The Issue Of Pragmatic Adaptation In Translation From English To Uzbek

Sobirova Nodirabegim Murodjon qizi
Kokand university, teacher
nodirabegimsobirova600@gmail.com

Abstract: In the current era of globalization, the issue of interlinguistic relations and translation is of particular importance. Studying lexical coordination between English and Uzbek languages serves to master these two languages and improve intercultural communication. This article examines the similarities and differences of word substitutes in English and Uzbek, the problems that arise in the translation process, and their practical importance for language learners.

Key words: Globalization era, translation issue, lexical coordination, intercultural communication, alternative analogy.

Introduction. Lexical equivalence refers to the degree of semantic, morphological, and contextual correspondence between words in two different languages. This phenomenon can be classified into three primary categories: Complete equivalence: This occurs when a word's meaning, form, and usage in one language fully correspond to those in another. Partial equivalence: Words may share similar meanings but differ in certain nuances or contextual applications. Non-equivalence: A word in one language lacks a direct counterpart in another, necessitating paraphrasing or explanatory translation.

Certain English and Uzbek words exhibit full lexical equivalence, making their translation straightforward and unproblematic for language learners. For example:
- Sun → quyosh
- Star → yulduz
- Book → kitob

Words with complete equivalence can be translated directly without altering meaning or contextual usage. Partial equivalence is common between English and Uzbek due to differences in semantic categorization and grammatical structures. Some notable examples include:
- Brother in English encompasses both "aka" (older brother) and "uka" (younger brother) in Uzbek.
- Home can mean both "uy" (house) and "vatan" (homeland) depending on the context.
- Light can be translated as "yorug'lik" (illumination), "yengil" (lightweight), or "o't oldirmoq" (ignite) based on its usage.

Such cases necessitate careful contextual analysis to ensure precision in translation. Some English words have no direct equivalents in Uzbek, requiring elaboration or adaptation:
- Privacy – can be interpreted as "shaxsiy hayot", "maxfiylik", or "yolg'izlik huquqi" (right to solitude).
- "Cupcake" – though sometimes translated as "kekscha", it does not hold the same cultural significance in Uzbek culinary traditions.

Several issues arise in ensuring lexical equivalence during translation, including:
1. Polysemy and Ambiguity: Many English words possess multiple meanings, making translation context-dependent. For instance:
  - Run → "yugurmoq" (to run), "ishlamoq" (to function, as in software), "boshqarmoq" (to manage).
  - Charge → "to'lov" (fee), "hujum" (attack), "zaryadlash" (charging a device), "topshirmoq" (to assign a task).
2. Cultural differences: Culturally bound terms often require creative adaptation. For example, Thanksgiving has no direct Uzbek equivalent and must be described contextually.

English and Uzbek metaphors do not always align. For instance:
- Green in English can mean "yashil" (color), "tajribasiz" (inexperienced), or "ekologik" (environmentally friendly).
- Look, glance, gaze all translate as "qaramoq" in Uzbek, yet each carries a distinct nuance in English.

_____

Such variations highlight the importance of contrastive linguistic analysis to determine appropriate translation strategies.

A comparative analysis of lexical equivalence between English and Uzbek provides deeper insights into linguistic and cultural connections. This research has significant implications for translators and linguists, particularly in the fields of translation studies and contrastive linguistics.

A functional style represents a system of interrelated linguistic means serving a specific communicative purpose. It reflects the structured organization of language within different spheres of communication. Functional styles primarily manifest in literary language and are subject to historical evolution. Each functional style depends on the developmental stage of literary language and undergoes modifications over time. For example:
- The poetic (literary) style emerged as an independent category in the late 16th century.
- The journalistic style later branched off from general publicistic discourse.
- The oratory style has undergone significant transformation over time.

The development of each style correlates with changes in the linguistic norms of standard English and Uzbek, influenced by social conditions, scientific advancements, and cultural shifts. Traditional functional styles include:
1. Scientific (academic) style – used in scholarly research and academic discourse.
2. Official (bureaucratic) style – prevalent in legal, administrative, and diplomatic documents.
3. Journalistic (publicistic) style – found in newspapers, magazines, and media texts.
4. Conversational (colloquial) style – characteristic of everyday spoken language.
5. Literary (artistic) style – employed in fiction and poetry.

