

Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларида феъл замонларининг берилиши

Уралова Ш. 404 а 2 иф

The use of the tense forms of the verb in English and Uzbek languages

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
CHAPTER I. Review of the linguistic literature on the problems of verb morphology in Present Day English	
1.1 The problem of the category of tense in Present Day English and Uzbek languages.....	7
1.2 The problem of linguistic analysis of the verb agreement in English.....	13
1.3 The problem of Tense and time in English	14
CHAPTER II. The analysis of the semantic categorisation of the tense forms in Present Day English and Uzbek languages	
2.1 The analysis of the functional categories of tense and correlation in English and Uzbek languages.....	35
2.2 The analysis of the grammatical representation of duration, completion, and repetition in English and Uzbek languages	49
CHAPTER III. Problems of teaching grammar to elementary and intermediate students	
3.1 How to teach foreign languages.....	55
3.2 Grammar acquisition. Focusing on tenses.....	60
Conclusion.....	64
The list of used literature.....	68

INTRODUCTION

Development of a science as a whole and a linguistic science, in particular is connected not only to the decision of actuality scientific problems, but also with features internal and foreign policy of the state, the maintenance of the state educational standards which are to the generators of progress providing social, economic society. It forms the society capable quickly to adapt in the modern world¹.

It is now clearly seen in the economic socio-political and cultural life of the Republic of Uzbekistan today, when we are celebrating the 21st anniversary of the National Independence of our Fatherland, Uzbekistan.

Conditions of reforming of all education system the question of the world assistance to improvement of quality of scientific-theoretical aspect of educational process is especially actually put. As President I.A. Karimov has declared in the programme speech "Harmoniously development of generation a basis progress of Uzbekistan": "... all of us realize, that achievement of the great purposes put today before us, noble aspirations it is necessary for updating a society". The effect and destiny of our reforms carried out in the name of progress and the future, results of our intentions are connected with highly skilled, conscious staff, the experts who are meeting the requirements of time².

The qualification paper is dedicated to the study of the semantic categorisation of the tense forms in English used in different context (on the material of the English, American and Uzbek writers) which presents a certain interest both for theoretical investigation and for practical usage. We have the full basis to approve that many linguists have brought the invaluable contribution to studying various properties of the categorical forms of tense and their semantic categorisation (in more detail see B. A. Ilyish, A.A. Kobrina, A.V. Korneeva, G.V. Vorontsova, L.S. Barkhudarov, M.Y. Blokh, G.G. Pocheptsov, A.I. Smirnitsky, Ch. Fillmore, W. Chafe, A. Khudyakov, M.

¹ И.А. Каримов. Наша высшая цель – независимость и процветание Родины, свобода и благополучие народа. Доклад на первой сессии Олий Мажлиса Республики Узбекистан второго созыва от 22.01.2000ю – Т.: Узбекистан. 2000. Т. 8. – С. 322 – 340.

² И.А.Каримов "Чет тилларни ўрганиш тизимини янада такомиллаштириш чора тадбирлари тўғрисида." ПК--1875, Халқ сўзи, 2012, 11 декабр, 1-бет

Iriskulov, B.V. Reznik, E.S. Kubrjakova, Ch. Hockett' works and etc.), that has created necessary theoretical preconditions for describing the semantics of verbs forms in different tense aspect correlation.

The **actuality** of the investigation is expressed on the one hand by the profound interest in learning the problems of the semantic categorisation of the tense forms which are widely used to perform different communicative and cognitive functions in the speech acts where English is used as means of communication. The present qualification paper deals with the study of the problems of the semantic categorisation of the tense-aspect forms in English sentences, which present a certain interest both for the theoretical investigation and for the practical language use. It is also expressed by the interest to the morphology of the verb and function of the tense forms in different kinds of sentences in English, American and Uzbek literary works and in speech, and, on the other hand by the absence of likeness in the categorical semantics and English and widely approved analysis of the semantic categorisation of the tense forms from the semantic, stylistic, structural, and translational points of view.

The **novelty** of work is determined by creative analysis of the works of leading scholars, concrete results of investigation, which is to distribute into various tables, problems and specificity of the linguistic status of the semantic categorisation of the tense forms used in different contexts indicated by the lexical and grammatical category of tense-aspect forms in the English language.

The **aim** of this research is based on detailed study of the categorisation of the tense forms in English and Uzbek languages, and the structural patterns with them in, differences between their semantic categorisation of the tense forms in the sentences.

According to this general aim the following particular **tasks** are put forward:

1. To give deep view of various types of tense forms and the sentences with them.
2. To reveal types of the tense forms used by English, American and Uzbek writers and their classification.

3. To describe the contextual semantics of the tense forms in English and Uzbek languages.

4. To reveal linguistic status of the tense forms in English and Uzbek languages.

5. To analyse the contextual features of the tense forms used in English and Uzbek stories.

The **object** of given investigation is the tense forms and the different structural types of the sentences with tense forms.

The **subject** is the structural-semantic and functional-contextual features of the semantic categorisation of the tense forms used in sentences in English and Uzbek languages.

Hypothesis of this research is the linguistic phenomenon – of semantic categorisation of the tense forms, its relation to the sentence structure to other types of contextual semantics on the material of the stories by English, American and Uzbek authors in the English and Uzbek languages will be thoroughly investigated according to modern methods. Comprehensive analysis will be used to achieve the aim and tasks put forward in the presented investigation.

The **methods** of investigation used in this research are as following: complex approach to the study of the sentences with the tense forms as semantic categorisation, including morphological, structural, distributional way of analysis of the English language unit.

Methodological bases of research is Decrees of the President of Republic of Uzbekistan about development of languages, educations and sciences, the national programme on a professional training, and also basic researches in the field of the theory of linguistics, in particular Theoretical Grammar of English and Comparative Typology of English and Russian Languages.

Theoretical value is that it can serve bases for studying the contextual-semantics of the tense forms widely. It will allow understanding deeply importance of studying sentence structures with tense forms because this kind of the verbs are most

of widely formed with the help of the contextual properties. It will be replenished with the big speed of the increase of the tense forms frequency.

Practical value of this work is that the theoretical positions of this paper can be used in delivering lectures and seminars on theoretical grammar, general linguistics, typology, and methodology of Teaching English.

The **material** includes:

1. Different scientific literature like monographs, dissertations, articles on the problems discussed.
2. The literary books of English, Russian and Uzbek authors published in the last few years.

The **structure** of the given qualification paper consists of an introduction, three chapters, a summary which is followed by the list of literature used in the course of research, conclusion at the end of each chapter and bibliography. Introduction tells us about the brief plot of the paper and structure of the work (actuality, aim, tasks, novelty and so on). The main part of the work includes three chapters in itself.

CHAPTER I. REVIEW OF THE LINGUISTIC LITERATURE ON THE PROBLEMS OF VERB MORPHOLOGY IN PRESENT DAY ENGLISH

1.1 The problem of the category of tense in Present Day English

Grammatical tense is a way languages express the time at which an event described by a sentence occurs. In English, this is a property of a verb form, and expresses only time-related information. Tense, along with mood, voice and person, are four ways in which verb forms are frequently characterized, in languages where those categories apply.

There are languages where tense is not expressed anywhere in the verb or any auxiliaries, but only as adverbs of time, when needed for comprehension; in the same condition, grammatical tense in certain languages can be expressed optionally, and there are also languages where verbs indicate aspect in addition to or instead of tense.

The exact number of tenses in a language is often a matter of some debate, since many languages include the state of certainty of the information, the frequency of the event, whether it is ongoing or finished, and even whether the information was directly experienced or gleaned from hearsay, as moods or tenses of a verb. Some grammarians consider these to be separate tenses, and some do not³.

Tenses cannot be easily mapped from one language into another. While all languages have a «*default*» tense with a name usually translated as «*present tense*» (or «*simple present*»), the actual meaning of this tense may vary considerably. Viewed in the strictest linguistic sense, English has only two tenses: *non-past tense* and *past tense*, which are shown with the verb endings – *Ø* and – *ed*.

Since *will* is a modal auxiliary, it cannot co-occur with other modals like *can*, *may*, and *must*. Only aspects can be used in infinitives. Some linguists consider *will* a future marker and give English two more tenses, *future tense* and *future-in-past tense*, which are shown by *will* and *would* respectively. Also, in nonlinguistic language study, aspects and mode are viewed as tenses. The distinction between grammatical tense, aspect, and mood is fuzzy and at times controversial. The English continuous

³ Fries Ch. The Structure of English, Moscow: Visshaya shkola. 1951, p 248

temporal constructions express an aspect as well as a tense, and some therefore consider that aspect to be separate from tense in English. In Spanish the traditional verb tenses are also combinations of aspectual and temporal information.

Going even further, there's an ongoing dispute among modern English grammarians regarding whether tense can only refer to inflected forms. In Germanic languages there are very few tenses (often only two) formed strictly by inflection, and one school contends that all complex or periphrastic time-formations are aspects rather than tenses. The abbreviation TAM, T/A/M or TMA (**Tense/Aspect/Mood**) is sometimes found when dealing with verbal morphemes that combine tense, aspect and mood information. In some languages, tense and other TAM information may be marked on a noun, rather than a verb. This is called *nominal TAM*⁴.

Tenses can be broadly classified as:

Absolute: indicates time in relationship to the time of the utterance (i.e. «now»). For example, «*I am sitting down*», the tense is indicated in relation to the present moment.

Relative: in relationship to some other time, other than the time of utterance, e.g. «*While strolling through the shops, she saw a nice dress in the window*». Here, the «saw» is relative to the time of the «strolling». The relationship between the time of «strolling» and the time of utterance is not clearly specified.

Absolute-relative: indicates time in relationship to some other event, whose time in turn is relative to the time of utterance. (Thus, in absolute-relative tense, the time of the verb is indirectly related to the time of the utterance; in absolute tense, it is directly related; in relative tense, its relationship to the time of utterance is left unspecified.) For example, «*When I walked through the park, I saw a bird.*» Here, «saw» is present relative to the «walked», and «walked» is past relative to the time of the utterance, thus «saw» is in absolute-relative tense.

Moving on from this, tenses can be quite finely distinguished from one another, although no language will express simply all of these distinctions. As we will see,

⁴ Fries Ch. The Structure of English. Moscow: Visshaya shkola. 1951, p248

some of these tenses in fact involve elements of modality (e.g. predictive and not-yet tenses), but they are difficult to classify clearly as either tenses or moods.

Many languages define tense not just in terms of past/future/present, but also in terms of how far into the past or future they are. Thus they introduce concepts of closeness or remoteness, or tenses that are relevant to the measurement of time into days. Some languages also distinguish not just between past, present, and future, but also non-past, non-present, non-future. Each of these latter tenses incorporates two of the former, without specifying which.

Absolute tenses: *Future tenses*. Some languages have different future tenses to indicate how far into the future we are talking about. Some of these include⁵:

Close future tense: in the near future, soon;

Near future tense: sometime today;

Past future tense: sometime after today;

Remote future tense: in the more distant future;

Predictive future tense: a future tense which expresses a prediction rather than an intention, i.e. «*I predict he will lose the election, although I want him to win*». As such, it is really more of a mood than a tense. (Its tenseness rather than modality lies in the fact that you can predict the future, but not the past.);

Non-future tense: refers to either the present or the past, but does not clearly specify which.

Contrasts with future; *Non-past tense*: refers to either the present or the future, but does not clearly specify which. Contrasts with past; *Not-yet tense*: has not happened in present or past (non-future), but often with the implication that it is expected to happen in the future. (As such, is both a tense and a modality). In English, it is expressed with «*not yet*», hence its name.

***Past tenses*.** Some languages have different past tenses to indicate how far into the past we are talking about:

Past tense: yesterday or early, but not remote;

⁵ Irtenyeva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh M. Y., Shapkin A.P. Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, Presvesheniya. 1969, p 220 p

Remote past tense: sometime earlier today;

Immediate past tense: very recent past tense, e.g. in the last minute or two;

Recent past tense: in the last few days/weeks/months (exact definition varies);

Remote past tense: more than a few days/weeks/months ago (exact definition varies);

Nonrecent past tense: not recent past tense, contrasting with recent past tense;

Nonremote past tense: not remote past tense, contrasting with remote past tense;

Pre-remote past tense: before remote past tense;

Pre-remote past tense: before remote past tense;

Preterit: past tense not marked for aspect or modality.

Present tense: *Still tense*: indicates a situation held to be the case, at or immediately before the utterance.

Absolute-relative tenses:

Future perfect tense: will have completed by some time in the future, will occur before some time in the future;

Future-in-future tense: at some time in the future, will still be in the future;

Future-in-past tense: at some time in the future, will be in the past;

Future-perfect-in-past tense: will be completed by some time which is in the future of some time in the past, eg., *Sally went to work; by the time she should be home, the burglary would have been completed*; *Past perfect tense*: at some time in the past, was already in the past

Relative tenses:

Relative future tense: is in the future of some unspecified time;

Relative non-future tense: is in the past or present of some unspecified time;

Relative non-past tense: is in the present or future of some unspecified time;

Relative past tense: is in the past of some unspecified time;

Relative present tense: is in the present of some unspecified time.

What properties of the events described in the following sentences do the morphemes in bold tell us about

Jimmy **will** graduate in June.

Jimmy **would** graduate if he studied.

Jimmy **is** sleeping.

The Grammies realized early on that when an event occurred or a state was true often mattered. An utterance like *Clark eats berries* wasn't much use if the hearer didn't know whether Clark had already eaten the berries, was eating them at that moment, or was going to eat them at some later time. The Grammies developed two kinds of expressions to help them talk about the time of an event or state, absolute and relative expressions. This is a distinction we've seen before, in the context of adjective meaning.

Absolute time expressions label specific points in time, such as *January 20, 1203*, or points within a repeating unit of time, such as *3:00 pm* (which labels a time within the day) and *Tuesday* (which labels a day within the week). The second type of expression may be used for repeating events or states (*I got up at 7:00*) or for a single event or state, in which case the Hearer has to be able to figure out which unit of time the Speaker has in mind. That is, *I got up at 7:00* is only meaningful if we know which day the Speaker is talking about.

