ISSN:3030-332X
Impact factor: 9,493
International journal of scientific researchers

THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING PRAGMATICS IN TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Xosiyatbibi Dilmurodova
E-mail: xziyadullayevna@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23262236

Abstract. Translation is not simply the replacement of words in one language with words in another. It is an act of intercultural communication in which translators must interpret speakers' intentions, relationships, assumptions, and expectations. Pragmatics—the study of meaning in context—therefore has a central role in producing translations that are accurate, natural, and appropriate for their intended audiences. This article examines the importance of pragmatic competence in translation between Uzbek and English. It focuses on speech acts, politeness, honorifics, indirectness, deixis, implicature, idiomatic meaning, and culturally shaped patterns of interaction. The study adopts a qualitative, contrastive approach and uses illustrative Uzbek–English examples to demonstrate how literal transfer can alter interpersonal meaning. The analysis suggests that pragmatic differences often arise not because the two languages lack equivalent expressions, but because similar forms may perform different communicative functions in different contexts. In Uzbek, forms of address and grammatical choices may explicitly encode respect, age, social distance, or solidarity; in English, these relationships are often conveyed through lexical choices, modal verbs, mitigation, intonation, and the wider discourse. The article proposes a context-sensitive procedure for pragmatic analysis before and during translation. It argues that translators should identify the communicative act, infer the speaker's intention, evaluate the social relationship, consider target-culture conventions, and select a strategy that preserves the function and effect of the source text. Pragmatic awareness is especially important in literary, diplomatic, business, educational, and audiovisual translation, where a formally correct sentence may still misrepresent the speaker or damage the relationship between participants.

Keywords: pragmatics, translation, Uzbek, English, speech acts, politeness, implicature, intercultural communication, pragmatic equivalence.

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation connects people who do not necessarily share a language, cultural background, or communicative conventions. A successful translation must transfer not only propositional content—the information explicitly expressed—but also the interpersonal and situational meaning that makes an utterance function as a request, apology, warning, invitation, refusal, compliment, or act of respect. This broader dimension of meaning is the domain of pragmatics. When translators overlook it, they may reproduce the dictionary meaning of a sentence while unintentionally changing its force, politeness, emotional tone, or social implications.

The distinction between linguistic meaning and speaker meaning is fundamental. A sentence such as "It is cold in here" can be a neutral observation, a complaint, or an indirect request to close a window. Its intended function depends on the situation, the participants' relationship, shared knowledge, and prosody. A translator who renders only the literal proposition may fail to communicate what the speaker is doing with the utterance. Pragmatic interpretation is therefore not an optional stylistic refinement; it is part of understanding the source text itself.

The Uzbek and English languages provide a particularly productive context for pragmatic comparison. Both languages enable speakers to express politeness, solidarity, distance, irony, and indirectness, but they do not always distribute these meanings across the same grammatical and lexical resources. Uzbek commonly uses the second-person plural form siz as a respectful singular as well as a plural pronoun, while sen may signal familiarity, intimacy, hierarchy, or disrespect depending on context. English generally uses "you" for both singular and plural addressees; respect and distance are often conveyed by titles, names, modal constructions, hedging, and discourse strategies. These systems do not map onto each other mechanically.

Pragmatic problems also emerge from culturally conventionalized expressions. Uzbek expressions such as Assalomu alaykum, marhamat, rahmat, and yaxshi boring have meanings shaped by social routine and context. Their English equivalents may be "Peace be upon you" or, more commonly in many contexts, "Hello"; "please," "go ahead," "you're welcome," or "take care," depending on what the expression is doing in a particular exchange. A single dictionary equivalent cannot cover every communicative use. Similarly, English phrases such as "Would you mind…?", "I was wondering if…," and "That's interesting" can convey requests, hesitation, disagreement, or restrained evaluation beyond their literal content.

The central problem addressed in this article is how pragmatic knowledge can help translators preserve communicative intention and interpersonal meaning when translating between Uzbek and English. The article has four objectives: (1) to clarify the relationship between pragmatics and translation; (2) to identify recurrent pragmatic contrasts between Uzbek and English; (3) to analyse illustrative examples in which literal translation risks changing meaning; and (4) to propose a practical procedure for pragmatic decision-making.

The study is guided by three research questions. First, which pragmatic features most frequently require attention in Uzbek–English translation? Second, how can differences in politeness, speech acts, and implied meaning affect translation choices? Third, what analytical steps can help translators achieve pragmatic rather than merely lexical equivalence?

