

**PRAGMATIC STRATEGIES IN RENDERING EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIONS: BASED ON RITHVIK SINGH'S I DON'T LOVE YOU ANYMORE**

**Ochilova Shakhnoza Mamarajab qizi**

Student of Termez state university

e-mail: [bintumamarajab@gmail.com](mailto:bintumamarajab@gmail.com), +99894-036-76-10

**Ramazonov Shohruh Nusratillo o'g'li**

Teacher of Termez state university

e-mail: [rshakhrookh@gmail.com](mailto:rshakhrookh@gmail.com), +99877-028-22-09

**Annotation**

This article investigates the pragmatic dimensions of translating emotional expressions from English into Uzbek, drawing on textual material from Rithvik Singh's *I Don't Love You Anymore*. The study examines how speech acts, conversational implicature, somatic metaphor, and politeness mechanisms operate in emotionally charged literary discourse, and how these features pose specific challenges when rendered into Uzbek. The analysis demonstrates that pragmatic equivalence — the preservation of illocutionary force and implied emotional meaning — must serve as the guiding principle in literary translation of this kind, and that purely lexical or structural approaches are insufficient for capturing the affective depth of the original text.

**Keywords**

pragmatics, emotional expressions, speech acts, conversational implicature, pragmatic equivalence, English-Uzbek translation, literary translation, somatic metaphor

**Аннотация**

Данная статья посвящена исследованию прагматических аспектов перевода эмоциональных выражений с английского языка на узбекский на материале произведения Ритвика Сингха «I Don't Love You Anymore». В работе рассматривается, каким образом речевые акты, разговорные импликатуры, соматические метафоры и механизмы вежливости функционируют в эмоционально насыщенном литературном дискурсе и какие специфические трудности они создают при переводе на узбекский язык. Анализ показывает, что прагматическая эквивалентность — сохранение иллокутивной силы и имплицитного эмоционального смысла — должна служить определяющим принципом при литературном переводе подобных текстов, тогда как сугубо лексические или структурные подходы оказываются недостаточными для передачи аффективной глубины оригинала.

**Ключевые слова**

прагматика, эмоциональные выражения, речевые акты, разговорная импликатура, прагматическая эквивалентность, англо-узбекский перевод, художественный перевод, соматическая метафора

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Literary translation presents the translator with challenges that go well beyond grammatical accuracy and lexical correspondence. Among the most demanding of these challenges is the translation of emotional language — the words, structures, and devices through which literary texts evoke, represent, and communicate feeling. Emotional expressions in literature are rarely self-contained; they derive their force from pragmatic context, from what is implied rather than stated, from the social relationship between speaker and addressee, and from cultural conventions that govern the expression of inner states.

The linguistic pair English and Uzbek is especially productive for examining these challenges. The two languages belong to different families, operate through different morphological and syntactic systems, and reflect culturally distinct orientations toward emotional expression. English, shaped by individualistic social norms, tends to favour direct and explicit verbal communication of feeling. Uzbek, embedded in a collectivist cultural tradition, often favours restraint, indirectness, and context-sensitivity in emotional discourse. This divergence means that a translation strategy adequate to the surface form of an English emotional utterance will frequently fail to reproduce its communicative function in Uzbek.

Rithvik Singh's prose-poetry collection *I Don't Love You Anymore* provides an exceptionally rich corpus for this investigation. The text is organized around emotional experience — love, longing, heartbreak, nostalgia, and quiet grief — and deploys a wide range of linguistic mechanisms to convey these states: indirect speech acts, conversational implicature, somatic metaphor, deictic displacement, repetition, and figurative vignettes. These mechanisms are precisely those that create the greatest difficulty for the translator, because their meaning cannot be recovered from propositional content alone.

This article argues that the concept of pragmatic equivalence — understood as the preservation of illocutionary force, implied meaning, and the management of social face — must be placed at the center of any adequate approach to translating emotional literary language. The study is organized according to the IMRAD structure: Section 2 describes the methodological framework; Section 3 reports the results of the textual analysis; Section 4 discusses the pragmatic mechanisms and translational decisions at stake; and Section 5 draws conclusions.

## 2. METHODS

The study adopts a qualitative, corpus-based approach. The primary data consist of passages selected from *I Don't Love You Anymore* on the criterion of pragmatic complexity — that is, passages in which the emotional meaning of an utterance cannot be derived from its literal propositional content and depends crucially on contextual inference, implied meaning, or the management of social face. Both the English source text and its Uzbek translation were examined.

