INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 8.854 Volume 13, issue 04 (2026)

DIFFERENCES AND CHALLENGES IN TRANSLATING IRONY BETWEEN UZBEK AND ENGLISH: A PRAGMATIC AND CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY

Latipov Bobur Bakhromovich
Teacher of Karshi State University

Abstract: Irony represents one of the most intricate and context-dependent phenomena in human communication, functioning as a pragmatic mechanism through which speakers convey meanings that diverge from literal expression. This article investigates the differences in the realization and functions of irony in Uzbek and English, as well as the challenges that arise in translating ironic expressions between these two linguistically and culturally distinct systems. The study adopts a qualitative comparative methodology based on literary texts, media discourse, and lexicographic materials. It is argued that English irony is frequently supported by explicit linguistic markers, whereas Uzbek irony is predominantly implicit and relies heavily on contextual and cultural inference. These differences generate significant translation challenges, including the loss of pragmatic meaning, cultural mismatch, and interpretive ambiguity. The study further demonstrates that successful translation of irony requires prioritizing pragmatic equivalence over formal correspondence. In addition, the article highlights the limitations of existing lexicographic practices in capturing the contextual and functional dimensions of irony. The findings contribute to translation studies, pragmatics, and intercultural communication by offering a comprehensive framework for understanding and translating irony across languages.

Keywords: irony, translation studies, Uzbek language, English language, pragmatic equivalence, cross-cultural communication, figurative language, discourse analysis, translation strategies, implicit meaning, linguistic pragmatics, intercultural translation, semantic shift, contextual inference.

РАЗЛИЧИЯ И ТРУДНОСТИ ПЕРЕВОДА ИРОНИИ МЕЖДУ УЗБЕКСКИМ И АНГЛИЙСКИМ ЯЗЫКАМИ: ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКОЕ И КРОСС-КУЛЬТУРНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ

Латипов Бобур Бахромович
Преподаватель Каршинского государственного университета

Аннотация: Ирония представляет собой одно из наиболее сложных и контекстно обусловленных явлений в человеческой коммуникации, функционируя как прагматический механизм, с помощью которого говорящий передаёт смысл, отличающийся от буквального выражения. В данной статье исследуются различия в реализации и функциях иронии в узбекском и английском языках, а также трудности, возникающие при переводе иронических выражений между этими двумя лингвистически и культурно различными системами.

В исследовании применяется качественная сравнительная методология, основанная на анализе художественных текстов, медиадискурса и лексикографических материалов. Утверждается, что ирония в английском языке часто поддерживается явными языковыми маркерами, тогда как узбекская ирония преимущественно носит имплицитный характер и в значительной степени опирается на контекстуальные и культурные факторы.

Выявленные различия порождают существенные трудности перевода, включая утрату прагматического значения, культурные несоответствия и интерпретационную неоднозначность. В статье также показано, что успешный перевод иронии требует приоритета прагматической эквивалентности над формальным соответствием. Кроме того, подчёркиваются ограничения существующих лексикографических практик в отражении контекстуальных и функциональных аспектов иронии.

Полученные результаты вносят вклад в развитие переводоведения, прагматики и межкультурной коммуникации, предлагая комплексную модель для понимания и перевода иронии в разных языках.

Ключевые слова: ирония, переводоведение, узбекский язык, английский язык, прагматическая эквивалентность, межкультурная коммуникация, фигуративный язык, дискурсивный анализ, стратегии перевода, имплицитное значение, лингвистическая прагматика, межкультурный перевод, семантический сдвиг, контекстуальная интерпретация.

Introduction

Irony, as a communicative phenomenon, occupies a unique position within linguistic and pragmatic studies due to its inherently indirect nature and its dependence on contextual interpretation. Unlike literal language, which conveys meaning explicitly through lexical and grammatical structures, irony operates through a discrepancy between what is said and what is intended. This discrepancy requires the listener or reader to engage in a process of inference, drawing upon contextual knowledge, cultural norms, and communicative expectations.

