



Received: February 4, 2021
Accepted: March 12, 2021
Available online: March 25, 2021

Islom Minnikulov

Teacher, Uzbekistan State World Languages
University
Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: mr.islom19@gmail.com

LINGUISTIC INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE WORLD LINGUISTICS

ANNOTATION

The article is devoted to the investigation of the problem of conditional relationships and their expression peculiarities in the world linguistics. In particular, a special emphasis is placed on the discussion of leading approaches, perspectives from which conditional relationships are studied, their representation and classification from different viewpoints. The aim of the research is determined by the analysis of the expression of conditional relationships from different perspectives and the formulation of main principles and basis of such approaches to the study of the issue under discussion. The following tasks have been set to reach the goal: a) description of the history of the study of conditional relationships in the world linguistics; b) investigation of peculiarities of the expression of conditional relationships in world linguistics; c) analysis of the basic approaches to the investigation of conditional relationships in the world linguistics and identification of certain principles of each approach which focus on the study of conditional relationships from a particular angle; d) identification of classification of conditional relationships in the world linguistics and analysis of criteria for such classifications. The following methods of investigation have been used: linguistic description (to analyze and criticize the works related to the problem of conditional relationships in world linguistics), componential analysis (to reveal semantic peculiarities of conditional relationships in

Ислом Минниқулов

Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети
ўқитувчиси
Филология фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори
Тошкент, Ўзбекистон

ЖАҲОН ТИЛШУНОСЛИГИДА ШАРТ МУНОСАБАТЛАРИНИНГ ЛИНГВИСТИК ТАДҚИҚИ

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ушбу мақолада шарт муносабатлари муаммоси ва уларнинг дунё тилшунослигида ифодаланиш хусусиятлари таҳлил этилган. Хусусан, етакчи ёндашувларга, шарт муносабатлари ўрганиладиган нуқтаи назарларга, уларнинг ифодаланиш усуллари ва шакллари масаласи ҳамда уларни турли ёндашувлар асосида таснифлаш муаммосини муҳокама қилишга алоҳида аҳамият берилади. Тадқиқотнинг мақсади – шарт муносабатларининг турли нуқтаи назардан ифодаланишини таҳлил қилиш ҳамда муҳокама қилинаётган масалани ўрганишда бундай ёндашувларнинг асосий тамойиллари ва асосларини шакллантириш билан белгиланади. Бундан ташқари, жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатларини таснифлаш масаласи ўрганилган ва бундай тил бирликларини таснифлаш мезонларини яратишга эътибор қаратилган. Тадқиқотда мақсадга эришиш учун қуйидаги вазифалар қўйилади: а) жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатларини ўрганиш тарихини тавсифлаш; б) жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатларини ифодалашнинг ўзига хос хусусиятларини ўрганиш; в) жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатларини текширишдаги тадқиқий ёндашувлар асосларини таҳлил қилиш ва шарт муносабатларини муайян аспектда ўрганишга қаратилган ҳар бир ёндашувнинг айрим тамойилларини аниқлаш; г) жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатларининг таснифини аниқлаш ва бундай таснифлаш мезонларини таҳлил қилиш. Ушбу тадқиқотда қуйидаги таҳлил усуллари

world linguistics), classification (to classify conditional relationships in world linguistics). The following results have been obtained: a) the conditional relationships in world linguistics have been studied from the following perspectives: semantic, syntactic, stylistic, functional, speech act, pragmatic, comparative-typological, pedagogical, historical-etymological; b) each perspective is characterized by certain principles; c) the conditional relationships can be classified from the viewpoints of semantics, syntax, speech act and pragmatics; d) each classification is based on certain criteria.

Key words: condition, conditional relationships, conditional form, conditional meaning, real, unreal, hypothetical, subjunctive, indicative mood.

қўлланилган: лингвистик тавсифлаш (дунё тил-шунослигида шарт муносабатлари муаммосига оид асарларни таҳлил ва танқид қилиш учун), компонент таҳлил (жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатларининг семантик ўзига хос хусусиятларини ёритиш учун), таснифлаш (жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатларини таснифлаш учун). Ушбу тадқиқотда қуйидаги натижаларга эришилди: а) жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатлари қуйидаги жиҳатлардан ўрганилган: семантик, синтактик, стилистик, функционал, нутқ акти, прагматик, қиёсий-типологик, педагогик, тарихий-этимологик; б) ҳар бир ёндашув уни ўрганишнинг маълум тамойиллари билан тавсифланади; в) шарт муносабатларини семантик, синтактик, нутқ акти ва прагматик нуқтаи назардан таснифлаш мумкин; г) ҳар бир тасниф ушбу тадқиқотда муҳокама қилинган муайян мезонларга асосланади.

Калит сўзлар: шарт, шарт муносабатлари, шарт форма, шарт маъно, реал, нореал, фаразий, субъюнктив, хабар майл.

INTRODUCTION

The advancement in technology and science enables to conduct various studies in all aspects of science, including linguistics. Sufficient works have been done in terms of language system researches, in particular, the problem of conditional relationships has been researched from different viewpoints. It should be noted that although the problem of investigation of conditional relationships has been studied in world linguistics up to the present, the issue is still topical and urgent to be investigated and still needs further research, which is addressed from different aspects. In particular, a number of researches should be conducted in the field of conditional relationships in world linguistics so that the following problems can be solved: complete classification of conditional relationships from different viewpoints within the language system and formulation of criteria of such classifications; comparative-typological study of the issue for improvement of teaching methods of foreign languages and translation studies; anthropocentric properties of the problem studied, systematic investigation of the issue such as its expression in all levels of the language hierarchy, etc.

This study is one of the first attempts to solve the problems mentioned above and it can fill the gaps between researches done in this field, particularly, the problem of clear and thorough classification of conditional relationships from different viewpoints within the language system and formulation of criteria of such classifications can be solved to some extent in this research.

In our opinion, it is expedient to pay attention to the lexical meaning of the concept of condition before quoting the definitions given to it by linguists. In the

explanatory dictionary under the editorship of A. Hojiev et al., the concept of condition is interpreted as follows: condition 1) mutual agreement, agreement on a case or issue; 2) demand, proposal of one of the contracting parties to the other party; 3) conditions, factors necessary for its realization [Hojiev et al., 2001; 321].

According to the explanatory dictionary edited by Z.M. Marufov, **condition** is 1) a written or oral agreement, mutual agreement on a case or issue; 2) a demand or proposal made by one of the parties to the mutual agreement or relationship to the other party; 3) factors, circumstances, conditions necessary for the realization of something; 4) **conditional mood** gram. a verb form denoting another action or state in which an action must be performed. **Conditional subordinate clause** gram. a follow-up sentence that indicates the conditions under which an event or an action understood from the main sentence [Marufov, 1981; 399-400].

In the dictionary edited by J.E. Khan, the word condition is defined as follows: a) condition of difficulty or distress (plight, predicament, quandary, dilemma); b) condition or restriction, as in an agreement or document; v) clause, typically beginning with if or unless, stating the condition in a conditional sentence or proposition (protasis, antecedent); g) main clause, stating the conclusion or consequence, in a conditional sentence or proposition (apodosis, consequent); d) prior condition for something, necessity or requirement (prerequisite, presupposition); e) require or lay down as a condition in an agreement or contract (stipulate) [J.E. Khan, 1990; 119-121].

According to the definition given in the translation dictionary under the editorship of T.K. Sattarov and I.A. Imamov, the word condition is translated as follows: 1) condition; 2) to condition, to be conditioned; 3) it has lexical meanings such as condition, status, situation [Sattarov et al., 2014; 127].

According to the explanations given to the concept of condition in the English and Uzbek explanatory dictionaries, the concept of **condition** in both languages is a) a factor, condition necessary for the realization of something; b) refers to lexical interpretations, such as a follow-up sentence, which signifies the event under which the event is understood from the proposition occurs. Hence, it is clear that in linguistics the concept of condition is studied not only as a lexical unit, but also as a syntactic unit or construction.

In this regard, it should be noted that sentences expressing conditional relations have been studied as an object of linguistic research, in particular as constructions of the language.

Cognitive-linguist B. Dancygier notes that statements expressing conditional relationships are interpreted as a construct in the works of scholars such as Fillmore 1986, 1988; Fillmore, Kay, and O'Connor 1988; Fillmore 1990a, 1990b; Fillmore and Kay 1994; Goldberg 1994; Shibatani and Thompson 1996 [Dancygier, 2001; 5]. In addition, conditional relations have been studied as constructions in the works of Y. Alotaibi (2014); N. Kikusawa (2011); Lily I-wen Su (2005); P. Nadathur (2013); Chen-Ling Chou (2000); SadamHaza 'Al Rdaat (2017), etc.