The article contributes a teaching-oriented framework for translation practice. Its examples are illustrative rather than a claim to represent every Uzbek or English speaker. Pragmatic choices vary by region, generation, genre, institution, relationship, and individual preference; accordingly, the analysis treats cultural patterns as tendencies that must be tested against the actual context.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Pragmatics is commonly understood as the study of how language users interpret and produce meaning in context. Morris's broad account of semiotics distinguished pragmatics from the study of relations among signs and their relations to what they signify. In modern linguistics, pragmatics examines how utterances are interpreted through context, inference, shared assumptions, social relations, and communicative purposes. Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996) provide influential introductions to its central concepts, including deixis, implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and discourse structure.

Speech act theory is especially relevant to translation. Austin (1962) argued that utterances do not merely describe the world; they can perform actions. Searle (1969) developed a classification of illocutionary acts, commonly discussed in terms of representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. For translators, the key question is not only "What does this sentence say?" but also "What action does the speaker perform by saying it?" An interrogative sentence may function as a request, a rhetorical question may express criticism, and a declarative sentence may function as a promise or warning.

Grice's (1975) account of conversational implicature explains how listeners infer meanings that are not directly encoded in the words. Speakers rely on expectations about relevance, informativeness, truthfulness, and clarity, while listeners infer why an utterance was produced in a particular way. These inferences are not always transferable across languages. A concise expression that sounds cooperative in one context may sound abrupt in another; an indirect answer may be interpreted as tactful, evasive, or uncertain depending on shared conventions.

Politeness theory also informs pragmatic translation. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe face as a socially important aspect of interaction and examine strategies used to mitigate face-threatening acts. Although their framework has been influential, later research has cautioned against treating politeness as a universal set of fixed rules. Politeness is relational and context-dependent: the same form may communicate respect, distance, irony, or condescension depending on participants and circumstances. Translators should therefore use politeness theory as an analytical tool rather than as a rigid cultural formula.

Relevance theory, associated with Sperber and Wilson (1995), emphasizes inferential communication and the search for relevant interpretations. In translation, it encourages attention to the assumptions that a target audience can reasonably recover. Baker (2018) similarly highlights the need to consider pragmatic equivalence, implicature, coherence, and the contextual conditions of interpretation. These approaches converge on a central principle: translation requires the reconstruction of a communicative event, not just the transfer of isolated linguistic forms.

Within translation studies, equivalence is consequently understood in several ways. Formal similarity may be useful when form itself matters, but pragmatic equivalence concerns whether a target utterance performs a comparable function and produces an appropriate effect. This does not mean that every feature must be identical. Rather, translators must decide which aspects of meaning are essential for the communicative purpose and which can be adapted to target-language norms.

3. METHODS

3.1. Research design

This article uses a qualitative, contrastive and example-based research design. It examines pragmatic phenomena relevant to translation between Uzbek and English and compares possible renderings in order to identify shifts in communicative force, interpersonal stance, and implied meaning. A qualitative approach is appropriate because pragmatic interpretation depends on context and cannot be adequately evaluated through word-for-word comparison alone.

3.2. Material and scope

The material consists of constructed illustrative utterances and conventional expressions drawn from general knowledge of Uzbek and English usage. Examples were selected to represent recurring translation challenges: address forms, requests, refusals, apologies, greetings, indirect speech acts, implicature, deixis, and culture-specific routines. They are designed to clarify analytical principles and are not presented as a corpus-based frequency study. The article does not claim that one wording is preferred by all speakers in either language.

3.3. Analytical procedure

Each example is considered through five questions. First, what is the literal or propositional meaning? Second, what speech act or communicative function is performed? Third, what social relationship and situational variables are relevant, including age, familiarity, status, formality, and

institutional setting? Fourth, what assumptions or implications would a target-language reader infer from a literal translation? Fifth, which translation strategy best preserves the intended function while remaining natural in the target language?

The analysis distinguishes source-text meaning from translator inference. A translator should not invent an intention merely because a phrase has a familiar cultural association. Contextual clues—surrounding turns, narrative description, speaker identity, genre, punctuation, prosody in audiovisual material, and the consequences of the utterance—must support the interpretation. When several readings remain possible, the translator may preserve ambiguity, use a neutral formulation, consult the author or client, or provide a note if the genre permits.

3.4. Criteria for evaluating pragmatic transfer

Four criteria are used. **Intentional adequacy** asks whether the translation preserves what the speaker is trying to do. **Interpersonal adequacy** considers whether respect, solidarity, distance, irritation, or mitigation is represented appropriately. **Contextual coherence** asks whether the utterance fits the situation and surrounding discourse. **Target-language naturalness** evaluates whether the wording resembles a plausible utterance in the target context. These criteria are related but not identical: a translation may be grammatically natural yet pragmatically inaccurate, or pragmatically understandable yet stylistically awkward.

