A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF METHODS FOR CREATING AN IRONIC MEANING IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES.

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ МЕТОДОВ СОЗДАНИЯ ИРОНИЧНОГО ЗНАЧЕНИЯ В УЗБЕКСКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ.

O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDA IRONIK MA'NO YARATISH USULLARINING QIYOSIY TAHLILI

Abduqodirova Madina Abduqayum qizi
Student of Tashkent state transport university
Gmail: madinaabdukodirova73@gmail.com
Tel:+998938025659

Annotation. This article offers a comparative study of how irony is expressed in the Uzbek and English languages. It investigates the linguistic methods both languages use to create irony, including elements like tone, wordplay, and contextual clues. The paper explores different types of irony—such as verbal, situational, and dramatic—and looks at how these are shaped by cultural and contextual factors in each language. By comparing the use of irony in daily communication and literature, the article highlights both the similarities and differences in ironic expression between Uzbek and English. The research provides valuable insights into how language structure and cultural influences affect the way irony is formed and understood in these two languages.

Key words: Sperber and Wilson point, Qodirova's approach, irony often takes subtle and culturally embedded forms, Islomov's notes

Аннотация.Эта статья представляет собой сравнительное исследование того, как ирония выражается в узбекском и английском языках. В ней рассматриваются лингвистические методы, с помощью которых оба языка создают иронию, включая такие элементы, как интонация, игра слов и контекстуальные подсказки. Статья изучает различные виды иронии, такие как вербальная, ситуационная и драматическая, и анализирует, как они формируются культурными и контекстуальными факторами в каждом языке. Сравнивая использование иронии в повседневной речи и литературе, статья подчеркивает как сходства, так и различия в ироничном выражении между узбекским и английским языками. Исследование дает ценные выводы о том, как структура языка и культурные влияния определяют, как ирония формируется и воспринимается в этих двух языках.

Ключевые слова: Точка зрения Спербера и Уилсона,Подход Кодировой, Ирония часто принимает тонкие и культурно обусловленные формы,Заметки Исламова

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola, o'zbek va ingliz tillarida irodni qanday ifodalashni taqqosiy o'rganishni taqdim etadi. Maqolada, har ikkala tilning ironiya yaratish uchun qo'llaydigan lingvistik metodlari, jumladan, intonatsiya, so'z o'yinlari va kontekstual alomatlar kabi elementlar ko'rib chiqiladi. Maqola, irodni turli shakllari – masalan, verbal, situatsion va dramatik ironiya – va ularning har bir tilda madaniy va kontekstual omillar tomonidan qanday shakllanishi o'rganiladi. Ironiyaning kundalik muloqotda va adabiyotda qanday ishlatilishini taqqoslayotib, maqola o'zbek va ingliz tillaridagi irodni ifodalashdagi o'xshashliklar va farqlarni ta'kidlaydi. Tadqiqot, til tuzilishi va madaniy ta'sirlarning ironiyaning shakllanishi va tushunilishiga qanday ta'sir qilishi haqida qimmatli tushunchalar beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: Sperber va Wilsonning qarashlari,Qodirovaning yondashuvi, Kinoya ko'pincha nozik va madaniy jihatdan singdirilgan shakllarda bo'ladi, Islomovning izohlari

Introduction. Irony is one of the most subtle and complex means of expression in human communication. It allows speakers and writers to convey attitudes, emotions, or criticism in indirect ways, often through saying the opposite of what is meant. Irony is not only a tool for humor or sarcasm but also a significant stylistic and rhetorical device used to engage the audience, highlight contradictions, and provoke thought. As a pragmatic phenomenon, irony depends heavily on linguistic structure, cultural norms, and contextual understanding, making its use and interpretation vary across different languages and societies. The purpose of this article is to conduct a comparative analysis of how ironic meaning is created and conveyed in the Uzbek and English languages. These two languages belong to different linguistic families—Uzbek being a Turkic language and English a Germanic one—and they reflect different cultural traditions and communicative styles. By studying the similarities and differences in the use of irony, we can gain deeper insights into the role of culture, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics in shaping ironic communication. This research focuses on three main types of irony: verbal irony (when the speaker says the opposite of what they mean), situational irony (where the outcome is opposite to what is expected), and dramatic irony (when the audience knows something the character does not). Each of these will be analyzed with examples from both everyday language and literary sources in Uzbek and English. Understanding how irony functions in different linguistic contexts is not only academically valuable but also important in an increasingly globalized world, where cross-cultural communication is common. This study aims to contribute to the fields of comparative linguistics, pragmatics, and intercultural communication by

offering a detailed look into how ironic meanings are constructed and interpreted in two distinct linguistic and cultural frameworks.