B. Dancygier admits that construction is a linguistic structure with features of form and meaning. She argues that in terms of form, construction has lexical,

morphological, and syntactic elements, while in terms of meaning, it consists of semantic and pragmatic components [Dancygier, 2001; 5].

We now turn our attention to the definitions of conditional relation construction in world linguistics: A.M. Abbas describes conditional sentences as a compound sentence consisting of two sentences, in which the performance of the action expressed in the main sentence depends on the fulfillment of the conditions in the follow-up sentence [Abbas, 2012; 41]. B.Dancygier admits that conditional sentences consist of a head and a follow-up sentence, and that a follow-up sentence is a compound sentence which is connected to the preposition mainly through the “If” conjunction [Dancygier, 1984; 1].

Summarizing the above definitions of the construction with a conditional relationship, we can formulate the following definition: the conditional relationship as a grammatical construction is mainly expressed in the form of the compound sentence, where the occurrence of the action expressed in the main sentence depends on the conditions of the follow-up sentence.

AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of the research is to analyze the history, principles, the ways of expression and problems of their classification of linguistic units representing conditional relations in the world linguistics; to develop the basis of study from different points of view of conditional relations and their classification criteria. To achieve this goal, the following tasks are set: a) to uncover the history of the study of conditional relations in the world linguistics; b) to study the issues of expression of conditional relations in the world linguistics; c) to analyze the basics of the study of conditional relations in the world linguistics on the basis of different approaches; to determine the principles of the study of a particular approach; g) to classify of expression of conditional relations and definition of criteria of classification.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

Linguistic description analysis (for analytical and critical description of works on the expression of conditional relations in world linguistics), componential (to highlight the semantic features of conditional relations) and classification analyses (to classify conditional relations) have been used.

The research is descriptive in nature and aims to explore the problem from a qualitative aspect. Hence, the study analyzes its content, essence and qualitative indicators of the laws of internal relations of the problem.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In world linguistics, conditional relations are studied from different perspectives: semantic, syntactic, stylistic, functional, speech act, pragmatic, cognitive, comparative analysis, methodical, etc.:

– works dealing with semantic analysis of the expression of conditional relations were conducted by foreign scholars such as A. Nahdim, N. Saed; C. Gabrieltos (2011); D. Rothschild (2011); E. Herburger (2015); E.D. Anna, S.H. Steffen et al (2017); Eun-

Ju Noh (1996); L. Qin (2013); A. Maria (2011); M. Ippolito (2002); P. Egge and G. Politzer (2013); Virpi (2007); M. Celce-Murcia and D. Larsen-Freeman (1999); H. Hasselgard (2016); C. Raguseo (2013) and by Russian scientists like N.Yu. Kiselyova (2005); A.A. Hakobyan (2011); O.V. Evstafiadi (2001);

– syntactic analysis of the problem is reflected in the works of foreign scholars such as K. Kazuhiro (2014); P. Cristina, A.O. José (2008); L. Haegeman (2009); M. Franke (2006); M. Celce-Murcia and D. Larsen-Freeman (1999); H. Hasselgard (2016); C. Raguseo (2013); T. Virpi (2007) and Russian scholar as V. Evstafiadi (2001). In particular, while J. Jalonen (2017) studied the relationships between parts of compound sentences (main and subordinate clause) as an object of study, semantic, stylistic analysis of the means of connecting parts of conditional compound sentences have been reflected in the work of scholars such as N. Prerna, L. Daniel (2014); R. Alexe (2013);

– the problem of expression of conditional relations in world linguistics has also been studied through stylistic analysis by scholars such as R. Narayanan, Bing Liu, A.Choudhary (2009). According to this approach, sentences expressing a conditional relationship are classified based on the sentimental state (positive, negative, and neutral) of the speaker;

– scientists such as Ching - Hui Su (2010), T. Virpi (2007) have conducted research on the use of conditional relations in speech and their functional properties. A group of scholars such as A. Bujak (2014); A. Bunyan (2014); J. Perner and E. Rafetseder (2011); N. Rottingen (1972); SadamHaza 'Al Rdaat (2017) have studied conditional relationships and their classification issues;

– most scholars who have studied the expression of conditional relations, including E. Christian, E. Cornelia, and H. Stefan (2008); M. Krifa (2017); M. Maryam, F. Judith, L. Maurice and K. Ralf (2018); A.Y. Richard (1989); R. Salnaker (2009) have explored the problem in terms of speech act;

– the pragmatic aspect of the expression of conditional relations has been researched by a number of foreign scholars such as A. Angeliki, D. Rene (1996); Chi-Hé Elder, K.M. Jaszczolt (2014); D.J. Hilton, J.F. Bonnefon (2011); M.V. Dolores, S. Gloria, M.J. Ferraces (1997); Hsun-Ming Hsu, Yu-Fang Wang, Kai-Ming Hu (2015); J.F. Bonnefon, G. Politzer (2011); R. Carston (2004); S. Moss (2012); H. Hasselgard (2016); Shaw-Jing Chao, P.W. Cheng (2000); H. Yasunari, H. Kumiko (2000); B. Dancygier, M. Ewa (1984); F. Recanati (2015); H. Jimaima (2014); P.N. Johnson-Laird, R. M. Byrne (2002), and Russian linguists as N.Yu. Kiselyova (2005); A.A. Akopyan (2011);

– from a cognitive point of view, the problems of expression of conditional relations have been analyzed in their work of the scholars such as B. Dancygier (2001); Lily I-wen Su (2005); P. Nadathur (2013);

– scholars such as A.A. Mustafa (2012); Chen-Ling Chou (2000); SadamHaza 'Al Rdaat (2017); Y. Alotaibi (2014); T. Virpi (2007); H. Hasselgard (2016) have been engaged in a comparative study of the expression of conditional relations in English and other languages;

- another foreign scientist K. Namiko (2011) conducted research on the historical evolution of the expression of conditional relations;
- significant work has been done in the field of social pedagogy on the problem of expression of conditional relations and its teaching. In particular, the issues of teaching conditional relations in English were deeply analyzed in the works of Ph. Supakorn, S. Demet, and T.T. Luu;
- in addition, a group of Russian linguists such as V.L. Kaushanskaya, I.P. Kovner (2008); I.P. Ivanova, V.V. Burlakova (1981); M.Ya. Blox (2006); E.M. Gordon, I.P. Krylova (1968); G.A. Weixman (1990); B.A. Ilish (1971) and others have also done significant work on the expression of conditional relations in English.

Semantic approach. According to D. Emmanuelle-Anna et al., who analyzed the expression of conditional meaning from a semantic point of view, there are basically two types of conditional sentences: factual (indicative) and counterfactual (subjunctive) [Emmanuelle-Anna et al., 2017; 55]. Scholars acknowledge that in a compound sentence expressing a factual conditional relationship, the occurrence or absence of an action is the same in both parts (the result in the preposition, the condition in the following sentence). However, a counterfactual condition may or may not occur as a result understood from the main part of a compound sentence expressing meaning, but the condition in the following part does not occur [Emmanuelle-Anna et al., 2017; 55]. Hence, semantically, conditional constructions can be divided into factual (real) and non-factual, counterfactual (unreal) types.

It should also be noted that another foreign scholar, Eun-Ju Noh while studying compound sentences denoting factual (indicative) conditional relations, emphasizes that in some of such sentences there is no semantic connection between parts (preposition and subordinate clause) and explains this phenomenon to be related to the relevance theory, which is based on a pragmatic factor [Eun-Ju Noh, 1996; 1-3]. Hence, there is no semantic connection between the parts of the factual (indicative) conditional constructions, and in this case the construction has a hidden pragmatic meaning, not a conditional one.

Chinese linguist Ling Qin also semantically analyzes sentences that express conditional relationships. In particular, the scientist deals with the semantic analysis of counterfactual conditional sentences. He emphasizes the role of cognitive factors in the expression of counterfactual conditional meaning and explores the expression of counterfactual conditional relationship using the conceptual integration model [Ling Qin, 2013; 764]. In his view, the counterfactual conditional meaning in English is expressed through certain verb forms and grammatical structures [Ling Qin, 2013; 754]. The scientist acknowledges that the meaning of the counterfactual condition has been studied by several scholars (cognitively by Fauconnier and Turner, 2002; Dancygier and Sweetser, 2005 and with a study of real conditional relationships by David Lewis, 1973 and semantically by Quirk et al, 1985) [Ling Qin, 2013; 755-765]. Hence, cognitive and conceptual analyses play an important role in the expression of counterfactual conditional meaning, the verb forms (tense suffixes and morphemes) play a special role in expressing conditional meaning (especially the counterfactual

conditional relationship).

