European International Journal of Philological Sciences (ISSN: 2751-1715)

Received: 14 April 2026 | Accepted: 02 May 2026 | Published: 31 May 2026

DOI: 10.55640/eijps-06-05-44

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Lexical-Semantic Analysis of Pragmalinguistic Terms "Implicature – Implikatura, Presupposition – Presuppozitsiya, Deixis – Deiksis, And Irony – Ironiya" In English And Uzbek: A Comparative Study

Sabirova Bernara Umarjanovna

Lecturer, PhD Researcher, Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Biruni, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue05 2026

PAGE: 208-221

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Philological Sciences, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This article investigates the lexical-semantic characteristics of four significant English pragmalinguistic terms and their Uzbek equivalents: implicature – implikatura, presupposition – presuppozitsiya, deixis – deiksis, and irony – ironiya. The principal objective is to identify the conceptual, lexical, semantic, and functional relationships between these terminological pairs and determine the extent to which their meanings are preserved in English–Uzbek linguistic comparison. The theoretical framework draws on classical and contemporary pragmatic theories, lexical semantics, contrastive linguistics, and terminology studies. The research employs descriptive, componential, comparative-contrastive, contextual, and functional-pragmatic methods. Particular attention is paid to the distinction between international terminological borrowing and indigenous Uzbek explanatory equivalents, including tagma'no, tagbilim, ishora, and kinoya. The findings demonstrate that the first three pairs exhibit relatively strong formal and conceptual correspondence, whereas the fourth presents a more complex relationship because the Uzbek lexical field of kinoya, kesatiq, piching, and istehzo encompasses several overlapping but non-identical meanings. The study establishes that terminological equivalence should be evaluated through formal, conceptual, functional, and contextual criteria rather than morphological similarity alone. The research contributes to the systematic investigation of English and Uzbek pragmalinguistic terminology and offers a comparative model for identifying semantic correspondence and terminological variation.

KEYWORDS

Pragmalinguistics, lexical semantics, terminology, implicature, implikatura, presupposition, presuppozitsiya, deixis, deiksis, irony, ironiya, kinoya, terminological equivalence, semantic adaptation.

INTRODUCTION

In different communicative contexts, each interlocutor develops and employs individual speech strategies and communicative plans, which guide their behaviour and interaction throughout the communication process. Everyday discourse prioritizes interpersonal harmony and flexibility, academic discourse values caution and mitigation, institutional discourse emphasizes authority and procedural clarity, while media discourse focuses on persuasion and audience

influence. Intercultural communication introduces additional complexity, as speech acts are deeply embedded in cultural norms. Communicative failure often occurs not because speakers lack vocabulary or grammatical knowledge, but because they misapply pragmatic conventions.

The development of modern linguistics has increasingly emphasized the relationship between linguistic meaning, communicative intention, contextual interpretation, and the social conditions of language use. The foundations of this approach can be traced to Austin's speech act theory, which demonstrated that utterances do not merely convey information but can also perform actions within particular communicative circumstances. Traditional linguistic approaches primarily concentrated on the structural and semantic properties of language units, whereas contemporary pragmatic research investigates how speakers produce meaning and how listeners interpret utterances in particular communicative situations. This development has contributed to the establishment of pragmatics and pragmalinguistics as significant areas of linguistic inquiry. It is essential to emphasize that the concept of communication is broader than that of interaction, since it encompasses various forms of interaction as well as methods of message transmission.

Within this framework, linguistic terminology constitutes an important object of investigation. The terminology of a scientific discipline does not merely provide names for theoretical concepts; it also reflects the conceptual organization, methodological principles, and intellectual development of that discipline. Consequently, the lexical-semantic investigation of pragmalinguistic terms is relevant to understanding how international linguistic concepts are adopted, interpreted, and adapted in different languages.

English has played a particularly influential role in the development of contemporary pragmatic terminology. Concepts such as implicature, presupposition, deixis, and irony have acquired established theoretical meanings through the works of internationally recognized linguists and philosophers of language, including H. P. Grice, C. J. Fillmore, S. C. Levinson, D. Sperber, and D. Wilson.

In Uzbek linguistics, these concepts have also become important components of linguistic research. Their terminological forms are generally represented through adapted international borrowings: implikatura, presuppozitsiya, and deiksis. The term ironiya is also used alongside the Uzbek lexical alternative kinoya. However, the existence of a formally corresponding term does not necessarily guarantee complete semantic and functional equivalence.

For instance, the Uzbek word tagma'no may be used to explain certain aspects of implicature, but it is not automatically interchangeable with implikatura. Similarly, tagbilim can describe background assumptions associated with presupposition, although the two concepts do not necessarily have identical theoretical boundaries. The lexical unit kinoya may correspond to irony in numerous contexts, but its semantic scope can also include sarcastic, critical, or indirect evaluative meanings.

These distinctions demonstrate the necessity of examining pragmalinguistic terminology through a comparative lexical-semantic approach. The present research therefore investigates four terminological pairs: implicature – implikatura, presupposition – presuppozitsiya, deixis – deiksis, and irony – ironiya.

