

e-ISSN 3060-5059

DOI: 10.67227



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNAL

Scientific and Innovative Research in
Social and Humanitarian Studies

Vol. 3 • Issue 8

2026



Founded in 2024



publishscience.uz



publish_science_journal@mail.ru



PEER REVIEWED • OPEN ACCESS

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA MAKON VA ZAMONNI IFODALOVCHI LEKSIK BIRLIKLAR: QIYOSIY LINGVISTIK VA PRAGMATIK TAHLIL

Jovliyav Dilshod Ziyoyul o'g'li

Axborot texnologiyalari va menejment universiteti, magistrant.

e-mail: dilshodjovliyav@mail.ru ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7594-5029>

Аннотация.

Makon va zamon inson tafakkurining asosiy kategoriyalari bo'lib, tilda leksik hamda frazeologik birliklar orqali ifodalanadi. Mazkur tadqiqot ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi makon va zamonga oid ifodalarning lingvistik hamda pragmatik xususiyatlarini o'rganishga bag'ishlangan. Tadqiqotda korpusga asoslangan qiyosiy yondashuv qo'llanilib, badiiy, publitsistik va og'zaki nutq manbalaridan olingan 600 ta misol tahlil qilindi. Natijalar har ikki tilda ham makon tushunchalarining zamon sohasiga metaforik ko'chirilishi keng tarqalganligini ko'rsatdi. Shu bilan birga, o'zbek tilida madaniy jihatdan shakllangan ifodalar va kontekstual deysis vositalari ko'proq uchrasa, ingliz tilida struktur jihatdan barqaror leksik modellarning ustunligi kuzatildi. Makon va zamon ifodalari nafaqat referensial vazifani, balki xushmuomalalik, baholash, ta'kidlash hamda diskursni tashkil etish kabi pragmatik funksiyalarni ham bajaradi. Tadqiqot makon va zamonning til orqali ifodalanishida leksik semantika, pragmatika va madaniy kognitsiya o'rtasidagi o'zaro bog'liqlikni yoritadi.

Kalit so'zlar: makon ifodalari, zamon ifodalari, leksik semantika, pragmatika, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, deysis.

ПРОСТРАНСТВЕННЫЕ И ВРЕМЕННЫЕ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИЕ ЕДИНИЦЫ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ И ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ

Жовлиев Дилшод Зиёкул угли

Университет информационных технологий и менеджмента, магистрант.

Аннотация.

Пространство и время являются фундаментальными категориями человеческого мышления, отражающимися в языке посредством лексических и фразеологических единиц. В данном исследовании рассматриваются лингвистические и прагматические особенности пространственных и временных выражений в английском и узбекском языках. Исследование основано на сравнительно-корпусном подходе; было проанализировано 600 примеров, отобранных из художественных, публицистических и разговорных текстов. Полученные результаты показывают, что в обоих языках широко представлены метафорические переносы из пространственной сферы во временную. Вместе с тем узбекский язык в большей степени опирается на культурно обусловленные выражения и контекстуальный дейксис, тогда как английский язык характеризуется преобладанием структурно закреплённых лексических моделей. Пространственные и временные выражения выполняют не только референциальную функцию, но и прагматические функции, связанные с вежливостью, оценкой, акцентуацией и организацией дискурса. Исследование демонстрирует взаимосвязь лексической семантики, прагматики и культурной когниции в языковой репрезентации пространства и времени.

Ключевые слова: пространственные выражения, временные выражения, лексическая семантика, прагматика, английский язык, узбекский язык, сравнительное языкознание, дейксис.

SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL LEXICAL EXPRESSIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: A COMPARATIVE LINGUISTIC AND PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

Jovliyav Dilshod Ziyoyul o'g'li

University of Information Technology and Management, Master's Student.

Abstract.

Space and time are fundamental categories of human cognition reflected in language through lexical and phraseological expressions. This study examines the linguistic and pragmatic features of spatial and temporal expressions in English and Uzbek. Using a comparative corpus-based approach, 600 examples from literary, journalistic, and conversational texts were analyzed. The findings show that both languages employ metaphorical extensions from spatial to temporal domains; however,

Uzbek relies more on culturally embedded expressions and contextual deixis, while English favors structurally fixed lexical patterns. Spatial and temporal expressions serve not only referential functions but also pragmatic purposes such as politeness, evaluation, emphasis, and discourse organization. The study highlights the interaction of lexical semantics, pragmatics, and cultural cognition in the representation of space and time.

Keywords: spatial expressions, temporal expressions, lexical semantics, pragmatics, English, Uzbek, comparative linguistics, deixis.