Another foreign scholar, M. Ippolito, also analyzes conditional sentences from a semantic point of view. He emphasizes the importance of tense forms in the construction of non-factual conditional meaning. He admits that the peculiarity of subjunctive conditional sentences in English is that the past tense suffix is also present in the preposition (along with the modal verb) and in the following part of the sentence [Ippolito, 2002; 1]. As he describes it, a non-factual conditional sentence refers to the fact that the realization of an idea or action expressed by the speaker is far from reality [Ippolito, 2002; 1]. It is worth noting that verb forms (tense suffixes) play an important role in the expression of non-factual conditional relationships.

While P. Egge and G. Politzer examine the sentences expressing the conditional relations, they define the aspect of the negation of the factual conditional sentences as the thesis of their research. The factual conditional sentences (*indicative*), as they acknowledge, are in the form of indicative mood [Egge et al., 2013; 12]. Linguists analyze the typology of negative conditional meaning in such statements. That is, the factual condition is explained by the fact that the negation in the sentences is expressed through the connecting means and in the conditional sentences, and that it has strong and weak levels. It emphasizes that weak negative meaning is expressed through some modal means (possibly / need / may not) [Egge et al., 2013; 10-12]. Hence, negative conditional meaning has different levels of meaning, it is expressed through connecting and other formal means, and the role of modal auxiliaries in expressing their levels of meaning is great.

According to B. Dancygier and M. Ewa, the problem of the category of condition has been studied in linguistics based on the following two theories [Dancygier et al., 1984; 121]:

- the meaning of conditional sentences can be non-factual or counter-factual, depending on whether the conditions in the following part of the sentence are fulfilled or not;
- although the meanings of conditional sentences are different, they have a common basis. They are classified on the basis of the following criteria: according to the forms of the verb, according to the tenses of the sentence, and according to the type of conditional relation (real or explicit and unreal).

According to B. Dancygier and M. Ewa, there are semantically three types of sentences with conditional relations: factual, theoretical (explicit), and counterfactual (hypothetical) [Dancygier et al., 1984; 122].

In addition, P.N. Johnson-Laird and M.J. Byrne conducted a study on the expression of conditional relations in the constructions of "*If A, then C*" and "*If A, then then possibly C*". While they mainly focus on the semantic aspect of the problem in their works, the different features of the conditional meaning expressed in the present structures have been revealed [Johnson-Laird et al., 2002; 646]. At the same time, it is recognized that the pragmatic and semantic aspects of conditional relations play an important role in revealing the essence of that meaning [Johnson-Laird et al., 2002; 646]. This, in turn, plays an important role in expressing the tense and other relations

between the parts of conditional sentences (main and if-clause) expressed by such constructions, as described by scholars [Johnson-Laird et al., 2002; 646]. Depending on the level of expression of the conditional meaning, it can appear as weak and strong, clear and vague, real and unreal. This is reflected in various constructions.

In English, the conjunction “If” and its function semantically have been studied by the foreign scholar D. Rothschild. In his view, the conjunction “If”, in addition to expressing a conditional meaning, also takes the function of setting a quantitative limit to a specific meaning [Rothschild, 2011; 7]. The scholar admits that this thesis is more philosophical in nature than linguistic. Such a function of the conditional conjunction “If” has also been studied by philosophers such as Lewis (1975), Kratzer (1981, 1986), and Heim (1982), who studied the theory of conditional relations from a philosophical point of view [Rothschild, 2011; 7]. It is known that in English the conditional conjunction “If” also serves as a quantitative limit to a certain meaning in the field of philosophy.

It should also be noted that the analysis of the semantic aspects of the means of connecting parts of conditional constructions has a special place in the work devoted to the study of expression of conditional relations. In particular, P. Nadathur and D. Lassiter analyzed the semantic properties of the “unless” (if ... not) conjunction and revealed the differences between the “unless” and “if not” conjunctions [Nadathur et al., 2014; 1]. In this case, *the prediction and implicature* factors require that the “unless” conjunction should be distinguished from the “if not” conjunction. The scientist concludes that the main difference of these connectors is felt in its pragmatics rather than in the semantics of the “unless” (if ... not) connector [Nadathur et al., 2014; 16]. It becomes clear that the connecting means can also provide information about the different levels of conditional meaning as well as the pragmatic aspects.

Hence, according to the semantic approach, the relationship between the preposition and the following sentence (whether the action occurs, whether there is a semantic connection between the parts); levels of expression of conditional meaning (strong, weak, clear, uncertain, real and unreal); the potential for conditional relationship markers to express other meanings than conditional meaning (pragmatic meaning); the question of mastering the semantic subtleties of the means of connecting parts of conditional sentences is the main subject of study.

Syntactic approach. K. Kazuhiro, while studying the construction of a condition from a syntactic point of view, studies the problem of the transformation of the subordinate sentence into the main sentence, which are parts of the compound sentences expressing the conditional relationship. In particular, the scholar studies the issue of the subordinate clause becoming main clause in the language of Kupsapiny (southern Ugandan) [Kazuhiro, 2014; 65]. The phenomenon of conditional relations in the subordinate clause, which has become the dominant sentence in the languages of the world, has been studied by the scientist, and the constructions expressing such conditional relations are inherent in the syntactic structure of most languages. Examples of such constructions are observed in English (independent subordinate conditional clauses), German (alternative subordinate conditional clauses) and Italian

(infinitives in the form of commands that express conditionals) [Kazuhiro, 2014; 67]. One may conclude that the conditional meaning can also be expressed by the subordinate clause itself, which has an inter-lingual character, as a result of which they become main clauses and function independently.

Foreign scholars P. Cristina and A. O. José point out that conditional relations in English are syntactically represented by two constructions: a) by conditional verb forms in a sentence; b) the conditional conjunctions or adverbial means in the sentence [Cristina et al., 2008; 1098]. According to the results of syntactic analysis, linguists divide the expression of conditional relations in English into first type (First Conditional), second type (Second Conditional) and third type (Third Conditional) conditional sentences [Cristina et al., 2008; 1098]. It is well known that verb forms, connecting and adverbial means are forms that express conditional meaning.

Another foreign scholar, L. Haegeman, in his syntactic analysis of the conditional category, points out that some connecting means of expressing a conditional relation perform two functions [Haegeman, 2009; 31]. For example, in English, the conditional conjunction “if” can refer to the adverbial relationships of time at the same time. The scientist also admits that this phenomenon is characteristic of other languages as well. For example, in German, “wenn” (if) means both a conditional relation and an adverbial modifier of time [Haegeman, 2009; 33]. Thus, it is an inter-lingual feature that the connecting means of conditional sentences express not only the conditional meaning but also the temporal one.

T. Virpi admits that the expression of conditional relations in English is both semantically and syntactically complex, and syntactically, there are three main types of conditional sentences: a) If + Simple Present, will + future (conditions expressed in the following sentence appear); b) If + Simple Past, conditional 1 (the condition expressed in the following sentence is possible, but very unlikely to occur); c) If + Past Perfect, conditional 2 (the condition expressed in the following sentence cannot occur, it is impossible) [Virpi, 2007; 14-15]. The scientist admits that, depending on whether the probability of fulfillment is low or high, conditional sentences are semantically divided into two: open and hypothetical [Virpi, 2007; 17]. In turn, T. Virpi points out that two types of hypothetical conditional sentences are also distinguished: impossible (improbable) and counterfactual [Virpi, 2007; 18]. Conditional constructions can be open and hypothetical depending on whether or not the condition in the following sentence can occur.

Thus, the conditional relationship is expressed in the form of a compound sentence including main and if-clause (sometimes an independent simple sentence) (syntactic); verb forms (morphological); conjunctions, pronouns, proverbs and phrases (lexical); and (phonological) expression through tone and pause are among the basic principles of the syntactic approach.

Stylistic approach. It should be noted that R. Narayanan and B. Liu et al. perform sentiment analysis of conditional constructions. This is a new approach to the study of conditional relationships. They acknowledge that this approach determines whether the thought expressed in conditional sentences is positive, negative or

neutral [Narayanan et al., 2009; 1]. The following forms of sentiment analysis are distinguished: a) the study of ideas (positive, negative or neutral); b) classification of subjectivity (subjective and objective); c) sentiment analysis within a feature / theme (positive or negative perception of a product feature or theme) [Narayanan et al., 2009; 1]. Such an approach is important in the stylistic classification of conditional relationships.

From the above considerations, it is clear that the positive, neutral and negative and stylistic coloring of the idea expressed in conditional sentences are issues of stylistic approach.