The principal research problem concerns the relationship between formal terminological correspondence and actual conceptual equivalence in English and Uzbek. Although the Uzbek forms implikatura, presuppozitsiya, and deiksis are structurally similar to their English counterparts, their explanatory alternatives may differ in semantic scope. Moreover, the term ironiya has several possible Uzbek equivalents, and selecting an appropriate equivalent depends on the communicative function and contextual characteristics of the particular expression. The study consequently addresses three interconnected research questions:

1. To what extent do the selected Uzbek terms preserve the conceptual meaning of their English counterparts?

2. What lexical-semantic similarities and differences characterize the four terminological pairs?

3. Which linguistic, contextual, and cultural factors influence their interpretation and translation?

The main aim of this research is to conduct a comparative lexical-semantic analysis of four English pragmalinguistic terms and their Uzbek equivalents. The objectives are:

1. To examine the theoretical foundations of the selected English terms.

2. To identify their corresponding Uzbek terminological forms.

3. To investigate their denotative, significative, and contextual-semantic characteristics.

4. To distinguish direct terminological borrowing from semantic and explanatory translation.

5. To identify similarities and differences in their use in English and Uzbek.

6. To establish the role of contextual and communicative factors in determining terminological meaning.

7. To propose criteria for evaluating terminological equivalence in English–Uzbek comparative linguistics.

The object of the research consists of English and Uzbek pragmalinguistic terminology. The subject concerns the lexical-semantic, conceptual, and functional characteristics of the terminological pairs implicature – implikatura, presupposition – presuppozitsiya, deixis – deiksis, and irony – ironiya.

The research offers a comparative framework for evaluating the selected terminological pairs according to four principal dimensions:

- formal lexical correspondence;
- conceptual-semantic equivalence;
- functional-pragmatic correspondence;
- contextual and cultural adaptation.

The study argues that terminological similarity should not be interpreted exclusively as morphological or phonetic similarity. A terminological unit must also preserve the essential conceptual characteristics and disciplinary function of the source-language term.

Pragmatics investigates the relationship between linguistic expressions and the contexts in which they are used. Unlike an exclusively semantic approach, which concentrates on conventional linguistic meaning, pragmatic analysis considers speakers, addressees, intentions, background knowledge, communicative situations, and contextual interpretation.

Levinson identifies deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and conversational structure as central areas of pragmatic investigation. His classification is particularly relevant to the present research because three of the four selected terms—implicature, presupposition, and deixis—constitute major components of classical pragmatic theory. Yule also provides a systematic introduction to these central areas of pragmatics, particularly deixis, reference, presupposition, and conversational implicature.

Grice`s theory of conversational implicature established an influential explanation of how speakers communicate meanings that are not directly encoded in the literal content of their utterances. His Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims demonstrate that interpretation frequently depends on the interaction between linguistic form and contextual reasoning.

Similarly, presupposition research investigates the background assumptions associated with linguistic expressions, while deixis examines the contextual anchoring of linguistic units to participants, time, place, and discourse. Irony, in turn, demonstrates the importance of interpreting an utterance beyond its literal meaning. Its interpretation frequently depends on the speaker`s communicative intention, shared knowledge, evaluative attitude, and contextual expectations.

Thus, all four phenomena demonstrate the importance of contextual interpretation, although they represent different theoretical mechanisms. Searle further developed speech act theory by providing a systematic account of the relationship between linguistic expressions, speaker intentions, and communicative acts. His approach is relevant to the present study because the interpretation of implicature and irony frequently requires consideration of the intended communicative force of an utterance.

Lexical semantics investigates the meanings of lexical units and the relationships established between them. In terminology research, however, the analysis must extend beyond ordinary lexical meaning because scientific terms designate specialized concepts within particular disciplinary systems.

Cabré emphasizes the relationship between terminology, specialized knowledge, and communication. From this perspective, a term should be examined not simply as a lexical form but as a linguistic representation of a specialized concept.

The distinction between a term and an ordinary lexical unit is particularly important in comparative linguistic research. A word may have several meanings in general language but acquire a restricted and relatively precise meaning in a specialized discipline.

For example, irony can refer to a rhetorical or literary phenomenon, a communicative strategy, or a pragmatic

mechanism of meaning interpretation. Its precise meaning depends on the theoretical framework in which it is employed. The same principle applies to implicature. In ordinary usage, the word may be associated with implication or suggestion, but in pragmatics it designates a specific mechanism through which an additional meaning is communicated and inferred. For this reason, the present article distinguishes three forms of terminological correspondence:

Formal equivalence. The Uzbek term reproduces the recognizable lexical and morphological structure of the English international term.

Conceptual equivalence. The Uzbek term expresses substantially the same specialized concept.

Functional equivalence. The Uzbek term performs a comparable theoretical or communicative function in the relevant linguistic context.

These dimensions provide the methodological basis for the subsequent comparative analysis.

The study employs descriptive, componential, comparative-contrastive, contextual, terminological, and functional-pragmatic methods.

