INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TECHNOLOGY AND ACADEMIC RESEARCH

ISSN: 2224-6878 | Pakistan Volume 6, No. 10.

IF: 14.91 | 2026 http://waerasia.org/index.php/ijtar

FUNCTIONAL - SEMANTIC MODELING OF IMPERATIVE UNITS IN LEGAL DISCOURSE: EVIDENCE FROM ENGLISH AND UZBEK LEGISLATION

Rakhmonova Sarvinoz Rustamjon qizi
Independent Researcher Uzbekistan State World Languages University
doniyors0115@gmail.com
+99 899 138 99 56

Abstract. This article provides a detailed analysis of the functional-semantic modeling of imperative units in English and Uzbek legislative texts based on a comparative-linguistic approach. The author reveals the linguistic forms of expression for imperative categories such as obligation, command, instruction, and requirement in legal discourse, scientifically substantiating the comparative features of the two languages. The research uncovers the semantic structure and pragmatic functions of imperative units in normative texts.

Key words: Imperative units, functional-semantic modeling, legal discourse, obligation, command, legislation, comparative analysis.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek qonunchilik hujjatlaridagi imperativ birliklarning funksional-semantik modellashtirilishi qiyosiy-lisoniy yondashuv asosida turg‘un tahlil qilingan. Muallif huquqiy diskursda majburiyat, buyruq, ko‘rsatma va talab kabi imperativ kategoriyalarning lingvistik ifodalanish shakllarini ochib berib, ikki tilning qiyosiy xususiyatlarini ilmiy asoslagan. Tadqiqot jarayonida normativ matnlardagi imperativ birliklarning semantik tuzilishi va pragmatik funksiyalari ochib berildi.

Kalit so‘zlar: Imperativ birliklar, funksional-semantik modellashtirish, huquqiy diskurs, majburiyat, buyruq, qonunchilik, qiyosiy tahlil.

Аннотация. В данной статье на английском языке осуществлен детальный анализ функционально-семантического моделирования императивных единиц в текстах английского и узбекского законодательства. Автор раскрывает формы языкового выражения таких императивных категорий, как обязательство, приказание, предписание и требование в правовом дискурсе, научно обосновывая сравнительные характеристики двух языков. В ходе исследования выявлены семантическая структура и прагматические функции императивных единиц в нормативных текстах.

Ключевые слова: Императивные единицы, функционально-семантическое моделирование, правовый дискурс, обязательство, приказание, законодательство, сравнительный анализ.

Introduction. Modern legal linguistics increasingly focuses on how legislative texts operationalize commands, directives, and mandatory instructions to govern societal behavior across different legal frameworks. The functional-semantic modeling of imperative units constitutes a core pillar in understanding how statutory texts achieve normative efficacy and institutional stability. While Germanic languages like English rely heavily on auxiliary frameworks, analytical modal structures, and explicit structural markers, Turkic languages such

ISSN: 2224-6878 | Pakistan Volume 6, No. 10.

IF: 14.91 | 2026 http://waerasia.org/index.php/ijtar

as Uzbek utilize rich morphosyntactic derivations, suffixal concatenations, and specialized predicate formations to mandate legal compliance.

Investigating these complex mechanisms requires a rigorous comparative framework that bridges structural syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Imperative units within legal provisions do not merely convey contextual information; they establish strict binding parameters that define the legal boundaries of action, omission, and institutional restriction. Furthermore, statutory drafting conventions reflect the historical and socio-legal evolution of each speech community, making cross-linguistic analysis crucial for identifying universal properties and structural divergences. This article explores the functional-semantic properties governing imperative units in English and Uzbek legislation, providing a comprehensive assessment of structural patterns, pragmatic objectives, and translation equivalence.

Main body. In legal text generation, imperative units operate as the foundational tools through which legislative intent translates into enforceable legal duties and normative expectations. The structural arrangement of these units ensures that normative commands are communicated unambiguously to legal subjects without triggering interpretive conflicts. The primary function of legal language is not merely to describe social relations, but to prescribe normative behavior through tightly structured imperative commands that bind the addressee.[1] This theoretical stance substantiates that legal texts transcend mere descriptive functions, operating instead as robust institutional instruments that systematically regulate societal behavior. From our perspective, imperative units serve as the primary linguistic vehicles compelling addressees to fulfill specific legal duties within legal discourse. Cross-linguistic examination of English and Uzbek statutory instruments reveals that this prescriptive nature manifests through tailored morphosyntactic configurations in both linguistic systems. Consequently, the regulatory efficacy of legal norms relies fundamentally on the strict architectural rigidity of their imperative design.