The theoretical foundation for understanding irony has been significantly influenced by the work of H. P. Grice, who introduced the concept of conversational implicature. According to Grice, irony arises when a speaker deliberately violates the maxim of quality – namely, the expectation that speakers should be truthful – in order to prompt the listener to infer an alternative meaning[1]. This interpretation places irony within the broader framework of pragmatic inference, emphasizing the cooperative nature of communication and the role of shared assumptions.

Subsequent developments in pragmatics, particularly within relevance theory, have refined this perspective by conceptualizing irony as a form of echoic representation. Sperber and Wilson argue that ironic utterances echo a previously expressed or implied thought while simultaneously expressing a critical or distancing attitude toward it[2]. This approach highlights the cognitive dimension of irony, suggesting that its interpretation involves both recognition of the echoed content and evaluation of the speaker’s stance.

Despite these theoretical advances, irony remains a challenging phenomenon to analyze, particularly in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural contexts. While irony is a universal feature of human communication, its realization varies significantly across languages. These variations are shaped by differences in linguistic structure, communicative conventions, and cultural norms.

In English, irony is often marked explicitly through linguistic devices such as lexical contrast, exaggeration, and prosodic cues. For example, an utterance like “That was just perfect” may be used ironically in a context where the outcome is clearly negative. The ironic meaning is signaled by the incongruity between the positive evaluation and the negative situation.

In Uzbek, by contrast, irony tends to be less overtly marked and more dependent on contextual interpretation. The same evaluative stance may be conveyed through expressions that do not contain explicit markers of irony but derive their meaning from situational context and shared cultural understanding. This reliance on implicit communication reflects broader

[1] Grice, H. P. *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press, 1975, p. 45.
[2] Sperber, D., Wilson, D. *Irony and the Use-Mention Distinction*. London, 1981, p. 308.

tendencies within Uzbek discourse, where indirectness and contextual sensitivity play a central role.

These differences have important implications for translation. Translating irony is not simply a matter of substituting words from one language to another; rather, it involves reconstructing a complex interplay of meaning, intention, and effect. As Peter Newmark observes, irony poses a particular challenge for translators because it depends heavily on the reader's ability to recognize the discrepancy between literal and intended meaning[3]. When this discrepancy is not preserved in translation, the ironic effect may be lost entirely.

Moreover, the translation of irony is further complicated by cultural factors. Ironic expressions often rely on shared cultural knowledge, including social norms, values, and stereotypes. When these cultural references are not shared by the target audience, the translator must find alternative means of conveying the intended meaning. This process may involve adaptation, explanation, or even omission, each of which has implications for the fidelity and effectiveness of the translation.

Another dimension of the problem concerns lexicography. Dictionaries play a crucial role in mediating between languages, yet they often fail to capture the pragmatic and contextual aspects of meaning. In the case of irony, dictionary definitions tend to be abstract and generalized, providing little guidance on how ironic expressions function in actual discourse. As a result, translators and language learners may struggle to interpret and reproduce irony accurately.

The present study seeks to address these issues by providing a detailed analysis of the differences and challenges involved in translating irony between Uzbek and English. It aims to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of irony as a pragmatic and cultural phenomenon and to offer practical insights for translation and lexicography.

Literature Review

The study of irony has evolved from classical rhetoric to modern pragmatics and cognitive linguistics, reflecting broader shifts in the understanding of language and communication. In classical rhetoric, irony was primarily viewed as a stylistic device used for persuasive or aesthetic purposes. However, contemporary linguistic theories have emphasized its role as a pragmatic phenomenon involving implicit meaning and inferential processes.

Grice's theory of conversational implicature represents a foundational contribution to this field. By framing irony as a violation of the maxim of quality, Grice highlighted the role of inference in communication and provided a systematic account of how speakers convey meanings that differ from what is literally expressed[4]. This approach has been widely influential, although it has also been subject to critique and refinement.