The descriptive method identifies and explains the meanings of the selected terms. Componential analysis identifies their principal semantic features. The comparative-contrastive method establishes similarities and differences between English and Uzbek terminological units. Contextual analysis examines how the selected pragmatic phenomena operate in communicative situations, while terminological analysis distinguishes international borrowings, adapted forms, and explanatory Uzbek alternatives.

The theoretical materials include major works in pragmatics, terminology, and linguistic semantics, particularly those by Grice, Fillmory, Levinson, Cabré, Mey, Sperber and Wilson, Hakimov, and Safarov.

The term implicature is one of the fundamental concepts in contemporary pragmatics. Its theoretical development is particularly associated with the British philosopher of language H. P. Grice.

In his influential paper "Logic and Conversation", Grice explains how speakers communicate additional meanings that cannot be derived exclusively from the conventional semantic content of their utterances. According to Grice`s approach, communication generally involves an assumption of cooperation between participants. The Cooperative Principle and its associated maxims—Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner—provide a theoretical framework for explaining how listeners infer meanings that are not explicitly expressed.

An implicature can therefore be defined as an additional meaning communicated or inferred through the interaction of an utterance`s linguistic content, conversational expectations, and contextual information Consider the following example:

A: Are you attending the conference tomorrow?

B: I have an important examination tomorrow.

A: Ertaga konferensiyada qatnashasizmi?

B: Ertaga muhim imtihonim bor.

The second speaker does not explicitly say that they will not attend the conference. Nevertheless, the listener can infer that the speaker is unlikely to participate because of the examination. The inferred meaning is not identical to the literal meaning of the response. It emerges through contextual reasoning.

This example demonstrates that implicature is not simply an additional dictionary meaning. It is an interpretative result produced through the interaction of linguistic expression and communicative context.

From a lexical-semantic perspective, the term implicature can be characterized by several conceptual components:

1. Indirectness of communication.
2. Additional or non-explicit meaning.
3. Contextual dependence.
4. Inferential interpretation.
5. Relationship between speaker intention and listener understanding.

These components constitute the conceptual-semantic structure of the term. The distinction between what is said and what is implicated is particularly significant. The speaker`s utterance provides linguistic material, while the listener uses contextual assumptions and communicative expectations to recover the additional meaning.

Grice distinguishes conventional and conversational implicatures. Conversational implicatures are derived through conversational reasoning, whereas conventional implicatures are associated with the conventional meaning of particular

expressions. For example:

English: He is poor but honest. Uzbek: U kambag‘al, ammo halol.

The conjunction but conventionally introduces a contrast or expectation of opposition between the two propositions. In Gricean terminology, this is an example of conventional implicature. By contrast:

English: Some students passed the examination.

Uzbek: Ayrim talabalar imtihondan o‘tdi.

Depending on the context, the listener may infer that not all students passed. This is a possible conversational implicature rather than an unavoidable consequence of the word some. The distinction is important because conversational implicatures are generally cancellable, whereas conventional implicatures are associated more directly with conventional lexical meaning.

The English term implicature is represented in Uzbek academic usage by the adapted international form implikatura. The two terms display a high degree of formal and conceptual correspondence. Both designate an additional meaning inferred through contextual and communicative processes.

However, Uzbek also employs explanatory expressions such as tagma’no, yashirin ma’no, implitsit ma’no, and nazarda tutilgan ma’no. These expressions are useful for explaining the concept but should not automatically be regarded as complete synonyms of implikatura.

For example, yashirin ma’no is a broad descriptive expression. It may refer to implicit information, presupposition, metaphorical meaning, indirect speech acts, or other forms of non-explicit communication. Similarly, tagma’no can describe an underlying or implied layer of meaning, but it does not necessarily identify the specific inferential mechanism associated with Gricean implicature.

The English term implicature is rendered in Uzbek linguistic terminology as implikatura, an adapted international terminological form used in Uzbek pragmalinguistic research.

Analytical dimension	English: implicature	Uzbek: implikatura
Lexical form	Implicature	Implikatura
Conceptual meaning	Additional inferred meaning	Additional inferred meaning
Theoretical basis	Gricean pragmatics	Adopted pragmatic concept
Contextual dependence	High	High
Inferential character	Essential	Essential
Terminological status	Established	Established in academic usage

The pair demonstrates strong terminological equivalence. Its main difference concerns the linguistic adaptation of the international term to Uzbek phonological and morphological conventions. The Uzbek explanatory forms are semantically related but vary in precision. The communicative functions of implicature in both languages include expressing disagreement indirectly, avoiding explicit refusal, communicating criticism, maintaining politeness, producing humour, and conveying additional evaluative information. Consider the following example:

A: How was my presentation?

B: Your slides were certainly colourful.

A: Taqdimotim qanday bo‘ldi?

B: Slaydlaringiz, albatta, juda rang-barang ekan.

Depending on the situation, the response may imply that the presentation was not particularly successful. The speaker avoids direct negative evaluation by commenting on a secondary characteristic. The pragmatic interpretation depends on intonation, previous knowledge, interpersonal relations, and the expectations of the participants. This demonstrates that the conceptual mechanism of implicature can be comparable across English and Uzbek, even when the linguistic expressions used to realize it differs.