Speech act (communicative) approach. In their study, M. Mohammadi and J. Fischer focus on the process of how speech act conditional sentences can indirectly answer general (yes / no) questions that occur in the field of commerce [Mohammadi et al., 2018; 80]. They argue that such a conditional statement would be an appropriate answer to general questions in the commercial context if the speaker does not make strict demands [Mohammadi et al., 2018; 80]. In this case, the act of speech implicitly expresses that *yes* or *no* answer without directly answering *yes* or *no* to the general question given by the conditional relational statements, i.e., it implicates the *yes* or *no* answer [Mohammadi et al., 2018; 80]. M. Mohammadi, J. Fischer note that the conditional speech acts is also called as biscuit conditional sentences in relation to Austin's (1970) example of "there are biscuits on the sideboard if you want some" (if you want, there is a biscuit on the side panel). Conditional constructions represent implicatures that give a *yes or no* answer, and in this case the principle of politeness of successful communication is achieved, i.e., the question is answered indirectly, not directly.

Another foreign scholar, A.Y. Richard, classified conditional sentences based on the theory of speech act. It is recognized by the scholar that the intention of the speaker to express conditional meaning is expressed not only through external formal elements such as time, inclination and other parts, but also through the speaker's intention, situational and social context and also through linguistic form [Richard, 1989; 29]. The scientist admits that the theory of speech act allows the classification of conditional sentences according to their function rather than their form, because it helps the listener to understand the purpose of the speaker. According to the theory of speech act, all conditional sentences are implicit performatives, which not only express conditional meaning, but also implicitly perform the following functions: convincing the listener; a strong belief in something; manipulating the listener; to exhort; reprimand; ask for something politely; self-justification / protection; making fun of someone; to moan [Richard, 1989; 39]. The scholar emphasizes that pragmatic reasons underlie the use of conditional sentences by the speaker to perform the above implicit tasks [Richard, 1989; 39]. The intended purpose of expression of conditional meaning is fully expressed through linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

M. Krifka equates biscuit conditional sentences to speech act conditional sentences and distinguishes two types of biscuit conditional sentences: relevance conditionals and speech act conditionals [Krifka, 2017; 3]. In addition, even in speech

act conditional sentences, the action in the main sentence does not depend on the condition in the following sentence, and such sentences have the property of forming a discourse [Krifka, 2017; 3]. In biscuit conditional sentences, the action in the main sentence does not depend on the condition in the following sentence.

From this it is clear that the function of implicit performance of a speech act of conditional sentences, the classification of conditional sentences according to the function they perform, the fact that the action of the main clause in conditional sentences does not depend on the condition of the following sentence, the politeness principle of successful communication is considered to be the subject matter of speech act approach to the study of conditional relationships.

A pragmatic approach. Foreign scholars such as A. Athanasiadou and R. Dirven were involved in the pragmatic features of the expression of conditional relations. They point out that conditional sentences can be divided into four types from a pragmatic point of view: identifying, inferencing, performative, metacommunicative [Athanasiadou et al., 1996; 99]. In particular, the executive (performative) and metacommunicative types have been studied by scholars, and the executive pragmatic conditional part of speech is part of a compound sentence that can be dropped (does not affect the meaning of the main sentence) [Athanasiadou et al., 1996; 99]. Scholars point out that the executive pragmatic conditionals can also be expressed through question-answer pair, supposition-response pair, and supposition-request pair [Athanasiadou and et al., 1996; 100]. The executive pragmatic conditional sentence and the metacommunicative conditional speech are functional in nature, the first condition emphasizes situations in which the speech act is significant, the second condition is important for certain aspects of communicative activity in interactive situations [Athanasiadou et al., 1996; 103]. Scholars acknowledge that the metacommunicative functions of conditional sentences are metapragmatic (depending on the complete act of speech), metalinguistic (depending on a particular aspect of the act of speech (expression of the act of speech)) and restrictive (limiting the expression of implicit meaning in the act of speech) and [Athanasiadou. et al., 1996; 103]. The conditional relationship can also be expressed in the form of a main clause without any markers.

While D. J. Hilton, J.F. Bonnefon analyze conditional sentences from a pragmatic point of view, they pay special attention to their following pragmatic features: drawing conclusions, motivating and instructing to do something [Hilton et al., 2011; 1]. The role and importance of context in the analysis of the pragmatic aspect of conditional relations is particularly recognized by scholars, and it is emphasized that context determines the original purpose of the speaker from expressing conditional relations [Hilton et al., 2011; 1]. According to their research, the pragmatic function of conditional statements is to direct the listener to make decisions as the speaker thinks (wishes) [Hilton et al., 2011; 6]. Conditional constructions can express not only a conditional relation but also a hidden pragmatic meaning, and such types of pragmatic meaning appear only in context.

M.D. Valina, G. Seoane et al. point out that the role and importance of pragmatic factors in making conditional judgments is high [Valina et al., 1997; 1]. They argue

that the probability expressed in the relationship between the main and the following sentence can be expressed in real everyday life situations (always, sometimes, and infrequently) [Valina et al., 1997; 2].

Chinese linguists Hsun-Ming Hsu, Yu-Fang Wang et al. explore the semantic-pragmatic features of markers such as *yaoshi* and *yaobushi*, which are conditional meanings of the mandarin language. In their view, the grammatical differences of the markers responding to this condition affect not only the expression of the conditional meaning but also its pragmatic functions [Hsun-Ming Hsu et al., 2015; 31]. Different markers have the potential to reflect not only the conditional meaning but also their pragmatic nature.

A.A. Akopyan (2011) deals with the problems of linguistic expression of conditional relations and mainly analyzes the problem from a pragmatic aspect. He studies conditional semantic markers into implicit and explicit types. The scientist admits that explicit markers, in addition to the conditional meaning, also represent the following additional meanings: accuracy, limitation, opportunity, chance, guess, uncertainty, intensification, comparison, choice, denial, prohibition, desire, regret, stylistic coloring. It is well known that conditional constructions have their own semantic field, which consists of hidden pragmatic meanings in addition to conditional relations.

The Russian scientist, N.Yu. Kiselyova (2005) analyzes the semantic-pragmatic aspect of the functions of constructions representing the conditional relationship. She argues that the approach to use such constructions in speech allows the analysis of their semantic, pragmatic, and communicative features and functions. The scientist acknowledges that the pragmatic aspect of conditional constructions is reflected in a particular discourse (speech processes that reflect the relationship between the act of speech and the conditional meaning). N.Yu. Kiselyova notes that different types of speech act can be expressed in constructions that express conditional meaning: question, various forms of encouragement (advice, please, offer, recommendation, instruction, command, prohibition, permission), promise, intimidation. Discourse is important in revealing various aspects of conditional meaning (pragmatic, semantic, communicative, functional).

Thus, the principles of the pragmatic approach are *the contribution to the success of the communicative act, the definition of the communicative purpose of the speaker using context, the definition of the pragmatic function of conditional markers, the expression of the pragmatic nature of conditional sentences through discourse analysis*.

Cognitive approach. B. Dancygier analyzes conditional clauses from a cognitive point of view and identifies how aspects of the structures that make up conditional clauses (connectives, verb forms and affixes, intonation, order of parts of conditional clauses) and contextual factors produce different meanings expressed by conditional sentences [Dancygier, 2001; 2]. In his work, B. Dancygier focuses on how the formal components of conditional sentences (conjunctions, verb forms, adverbs, auxiliaries, lexemes, intonation and the order of parts of speech in the sentence and the reflection

of these formal components in the context) and the semantic elements that form conditional meaning are interconnected with each other [Dancygier, 2001; 5]. Lexical, grammatical, and phonological units together represent a conceptual conditional meaning, and this condition is determined by the analysis of the relationships between the formal and semantic elements of conditional constructions.

The Russian scientist, M.E. Chumakina (2001) also analyzes the cognitive, semantic, and syntactic aspects of conditional constructions. Regarding a cognitive approach to the study of the problem, he identifies the semantic field of constructions that represent conditional meaning and analyzes the relationship between the semantic components that make up that field and the formal aspects expressing them.

Thus, *the question of how formal and semantic components interact in conditional constructions, the issues of lexical, grammatical and phonological units together express conceptual conditional meaning* are inherent in the cognitive approach.

Comparative research. Foreign linguist-scientist H.Jimaima made a comparative analysis of the expression of conditional relations in English and Tonga from a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic point of view and used speech act theory and cognitive analysis methods as a research method. He notes that the syntactic structure of the languages being compared is similar, and that both languages are expressed in four forms: zero form (zero conditional), first type form (first conditional), second type form (second conditional), and third type form (third conditional) [Jimaima, 2014; 106]. According to the syntactic form, in both languages, conditional sentences consist of a preposition (consequence) and a follow-up sentence (condition) [Jimaima, 2014; 106]. If the following sentence expresses an assumed or assumed situation, the main sentence represents the action (result) arising from the realization of that assumed sentence [Jimaima, 2014; 106]. He admits that the general semantic nature of such sentences arises through every aspect of the forms that express conditional meaning. From a pragmatic point of view, the scholar notes, the gap between the thought expressed in speech and the linguistic meaning is filled by context. The scholar emphasizes that in comparative languages, conditional sentences perform the same pragmatic functions [Jimaima, 2014; 107]. Hence, from a syntactic perspective, conditional constructions consist of a main and a follow-up clause, which is inter-linguistic.