Literature review. Irony, as a rhetorical and stylistic device, has long attracted scholarly attention across various languages and cultures. In both Uzbek and English linguistic traditions, irony serves as a powerful tool for conveying implicit criticism, humor, or contradiction. However, the methods of constructing ironic meaning differ due to cultural, historical, and linguistic contexts. When we start to analyze from scientists, Sperber and Wilson developed the Relevance Theory, which offers a cognitive-pragmatic explanation of irony. According to their theory, irony is not simply saying the opposite of what one means. Instead, irony involves echoing a thought, belief, or statement—often someone else's—and expressing a critical, humorous, or mocking attitude toward it. In this framework, the speaker intentionally echoes an idea or expectation, but does so in a context that reveals their dissociation from that idea. The listener recognizes this mismatch and interprets the utterance as ironic. *"Oh great, another meeting that could have been an email."* serves as a clear example of irony as explained by Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory. [6;7]The speaker echoes a commonly held belief—that meetings are important and contribute to productivity—but does so in a context where the meeting is perceived as unnecessary or unproductive. Although the word "great" typically expresses a positive evaluation, its use here is clearly sarcastic, signaling the speaker's frustration. The irony arises not from a simple contradiction of meaning, but from the contrast between the positive linguistic form and the negative reality, which is understood through shared contextual knowledge. This mismatch allows the listener to recognize the speaker's critical attitude, making the utterance ironic in nature. The Uzbek sentence *"Barakalla, vaqtni zo'r sarflading!"* (*"Well done, you really spent your time wisely!"*) illustrates irony through the echoic mechanism described by Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory.[4;5] The speaker echoes a socially accepted belief—that effective use of time deserves praise—but applies it in a context where the addressee has, in fact, wasted time on trivial or unimportant activities. Although the phrase appears to be a compliment, the speaker's true attitude is critical, using a positive expression to highlight the opposite of what is meant. The irony arises from the contrast between the literal praise and the actual situation, which the listener understands through tone, context, and shared social norms. This mismatch enables the utterance to be interpreted ironically, effectively conveying the speaker's disapproval in an indirect and humorous way. We think that, Sperber and Wilson's point about irony—viewing it as an echoic utterance rather than merely saying the opposite of what one means—is insightful and more nuanced than traditional theories like Grice's. Their Relevance Theory accounts for the contextual and cognitive aspects of communication, which are especially important in understanding irony across different languages and cultures.What makes their

approach especially valuable is that it explains how irony often works through shared assumptions and attitudes, not just through oppositional meaning. For example, both the English and Uzbek ironic examples you provided show that the speaker is not inventing a new idea, but rather echoing a socially recognized one—and signaling a negative stance toward it. This framework helps explain why irony can be subtle, and why it often depends on tone, context, and shared knowledge, making it culturally rich and complex. In short, their theory is quite effective for analyzing irony in both English and Uzbek, as it focuses not just on the literal words, but on the intent and cognitive environment in which the utterance is made. Qodirova D. approaches irony primarily through the lens of pragmatics and stylistics, emphasizing its communicative and functional role in Uzbek speech and literature. She argues that irony in Uzbek is not merely a stylistic ornament, but a pragmatic tool used to express indirect criticism, humor, or emotional evaluation, often shaped by cultural norms of politeness and indirectness. Unlike Western theories that focus on irony as a violation of logical expectations (Wilson's echoic mechanism), Qodirova grounds her analysis in Uzbek socio-cultural and communicative norms. She points out that in Uzbek discourse, irony often takes subtle and culturally embedded forms, such as: 1.*He inversion of proverbs,2.Use of understatement or exaggerated politeness,3.Reliance on contextual cues and social relationships between speaker and listener.* A clear example of irony in Uzbek, as described by Qodirova D., is the utterance *"Voy, shunaqa halol odamlarni kam uchratasan!" "Wow, you rarely meet such honest people!",* used in a situation where the addressee has clearly acted dishonestly. On the surface, the statement appears to offer praise, expressing admiration for the person's honesty. However, in reality, the speaker is indirectly criticizing the opposite behavior—dishonesty. According to Qodirova, such irony reflects a cultural preference in Uzbek speech for indirectness and politeness, especially in social or familial contexts where open confrontation may be discouraged. The irony here is achieved through exaggeration and contradiction between literal meaning and actual intent, which the listener understands based on shared social norms and context. The phrase uses a mock-complimentary tone to highlight unethical behavior in a way that maintains conversational harmony while still delivering criticism. This form of irony, rooted in pragmatics and cultural convention, demonstrates how Uzbek speakers employ language not just for information, but also for managing social relationships. We totally believe that, Qodirova's framework is valuable because it provides a localized, pragmatic lens on irony that helps explain not just what is being said, but why and how it is interpreted within the social fabric of Uzbek culture. This is because, Qodirova D.'s approach to irony is both insightful and culturally grounded. Unlike many Western models that focus on irony primarily as a linguistic or logical phenomenon, her analysis recognizes the social and cultural functions of irony in Uzbek communication.[1] This