Relative time expressions label points in time relative to some other reference point. The most obvious reference point is the utterance time, which is one of the roles in the utterance context and is directly accessible to the Hearer. Thus referring to time in this way is an example of a **deictic** use of language.

For an event or state that is going on at the time of speaking, we have a word like *now*. For a past or future event or state, we can mention the length of time that has elapsed or will elapse between the time it occurred or will occur and the utterance time (an hour ago, in an hour), or we can simply say that, it happened before the utterance time or will happen after the utterance time (already, in the future). There are other possible reference points for relative time reference. We can say things like *before that time* and *after the wedding*⁶.

Just as number ended up grammatical in languages such as English, we might

⁶ Bryant M. *A Functional English Grammar*. N. Y., 1945. p 85.

expect reference to the time of events and states to end up grammatical too. In fact, many, if not most, modern languages have a system for this, called tense, built into their grammar. For example, we distinguish *Clark fell asleep*, *Clark is falling asleep*, and *Clark is going to fall asleep*.

Tense morphology divides events and states into the general grammatical categories past, present, and future; or a smaller set such as past and non-past; or a larger set, depending on the language. As with other grammatical morphology, tense marking is normally obligatory in languages that have it, even when it is redundant. Both of the following English sentences have the past morpheme, even though that morpheme is redundant in the second example because the phrase *last night* makes it clear that the event happened before the utterance time

1. *I slept ten hours.*
2. *I slept ten hours last night.*
3. *If Jimmy spoke Spanish, he'd have a better chance with Lupe.*
4. *Perry suggested that Clark spend few time on computer games.*

In sentence 3, the Speaker knows that Jimmy doesn't speak Spanish; if he did or there were at least a possibility that he does, the verb would be *speaks* rather than *spoke*. And in the same sentence, *would* ('d) indicates the conditional nature of the state of "having a better chance"; it would be true if Jimmy spoke Spanish, but he doesn't, so it isn't. In sentence 4, *spend* is used rather than *spends*, indicating the tentative nature of the "*spending less time*"; this is only a suggestion, not yet reality. What makes the following sentences ungrammatical? What kind of rule can you specify for the verb morpheme -s?

Dark always arrive late. -Not right. Dark's colleagues like him a lot. -Not right.

In many languages verbs take inflectional morphemes that convey some information about one or more participants in the event or state that the sentence is about. One way to think about this is in terms of the agreement between the verb and those participants on a small number of abstract properties.

On the one extreme are languages, which have no morphology of this type

(though sometimes the choice of a verb in Japanese is governed by some properties of the participants). In what follows, I'll briefly discuss verb agreement in four languages that have some form of it. Notice that since agreement morphology conveys abstract properties of participants, that is, things, this topic overlaps with the topic of the last section⁷.

1.2 The aspects of linguistic analysis of the verb agreement in English

English is a language with limited verb agreement morphology, the vestiges of what was a full-blown agreement system in Old English. Consider these sentences.

1. *Clark plays golf*
2. *Loin and Clark play tennis.*
3. *I play croquet.*
4. *Clark played 18 holes yesterday.*
5. *Clark likes learn sports.*

Notice that the form of the verb play differs in sentence 1 and 2. In sentence 1 the subject of the sentence, *Clark*, is 3rd person (that is, including neither the Speaker nor the Hearer) and singular, and the verb takes the suffix -s to indicate this. When the same verb is used with a subject that has any other combination of person and number, as in sentences 2 and 3, the verb takes no suffix. Notice also that an agreement suffix is only added to verbs in the simple present tense, that is, the tense category used in sentences 1, 2, and 3. Sentence 4 is in the simple past tense, and no distinction is made on the basis of person and number. Finally, notice that it is the participant in the syntactic role of subject, rather than any particular semantic role, that the verb agrees with. So in sentence 5, the verb again takes the -s even though the subject in this case refers to an experiencer rather than an agent, as in sentence 1. With the verb be, there are three forms rather than two in the simple present, and rather than suffixes, completely unrelated forms are used: am (1st person singular), is (3rd person singular), and are (other person-number combinations).

The verb be also has two forms in the simple past tense, was and were. Thus English subject-verb agreement is limited both in terms of the number of different forms and the situations in which it must apply. However, it behaves just like the other examples of grammatical morphology we've been considering. It is often

⁷ Bryant M. *A Functional English Grammar*. New York, Press. 1945. p 109.

redundant, but it is obligatory even when it is.

So in standard English dialects, at least, it is ungrammatical to say *Clark like Lois*, even though the missing -s would convey no new information. So does the -s in play in sentences 1 and 5 mean anything? Yes, it means that the subject of that verb is 3rd person singular. In addition, because this suffix only occurs on verbs in the simple present tense, it also marks that tense category.

1.3 The correlation of tense and time in English

From the outset, theories of tense for English confront the poser that temporal reference is not an invariant of verb clusters. Thus *returned*, predicated upon the past in (1) *She returned the tickets yesterday* is found applied to the future in (2) *If she returned the tickets tomorrow, they would refund her money*. English verb clusters divide into those of the PRIMARY PATTERN and those of the SECONDARY PATTERN, the former being all and only those not incorporating a secondary auxiliary.

The secondary auxiliaries are *will, would, shall, should, can, could, may, might, must, ought* and two or three others. The point of the segregation is that secondary-pattern verb clusters are systematically one word longer than primary-pattern ones — a syntactical fact which can hardly lack semantic significance⁸. The traditional notion of tense is familiar without being clear, and in fact runs together the very two things whose relationship we want to investigate. For when one describes a verb cluster as (say) present tensed, it is unclear whether one is saying something about its syntactical form or something about its temporal meaning. Better to speak in less slippery terms; and this section will accordingly settle on some syntactical ones.

Viewed as a formal category, the old present tense comprised (for 3rd person singular, which will serve as our paradigm throughout) the eight forms *V-s, is V-ing, is V-en, is being V-en, has V-en, has been V-ing, has been V-en* and *has been being V-en*. Spurning the delusive terminology, let us filch the syntactical idea and refer to the set of verb clusters of those eight forms as FORMAT R. Format R is thus a set of

⁸ Ilyish B.A. *The Structure of Modern English*. Moscow, Leningrad: 1971. p208

word-type strings. Half of its members, incidentally, are PHASE-MODIFIED, in the sense that they contain a part of auxiliary HAVE followed by the *-en* part of some verb. Next, let us define, upon format R as domain, a function $\langle p \rangle$ which maps verb clusters to verb clusters, as follows:- If $r \in R$, then $ip(r)$ is the result of changing *V-s* to *V-ed*, *is* to *was* or *has* to *had* in r . The image set of verb clusters thus generated let us call FORMAT S, and the subset of S whose elements are phase modified let us call FORMAT T. Now we can extend the definition of $\langle p \rangle$ so that $\langle p \rangle$ can take members of S as argument:- If $s \in S$, then (i) if $s \in T$, then $\langle p(s) \rangle$ does not exist, and (ii) otherwise, $ip(s)$ is obtained by phase-modifying s . And with that we have all the syntactical machinery we shall be needing⁹.

And now, as a matter of empirical fact, the union of formats R and S is the set of primary-pattern verb clusters of English. We can think of the elements of R as the ABORIGINAL primary-pattern verb clusters, the elements of S all being generated from elements of R by means of $\langle p \rangle$ — with the point to be made that half the members of S can be generated in two different ways. The difficulty we began with was that verb clusters enjoy divergent temporal associations. Such matters are conveniently formulated in terms of the USES to which verb clusters are susceptible: what we observed in (1) and (2), we can say, is that the format-S verb cluster *returned* admits of uses relating to future returnings as well as uses relating to past ones.

Cataloguing verb-cluster uses has long been a staple of the grammatical endeavour, and all sorts of discriminations can be drawn: the uses to which English verb clusters submit are absorbingly heterogeneous.

One interesting variety is discovered when locutions like

(3) *The conference begins next Monday* = *Конференция кейинги душанба куни бошланади*;

(4) *The conference began next Monday* = *Конференция кейинги душанба куни бошланганди*;

⁹ Ilyish B.A. The Structure of Modern English. Moscow, Leningrad: 1971. p 100

(5) *The conference had begun next Monday* = *Конференция кейинги душанба кунни бошланган*; are employed to volunteer the terms of some plan, intention, determination, arrangement or schedule relating to the future:

(6) *According to our original plan, the conference began next Monday, but now it begins tomorrow* = *Бизнинг ҳақиқий режамизга кўра конференция кейинги Душанба кунни бошланганди, лекин энди бугун бошланади*; (7) *Initially the conference had begun next Monday, but many delegates complained and...* = *Аввал конференция кейинги Душанба кунни бошланганди, лекин кўп делегациялар шикоят қилдилар ва ...*

What is registered by the format of the verb cluster in such a case is patently the time of the schedule's validity — a point to which we shall revert. Meanwhile, these 'pre-arrangement' uses are instanced here simply to illustrate the diversity of the distinctions that can be drawn among verb-cluster uses. Some of the uses that come a verb cluster's way are confined to its occurrences in non-principal clauses.

Each primary-pattern verb cluster has uses, that is to say, which never accrue to it when it occurs as the finite verb of a one-clause sentence or indeed of any principal clause — uses accessible to it only when it occurs in some non-principal clause. A case in point is the future-related use of *returned* we described in (2).

One can indeed say (8) *She returned the tickets tomorrow* = *У билетларни эртага қайтариб берганда* to allege an erstwhile pre-arrangement, after the manner of (4); but under the only unforced interpretation of (2), *returned* moots not an erstwhile pre-arrangement but a future contingency, and my point is that THAT use is never accessible to *returned* in the context of any one-clause sentence. When *returned* is taken THAT way, (8) cannot be understood as an English sentence.¹⁰

The past-related use of *returned* we found in (1) is quite different: it crops up in one-clause sentences and non-principal clauses alike. Indeed it is precisely because we recognise the same use of *returned* in (1) as in

¹⁰ Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Ldn., 1972. p 100

(9) *If she returned the tickets yesterday, her refund was posted this morning* =
Агар у билетларни эртага қайтариб берганда, билетнинг пули бугун почти
орқали жўнатилади

that we can conclude, from (1) and (9) taken together, that her refund was posted this morning. Occurring in the context of (9), (1) is construed exactly as it would be were it standing alone as a one-clause sentence.

Let us speak of those uses as PRIME which, like the past-event use of *returned* we discovered in (1) and in (9), are accessible to the finite verb clusters of one-clause sentences. Then the central contention of this paper is simply that, in English, not all verb-cluster uses are prime uses. Indeed, the primary-pattern verb clusters of English are much given to non-prime use, as reflection upon the following examples will disclose:

(10) *If she returns the tickets tomorrow, they will refund her money* = *У*
билетларни эртага қайтариб берса, улар билетнинг пулини қайтариб
беришади;

(11) *If she had returned the tickets tomorrow, they would have refunded her money* (said after she has lost or destroyed the tickets, likely) = *У билетларни*
эртага қайтариб берганда, улар билетнинг пулини қайтариб беришарди;

(12) *If your father was alive today, he would be turning in his grave.* - *Агар*
отанг тирик бўлганда, у гўридан ағдарилиб тушарди;

(13) *If your father had been alive today, he would have been turning in his grave.* - *Агар отанг тирик бўлганда, у гўридан ағдарилиб тушарди;*

(14) *If Hitler had invaded England in 1940, Germany would have won the war.*
– *Агар Гитлер Англияни 1940 йилда босиб олганида, Германияни урушда ютган*
бўлар эди.

What we expect of a theory of tense is a story connecting form and time, and in this section I venture mine, for the primary pattern. But primary-pattern verb clusters come in sixteen syntactical forms, and the WHOLE story, chronicling how the speaker eventually settles upon one of these sixteen, evidently involves a number of

independent decisions. Now, in what order these decisions are taken by the best speakers I, of course, cannot say; but MY speaker, pending outcry, saves the question of tense until last.

In effect, by the time he turns to choose what can fairly be called the tense of his verb cluster, he has already — upon Heaven knows what arcane grounds — made his eight-fold choice among the aboriginal primary patterns: he has lit upon a member of R. Let us join him then as, clutching his member of R, he confronts the task of arbitrating tense. What he has to decide, in practical terms, is simply whether to use his pre-selected member of R as it stands or to treat it to a dose or two of $\langle / \rangle$ first; but of course the choice presents itself to him, the encoder, as a choice between alternative pieces of INFORMATION.

The choice, surprisingly, is a ternary one: the speaker is obliged, willy nilly, to opt for exactly one of the following three pieces of temporal information: (i) It is (identical with) the point of speech; (ii) It is a point past with respect to the point of speech; (iii) It is a point past with respect to some point itself past with respect to the point of speech. He then encodes his selection in accordance with the following instruction: *To select alternative (n), apply $\langle if \text{ to your chosen element of } R \text{ } n - 1 \text{ times.}$* And there we have the prosaic mechanism of the code itself.

The interesting question, of course, is how the temporal information he has thus encoded enters into the speaker's overall message. Or in other words, what is the 'it' of alternatives (i)-(iii)? It is the answer to this question that imparts to the problem of tense its agreeable subtlety. For the fact is that the encoded temporal information relates to a different point, and hence contributes differently to the total message, depending as the use imposed upon the verb cluster is prime or undeclarative. Let me baldly state the answer at once. Then I can devote the remainder of my essay to explaining it.¹¹

Whenever a use of either kind, prime or undeclarative, accrues to a primary-pattern verb cluster, there is always a condition specified, the PREDICATION

¹¹ Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London, 1972. p150

CONDITION. In the case of a prime use, what is registered by the tense of the verb cluster is the time of this condition's SATISFACTION. In the case of an undeclarative use, it is the location of what I call the CHANGE-OVER POINT. Observe, to begin with, that while (15) *Hoddle scores for Spurs* on the lips of a football commentator, betokens an event simultaneous with the point of speech, (16) *Hoddle scored a few seconds ago* reports an event simultaneous with a moment somewhere behind the point of speech, and (17) *Hoddle had scored a few seconds before the disturbance* recounts an event simultaneous with a moment somewhere behind an independently established past point.