A.M. Abbas comparatively analyzes the types, uses, and functions of conditional sentences in English and Kurdish and recognizes that implicit expression of conditional meaning, open and hypothetical conditional relations are inherent in both languages, and is open and hypothetical. The scholar emphasizes the role and importance of tenses in English in the expression of sentences, and the importance of other parts in Kurdish [Abbas, 2012; 40]. He admits that in English, conditional sentences perform the following functions in speech activity: to beg; counseling; to criticize; to offer; to recommend; warning; intimidation [Abbas, 2012; 43]. According to A.M. Abbas, based on the degree of probability of occurrence of a particular conditional relationship, conditional sentences in English are classified into four main types: zero category (zero conditional), first type (first conditional), second type (second conditional), third

type (third conditional). This classification is based on tense indicators expressed in verb forms in conditional sentences [Abbas, 2012; 43]. According to the comparative analysis, the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features of conditional relations have a similar character in world languages, in which explicit and implicit factors play an important role.

The Arabic scholar, Y. Alotaibi makes a comparative analysis of constructions representing conditional relations in modern Arabic and Taif dialects. He notes that in both dialects, conditional meaning is represented by two constructions: conditional conjunctions and relative clause construction. In both comparative dialects, *pin* and *law* are conditional conjunctions [Alotaibi, 2014; 1]. The scientist admits that, supporting the ideas of philologists such as Jarvis (1971), Palmer (1974), Sweet (1898), he also divides conditional constructions into two: real and unreal conditionals [Alotaibi, 2014; 1]. He defines real conditional sentences as units in which the speaker does not express any conjectural opinion or has any information about the fulfillment of the condition expressed in the following sentence. Unreal conditional sentences are units in which the speaker expresses a negative opinion about the fulfillment of the condition expressed in the following sentence [Alotaibi, 2014; 1]. The expression of a conditional meaning has syntactic (using the same connecting means) and semantic (real and unreal) similarities in the compared languages. That is, according to the comparative analysis, the similarities in the semantic, syntactic, pragmatic features of conditional sentences are inter-linguistic in nature, and such features can be reflected both implicitly and explicitly.

Classification of conditional relationship expressions.

Although a number of studies have been carried out in world linguistics on the classification of expressions of conditional relations, no specific model criteria for determining the ways of its expression have been developed yet. The main reason for this is explained by a group of Russian linguists (B.A. Ilish (1971); E.M. Gordon, I.P. Krylova (1968); B.S. Khaymovich, B.I. Rogovskaya (1967); and et al.) in the example of English as follows: In English, the relationship between meaning and form is ambiguous in the expression of conditional relations. That is, different meanings can be expressed with a single form, and conversely, a single meaning can be expressed through multiple forms as well. The analysis of the relevant literature shows that such a problem in the classification of the expression of conditional relations is a characteristic feature of world languages. This suggests the need to address the classification problem from both a semantic and syntactic perspective.

A number of foreign scholars dealt with the problem of classifying the expression of conditional relations in the field of linguistics (SadamHaza 'Al Rdaat (2017); N. Rottingen (1972); J. Perner and E. Rafetseder (2011); A. Bunyan (2014); A. Bujak (2014); A Lusekelo (2016); D. Zaefferer (1991); Kai von Fintel (2011); R. Carla (2013); S. Arita (2014); S. Nicolle (2017) et al.). However, these scholars have different approaches to the problem of classifying conditional relations: semantic, structural, communicative (speech act), pragmatic, functional, and so on.

Semantic classification of conditional relations. A number of scholars in the

field of linguistics (Eun-Ju Noh (1996); M. Ippolito (2002); P. Egge et al. (2013); J. Perner and E. Rafetseder (2011); et al.) distinguishes two types of conditional relations: 1) indicative and 2) subjunctive. At this point, it should be noted that according to the explanatory dictionary edited by foreign lexicographers S. B. Flexner and L. C. Hauck, the term **indicative** is a) a verb inclined in simple, objective verbs and interrogative sentences; b) inclination to accuracy; c) if precision refers to the verb in the mood [Flexner et al., 1987; 972], the subjunctive concept a) subjective, ambiguous, hypothetical and grammatically dependent verb moods in interrogative and affirmative sentences; b) subjunctive mood; c) refers to a verb of subjunctive mood [Flexner et al., 1987; 1894]. In the translation dictionary edited by Sh. Bo'taev and A. Iriskulov, the word **indicative** is translated as the definite form of the verb [Butaev et al., 2008; 268], while the word **subjunctive** (gram.) is translated as a verb or mood of desire [Butaev et al., 2008; 447]. It is clear from this that while the indicative term refers to the definite mood and the definite form of the verb in this mood, the word **subjunctive** refers to the subjunctive mood and the verb of desire in this mood.

M. Ippolito points out that in English the subjunctive condition occurs in the past tense of both past and present participles of sentences, and modal means are involved in the structure of the main sentence [Ippolito, 2002; 1]. According to Egge et al., in indicative conditional sentences, both in the preposition (the consequent) and in the antecedent, the verb forms tend to be precise [Egge et al., 2013; 10]. J. Perner and E. Rafetseder state that the division of conditional relations into two types (indicative and subjunctive) is based on the linguistic tendency of prepositions and adverbs [Perner et al., 2011; 92]. That is, in indicative conditional sentences the verb forms are in the present tense, and in subjective conditional sentences they are in the past tense.

The above classification was made by foreign linguists E.D. Anna et al. who recognized that subjunctive conditional sentences are called counterfactual conditional sentences. They point out that in indicative conditional sentences, the action in both the following sentence (condition) and the preposition (result) may, may not be possible, or may be unknown. However, in subjunctive conditional sentences, the result in the main sentence may be possible, impossible, or unknown, but the condition in the following sentence may not occur [Anna et al., 2017; 55]. However, it should be noted that in our opinion, it is not entirely justified to call subjunctive conditional sentences in this classification as counterfactual conditional sentences. This is because the action in subjective conditional sentences can be not only counterfactual but also hypothetical.

A. Maria also points out that conditional relations in English are semantically divided into two types: 1) factual and 2) non-factual (counterfactual and hypothetical). She notes that factual conditional sentences are divided into three: past, present, and future factual conditional sentences [Maria, 2011; 24]. The scientist notes that non-factual conditional sentences also differ into three types (past, present and future) depending on the time indicator in the following sentence [Maria, 2011; 28]. The scientist also admits that there are different types of non-factual conditional sentences:

counterfactual (action in the following sentence contradicts the fact) and hypothetical (action in the following sentence is hypothetical) [Maria, 2011; 30]. They note that while a factual conditional sentence indicates that the action in the following sentence is factual, a non-factual conditional sentence indicates that the action in the following sentence is not a fact [Maria, 2011; 30]. At this point, it can be noted that such a semantic classification of conditional relations depends on the content of the above classification (indicative and subjunctive).

Also, in the language of K. Kazuhiro Kupsapiny (southern Ugandan), conditional relations are semantically of two types: 1) factual (probable) (yèè / yòò constructive conditional) and 2) counterfactual impossible) (nte / nto is a constructive condition) [Kazuhiro, 2014; 72-73]. At the heart of such a classification is also the criterion of whether or not the action in the following sentence occurs. It should be noted, however, that the division of non-probable statements into counterfactual and hypothetical types would have made the problem of classification more precise.

According to B. Dancygier et al., conditional sentences are semantically divided into types such as 1) factual, 2) theoretical or open, and 3) hypothetical or unreal [Dancygier et al., 1984; 122]. Scholars acknowledge that the main difference between these types of conditional sentences is related to the verb forms in the preposition and the adverb. That is, in theoretical or open conditional sentences the verb message is inclined and constant, while in hypothetical or unreal conditional sentences the verb forms are variable [Dancygier et al., 1984; 127]. Scholars note that conditional sentences usually reflect theoretical (explicit) and noreal (hypothetical) meanings rather than actual meanings [Dancygier et al., 1984; 127]. They note that factual meaning can be expressed in conditional sentences only in pragmatic explicit contexts [Dancygier et al., 1984; 128]. They admit that the emergence of a condition expressed in an open (theoretical) conditional sentence is completely clear, and such sentences are divided into two: a) present and past open conditional sentence and b) next open conditional sentence [Dancygier et al., 1984; 128]. Scholars acknowledge that the hypothetical condition refers to actions that the speaker considers not to occur in the present, past, and future tenses, and is divided into two: a) past and b) present or future [Dancygier et al., 1984; 130]. This classification is based on a much broader approach and includes a complete semantic classification of conditional relationships.