Each style exhibits distinctive phonetic, morphological, lexical, syntactic, and textual features. Scientific style and its subcategories:
- Technical-scientific style – used in research papers, dissertations, and monographs.
- Popular-scientific style – simplifies scientific knowledge for a broader audience.
- Educational-scientific style – found in textbooks and instructional materials.
- Publicistic-scientific style – combines scientific rigor with accessibility for the general public.
- Legal-scientific style – applied in patents and technical documentation.

Characteristics of scientific discourse. Scientific texts share common features, including:
- Precision and objectivity – ensuring clarity of information.
- Logical structure – presenting ideas systematically.
- Conciseness and coherence – minimizing ambiguity.
- Terminological consistency – maintaining accuracy in specialized vocabulary.

Unlike other styles, scientific discourse demands unambiguous expression of ideas through logically structured, contextually precise language.

The official (bureaucratic) style is employed in diplomatic correspondence, government documentation, legal texts, and business communication. It is characterized by:
- Strict adherence to literary norms and avoidance of dialectal or colloquial expressions.
- Formalized structures such as legal contracts, official reports, and legislative acts.
- Use of archaic and historical terms in legal documents, e.g., shahzoda (prince), shoh (king), hazrati oliylari (His Majesty).
- Fixed phraseology and formulaic expressions (e.g., "Sizga chuqur hurmat bilan" – "With deep respect").

Legal and bureaucratic documents prioritize clarity, precision, and brevity, minimizing rhetorical embellishments.

Lexicography, the science of dictionary compilation, plays a crucial role in linguistic analysis. It involves:
- Systematization of lexical data for comprehensive reference.
- Analysis of polysemy and semantic shifts over time.
- Documentation of neologisms and evolving meanings.

For instance, the English word "smog" was first recorded as a neologism in 1955 and retained its meaning in contemporary dictionaries as "polluted air that is a mixture of smoke and fog". Similarly, the acronym VIP was introduced in the mid-20th century and remains in active usage.

_____

_____

Lexicographic studies reveal that words undergo:

1. Stable semantic retention over extended periods.

2. Gradual shifts in meaning and stylistic connotations.

3. Eventual obsolescence or revitalization through metaphorical reinterpretation.

The study of lexical equivalence between English and Uzbek underscores the complex interplay of linguistic, cultural, and historical factors. By analyzing translation challenges, functional styles, and lexicographic trends, researchers can enhance cross-linguistic understanding and improve translation methodologies. This research is essential for the advancement of contrastive linguistics, translation studies, and language standardization efforts.

Literature review. V.G. Gak considers the sentence, in contrast to the word, to be a complete linguistic sign and emphasizes that the referent of a sentence ("высказывание", utterance) is the situation (ситуация) it describes. He states: "A sentence serves as the name of an integral situation, forming a distinct type of nomination that fundamentally differs from lexical nomination."

According to Gak, a sentence is directly connected to the "situation"—that is, to a concrete event or fact—which is why it qualifies as a complete linguistic sign. In contrast, a "word" can only be linked to a situation when it functions as part of this complete linguistic unit. Thus, a word represents an "individual linguistic sign", whereas a sentence, as a complete linguistic entity, encompasses a "denotative dimension".

O.I. Moskalskaya refers to this denotative aspect of the sentence as its "semantic core" (семантическое ядро). However, this semantic core does not fully encapsulate the meaning of the sentence but rather constitutes a particular aspect of its overall content. Nevertheless, this concept is crucial for understanding the disproportionate relationship between the formal and semantic structures of a sentence.

According to Sh. Bally, a given dictum can be expressed with various moduses. For example, the following sentences convey the same dictum but differ in their modus:

- Uzbek: Ahmad o'qiydi (Ahmad studies), *Ahmad o'qisa ed (If only Ahmad studied), Ahmad o'qimoqchi (Ahmad is going to study), *Ahmad, ehtimol, o'qiydi* (Perhaps Ahmad would study).