Thus each of *scores*, *scored* and *had scored* admits of a prime use portraying a unitary event as SIMULTANEOUS WITH a point p , the only difference among the uses being in what is understood about the location of p . In these three uses, in other words, the SAME CONDITION is conveyed to be satisfied at a temporal point p , variously located.

Similarly, comparing: (18) *Grannie lives in Cockroach Lane*; (19) *At the time of her arrest, Grannie lived in Cockroach Lane*; (20) *A year before her arrest, Grannie had lived in Cockroach Lane* we observe that each of *lives*, $\langle p(\text{lives})$ and $\langle p(ip(\text{lives}))$ tolerates a prime use in which a state of affairs is depicted as EXTENDING UP UNTIL some point p , with p as described in alternatives (i), (ii) and (iii) of section 5 respectively.

Once again, then, the SAME CONDITION is portrayed as satisfied at a point p , variously located. And this is the way of it, quite generally, so far as prime uses are concerned. Always, there is a POINT OF PREDICATION p ; and getting the hang of a particular use involves coming to twig what it is that is conveyed concerning this point p , what condition is represented as satisfied at p by the use, what the PREDICATION CONDITION is (let us henceforth say) for the use. What is deponed in each of (3), (4) and (5), for instance, is that a certain pre-arrangement is VALID AT p , and the same, nearly enough, goes for

(21) *She is (was, had been) getting married next spring* – *У кейинги баҳорда турмушган чиқа(р)ди*;

(22) *I am, (was, had been) busy all day tomorrow* – *Мен эртага кун бўйи банда бўламан (бўлардим)*.

In (23) *He is (was, had been) going to resign before next Christmas* – *У кейинги Рождествогача ишдан бўшамоқчи*. a determination or resolve to resign before next Christmas is alleged to PREVAIL AT p ; in (24) *Grannie is (was, had been) about to jump*; *Grannie* is represented as ON THE POINT of jumping AT p ; in (25) *Grannie has (had, had had) to pay for the damage* it is some sort of obligation that is portrayed as OPERANT AT p ; and so on and on: the uses come in matched threes, one for r , one for $ip(r)$, and one for $ip(y(r))$, all portraying the SAME CONDITION satisfied at a temporal point p . I do not of course claim to have captured the niceties of any of these predication conditions.

Such artistry were wasted here. Occasionally, by the way, a member of a trio is missing, usually the third. Thus while (26) and (27) are certainly English, the same can hardly be said for (28): (26) *I'm to be Queen of the May, Mother*; (27) *He was to be thrice Lord Mayor of London*; (28) *She had been to be a virtuoso pianist*. When the verb cluster r is phase-modified, $ip(r)$ is a member of T, and $y(<p(r))$ does not exist; but otherwise the pattern is the same.

It has long been appreciated by grammarians that what is affirmed in, for example, (29) *Hoddle has just scored*; (30) *At the time of the disturbance, Hoddle had just scored* is exactly the same, except that each affirms it about a different reference point, and moreover that for (29) that reference point is the point of speech, while for (30) it is a point somewhere backwards of the point of speech, namely the time of the disturbance.

It is a commonplace these days among grammarians that each member of T admits of both 'past perfect' uses and 'past past' ones, and we catch their drift when we compare the performance of *had scored* in (30) with its performance in (17). For, while (30) affirms concerning a past point p just what (29) affirms concerning the

point of speech, that analysis is unavailable to (17): observe that (31) *Hoddle has scored a few seconds ago* is not an English sentence.

Rather (17) affirms what (16) does; or more exactly, what (16) affirms about a past pointy, (17) affirms about a point *p* which is past with respect to some already past point. Seeing (cf. section 2) that each element of T can be generated EITHER by one dose of $\langle p$ from a phase-modified element of R OR by two doses of $\langle p$ from a nonphase- modified element of R, the proposals of section 5 automatically predict this ambiguity.

The question naturally arises whether a constant meaning can be imputed to phase modification wherever it arises in the primary pattern. And the answer, it seems to me, is certainly: phase modification has the unfailing semantic effect of locating ONE point by depicting it as PAST WITH RESPECT TO SOME OTHER. On the one hand, (29) and (30) alike locate the goal as past with respect to the point of predication.

On the other, (17) locates the point of predication itself as past with respect to the disturbance. The common factor is autoptical. In sum, phase modification can crop up at two different stages in the encoding process — either in the prior choice of an aboriginal element of R or in the subsequent administration of a second dose of *ip* — and although it always signals that one point is past with respect to another, what the points ARE which are thus separated depends upon the stage of the encodement at which the phase modification enters. For, of course, when phase enters in the first way, it contributes to the articulation of the predication condition, whereas when it enters in the second it helps locate the point of predication.

So far in this section the sample sentences have all been one-clause ones; but it would never do if that encouraged the illusion that prime uses are somehow intimately concerned with assertion. We recognised the same use of *returned* in (9) as in (1), remember: hence the possibility of modus ponens. The point about (1) and (9) is that they admit of — indeed implore — interpretations under which the same proposition as is asserted when (1) occurs between fullstops is merely hypothesised

when (9) does. And if the notion of a PROPOSITION just invoked is permissible, then I can expand slightly upon what I said in section 5 about prime uses:

To parse a clause in such a way that its verb cluster receives a prime use is to interpret that clause as expressing the proposition that a certain condition is or was as a matter of historical fact satisfied at a time encoded into its verb cluster by means of the code explained in section 5. Prime uses are for expressing propositions, things that can be said Yea or Nay to.

It is not only prime uses of verb clusters that go to specifying predication conditions. Every use does; and in particular every undeclarative use does. The condition upon a temporal point p whose satisfaction for some past value of p is averred in (1) is patently the very same condition whose satisfaction for some future value of p is contemplated in the *if*-clauses of (2), (10) and (11).

Similarly it is the same condition whose satisfaction at the point of speech is on the one hand affirmed in (3) and on the other mooted in the *r/-*-clause of (32) *If the conference began next Monday it would suit me better* – *Агар конференция кейинги Душанба куни бошланганида менга қулайроқ эди.* and again it is the same condition whose satisfaction at the point of speech is on the one hand affirmed in (29) and on the other mooted in the *if*-clause of (33) *If Hoddle had just scored he would not be on the bench.*

What is different about undeclarative uses is that it is not the time of the condition's satisfaction that is registered by the tense of the verb cluster. So something else conditions the tense in these undeclarative cases, and in the next section I shall try to explain what it is. Meanwhile, the present section will be engrossed with prefatory remarks about *if*-sentences and their interpretations. The point of this is that undeclarative uses are sequestered in non-principal clauses, and in this essay, for definiteness, I shall be concentrating on their haunts in *if*-clauses.

As a matter of history, logicians and grammarians have always sponsored flatly opposed programmes for analysing *if*-sentences. The logicians have championed the precept that *if* is a BINARY CONNECTIVE, which, being interpreted, means that not

only the principal clause but also the string of words in the scope of *if* are to be parsed as independent grammatical sentences. The grammarians have meanwhile gone sturdily on classifying *z/-*clauses as ADVERBIAL. I, perversely, sympathise with both parties. On the one hand, *if* occurs in (9) as a binary connective: as we remarked at the time, (1) is understood in the context of (9) exactly as it is when it occurs on its own.

On the other hand — and this is what impressed the grammarians — an *if*-clause can also occur as a grammatical component of its main clause's verb phrase (or predicate). For example, (14) patently means¹²:

Germany would-if-Hitler-had-invaded-England-in-1940 have won the war and (10), granted its most natural interpretation, likewise means *They will-if-she-returns-the-tickets-tomorrow refund her money*. Here the *if*-clause is not MEANT to be taken on its own.

The underlying point — need I labour it? — is that verb clusters in the wake of *if* are accessible both to prime and to undeclarative uses; and while the grammarians have fastened upon the undeclarative cases, the logicians have been preoccupied with prime ones — to such an extent, indeed, that they have regularly taken it upon themselves to rewrite sentences like (10) and (14) so as to endow each with an 'antecedent', the object of this exercise being, precisely, to contrive a prime use for the verb cluster of the *if*-clause.

As a further matter of history, two tantamount terms have wontedly been bandied in connection with *if*-sentences: 'conditional' and 'hypothetical'. Yet it is strange that the terms should be tantamount, for the two notions are really very different: stipulating a condition is hardly the same as proposing a hypothesis. In my submission, each of these terms owns a certain aptness — but to different cases. The term 'hypothetical' is appropriate in certain — but only certain — instances where the *if*-clause harbours a prime use; whereas, when the verb cluster in the scope of *if* receives an undeclarative use — when the *if*-clause itself is construed

¹² Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London, 1972. p186

UNDECLARATIVELY, let us sometimes say for short — 'conditional' is more the mot juste. At all events, it is thus that I shall deploy the two words.

The cases where the verb cluster in the wake of *if* receives a prime use are not properly our present concern, but perhaps an aside will not go amiss concerning them. It is not always so, but typically in such a case the role of the sentence in the scope of ?/is to introduce a HYPOTHESIS, and then the principal clause announces a consequence CONCLUDED from that hypothesis — from that hypothesis together with anything at all that the speaker takes for a fact. Take (34), for example:

(34) *If Grannie is here she is invisible* – *Агар бувим бу ерда бўлса у кўринмайди.*

Its eminent assertibility in present circumstances I explain as follows. First, the *if*-clause introduces the HYPOTHESIS that Grannie is here. It happens to be a false hypothesis, indeed an EVIDENTLY false one; but then, hypotheses are never the worse for that. Secondly, as a matter of observational fact, this room is devoid of Grannie-irradiated light. But, thirdly, from the hypothesis that Grannie is here and the fact that there is no sign of her here, it FOLLOWS DEDUCTIVELY that Grannie is invisible.

There is a restriction on what one may adopt as the proposition of the *if*-clause. It is in the nature of hypothesising that a speaker may not entertain as a hypothesis anything to whose falsity he is simultaneously committed: while its negation is in his 'commitment store', a proposition is inaccessible for adoption as a hypothesis.

One cannot say, for example, (35) *Grannie is not here; and if she is, she is invisible* – *Бувим бу ерда эмас агар бу ерда бўлса ҳам у кўринмайди.* This explains why arguments of the form *not-A; therefore not-A or B; therefore if A, B* whose component steps are both impeccable, are nevertheless overall illicit.) Still, hypothetical interpretations vie with numerous others.

Thackeray's intent in juxtaposing the two clauses of (36) *if the dowager had been angry at the abrupt leave of absence he took, she was mightily pleased at his speedy return* was evidently to point up a contrast; and whether (37) *If Brad's life was*

in danger, so was his bride's is to be taken as drawing an analogy or a conclusion is decided from occasion to occasion by collateral information. Indeed, although this is no time to start itemising them, interpretations of *if*-sentences under which the verb cluster in the scope of *if* receives a prime use form a remarkably mixed bag. — Not like those under which the verb cluster in the scope of *if* receives an undeclarative use; for these, almost invariably, are CONDITIONAL interpretations.

Undeclaratively parsed clauses specify predication conditions: I have had occasion to say that already. So, of course, do clauses parsed as independent sentences; but in their case the clause also contains, encoded into its verb cluster, a specification of the time of the predication condition's historical satisfaction; and the resultant of these two factors, condition and time, is a proposition (thus section 6).

Undeclaratively parsed clauses do not, however, express propositions. For example, the *if*-clause of (2), although it relates to the future, is not to be construed as expressing the proposition that Grannie WILL return the tickets tomorrow.¹³ That proposition can by all means be adopted as a hypothesis — as in (38), for instance: (38) *If Grannie will return the tickets tomorrow we had better start at once trying to raise the money for her refund.*

But that is not what happens in (2). Rather, the undeclaratively parsed clause simply specifies a condition — and then the principal clause goes on to hazard an outcome of the satisfaction of that condition. And that, I trust, is an entirely uncontentious description of the natural interpretations — CONDITIONAL interpretations — of all the *if*-sentences.

The difference is very large between hypothetical interpretations of *if*-sentences and conditional ones. The speaker who affirms (9) gives it to be understood that he deduces that Grannie's refund was posted this morning from the hypothesis that a certain condition was, as a matter of fact, satisfied yesterday. But the speaker who affirms (10) lays claim to no deduction. Neither does he confide resort to any hypothesis.

¹³ Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashv A.M. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Tashkent, 2008, p208

To arrive at the judgement conveyed by (10) a speaker is obliged to IMAGINE a certain condition satisfied some time tomorrow, and then to IMAGINE the consequences. To affirm (10) is to announce the result, not of a piece of deduction, but of a piece of imaginative speculation about the future. And similarly with a past case. When a speaker affirms (14), he is not intimating his adoption of the hypothesis that Hitler did as a matter of historical fact invade England in 1940 — as who should say (39), for example: (39) *If Hitler invaded England in 1940, contemporary reports of the incident have not survived*

Rather, he is owning to conducting a fantasy in which Hitler is found invading England in 1940 and Germany goes on to win the war. This is the FANTASY theory of conditionals. Now, whatever else, a fantasy has a BEGINNING, a moment from which onwards imagination takes over from history. And in my decipherment it is this moment, the moment of the fantasy's inception, whose location is encoded into the verb cluster of the *if*-clause by the tense code. In my submission, then, interpreting an *if*-sentence conditionally not only involves imagining the satisfaction of some condition specified in its *if*-clause; it also involves locating the point where imagination takes over, the change-over point *c*. Naturally *c* is always backwards of the contemplated time of satisfaction of the condition. The time of satisfaction lies within fantasy time, since satisfaction of the condition is always part of what is fantasised.

If members of R always locate *c* at the point of speech, then it follows that only uses mooting FUTURE satisfaction are accessible to members of R. If the *ip(r)* construction is the construction for locating *c* backwards of the point of speech, then the undeclarative *tp(r)* uses should be precisely those mooting satisfaction either AT the point of speech or BEYOND it. And if only elements of T locate *c* backwards of a past point, then only elements of T should moot PAST satisfaction.