As a conclusion Implicature – implikatura represents a strong case of international terminological equivalence. The Uzbek explanatdifferssrms tagma’no and yashirin ma’no are useful

semantic interpretations but should not replace the established technical term in theoretical discussion.

The term presupposition occupies an important position in linguistic semantics and pragmatics. It refers to information that a speaker treats as already established, accepted, or available as background knowledge when producing an utterance.

Presupposition is closely associated with the interpretation of linguistic expressions and the relationship between explicit propositions and assumed background information. In contemporary linguistic research, presupposition is examined from semantic, pragmatic, cognitive, and discourse-oriented perspectives.

Consider the following example:

English: John has stopped smoking. Uzbek: Jon chekishni tashladi.

The English verb phrase has stopped smoking and the Uzbek expression chekishni tashladi suggest that John smoked previously. The proposition that John previously smoked is not the main assertion. Instead, it functions as background information associated with the utterance. Another example:

English: Mary regrets that she missed the meeting.

Uzbek: Meri yig'ilishni o'tkazib yuborganidan afsusda.

The verb regret introduces a factive presupposition: Mary missed the meeting. These examples illustrate the difference between asserted information and background assumptions. The conceptual-semantic structure of presupposition includes the following

features:

1. Background information.
2. Assumed familiarity or acceptance.
3. Relationship with linguistic triggers.
4. Contextual interpretability.
5. Potential persistence under certain sentence transformations.

One important property of presupposition is its tendency to remain identifiable when a sentence is negated or questioned . For example:

Affirmative: John has stopped smoking. Negative: John has not stopped smoking.

Question: Has John stopped smoking?

All three constructions generally preserve the assumption that John smoked previously. This phenomenon is commonly discussed as presupposition projection.

Nevertheless, presupposition projection is not unrestricted. Context, discourse organization, and the linguistic environment can influence whether a presupposition is maintained, accommodated, or challenged.

The English term presupposition is represented in Uzbek by presuppozitsiya. This form is an adapted international borrowing and is used in Uzbek linguistic research. Uzbek linguistics also employs the expressions tagbilim, oldindan ma'lum axborot, oldindan faraz qilingan ma'no, and fon bilimlari. Among these expressions, tagbilim is particularly important because it identifies the background knowledge involved in interpreting an utterance. Uzbek linguistic research has discussed the relationship between tagma'no, tagbilim, and presuppozitsiya. Hakimov`s monograph on the foundations of Uzbek pragmalinguistics provides an important theoretical context for investigating pragmatic meaning and interpretation. The investigation of linguistic presupposition in Uzbek linguistics is also reflected in Rahimov`s study, which provides an additional national scholarly perspective for examining the relationship between presuppositional meaning and Uzbek linguistic expression.

Nevertheless, tagbilim and presuppozitsiya should not be treated as completely interchangeable. Tagbilim primarily emphasizes the knowledge assumed to be available to communication participants. Presupposition, however, refers to a linguistic and interpretative phenomenon through which particular propositions are treated as background assumptions.

Thus, background knowledge can support presupposition, but the two concepts do not have identical theoretical scopes.

Feature	English: presupposition	Uzbek: presuppozitsiya
Core meaning	Background assumption	Background assumption

Linguistic realization	Lexical and grammatical triggers	Lexical, grammatical and contextual triggers
Contextual dependence	Significant	Significant
Relationship with common knowledge	Strong	Strong
Terminological form	International English term	Adapted international borrowing
Explanatory alternative	Background assumption	Tagbilim, oldindan faraz

The English and Uzbek terms demonstrate a high degree of conceptual correspondence. However, the explanatory equivalents require careful differentiation. For example, oldindan faraz may suggest a speaker`s expectation or assumption, whereas a presupposition can be conventionally associated with a linguistic construction. Similarly, tagbilim emphasizes background knowledge rather than the full linguistic mechanism through which presuppositional content is activated.

Presupposition performs several important functions in communication: introducing information as already known, reducing the amount of explicitly expressed information, establishing shared assumptions, organizing discourse, supporting indirect evaluation, and facilitating the interpretation of subsequent statements. Consider the following example:

English: When did you return to Tashkent?

Uzbek: Toshkentga qachon qaytdingiz?

The question presupposes that the addressee returned to Tashkent. If the addressee has not returned, the presupposition may be challenged:

English: I have not returned to Tashkent.

Uzbek: Men hali Toshkentga qaytganim yo‘q.

This response demonstrates that presuppositions are not necessarily accepted by all participants. They may be questioned or rejected during interaction. Another example:

English: Even the youngest student understood the explanation.

Uzbek: Hatto eng yosh talaba ham izohni tushundi.

The expression even suggests an expectation that the youngest student might have been less likely to understand the explanation. The Uzbek particle hatto performs a comparable discourse-pragmatic function.

Nevertheless, the exact interpretation depends on the context and the assumptions shared by the speakers.

