

## THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATIVE PURPOSE AND SITUATIONAL CONTEXT IN TRANSLATING CONDITIONAL MOOD UNITS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17988872>

**Shukurova Madina Askarovna**

*Associate Professor of English Linguistics Department, PhD  
Bukhara State University*

**Samandarov Islom Ilromovich**

*1st year master's student of the specialty "Linguistics: English language"  
English Linguistics Department  
Bukhara State University*

### **Abstract**

The article under consideration lays out the significant impact of communicative intention and situational context on the translation of conditional mood grammatical units between English and Uzbek. The results indicate that the translators involved in the modality between the two languages have to take into account not only the morphological and syntactic characteristics but also the general communicative situation and the speaker's intention as well.

### **Keywords**

conditional mood, grammatical category, translation, communicative purpose, situational context, pragmatic equivalence

## РОЛЬ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ ЦЕЛИ И СИТУАЦИОННОГО КОНТЕКСТА В ПЕРЕВОДЕ ЕДИНИЦ УСЛОВНОГО НАКЛОНЕНИЯ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И УЗБЕКСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ

**Шукурова Мадина Аскарровна**

*доцент кафедры английского языкознания  
Бухарского государственного университета, PhD*

**Самандаров Ислон Икромович**

*Магистрант 1-го курса специальности «Лингвистика: английский язык»  
кафедры английского языкознания  
Бухарского государственного университета*

### **Аннотация**

Рассматриваемая статья раскрывает значительное влияние коммуникативного намерения и ситуационного контекста на перевод грамматических единиц условного наклонения между английским и узбекским языками. Полученные результаты показывают, что переводчики, работающие с модальностью между этими двумя языками, должны учитывать не только морфологические и синтаксические особенности, но и общую коммуникативную ситуацию, а также намерение говорящего.

#### **Ключевые слова**

условное наклонение, грамматическая категория, перевод, коммуникативная цель, ситуационный контекст, прагматическая эквивалентность

### **SHART MAYLI BIRLIKLARINI TARJIMA QILISHDA KOMMUNIKATIV MAQSAD VA VAZIYAT KONTEKSTINING O'RNI: INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARINING QIYOSIY TAHLILI**

**Shukurova Madina Askarovna**

*Buxoro davlat universiteti Ingliz tilshunosligi kafedrasida dotsenti, PhD*

**Samandarov Islom Ikromovich**

*Ingliz tilshunosligi kafedrasida Lingvistika: ingliz tili mutaxassisligi*

*I-bosqich magistranti*

#### **Annotatsiya**

Ko'rib chiqilayotgan maqola ingliz va o'zbek tillari o'rtasida shart mayli grammatik birliklarini tarjima qilishda kommunikativ niyat va vaziyat kontekstining sezilarli ta'sirini yoritib beradi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, ushbu ikki til o'rtasida modallik bilan ishlovchi tarjimonlar nafaqat morfologik va sintaktik xususiyatlarni, balki umumiy kommunikativ vaziyat hamda so'zlovchining niyatini ham hisobga olishlari lozim.

#### **Kalit so'zlar**

shart mayli, grammatik kategoriya, tarjima, kommunikativ maqsad, vaziyat konteksti, pragmatik ekvivalentlik

**INTRODUCTION.** Mood, which is a grammatical category, is one of the most complicated and theoretically important issues in linguistic analysis through which languages mainly represent the connection between an action and its existence in reality [1; 197]. In the Uzbek linguistic tradition, the category of mood is closely associated with tense and person-number categories and thus forms a part of the conjugation system of the language. This close association indicates that mood not

only signifies the relationship of action to reality but also the relationship between the actor and the action in the context of the actual happening [2; 456]. The Uzbek language is characterized by four main mood types: imperative-optative mood, conditional mood, purposive mood, and indicative mood, each of which has its own distinct semantic and morphological features that set it apart from the others [3; 612].