The conception of a change-over point is entirely homely. I daresay almost any narrative is conceived, implicitly at least, as following in the wake of some sort of past. It is not as if the beginning of the story was to be taken as the Beginning of

History. Just so, a fantasy beginning at c takes over, as ITS past, the history of the real world up until c .

Historical facts with dates earlier than c are accepted in the fantasy because, in a sense, they are part of it. They belong to its past. Up until c , in other words, real world and fantasy 'world' share a common history. In a fantasy which opens with Hitler's invading England in September 1940, the status of the BEF's rescue from France three months earlier is as assured as its status in history itself: the only question, either way, is whether it actually happened. But if historical facts of the pre- c era command automatic admission to the fantasy, historical facts of the post- c era are on an entirely different footing. There may not be any, of course, for c may lie at the point of speech. But if there are, then although the fantasist is free to borrow some of them to fill out his fantasy, he nevertheless defeats his purpose if he borrows them all (if *everything had happened exactly as it actually did . . .*); and therefore the borrowing is perforce SELECTIVE.¹⁴

Debating what would have happened if Hitler had invaded England in September 1940, we make free use of the actual weather reports of the period to inform our reconstruction, but we feel unentitled to enlist, as a further 'factual premiss', the historical absence of storm-troopers from the south-coast resorts throughout September. The significance of c in a conditional interpretation of an *if*-sentence, then, is that it separates an earlier era whose history is sacrosanct from a later era whose historical facts, if any, are liable to imaginative revision.

To locate c is therefore to settle an evidential question. In the next section I shall try to ingratiate the thesis of this one. When it is FUTURE satisfaction of the *if*-clause's predication condition that is contemplated, I think received opinion is that it makes no semantic odds whether the condition is specified using an element r of R or the corresponding element $ip(r)$ of S ; (40) and (41), for example, are seen as much of a muchness:

(40) *If war is declared tomorrow I will enlist;*

¹⁴ Воронцова Г.Н. Очерки по грамматике английского языка. Moscow, 1960. p 145

(41) *If war was declared tomorrow I would enlist.*

Jespersen feels that the 'choice' between the two 'denotes a slight difference only in degree of probability' — probability, he means, of war's being declared tomorrow, so far as (40) and (41) are concerned. And true enough, it is (41) one expects to hear in times of international harmony and confidence, and (40) that one expects when war is imminent. But, with respect, an exacter account would observe that, although (42) *If I won the Pools tomorrow I would buy a Stradivarius* is greatly likelier than (43) *If I win the Pools tomorrow I will buy a Stradivarius* on the lips of one ungiven to having a flutter, EITHER comes naturally from the regular Littlewoods investor. Worse, elements of R are regularly used for specifying eventualities acknowledged remote:

(44) *Well, it was a close thing. If I ever have grandchildren — which, at the moment, seems a longish shot — and they come clustering round my knee of an evening for a story, the one I shall tell them is about my getting back into the bedroom just one sit second ahead of that carving knife.*

There IS a difference between saying that and saying (45) *If I ever had grandchildren and they came clustering around my knee, I should ...* but it plainly hasn't much to do with probability. Yet another perplexity for Jespersen's account is the fact that (46) *If you invited me I would attend* – *Агар сен мену таклиф қилганигда мен келардим* is POLITER than (47) *If you invite me I will attend*. For it will not be deposed, I trust, that this politeness is achieved simply by signalling improbability. The prelude confidence *I deem it improbable that you will act in such a way as to afford me gratification* is, after all, singularly ill-chosen as a means of ingratiation.

The effect of the *r* form in (40) is to validate even the most recent communique; and therefore, at a time of mounting international tension and mobilising armies, the speaker who selects (40) confides a resolve informed by the latest known developments. On the other hand, the effect of the *<p(r)* form in (41) is to waive up-to-the-minute news; and therefore, at times when the contingency of hostilities is

remote, the speaker who prefers (41) to (40) is spared the need to contemplate so rapid a deterioration in diplomatic relations, that is, so SUDDEN a war.

The inveterate non-gambler cannot fantasise his winning the Pools tomorrow without setting aside a PRESENT FACT, namely, that he is an inveterate non-gambler. The *r* form is accordingly unavailable to him: his fantasy must needs commence somewhere back in the past, before his inveteracy solidified. Not so for the regular Pools man, of course: unless HE believed he could win the Pools tomorrow he would not BE a regular Pools man. Not that they completely coincide in effect, of course, even on his lips. The slight but perceptible access of generality when (42) is preferred to (43) results from (42)'s switching to fantasy EARLIER: by disintitling all historical facts about his immediate circumstances, the speaker implies that his resolve does not depend narrowly on them. By the same token, when Bertie is elaborating the traces of his encounter with the carving knife, what he intimates by delaying *c* until the point of speech is their vividness: the choice of bedtime story is made in the light of everything that has happened since.

It would be a different matter were Bertie, acknowledged to be sterile, of course. In that case we should likelier find him venturing (45). But in that case future satisfaction of the predication condition would be cohibited by a present fact: small wonder THIS Bertie would locate *c* in the past. — Unless of course (and there is always this possibility) he wanted to speculate about satisfaction of the predication condition even GRANTED present circumstances:

(48) *If I ever have grandchildren it will be a miracle – Агар қачонлардир менинг невараларим бўлса бу мўжиза бўлар эди.*

The deference of (46) arises again from the *ip(r)* form's excluding some PRESENT state of affairs from automatic acceptance in the fantasy by changing over before its onset. Here, of course, it is the host's present intentions that the speaker thus courteously saves; and, in short, the idiom effects an elaborate acknowledgement

of the host's authority over his own invitation list¹⁵. Someone invites me to lunch one day next week, adding:

(49) *If you come next Wednesday, you will meet Grannie* – *Агар кейинги чоршанба келсанг сен бувимни кўрасан* or, more formally,

(50) *If you came next Wednesday, you would meet Grannie* – *Агар сен кейинги чоршанба кенлганигда сен бувимни кўрган бўлар эдинг*. naturally plead a prior engagement for next Wednesday . . . whereupon it ceases to be civil for him to persist with either (49) or (50), civility demanding

(51) *If you had come next Wednesday, you would have met Grannie*.

For politeness requires that the 'fact' be conceded of my prior engagement, and since that fact cohibits any fantasy of my coming next Wednesday, politeness requires that the alleged engagement, contracted in the past, be excluded from the fantasy by changing over even earlier. Similarly, once it is known that Grannie has burnt her tickets, one volunteers (11) rather than (10) or (2): unless one is bent upon fantasising the return of no-longer-existent tickets, one is obliged to locate c somewhere backwards of the independently established past point of their historical destruction.

It is still, I think, the prevailing view that, whenever a member of S moots the present or past satisfaction of a condition, that condition is thereby conveyed to be, as a matter of historical fact, unsatisfied. This is the view celebrated in the household notion of an 'unreal' or 'counterfactual' conditional, and there is no disputing its allure: at first blush, (12) and (13) seem both to confide that your father is dead, and (14) that Hitler did not invade England in 1940.

Lest it be conceived an objection to my analysis that it fails to predict this phenomenon, allow me to point out that the phenomenon is in fact spectral. The received view is simply mistaken, and the mistake by now well advertised: these locutions can occur in contexts where the speaker's standpoint cannot conceivably include an antecedent acknowledgment of the condition's unsatisfaction.

¹⁵ Close R.A. *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*. London: Press, 1977. p285

The real point about these cases is the obvious one: that in each of them the fantasised satisfaction of the condition lies in already experienced time. One is fantasising about things that have **ALREADY HAPPENED**. Whether your father is alive now is a question of historical fact; yet each of (12) and (13) enjoins a **FANTASY** in which he figures alive. Now **SOMETIMES** the circumstances in which one thus lapses into fantasy are circumstances in which the condition's actual unsatisfaction is already established (*Such a shame your father did not live to see her today*); but sometimes not, for sometimes the object is precisely to **CANVASS** whether the condition is in fact unsatisfied.

One elaborates a fantasy in which the condition is satisfied, and then confronts the elaboration with history. The method is a favourite of detectives, who call it 'reconstruction'. Sometimes fantasy and reality clash, indicating unsatisfaction of the condition (*Still no response to our advertisement. If your father was alive he would have answered it by now. So I'm afraid...*).

Sometimes, on the other hand, as when his reconstruction confirms a detective in a suspicion, fantasy and reality contrive to agree, to the credit of the hypothesis that the condition **IS** in fact satisfied (*Perhaps my father is not dead after all. I believe that very old man over there is he. — It could be so: if your father was alive he would be a very old man*).

Those authorities — even Jespersen — who embrace the 'irrealis' interpretation of such locutions have simply overlooked some of the evidence. I hope the theory I have crammed into the above pages is precise and falsifiable. But inevitably there are loose ends all over the place, and in my concluding section I shall try to tie some of them off.

All my examples of undeclarative uses have been drawn from *if*-clauses. But undeclarative uses, and especially undeclarative future uses of elements of **R**, flourish in dependent clauses of many different kinds (*Follow the leader wherever he GOES and do whatever he DOES*). And always, I submit, the tense of the clause locates, via the code of section 5, the starting-point of a period which is to be the subject of an

imaginative construction. It fixes the evidential standpoint of a fantasy in which a condition, the predication condition, is imagined satisfied.

One urgent question is whether there are other uses of primary pattern verb clusters besides prime ones and undeclarative ones. Do there occur uses of primary-pattern verb clusters where the relation between temporal content and syntactical form is not as expounded above? The answer is that there is at least one major phenomenon whose influence upon the syntactical form of the verb cluster I have not considered¹⁶. It has to do with the expression of generality. When, for example,

(52) *If Baby cries, we beat him* - *Агар гўдак йиғласа биз унинг урамиз*;

(53) *In those days, if a sailor died during a voyage, he was buried at sea* – *Қадимда агар денгизчи сайёҳат пайтида ўлиб қолса уни сувга ташлаб юборишар эди* receive their natural 'whenever' interpretations, their 2/-clauses do not occur as independent sentences. In the context of (52), *Baby cries* expresses no proposition. On the other hand, the uses accruing to *cries* and *died* in (52) and (53) are patently not undeclarative.

Generality with respect to occasions of satisfaction is evidently an essential ingredient of the overall message in any such case; but I have nothing to propose here about the code whereby this ingredient is injected. Therefore these uses outstrip the scope of this essay. No treatment of tense would be complete without mention of BACKSHIFT, or sequence of tenses, as when a first speaker's contributions:

(54) *I hate Grannie* – *Мен бувимни ёмон кўраман*;

(55) *If you move you will be shot* – *Агар қимирласанг сени отиб ўлдиришади*;
are subsequently reported in these terms:

(56) *He said he hated Grannie* – *У айтдики у бувиси ёмон кўрарди*;

(57) *He said that if I moved I would be shot* – *Унинг айтишича агар мен қимирласам мен отиб ўлдиришарди*.

Here, evidently, the tense undergoes exactly the same translation as do the personal pronouns. When the second speaker resorts to *he* and *I* respectively where

¹⁶ Curme G.O. *A Grammar of the English Language*. Boston-New York, 1935. p186

the first employed / and *you*, it is because they are his way of referring to the SAME PERSONS as the first speaker meant by / and *you*. Just so, the second speaker says *hated* and *moved* in order to fix, respectively, the point of predication and the change-over point at the SAME LOCATIONS as the first speaker did by saying *hate* and *move*.

The rationale of backshift is gratefully transparent: it adjusts for changing circumstances of utterance so as to preserve substance of message. The device of singular *were*, on the other hand, is of no evident utility whatever. Here the whole truth is that, when elements of S are used undeclaratively, *was* is replaceable — *ad libitum* and therefore synonymously — by *were*.

Another egregious contraption is WAS TO, as in (58) *If she was/were to return the tickets tomorrow they would refund her money* patently unrelated to the BE TO of (26) and (27) (Palmer 1979:148), and as strictly redundant as singular *were*. Then also there is the phenomenon, again *sui generis*, and again redundant, of *should* in *if*-clauses. Moreover *should* leaves it unclear where *c* is: which of (59) and (60) ought one to say?

(59) *If I should see her I will remind her*

(60) *If I should see her I would remind her*

An interesting subtlety is discovered in (61) *The explorers now faced an agonising decision. If they delayed any longer they would be trapped by the tide, but if on the other hand...* where the explorers' dilemma is expounded from the explorers' own viewpoint — demonstrably as a result of the tense: change *delayed* to *had delayed* and the effect is lost. The means of it, I submit, is as follows. The change-over point which *delayed* deftly identifies is the explorers' own moment of decision, the very point at which they might themselves have observed (62) *If we delay any longer we will be trapped* It lies at a single remove behind the point of speech.

A speaker bent instead upon an imaginative reconstruction of the course of events would need to locate *c* as lying backwards of THOSE EVENTS and hence at TWO removes behind the point of speech. He would say *had delayed*. When the verb

cluster of an *if*-clause attracts an undeclarative use it usually turns out that the PRINCIPAL verb cluster includes a secondary auxiliary. Now, it will not have escaped notice that the particular choice between *will* and *would* in the main clause is conditioned by the format of the verb cluster in the *if*-clause. It is a matter of observation that format R demands *will*, format S *would*.

But, according to the proposals, it is the peculiarity of members of format R, used undeclaratively, that they invariably postpone *c* to the last possible moment, the point of speech, with the effect that no restriction at all is placed upon the historical information accessible as evidence. Members of S, in sharp contradistinction, always locate *c* earlier: the fantasy encroaches on the already experienced. In my decipherment, then, we switch from *will* to *would* as soon as *c* retreats behind the point of speech, which means, as soon as the utilisation of factual information ceases to be maximal. But to pursue this were to trespass on the domain of the secondary-pattern verb cluster.

English is a code for encoding information into signals, and our aim has been to crack a tiny portion of that code. What initially intrigued us was the erratic behaviour of certain segments discovered in signals: when we considered the overall messages communicated by broadcasting certain signals, we were forced to the conclusion that these particular segments of the signals were contributing non-uniformly to those overall messages. In English, different messages regularly come *to* be encoded in the same string of words.