Presupposition – presuppozitsiya demonstrates strong conceptual and terminological correspondence. The Uzbek terms tagbilim and oldindan faraz are useful explanatory alternatives, but neither fully replaces the technical meaning of presuppozitsiya.

The term deixis originates from a Greek word associated with pointing or indicating. In linguistics, it refers to expressions whose interpretation depends on the communicative situation. Deictic expressions are interpreted with reference to the speaker, addressee, time, place, and discourse context. Fillmore provides an influential discussion of deixis, emphasizing the relationship between linguistic expressions and the contextual circumstances in which they are interpreted. Levinson also identifies deixis as a central component of pragmatic theory.

Unlike expressions with relatively stable referential meanings, deictic expressions require contextual anchoring. For example, the English pronoun I cannot be assigned a specific referent without identifying the speaker. Likewise, here and now require information about the location and time of the utterance. Consider:

English: I will meet you here tomorrow.

Uzbek: Men ertaga siz bilan shu yerda uchrashaman.

The interpretation of I, you, here, and tomorrow depends on the participants and circumstances of communication.

The semantic structure of deixis is based on the relationship

between linguistic expressions and the communicative situation. The major categories traditionally discussed in pragmatic research include the following.

1. Person deixis. Person deixis identifies the participants in communication.

English: I, you, we, they. Uzbek: men, sen, siz, biz, ular.

Example: English: I will explain the problem to you.

Uzbek: Men sizga muammoni tushuntiraman.

The interpretation of the pronouns depends on the identities of the speaker and addressee.

2. Spatial deixis. Spatial deixis identifies the location of an entity in relation to the speaker or another reference point.

English: here, there, this place, that place.

Uzbek: bu yerda, shu yerda, u yerda, ana u joyda. Example:

English: Leave the documents here. Uzbek: Hujjatlarni shu yerda qoldiring.

The word here and its Uzbek equivalent shu yerda refer to a location associated with the communicative situation.

3. Temporal deixis. Temporal deixis locates events in relation to the time of speaking.

English: now, yesterday, today, tomorrow, then.

Uzbek: hozir, kecha, bugun, ertaga, o‘shanda. Example:

English: We will discuss the issue tomorrow.

Uzbek: Biz bu masalani ertaga muhokama qilamiz.

The reference of tomorrow depends on the date of utterance.

4. Discourse deixis. Discourse deixis refers to parts of the discourse itself.

English: this, that, the following, the previous.

Uzbek: bu, ana shu, quyidagi, yuqoridagi.

Example: English: This is the main argument of the article.

Uzbek: Bu maqolaning asosiy dalilidir.

The demonstrative this refers to an element of the discourse rather than necessarily indicating a physical object.

5. Social deixis. Social deixis expresses social relationships, status, respect, or degrees of interpersonal distance .

English: titles, honorific expressions, and formal address forms.

Uzbek: siz, janob, xonim, ustoz, domla, hurmatli. Example:

English: Could you explain this issue, Professor?

Uzbek: Professor, ushbu masalani tushuntirib bera olasizmi?

The choice of address form reflects the social relationship between the participants.

The English term deixis is represented in Uzbek academic usage by deiksis. The term deiktik birlik is also used to refer to a linguistic unit performing a deictic function. Uzbek explanatory alternatives include ishora, ko‘rsatish, ko‘rsatish birligi, and ishora birliklari. However, these expressions should not be regarded as complete equivalents of the technical term.

The word ishora generally refers to pointing, indication, or a sign. Deixis, by contrast, is a linguistic phenomenon involving the contextual anchoring of expressions. For instance, the pronoun I is deictic even though it does not necessarily involve a physical gesture.

Therefore, deiksis is the more precise term for academic linguistic analysis. The use of deictic terminology in Uzbek research is consistent with the broader development of Uzbek pragmalinguistics.

Analytical dimension	English: deixis	Uzbek: deiksis
Etymological meaning	Pointing or indicating	Adapted international concept
Core linguistic meaning	Context-dependent reference	Context-dependent reference
Person category	I, you, we	Men, sen, siz, biz
Spatial category	Here, there	Bu yerda, u yerda
Temporal category	Now, then	Hozir, o‘shanda

Discourse category	This, that	Bu, ana shu
Social category	Titles and address forms	Siz, ustoz, janob
Terminological status	Established	Established in academic usage

The pair demonstrates a strong conceptual correspondence. Nevertheless, English and Uzbek may differ in the linguistic means through which deictic meanings are expressed. For example, the Uzbek second-person pronouns sen and siz encode distinctions in interpersonal relations that are not directly reproduced by the English pronoun you. This difference is particularly important for social deixis.

The Uzbek form siz can communicate respect, politeness, formality, or social distance, depending on the situation. English generally requires additional lexical, grammatical, or prosodic resources to express comparable distinctions.

Deixis performs several functions: identifying participants, locating events in time and space, establishing discourse reference, expressing interpersonal relationships, and connecting linguistic expressions with communicative reality. Consider: English: Come here now. Uzbek: Hozir bu yerga keling.