Sperber and Wilson's relevance-theoretic account of irony offers an alternative perspective, emphasizing the cognitive mechanisms involved in interpretation. According to this view, irony is not simply a matter of saying the opposite of what one means but involves the representation of a thought that is implicitly attributed to another source and evaluated critically. This approach has been particularly influential in highlighting the role of context and shared knowledge.

In translation studies, the problem of irony has been addressed primarily in terms of equivalence and communicative effect. Newmark argues that the translator must prioritize the intended meaning and effect of the source text, even if this requires significant departures from its formal structure. Similarly, Mona Baker emphasizes the importance of context and cultural knowledge, noting that translation often involves reconstructing meaning rather than simply transferring it[5].

---

[3] Newmark, P. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall, 1988, p. 125.
[4] Grice, H. P. *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press, 1975, p. 45.
[5] Baker, M. *In Other Words*. London: Routledge, 1992, p. 223.

Functionalist approaches to translation, particularly those associated with Christiane Nord, further reinforce this perspective by focusing on the purpose of the translation and the needs of the target audience[8]. From this viewpoint, the translation of irony requires a flexible and context-sensitive approach that takes into account the communicative function of the text.

Research on Uzbek linguistics has not extensively addressed irony as a distinct category, but studies of figurative language suggest that meaning is often conveyed indirectly and contextually. This characteristic has important implications for both the interpretation and translation of irony, as it underscores the importance of contextual and cultural knowledge.

Lexicographic research has also highlighted the limitations of traditional dictionaries in representing pragmatic phenomena. Atkins and Rundell argue that dictionary definitions often fail to capture the variability of meaning in actual use, particularly in the case of figurative language. This observation is especially relevant for irony, which depends on context for its interpretation.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative methodology designed to capture the complexity of irony as a pragmatic and cross-cultural phenomenon. The data consist of selected examples from English and Uzbek literary texts, media discourse, and lexicographic sources. These examples were chosen to represent a range of contexts and functions of irony.

The analysis proceeds through several stages. First, instances of irony are identified based on their deviation from literal meaning and their reliance on contextual inference. Second, these instances are classified according to their communicative function, including evaluative, humorous, and expressive uses. Third, their linguistic and pragmatic characteristics are compared across the two languages. Finally, translation strategies are analyzed with a focus on their effectiveness in preserving ironic meaning.

The study is informed by descriptive translation studies, which emphasize the analysis of actual translation practices, as well as by discourse analysis, which provides tools for examining the relationship between language and context.

Results

The analysis of irony in Uzbek and English reveals significant differences not only in their linguistic realization but also in their pragmatic functions, interpretive mechanisms, and translatability. These differences become especially evident when examining how ironic meaning is constructed, perceived, and transferred across languages. The findings presented in this section are organized around three interrelated dimensions: functional characteristics of irony, structural and pragmatic divergence, and translation-related challenges.

Irony in both Uzbek and English serves a range of communicative functions, yet the way these functions are realized differs considerably. In English discourse, irony is frequently employed as a tool of explicit evaluation, often carrying a critical or sarcastic undertone. For instance, an utterance such as *“That was a brilliant decision”* used in the aftermath of an obvious failure relies on a clear lexical contradiction between the positive adjective *brilliant* and the negative context. The ironic effect is achieved through the deliberate mismatch between form and reality, guiding the listener toward an intended negative evaluation.

In Uzbek, however, a similar evaluative function is often conveyed through more subtle means. An expression such as *“Juda yaxshi bo‘ldi”* (literally “It turned out very well”) may function ironically depending on the situational context. Unlike its English counterpart, this utterance does not necessarily contain an overt lexical contradiction; instead, its ironic meaning emerges through shared contextual knowledge. This indicates that Uzbek irony tends to rely more heavily on pragmatic inference than on linguistic marking.

INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 8.854 Volume 13, issue 04 (2026)

This difference reflects a broader divergence in communicative styles. English, particularly in informal and media discourse, allows for a relatively direct expression of ironic intent through linguistic cues. Uzbek discourse, by contrast, often favors indirectness, where meaning is negotiated through context and shared understanding. As a result, the same communicative function – such as criticism – may be realized through fundamentally different mechanisms.

Another important function of irony is humor. In English, humor generated through irony often depends on exaggeration and contrast. For example, the statement *"What a wonderful weather!"* uttered during a heavy storm produces humor through its obvious incongruity. The exaggeration serves as a clear signal that the speaker's intention is not to praise but to mock the situation.

In Uzbek, humorous irony may arise from situational incongruity rather than explicit exaggeration. An expression like *"Ob-havo zo'r ekan-da"* ("The weather is great, isn't it") can function similarly, but its interpretation depends more strongly on the listener's awareness of the situation. The absence of strong lexical exaggeration makes the ironic intent less immediately transparent, thereby increasing the interpretive burden on the listener.

A further function of irony concerns politeness and social interaction. In both languages, irony can serve as a means of mitigating criticism, allowing speakers to express negative evaluations without direct confrontation. However, the degree of indirectness differs. In Uzbek communicative culture, where maintaining social harmony is highly valued, irony often functions as a subtle and indirect form of critique. The speaker avoids explicit negativity, relying instead on contextual cues to convey disapproval.

In English, while irony can also function as a politeness strategy, it is often more overt and may even carry a stronger sarcastic tone. This difference suggests that the pragmatic function of irony is shaped not only by linguistic factors but also by cultural norms governing interpersonal communication.

The structural realization of irony reveals further contrasts between Uzbek and English. English ironic expressions frequently employ lexical markers, syntactic constructions, and prosodic features that signal non-literal meaning. These may include intensifiers, contrastive structures, and marked intonation patterns. For example, the use of intensifiers such as *absolutely* or *totally* in phrases like *"That was absolutely fantastic"* often serves to reinforce the ironic effect by amplifying the discrepancy between expression and reality.

Uzbek, on the other hand, tends to utilize fewer overt linguistic markers. Instead, irony is often embedded within broader discourse structures, emerging from the interaction between the utterance and its context. This reliance on context can be seen as a reflection of the high-context nature of Uzbek communication, where meaning is frequently conveyed implicitly.

From a pragmatic perspective, this difference has important implications for interpretation. In English, the presence of explicit markers reduces the risk of misunderstanding by guiding the listener toward the intended interpretation. In Uzbek, however, the absence of such markers means that the listener must rely more heavily on contextual knowledge and inferential reasoning. This increases the potential for ambiguity, particularly in cross-cultural communication.

The role of shared knowledge is particularly crucial in the interpretation of irony. As Sperber and Wilson note, ironic utterances often depend on the recognition of an underlying assumption or expectation that is being implicitly challenged[6]. When this shared knowledge is absent, the ironic meaning may not be successfully communicated.

This issue becomes especially salient in translation, where the target audience may not share the same cultural or contextual background as the source audience. In such cases, the translator

[6] Sperber, D., Wilson, D. *Irony and Relevance*. London, 1981, p. 315.

must find ways of compensating for this gap, either by adapting the expression or by providing additional contextual cues.

The translation of irony between Uzbek and English presents a range of challenges that stem from the differences outlined above. One of the most pervasive problems is the loss of ironic meaning. When an ironic expression is translated literally, the absence of appropriate contextual or linguistic cues may result in a purely literal interpretation.

For example, the English sentence *"Well, that went perfectly"* used after a failed attempt may lose its ironic force if translated directly into Uzbek without contextual support. The Uzbek equivalent *"Hammasi mukammal o'tdi"* may be interpreted literally unless the context clearly indicates otherwise. This demonstrates that literal equivalence is insufficient for preserving ironic meaning.

