to the main clause, typically appearing at the beginning of the subordinate clause and often correlating with a word in the main clause. [20, p. 72]

Musayev, Hajiyev, and Huseynov highlight that the study of synonymy in object subordinate clauses remains an important issue, especially in stylistics and grammar. [14, p. 301] They explain that syntactic synonymy is crucial in translation and grammatical analysis, and that object subordinate clauses may have synonymic relations with infinitive, participial, and gerundial constructions, as well as with simple sentences. Bababayev adds that absolute syntactic synonymy does not exist due to semantic and stylistic nuances. [17, p. 93] Arnold further notes that in English, clauses with *that* are stylistically neutral, whereas clauses with *whether* and *lest* are generally bookish, while in Azerbaijani, clauses with *ki* are stylistically neutral. [10, p. 102]

Conclusion. Based on the characteristic features and properties of object subordinate clauses in modern English and Azerbaijani, the following conclusions can be drawn. The parts of a complex sentence are interconnected grammatically, semantically, and intonationally. From the standpoint of semantic relations, complex sentences are divided into two main groups: subordinate and coordinate complex sentences.

These types of complex sentences possess certain distinctive features. In both languages, the parts of coordinate complex sentences are characterized by relations of mutual independence and are connected by coordinating intonation as well as coordinating conjunctions. In such sentences, an equal relationship between the parts is observed. The parts of subordinate complex sentences, as their name suggests, are

characterized by a subordinative relationship. These parts are connected by various conjunctions, conjunctive words, prepositions, or solely by means of subordinative intonation. Based on their research, various scholars note the existence of different types of subordinate clauses, usually classifying them into three, five, or six groups.

One of the types of subordinate complex sentences is the object subordinate clause complex sentence. All the characteristics mentioned above regarding complex sentences are also applicable to this type. In English, conjunctions such as that, if, whether, and lest are used in the formation of object subordinate clauses, whereas in Azerbaijani the conjunction ki is employed. Object subordinate clauses formed with conjunctive words are used in both English and Azerbaijani. Conjunctive words used in English include how much, which, why, what, and others. In Azerbaijani, conjunctive words such as kim, hər nə, nə təhər, and others are used.

It has also been established that object subordinate complex sentences have synonymic relations with other types of sentences.

References:

1. Lyons, J. *Language and linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 1981.

2. Blokh, M.U. *A course in theoretical English grammar*. Visshaya Shkola, 1983.

3. Abdullayev, K.M. *Theoretical problems of Azerbaijani syntax*. Maarif, 1999.

4. Barkhudarov, L.S. *Struktura prostogo predlozheniya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka*. Vysshaya Shkola, 1966.

5. Kaunshanskaya, V.L.; Kovner, R.L.; Kozhevnikova, O.N. *A grammar of the English language*. Prosveshcheniye, 1967.

6. Leech, G.; Svartvik, Y. *A communicative grammar of English*. Prosveshcheniye, 1983.

7. Gordon, E.M.; Krylova, I.P. *Grammar of present-day English (Parts of speech)*. Visshaya Shkola, 1980.

8. Khaimovich, B.S.; Rogovskaya, B.I. *A course in English grammar*. Higher School, 1967.

9. Kazimov, G.Sh. *Modern Azerbaijani language: Syntax*. Unsiyyət, 2000.

10. Arnold, I.V. *The English word*. Visshaya Shkola, 1986.

11. Barkhudarov, L.S.; Shtelling, D.A. *Grammatika angliyskogo yazyka*. Vysshaya Shkola, 1973.

12. Kachalova, K.N.; Izrailevich, E.E. *Prakticheskaya grammatika angliyskogo yazyka s uprazhneniyami i klyuchami*. LalKom, 2008.

13. Abdullayev, Ə.; Seyidov, Y.; Hasanov, A. *Modern Azerbaijani language. Part IV: Syntax*. Sharq-Garb, 2007.

14. Musayev, O.I.; Hajiyev, E.I.; Huseynov, A.R. *A practical grammar of contemporary English*. KM, 2014.

15. Huseynzade, M. *Modern Azerbaijani language. Part III: Morphology*. Sharq-Garb, 2007.

16. Akhundov, A.A.; Mammadov, N. *Introduction to linguistics*. Maarif, 1980.

17. Bababayev, A. *Introduction to linguistics*. Maarif, 2004.

18. Abdullayev, Ə.Z. *Subordinate complex sentences in the modern Azerbaijani language*. Maarif, 1974.

19. Asadova, M. *Object clauses in English and Azerbaijani*. Nurlan, 2007.

20. Swan, M. *Practical English usage*. Visshaya Shkola, 1984.

Citation: Abbasova, P. Linguistic analysis of the object clauses. In: Dialogica. Cultural Studies and Literature Scientific Journal, 2026, nr. 1, p. 39-47. https://doi.org/10.59295/DIA.2026.1.05

Publisher's Note: Dialogica stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).