is a major strength, as it highlights how irony is used not only for humor or critique, but also for maintaining politeness, saving face, and avoiding direct conflict, all of which are deeply valued in Uzbek discourse.Her emphasis on indirectness and contextual meaning aligns well with pragmatic theories, but she adds an important layer by tying these strategies to local communicative norms. For instance, her observations on the use of irony in family and community settings show how it operates as a softening tool, which is often overlooked in more theory-heavy Western approaches.[8] However, according to Islomov, irony in Uzbek functions as a semantic-pragmatic phenomenon, where meaning is shaped not just by linguistic structure, but by context, speaker intent, and cultural background. He views irony as a communicative strategy that reflects the speaker's attitude and emotional stance, often used for ridicule, criticism, or subtle humor.What distinguishes his view is the emphasis on how ironic meaning arises from the interaction between form and context. For example, an ironic statement may structurally resemble praise or agreement, but it acquires an opposite meaning through intonation, social setting, and shared assumptions between speaker and listener. This aligns with pragmatic theories like those of Grice or Sperber and Wilson but is tailored to Uzbek cultural and linguistic realities.[3] Islomov also notes that irony in Uzbek often relies on semantic inversion, where the literal meaning is reversed, and the real message is inferred by the hearer through contextual cues. He sees this as a natural function of figurative language, used not only in literature but also in everyday speech.[2] A representative example of irony in Uzbek, as interpreted through Islomov A.'s framework, is the utterance: *"Gap yo'q, ishni qoyillatibsan!" "No words—what an excellent job you've done!",* used in a context where someone has clearly failed or made a significant mistake.[9] Literally, the sentence appears to offer high praise, but the actual intent is critical or mocking.Islomov A. considers irony part of a broader system of figurative language, where semantic inversion plays a key role. In this case, the structure of the sentence resembles sincere praise, but its meaning is reversed through intonation, facial expression, and contextual knowledge. The speaker relies on the listener's ability to recognize the incongruity between form and intent, which Islomov identifies as essential to understanding irony in Uzbek. This strategy allows speakers to convey negative evaluations indirectly, in line with cultural preferences for politeness and non-confrontation. Islomov, such examples demonstrate that irony in Uzbek is not just a stylistic device but a pragmatic tool for expressing complex attitudes, often functioning to soften criticism, inject humor, or reflect emotional distance. The meaning arises dynamically from the interaction between linguistic form, speaker intention, and shared cultural norms, illustrating the inherently context-dependent nature of ironic communication.[10]

Conclusion. The comparative analysis of irony in English and Uzbek reveals that, while the linguistic expressions may differ, the underlying communicative purpose of irony remains largely universal: to express criticism, humor, or emotional evaluation indirectly. Western theories, particularly Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, explain irony as an echoic utterance in which the speaker dissociates from a commonly held belief. This approach highlights the cognitive and contextual processes involved in recognizing ironic intent.Uzbek scholars such as Qodirova D. and Islomov A. contribute valuable perspectives by emphasizing the pragmatic and culturally embedded nature of irony in Uzbek speech. Qodirova focuses on the role of irony as a politeness strategy, used to maintain social harmony through indirect expression. Islomov, on the other hand, situates irony within the broader system of figurative language, highlighting how semantic inversion and context are essential to interpreting ironic meaning.Together, these perspectives demonstrate that irony is not only a linguistic phenomenon but also a cultural and social tool, shaped by the norms, expectations, and values of each speech community. Understanding irony through both cognitive and cultural lenses allows for a richer appreciation of how language reflects thought, emotion, and social interaction across different languages.

References:

1. Qodirova, D. Pragmatik stilistika asoslari. Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti Nashriyoti.2010

1. 2.Islomov, A. Til va tafakkur: Semantik va pragmatik tadqiqotlar. Toshkent: Fan.2008.

2. 3.Sperber, D., and Wilson, D. Relevance: Communication and Cognition (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.1995.

3. Achilov, O. (2023). Jorj Oruell qalamiga mansub" 1984" asarining ingliz tilidan o'zbek tiliga tarjima tahlili, morfologik va leksik farqliklar. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).

4. Achilov, Oybek Rustamovich, & Inog'Omjonova, Robiya Rustamjon Qizi (2023). The role of lexical transformation in the translation process. Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 3 (4), 288-294.

5. Achilov, Oybek Rustamovich, & Todjidinova, Umida Urinboy Qizi (2023). Tarjimonlik va tarjima madaniyati muammolari. Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 3 (4), 131-135.

6. Achilov, O. (2023). Hozirgi zamon tilshunosligida ilgari surish hodisasini tadqiq etishning nazariy asoslari. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).

7. Achilov, O. (2023). Foregrounding and interpretation. Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики, 5(5).

8. Oybek Achilov. Reflection of foregrounding means in the works of Jack London. Vol. 1 No. 1.3 (2024): O'zMU XABARLARI (1.3 SONI) 2024.https://doi.org/10.69617/uzmu.v1i1.3.1387

9. Achilov, Oybek Rustamovich, & Khudoyberganova, Durdona Ismail Qizi (2023). Stylistic changes in joanna kathleen rowling's harry potter and the philosopher's stone. Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 3 (4), 295-299