Another scholar, T. Virpi, also noted that in English, depending on the degree of probability (high and low) of the occurrence of a conditional meaning in sentences expressing a conditional relationship, such sentences are semantically divided into two types: 1) open and 2) hypothetical [Virpi, 2007; 17]. In this case, it is clear that the action is likely to occur in open conditional sentences, and in hypothetical conditional sentences, the occurrence of action is unknown, the probability is very low or impossible. Such a classification is also based on the criterion of occurrence and non-occurrence of action, but it should be borne in mind that it is necessary to distinguish not only hypothetical but also counterfactual type of conditional statements that do not occur.

Such a classification (open and unreal) is also made by the Arabic linguist, M.A.

Abbas, but the second type is classified as unreal conditional rather than hypothetical. However, both nomenclatures are described in the same content. According to him, explicit conditional statements represent actions that may or may not be true [Abbas, 2012; 43]. The scientist notes that this type includes zero conditional and the first type of conditional [Abbas, 2012; 43-44]. Unreal conditional sentences, on the other hand, denote actions that cannot occur, and include the second type (two conditional) and the third type (three conditional) conditional sentences [Abbas, 2012; 46-48]. Here, again, we propose it would be expedient to divide the unreal condition into a counterfactual and a hypothetical internal division.

A number of scholars such as J. Jalonen (2017); Sadam Haza 'Al Rdaat (2017); Yasir Alotaibi (2014) et al. have noted that in most languages, sentences denoting conditional relations are semantically divided into two types: 1) real (real) and 2) unreal (unreal) conditional sentences. However, J. Jalonen admits that such a classification is ambiguous and does not shed light on the full semantic classification of conditional relational constructions [Jalonen, 2017; 11]. It is clear from this that sentences denoting conditional relations are semantically divided into two general types (real and unreal). However, it would be appropriate to divide the unreal conditional statements into smaller groups, such as hypothetical and counterfactual.

In a comparative analysis of Arabic and English, Sadam Haza 'Al Rdaat note that real conditional sentences include zero conditional and first conditional sentences, and unreal conditional sentences include second conditional and third conditional sentences. (third conditional) [Sadam Haza 'Al Rdaat, 2017; 3]. The scholar also admits that while the conditional meaning expressed in Arabic and English is expressed in Arabic by various markers, it is reflected in English mainly through verb forms [Sadam Haza 'Al Rdaat, 2017; 4]. It is well known that conditional meaning is represented by different markers in different languages, and the most common conditional meaning marker in English is these verb forms.

Another Arabic scholar, Y. Alotaibi, comparing conditional relations in modern Arabic and Taif dialects, notes that real conditional sentences refer to actions in which the speaker has no knowledge of the occurrence of the condition or has no presumption. Unreal conditional sentences, on the other hand, refer to an action in which the speaker reacts negatively to the occurrence of a condition [Alotaibi, 2014; 1].

While endorsing the views expressed by the above Arabic linguists, we recognize that the division of conditional relations into real and unreal conditional sentences is a broad classification. Therefore, in our opinion, it would be expedient to divide unreal conditional sentences into internal divisions (hypothetical and counterfactual). Indeed, hypothetical and counterfactual conditional sentences have semantic subtleties and can be interpreted differently.

A comparative study of English and Mandarin Chinese, the Chinese linguist-scientist Chen-Ling Chou admits that the probability of occurrence of action in conditional sentences in English is different (factual-factual, hypothetical-hypothetical, counterfactual-counterfactual) while it is represented by different verb forms and

modal auxiliaries, in Mandarin the probability levels of occurrence of an action are represented by a single verb form [Chen-Ling Chou, 2000; 60]. Also, in Mandarin, the verb is not required to be in the past tense to express a counterfactual conditional meaning [Chen-Ling Chou, 2000; 60]. It is clear from this that in English the factual, hypothetical, and counterfactual meanings of conditional relations differ, and while they are expressed through different verb forms and modal auxiliaries, in Mandarin such conditional meanings are represented by a single verb.

H. Jimaima notes that in the Tongan language conditional relations are semantically divided into two types: 1) simple and 2) modified. While the first round represents an action that may occur and an action that is also likely to occur in the future, the second type refers to an action that is unlikely to occur and is unlikely to occur [Jimaima, 2014; 32]. In such an approach to the classification of conditional relations, although conditional sentences are semantically called simple and modified, like the above classifications, an action can be divided into actions that may or may not occur depending on the probability of occurrence.

The English linguists C. Murcia and L. Freeman carry out the semantic classification of sentences denoting conditional relations as follows:

- α) statements expressing factual (factual conditional relationships) conditional relations;
- β) future (or predictive) conditional relationships;
- χ) imaginative (or subjunctive) conditional relationships) [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 548].

Understanding of the content of this classification urges an in-depth analysis:

A. Sentences that express a factual conditional relation. Such statements are divided into four subgroups:

a) Generic Factual Conditionals express the laws of nature, scientific facts, and general truths, both parts of a conditional sentence usually occur in the present simple tense [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 548].

b) Habitual Factual Conditionals refer to ordinary, repetitive conditional sentences and represent present and past ordinary truths [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 549].

c) Implicit Inference Conditionals. Unlike general and habitual conditional sentences, such sentences refer to conditional sentences that represent relations between a particular time and space. The relationship between a particular time and space is expressed in the following part of speech. In such sentences, the signs of time and aspect are different, and modal auxiliaries are also widely used [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 549].

Like general and habitual conditional sentences, such sentences usually have the same tense or aspect and modal auxiliaries in both parts (preposition and preposition) and occur mainly in oral speech [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 549].

g) Explicit Inference Conditionals do not require the same time, aspect, and modal relations in both parts of a compound sentence. In this case, the following part of the sentence is the basis for showing the obvious result in the main sentence, and

in the main sentence the modal auxiliaries “must” and “should” are used to make the result more transparent [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 550]. It should be noted that the modal verbs “must” and “should” indicate the accuracy of the modal relation according to the laws of the modality category of the English grammatical layer. The following part of speech also refers to the conditions in a particular space and time relationship. Like the hidden conditional statements, such statements also refer to the present and the past [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 550].

B. Future (or predictive) conditional relationships. Such statements represent future plans (or probabilities) and conditions and are divided into two:

a) Strong conditions and strong result. In the main sentence, the result is strong, and in the following sentence, the conditions are inevitable.

b) Weak conditions and weak outcome levels. In this case, auxiliary modal verbs are selected depending on the degree of realization of the result expressed in the main sentence [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 550].

The levels of probability of occurrence of the result expressed in the main sentence are modal predators (will, be going to-inevitable (strong result); should-probability (more accurate); may-probability (stronger than might); might-probability (weaker than square) [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 550]).

The modal verb “should” and the simple verb “happen” can be used to reduce the level of conditions understood from the following part of speech of compound sentences denoting future conditional relations [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 550].

C. Imaginative (or subjunctive) conditional relationships). Such statements are divided into two: hypothetical and counterfactual statements.

a) The hypothesized conditional statement implies that the condition in the following part of speech may actually occur (if influenced by an external factor), but the action is unlikely to occur in the speaker's imagination or very unlikely to occur [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 551]. For this reason, imaginary conditional sentences are called expressive expressions. Such statements point to the present and the future.

Sometimes the difference between conditional sentences that predict the future (when expressing strong conditions and outcome) and hypothetical conditional sentences depends on the choice of the speaker [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 552]. Depending on the degree of probability of the occurrence of the condition, the predicative conditional sentence or the hypothetical conditional expression is expressed in his speech.

b) Conditional clauses that contradict the fact mean that the conditions in the following clause cannot occur. Such statements refer to the present and the past [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 552].

In addition, in rare cases, the form “be” can be used instead of “were” in the following part of speech to express the present counterfactual conditional relationship, but this is very rare because it has become archaic [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 551].

It should be noted that the semantic classification made by C. Murcia and L. Freeman is of a more exemplary nature, and the semantic features of conditional relation sentences are described in detail.

Thus, it can be noted that in the semantic classification of sentences expressing a conditional relation lies the criterion of the probability levels of occurrence of the action in the main and (mainly the following sentence).

Syntactic classification of conditional relations. P. Cristina et al. analyze the expression of conditional relations in English from a syntactic point of view. Scholars acknowledge that conditional meaning is syntactically expressed in two ways:

a) through verb forms;

b) by means of connecting means and forms [Cristina et al., 2008; 1098]. As we can see, the syntactic classification of the scientist is based on the morphological language tools that express conditional relations.

Arab linguist Sadam Haza 'Al Rdaat and Russian scholar A.S. Hornby et al. syntactically note the following types of conditional sentences:

1. Zero Conditional. This type of conditional statement represents general facts and scientific facts (real actions) and is formed as follows: If + present tense, S + present tense or If + low tense, S + low tense [Sadam Haza 'Al Rdaat, 2017; 3].

