E CONF SERIES

International Conference on Educational Discoveries and Humanities
Hosted online from Moscow, Russia
Website: econfseries.com   16ᵗʰ November, 2025

COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF TEMPORALITY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Surayyo Marimbaeva
PhD student, Urgench State University Urgench, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This literature review examines the typological divergence in temporal encoding between Uzbek (Turkic, agglutinative, SOV) and English (Germanic, analytic, SVO). Uzbek employs morphologically dense verbal suffixes (-di, -gan, -yap) that fuse Tense, Aspect, Modality, and Evidentiality (TAM-E), while English relies on periphrastic constructions and auxiliary verbs within a binary tense system. Both languages utilize spatial metaphors for temporal conceptualization, yet their structural differences generate distinct discourse patterns and substantial challenges for translation and second language acquisition. The review advocates for corpus-based research to quantify pragmatic realizations of these typological contrasts.

Keywords: Temporality, Tense, Aspect, Evidentiality, Uzbek, English, Agglutinative, Analytic, Comparative Linguistics, Typology.

Introduction

This review synthesizes scholarly literature on temporal expression in Uzbek (Turkic, agglutinative, SOV) and English (Germanic, analytic, SVO), focusing on typological divergence and functional parallels in encoding Tense, Aspect, Modality (TAM), and Evidentiality. Despite serving similar communicative functions, these languages employ fundamentally different structural mechanisms, with significant implications for cross-linguistic understanding, translation, and pedagogy.

The fundamental contrast resides in typological approach to verbal systems. Uzbek demonstrates morphological density, integrating TAM and Evidentiality through suffixal sequences (Daniqulova, 2025; Guérin, 2021; Johanson, 1998). The language distinguishes the Direct Past (-di), requiring speaker's personal knowledge, from the Inferential Past (-gan/-ibdi), simultaneously marking perfective aspect and evidential source (Riddle, 2024; Straughn, 2011). This grammaticalized fusion of

TAM-E constitutes a defining typological feature absent in English (Koev, 2017; Plungian, 2010).

English operates through a binary tense system (past/non-past), deploying auxiliary verbs and periphrastic constructions for aspectual distinctions (Comrie, 1985). The progressive (be+Ving) encodes ongoing actions, while the perfect (have+V3) expresses resultative states (Cross-Linguistic Analysis, 2025). This analytic strategy distributes temporal information across multiple syntactic elements rather than condensing it morphologically.

Despite structural divergence, both languages fulfill universal aspectual requirements. Progressive meaning manifests through English periphrasis ("is eating") and Uzbek suffixation (yeyapman with -yap marker), while perfective meaning emerges through English Perfect constructions and Uzbek -gan forms (Cross-Linguistic Analysis, 2025). Uzbek's converb and participle systems establish relative temporal relations analogously to English non-finite.

Beyond verbal morphology, both languages employ temporal adverbials and relators, though their interaction with grammar reflects typological patterns. English prepositions ("before," "after") precede temporal noun phrases, whereas Uzbek postpositions ("avval," "keyin") follow them, consistent with head-final structure (Klum, 2017). Cross-linguistic studies reveal structurally stable deictic paradigms despite morphological differences, with forms like "yesterday/kecha" serving parallel functions.

Cognitive linguistic research reveals both universal and culture-specific patterns in temporal conceptualization. Both languages employ spatial metaphors (TIME IS MOTION: "The future lies ahead/Kelajak oldinda"), reflecting universal cognitive tendencies. However, English frequently commodifies time (TIME AS MONEY: "waste time"), reflecting industrialized productivity values, while Uzbek metaphors may incorporate cyclical, seasonal associations aligned with Central Asian cultural traditions, though further corpus investigation is warranted (Lakoff&Johnson, 1983).

Typological differences generate significant consequences for discourse organization and language acquisition. English narratives establish linear timelines through explicit past tense marking, whereas Uzbek narratives frequently deploy

E CONF SERIES

International Conference on Educational Discoveries and Humanities
Hosted online from Moscow, Russia
Website: econfseries.com   16ᵗʰ November, 2025

present tense for immediacy, relying on aspectual and evidential suffixes for sequencing (Short Stories and their Grammatical Aspects, 2025). Psycholinguistically, Uzbek's agglutinative structure requires processing dense morphological combinations, contrasting with English's analytical, syntax-based processing.

These contrasts create substantial SLA challenges. Uzbek learners struggle with English Tense-Aspect distributions and may inappropriately transfer obligatory evidential distinctions into English, where evidentiality remains lexical rather than grammatical (Cross-Linguistic Analysis, 2025). Translation demands compensation strategies: single Uzbek morphological markers require multiple English lexical elements (adverbs, modals) to convey temporal, aspectual, and epistemic meanings adequately. Conversely, English perfect constructions necessitate explicating relationships more implicit in the source text or selecting among Uzbek forms encoding evidential values unspecified in English (Cross-Linguistic Analysis, 2025).

Conclusion

The literature establishes temporal expression in Uzbek and English as quintessential typological contrast. English employs analytic, SVO strategies distributing TAM meanings across distinct components, with evidentiality remaining extra-grammatical. Uzbek utilizes dense, agglutinative, SOV morphology fusing these categories, with evidentiality fully grammaticalized. These differences extend beyond morphosyntax to influence discourse organization, cognitive processing, and pragmatic realization. Future research should prioritize corpus-based methodologies quantifying frequency distributions and discourse-level interactions across registers, alongside experimental psycholinguistic investigations elucidating cognitive processing implications of these typological divergences.

References

1. Comrie, B. (1985). Tense. Cambridge University Press.
2. Cross-Linguistic Analysis of Tense and Aspect in English and Uzbek. (2025). American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education, 3(9), 141–144.

International Conference on Educational Discoveries and Humanities
Hosted online from Moscow, Russia
Website: econfseries.com   16th November, 2025

3. Daniqulova, N. A. (2025). Expression of Time in Uzbek and English: Grammatical and Lexical Approaches. International Conference on Linguistics, Literature And Translation (London), 17.

4. Guérin, C. (2021). Tense, aspect, and evidentiality in Uzbek: A morphosyntactic account. Journal of Turkic Linguistics.

5. Johanson, L. (1998). The structure of Turkic. In L. Johanson & E. Csató (Eds.), The Turkic Languages (pp. 30–66). Routledge.

6. Koev, T. (2017). Evidentiality and temporal interpretation: The case of Bulgarian evidential past. Linguistics and Philosophy, 40, 1–32.

7. Muslimova, K. S. (2024). Metaphors of Time: English vs. Uzbek and Russian. ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN MODERN SCIENCE, 133.

8. Plungian, V. A. (2010). Types of verbal evidentiality markers. In B. Dancygier, E. D. R. B. H. M. P. (Eds.), Evidentiality in language and cognition (pp. 11–26). Mouton de Gruyter.

9. Riddle, N. (2024). Lexical and syntactic strategies for evidentiality in English: A corpus study. Journal of English Linguistics.

10. Straughn, J. (2011). The syntax and semantics of evidentials in Uzbek. (Doctoral dissertation).