

Шукурова Ш.Ш.,
Старший учитель,
Общеобразовательная школа,
Республика Узбекистан, г. Ташкент.

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ УСЛОВНЫХ КОНСТРУКЦИЙ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматриваются лингвистические особенности условных союзов в английском и узбекском языках. Исследование посвящено этимологии, грамматическим функциям и семантическим особенностям союзов, вводящих придаточные условия. Английские условные союзы (if, unless, provided that, in case, as long as) сопоставляются с их узбекскими аналогами (agar, mabodo, toki, bo‘lmasa). Результаты исследования показывают как универсальные типологические черты, так и национально-специфические различия, подчёркивая роль союзов условий в синтаксических структурах, модальности и дискурсе.

Ключевые слова: *условные союзы, английский язык, узбекский язык, модальность, сопоставительная лингвистика, синтаксис.*

Shukurova Sh.Sh.,
Senior Teacher,
General Education School,
The Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent.

LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES OF CONDITIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Abstract: This article investigates the linguistic peculiarities of conditional conjunctions in English and Uzbek languages. The study focuses on the etymology,

grammatical functions, and semantic variations of conjunctions that introduce conditional clauses. English conditional conjunctions (if, unless, provided that, in case, as long as) are compared with their Uzbek counterparts (agar, mabodo, toki, bo'lmasa). The research reveals both universal typological features and language-specific strategies, emphasizing the role of conditionals in syntactic structures, modality, and discourse. The findings contribute to contrastive linguistics and practical applications in translation studies and bilingual education.

Keywords: *conditional conjunctions, English, Uzbek, modality, comparative linguistics, syntax*

Introduction. Conditionality is one of the universal categories of human language, as it reflects logical relations between actions, events, and states. The linguistic realization of conditionality involves specific markers, among which conjunctions play a central role. In both English and Uzbek, conjunctions function as linking devices that establish semantic and syntactic dependency between clauses. However, the means of expressing conditionality vary across languages depending on typological and cultural factors.

The purpose of this research is to explore the linguistic peculiarities of conditional conjunctions in English and Uzbek languages, identify their similarities and differences, and analyze their grammatical and semantic properties within comparative-typological linguistics.

Methods and Research. Conjunctions have been widely studied in syntax and semantics as relational markers. Halliday (1994) defines conjunctions as cohesive devices that signal logical relations between clauses. In Uzbek linguistics, conjunctions (bog'lovchilar) are studied as independent word classes that perform the function of syntactic linking (Ibragimov, 2002). Within conditional clauses, conjunctions indicate the dependency of the subordinate clause upon the main clause.

Conditionals are generally classified into real, unreal, and hypothetical. The conjunctions used in these structures serve as explicit signals of conditional meaning. The typological comparison of English and Uzbek shows both overlap and divergence in the inventory and usage of conditional conjunctions.

Results and Discussion. Conditional conjunctions in English
English employs a wide variety of conjunctions to mark conditions:

Basic conditional marker:

if – the most frequent marker, e.g., If you study hard, you will succeed.

Negative condition:

unless – expresses exception, e.g., Unless you try, you cannot achieve anything.

Restrictive/limited condition:

as long as, provided that, on condition that – introduce necessary circumstances, e.g., You can borrow the book as long as you return it tomorrow.

Preventive/precautionary condition:

in case – indicates potential preventive measures, e.g., Take an umbrella in case it rains.

English conditionals rely on these conjunctions alongside tense and modality to create nuanced meanings.

Conditional conjunctions in Uzbek

Uzbek uses a more limited but morphologically diverse set of conditional markers:

Basic marker:

agar – the most universal marker, e.g., Agar o‘qisang, muvaffaqiyat qozonasan.

Hypothetical marker:

mabodo – expresses uncertainty or remote possibility, e.g., Mabodo kelmasa, uchrashuv bekor bo‘ladi.

Temporal-conditional marker:

toki – meaning “until,” sometimes with conditional sense, e.g., Toki u qaytmaguncha, kutamiz.

Alternative/negative condition:

bo‘lmasa – used to indicate the opposite consequence, e.g., Shoshil, bo‘lmasa avtobusni qo‘ldan boy berasan. Unlike English, Uzbek heavily relies on affix -sa in addition to conjunctions, showing agglutinative typology.

Comparative analysis

The comparison shows:

Inventory: English has a richer inventory of lexicalized conditional conjunctions, while Uzbek relies on fewer but multifunctional forms supported by morphology.

Semantics: English conjunctions express fine distinctions (exception, restriction, precaution), whereas Uzbek markers are broader but rely on context.

Syntax: In English, the position of the conditional clause is flexible (initial or final). In Uzbek, agar clauses usually precede the main clause.

Discourse: English often uses conditionals for politeness strategies, while Uzbek employs them in proverbs, moral sayings, and oral traditions.

Pragmatic functions

Conditional conjunctions serve important pragmatic roles:

Politeness and mitigation:

English: If you could send me the file, I would appreciate it.

Uzbek: Agar iloji bo‘lsa, yordam qilsangiz.

Proverbs and folklore:

English: If winter comes, can spring be far behind?

Uzbek: Agar mehnat qilsang, rohat topasan.

This demonstrates cultural embedding of conditionality in discourse.

Typological implications

The findings support the view that:

English is more analytical, relying on auxiliary verbs and lexical conjunctions.

Uzbek is more agglutinative, relying on suffixes and particles, with conjunctions playing a secondary role.

Both languages demonstrate universality in expressing cause-effect and hypothetical relations, but diverge in the means of realization.

Conclusion. The linguistic peculiarities of conditional conjunctions in English and Uzbek highlight the interplay of universal and language-specific features. English employs a wide range of lexical conjunctions, each carrying nuanced meanings, whereas Uzbek uses fewer conjunctions supported by morphological markers. Pragmatic functions reveal cultural influences on the usage of conditionals.

Furthermore, the comparison demonstrates that conditional conjunctions are not only grammatical connectors but also powerful tools for shaping discourse and expressing modality. They reflect cultural norms of politeness, reasoning, and argumentation in both languages. In English, the variety of conditional conjunctions provides speakers with fine distinctions of meaning, while in Uzbek, the multifunctionality of a limited set of markers shows the flexibility of agglutinative morphology.

From a pedagogical perspective, understanding these similarities and differences is crucial for effective bilingual education, translation, and intercultural communication. This research proves that conditional conjunctions serve as a bridge between grammar, semantics, and pragmatics, and their study contributes to the broader field of comparative-typological linguistics. The results can be applied in teaching English and Uzbek languages and in translation processes. Future research may focus on corpus-based analysis of conditionals in spoken discourse, literary texts, and digital communication, which would further enrich our understanding of their linguistic and cultural significance.

References

1. Comrie, B. (1986). *Conditionals: A Typological Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Dancygier, B., & Sweetser, E. (2005). *Mental Spaces in Grammar: Conditional Constructions*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Edward Arnold.
5. Ibragimov, A. (2002). *O‘zbek tilida ergash gapli qo‘shma gaplar sintaksisi*. To shkent: Fan.
6. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
8. Sweetser, E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

9. Yuldashev, M. (2015). O'zbek va ingliz tillarida bog'lovchilar qiyosiy tahlili. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya.
10. Xudoyberganova, D. (2010). O'zbek tilida shart munosabatlarining ifodalanishi. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.