The utterance contains both temporal and spatial deixis. The speaker identifies a location and a time relative to the communicative situation. Another example:

English: I told you about this yesterday. Uzbek: Men sizga bu haqda kecha aytgan edim.

The sentence includes person, discourse, and temporal deixis. The Uzbek and English expressions perform comparable communicative functions, although their morphological and syntactic structures differ.

Conclusion: Deixis – deiksis is a strong example of international terminological borrowing with conceptual preservation. The Uzbek forms ishora and ko‘rsatish are explanatory expressions, while deiksis remains the more accurate technical term.

The term irony differs from the preceding three terms because its theoretical scope extends beyond pragmatics into rhetoric, stylistics, literary studies, discourse analysis, and cognitive linguistics. In pragmatic research, irony is commonly examined as a communicative phenomenon in which the speaker`s intended meaning differs from, or stands in an evaluative relationship with, the literal meaning of the utterance. Irony frequently involves an interaction between literal expression, contextual expectations, speaker attitude, and listener interpretation.

Grice`s theory of conversational implicature provides an important basis for explaining ironic utterances. In particular, ironic communication may involve the deliberate expression of a proposition that is understood as incompatible with the speaker`s actual evaluation.

However, irony cannot be reduced exclusively to the opposition between literal and intended meanings. Sperber and Wilson`s relevance-theoretic approach offers an alternative account in which irony is associated with the expression of an attributed thought or utterance and the speaker's attitude towards it. Their account emphasizes the interpretative and contextual dimensions of ironic communication.

The conceptual-semantic structure of irony may include:

1. Contrast between expressed and intended meaning.
2. Evaluative or attitudinal content.
3. Contextual dependence.
4. Recognition of communicative intention.
5. Potential humorous, critical, or distancing effects. Consider the following example:

English: What a wonderful performance! (Context: The performance was unsuccessful.)

Uzbek: Qanday ajoyib chiqish bo‘ldi! (Context: The performance was unsuccessful.)

The literal expression communicates positive evaluation. However, the communicative situation indicates that the speaker intends a negative or critical evaluation. The listener recognizes the irony through contextual information, intonation, shared expectations, and the speaker's attitude.

Nevertheless, not every expression with an opposite literal and intended meaning should automatically be classified as irony. The analysis must consider the communicative circumstances and the speaker`s evaluative stance.

The English term irony is represented in Uzbek by the international form ironiya and the indigenous lexical alternative kinoya. Other related Uzbek expressions include kesatiq, piching, istehzo, and shama.

Although these expressions may overlap semantically, they do not always designate identical phenomena.

Ironiya – ironiya. The international term is suitable for theoretical and comparative research because it maintains a recognizable relationship with the English concept.

The term kinoya is a widely used Uzbek lexical alternative. It can express indirect evaluation, implied criticism, or a meaning that differs from the literal expression. Kesatiq generally emphasizes a pointed or critical remark directed at a person or situation. Piching often refers to a sarcastic or mocking expression that indirectly communicates criticism. Istehzo emphasizes a mocking, contemptuous, or derisive attitude. Shama refers more generally to indirect indication or allusion and is not necessarily ironic.

These distinctions demonstrate that the Uzbek lexical field associated with irony contains several semantically related but non-identical units. Consequently, the translation of irony requires attention to contextual meaning rather than the automatic selection of one Uzbek equivalent.

Comparative lexical-semantic characteristics

English concept	Uzbek equivalent	Main semantic feature
Irony	Ironiya	International theoretical term
Irony	Kinoya	Indirect or implied evaluative meaning
Sarcasm	Kesatiq piching	Sharper criticism or mockery
Mockery	Masxara	Ridicule
Allusion	Shama	Indirect reference
Derision	Istehzo	Contemptuous or mocking attitude

This table illustrates why kinoya should not be considered a universal substitute for every occurrence of irony. For instance, irony may be affectionate, humorous, self-directed, situational, or critical. By contrast, kesatiq and piching frequently carry stronger negative interpersonal implications.

Thus, the semantic scope of the Uzbek equivalents must be evaluated according to the particular communicative context.

Irony performs several communicative functions: expressing criticism indirectly, communicating disagreement, producing humour, establishing interpersonal distance, expressing dissatisfaction, challenging social expectations, and strengthening evaluative meaning. Example 1: Positive wording with negative evaluation

English: A: I forgot to send the documents again.

B: Excellent! You are becoming very reliable.

Uzbek: A: Hujjatlarni yana yuborishni unutibman.

B: Ajoyib! Ishonchliligingiz kundan-kunga oshib boryapti.

The second speaker uses positive expressions to communicate criticism.

Example 2: Context-dependent irony

English: A: We have been waiting for three hours.

B: What excellent service!

Uzbek: A: Uch soatdan beri kutyapmiz.

B: Xizmat ko‘rsatish darajasi naqadar ajoyib!

In this example, the positive evaluation is inconsistent with the negative experience described by the participants.

Example 3: Indirect criticism

English: That was a rather interesting decision.

Uzbek: Bu ancha qiziqarli qaror bo‘libdi.

