

# TRANSFORMATION IN TRANSLATION: THE ROLE OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Safoyeva Sadokat Nasilloevna  
Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute  
E-mail:aminova.saodat@list.ru

## Abstract

Translation is more than a mere transformation of words from one language into another; it is an evolving process that involves adjusting linguistic, cultural, and contextual factors. This research considers how discourse markers (DMs) change during translation from English to Uzbek with an emphasis on their retention, omission, or replacement. Through the analysis of translated texts, the study demonstrates how these changes affect coherence and general meaning. Also, this study investigates the impact of changes in discourse markers on readability and maintenance of meaning, with particular focus on the translator's decisions in different text environments.

**Keywords:** Discourse, transformation, linguistics, retention, substitution, omission, equivalence, textual, contextual, interpretation.

## Introduction

Discourse markers (DMs) are words or phrases that make it easier to structure communication, allowing the conversation and texts to flow smoothly. They are, for instance, "however," "therefore," "meanwhile," and "on the other hand" in English and their Uzbek translations such as "ammo," "shuning uchun," "bu ora," and "boshqa tomondan." They play a role in making things rational in motion, emphasizing something, and staying consistent in speech. It is hard to translate these signals since their meaning and function are diverse across languages. This study examines how DMs are different in translation between English and Uzbek, taking into account linguistic, stylistic, and cultural factors. It also examines how translators manage variation in English and Uzbek discourse organization for clarity and cohesion.

## Methods:

Qualitative analysis was conducted on a variety of literary and non-literary writings. English originals and their Uzbek translations were compared in relevance, genre, and quality of translation. The study focused on determining how DMs were handled—whether word for word translated, omitted, replaced, or rephrased for functional equivalence. Textual analysis software was used to collect data, which was later checked manually for contextual correctness. In addition, native speakers for both languages were consulted to estimate the naturalness and effectiveness of the translated discourse markers in preserving meaning and coherence.

---

**Results:**

The findings indicate that DMs tend to get altered when they are translated. Four overall patterns were discovered:

*Retention:* Some DMs were simply translated where a comparable one was present in Uzbek. For instance, "therefore" was translated mostly as "shuning uchun" with little alteration.

*Substitution:* A few of the DMs were replaced with expressions that served a similar purpose but in a more idiomatic manner in Uzbek. For example, "on the other hand" was rendered as "boshqa tomondan," though in colloquial contexts, it was often replaced with "boshqa tarafdan."

*Omission:* Certain DMs were left out if they were redundant or superfluous in terms of the linguistic structure. For instance, "meanwhile" was occasionally left out of Uzbek translations when the sequence of events was already clear from context.

*Addition:* Translators sometimes added new DMs to improve the coherence of the target text. For instance, "demak" was added in certain Uzbek translations to assert logical conclusions that were only implied in English.

**Discussion:**

The dynamic nature of translation is highlighted by the research, particularly when it comes to translating DMs from English to Uzbek. Such linguistic items are not rigidly word-for-word translated, but are adapted to fit the norms of the target language. One of the main issues with translating between the two languages is structural contrast—English relying more on overt connectors, and Uzbek relying more on sentence structure and implicit marking. The results show that translation methods differ depending on the type of text, cultural expectations, and translator interpretation. These changes can improve or alter the overall coherence of the final text, affecting readability and comprehension.

In addition, the present study finds that Uzbek discourse markers not only link ideas but also help the tone and level of formality of the speaker or writer. For example, English marker "actually" could be translated as "aslida" in formal writing but otherwise expressed in colloquial speech. This means that the translation of discourse markers must be addressed by both linguistic accuracy and cultural sensitivity.

**Conclusion:**

Discourse markers play a crucial role in maintaining coherence in communication, but their translation is not always direct. This study confirms the radical change they undergo in English-Uzbek translation, pointing to the necessity of both linguistic accuracy and contextual adjustment. Understanding how different discourse markers function in each language allows translators to make well-informed choices that preserve meaning as well as clarity. Future research could further expand to other genres, e.g., scholarly and legal writing, to examine how DMs function in other forms of written and spoken communication. Additionally, a comparative study of spoken and written discourse markers in English and Uzbek would provide more insight into their application in communication.



**References:**

1. Baker, M. (2018). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. Routledge.
2. Blakemore, D. (2002). Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.
3. Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? Journal of Pragmatics, 31(7), 931-952.
4. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). The Translator as Communicator. Routledge.
5. Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.
6. Venuti, L. (2008). The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. Routledge.
7. Muxtorovna, K. N., Shavkatovna, S. N., & Nasilloevna, S. S. (2019). The role of the ethnographic vocabulary in the English and Uzbek languages. International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering, 8(9 S3), 1551-1554.
8. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2024). PRAGMATIC POSSIBILITIES OF DISCOURSE MARKERS. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING, 2(5), 866-873.
9. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2021). Synonymy and Its Features. In 4th Global Congress on Contemporary Sciences & Advancements 30th April (pp. 120-121).
10. Qayumova, N., & Safojeva, S. (2020). The Connotative meanings of noun and adjective lexemes in Uzbek and English languages. Scientific reports of Bukhara State University, 6(82).
11. Xamroyevna, X. G., Shavkatovna, S. N., Nasilloevna, S. S., & Khaydarovna, P. S. (2022). Homonyms In The Uzbek And English Languages. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 10633-10636.
12. Safojeva, S. (2022). Text-reality integration and sociological analysis of literary text. Центр научных публикаций (buxdu. uz), 26, 26.
13. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2021). The image of a woman in a Victorian novel.
14. Safojeva, S. (2024). UNRAVELING THE TAPESTRY OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE/PRAGMATIC MARKERS ACROSS CULTURES. Collection of scientific papers «ΛΟΓΟΣ», (March 1, 2024; Paris, France), 337-340.
15. Safojeva, S. N. (2024). The Main Approaches to the Description of Discursive Markers. International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education, 2(12), 616-621.
16. Safojeva, S. (2024). PRAGMATIK MARKERLAR, LINGVISTIK YONDASHUV VA BOG'LIQLIK NAZARIYASI. Innovative Development in Educational Activities, 33.
17. Nasilloevna, S. S. (2023). SPECIFIC ASPECT OF STUDYING RUSSIAN APHORISMS. O'ZBEKISTONDA FANLARARO INNOVATSIYALAR VA ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI, 2(18), 1236-1241.
18. Nasilloevna, S. S. THE CONNOTATIVE MEANINGS OF NOUN AND ADJECTIVE LEXEMES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES Qayumova Nigora Muxtor kizi. Scientific reports of Bukhara State University, 79.
19. Sadokat, S. (2024). Pragmatic Markers and Gender. Miasto Przyszłości, 45, 622-624.