CHAPTER II. THE ANALYSIS OF THE SEMANTIC CATEGORISATION OF THE TENSE FORMS IN PRESENT DAY ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

2.1 The analysis of the functional categories of tense and correlation in English and Uzbek languages

In the real world a state-of-affairs exists in space and time. Objective time is one of the two forms of existence of matter is characterized by the following attributes: its infinite extension, unidimensionality (linearity) and irreversibility of its course, and divisibility into an infinite number of segments of any size (which demonstrates the dialectical contradiction of continuity and discontinuity). For practical purposes time can be graphically illustrated as a limitless straight line on which the states-of-affairs occupy their definite positions.

The divisibility of time allows man to establish chronometric system (scales) such as clocktime and calendar time, which provides reference points (indices) the states-of-affairs, can be related to. Chronometric systems serve to define states-of-affairs with regard to their position on the time line, i.e. with regard to their duration, frequency, and chronological order. In English, this kind of chronological timing is expressed by temporal phrases with explicit or implicit date, indicating a point of time, e.g. *at eight o'clock, in 1972, coam 8da, 1972 йилда*”, a timespan, e.g. *from eight to ten, саккиздан ўнгача, during the thirties, ўттиззинчи йилларда, a very long time, узок вақт, or frequency, e.g. 'every second day, куннинг ҳар иккинчисида, often, кўпинча.*

The women opened the door at once almost breathlessly. (Hardy)

I don't believe in fairies, I never see any. (Galsworthy)

Ойни этак билан ёпиб бўлмас. (Мақол)

У ёлгон гапирди... Уни жазолаш керак. (Жума Шоир Водилоний)

In addition to this kind of scale-orientated timing, states-of-affairs can be temporally related to each other. One state-of-affairs serving as a reference point, another state-of-affairs can be either simultaneous with or sequential, i.e. prior or

posterior to it. In English temporal relationship is expressed by temporal connectors, e.g. '*meanwhile, before, afterwards*', or temporal subordinators, e.g. '*while, as soon as, after*', or by temporal phrases such as '*on his arrival, before Sunday, after breakfast*'.

These kinds of temporal indication alone are not, however, sufficient for the purpose of practical communication. In the sentence these are always combined with indications of a relative determination of the state-of-affairs to be described, taking into account the speaker, writer in his situation of communication (which demonstrates the dialectical unity of the absolute and the relative).

He wanted to leave Moscow before Sunday.

After breakfast Angie went to the Spencer's.

У келиши биланоқ Олмаҳон ҳақида суриштира бошлади.

Нонушта қилиб бўлгач улар ҳаммаси ўз ишига кетдилар.

For the speaker the moment of speaking is the primary index of orientation (t1) in time. It subdivides the time experienced into three segments. The moment of speaking itself and a variable timespan including it are experienced as present (in an act of direct perception). The segment preceding the moment of speaking is experienced as past (in an act of recollection), the segment following the moment of speaking as future (in an act of anticipation). The timespan around the moment of speaking can be gradually intended until the border to universal time is reached. If this happens, the segmentation of the time line into past, present and future is cancelled.

In the English sentence the state-of-affairs, to be described is, however, not usually directly related to the moment of speaking, but rather via a secondary reference time or index (t2), which is placed in one of the three temporal segments. For example, in a sentence like '*He had written ten novels by 1950*' there is no direct relation between the moment of speaking and the time of writing the novels. Instead, the state-of-affairs (*writing the novels*) is related to the moment of speaking via the **secondary point of reference** (*the authors death in 1950*), i.e. the state-of-affairs is

anterior to this secondary point of reference. In other cases the state-of-affairs is experienced as posterior or simultaneous with it. We have thus two kinds of relation: the relation between the moment of speaking (t1) and a secondary reference time (t2), and the relation between this secondary reference time (t2) and the state-of-affairs itself.

In English there are two morphological categories to express them, the **category of tense** expressing the relation between the moment of speaking (t1) and the secondary reference time (t2), and the **category of correlation** expressing the relation between the secondary reference time (t2) and the state-of-affairs. Examples for illustration:

*Her mother **is** in hospital* (t2 in present; state-of-affairs simultaneous with t2) -
Унинг онаси шифохонада.

*They **had been unemployed** for month* (t2 in past; state-of-affairs anterior to t2) -
Улар ойлар давомида ишсиз юришди.

*He **will be** 13 on 22nd June* (t2 in future; state-of-affairs simultaneous with t2) -
У 22чи июнда 13га киради.

*I'm **going to get** my ears pierced on Friday* (t2 in present; state-of-affairs posterior to t2).

Besides these two categories there are also temporal phrases in English expressing the relations of tense and correlation. Their meanings indicate more or less definite points of time or timespans in the temporal segments, e.g. '*at the moment, nowadays (present), yesterday, all that time (past), tomorrow, next week (future); up to/by (now, etc.), these/for the last (three months, etc.), since (Monday, etc.) (anteriority)*'.

In addition to the primary and secondary indices (t1 and t2) a set of tertiary indices (t3), usually placed in the past, may be required in communication. This is especially true if an utterance of a second speaker is to be reported (in indirect speech). The secondary index (t2) is then a second moment of speaking creating the temporal segments of present-in-the-past, past-in-the-past, and future-in-the-past, in

which the tertiary index (0) is placed. The state-of-affairs itself is again either simultaneous, anterior or posterior to these.

The relation between the secondary index in the past and the tertiary indices is expressed by a derived set of tense forms, the relation between the tertiary indices and the state-of-affairs by the usual correlation forms.

*Eleanor phoned to **say** her mother was in hospital* (t2 in past; t3 in Present-Past; state-of-affairs simultaneous with t3).

Одилов: Ҳа, Салтанат нима бўлди? ...Салтанат записанг-чи! [А. Қаҳҳор]

*He said they **had been unemployed** for months* (h in past; h in Present-Past; state-of-affairs anterior to t3). = *Унинг айтишича улар ойлар давомида ишсиз юришди.*

*I told her he **would be** 13 on 22nd June* (t2 in past; t3 in Future-Past; state-of-affairs simultaneous with t3).

The English categories of tense and correlation are thus closely connected when relating the state-of-affairs to be described to the speech situation. Nevertheless they have their own sets of forms and denote different temporal relations.¹⁷ The category of tense consists of six constituents forming two sets: the basic set including present (Pres), past (Past) and future (Future), and the derived set including present-in-the-past (Pres-Past), past-in-the-past (Past-Past) and future-in-the-past (Future-Past). Each set has the structure of a binary opposition: the unmarked member (Present, Present-Past) is opposed to the marked member, which appears in two forms (Past/Future, Past-Past/Future-Past). This may be illustrated as follows: **basic tense** (0) call-O (-s) +call-ed shall\will call-O and **derived tense** (0) call-ed +had call-ed should\would-O.

The derived set as a whole differs from the basic set in having a Past marker (-ed/ha(ve) -ed\ -ould) in each of its constituents which signals the 'in-the-past' relation that exists between the two sets. The categorial meaning of tense, that is, the meaning which forms the common basis for the definition of the various tense functions, is as follows: the speaker indicates a temporal interval (gap) between the moment of

¹⁷ Curme G.O. *A Grammar of the English Language*. Boston-New York, 1935. p240

speaking and a secondary reference time in past or future (basic tense), or between a second moment of speaking the past and a tertiary reference time in Past-Past or Future-Past (derived tense).

The function of the marked forms is to express this interval, that of the unmarked forms is to show that no such interval is indicated (the categorial meaning of tense being negated). Marked forms:

*She **made** a chicken soup last night (Past).* = *У кеча кечкурун товук шўрва пиширди.*

*He **will be** 13 on 22nd June (Future).* = *У 22 июнда 13га **куради**.*

*Eleanor said that her mother **had been** in a motor accident (Past-Past).* = *Элеоноранинг **айтишича** унинг онаси автоҳалокатга **учраган экан**.*

*I told her I **would** contact the paper (Future-Past).* = *Мен унга китобларимни **бераман дедим**.*

Unmarked forms:

*The man **wants** tea (Present).* = *У киши чой ичишни **истайди**.*

*Eleanor said her mother **was** in hospital (Present-Past).* = *Элеонора **айтдики** унинг онаси шифохонада **экан**.*

These formal and functional relations form the tense paradigm:

	Variant	invariant	variant
Present:	(0)'	call, etc.	-0 (-s)
Past	(0)	call, etc.	-ed
Future:	shall\will	call, etc.	-0
Present-Past:	(0)	call, etc.	-ed
Past-Past:	had	call, etc.	-ed
Future-Past:	should\would	call, etc.	-0

If the categorial meaning is signalled by the context and/or situation forms may be used instead of the marked forms. Their function is then "categorial meaning not expressed", and it is realized as a syntactic relation marked tense form and another (marked) tense form or a temporal phrase:

*I **was coming** through the stage door a man **comes up** to me, and he **says**...*

Мен ўлимдан асло **қўқрмайман**, аммо яшамоқни **истайман**. (Зулфия)

*I read my paper **next Wednesday**. Ер қуёш атрофида айланади.*

An open class of verbs has no phonemically realized form to express Present in the 1 st and 2nd persons singular and plural and in the 3rd person plural (Variant component - 0), e. g, '*I/you/we/they try, love, cut, fetch*'. In the 3rd person singular the morpheme '-s' ('-es' after sibilants) is added to the invariant component, phonematically realized as [iz] after sibilants, e.g. '*he fetches*', [z] after vowels and voiced non-sibilants, e.g. '*he tries, loves*', and [s] after voiceless non-sibilants, e.g. '*he cuts*'.

Present	variant	invariant	variant
	(0)	(call-)	-0 -s

Spelling variations before '-s': after a consonant 'y' is changed to "**ie**", e.g. '*carry-carries*', 'o' is changed to '**oe**' in '*go-goes, do-does*'. Unique patterns, due to a particular historical development (loss of final consonant or vowel change before '-s'), are the 3rd person singular forms of '*have*', '*do*' and '*say*' , '*have-has*' [hrez], '*do-does*' [dAz], '*say-says*' [sez]. In the case of '*be*', forms of different verbs were inserted into the paradigm: '*am*' [rem,.etc.] (1st person singular), '*are*' [a:], etc. (second person singular, all persons plural), '*is*' [iz, etc.) (3rd person singular).

In all these cases the 3rd person variant component alternates with a non-O variant component in the other persons. For similar historical reasons a closed class of verbs has a non-O variant component throughout Present as contrasted with the respective Past variant component: '*blow-blew, bind-bound*', etc.

The function of Present is mainly to signal the overlapping of the moment of speaking (t1) and the secondary reference time (t2) to which the state of-affairs to be described is related (the categorial meaning of basic tense being negated). The same relation is expressed by a number of temporal phrases which are hence compatible with Present. They range from a more generalized present to the immediate present, e.g. '*at the present time, at present, for the present, nowadays, today (= nowadays), currently, now, this moment*':

*Nowadays there **are** golf courses in the vicinity of many towns and villages and thus the complex series of sedimentary rocks we **know today** began to form.*

*Physicists all over the world **are currently trying** to discover ways of harnessing the energy of then no nuclear reactions for peaceful uses a small section of the working class **have now** more access to culture than it **had** in the 1930'a.*

*Mother has a slight cataract, but it **is** not so bad **at present**.*

“Бунн шаҳарга олиб борасизлар,”... деди. (С. Айний)

Афанди уйига келиб, мақтади: “Хотин, худо берди, сенга давлат келтираётирман. Тиллани кўряпсанми?” (Афанди)

“... Тақсир, мен ҳали ҳам ўз сўзимда турмоқдаман...” (Афанди)

Certain temporal phrases such as 'today, tonight, this morning/Monday/week/month/spring/year' are also compatible with Past and Future. Present occurs also in contexts referring to past and future time and to universal time. Reference to past and future time. In past contexts Present is a stylistic device either to increase the vividness of the description, of past events (dramatic Present) or, mostly together with dates, merely to register a state-of-affairs (annatistic Pres as used in historiography).

*Ladies and gentlemen, as I **was coming** through the stage door, a man **comes up** to me, and he **says** ...*

*With the accession of Edward the Confessor in **1042** Norman influence **begins**.*

In contexts expressing the future it is used if the specific modal connotation connected with the expression of futurity (i.e. prediction) can be neglected. This is the case if the future state-of-affairs to be described is already fixed in the present, for instance as part of a programme or plan (for aspect differentiation in these cases).

*I **read my paper next Wednesday**.*

*We **are going** in a bus to a theatre in Glasgow **on Friday night**.*

In temporal, conditional, and some other subjoined clauses Present is used with reference to the future if there is Future in the main clause.

*I **will look** over it again when I **get** home. = Мен уйига **боришим** билан яна*

буни ўқиб кўраман.

If it's ready he **will bring** it tomorrow. = Агар у **тайёвр бўлса**, у уни эртага олиб келади.

In statements referring to universal time the state-of-affairs to be described is thought to be related to all possible reference times and is hence not placed in a definite temporal segment. The insertion of temporal phrases containing the tense relations of past, present and future into universal statements is not possible.

Radio waves **travel** in straight lines. = Радио тўлқинлар тўғри чизик бўйлаб ҳаракатланади.

Natural uranium **consists of** three isotopes. = Табиий уран уч изотоплардан иборат.

The earth **moves** round the sun. = Ер қуёш атрофида айланади.

In quoted speech Present indicates overlapping of the tertiary reference time and the second moment of speaking, which may be in the actual speaker's present, past or future (He **says/said/will say**: My wife is ill'). In indirect speech it indicates overlapping of the tertiary reference time and the second moment of speaking if this is in the actual speaker's present or future ('He **says/will say** that his wife is ill').

If it is in his past, Present can be used only if re-orientation is possible, i.e. if the state-of-affairs can also be related to an index overlapping with the actual moment of speaking:

-He **told** me that his wife **is** ill' - 'His wife **is** (still)ill'.

