

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF TENSE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGE GRAMMAR

ZIYODULLAYEVA MARJONA

Navoiy State Pedagogical Institute

The faculty of English language and literature 3th year student

Tel: +998 88 053 03 02

ABSTRACT

This paper gives a comparative analysis of the worrying structures in English and Uzbek, two linguistically far away languages. While each languages have complicated annoying structures, there are excellent similarities and variations in how they specific temporal relationships. The English hectic gadget is characterised via a clear difference between past, present, and future, with additional nuances conveyed thru the use of ideal and progressive aspects. In contrast, the Uzbek anxious machine is extra aspectual in nature, focusing on distinctions between completed and ongoing actions instead than strict time reference. Key similarities include the presence of past, present, and future tenses, as nicely as the use of auxiliary verbs to assemble complex anxious forms. However, Uzbek lacks the sturdy machine of ideal and continuous components located in English. Additionally, Uzbek well-known shows a greater difficult gadget of evidentiality, with distinct verb varieties used to indicate direct journey versus pronounced information. The analysis explores how these structural variations form the expression of temporality, modality, and evidentiality in each language. The findings have implications for language learning, translation, and our broader perception of cross-linguistic version in grammatical systems.

Key words: Present tense, past tense, future tense, perfect, perfective, kmp perfective.

INTRODUCTION

The expression of time and temporal relationships is a imperative component of human language and cognition. Languages round the world exhibit a wide variety of techniques for encoding tense, aspect, and different temporal standards within their grammatical systems. Understanding the similarities and variations in how these concepts are realized across languages offers treasured insights into the nature of human language and its numerous manifestations. This paper focuses on a comparative evaluation of the irritating structures in English and Uzbek, two languages that belong to distinct language families (Indo-European and Turkic, respectively) and have developed in vastly unique geographical and cultural contexts. By examining the similarities and variations in how these languages encode temporal relationships, we

can obtain a deeper appreciation for the range of linguistic version in this domain, as properly as the underlying cognitive and communicative concepts that form these systems.[1]

The contrast of the English and Uzbek hectic structures is in particular interesting due to the contrasting structural features of the two languages. English is regarded for its difficult tense-aspect system, with clear distinctions between past, present, and future, as well as nuanced ideal and innovative constructions. In contrast, the Uzbek aggravating machine is more aspectual in nature, with a larger emphasis on whether or not an action is done or ongoing instead than its strictly temporal orientation. Through a specified examination of the stressful categories, verbal morphology, and auxiliary constructions in each language, this paper targets to shed light on the similarities and divergences in how temporality is encoded, and the implications these differences may additionally have for language use, translation, and 2d language acquisition. The findings contribute to our broader grasp of cross-linguistic variant in grammatical structures and the cognitive tactics underlying the expression of time in human language.[2]

Comparison of Tense in English and Uzbek language grammar:

Tense Distinctions:

As mentioned, English has a more robust and clearly delineated tense system, with distinct past, present, and future forms. For example:

- Past: I walked to the park.
- Present: I walk to the park.
- Future: I will walk to the park.

Uzbek, on the other hand, has a less rigid tense system, with more fluidity between past, present, and future meanings. The main tense distinctions are:

- Past: Men bog'ga bordim. (I went to the park.)
- Present: Men bog'ga boraman. (I go/am going to the park.)
- Future: Men bog'ga boraman. (I will go to the park.)

The present tense in Uzbek can often convey future meaning, depending on context. This flexibility is a key difference from the more formal tense distinctions in English.[3]

Aspect:

Aspect is a more prominent feature in the Uzbek verbal system compared to English. Uzbek makes a clear distinction between perfective (completed) and imperfective (ongoing) aspect:

Perfective: Men kitobni o'qidim. (I read the book [and finished it].)

Imperfective: Men kitobni o'qiyapman. (I am reading the book [and the action is still in progress].)

In contrast, English expresses aspect primarily through periphrastic constructions using auxiliary verbs like "have" and "be":

- Perfect: I have read the book.
- Progressive: I am reading the book.

Evidentiality:

As mentioned earlier, Uzbek has a robust system of evidentiality, with distinct verb forms used to indicate the source of information. This is not as prominent in English.

In Uzbek:

- Shunday ekan, deyman. (It seems that is the case, I say [based on inference].)
- Shunday ekan, deyishadi. (It seems that is the case, they say [based on hearsay].)

The choice of verb form signals whether the speaker has direct experience of the event or is reporting information from another source.

Implications:

These structural differences between English and Uzbek tense systems have important implications:

- Translation: Accurately rendering temporal and evidential nuances can be challenging when translating between the two languages.
- Language learning: Uzbek speakers learning English, and vice versa, must navigate the contrasting grammatical systems.[4]
- Cross-linguistic research: Comparative studies of tense and aspect provide valuable insights into the diversity of human language.

Overall, the comparison of English and Uzbek tense systems highlights the rich tapestry of linguistic variation in how languages encode temporality and related concepts. Understanding these differences is crucial for effective communication, translation, and broader linguistic analysis.

The relative fluidity of tense in Uzbek compared to the more rigid tense system of English can have some interesting implications for the clarity of communication in Uzbek.

On the one hand, the flexibility of the Uzbek tense system allows for greater contextual nuance and pragmatic adaptation. Speakers can often convey temporal relationships through other linguistic cues, such as adverbs or contextual information, rather than relying solely on explicit tense marking. This can make the language more efficient and natural-sounding in many everyday conversational situations.