Depending on the context, the utterance may communicate

doubt or disapproval without expressing it directly.These examples demonstrate that the pragmatic function of irony is not determined exclusively by individual lexical items. It emerges through the relationship between the utterance, context, communicative intention, and shared knowledge.

The comparison of English and Uzbek irony requires attention to cultural conventions and interpersonal relationships. The interpretation of irony may depend on the degree of familiarity between speakers, social hierarchy, communicative formality, intonation and prosody, shared cultural knowledge, the acceptability of direct criticism, and the speaker`s intention. Pragmatics investigates the relationship between linguistic expressions …For example, an ironic expression used between close friends may be interpreted as humorous rather than offensive. The same expression in a formal professional context may be perceived as disrespectful.

Uzbek communication may also employ lexical forms such as kinoya, piching, and kesatiq to express different degrees of indirect criticism. These forms should be distinguished rather than treated as complete synonyms.

As a conclusion: Irony – ironiya represents a strong formal terminological correspondence, while kinoya is an important Uzbek semantic and functional equivalent. Nevertheless, kesatiq, piching, and istehzo express more specific evaluative features and should be selected according to contextual meaning.

The analysis of the four pairs demonstrates that English and Uzbek pragmalinguistic terminology exhibits both international conceptual similarities and language-specific lexical-semantic characteristics.

The terms implicature, presupposition, and deixis are established components of pragmatic theory. Their Uzbek counterparts are formed primarily through the adaptation of international terminology. The term irony also has an established Uzbek international equivalent, ironiya, but its lexical-semantic field includes several indigenous alternatives with different pragmatic implications.

Comparative terminological classification

English term	Uzbek term	Formal equivalence	Conceptual equivalence	Main distinction
Implicature	Implikatura	High	High	Tagma’no is broader
Presupposition	Presuppozitsiya	High	High	Tagbilim emphasizes background knowledge
Deixis	Deiksis	High	High	Ishora is less specialized
Irony	Ironiya	High	High, subject to theoretical definition	Kinoya and related forms have different semantic nuances

The classification indicates that formal similarity is particularly strong in all four international terminological pairs. However, the explanatory alternatives display different degrees of conceptual correspondence.

Implicature and presupposition. Both involve meanings that are not necessarily asserted directly. However, implicature is generally derived through inferential reasoning, whereas presupposition concerns background information associated with an utterance.

Presupposition and deixis. Both depend on contextual interpretation, but they perform different functions. Presupposition introduces or activates background assumptions, whereas deixis anchors linguistic expressions to the communicative situation.

Implicature and irony. Irony may generate implicatures, particularly when the speaker communicates an evaluative meaning indirectly. Nevertheless, not every implicature is ironic, and not every theory of irony reduces irony to implicature.

Deixis and irony. Deictic expressions may contribute to the interpretation of irony by establishing the relevant participants, time, place, and discourse reference. However, deixis itself does not necessarily produce ironic meaning.

On the basis of the comparative analysis, the following model can be proposed:

English terminological form → specialized concept → semantic components → Uzbek terminological equivalent → contextual realization → functional interpretation. The model emphasizes that the translation of a term should not be based exclusively on its external linguistic form. For example:

Implicature → inferred additional meaning → contextual inference → implikatura → tagma'no as an explanatory alternative → indirect communication.

Similarly:

Presupposition → background assumption → shared or accommodated information → presuppozitsiya → tagbilim as an explanatory alternative → establishment of common ground.

For deixis:

Deixis → context-dependent reference → person, time, place, discourse, and social relations → deiksis → ishora as an explanatory expression → contextual anchoring.

For irony:

Irony → contextually interpreted evaluative meaning → contrast, attitude, and inference → ironiya → kinoya as a frequent Uzbek equivalent → indirect criticism, humour, or evaluation.

This model may be useful for future research into the lexical-semantic organization of English and Uzbek pragmalinguistic terminology.

Comparative findings reveal that the relationship between English and Uzbek pragmalinguistic terms cannot be explained exclusively through direct lexical translation. The selected terms demonstrate the importance of separating international terminological borrowing from explanatory lexical alternatives.

First, the pairs implicature – implikatura and presupposition – presuppozitsiya show that international scientific terminology can be incorporated into Uzbek without fundamentally changing the conceptual meaning of the source terms. Nevertheless, explanatory alternatives such as tagma'no and tagbilim require careful interpretation because they may refer to broader or related semantic phenomena.

Second, the pair deixis – deiksis demonstrates that international terminological borrowing can provide greater conceptual precision than a general Uzbek explanatory equivalent such as ishora. The latter identifies the basic idea of pointing or indicating but does not fully express the specialized linguistic mechanism of contextual reference.

Third, irony – ironiya presents a more complex case of terminological correspondence. Although ironiya is formally and conceptually close to the English term, the Uzbek equivalents kinoya, kesatiq, piching, and istehzo represent different aspects of indirect evaluation and speaker attitude.

This distinction is especially relevant to translation studies. A translator who automatically replaces every occurrence of irony with kinoya may fail to preserve the intended pragmatic effect when the source expression communicates sarcasm, ridicule, affectionate humour, or another evaluative meaning.