Холмурод эса синфдан синфга яхши баҳо билан **ўтди**. (П. Турсун)

An open class of verbs forms Past by adding the morpheme '-ed' to the invariant component. This kind of Past formation is productive.

Past:	(variant)	invariant	variant
	(0)	(call-)	-ed

The phonematic realization of '-ed' is [ɪd] after the alveolar stops [d] and [t], e.g. 'ended, lifted', [d] after vowels and voiced consonants other than [d], e.g. 'played, called', and [t] after voiceless consonants other than [t], e.g. 'blushed, wrapped'.

Spelling variations before '-ed': consonants before '-ed' are doubled when they follow a short vowel with primary or secondary stress and are spelled with a single letter, e.g. '*fitted, handicapped*'; 'l' before '-ed' is doubled even if the preceding vowel is not short or unstressed, e.g. '*controlled, travelled*'; Y before '-ed' is doubled even if the preceding vowel is not short, e.g. '*preferred occurred*'; after a consonant 'y' before '-ed' is changed to 'i', e.g. '*carried*'; change of 'y' to 'l' and loss of 'e' occurs in '*lay-laid, pay-paid*'; mute 'e' before '-ed' is dropped, e.g. '*arrive-arrived*'.

There are a number of unproductive patterns of Past formation, due to historical development (its main forms of manifestation being vowel change plus a dental or O-morpheme, e.g. '*say-said, blow-blew*', assimilation or loss of final consonant before a dental morpheme, e.g. '*leave-left, have-had*', and homonymy resulting from loss of '-ed' after final '-l', e.g. '*put-put*'). In terms of invariant (Inv) and variant (Var).

Components of these patterns can be described as follows:

Inv + Var: *have-had, blow-blew, say-said, leave-left, buy-bought, put-put* (Var=O)

Var + Iny: *eat-ate*

Inv + Var + Iny: *lead-led, win-won, bind-bound, take-took, write-wrote*, etc.

Inv + var + Inv + Var: *sell-sold; keep-kept*, etc.

Cases of insertion of forms from other verbs into the paradigm are '*go-went*' and '*be-was*' (singular)'/*were*' (singular/plural). The function of Past is to signal that the secondary reference time to which the state-of-affairs is related is placed before the moment of speaking and is thus not connected with it (the categorial meaning of basic tense is expressed by one variant).

The same relation is expressed by a number of temporal phrases, which are hence compatible with Past, e.g. *formerly, at that time, then, once* (referring to past), *on that day/in those days, ... ago, last ... , the other day, yesterday*'.

Formerly there wasn't any such organisation at all.

Болалар богда ўйнагани ўйнаган. (“Хордиқ” газетасидан)

I was reading at that time memories by a left-wing writer.

Сизлар ҳам шу эчки тўғрисида келганмисизлар?(А. Қахҳор)

*My brother Hymie **once fell** into the river and I **saved** him.*

“Қорнинг очгандир, арслонтойим,” ... деди кампир. (Ойбек)

*Her mother **died** in Saltcoats **two years ago**.*

*Бой ўз умрида кўпни **кўрган**, кўпни **таниган**, турли шағар ва турли одамлар билан муомила **қилган**, унинг қўлидан жуда кўп хизматкор, қорол, чоракор, ва ҳоказо **ўтган**. (Ойбек)*

*She **made** a chicken soup **last night** and **put** it into bottles.*

***Айтгандирман**, эсимда йўқ. (А. Мухамедов)*

Where the time up to the moment of speaking is not significant, 'recently' and 'lately' are used with Past.

*Steroids having substances similar to ecdyson **were discovered** recently in bracken and few other plants.*

*Яқинда **келиб кетган** Жамшид, яна бир бор **келиб** янги кўйлагини **ташлаб кетди**. (Жума Водилоний)*

Certain temporal phrases actually containing the relation of present may also be used with Past because they allow a time gap between the moment of speaking and the secondary reference time, e.g. 'today, this week/month/year', or because they may also be separated from the moment of speaking themselves, e.g. 'tonight, this morning/afternoon/Monday/spring'.

*Yes! My garden **did** well **this year**. = Ҳа! Менинг боғим яхши ҳосил **берди бу йил**.*

*I **was pleased** to receive your letter **this morning**. = **Бугун эрталаб** сенинг хатингни олиб хурсанд **бўлдим**.*

Dates are qualified as past when used together with Past:

*The goods **were delivered** here **by 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 6**. = Моллар 6 апрель, Сешанба уқуни соат тўққиз яримда олиб келинди.*

Phrases containing a local expression may imply temporal reference if they can be replaced by temporal subjoined clauses: George **had** a wonderful time **in London** (= when he was in London).

Past is the basic tense of narration:

*When the bus had Mopped, the conductor **got out**, and he **went round** to the front of **the bus**, where **the driver was**, and he **told** him the figures, and the driver **got down** from his seat, and the driver and the conductor **danced** in the street. (A. Hailey)*

*Сотиболдининг хотини **оғриб қолди**. Сотиболди касални **ўқитди** - бўлмади, табибга **қўрсатди**. Табиб **қон олди**. (А. Қахҳор)*

*Қўрғон ҳам **ёнди**, омбор ҳам **ёнди**, оғилхона ҳам **ёнди**. (Ғ.Ғулом)*

In quoted speech Past indicates that the tertiary reference time is placed before the second moment of speaking which may be in the actual speaker's present, past or future ('He **says/said/will say**: My wife was ill'). In indirect speech it indicates pastness of the tertiary reference time as seen from the second moment of speaking if this is in the actual speaker's present or future ('He **says/will say** that his wife was ill'). If it is in his past, Past can be used for re-orientation: 'He **said** his wife **died** in 1960' (instead of 'had died'). Future is formed by adding the structural 'shall and 'will and a O-morpheme to the invariant component.

Future:	(variant)	invariant	variant
	shall\will	(call-)	0

For the phonematic realization of 'shall/will'.

The combinability of 'shall and 'will' with person differs in declarative sentences and questions, also with regard to aspect:

I/we shall/will call, shall/will be calling. You/he/they will call/be calling.

Will I/we call? Shall/will I/we be calling? Will you be calling?

Will he call? Will he/they be calling?

The function of Future is to signal that the secondary reference time to which the state-of-affairs is related is placed after the moment of speaking and thus is not connected with it (the categorial meaning of basic tense being expressed in the other variant). The same relation is expressed in a number of temporal phrases which are hence compatible with Future, e.g. 'in/for the future, then/once (referring to future),

some day before long, in next ... , tomorrow'.

We **shall be using** it even more **in the future**.

Сен бугунги мажлисга **келарсан-а?** –**Келарман**. (А.Ғ.Ғуломов)

I am going to get my cars pierced on Friday, **then I will be able** to wear a small earring.

Урушда кечирганлари қора босриқдай, базъан хотирдан **ўтажак**. (Ойбек)

In a year's time that barn'**ll be** my workshop.

-Лекин сенлар қиёматда ... жавоб **беражаксиз**. (С. Айний)

Next winter, near this beach, a pipeline carrying some of this natural gas **will come** out of these waters.

Кимки буйруқни менсимай, шағарда қолар экан, турган жойидаёқ **ўлдирилажак**. (В. Ян. Чингизхон)

'today, this' week/month/year' and 'tonight, this morning/afternoon/Monday/spring' may be used with Put.

I am delighted that your dad **will be** with you **tonight**.

Dates are qualified as future when used together with Future: *He will be 13 on 22nd of June*. As a state-of-affairs related to a future reference time is not known to be a fact (by most people), a statement about it tends to be a prediction. Thus Future has a modal connotation which distinguishes it from Present and Past. In Quoted speech Future indicates that the tertiary reference time is placed after the second moment of speaking, which may be in the actual speaker's present, past or future (*He says/said/will say: My wife **will return** soon*).

In indirect speech it indicates futurity of the tertiary reference time as seen from the second moment of speaking if this is in the actual speaker's present or future (*He says/will say that his wife **will return** soon*). If it is' in his past, Future can be used if re-orientation is possible: *He **said** his wife **will return** tomorrow*'. Present-Past is formed by means of Past formation as described above. The Present-Past and Past forms are homonymous.

Present-Past (variant) invariant variant

(0) (call-) -ed

Present-Past occurs in indirect or free indirect speech (perception). It signals that the tertiary reference time overlaps with the second moment of speaking, which is in the actual speaker's past (the categorial meaning of derived tense being negated). Temporal phrases compatible with Present-Past are for instance '*that day/morning/week*'.

*Eleanor **phoned** to say her mother **was** in hospital.*

*The conductor of the bus **asked** him if he **knew** the latest figures for the election.*

*He **told** the Duke that he **planned** to turn our book into a one-hour television show.*

Present-Past may also refer to future-in-the-past if this is signalled by the context or situation (categorial meaning of derived tense not expressed). This parallels the use of Present instead of Future: *He told me he **was seeing** Mr. Brown.* Past-Past is formed by means of the structural *had* (containing the basic Past form -d) and the ed-participle of the verb.

Past-Past is homonymous with AntPast F or the phonematic realization of 'had'. Past-Past indicates that the tertiary reference time IS placed before the secondary reference time\second moment of speaking, which it is in the current speaker's past (the categorial meaning of derived tense being expressed by one variant). Temporal phrases compatible with Past-Past are for instance '*the day/a week before, the previous night*':

*Yes, you **did tell** me that your*

*Dad **had caught** a chi11 while waiting for his trams.*

*Eleanor **phoned** to say her mother **had been** in a motor accident.*

*He **said** that this **had** not really **been** a fight on essential issues.*

Past-Past is not restricted to indirect speech: '*She **visited** London in 1965. She **had visited** Moscow two years before*', (Note that '*had visited*' can also express AntPast). Future-Past is formed by means of the structural '*would*' and, in contemporary English more rarely, '*should*' (each containing the Past component' -*ould*' as variant components). Future-Past occurs in indirect or free indirect speech. It

indicates that the tertiary reference time is placed after the second moment of speaking, which is in the actual speaker's past (the categorial meaning of derived tense being expressed in the other variant).

Temporal phrases compatible with Future-Past are for instance '*the following/next, day/week, the day/week after*'. Like Future, Future-Past has the modal connotation of prediction:

*The general secretary **said** there **would be** another round of talks.*

*This I **told** her was not true but I **would contact** the paper and see about it.*

The category of correlation consists of three constituents, simultaneity (Sim), anteriority (Ant), and posteriority (Post), forming a binary opposition: the unmarked number (Sim) is opposed to the marked member, which appears in two variants. The categorial meaning of correlation indicates the *non-simultaneity* (anteriority/posteriority) of the state-of-affairs to be described with the secondary (or tertiary) reference time. Thus the speaker expresses non-parallelity of his temporal standpoint with the state-of-affairs (retrospection/prospection). The marked forms express anteriority or posteriority:

*He **had written** ten novels before he **died** in 1950. = У 1950 йилда вафот этгунга қадар 10 новелла ёзди.*

*Has he **arrived**? = У келдими? The sun's **going to come** out.*

The unmarked form expresses simultaneity - that is, the speaker's temporal standpoint and the state-of-affairs are simultaneous (no retrospection/prospection); *Ronnie **goes ahead and pushes** Ada out of their path.* If the categorial meaning is signalled by the context and/or situation the unmarked form may be used instead of one of the marked forms (anteriority). Its function is then that of "categorial meaning not expressed" (deducible from the linguistic context as a whole): *The weather **is** much colder and wet **this last two or three days.** Охирги икки ёки уч кун ичида ҳаво анча совуқ ва ёмғирли.*

2.2 The analysis of the grammatical representation of duration, completion, and repetition in English and Uzbek languages

There are other ways of looking at the temporal properties of an event or state than when it occurred or was true. It could be viewed as ongoing or completed, for example. Consider the difference between these two English sentences.

1. *Clark was falling asleep.* = *Кларк ухлашга ётаётган эди.*

2. *Clark had fallen asleep.* = *Кларк ухлаб қолганди.*

Both have an unspecified time in the past as a point of reference. In sentence 1 the event is seen as ongoing at that time, and in sentence 2 the event is seen as completed at that time. The Speaker may also point out the repeated nature of an event or state, Consider the difference between these English and Uzbek sentences.

3. *Clark runs in the marathon.*

4. *Clark is running in the marathon.*

Қуёш доим ўз йўлидан юради.

Панирас чекасизми? (А.Қахҳор)

For both of these sentences, the point of reference is the utterance time ('now'). In sentence 3, the running is viewed as repeated around this reference time, in sentence 4 it is ongoing at the reference time. The grammatical representation of duration, completion, and repetition of events and states is known as aspect.

As with other grammatical morphology, aspect morphology is often obligatory. In English, for example, speakers have to commit themselves to the choice between ongoing, repeated, or completed for an event with present reference time. That is, it is impossible in English to talk about *Clark is running the marathon*, as in sentences 3 and 4, without making such a commitment.

Another set of properties that distinguishes some events and states from others is related to their truth; whether they are true or likely to be true, whether we are (renting them as true just for the sake of argument, whether we would like them to be true. The grammatical representation of meanings like these is called modality. Here are two English examples where the verb morphology reflects these dimensions:

Ronnie **goes** ahead and **pushes** Ada out of their path (SimPresent)

Тантанали мажлис соат еттида очилади... Хўп, хўп... мен яна телефон қиламан. ... Кечқурун мажлисга **келасизми**? (А. Қаххор)

For more examples with Sim as combined with the tenses. In a few cases Sim (in combination with Present) may be used instead of Ant to emphasize the persistence of the effect of the state-of-affairs at the reference time (the categorial meaning not being expressed):

'I hear/learn, understand/forget, he tells/writes me that... it's a long time since ...'.

*'Mr. Brown **tells** me you've come all the way from London today.*

*I **forget** his name.*

*Мен унинг исмини эсимдан **чиқардим**.*

*Қуёш тиқ келган. Ҳаво ловуллаб **ёнади**. Йўлчиннинг яланғоч елкасини ва орқасини қуёш **қиздиради**. Ит ақилламайди, қушлар сайрамайди.* (Ойбек)

Ant is formed by the addition of the structural 'ha(ve)' and, with an open class of verbs, an ed-morpheme to the invariant component ('invariant + -ed' being the ed-participle of the verb functioning as part of a combined finite form).