3.5. Limitations and ethical considerations

Because the study is illustrative and qualitative, it cannot establish statistical patterns or universal claims about Uzbek and English speakers. A larger empirical study would need a balanced bilingual corpus, contextual metadata, and evaluations by qualified speakers from different backgrounds. The examples below are therefore intended as a practical framework for analysis and translator education, not as a substitute for context-specific consultation.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Address forms and social deixis

A major pragmatic contrast concerns the expression of social relationships. Uzbek distinguishes sen and siz, and the choice may index familiarity, respect, hierarchy, solidarity, or a deliberate change in relationship. English “you” does not grammatically encode the same distinction. A translator moving from Uzbek into English may therefore need to compensate through a title, a name, sentence structure, modal verbs, or the overall register. Conversely, translating English “you” into Uzbek requires a contextual decision that English grammar itself may not resolve.

For example, Sizdan bir narsani so‘rasam maylimi? can be rendered as “May I ask you something?” In English, the respect encoded by siz is not directly visible in “you.” The translation may still be appropriate because “May I…?” is a conventional, mitigated way of opening a request. In a highly formal institutional exchange, a title or more formal surrounding language may be necessary; between close friends, a simpler version may be more natural. No single English marker replaces siz in all contexts.

Social deixis also appears in titles and kinship terms. Uzbek speakers may use kinship terms or respectful forms of address beyond literal family relationships, whereas English uses such forms differently and less uniformly in some settings. Translating a term literally can sound overly intimate, archaic, or confusing. Translators should identify whether the form expresses biological relationship, social respect, affection, age hierarchy, or a conventional mode of address before choosing an equivalent.

4.2. Requests and indirectness

Requests are among the clearest examples of pragmatic meaning exceeding sentence meaning. Compare the direct English imperative "Close the door" with "Could you close the door, please?" Both may seek the same outcome, but their interpersonal effects differ. A literal translation of an Uzbek request into an English imperative—or the reverse—may make the speaker sound more commanding or more hesitant than intended. The appropriate form depends on urgency, power relations, familiarity, and the conventions of the setting.

Consider the Uzbek expression Derazani yopib yubora olasizmi? A natural English translation might be "Could you close the window?" The expression should not be translated mechanically as "Can you send the window closed," because the verb construction's practical function is to request an action, not to describe sending anything. In another context, an equivalent involving "Would you mind closing the window?" may better preserve a deferential tone, although that wording can be too elaborate for a casual exchange.

Indirectness should not automatically be equated with politeness. It may communicate tact, uncertainty, strategic distance, irony, or reluctance. An explicit request can be entirely polite when participants share expectations and the situation requires efficiency. The translator's task is to preserve the degree and function of indirectness, not to make every utterance more formal.

4.3. Refusals, apologies, and face management

Refusals are pragmatically delicate because they reject a proposal while managing the relationship with the person who made it. A refusal may include appreciation, an explanation, regret, an alternative, or a future-oriented promise. Uzbek and English speakers can use all of these resources, but their placement and degree of explicitness vary with context. Translating only the central negative response may omit the relational work performed by the surrounding language.

For instance, Taklifingiz uchun rahmat, lekin bu safar bora olmayman can be translated as "Thank you for the invitation, but I can't make it this time." The translation preserves appreciation, refusal, and a time-limited explanation. A blunt version such as "I cannot go" may communicate the basic proposition but lose the speaker's effort to maintain goodwill. However, adding a lengthy apology when the source is brief can also distort the speaker's stance.

Apologies likewise combine several possible functions: acknowledging harm, expressing regret, accepting responsibility, explaining circumstances, or seeking reconciliation. Uzbek Kechirasiz may correspond to "Excuse me," "I'm sorry," or "Pardon me," depending on whether the speaker is interrupting, apologizing for an offence, asking someone to repeat something, or trying to pass through a crowded space. Choosing the equivalent requires identifying the act rather than relying on a fixed bilingual match.

4.4. Conversational implicature and implied meaning

Implicature occurs when the intended message goes beyond what is explicitly stated. Suppose a person asks, "Will you join us tonight?" and the reply is "I have an early meeting tomorrow." The answer does not literally say "no," but in context it may imply a refusal. A translator who turns the reply into a direct negative could make the speaker more explicit than intended; a literal translation may preserve the ambiguity if the target audience can infer the same conclusion.