- English: Ahmad studies, If only Ahmad studied, Ahmad is going to study, Perhaps Ahmad would study.

In each of these sentences, the objective content (dictum) remains the same, but the speaker's attitude towards this content (modus) varies. This reflects the subjective perspective of the speaker in relation to the same objective semantic core of the proposition.

Semantic-syntactic mismatch in language

The emergence of semantic-syntactic incongruities in language is primarily due to the interplay of two opposing principles:

1. Redundancy Principle – Certain propositions, which could be expressed in a simple syntactic structure, are instead formulated as compound sentences. This results in syntactically complex but semantically simple constructions.

2. Economy of linguistic means – The tendency to minimize structural elements while maintaining meaning efficiency.

Such phenomena lead to semantic-syntactic mismatches, where the structure of a sentence does not fully align with its underlying semantic content.

As Sh. Bally notes, in some cases, modus and dictum can be separately and fully expressed (e.g., I think that this accused is not guilty or I think you are cheating). Such constructions are particularly prevalent in English, where certain types of complex sentences explicitly separate subjective and objective content:

- The main clause expresses subjective meaning (modus), while

- The subordinate clause conveys objective meaning (dictum or propositional content).

Thus, the distinction between modus and dictum plays a crucial role in understanding the semantic and syntactic structuring of complex sentences in English and other languages.

Methodology. This study employs a comprehensive methodological approach to conduct a comparative analysis of derivational processes in English and Uzbek phraseology. Special attention is given to morphological and syntactic modifications, including prefixation, suffixation, infixation, and other word-formation mechanisms. The dataset used for analysis provides a robust foundation for examining a broad spectrum of lexical elements, facilitating a nuanced comparison of derivational strategies in both languages.

_____

_____

The study of derivation in English has long been of interest to linguists, as the language possesses a rich system of affixation for word formation. English employs both prefixes and suffixes, which attach to the beginning and end of words, respectively. For instance, the word "employed" can be transformed into "unemployed" by adding the prefix "un-", while "happy" can be modified into "happiness" by appending the suffix "-ness", thereby creating a noun that denotes the state of being happy.

In contrast, Uzbek exhibits a more limited derivational affix system, yet it still shares fundamental word-formation principles with English. Like in English, Uzbek utilizes both prefixes and suffixes for derivation. For example, the prefix "be-" in "bevatan" (stateless) and the suffix "-chi" in "tilchi" (linguist) illustrate Uzbek derivational patterns. However, compared to English, the Uzbek language relies more heavily on suffixation than prefixation, reflecting its agglutinative nature.

In addition to affixation, English exhibits other productive derivational processes, including:

1. Conversion (Zero Derivation) – A process in which a word's form remains unchanged while its grammatical category shifts. For example, email (noun) can be used as a verb in "I will email you later."

2. Compounding – The creation of new words by combining two or more existing words, such as "blackboard" (black + board).

These processes are highly productive in English, whereas Uzbek derivation relies primarily on suffixation rather than conversion. Nevertheless, Uzbek does feature compounding, although its structures often differ from those in English.

Despite these differences, both languages exhibit similarities in derivational strategies, such as transposition and reduplication, which also contribute to word formation.

The comparative analysis highlights several similarities and differences in affixation systems across the two languages:

- Affixation as a universal strategy: Both English and Uzbek employ affixation extensively, but English has a larger inventory of prefixes and suffixes, whereas Uzbek derivation is predominantly suffix-based.

- Structural Differences: In English, affixes can alter a word's grammatical category (e.g., real → realize), whereas Uzbek derivation often preserves the word class, transforming a noun into another noun or a verb into another verb.

The formation of new words in both English and Uzbek is shaped by historical and cultural influences. English, with its long history of contact with Latin and French, exhibits a highly flexible derivational system that accommodates a vast number of affixes and compounding strategies. Conversely, Uzbek, influenced by Turkic and Persian linguistic traditions, showcases a more localized approach to word formation, with an emphasis on agglutination.