Another major challenge is cultural mismatch. Ironic expressions often draw upon culturally specific norms, values, and expectations. When these cultural references are not shared by the target audience, the ironic meaning may be lost or misunderstood. For instance, irony based on British understatement may not have a direct equivalent in Uzbek communicative practice, where understatement functions differently.

Ambiguity also poses a significant problem. Because irony inherently involves a dual layer of meaning, it is susceptible to multiple interpretations. In translation, this ambiguity may be either reduced or amplified, depending on the strategies employed. In some cases, the translator may choose to make the ironic meaning more explicit, thereby reducing ambiguity but potentially altering the stylistic effect.

Over-explicitation represents another challenge. While making the implicit meaning explicit can help ensure comprehension, it may also diminish the subtlety and rhetorical impact of the original expression. Irony often derives its effect from its indirectness, and excessive clarification can undermine this effect.

Conversely, under-translation can result in the complete loss of irony. When the translator fails to recognize or convey the ironic intent, the resulting text may misrepresent the original meaning. This highlights the importance of pragmatic competence in translation, as the ability to identify irony is a prerequisite for its successful transfer.

The analysis of lexicographic sources reveals that irony is inadequately represented in both English and Uzbek dictionaries. Definitions tend to be abstract and generalized, focusing on the idea of "saying the opposite of what is meant" without addressing the contextual and pragmatic dimensions of irony.

Moreover, examples provided in dictionaries are often limited and fail to illustrate the full range of ironic usage. This lack of contextualization makes it difficult for users to understand how irony functions in real discourse. As Atkins and Rundell observe, effective lexicography should reflect actual language use rather than relying on decontextualized definitions[7].

The limitations of lexicographic representation have practical consequences for translation. Without access to detailed and context-sensitive information, translators may struggle to interpret and reproduce ironic meaning accurately. This underscores the need for more sophisticated lexicographic models that incorporate pragmatic and cultural information.

Discussion

The findings presented in the previous section confirm that irony, while often treated as a universal pragmatic phenomenon, manifests itself in fundamentally different ways across linguistic and cultural systems. The comparison between Uzbek and English demonstrates that these differences are not superficial but are rooted in deeper communicative norms, cognitive processing patterns, and sociocultural expectations. Consequently, the translation of irony cannot

[7] Atkins, B., Rundell, M. *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford, 2008, p. 412.

be approached as a purely linguistic task; rather, it must be understood as a complex act of intercultural mediation.

At the core of this issue lies the relationship between explicitness and implicitness in communication. English, particularly in its contemporary usage, exhibits a tendency toward semi-explicit marking of irony. Although irony remains inherently indirect, it is often accompanied by lexical, syntactic, or prosodic cues that guide interpretation. These cues function as signals that reduce ambiguity and facilitate the inferential process. In contrast, Uzbek communicative practice demonstrates a stronger reliance on contextual inference, where meaning is constructed through shared situational knowledge rather than overt linguistic markers.

This distinction can be interpreted within the broader framework of high-context and low-context cultures. As communication theorists have observed, high-context cultures tend to encode meaning implicitly, relying on shared background knowledge and situational awareness, whereas low-context cultures favor explicit verbalization of meaning. Although such categorizations should not be applied rigidly, they provide a useful lens for understanding the differences observed in this study. Uzbek discourse, with its emphasis on indirectness and contextual sensitivity, aligns more closely with high-context communication patterns, while English displays features associated with more explicit communicative styles.

From a pragmatic perspective, these differences have significant implications for the interpretation of irony. In English, the presence of explicit cues often constrains interpretation, making it easier for the listener to recognize ironic intent. In Uzbek, however, the absence of such cues means that interpretation depends more heavily on contextual inference, which may vary among individuals. This variability introduces a degree of interpretive instability that is particularly problematic in translation.