The analytical framework integrates three theoretical perspectives. First, Speech Act Theory, as developed in the philosophical tradition of Austin and elaborated by Searle, provides the basis for classifying the illocutionary function of emotional utterances. The central question at this level is whether the translation preserves the communicative act being performed — the accusation, the plea, the withdrawal of affection — rather than merely the surface proposition. Second, the theory of Conversational Implicature, grounded in Grice's formulation of the Cooperative Principle, is used to analyse passages in which emotional meaning is conveyed through apparent violations of conversational norms. The translator's task in such cases is to decide whether to preserve the indirectness and risk pragmatic opacity, or to make the implied meaning explicit and sacrifice the subtlety of the original. Third, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, particularly the concepts of positive and negative face and the strategies

speakers use to manage face-threatening acts, informs the analysis of passages involving emotional vulnerability, relational withdrawal, and the indirect expression of hurt.

Translation strategies are classified according to a typology that distinguishes between: literal transfer, which preserves source-language form at the risk of pragmatic loss; semantic adaptation, which adjusts lexical and syntactic form to achieve equivalent meaning; pragmatic compensation, which introduces target-language devices to restore communicative functions lost in direct translation; and explicitation, which makes implicit emotional meaning overt. Each strategy is evaluated in terms of its success in preserving the pragmatic force of the original.

### 3. RESULTS

#### 3.1. Linguistic and Pragmatic Features of the Source Text

Analysis of the selected passages from *I Don't Love You Anymore* identified a consistent set of linguistic mechanisms through which emotional meaning is constructed and communicated. These mechanisms are summarized in Table 1, with representative examples drawn directly from the text.

Linguistic Feature	Example from <i>I Don't Love You Anymore</i>	Pragmatic Function	Translation Challenge (EN → UZ)
Somatic metaphor	"Your absence has created cemeteries in my soul"	Conveys grief as a physical, embodied experience	Uzbek uses <i>yurak/jigar</i> -based imagery; conceptual remapping required
Indirect speech act	"There's room for so many things, but no space for me"	Functions as an accusation/complaint, not a simple statement	Illocutionary force may be lost in a literal Uzbek rendering
Conversational implicature	"Sometimes the person who was your happy place doesn't want you to be happy anymore"	Implies betrayal and emotional withdrawal without stating it directly	Implicature depends on shared norms; explicitation may be needed in UZBEK
Rhetorical repetition	"Someone who would leave flowers, kisses, and the scent of love; someone who never lets you question"	Accumulates emotional intensity; creates a rhythm of longing	Uzbek syntax may disrupt rhythmic build-up; restructuring risks pragmatic loss
Personification / figurative vignette	"The sky loves its stars"	Universalizes emotional experience through natural imagery	Imagery is cross-culturally intelligible but stylistic register must be preserved
Temporal	"I pretend not to love	Marks emotional	Deictic shift must be

deixis nostalgia	+	you anymore, but catch myself opening those books"	continuity across time; conveys unresolved attachment	maintained; Uzbek verb aspect system differs from English
---------------------	---	--	---	---

**Table 1. Linguistic and pragmatic features of emotional expressions in *I Don't Love You Anymore***

As Table 1 illustrates, the emotional language of the source text operates primarily through indirection. Somatic metaphors externalize inner states through bodily imagery that is culturally specific. Indirect speech acts perform communicative functions — complaint, accusation, withdrawal — that are not recoverable from their surface grammatical form. Conversational implicature requires the reader to perform inferential work, and the meaning recovered depends on familiarity with English conversational norms. Repetition and parallelism create affective intensity through form rather than lexical content.

A particularly significant finding concerns the relationship between directness and emotional vulnerability in the text. Singh systematically favours indirect expression at the moments of greatest emotional intensity — when the speaker is most exposed, most hurt, most in need of acknowledgement. This indirectness is not stylistic ornament; it is integral to the characterization and the emotional logic of the text. A translation that consistently converts this indirectness into explicit statement thereby alters the nature of the emotional experience the text offers.

### 3.2. Translation Strategies and Their Pragmatic Effects

The analysis of the Uzbek translation revealed six principal strategies deployed across the selected passages. These are described in Table 2, with examples illustrating the nature of the translational decision in each case.