Implicatures can be especially vulnerable in humour, irony, understatement, and criticism. An English comment such as "That was a brave decision" may be sincere praise or ironic disapproval. The intended reading depends on tone, context, and shared knowledge. Written translation may not have

access to all these cues. Translators should therefore examine surrounding dialogue and narrative signals before deciding whether to retain the wording, make the implication clearer, or use a target-language expression with a similar ironic effect.

A related challenge is the translation of restrained disagreement. “I’m not sure that’s the best approach” can function as a tactful objection rather than a statement of uncertainty. If translated as a purely epistemic comment, the objection may be weakened; if translated too forcefully, the speaker may appear confrontational. Pragmatic equivalence requires preserving both the disagreement and its mitigation.

4.5. Deixis and contextual reference

Deixis includes expressions whose interpretation depends on the context of utterance, such as “I,” “you,” “here,” “there,” “now,” “tomorrow,” “this,” and “that.” Translation can become difficult when the source and target texts are produced at different times or when a text is moved between settings. A word such as “tomorrow” is anchored to the speaker’s time, not necessarily the time at which the translation is read. In subtitling, dubbing, letters, and archival documents, translators must decide whether to preserve the original temporal viewpoint or adapt it for the target situation.

Demonstratives may also signal emotional or discourse distance. The difference between “this problem” and “that problem” is not always merely physical; it may frame an issue as immediate, remote, shared, or disassociated. Uzbek and English demonstrative systems overlap, but the choice of form must be interpreted in context. An automatic one-to-one mapping may lose a discourse contrast or introduce a contrast absent from the original.

4.6. Culture-specific expressions and communicative routines

Greetings, leave-taking expressions, blessings, congratulations, and hospitality formulas are highly conventionalized. The Uzbek greeting Assalomu alaykum can be preserved in a text where cultural identity or religious context matters, transliterated and briefly explained for an unfamiliar audience, or rendered functionally as “Hello” when the priority is conversational flow. The right decision depends on genre, readership, and the purpose of the translation. A diplomatic document, an ethnographic account, a novel, and a casual dialogue may require different strategies.

The expression marhamat illustrates context sensitivity. It can function as “please,” “here you are,” “go ahead,” or an invitation to proceed. Translating it with the same English word every time would ignore its interactional role. Similarly, yaxshi boring may be a conventional leave-taking formula rather than a literal wish about physical movement; “Take care,” “Have a good journey,” or “Goodbye” may be appropriate in different circumstances.

Idioms and figurative expressions pose a related problem. Their pragmatic effect may be more important than their literal imagery. A translator should ask whether the expression conveys humour, criticism, intimacy, emotional intensity, or a culturally recognizable reference. Possible strategies include using a target-language idiom with a comparable function, paraphrasing the meaning, retaining the original image when it is interpretable, or adding a brief explanation where the genre allows. The strategy should be consistent with the text’s purpose and audience.

4.7. Register, genre, and professional contexts

Pragmatic choices differ across domains. In business correspondence, excessive directness may seem discourteous, while excessive hedging may obscure responsibility. In academic writing, cautious claims such as “the findings suggest” communicate epistemic restraint. In legal or administrative

translation, however, mitigation must not weaken obligations or rights. In literary translation, deviations from standard politeness may be essential to characterization. Pragmatic competence therefore includes recognizing genre conventions and avoiding a single translation style for all contexts.

5. DISCUSSION

The examples indicate that pragmatic problems in Uzbek–English translation are systematic rather than marginal. They arise whenever meaning depends on the relationship between a form, its user, and a communicative situation. Address forms, requests, refusals, apologies, implicatures, deixis, and conventional expressions all demonstrate that lexical accuracy is necessary but insufficient. A translator can select dictionary-correct words and still produce a target utterance that misrepresents the speaker's intention or interpersonal stance.

One important implication is that pragmatic equivalence should be understood functionally, not mechanically. Uzbek siz does not have a single English equivalent because English distributes comparable social meanings across different linguistic resources. Likewise, English "please" cannot automatically replace Uzbek marhamat, since the Uzbek expression performs several interactional functions. The translator must identify what the expression does in the particular exchange and then select a target-language resource capable of doing similar work.

A second implication concerns cultural generalization. It is tempting to describe one culture as direct and another as indirect, or one language as polite and another as informal. Such broad oppositions are unreliable because speech communities contain variation and speakers adjust their behaviour according to status, age, familiarity, setting, personality, and communicative goals. Pragmatic comparison should identify tendencies and available resources without treating them as fixed national characteristics. Translators should use contextual evidence before making cultural interpretations.