A.S. Hornby admits that such a real conditional relationship is also represented by proverbs: Spare the rod, spoil the child [Hornby, 1957; 307]. It is clear from this that such a conditional attitude can also be reflected in articles.

2. First Conditional. This type of conditional statement is characterized by a high probability of occurrence of any action in the present and future tenses (real) and very close to reality, and is formed as follows: If + present simple, S + will + base form. Modal verbs such as “can”, “may” and “should” can be used in this type of conditional sentences [SadamHaza 'Al Rdaat, 2017; 3]. As can be seen, this construction is mainly used to express actions with a high probability of occurrence.

This conditional relationship can also be expressed by the construct “If + should + base form, S + present simple”, where “should” means “advice” and is used in the following part of speech in a compound sentence that emphasizes duty and obligation [Hornby, 1957; 306-307].

According to Uzbek linguists M. Gapporov, R. Kasimova, the first type of conditional sentence is expressed by the construction “If + S + should + infinitive, S + will + base form”, which means that the probability of the condition in the following sentence is very low [Gapporov et al., 2008; 317]. It should be noted that the modal auxiliary “should” in the following sentence reduces the probability of the action occurring.

The first type of conditional sentences is also expressed by the construction “If + S + will + infinitive, S + will + base form”, expressing the meanings of desire, request and readiness, with the auxiliary “will” pronounced with special emphasis (p. 334). It is clear that phonological components (accents) can also be important in the expression of a conditional relationship.

This type of condition can also be in the imperative mood of the main part of speech and is reflected in the syntactic form If + S + present simple, V + object [Gapporov et al., 2008; 317].

3) Second Conditional. It has the syntactic form “If + low tense / were, S +

would + base form”, which represents (unreal) actions that cannot occur in the present and future tenses (the “were” form of the auxiliary verb to be used for all persons follow comes in part) [SadamHaza 'Al Rdaat, 2017; 3] sentences are the second type of conditional sentences.

A.S. Hornby notes that sometimes the second type of conditional clause (the present unreal conditional relation) can also be expressed through an attributive conditional clause. In such sentences, the conditional relation is expressed not in the context of a compound sentence, but in the form of a simple sentence, through the attributive conditional clause + would + base form [Hornby, 1957; 306]. For example: A country that stopped working would quickly be bankrupt.

In addition, Russian linguists B.S. Khaymovich and B.I. Rogovskaya admit that the present unreal conditional relationship (second round conditional sentence) Would you mind my opening the window? (Would you mind if I opened the window?), I would like to speak to you? (I would like to talk to you) can also be expressed through structures (simple sentences) [Khaymovich et al., 1967; 154].

English linguists C. Murcia and L. Freeman point out that present unreal conditional sentences (the second type of conditional sentence) can also be expressed through pro-forms such as If so, If not. That is, the whole follow-up sentence is used in the sense of being “so” after the “if” conjunction to express the meaning of the part, without being “not” [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 548].

A.S. Hornby points out that “should” or “were to” is used in the following part of conditional sentences, denoting the future unreal actions (second type of conditional sentence), and If + S + should / were to + infinitive, S + would / should / could / might / represented by the construction of ought + base form [Hornby, 1957; 304].

In the literary language, the present and past tense (mainly through the auxiliary verb “had”) can be expressed in the inversion mode, without the “if” (if) conjunction, in the follow-up clause of a compound sentence. In this case, the auxiliary verbs *were* / *should* / *had* precede the subject of the following sentence, and the owner's inversion occurs, and the present unreal conditional sentence should, were + S + (were with) + base form, S + would + base form, past unreal the conditional case is expressed through the syntactic form had + S + past participle, S + would + have + past participle [Hornby, 1957; 305].

According to Russian linguists E.M. Gordon and I.P. Krylova, the present unreal conditional sentence (second round conditional sentence) if it were not for... S + should + through the base form, and the past unreal conditional sentence (third type conditional sentence), if it had not been for... S + should + is represented by a past participle construction.

4) Third conditional. These types of conditional sentences express non-real sentences in the past tense, i.e., actions that did not occur in the past tense, through the syntactic form If + past perfect, S + would have + past participle [SadamHaza 'Al Rdaat, 2017; 3].

It should also be noted that mixed types of unreal conditional relationships also differ. M.Gapporov, R.Kasimova argue that the condition (action in the following

sentence) belongs to the past tense, and the result (action in the main sentence) may belong to the present tense or vice versa [Gapporov et al., 2008; 320].

5) Mixed unreal conditionals I (mixed unreal conditional gap I). If the action in the following part of the sentence expresses a past unreal conditional relation, in the preposition the action represents the present unreal result and is represented by the syntactic form If + S + had + Past Participle, S + would + base form [M.Gapporov et al., 2008; 320].

6) Mixed unreal conditionals II (mixed unreal conditionals II). The action in the following part of speech of such compound sentences represents the present unreal conditional relation, while in the preposition the action represents the past unreal conditional relation and is represented by the syntactic device If + S + Past Simple / were, S + would + have + past participle [Gapporov et al., 2008; 320].

M.G'apporov and R.Kasimova distinguish unreal conditional sentences that do not have a condition or result. They state that sometimes the unreal conditional sentences do not have a preposition or a follow-up sentence. For example: Why didn't you tell me about it? I should have helped you. (Here you can guess the condition). If I had known it before! (Here it is possible to predict the outcome of the condition) [Gapporov et al., 2008; 320].

A Chinese linguist, May Fan, analyzing the difference in the use of conditional form like *as if* as a collocational pattern in the speech of native speakers and Hong Kong students emphasizes that British students more frequently use these collocations in describing people than Hong Kong students [May Fan, 2009; 119]. Another Chinese scholar, Zeping Huang studied lexico-grammatical verbalization of the word "situation" in the speech of Chinese students. According to Zeping Huang, the meaning of "situation" can be verbalized by lexico-grammatical structure as *if-clause* [Zeping Huang, 2014; 171].

Thus, it can be noted that the syntactic classification of conditional relations is characterized by the fact that they are based on morphological (verb forms, conjunctions and prepositions), syntactic (pro-forms, simple and compound sentences) and lexical (proverbs, modal means) forms.

Classification of conditional relations in terms of speech act. Foreign linguist-scientist A.Y. Richard classifies conditional relationships in terms of a speech act. According to him, conditional sentences are acts of performance speech [Richard, 1989; 35]. There are different types of performatives, such as making promises, warnings, giving thanks, giving orders, congratulating, and apologizing [Richard, 1989; 35]. That is, conditional sentences can also perform their function as performative speech acts.

He notes that there are implicit and explicit types of performative speech acts, which are reflected in conditional attitude sentences [Richard, 1989; 36]. For example, through the conditional construction "If you had been here, my brother would not have died," the speaker implicitly expresses his communicative purpose (reprimand, reprimand) [Richard, 1989; 37]. In order for the speaker to successfully express his/her communicative purpose, he/she also implicitly performs a certain act of speech

while using conditional attitude sentences.

The scientist admits that the classification of conditional sentences in terms of the act of speech allows a better understanding of the communicative purpose (intention) of the speaker [Richard, 1989; 39]. According to the speech act model, all conditional relational sentences are implicit performatives: in addition to expressing conditional relations, implicit also has a performative meaning [Richard, 1989; 39]. It is clear from this that the communicative purpose of the speaker is fully manifested when the implicit meaning is understood, along with the conditional meaning.

Conditional clauses are classified according to the theory of speech act as follows:

- convincing the listener;
- strong confidence in something;
- manipulation of the listener;
- counseling;
- reprimand;
- ask for something politely;
- self-justification or defense;
- making fun of someone;
- to moan [Richard, 1989; 39-46].

According to the English scholars C. Murcia and L. Freeman, statements expressing a conditional attitude also perform functions based on the following speech act theory:

- suggestion: If I can help you in any way, just let me know.
- command: If you are not here to help, please leave!
- apologize: If I've offended you in any way, I'm very sorry.
- suggestion: Don't take English 120 A unless you've already completed English 20.
- direction: Take Introduction to Symbolic Logic only if you're willing to work very hard for a B [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 559].

Thus, it can be argued that in constructions expressing a conditional relationship, in addition to the conditional meaning, there are also implicit performative meanings; such components of meaning that allow a complete understanding of the communicative purpose of the speaker.

Pragmatic classification of conditional relations: Foreign linguist-scientist A. Angeliki and R. Dirven classify conditional relations into four groups from a pragmatic point of view:

- identifying;
- inferencing;
- performative;
- metacommunicative [Angeliki et al., 1996; 99].