From a global perspective, English functions as a lingua franca, allowing it to integrate new derivational patterns from various linguistic backgrounds. In contrast, Uzbek, deeply rooted in Central Asian linguistic heritage, reflects a stronger emphasis on indigenous word-formation strategies.

This comparative analysis of English and Uzbek derivational processes offers valuable insights into the structural, semantic, and morphological mechanisms that shape word formation in different linguistic systems. Key takeaways include:

- The rich affixational system of English compared to the more suffix-oriented nature of Uzbek.

- The presence of conversion and compounding in English, which have no exact parallels in Uzbek.

- The historical and cultural factors that influence the evolution of derivational patterns in both languages.

Moreover, this study emphasizes the interconnection between language and culture, demonstrating that word formation is not solely a linguistic phenomenon but also a reflection of a society's history and communicative needs.

The study of derivational processes highlights the adaptive and evolving nature of languages. English, with its extensive affixation and flexible compounding strategies, demonstrates high morphological

_____

_____

productivity, while Uzbek, with its agglutinative structure, showcases a unique approach to word formation that aligns with Turkic linguistic traditions.

Ultimately, the comparison of derivational mechanisms in these two languages underscores the broader significance of comparative linguistics, shedding light on the intricate systems of word formation and their cultural underpinnings. Furthermore, this research serves as a reminder that languages are constantly evolving, adapting to the communicative demands of their speakers while preserving their historical and cultural identities.

Results. The presence of a secondary predicative participial phrase in a sentence adds complexity to its semantic structure, as it allows for the coexistence of two layers of meaning within a single syntactic unit. In such constructions, the primary predicate remains the central element of the sentence, while the participial phrase functions to logically emphasize, qualify, or describe the subject.

This phenomenon is illustrated in the following example:

- Fascinated by the beauty of nature, Kuldoshali looked down at his feet.

- Tabiat sehri elitg'an Quldoshali oyoq taglariga qaradi. (Y. Sulaymon)

Here, the participial phrase (Fascinated by the beauty of nature) serves as a secondary predication, providing additional information about the subject (Kuldoshali) while maintaining the structural integrity of a simple sentence.

A key observation in such constructions is that the logical emphasis can shift, leading to different syntactic realizations. If the focus were to shift from Kuldoshali to the phrase "the magic of nature," the sentence structure would undergo significant modification. This transformation would place "the magic of nature" in the subject position rather than the participial construction, resulting in a sentence such as:

- Fascinated by the magic of nature...

- Quldoshalini elitg'an tabiat sehri (The magic of nature that fascinated Kuldoshali).

For example:

- Nature embraced everyone...

- Quldoshalini elitg'an tabiat sehri hammmani o'z og'ushiga oldi. (The magic of nature that fascinated Kuldoshali embraced everyone.)

In such structures, the subject of the participial phrase often appears syntactically unexpressed, creating the illusion that it is absent. However, a closer analysis reveals that the subject of the main clause Nature fascinated Kuldoshali // Tabiat sehri oldi) and the subject of the secondary predication (Fascinated by the magic of nature // Tabiat sehri elitg'an) actually refer to the same entity.

Thus, the syntactic and referential alignment between the primary and secondary predications demonstrates the cohesion of meaning within the sentence, despite the apparent syntactic distinction. This interplay between implicit and explicit subjects highlights the intricacy of participial constructions, particularly in languages that allow for structural variation in predicate-subject relationships.

Discussion. In participial constructions where the subject is not explicitly expressed, the implicit subject—despite its lack of direct syntactic representation—remains semantically aligned with the subject, object, attribute, or other referential elements of the main predicate. In other words, the syntactically unexpressed subject of the secondary predication is still inherently present in the semantic structure of the main clause.

This referential correspondence between the elements of the primary and secondary predications enables the embedding of multiple propositions within a single simple sentence. Consequently, the complexity of the sentence's semantic structure increases, as multiple layers of meaning coexist within a single syntactic framework. This phenomenon highlights the essential role of referential identity in facilitating the integration of multiple predications within a single clause, thereby contributing to the structural and semantic expansion of the sentence.