Strategy	English Expression	Uzbek Rendering	Explanation
Pragmatic compensation	"Your heart is a crime scene"	"Qalbingiz jinoyat joyi kabi"	Metaphorical imagery retained; emotional drama preserved through structural equivalence
Semantic expansion	"Love flooding inside you"	"Ichingizda sevgi to'lqin urib, toshib yotibdi"	Uzbek requires elaboration to convey the same intensity; single English word expanded into verb phrase
Cultural substitution	"Some people are like songs stuck in your head"	"Ba'zi odamlar boshingizda doimiy chaladigan qo'shiq kabi"	Idiomatic concept rendered through functionally equivalent Uzbek expression
Illocutionary	"There's room	"Har narsaga joy	Complaint/accusation function

preservation	for so many things, but no space for me"	bor, faqat menga emas"	maintained; syntactic simplification preserves pragmatic force
Morphological adaptation	"I am deeply in love"	"Men qattiq sevib qolganman"	English uses adverb + adjective; Uzbek conveys intensity through verb morphology and aspect marking
Explicitation of implicature	"You've kept hundreds of books, old perfume bottles..."	Contextual elaboration added in target text	Implicit accusation made slightly more transparent for Uzbek readers unfamiliar with English understatement conventions

**Table 2. Translation strategies for emotional expressions: English source and Uzbek rendering**

The most frequently applied strategy was pragmatic compensation, in which Uzbek linguistic resources — particularly morphological markers of intensity and verbal aspect — were used to restore communicative force that could not be transferred through structural equivalence. Semantic expansion was required in cases where English achieved emotional intensity through compact metaphorical expression for which Uzbek has no direct equivalent. Explicitation of implicature, while preserving the basic emotional content, was found to reduce the pragmatic complexity of the interaction in all cases where it was applied.

A pattern of particular interest emerged in the rendering of indirect speech acts. In several passages, the illocutionary function of the source utterance — typically complaint, accusation, or rejection — was preserved in the Uzbek translation, but the face-management dimension was lost. The source text deploys indirectness precisely to perform these face-threatening acts while minimizing the degree of face damage, maintaining a quality of emotional restraint that is itself emotionally significant. In translation, the face-saving indirectness was sometimes replaced by a more direct rendering that altered this balance.

### 3.3. Cases of Pragmatic Loss

The analysis identified a subset of passages in which pragmatic loss was most acute. These were invariably passages in which the emotional meaning depended on the simultaneous operation of multiple pragmatic mechanisms: indirect speech act plus implicature, or metaphor plus face-management, or deictic displacement plus nostalgia. In these cases, the translation succeeded in preserving one dimension of meaning at the cost of another.

The most significant single source of pragmatic loss was the conversion of emotional indirectness into explicit statement. While this strategy guaranteed communicative clarity, it systematically removed the inferential space in which the reader participates in constructing the emotional meaning. This loss is not trivial: in a text whose central concern is with feelings that resist direct articulation, the pragmatic texture of indirection is part of the meaning itself.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study illuminate a fundamental tension inherent in the literary translation of emotional language: the tension between communicative clarity and pragmatic fidelity. In the domain of emotional expression, these two values frequently pull in opposite directions. Clarity is best served by making implicit meaning explicit, by converting indirect speech acts into direct statements, and by substituting culturally familiar imagery for culturally foreign metaphors. Pragmatic fidelity, by contrast, requires preserving the mechanisms of indirection, implicature, and face-management through which emotional meaning is actually constituted in the source text.

This tension is sharpened by the specific features of English-Uzbek translation. The divergence between English low-context communicative norms and Uzbek high-context conventions means that certain pragmatic features of the source text — in particular, the direct verbal expression of romantic or negative emotion — may already appear culturally marked to a Uzbek reader, even without any explicit violation of translation norms. Singh's text is, in the English literary context, comparatively direct in its emotional address; in Uzbek, the same degree of directness may read as excessive or socially inappropriate. The translator must navigate this difference without either neutralizing the emotional intensity of the original or producing a text that feels culturally incoherent to its target audience.

The concept of pragmatic equivalence proves more productive than either formal or dynamic equivalence as a guiding framework for these decisions. Formal equivalence, which prioritizes structural correspondence between source and target text, is demonstrably inadequate: the morphological and syntactic divergence between English and Uzbek means that formally equivalent structures frequently produce pragmatically non-equivalent communicative effects. Dynamic equivalence, which asks whether the translation produces an equivalent emotional effect on the target reader, is a more appropriate ideal, but it is insufficiently precise about the mechanisms through which equivalence should be achieved.