A third implication is that pragmatic analysis can help translators distinguish between preserving form and preserving effect. In some texts, the form itself is meaningful: a repeated phrase, a marked pronoun, a pun, or an unusual syntactic pattern may contribute to characterization or style. In other cases, a literal form is incidental and should be adapted to preserve the intended function. The translator must weigh semantic content, interpersonal meaning, stylistic value, and audience accessibility rather than automatically privileging one dimension.

The findings support a five-stage procedure for practical translation. **Stage 1: identify the speech act.** Determine whether the utterance informs, requests, refuses, apologizes, promises, criticizes, or performs another action. **Stage 2: reconstruct the context.** Establish who speaks, to whom, in what setting, with what degree of familiarity and power difference. **Stage 3: infer pragmatic meaning.** Examine implications, presuppositions, indirectness, humour, irony, and relevant shared knowledge. **Stage 4: select a target-language strategy.** Consider a functional equivalent, modulation, paraphrase, explicitation, compensation, or retention of a culturally marked form. **Stage 5: test the result.** Read the translation as a target-language utterance and ask what a typical reader might infer about the speaker's intention, attitude, and relationship with the addressee. This procedure is useful for translator training because it makes implicit decisions explicit. Students can compare literal and context-sensitive versions, explain how each affects the interaction, and justify their choices with evidence. Peer review by proficient Uzbek and English users can reveal unintended levels of formality or ambiguity. For high-stakes work, consultation with subject specialists and users from the relevant communicative community may be necessary.

Pragmatic competence should be incorporated into translation curricula alongside grammar, terminology, and textual analysis. Classroom activities can include role-play, dialogue translation,

analysis of authentic correspondence, comparison of subtitled scenes, and revision of deliberately literal translations. Learners can be asked to identify the speech act, infer the intended meaning, describe the relationship between participants, and defend a target-language choice. Such activities develop not only linguistic accuracy but also awareness of audience and communicative consequences.

Technology does not remove the need for pragmatic judgement. Machine translation systems may produce fluent sentences while missing irony, implied refusal, honorific nuance, or the social implications of address forms. Post-editors should therefore check whether the translated utterance is appropriate to its context, not only whether it is grammatically correct. Context windows, parallel examples, terminology resources, and human review can improve results, but ambiguous cases still require informed interpretation.

The framework also has practical value beyond literary translation. In interpreting, pragmatic misjudgement can change the perceived tone of a speaker and affect trust. In business, it can make a cooperative proposal sound like an order or make a firm commitment sound optional. In education, it can influence how teachers' instructions and students' responses are understood. In public communication, it can affect whether advice is perceived as supportive, patronizing, or coercive. The consequences of pragmatic transfer are thus communicative and sometimes institutional, not merely stylistic.

6. CONCLUSION

This article has examined why understanding pragmatics is essential for translation between Uzbek and English. The analysis has shown that translation involves the transfer of communicative actions and interpersonal meanings as well as linguistic content. Speech acts, address forms, politeness strategies, indirectness, implicature, deixis, and culture-specific routines can all create difficulties when the translator relies exclusively on literal equivalence.

The central conclusion is that pragmatic competence enables translators to ask the right questions: what is the speaker doing, what does the speaker intend, what relationship is being enacted, what assumptions will the audience make, and how can the target text achieve a comparable communicative effect? These questions are especially important when the languages encode social relations differently, as in the contrast between Uzbek sen/siz and English "you," or when conventional expressions such as marhamat have several context-dependent functions.

The article's qualitative examples suggest that a reliable translation process should combine semantic analysis with contextual inference and target-culture awareness. Translators should avoid rigid cultural stereotypes, preserve meaningful ambiguity where appropriate, and adapt wording only when contextual evidence supports the choice. Pragmatic equivalence does not require identical linguistic forms; it requires a defensible decision about which communicative functions must be preserved and how they can be expressed naturally in the target language.

Further research could test these observations using a parallel Uzbek–English corpus, interviews with professional translators, and reader-response studies. Such work could investigate which pragmatic shifts occur most frequently across genres and how readers interpret alternative translations. Despite its illustrative scope, the present analysis demonstrates that pragmatics is not an optional addition to translation theory. It is a core component of accurate, ethical, and effective intercultural communication.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.
2. Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.

3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.
4. Chesterman, A. (1997). Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory. John Benjamins.
5. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
6. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). Discourse and the translator. Longman.
7. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
8. Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An introduction (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
9. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.
10. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance: Communication and cognition (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
11. Venuti, L. (Ed.). (2012). The translation studies reader (3rd ed.). Routledge.
12. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.