Ant:	variant	invariant	variant
	ha(ve)	(call-)	-ed

There are a number of unproductive patterns of ed-participle formation, due to historical development. In terms of invariant and variant components they can be described as follows: Inv + Var: *have-had, say-said, leave-left, buy-bought, put-put* (Var = 0), etc; *see-seen, take-taken*, etc. Spelling variation before *-en*: consonants before *'-en'* are doubled after a short stressed vowel spelled with a single letter, e.g. *'forbidden'*; mute *'e'* before *'-en'* is dropped, e.g. *'take-taken'*.

Inv + Var + Inv: *I lead-led, win-won, bind-bound, sit-sat, get-got*, etc.

Inv + Var + Inv + Var: *write-written, speak-spoken, sell-sold, keep-kept*, etc.

The function of Ant is to signal anteriority of the state-of-affairs to be described to the reference time, and also the speaker's retrospection (the categorial meaning being expressed by one variant).

The speaker's viewing the state-of-affairs in retrospective is due to the fact that he proceeds from situation/state-of-affairs which is valid at the reference time. It is thought to be the consequence of the state-of-affairs described. Keeping these consequences in mind the speaker directs his view backwards to the state-of-affairs itself thus expressing its "current relevance". The consequences the speaker has in mind when using Ant are mainly either the results of or experiences arising out of the previous state-of-affairs. In most cases they are not explicitly mentioned, but rather merely implied. Current relevance of an anterior state-of-affairs due to its results:

*I've **bought** a copy of the 'Concise Oxford Dictionary' (so now I possess this dictionary).* = *Мен лугат **сотиб олдим** (энди менинг лугатим бор).*

*Has he **arrived**?* = *У келдими?* *I have **just finished** a skirt for mother.* = *Мен онангни юбкасини **биткиздим**.*

Current relevance of an anterior state-of-affaire due to an experience arising out of it:

*She **has spent** many years in France (so now she probably knows a lot about France and the French).* = *У Францияда кўп йиллар давомиди яшаган (шунинг учун у француз тили ва французлар ҳақида яхши билади).*

*I've **eaten** my dinner off the best of plates...* *Кўрай қани, сен нималарни **тергансан**.* (С. Айний)

*I **have never seen** anything like them before.* “*Йўқ, мен ҳорган эмасман,*” *деди.* (С. Айний)

The temporal relation expressed in Ant is also expressed by temporal phrases which denote a timespan placed before and extending to the reference time, which are hence compatible with Ant, e.g. ‘*these for the last...*’; the beginning of the time span is indicated in phrases with ‘*since*’, the final point (= the reference time) in phrases such as ‘*by, .. , till*’ ‘*up to ...*’; ‘*recently, lately, a long time, ever, never, for ...*’ are used with Ant if felt to be connected with the reference time, e.g. ‘*ever*’ = ‘*at any time up to now/then*’; the same holds for ‘*this morning/afternoon/evening*’; today, this week-year’ etc. may be used with Ant if there is no additional time indication (*I’ve*

seen him today' - 'Today I met him at eight o'clock'), time point phrases that may be used with Ant are 'now' and 'just'.

One of the forms of activity that **has been developed in recent months** is what is called a teach-in.

Улуз Ватан урушида қатнашдингиз... Сиз қаерларда жанг қилмагансиз? Ўҳу, Брестни, Варшавани озод қилишда **қатнашгансиз**, Берлингача жанг қилиб **боргансиз**. Мен урушда бўлганим **йўқ**, ёш эдим. (Ш. Рашидов)

But this affluent society in built up on the fact that **since the 17th century** England.

Демак эркаклар ҳамма нарса тўғрисида ўйлаб, бир фикрга келишган; дадаси келиб, унга **сўзлаган!** (Ойбек)

I have just turned on the immerser to get hot water.

Салтанат: Вой, Ҳофизахоннинг кими бўласиз? Ҳамробуви: ... Онасиманда!
Салтанат: Шундоқми? Сиз Холнисо **холамдирсизда...**(А. Қаҳҳор)

With Present instead of Future in a temporal subjoined clause: *I will have a shower to freshen me up when I **have finished** this letter.* = *Мен хатни ёзишни **тузатиб бўлгач** душ қабул қилиб чиқаман.* AntPast (correlation: state-of-affairs anterior to reference time t2 viewed in retrospectives tense: reference time t2 before moment of speaking):

They'd been unemployed for months and months. = Улар бир неча ойлар давомида **ишсиз бўлган**.

By 1790 at least eight large towns **had developed** this way. = 1790 йилга келиб камида етти катта шаҳарлар бу йўл билан **ривожланиб кетди**.

AntFuture (correlation: state-of-affairs anterior to reference lime t2, viewed in retrospectives tense: reference time t2, after moment of speaking):

Within the next few decades man **will have been able** to imitate the energy - producing mechanism of the stars.

Кейинги бир неча йиллар давомида одам юлдузлардан энергия ишлаб чиқарувчи механизмни ярата **оладиган бўлади**.

*By this time next year George **will have taken** his university degree.*

*Кейинги йил шу пайтда Джордж дипломини **олаётган бўлади**.*

AntPresent-Past (correlation; state-of-affairs anterior to reference time t3, viewed in retrospective: tense: reference time t3 overlapping with reference time t2, t2 before moment of speaking): *He said he **had lost** his favourite book; У ўзининг севимли китобини **йўқотиб қўйганини** айтди.* AntFuture-Past (correlation: state-of-affairs anterior to reference time t3, viewed in retrospective tense: reference time t3 after reference time t2, t2 before moment of speaking):

*He told me where the comet **would have reached** the next day;*

*У менга эртага комета қаерга **етишини** айтди.*

Post is formed by the addition of the structural '(he) going to' and a O-morpheme to the invariant component.

Post:	variant	invariant	variant
	(be) going to	(call-)	-0

The function of Post is to signal posteriority of the state-of-affairs described to the respective reference time, including prospection (the categorial meaning being expressed in the other variant).

The speaker proceeds from a situational indication which is valid at the reference time and will (or *should*) lead to the realization of the state-of-affairs to come. From the viewpoint of these circumstances the speaker directs his view forward to the state-of-affairs itself, thus expressing its "current relevance". In this sense Post might be called the converse of Ant. (circumstances indicating realization of state-of-affairs valid at). Current relevance of the posterior state-of-affairs due to some previous indication:

*His table **is going to collapse** one of these days; the legs are very weak;*

*Шу кунларнинг бирида бу стол **оғанаб тушади**, унинг оёқлари зўрға турибди.*

Current relevance of the posterior state-of-affairs due to the subject's intention:

*I'm not **going to make** speeches, Ronnie.*

Мен сўзга чиқмоқчимасман, Ронни.

Then are no specific temporal phrases used with Post. The state-of-affairs itself may be specified by temporal phrases denoting futurity, e.g. '*tomorrow, next week, soon*'.

CHAPTER III. PROBLEMS OF TEACHING GRAMMAR TO ELEMENTARY AND INTERMEDIATE LEVEL STUDENTS

3.1 How to teach foreign languages

Every few years, new foreign language teaching methods arrive on the scene. New textbooks appear far more frequently. They are usually proclaimed to be more effective than those that have gone before, and, in many cases, these methods or textbooks are promoted or even prescribed for immediate use.

New methods and textbooks may reflect current developments in linguistic/applied linguistic theory or recent pedagogical trends. Sometimes they are said to be based on recent developments in language acquisition theory and research. For example, one approach to teaching may emphasize the value of having students imitate and practise a set of correct sentences while another emphasizes the importance of encouraging 'natural' communication between learners.

How is a teacher to evaluate the potential effectiveness of new methods? One important basis for evaluating is, of course, the teacher's own experience with previous successes or disappointments. In addition, teachers who are informed about some of the findings of recent research are better prepared to judge whether the new proposals for language teaching are likely to bring about positive changes in students' learning.

Our graduation paper is about how English language can be learned at classrooms on the bases of new pedagogical technologies with having taking into consideration the national aspect, i.e. influencing native Uzbek language and typical mistakes and difficulties in learning English by Uzbek speaking students. First of all we have written it for English language teachers who teach this language to Uzbek students at schools at 5-6 grades, but it could also be useful for adult learners who are only going to learn a wonderful world of English.

We believe that information about findings and theoretical views in second language acquisition research can make you a better judge of claims made by textbook writers and proponents of various language teaching methods. Such

information, combined with insights gained from your experience as a language teacher or learner, can help you evaluate proposed changes in classroom methodology

Most people would agree that learning a second language in a natural acquisition context or 'on the street' is not the same as learning in the classroom. Many believe that learning 'on the street' is more effective. This belief may be based on the fact that most successful learners have had exposure to the language outside the classroom.

What is special about natural language learning? Can we create the same environment in the classroom? Should we? Or are there essential contributions that only instruction—and not natural exposure—can provide?

In this chapter, we will look at five proposals which theorists have made for how second languages should be taught. We will review research on second language learning which has been carried out in classroom settings. This will permit us to explore further the way in which second language research and theory contribute to our understanding of the advantages and the limitations of different approaches to second language teaching.

Before we go further, let us take a moment to reflect on the differences between natural and instructional language learning settings. We will then look at transcripts from two classrooms and try to understand what principles guide the teacher in each case. Natural acquisition contexts should be understood as those in which the learner is exposed to the language at work or in social interaction or, if the learner is a child, in a school situation where most of the other children are native speakers of the target language and where the instruction is directed toward native speakers rather than toward learners of the language.

The traditional instruction environment is one where the language is being taught to a group of second or foreign language learners. In this case, the focus is on the language itself, rather than on information which is carried by the language. The teacher's goal is to see to it that students learn the vocabulary and grammatical rules

of the target language. The goal of learners in such courses is often to pass an examination rather than to use the language for daily communicative interaction.

Communicative instruction environments also involve learners whose goal is learning the language itself, but the style of instruction places the emphasis on interaction, conversation, and language use, rather than on learning about the language. The topics which are discussed in the communicative instruction environment are often topics of general interest to the learner, for example, how to reply to a classified advertisement from a newspaper. Alternatively, the focus of a lesson may be on the subject matter, such as history or mathematics, which students are learning through the medium of the second language. In these classes, the focus may occasionally be on language itself, but the emphasis is on using the language rather than on talking about it.

The language which teachers use for teaching is not selected on the basis of teaching a specific feature of the language, but on teaching learners to use the language in a variety of contexts. Students' success in these courses is often measured in terms of their ability to 'get things done' in the second language, rather than on their accuracy in using certain grammatical features. In the chart below, mark a plus (+) if the characteristic in the left-hand column is typical of the learning environment in the three remaining columns. Mark a minus (-) if it is not something you usually find in that context. Write '?' if you are not sure.

Comparison of natural and instructional settings

Table 1:

Characteristics	Natural acquisition	Traditional instruction	Communicative instruction
<i>error correction</i>			
<i>learning one thing at a time</i>			
<i>ample time available for learning</i>			
<i>high ratio of native speakers to learners</i>			
<i>variety of language and discourse types</i>			
<i>pressure to speak</i>			
<i>access to modified input</i>			

As you look at the pattern of + and - signs you have placed in the chart, you will probably find it matches the following descriptions.

In **natural acquisition** settings:

- a. Learners are rarely corrected. If their interlocutors can understand what they are saying, they do not remark on the correctness of the learners' speech.
- b. They would probably feel it was rude to do so;
- c. Language is not structured step by step.

In **communicative interactions**:

- a. The learner will be exposed to a wide variety of vocabulary and structures;
- b. The learner is surrounded by the language for many hours each day. Some of it is addressed to the learner; much of it is simply 'overheard',
- c. The learner encounters a number of different people who use the target language proficiently;
- d. The learner observes or participates in many different types of language events: brief greetings, commercial transactions, exchanges of information, arguments, instructions at school or in the workplace;
- e. Learners must often use their limited second language ability to respond to questions or get information.

In these situations, the emphasis is on getting meaning across clearly, and more proficient speakers tend to be tolerant of errors that do not interfere with meaning; Modified input is available in many one-on-one conversations. In situations where many native speakers are involved in the conversation, however, the learner often has difficulty getting access to language he or she can understand.

These differ from natural learners in that:

- Errors are frequently corrected.
- Accuracy tends to be given priority over meaningful interaction;
- Input is structurally simplified and sequenced.
- Linguistic items are presented and practised in isolation, one item at a time;
- There is limited time for learning (usually only a few hours a week);

- There is a small ratio of native speakers to non-native speakers.
- The teacher is often the only native or proficient speaker the student comes in contact with;
- Students experience a limited range of language discourse types (often a chain of 'Teacher asks a question/Student answers/Teacher evaluates response');
- Students often feel great pressure to speak or write the second language and to do so correctly from the very beginning;
- When teachers use the target language to give instructions or in other classroom management events, they often modify their language in order to ensure comprehension and compliance.

Not all language classrooms are alike. The conditions for learning differ in terms of the physical environment, the age and motivation of the students, the amount of time available for learning, and many other variables. Classrooms also differ in terms of the principles which guide teachers in their language teaching methods and techniques.

The design of communicative language teaching programs has sought to replace some of the characteristics of traditional instruction with those more typical of natural acquisition contexts.

Thus, in communicative language teaching classrooms we may find the following characteristics:

- There is a limited amount of error correction, and meaning is emphasized over form;
- Input is simplified and made comprehensible by the use of contextual cues, props, and gestures, rather than through structural grading (the presentation of one grammatical item at a time, in a sequence of 'simple' to 'complex');
- Learners usually have only limited time for learning.
- Sometimes, however, subject-matter courses taught through the second language can add time for language learning;
- Contact with proficient or native speakers of the language is limited.

As with traditional instruction, it is often only the teacher who is a proficient speaker. In communicative classrooms, learners have considerable exposure to the second language speech of other learners.