Pragmatic equivalence, by contrast, asks a specific question about each utterance: does the translation perform the same illocutionary act, convey the same implicatures, and manage face in the same way as the source? This question can be answered at the level of individual passages, allowing the translator to identify precisely where and how pragmatic loss occurs and to make principled compensatory decisions.

The specific mechanisms of pragmatic loss identified in this study — the loss of illocutionary indirection, the explicitation of implicature, and the reduction of face-management complexity — are likely to be characteristic not only of this text but of literary translation between English and Uzbek more broadly. They arise from the interaction of systemic linguistic differences (morphological, syntactic) with cultural differences in the norms governing emotional expression. A translator aware of these mechanisms is better positioned to make informed decisions about when to compensate, when to adapt, and when the requirements of pragmatic fidelity must take precedence over those of cultural adaptation.

The analysis of *I Don't Love You Anymore* also highlights the role of the translator as a pragmatic analyst and cultural mediator, not merely a linguistic converter. The decisions required by this text — about when to make indirection explicit, how to render somatic metaphors that have no Uzbek equivalent, how to preserve the face-management logic of emotionally vulnerable utterances — are not resolvable by any mechanical application of translation rules. They require a capacity for close pragmatic reading, cultural sensitivity, and what might be called emotional intelligence: the ability to inhabit the affective world of the text and to re-express it authentically in another language.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that the translation of emotional expressions from English into Uzbek is irreducibly a pragmatic enterprise. The emotional language of *I Don't Love You Anymore* functions through mechanisms — speech acts, conversational implicature, somatic metaphor, and face-management — whose operation depends on contextual inference rather than on propositional content. No purely lexical or structural approach to translation can adequately preserve these mechanisms across the English-Uzbek linguistic and cultural boundary.

The analysis identified six principal translation strategies — pragmatic compensation, semantic expansion, cultural substitution, illocutionary preservation, morphological adaptation, and explicitation of implicature — and showed that each strategy involves specific trade-offs between communicative clarity and pragmatic fidelity. The most significant source of pragmatic loss was the explicitation of indirectness: the conversion of implied emotional meaning into direct statement, which removes the inferential space that is itself part of the emotional experience the text constructs.

These findings have implications for translation theory, practice, and pedagogy. Theoretically, they support the centrality of pragmatic equivalence — as opposed to formal or dynamic equivalence — as the appropriate evaluative criterion for literary translation of emotional content. Practically, they suggest that translators of this type of text must develop skills in close pragmatic analysis: the capacity to identify speech act types, recognize implicature, and understand the face-related implications of emotionally sensitive utterances. Pedagogically, they argue for the integration of pragmatic frameworks — speech act theory, relevance theory, politeness theory — into translator training programs, particularly those concerned with literary translation.

Future research might extend this analysis to a wider corpus of English-Uzbek literary translation, examining whether the patterns of pragmatic loss identified here are systematic features of this translation direction, or whether they are specific to the particular register and style of Singh's text. Comparative analysis with other target languages would also be valuable in determining the extent to which the challenges identified are specific to the English-Uzbek pair or reflect broader cross-cultural differences in the pragmatics of emotional expression.

## REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Javliyev Mansurbek Odil o'g'li .Ochilova Shakhnoza Mamarajabovna. (2023). THE CONCEPTUAL STRUCTURE OF MODERN LINGUISTICS. *Ethiopian International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 10(12), 771–773. Retrieved from <https://www.eijmr.org/index.php/eijmr/article/view/839>
3. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Harvard University Press.
4. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman.
5. Aliboyeva, N. A. Q. (2022). The direct translation of roald dahl's novel “matilda” into Uzbek language. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 12(9), 77-80.
6. Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.
7. Nabi, F., & Xudayqulov , A. (2024). GRAMMATICAL RULES OF PRINCIPLES OF ENGLISH TO DARI TRANSLATION. *Interpretation and Researches*, (8(30). извлечено от <https://interpretationandresearches.uz/index.php/iar/article/view/2459>
8. Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
9. Nafisa, A. Using Stylistic Devices in Translation as an Example of the Story a Christmas Carol. *JournalNX*, 40-43.
10. Singh, R. (2024). *I Don't Love You Anymore*. Penguin Random House India.

11. Yusupov, U. K. (2010). Contrastive Linguistics of the English and Uzbek Languages. Fan Publishing.
12. Aliboyeva, N. (2022). Selection of special translation methods for adequate interpretation of children's literature. Scientific Collection «InterConf», 120, 121–124.