The findings also confirm that contextual interpretation is a common analytical dimension across the four categories. However, context performs different theoretical functions in each case:

- In implicature, context supports inferential recovery of additional meaning.
- In presupposition, context supports the identification and accommodation of background assumptions.
- In deixis, context establishes the reference point for interpreting linguistic expressions.
- In irony, context enables the recognition of the speaker's intended evaluative meaning.

Consequently, contextual dependence should be understood as a shared feature of pragmatic interpretation rather than as evidence that the four concepts have identical semantic structures.

The study further suggests that the use of international terminology alongside explanatory Uzbek forms is a productive approach to academic communication. In theoretical discussion, the international borrowing should generally be retained where it represents an established disciplinary concept. The Uzbek explanatory alternative can then be introduced to clarify its meaning and language-specific realization.

CONCLUSION

The present research has examined the lexical-semantic characteristics of four English pragmalinguistic terms and their Uzbek equivalents: implicature – implikatura, presupposition – presuppozitsiya, deixis – deiksis, and irony – ironiya.

The comparative analysis leads to the following conclusions.

First, all four English terms have established theoretical relevance to pragmatic or pragmalinguistic research. Nevertheless, their theoretical status differs. Implicature, presupposition, and deixis are central categories of classical pragmatics, whereas irony is a broader communicative phenomenon studied across pragmatics, rhetoric, stylistics, and discourse analysis.

Second, the Uzbek forms implikatura, presuppozitsiya, deiksis, and ironiya demonstrate the adoption and adaptation of international linguistic terminology. They provide recognizable terminological correspondences to their English counterparts.

Third, the explanatory alternatives do not always demonstrate complete conceptual equivalence. Tagma'no is broader than implikatura; tagbilim emphasizes background knowledge rather than the entire theoretical scope of presupposition; ishora does not fully reproduce the specialized meaning of deixis; and kinoya may represent only certain semantic and pragmatic dimensions of irony.

Fourth, the comparative investigation establishes that terminological equivalence should be evaluated according to formal, conceptual, functional, and contextual criteria. Formal similarity alone is insufficient to determine whether two terms designate the same scientific concept.

Fifth, the four categories demonstrate different relationships between linguistic form and contextual meaning. Implicature involves inference, presupposition involves background assumptions, deixis involves contextual reference, and irony involves the interpretation of an evaluative communicative intention.

Sixth, English and Uzbek demonstrate comparable pragmatic mechanisms, but the linguistic resources through which these mechanisms are expressed may differ. These differences are particularly evident in social deixis and the lexical field of irony.

Seventh, the study proposes retaining the international forms implikatura, presuppozitsiya, deiksis, and ironiya as the principal technical terms in comparative academic discussion, while using their Uzbek explanatory alternatives where they improve conceptual clarity.

In general, the research demonstrates that the lexical-semantic investigation of pragmalinguistic terminology requires an integrated approach combining lexical semantics, pragmatics, contrastive linguistics, and terminology studies. Such an approach contributes to the systematic development of Uzbek linguistic terminology and supports greater precision in English–Uzbek comparative research.

REFERENCES

1. Sabirova, B. U. (2024). Pragmalingvistik termin "kommunikativ kompetensiya" va "kommunikatsiya"larning leksik-semantik tadqiqi. Xorazm Ma'mun akademiyasi axborotnomasi, 7(4), 170–175. http://mamun.uz/uz/page/56
2. Abidova, R. (2026). Cross-discourse realization of speech acts and communicative errors in intercultural communication. World Bulletin of Social Sciences, 58, 50–54.
3. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313
4. Sabirova, B. (2025). Lexical-semantic study of the pragmalinguistic terms "communicative competence" and "communication" in the English language. Journal of Advanced Linguistic Studies, 12(2), 1016–1027. https://bahripublications.co.in/pdf/JALS/JALS%2C%20No.%202%2C%20Jul-Dec%202025/77%20-%20Lexical-semantic%20study%20of%20the%20-%20FULLY%20FINAL.pdf
5. Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An introduction (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
6. Cabré, M. T. (1999). Terminology: Theory, methods and applications. (J.C)
7. Fillmore, C. J. (1975). Santa Cruz lectures on deixis, 1971. Indiana University Linguistics Club.
8. 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.
9. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1981). Irony and the use-mention distinction. In P. Cole (Ed.), Radical pragmatics (pp. 295–318). Academic Press.

10. Ҳакимов, М. (2013). Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси асослари. Akademnashr.

11. Сафаров, Ш. (2008). Прагмалингвистика. Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси Давлат илмий нашриёти.

12. Schwarz, F. (2016). Experimental work in presupposition and presupposition projection. Annual Review of Linguistics, 2, 273–292. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011415-040809

13. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). Relevance: Communication and cognition. Basil Blackwell.

14. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

15. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.

16. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

17. Раҳимов, У. (2004). Лисоний пресуппозиция. In Айюб Ғулом ва ўзбек тилшунослиги: Илмий ишлар тўплами (б. 57–60).