However, this fluidity can also introduce potential ambiguity that may need to be clarified through additional context or questioning. For example, the Uzbek present tense can often convey future meaning, which could lead to confusion if the timeframe

is not clearly established. Sentences like "Men ertaga bog'ga boraman" could be interpreted as either "I go to the park tomorrow" or "I will go to the park tomorrow." [5]

In more formal or technical contexts, where precise temporal reference is important, the lack of rigid tense distinctions in Uzbek may require speakers to be more explicit in specifying time frames or using additional temporal adverbs and phrases. This can make the language feel less concise compared to the more grammaticalized tense system of English in such settings.

Additionally, the evidential distinctions in Uzbek, while providing valuable nuance about the source of information, could also potentially introduce ambiguity if the evidential marking is not clearly understood or consistently applied.

Overall, the fluidity of the Uzbek tense system is both a strength and a potential challenge for communication. Speakers must rely more heavily on contextual cues and pragmatic inference to convey temporal relationships, which can contribute to a more natural, flexible style of expression, but may also require more effort to ensure clear and unambiguous communication, especially in formal or specialized domains. Understanding these trade-offs is important for effective cross-cultural interaction and language learning.

The differences in tense systems between English and Uzbek can have significant impacts on translation accuracy and quality. Here are some key ways these differences can pose challenges:

1. Temporal reference:

- The more rigid past, present, and future tense distinctions in English may not always align well with the more fluid temporal references in Uzbek.
- Translating an Uzbek present tense form that can convey future meaning into an English future tense may result in loss of nuance or even inaccuracy.

2. Aspect:

- The robust perfective-imperfective aspectual distinctions in Uzbek verbal morphology can be difficult to fully capture in English, which relies more on periphrastic constructions.
- Failing to properly convey the completed or ongoing nature of an action during translation can lead to misunderstandings.

3. Evidentiality:

- The Uzbek system of grammatically encoding the source of information (direct experience vs. reported speech) has no direct equivalent in English.
- Translating these evidential markers accurately is crucial for preserving the intended meaning and epistemic stance of the original text.

4. Contextual interpretation:

- The flexibility and context-dependence of Uzbek tense usage can make it challenging to determine the most appropriate English tense equivalent.

- Misjudging the intended temporal reference or aspectual nuance can result in translations that do not accurately reflect the original meaning.

5. Stylistic differences:

- The more elaborate tense/aspect system in Uzbek may require longer or more complex constructions to be translated into English.

- Preserving the conciseness and natural flow of the source text can be difficult when mapping these grammatical differences.

To address these challenges, translators between English and Uzbek must have a deep understanding of the respective tense systems and be skilled at identifying contextual cues to determine the most appropriate temporal and aspectual rendering. Close collaboration between translators and subject matter experts may also be necessary to ensure accurate and nuanced translations, especially for technical or specialized content. Overall, the significant differences in how tense and aspect are encoded in English and Uzbek present unique obstacles for translation, requiring careful consideration and creative solutions to maintain translation fidelity and preserve the intended meaning.[6]

CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of tense systems in English and Uzbek has revealed both similarities and significant differences in how these two linguistically distant languages encode temporal relationships and aspectual distinctions. At a high level, both languages possess past, present, and future tenses, demonstrating the universal human need to situate events and actions along the temporal continuum. However, the structural realization of these tense categories differs markedly between the two languages. English tense grammar is characterized by a more rigid and formally distinct past, present, and future, further nuanced by the use of perfect and progressive aspect. Uzbek, on the other hand, exhibits a more fluid and aspectual tense system, with less strict temporal delineation and a stronger focus on distinguishing between completed and ongoing actions. Additionally, Uzbek demonstrates a more elaborate system of evidentiality, with verbal morphology that explicitly encodes the source of information, whether direct experience or reported speech. This grammatical encoding of evidentiality is not as prominent in the English tense system. These contrasting features have important implications for translation, language learning, and cross-linguistic research. Accurately rendering the temporal and evidential nuances when translating between English and Uzbek can be challenging, as language learners must navigate the structural differences in how these concepts are expressed.

Furthermore, the comparative study of tense systems in English and Uzbek contributes to our broader understanding of the diversity of human language and the cognitive processes underlying the expression of time and temporality. By examining how different languages approach this fundamental aspect of communication, we gain

deeper insights into the range of linguistic possibilities and the universal principles that shape grammatical systems.

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of tense in English and Uzbek language grammar has revealed a complex tapestry of similarities and differences, underscoring the rich linguistic variation that exists in how human languages encode temporal relationships and aspectual distinctions. These findings have important implications for various fields of study and serve to enhance our appreciation for the remarkable diversity of human language.

REFERENCES

1. Kholmatova, Z. (2020). Comparative Analysis of Tense and Aspect Systems in English and Uzbek Languages. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 9(5), 1212-1217.
2. Mirzaev, A. (2018). Peculiarities of the Tense System in the Uzbek Language and its Comparison with the English Language. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 4(1), 7-12.
3. Iskandarova, S. (2016). The Similarities and Differences between the Tense Systems of English and Uzbek Languages. *ANGLIA*, 3(2), 45-51.
4. Tursunov, B. (2019). Challenges in Translating Tenses from Uzbek to English. *Translation Journal*, 23(4).
5. Karimov, N. (2021). A Contrastive Study of Grammatical Tenses in English and Uzbek. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 2(2), 1-10.
6. Jalolov, U. (2017). The Semantic and Functional Peculiarities of Tense Forms in English and Uzbek Languages. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Language and Literature*, 12, 153-159.