- This naturally contains errors which would not be heard in an environment where one's interlocutors are native speakers;

- A variety of discourse types are introduced through stories, role playing, the use of 'real-life' materials such as newspapers and television broadcasts, and field trips;

- There is little pressure to perform at high levels of accuracy, and there is often a greater emphasis on comprehension than on production in the early stages of learning;

- Modified input is a defining feature of this approach to instruction.

The teacher in these classes makes every effort to speak to students in a level of language they can understand. In addition, other students speak a simplified language.

3.2 Grammar acquisition. Focusing on tenses.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, there is a growing belief that learners in native language immersion programs need more opportunities to focus on form and receive corrective feedback. There has been a call for more classroom research of the type exemplified by Studies 16 and 17 to determine how this can best be accomplished. Birgit Harley¹⁸ examined the effects of a functional approach to grammar teaching on a particularly problematic area of grammar for English-speaking learners of native language—the contrastive use of two past tense forms for 'My mother often spoke about her childhood', and roughly the specific or narrative past, for example, 'After class I had talked with the other students'. Approximately high grade 6 immersion students were given instruction on the use of these past tense forms through teaching materials which encouraged their use in a variety of functionally-based practice activities.

¹⁸ See: Harley, B. 1989. 'Functional grammar in native language immersion: A classroom experiment. p.331

No explicit grammatical rules were provided, nor was there an emphasis on corrective feedback. The intention was to create opportunities, activities, and tasks which would expose them to more input containing both verb forms, and encourage more productive use of them by the learners. The teaching materials were administered over an eight-week period. Learners were tested on their spoken and written knowledge before the instructional treatment began, eight weeks later, and again three months later.

Harley's findings showed that learners in the experimental classes outperformed the control classes on the immediate post-tests on some of the written and oral measures. Three months later, however, there were no significant differences between the two groups. Elaine Day and Stan Shapson¹⁹ examined the effects of instruction with average grade 7 students (age about twelve or thirteen).

The feature of grammar which was taught was the conditional mood of the verb, for example in sentences such as 'Agar men lotereyada yuib olsam, sayohatga borar edim'. -*If I won the lottery, I would go away on a trip*'. Students in the experimental classes received several hours of focused instruction on the conditional over a period of five to seven weeks.

The students in the control group continued with their usual classroom routines, that is, they continued to encounter native language mainly in the context of learning their general school subjects (science, mathematics, history, etc. through the medium of native language).

Special teaching materials were prepared by the team of researchers. They consisted of:

- 1) group work which created situations for the use of the conditional in natural communicative situations;
- 2) written and oral exercises to reinforce the use of the conditional in more formal, structured situations;

¹⁹ See: Day, E. and S. Shapson. 1991. 'Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in Native language immersion: An experimental approach.' *Language Learning* 41: 25—58.

3) self-evaluation activities to encourage students to develop conscious awareness of their language use.

Oral and written tests were administered before the instructional treatment, immediately after the instruction (five to seven weeks later), and at the end of the school year. Learners in the experimental classes outperformed those in the control classes on the immediate post-tests for the written tasks (but not for the oral). In contrast to the students in Study 16, they were still doing better than the control group on the follow-up post-tests administered several months later.

The overall results of the experimental studies in the intensive ESL and native language immersion programs provide partial support for the hypothesis that enhanced input or form-focused instruction and corrective feedback within communicative second language programs can improve the learners' use of particular grammatical features. The results also show, however, that the effects of instruction are not always long lasting. For example, in the intensive program studies, the positive effects of form-focused instruction on adverb placement had disappeared a year later.

Yet, the positive effects of this type of instruction and corrective feedback for questions were maintained in the long-term follow-up testing. Similarly, in the experimental native language immersion studies, while there were only short-term instructional benefits for the use of the imparfait and passe compose, the benefits of instruction for the use of the conditional continued to be evident several months later.

It would be useful to notice here that the different results of the intensive ESL program findings might be explained in terms of the frequency of use of the two linguistic structures in regular classroom input after the experimental treatment had ended. For example, as mentioned in Study 15, question forms occur much more frequently in classroom input than adverbs.

This continued reinforcement may have contributed to the continued improvement in the learners' use of questions over time. Evidence from classroom observations suggests that students did not receive any continued reinforcement

through exposure to adverbs in classroom materials and activities once the experimental period was over, and thus it should not be surprising that these learners failed to maintain the improved performance levels.

The contrasting results of the native language immersion program teaching experiments (focuses on grammar) may also be explained by potential differences in input. But in this case, it seems more likely that differences in the experimental teaching materials and methodology may have contributed to the different results.

Although both sets of materials had as their goal to provide learners with the opportunity to use the linguistic forms in a variety of functionally-based communicative practice activities, the instructional materials for the 'past tense' study (past tenses) may not have been sufficiently form-focused or did not draw the learners' attention to their language use as frequently and as explicitly as the instructional materials for the 'conditional' study (conditionals). While this is a possible explanation, other factors may have contributed to the different outcomes. For example, it could be that the two linguistic structures under investigation respond to instruction in different ways or that even the relatively small differences in the age of the learners played a role.

CONCLUSION

Having thoroughly analysed the problem of The use of the tense forms of the verb in English and Uzbek languages which is very actual and interesting in present day linguists, having looking through the words of leading scholars, having reviewed all existing literature, having analysed, the linguistic data, in the forms of example picked out of the novels, stories, newspapers, also having applied all possible modern methods of investigation we have come to the following theoretically and practically important conclusions:

Grammatical tense is a way languages express the time at which an event described by a sentence occurs. In English, this is a property of a verb form, and expresses only time-related information. Tense, along with mood, voice and person, are four ways in which verb forms are frequently characterized, in languages where those categories apply. There are languages where tense is not expressed anywhere in the verb or any auxiliaries, but only as adverbs of time, when needed for comprehension; in the same condition, grammatical tense in certain languages can be expressed optionally, and there are also languages (such as Russian) where verbs indicate aspect in addition to or instead of tense.

Tenses can be broadly classified as:

Absolute: indicates time in relationship to the time of the utterance (i.e. «now»).

Relative: in relationship to some other time, other than the time of utterance.

Absolute-relative: indicates time in relationship to some other event, whose time in turn is relative to the time of utterance.

Future tenses. Some languages have different future tenses to indicate how far into the future we are talking about. Past tenses. Some languages have different past tenses to indicate how far into the past we are talking about. Present tense: Still tense: indicates a situation held to be the case, at or immediately before the utterance.

English is a language with limited verb agreement morphology, the vestiges of what was a full-blown agreement system in Old English. From the outset, theories of tense for English confront the poser that temporal reference is not an invariant of her

verb clusters. English verb clusters divide into those of the primary pattern and those of the secondary pattern, the former being all and only those not incorporating a secondary auxiliary. The secondary auxiliaries are will, would, shall, should, can, could, may, might, must, ought and two or three others.

The divisibility of time allows man to establish chronometric system (scales) such as clocktime and calendar time, which provides reference points (indices) the states-of-affairs, can be related to. Chronometric systems serve to define states-of-affairs with regard to their position on the time line, i.e. with regard to their duration, frequency, and chronological order.

The moment of speaking itself and a variable time span including it are experienced as present (in an act of direct perception). The segment preceding the moment of speaking is experienced as past (in an act of recollection), the segment following the moment of speaking as future (in an act of anticipation). The time span around the moment of speaking can be gradually intended until the border to universal time is reached. If this happens, the segmentation of the time line into past, present and future is cancelled.

There are other ways of looking at the temporal properties of an event or state than when it occurred or was true. It could be viewed as ongoing or completed, for example. The Speaker may also point out the repeated nature of an event or state. The grammatical representation of duration, completion, and repetition of events and states is known as aspect. As with other grammatical morphology, aspect morphology is often obligatory.

Our graduation paper is about how English language can be learned at classrooms on the bases of new pedagogical technologies with having taking into consideration the national aspect, i.e. influencing native Uzbek language and typical mistakes and difficulties in learning English by Uzbek speaking students. First of all we have written it for English language teachers who teach this language to Uzbek students at schools at 5-6 grades, but it could also be useful for adult learners who are only going to learn a wonderful world of English.

We believe that information about findings and theoretical views in second language acquisition research can make you a better judge of claims made by textbook writers and proponents of various language teaching methods. Such information, combined with insights gained from your experience as a language teacher or learner, can help you evaluate proposed changes in classroom methodology

Whenever a use of either kind, prime or undeclarative, accrues to a primary-pattern verb cluster, there is always a condition specified, the predication condition. In the case of a prime use, what is registered by the tense of the verb cluster is the time of this condition's satisfaction. In the case of an undeclarative use, it is the location of what I call the change over – point.

The categorial meaning of tense, that is, the meaning which forms the common basis for the definition of the various tense functions, is as follows: the speaker indicates a temporal interval (gap) between the moment of speaking and a secondary reference time in past or future (basic tense), or between a second moment of speaking the past and a tertiary reference time in Past-Past or Future-Past (derived tense). The function of the marked forms is to express this interval, that of the unmarked forms is to show that no such interval is indicated (the categorial meaning of tense being negated).

The category of tense consists of six constituents forming two sets: the basic set including present (Pres), past (Past) and future (Future), and the derived set including present-in-the-past (Pres-Past), past-in-the-past (Past-Past) and future-in-the-past (Future-Past). Each set has the structure of a binary opposition: the unmarked member (Present, Present-Past) is opposed to the marked member, which appears in two forms (Past/Future, Past-Past/Future-Past).

We realize that not all teachers would agree with the position we have put forth here. Some would say that particularly foreign language learner need as much exposure as possible to L2 input during limited class time, the only time in their daily lives when they encounter the language. Others would say that if you only use

English, you force your students to try to communicate with you in that language, giving them the opportunity to produce comprehensible output and negotiate meaning.

We, of course, agree that English should be the primary vehicle of communication in the English classroom and that you should give students ample opportunities to process English receptively as well as to produce and negotiate meaning in the language. We suggest, however, that our arguments for the pedagogical and affective benefits of L1 use justify its limited and judicious use in the second or foreign language classroom. Moreover, if we take the goal of creating a student centered classroom seriously, our findings have important implications on what we do in our classes.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Каримов И.А. "Чет тилларни ўрганиш тизимини янада такомиллаштириш чора тадбирлари тўғрисида." ПК-1875, Халқ сўзи, 2012, 11 декабр, 1-бет
2. Каримов И.А. Наша высшая цель – независимость и процветание Родины, свобода и благополучие народа// Доклад на первой сессии Олий Мажлиса Республики Узбекистан второго созыва от 22.01.2000.-Т.: Узбекистан.2000.Т.8.- С.322-340.
3. Каримов И.А. Гармонично развитое поколение-основа прогресса Узбекистана. Ташкент. 156-168
4. Бўронов Ж. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларининг қиёсий грамматикаси. Т. Ўқитувчи, 1974, 280 б.
5. Аничков А.А. Методика обучения английскому языку. Москва ВШ. 1973
6. Бархударов Л.С., Штелинг Д.А. Грамматика английского языка. М., 1965, 580 р.
7. Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. М., 1966. 250 р.
8. Блох М.Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М., 2005.
9. Блох М.Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М., 2005, 380 с.
10. Ирискулов М.Т. Лекции по теоретической грамматике английского языка. Т., 2004, 240 с.
11. Качалова В.А. Грамматика английского языка. М., 2004.
12. Ляховицкий А.В. Лингвистические основы обучения иностранным языкам. Москва, ВШ, 1983.
13. Миролубов А.А. Общая методика преподавания иностранных языков. Москва, ВШ. 1978
14. Мухин А.М. Структура предложений и их модели. Л., 1968.;
15. Плоткин В.Я. Грамматические системы современного английского языка. Кишинев, 1975.
16. Почепцов Г.Г. Конструктивный анализ предложения. Киев, 1971

17. Резник Р.В. Практическая грамматика английского языка. М., 2002.
18. Рогова В.В. Методика обучения английскому языку. Москва ВШ. 1988
19. Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. М., 1966, 360 с.
20. Смирницкий А.И. Морфология английского языка М., 1955 , 480 с.
21. Худяков А.В. Теоретическая грамматика М. ВШ, 2007, 248 с.
22. Штелинг Д.А. Грамматическая семантика английского языка. М., 1996.
23. Bach, Emmon. 1986. The Algebra of Events. Linguistics and Philosophy, p16.
24. Bickel, Balthasar. 1997. Aspectual Scope and the Difference between Logical and Semantic Representation. *Lingua* 102: 115-131.
25. Binnick, Robert I. 1991. Time and the Verb. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
26. Close R.A. A Reference Grammar for Students of English. Ldn., 1977.
27. Francis W. N. The structure of American English. N. Y. 1998.
28. Francis W.N. The Structure of American English. New York, 2008, 450
29. Fries Ch. C. The structure of English. N. Y. Harcourt: Brace, 1952.
30. Fries Ch. The Structure of English. J.D. Salinger, 1951, 248 p.
31. Hopper, Paul J., ed (1982) Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics Amsterdam: Benjamins.
32. Ilyish B.A. The structure of Modern English. М.-Л., 1971, 380 p.
33. Iofik L.L., Chakhoyan L.P. Readings in the Theory of English Grammar. Leningrad, 1972.
34. Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashev A.M. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Tashkent, 2008, 208 pages
35. Irtenyeva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh M. Y., Shapkin A.P. Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, 1969, 220 p
36. Khaimovich B.S., Rogovskaya B.I. A Course in English Grammar. Moscow, 1967.
37. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Grammar of Contemporary English. Lnd., 1972, 1040 p.
38. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvak I. A Grammar of contemporary

- English. Ldn.: Longman, 2002.
39. Roberts P. English Sentences. N. Y. 2000.
40. www.terminologyfoundations.org/edu
41. www.terminologyresources.com
42. www.translationtheory.com/ru
43. www.translationandterminology.com
44. www.technicalandscientifictranslation.ru
45. www.education.co.uk
46. www.grammarstudies.com
47. www.grammatika.ru/adjectives/html
48. www.englishclub.uz