The concept of pragmatic equivalence is central to addressing this problem. Traditional approaches to translation have often emphasized formal or semantic equivalence, focusing on the accurate transfer of lexical and grammatical meaning. However, as numerous scholars have argued, such approaches are insufficient for capturing the full complexity of meaning in use. As Eugene Nida notes, the goal of translation should be to achieve “dynamic equivalence,” whereby the response of the target audience approximates that of the original audience[8]. In the case of irony, this means reproducing not only the content of the utterance but also its pragmatic effect.

Achieving pragmatic equivalence in the translation of irony requires a high degree of interpretive competence on the part of the translator. The translator must first recognize the presence of irony in the source text, which is not always straightforward, particularly when irony is implicit. This recognition involves an understanding of contextual cues, cultural norms, and communicative conventions. Once the ironic intent has been identified, the translator must then determine how best to reproduce this effect in the target language.

This process often involves a shift from form-based to function-based translation strategies. Translation should be guided by the function of the text rather than by its formal properties. In the context of irony, this may require the translator to depart significantly from the original wording in order to preserve the intended effect. For example, an ironic expression that relies on lexical contrast in English may need to be rendered through contextual cues in Uzbek, or vice versa.

However, this functional approach raises important questions about fidelity and transformation. To what extent can the translator modify the form of the source text without compromising its integrity? This question is particularly relevant in the translation of literary texts, where stylistic features play a central role. Translation inevitably involves a degree of domestication or foreignization, reflecting the translator’s choices about how to balance fidelity

[8] Nida, E. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill, Netherlands, 1964, p.

to the source text with accessibility for the target audience. In the case of irony, this balance is especially delicate, as the effect of irony often depends on subtle nuances of expression.

Another important dimension of the discussion concerns the cognitive processing of irony. The interpretation of ironic utterances requires the listener to recognize a discrepancy between literal and intended meaning and to resolve this discrepancy through inference. This process is cognitively demanding and depends on the availability of contextual information. In cross-linguistic contexts, where such information may be incomplete or unfamiliar, the cognitive load increases, making misinterpretation more likely.

This observation underscores the importance of cultural competence in translation. The translator must not only understand the linguistic structure of the source text but also possess a deep familiarity with the cultural context in which it is embedded. Without this knowledge, it is difficult to recognize the assumptions and expectations that underlie ironic expressions. Translation is fundamentally an act of intercultural communication, requiring the mediator to navigate between different systems of meaning.

The findings of this study also have important implications for lexicography. The analysis revealed that existing dictionaries provide only limited support for the interpretation of irony, offering abstract definitions that fail to capture its contextual and pragmatic dimensions. This limitation reflects a broader tendency in lexicography to prioritize denotative meaning over pragmatic usage. However, as language use becomes increasingly dynamic and context-dependent, there is a growing need for lexicographic models that incorporate pragmatic information.

In particular, dictionaries could benefit from the inclusion of authentic usage examples that illustrate how irony functions in real discourse. These examples should be accompanied by annotations that explain the contextual factors contributing to the ironic effect. Additionally, cross-references to cultural information could help users understand the assumptions underlying ironic expressions. Such enhancements would not only improve the usefulness of dictionaries for translation but also contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of language in use.

Finally, it is important to consider the broader implications of these findings for translation theory. The challenges associated with translating irony highlight the limitations of approaches that treat language as a self-contained system of signs. Instead, they point to the need for a more holistic perspective that integrates linguistic, pragmatic, and cultural dimensions. This perspective aligns with recent developments in translation studies, which emphasize the role of the translator as an active interpreter and mediator.

Conclusion

The present study has explored the differences and challenges involved in translating irony between Uzbek and English, with a particular focus on the functional, structural, and pragmatic aspects of this phenomenon. The analysis has demonstrated that irony, while a universal feature of human communication, is realized in language-specific ways that reflect broader cultural and communicative norms.