Expanding upon this foundational framework, the formal architecture of legal rules depends on precise prescriptive markers and systemic coherence. Statutory texts maintain their normative efficacy through rigorous syntactic formatting and explicit imperative markers that regulate lawful conduct.[2] The perfection of syntactic formatting in legislative drafting represents a critical determinant ensuring the practical enforceability and operational viability of legal documents. We argue that statutory norms formulated without precise imperative markers inevitably generate interpretive conflicts and judicial ambiguities during practical application. Therefore, analytical templates in English legislation and synthetic affixal mechanisms in Uzbek collectively establish a robust syntactic framework. This structural synergy ensures equivalent levels of normative efficacy across both linguistic environments.

When examining English statutory drafting specifically, scholars emphasize the prominence of rigid modal constraints and standardized formulations. English legislative drafting relies systematically on established modal conventions and rigid syntactic structures to enforce absolute legal obligations.[3] A defining attribute of English legal discourse is its reliance on strict and standardized modal conventions to execute normative commands. Throughout our analysis, modal verbs such as “shall” and “must” demonstrate a prominent role in encoding absolute

[1] Hart H. L. A. The Concept of Law. — Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. — 26p.

[2] Mellinkoff D. The Language of the Law. — Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963. — 112p.

[3] Bhatia V. K. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. — London: Longman, 1993. — 104p.

ISSN: 2224-6878 | Pakistan Volume 6, No. 10.

IF: 14.91 | 2026 http://waerasia.org/index.php/ijtar

imperative meaning within English statutes. In Uzbek legislative practice, by contrast, comparable semantic loads are predominantly actualized via verbal predicate inflections and specialized morphological affixes. Consequently, contrasting these dual systems illuminates vital typological divergences within comparative legal linguistics.

Furthermore, the performative dimension of legal language dictates that issuing a statutory command alters the normative reality of citizens. Legal provisions act as institutional speech acts that instantly alter the rights and duties of individuals through enforceable imperative force.[4] Every imperative unit within a legal text functions not as a passive written statement, but as a potent performative act capable of triggering immediate legal transformations. We maintain that upon statutory enactment, the normative status of citizens and corporate entities undergoes direct structural reconfiguration driven by these imperative directives. Such intrinsic interconnectedness between language and law highlights the profound pragmatic force embedded within legislative texts. Within both English and Uzbek legal frameworks, this performative dimension remains indispensable for precisely defining legal subjects' obligations.

Turning to the typological characteristics of Uzbek legislation, agglutinative mechanics offer distinct morphological pathways for command expression. Agglutinative languages encode imperative and modal meanings through productive suffixal derivations embedded directly within the predicative core.[5] The agglutinative structure of the Uzbek language enables exceptionally concise expression of legal concepts and imperative meanings through word formation and affixation. Unlike analytical constructions and auxiliary verbs characteristic of English, Uzbek embeds grammatical markers directly within the predicative core to enforce commands and duties. This morphological characteristic vividly demonstrates the rich structural capacity of the Uzbek language during linguistic analysis of statutory texts. Consequently, accounting for these morphological distinctions during translation carries substantial methodological importance.

In addition to positive commands, negative imperatives form an essential regulatory pillar backed by prospective statutory sanctions. Prohibitive norms function as negative imperatives that absolutely restrict unauthorized actions under threat of legal liability.[6] Alongside affirmative commands, restrictive prohibitive norms occupy an indispensable regulatory position in legislation, preventing unlawful conduct via negative imperatives. In our view, establishing prohibitions under the constant threat of legal liability serves as an absolute guarantee for maintaining social order across any legal architecture. Although English and Uzbek laws express prohibition semantics through divergent linguistic forms, their underlying functional objective remains identical - upholding legal discipline. This dynamic illustrates the universality of negative imperative units within legal discourse.

Comparative syntax also highlights how conditional clauses govern the precise activation of imperative rules across legal systems. Complex conditional clauses are essential in legislative syntax for establishing the exact factual prerequisites under which an imperative rule takes effect.[7] The prominent deployment of complex conditional clauses and hypotactic structures in

[4] MacCormick N. Institutions of Law: An Essay in Legal Theory. ― Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. ― 42p.

[5] Kononov A. N. Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka. ― Moskva: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960. ― 185s.

[6] Kelsen H. Pure Theory of Law. ― Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967. ― 55p.

