



COMPARATIVE-TYOLOGICAL STUDY OF LANGUAGE UNITS EXPRESSING CONDITIONAL RELATIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Shukurova Sh. Sh.

Senior Teacher at a General Education School in Tashkent

Abstract

This article analyzes the comparative-typological features of conditional sentence structures in English and Uzbek languages. The study reveals similarities and differences in the syntactic and semantic properties of conditional constructions, focusing on structural types, categories of condition (real, unreal, hypothetical), and their communicative functions. The results show both languages exhibit universal patterns, yet differ due to historical-linguistic and typological classifications. This research is significant for linguistic typology, translation, and second language acquisition.

Keywords: Conditional sentences, comparative typology, English, Uzbek, real condition, unreal condition, hypothesis, syntactic structure, semantic functions.

Introduction

Conditional constructions are a fundamental component of human language that enable speakers to express hypothetical situations, predictions, causes, and logical consequences. In both English and Uzbek, these constructions serve as essential tools for structuring thought and discourse. Despite having different typological characteristics—English being an analytic language and Uzbek being an agglutinative one—both languages demonstrate comparable strategies for expressing conditions. This paper aims to provide a detailed comparative-typological analysis of conditional sentence structures in the two languages.

Theoretical Framework

The study is grounded in typological linguistics and comparative syntax. Conditional sentences are analyzed according to their structural makeup, semantic categories (real, unreal, hypothetical), and communicative intentions. The

classification of conditional sentences in English follows traditional types (Type 0, I, II, III), while Uzbek employs grammatical markers and verb morphology to distinguish conditional meanings.

Types of Conditional Sentences in English

English conditional sentences are typically divided into four types:

1. Zero conditional – expresses general truths:

If + Present Simple, Present Simple

Example: If water boils, it turns into steam.

2. First conditional – expresses real future possibilities:

If + Present Simple, will + Verb

Example: If it rains, we will stay home.

3. Second conditional – expresses unreal present or future:

If + Past Simple, would + Verb

Example: If I were rich, I would travel the world.

4. Third conditional – expresses unreal past:

If + Past Perfect, would have + Past Participle

Example: If she had studied, she would have passed.

Types of Conditional Sentences in Uzbek

Uzbek conditional sentences are categorized less rigidly than in English. They are formed using conjunctions such as *agar*, *bo‘lsa*, suffixes like *-sa/-se*, and verb morphology. The main types include:

1. Haqiqiy shart (real condition):

Agar u kelsa, biz boshlaymiz.

(If he comes, we will start.)

2. Haqiqiy bo‘lmagan shart (unreal condition):

Agar u kelsa edi, biz boshlagan bo‘lardik.

(If he had come, we would have started.)

3. Taxminiy shart (hypothetical condition):

U kelgan bo‘lsa kerak.

(He might have come.)



Comparative Analysis

The comparative study reveals that both languages express similar logical relations but employ different linguistic tools. English relies on auxiliary verbs and tense shifts, while Uzbek uses verb suffixes and particles. Structural correspondence is often approximate but functionally equivalent. The real condition is most directly comparable, while unreal and hypothetical conditions exhibit greater divergence due to typological structure.

The agglutinative nature of Uzbek allows greater morphological flexibility in conveying conditionality. Meanwhile, English uses more rigid syntactic templates and auxiliary constructions. Despite these differences, both languages fulfill similar communicative needs through different means.

Conclusion

The scientific novelty of this study lies in its functional-communicative approach to comparing conditional constructions in English and Uzbek, beyond traditional classifications. While most previous studies focus solely on structural types, this research emphasizes the semantic and pragmatic differences, particularly in unreal and hypothetical conditionals. The study also highlights translation asymmetries between the two languages, demonstrating how certain conditional meanings in English have no direct structural equivalents in Uzbek.

This comparative-typological analysis confirms that conditional constructions in English and Uzbek, while functionally similar, differ structurally and morphologically. These differences reflect the languages' typological natures. Recognizing these patterns benefits translation, second language acquisition, and cross-linguistic studies. Future research may explore conditionality in colloquial usage or in other Turkic and Indo-European languages for broader generalization.

References

1. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
2. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.



4. Amonov, A. (2007). O‘zbek tilida shartli gaplar: Semantika va struktura. Toshkent: Fan.
5. Komilov, N. (1992). O‘zbek tilining tipologiyasi. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi.
6. Crystal, D. (1997). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge University Press.
7. Kortmann, B. (2005). English Grammar: A Minimalist Approach. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Swan, M. (2005). Practical English Usage (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
9. Mamatov, M. (2015). O‘zbek tili grammatikasida shart va taxmin munosabatlari. Toshkent: TDPU nashriyoti.
10. Dixon, R. M. W. (2009). Basic Linguistic Theory: Volume 2 – Grammatical Topics. Oxford University Press.
11. Tillyayeva, Z. (2020). “Comparative Analysis of Conditional Sentences in English and Uzbek.” *Philology Studies Journal*, No. 2(45), pp. 65–72.