_____

_____

Conclusion. Through a comprehensive comparative analysis of derivational processes in English and Uzbek phraseological systems, this study has uncovered the multifaceted nature of linguistic complexity, cultural influences, and word-formation mechanisms in both languages. The research began by examining English derivational processes, highlighting how the language's extensive lexicon has been shaped by historical borrowing and multiple layers of influence. As a global lingua franca, English integrates cultural and linguistic influences from diverse traditions, contributing to its lexical diversity and morphological flexibility.

Conversely, an analysis of Uzbek derivational processes, rooted in the linguistic and cultural history of Central Asia, revealed distinct patterns reflective of its historical trajectory. The widespread use of agglutination, where affixes are systematically appended to root words, underscores the precision and predictability inherent in Uzbek word formation. While compound words are less frequent in Uzbek than in English, they encapsulate the essence of the language's cultural distinctiveness, embedding subtle, locally contextualized concepts within their structure.

REFERENCES

1. Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language.
2. Norqulov, O. (2015). O'zbek tilining leksikologiyasi.
3. Baker, M. (2011). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation.
4. Rafiqov, A. (2004). Tarjima nazariyasi va amaliyoti.
5. Гальперин И. Р. Стилистика английского языка. М.: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», Изд.5, 2013. 336 с.
6. Тихонова Е. В. Медиатекст как инструмент вербальной диагностики конфессиональной напряженности // Мировое культурно-языковое и политическое пространство: инновации в коммуникации: сборник научных трудов. М.: ТрансАрт, 2014. С. 172–186.
7. Шомақсудов А. ва бошқалар, Ўзбек тили стилистикаси. –Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1983, 9- бб.
8. M.Xalilova: "O'zbek tili stilistikasi asoslari", "Farg'ona" nashriyoti, 2009. 6- бет
9. Abdulaziz.A, Sodiqov.N, Bashakov.N, Umumiy tilshunoslik T., 1979
10. Rahmatullayev.Sh . Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. 1978
11. Oxford dictionary of idioms Published in the United States by Oxford University Press New.
12. Raxmatullayev Sh. O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati. – T.: Qomuslar bosh tahririyati. 1982. 6. Smirnitskiy A.I. Ingliz tilining leksikologiyasi. - M., 1996 yil.
13. Vinogradov V.S. Tarjimashunoslikka kirish. - M., 2001 yil.
14. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка.–М. 1986.
15. Narimonova Z. Frazeologik iboralarning tarjimasi haqida.-T.:O'zMU to'plami. 2007.
16. Ashurov Sh. S. Ingliz va o`zbek tillarida kesim tipologiyasi. Nom. diss, Samarqand, 2017.
17. Buranov J. Ingliz va O`zbek tillari qiyosiy grammatikasi. Toshkent, 2013.
18. Bushuy T., Safarov Sh. Til qurilishi: tahlil metodlari va metodologiyasi. Toshkent, 2017.
19. Sobirova N. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida so'z muqobillarini leksik muvofiqlashtirish. //Komparativistika (Comparative Studies). — 2024. — Vol.2, № 1. — B. 110-129.
20. Karimova, O., & Sobirova, N. (2025). MUQIM FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLAR TARJIMASINING O 'ZIGA XOSLIKLARI. TAMADDUN NURI JURNALI, 1(64), 214-217.
21. Daniyeva M.J. Ingliz tilida otli so`z birikmalarining derivatsion-funksional va matn shakllantirish xususiyatlari. Nom.diss.avtoref., Samarqand,2012.
22. Komilova X. O`zbek tilidagi to`ldiruvchilar haqida. A.S.Pushkin nomidagi Til va adabiyot institute asarlari. 1-kitob. T., 2009, 148-bet.
23. Tojiyeva O.M. O`zbek tilida ot predikat gaplarning mazmuniy va sintaktik tuzilishi. Nom.diss.Toshkent,1995.
24. Собирова, Н. (2022). Principles of teaching english in non-linguistic higher education institutions on the basis of non-traditional methods. Общество и инновации, 3(4/S), 73-77