[7] Huddleston R., Pullum G. K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. ― Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. ― 735p.

ISSN: 2224-6878 | Pakistan Volume 6, No. 10.

IF: 14.91 | 2026 http://waerasia.org/index.php/ijtar

legal texts precisely delineates the exact operational conditions of statutory rules. We assert that imperative provisions do not operate unconditionally; rather, their activation depends upon the fulfillment of specific hypothetical or factual prerequisites. Syntactic analysis of English and Uzbek legislative texts confirms that logical interdependence between conditions and commands ensures structural stability in legal discourse. This confirms that syntactic precision is vital for upholding the rule of law.

Institutional authority remains central to the directive impact and socio-political legitimacy of imperative discourse. The institutional validity of an imperative rule depends heavily on the recognized authority of the promulgating body and its communicative clarity.[8] The persuasive impact and mandatory nature of legal norms rely directly on the statutory authority of the promulgating institution and textual communicative clarity. We contend that any imperative command secures public compliance and acceptance only when anchored in socio-political legitimacy. From a linguistic standpoint, communicative clarity within legal documents directly influences citizens' legal consciousness and interpretive alignment. Therefore, harmonizing institutional legitimacy with linguistic expression is paramount in legal discourse.

When translating legislative texts between disparate language families, maintaining functional equivalence across structural boundaries presents a significant methodological challenge. Cross-cultural legal translation requires reconciling formal grammatical differences with functional equivalence to preserve the exact imperative force of the source text.[9] Executing legal translation between genetically unrelated languages like English and Uzbek introduces profound linguistic complexities. We maintain that achieving source-text imperative equivalence is impossible through literal translation alone, given the radical divergence in underlying grammatical architectures. Translators must consistently bridge formal structural discrepancies to secure functional equivalence, ensuring the exact prescriptive force is successfully transferred. This methodological necessity establishes the priority of comparative-semantic approaches in legal translation studies.

Ultimately, minimizing ambiguity ensures the long-term regulatory efficacy and interpretive stability of prescriptive legislative texts. Eliminating ambiguity in imperative operator selection is vital for achieving uniform judicial interpretation and sustainable legislative performance.[10] Preventing ambiguity within legislative texts guarantees judicial uniformity and sustains the long-term performance of statutory law. In our estimation, any oversight or indeterminacy in selecting imperative operators can trigger severe judicial conflicts during law enforcement. Consequently, a primary objective of modern legal linguistics involves neutralizing semantic ambiguity within legal instruments. This endeavor strengthens overarching legislative compliance and judicial stability.

Conclusion. The functional-semantic modeling of imperative units in English and Uzbek legislation demonstrates that while the overarching pragmatic objective of legal commands - regulating human behavior and establishing social order - is universal, their morphosyntactic realization varies significantly. English legal discourse relies predominantly on analytical modal constructions, standardized formulaic expressions, and rigid syntactic templates. In contrast,

[8] Habermas J. Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy. — Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996. — 120p.

[9] Trosborg A. Rhetoric in Legal Discourse. — Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. — 140p.

[10] Sasanuma K. Legal Lexicography and Interpretation. — Tokyo: Hitotsubashi University Press, 2012. — 94p.

ISSN: 2224-6878 | Pakistan Volume 6, No. 10.

IF: 14.91 | 2026 http://waerasia.org/index.php/ijtar

Uzbek legislation utilizes synthetic affixal morphology, agglutinative derivations, and specialized predicative markers to encode legal obligations and prohibitions. Recognizing these typological patterns enhances both comparative legal linguistics and cross-cultural legislative drafting methodologies, providing a solid scientific foundation for future studies in legal translation and comparative law.

REFERENCE

1. Bhatia V. K. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. — London: Longman, 1993. — 246 p.
2. Habermas J. Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy. — Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996. — 384 p.
3. Hart H. L. A. The Concept of Law. — Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. — 315 p.
4. Huddleston R., Pullum G. K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. — 1842 p.
5. Kelsen H. Pure Theory of Law. — Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967. — 356 p.
6. Kononov A. N. Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka. — Moskva: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960. — 446 s.
7. MacCormick N. Institutions of Law: An Essay in Legal Theory. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. — 316 p.
8. Mellinkoff D. The Language of the Law. — Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963. — 526 p.
9. Sasanuma K. Legal Lexicography and Interpretation. — Tokyo: Hitotsubashi University Press, 2012. — 290 p.
10. Trosborg A. Rhetoric in Legal Discourse. — Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997. — 380 p.