The conditional mood in Uzbek, expressed through the suffix *-sa*, is one of the most difficult categories for translation into English because of the fundamental differences between the two languages both structurally and functionally. English uses a complex system of conditional constructions that include different verb forms, modal auxiliary verbs, and syntactic patterns, while Uzbek mainly uses morphological marking to express conditionality [4; 320]. This difference in the number of markings leads to great difficulties for translators who have to switch between different grammatical paradigms and, at the same time, maintain the same communicative intent and pragmatic force.

**METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW.** The study employs a methodology that is descriptive-analytical, which involves a thorough review and synthesis of current scholarly literature in the areas of contrastive linguistics, translation studies, and grammatical theory. The analysis is based on functional-communicative approaches to language that regard the context and speaker's intention as pivotal factors in establishing grammatical meaning and finding its equivalents in different languages [5; 186]. The theoretical basis for treating mood as a grammatical category comes from the traditional distinction that mood reflects the connection between the event and its reality, which has been the guiding idea of the Uzbek linguistic community for a long time [6; 446]. With this conceptual scheme, the conditional mood is pictured as the one that, in a practical sense, outlines hypothetical, possible, or contingent relations, thereby signaling actions that are subject to certain conditions for their being accomplished. In support of this view, Nurmonov and his team have shown that the Uzbek conditional forms with the *-sa* suffix have a broad semantic usage, including possibilities given in nature, imaginary situations, and contrary-to-fact propositions, with the precise meaning mainly determined by situational factors and the presence of grammatical elements [7; 228]. The wide semantics involved here poses significant problems in the case of translation, as English conditional structures normally require more explicit marking of differing conditional types through systematic verb form selection.

Translation studies have come to a clear conclusion: the transfer of grammatical categories is done by stressing the functional equivalency and not by the formal correspondence [8; 253]. Komissarov's foundational theories on

translation have pointed out that the most pragmatic factors, such as the communicative purpose and situational appropriateness, must go hand in hand with the translation decisions when the structural equivalence is not simply possible, or when it does not suffice. This sanction is particularly valid for the mood categories, where one and the same morphological form of the source language may fit into different constructions in the target language depending on the communicating context. Baker has advanced this theoretical position even more by illustrating how thematic and information structure, considerations of register, and pragmatic implicature all play a role in deciding how grammatical categories should be rendered in translation [9; 372]. The contrastive analysis of English and Uzbek conditional systems shows the existence of major structural differences that make direct translation difficult. English, by means of systematic verb form variation, is able to clearly define three main types of conditionals: zero conditionals, which use present tense form, first conditionals with present and future forms for real future possibilities, second conditionals applying past forms for hypothetical present situations, and third conditionals involving past perfect constructions for counterfactual past scenarios. In contrast, the Uzbek language makes use of the single conditional suffix *-sa* throughout all these semantic domains with the interpretation based on contextual factors, aspectual markers, and discourse situation [10; 236].

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.** From the analysis of the scholarly literature on the subject, it is concluded that the communicative purpose is the main factor that determines which conditional mood in English and Uzbek is appropriate to use. In using the conditional mood, the speaker shows their intention, whether they are being uncertain, asking politely, warning, or reasoning hypothetically. The translator needs to find out the hidden communicative purpose and choose the forms in the target language that keep it, even if such preservation means breaking down the structural parallelism. The research shows that in addition to the logical-conditional meaning, the Uzbek conditional forms often perform politeness function which is the pragmatic dimension that may not be evident from morphological analysis alone but is crucial for accurate translation. Thus, the English translations would require to take into account the register and politeness levels, possibly using modal auxiliaries or alternative constructions to fully express the communicative power of the Uzbek conditional utterances.

The situational context is equally important as the analysis to successful translation of the conditional mood and thus emerge from the analysis. The same conditional construction in Uzbek may require different translations into English according to the context whether it be formal written discourse, casual

conversation, literary narrative, or technical documentation. Context determines not only which conditional type is appropriate but also influences lexical selection, syntactic complexity, and overall register of the translation. Moreover, cultural context is very influential since the conditional constructions in both languages have culture-specific associations and conventional usage patterns that the translators have to be aware of and adapt their work accordingly. The discovery points out that decontextualized translation of the conditional mood units frequently results in semantically accurate but pragmatically inappropriate outcomes, thus highlighting the importance of using the holistic contextual analysis in translation practice.