One of the central findings of the study is that English and Uzbek differ significantly in their use of explicit and implicit strategies for conveying ironic meaning. English tends to employ linguistic markers that guide interpretation, whereas Uzbek relies more heavily on contextual inference. This difference has important implications for both interpretation and translation, as it affects the ease with which ironic meaning can be recognized and reproduced.

The study has also identified several key challenges in the translation of irony, including the loss of pragmatic meaning, cultural mismatch, and interpretive ambiguity. These challenges arise from the complex interplay between linguistic form, contextual knowledge, and cultural expectations. Addressing them requires a shift from form-based to function-based approaches to translation, with an emphasis on pragmatic equivalence.

In this regard, the concept of dynamic equivalence provides a useful framework, as it focuses on the response of the target audience rather than on the formal properties of the text. However, achieving such equivalence is not straightforward and requires a high level of interpretive and cultural competence. The translator must be able to identify ironic intent, understand its underlying assumptions, and reproduce its effect in a different linguistic and cultural context.

The findings of the study also highlight the limitations of existing lexicographic resources, which often fail to capture the contextual and pragmatic dimensions of irony. This suggests the need for more sophisticated approaches to lexicography that incorporate usage-based data and cultural information.

From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of irony as a pragmatic and intercultural phenomenon. It underscores the importance of integrating insights from linguistics, pragmatics, and cultural studies in the analysis of translation. Moreover, it reinforces the view that translation is not merely a technical process but a form of intercultural communication that requires sensitivity to multiple dimensions of meaning.

In practical terms, the study offers several implications for translators, educators, and lexicographers. Translators should be trained to recognize and interpret irony, as well as to apply flexible strategies for its transfer. Educators should emphasize the role of context and culture in language learning, particularly in relation to figurative language. Lexicographers should consider ways of enhancing dictionary entries to better reflect pragmatic usage.

Future research may build on these findings by exploring the translation of irony in specific genres, such as literary texts, film subtitles, or digital communication. Corpus-based studies could provide further insights into patterns of usage and translation strategies. Additionally, experimental research on the comprehension of irony in cross-cultural contexts could shed light on the cognitive processes involved.

In conclusion, the translation of irony between Uzbek and English represents a complex and multifaceted challenge that cannot be fully addressed within the confines of traditional linguistic approaches. It requires a comprehensive understanding of language as a dynamic and context-dependent system, as well as a recognition of the cultural and cognitive factors that shape communication. By adopting such an approach, translators and researchers can move toward more effective and nuanced strategies for dealing with one of the most intricate phenomena in language.

References

1. Atkins B. T. S., Rundell M. *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 552 p.
2. Baker M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. – London: Routledge, 1992. – 304 p.
3. Grice H. P. Logic and Conversation // *Syntax and Semantics*. – New York: Academic Press, 1975. – P. 41–58.
4. Hatim B., Mason I. *The Translator as Communicator*. – London: Routledge, 1997. – 258 p.
5. Iskandarova Sh. *O'zbek nutqining pragmatik xususiyatlari*. – Toshkent: Fan, 2015. – 120 b.

6. Karimova, I. B. (2024). EXPLORING THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF COMPOUND NOUNS REFERRING TO NUMBERS: A SCIENTIFIC INQUIRY. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, *5*(03), 194-202.

7. Mahmudov N. *Til va nutq madaniyati*. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi, 2010. – 160 b.

8. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. – London: Prentice Hall, 1988. – 292 p.

9. Nida E. A. *Toward a Science of Translating*. – Leiden: Brill, 1964. – 331 p.

10. Nord C. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. – Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997. – 154 p.

11. Sperber D., Wilson D. Irony and Relevance // *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. – P. 237–243.

12. Sperber D., Wilson D. Irony and the Use-Mention Distinction // *Radical Pragmatics*. – New York: Academic Press, 1981. – P. 295–318.

13. Venuti L. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. – London: Routledge, 1995. – 353 p.