Scholars have acknowledged that the meta-communicative condition is always a commentary on the main sentence and the communicative act expressed in it in each of the sentences [Angeliki et al., 1996; 106]. Such a pragmatic connection can be made syntactically by means of syntactic means such as if (if I may ask so), phrases

(If any, anything, anywhere), rhyming means (if there is one), or an anaphoric element (if that is what you mean). represented [Angeliki et al., 1996; 106]. They admit that the pragmatic condition is that all sentences serve the execution of the communicative act in the preposition [Angeliki et al., 1996; 107]. While the performative condition in speech expresses the condition according to the speaker's own speech act, the meta-communicative condition emphasizes the important aspects of his/her communicative act in sentences [Angeliki et al., 1996; 107].

C. Murcia and L. Freeman point out that sentences expressing a conditional attitude mainly perform the following pragmatic functions in oral discourse:

A) to show courtesy politely. For example: If you look out the left side, you will see a Chinese restaurant.

B) to demonstrate an ironical and sarcastic speech. For example: If he is intelligent, then I am Albert Einstein. It is also permissible to repeat the same structure in both parts of a compound sentence with a conditional sentence to perform the same function. For example: If she is not coming, she is not coming [Murcia, Freeman, 1999; 558-559].

Hence, it turns out that at the heart of the pragmatic classification of conditional relations lies the problem of correctly understanding the communicative purpose of the speaker.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that sentences denoting conditional relations have been studied as an object of linguistic research as constructions in the field of linguistics. In the study of this construction, the following aspects of the problem were studied as the subject of research: semantics, syntax, stylistics, speech act, pragmatics, classification problem, teaching problem, etc.

A construct representing a conditional relationship is a linguistic structure with a plan of form and meaning, the semantic side of which is expressed in semantic and pragmatic aspects, while the form side is expressed in lexical, morphological and syntactic aspects.

Conditional relationships can be classified from different perspectives: semantic, syntactic, speech act, and pragmatic. From a semantic point of view, conditional sentences can be divided into a) real according to the criterion of the probability levels of occurrence of the action; b) unreal (hypothetical and counterfactual) types. The syntactic classification of conditional relations is based on morphological, syntactic and lexical forms. Based on the theory of speech act, conditional sentences have their own internal implicit meaning, perform the function of a specific speech act and allow the speaker to correctly understand the communicative purpose. At the heart of pragmatic classification there is also the question of achieving successful communication and a correct understanding of the communicative purpose.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, M.A. (2012). Conditional Sentences in English and Kurdish: A Contrastive Study. *Al-Fatih Journal*, 50, 40-66.
2. Angeliki, A., & Rene, D. (1996). Pragmatic conditionals. *Theoretical and applied linguistics* (Vol. 9, pp. 99-108). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University.
3. Barbara, D., & Ewa, M. (1984). Semanto-pragmatic classification of conditionals. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* (pp. 121-133). Warsaw: University of Warsaw.
4. Barbara, D. (2001). *Conditionals and Prediction: Time, Knowledge, and Causation in Conditional Constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://assets.cambridge.org/o7805215/91515/excerpt/9780521591515_excerpt.pdf.
5. Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*. New York: Heinle and Heinle, 843 p.
6. Chen-Ling, Ch. (2000). Chinese speakers' acquisition of English conditionals: Acquisition order and L1 transfer effects. *Second Language Studies*, 19(1), 57-98.
7. Chumakina, M.E. (2001). *Cognitive and formal structure of conditionality constructs*: Author's abstract. diss. ... Cand. philol. sciences. M., 33 p.
8. Cristina, P., & José, A.O. (2008). Analysis, detection and classification of certain conditional sentences in text documents. *Proceedings of IPMU'08, Torremolinos*, 1097-1104.
9. Daniel, R. (2011). *A note on conditionals and restrictors*. London: University College London, 33 p.
10. Emmanuelle-Anna, D.S., Steffen, H., & Isabelly, L.R. (2017). Obligation versus Factual Conditionals under the Weak Completion Semantics. *International Center for Computational Logic TU* (pp. 55-64). Dresden, Germany.
11. Eun-Ju, N. (1996). A relevance-theoretic account of meta representative uses in conditionals. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8, 1-41.
12. Haegeman, L. (1984). Pragmatic conditionals in English. *Folia Linguistica*, 18, (3-4), 485-502.
13. Haegeman, L. (2009). The syntax of conditional clauses. *Proceedings XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa Università di Siena* (pp. 28-50). University of Ghent.
14. Handili, J. (2014). *The syntax, semantics and pragmatics of conditional clauses in Tonga and English: A comparative analysis*. Diss. ...Zambia, 136 p.
15. Hornby, A.S. (1957). *Constructions and turns of modern English*. M.: State educational and pedagogical publishing house of the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR, 334 p.
16. Hsun-Ming, H., Yu-Fang, W., & Kai-Ming, H. (2015). Direct and indirect conditionals: A corpus-based study of Chinese yaoshi and yaobushi in spoken and written discourse. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics*, 13 (2), 31-77.
17. Jënni, J. (2017). *Conditional constructions in Damascus Arabic. Form and meaning*. Uppsala University, Department of Linguistics and Philology, 44 p.
18. Johnson-Laird, P.N., Ruth, M.J.B. (2002). Conditionals: A Theory of Meaning, Pragmatics, and Inference. *Psychological Review*, 109 (4), 646-678.
19. Josef, P., & Eva, R. (2011). *Counterfactual and Other Forms of Conditional Reasoning* (pp. 91-109). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Kawachi, K. (2014). Insubordinated conditionals in Kupsapiny. *Asian and African Languages and Linguistics*, 9, 65-104.
21. Khaimovich, B.S., & Rogovskaya, B.I. (1967). *Theoretical grammar of the English language*. M.: Higher school., 154 p.
22. Liliane, H. (2009). The syntax of conditional clauses. *Proceedings XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa Università di Siena* (pp. 28-50). University of Ghent.
23. Ling, Q. (2013). The Semantic Understanding of the English Counterfactual Conditionals-A Model Based on Conceptual Integration Theory. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4 (4), 754-766.
24. Manfred, K. (2017). Biscuit Conditionals as Anticipatory Speech Acts. *Workshop "Biscuit*

- Conditionals*”. Universität Hamburg, 34 p.
25. Maria, A. (2011). Modals and non-factual conditionals. *Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in Applied Linguistics*. Canada: University of Ottawa, 126 p.
 26. May, F. (2009). An Exploratory Study of Collocational Use by ESL Students – A Task Based Approach. *Science Direct System* (37), 110-123.
 27. Paul, E., & Guy, P. (2013). On the negation of indicative conditionals. *Proceedings of the 19th Amsterdam Colloquium* (pp. 10-18). Institute Jean-Nicod, CNRS, NYU, Philosophy Department.
 28. Perna, N. (2009). If . . . (and Only If): Conditional Perfection and Completeness. *Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Philosophy in General Linguistics and Comparative Philology at the University of Oxford*, 77 p.
 29. Ramanathan, N., Bing, L., & Alok, C. (2009). *Sentiment Analysis of Conditional Sentences*. Northwestern University, 10 p.
 30. Richard, A.Y. (1989). A classification of conditional sentences based on Speech Act Theory. *Grace Theological Journal*, 10 (1), 29-49.
 31. Sadam, H. Al R. (2017). An Analysis of Use of conditional Sentences by Arab Students of English. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8 (2), 1-13.
 32. Turunen, V. (2007). *The use of If-conditionals in English: A comparative study of Finnish upper secondary school textbook series*. Toukokuu: University of Tampere, 69 p.
 33. Yasir, A. (2014). *Conditional sentences in Modern Standard Arabic and the Taif Dialect*. A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy Department of Language and Linguistics University of Essex, 343 p.
 34. Zeping, H. (2014). *The effect of paper-based DDL on the acquisition of lexico-grammatical patterns in L2 writing*. *ReCALL*, 26, 163-183. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000020>

DICTIONARIES

35. Butayev, Sh., & Irisqulov, A. (2008). *English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionary*. Tashkent: Science, 847 p.
36. Hojiev, A., Nurmonov, A., Zaynobiddinov, S. (2001). *Explanatory dictionary of active words of modern Uzbek language*. T.: East, 336 p.
37. John, E.K. (1990). *Illustrated Reverse Dictionary. Find the Words on the Tip of Your Tongue*. New York: The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., 608 p.
38. Marufov, Z.M. (1981). *Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language*. M.: the Russian language, 715 p.
39. Sattorov, T.K., & Imomov, I.A. (2014). *English-Russian-Uzbek comprehensive law dictionary (English-Russian-Uzbek general legal dictionary)*. Tashkent: Science Ziyo, 668 p.
40. Stuart, B.F. & Leonore, C.H. (1987). *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House, Inc., 2478 p.