**Table 1. Communicative Functions and Translation Correspondences of Uzbek Conditional Mood Constructions**

<b>Communicative Function</b>	<b>Uzbek Conditional Form</b>	<b>English Equivalent Construction</b>	<b>Situational Context Markers</b>
Real future condition	Kelsa, gaplashamiz	If he comes, we will talk	Present-future temporal reference, neutral register
Hypothetical present	Bilsam, aytardim	If I knew, I would tell	Counterfactual implication, subjunctive meaning
Polite request	Yordamingiz kersak	If you could help us / Could you help us	Formal register, interpersonal function
General truth condition	Suv qaynatilsa, bug'lanadi	If water is boiled, it evaporates	Scientific or didactic context, atemporal reference
Past counterfactual	O'qisa, muvaffaq bo'lardi	If he had studied, he would have succeeded	Past temporal frame, unrealized condition
Warning or advice	Ehtiyot bo'lmasang, yiqilasan	If you are not careful, you will fall	Admonitory function, future consequence
Wish or desire	Kelsa edi	If only he would come	Optative overtone, emotional involvement

What is shown in Table 1 is that the solitary morphological marker -sa in Uzbek covers a semantic variety that English assigns to several conditional constructions distinguished by formal characteristics. The fact indicates that the



communicative purpose is the main factor determining the translation equivalence, which is theoretically represented by the same surface structure in Uzbek that requires different English renderings depending on the speaker's illocutionary intent and the discourse situation [8; 253]. The analysis indicates that the translators have to go beyond the direct structural correspondences and apply a pragmatic analysis to determine the exact communicative function served by the conditional construction in its original context.

Theoretical implications of these findings involve larger discussions of grammatical category transfer in translation. The analysis indicates that moods, which encode speaker's attitude and relationship to truth of the proposition, need a totally different translation approach when compared to other categories that express more objective semantic content. Furthermore, the translation of mood necessitates considering pragmatic dimensions that might not be formally indicated in either the source or the target language, thus requiring the translators' role to be that of the communicative intention interpreters rather than just the linguistic form transcoders.

**CONCLUSION.** This research has revealed that the translation of conditional moods between English and Uzbek necessitates constant guidance to communicative intention and situational context as the main factors determining translation adequacy. The difference in the structure of the two languages' conditions, the Uzbek morphological system which infers conditionality using the one -sa suffix, and the English system which uses different conditional constructions, the latter requiring extensive interpretative analysis beyond mere grammatical congruence. The successful translation process involves recognizing speaker's intention, determining the pragmatic function, and assessing the appropriateness of the situation, thus, the target language forms would be selected so that the communicative force is preserved rather than structural parallelism. These results are beneficial to translation theory as they point out the inadequacy of form-centered approaches to the transfer of grammatical categories and at the same time provide theoretical support for context-adaptive translation methods. It is recommended that future studies would apply this argument to the other mood categories in the Uzbek language system and also look for ways to apply these theoretical insights in translator training and professional practice.

#### THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Lyons J. Semantics. Volume 2. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. – 897 p.

2. Nurmonov A. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2002. – 456 b.
3. Shoabdurahmonov Sh. va boshq. O'zbek tili grammatikasi. I tom. Morfologiya. – Toshkent: Fan, 1975. – 612 b.
4. Бондарко А.В. Теория морфологических категорий и аспектологические исследования. – Москва: Языки славянских культур, 2005. – 620 с.
5. Halliday M.A.K., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. 4th ed. – London: Routledge, 2014. – 786 p.
6. Kononov A.N. Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka. – Moskva-Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1960. – 446 s.
7. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov, N. O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2008. – 228 b.
8. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). – Москва: Высшая школа, 1990. – 253 с.
9. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. 3rd ed. – London: Routledge, 2018. – 372 p.
10. Palmer F.R. Mood and Modality. 2nd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 236 p.