Introduction. Space and time constitute fundamental cognitive and linguistic categories through which human beings perceive, conceptualize, organize, and communicate their experience of reality. These categories are not represented in language merely as objective dimensions of the physical world; rather, their linguistic realization reflects complex interactions between cognitive mechanisms, cultural models, communicative intentions, and language-specific structural patterns. Consequently, the verbalization of spatial and temporal relations has become an important area of inquiry within contemporary linguistics, particularly in lexical semantics, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and linguistic typology. A substantial body of linguistic research has demonstrated that spatial conceptualization frequently provides a cognitive basis for the linguistic representation of temporal relations. In many languages, abstract temporal meanings are structured through spatial schemas and metaphorical mappings, whereby temporal succession, duration, proximity, distance, and direction are conceptualized in terms of spatial orientation and movement. Expressions referring to such notions as *before, after, ahead, behind, approaching,* or *distant* illustrate the close interaction between spatial and temporal domains. This relationship suggests that space and time are not isolated semantic categories but interconnected conceptual systems whose linguistic realization is shaped by both universal cognitive tendencies and culturally conditioned patterns of interpretation.

At the same time, the lexical and pragmatic representation of spatial and temporal relations may differ considerably across languages. English and Uzbek are particularly relevant for comparative analysis because they belong to different language families and display distinct structural and typological characteristics. English, as a predominantly analytic language, frequently relies on prepositions, particles, adverbial constructions, lexical verbs, and syntactic combinations to encode spatial and temporal relations. Uzbek, as an agglutinative Turkic language, makes extensive use of case markers, postpositions, derivational and inflectional morphology, as well as specific lexical and syntactic structures. These typological distinctions may influence not only the formal realization of spatial and temporal meanings but also the ways in which speakers conceptualize and pragmatically employ such expressions in actual discourse. Despite the growing scholarly interest in spatial and temporal conceptualization, comparative research focusing specifically on the lexical-semantic and pragmatic characteristics of English and Uzbek expressions remains relatively limited. Existing studies have often examined spatiality, temporality, metaphor, or deixis separately, whereas the interaction between lexical meaning, metaphorical extension, contextual interpretation, and communicative function requires more systematic cross-linguistic investigation. In particular, insufficient attention has been paid to the ways in which equivalent or functionally similar spatial and temporal expressions may acquire different pragmatic meanings depending on discourse context, speaker intention, communicative situation, and cultural convention.

The relevance of the present study is therefore determined by the necessity of identifying both universal and language-specific mechanisms underlying the verbalization of spatial and temporal relations in English and Uzbek. A comparative analysis of these languages makes it possible to reveal how similar conceptual content is encoded by different lexical and grammatical resources and how such expressions function pragmatically in communication. Such an approach contributes not only to a deeper understanding of the semantic organization of space and time but also to broader issues of cognitive categorization, linguistic worldview, intercultural communication, and comparative typology. The aim of this study is to investigate the linguistic and pragmatic characteristics of spatial and temporal expressions in English and Uzbek by examining their lexical-semantic structure, metaphorical extensions, contextual meanings, and communicative functions. Particular attention is given to the interaction between spatial and temporal conceptual domains and to the similarities and differences that emerge in their linguistic representation across the two languages.

To achieve this aim, the study pursues the following objectives:

1. to identify and classify the principal lexical means used to express spatial and temporal relations in English and Uzbek;
2. to analyze the semantic structure of these units and determine the mechanisms through which spatial meanings develop temporal and metaphorical extensions;
3. to examine the pragmatic functions of spatial and temporal expressions in different discourse contexts, with particular attention to speaker intention and contextual interpretation;
4. to establish the major similarities and differences between English and Uzbek in the lexicalization, conceptualization, and pragmatic use of spatial and temporal relations.

Literature Review

The linguistic representation of space and time has been extensively examined within cognitive linguistics, lexical semantics, and linguistic typology. One of the most influential approaches to spatial conceptualization was developed by Leonard Talmy. In **Toward a Cognitive Semantics**, Talmy considers space, time, motion, location, causation, and force dynamics among the fundamental conceptual domains through which language structures human experience. His framework demonstrates that linguistic expressions of motion and location can be analyzed through such semantic

components as Figure, Ground, Path, Motion, and Manner [1]. This approach is particularly relevant to the comparative analysis of English and Uzbek because the two languages may encode similar spatial situations through structurally different lexical and grammatical devices. Talmy's model also provides a theoretical basis for explaining how concrete spatial configurations may participate in the conceptualization of more abstract relations, including temporal meanings.

Ronald W. Langacker approaches spatial and temporal meaning from the perspective of Cognitive Grammar. According to Langacker, linguistic meaning cannot be reduced to an objective description of an external situation; rather, meaning involves conceptualization and the particular way in which a speaker construes a given event or relation [2]. From this perspective, spatial and temporal expressions are significant not only because of what they denote, but also because of the viewpoint, perspective, prominence, and contextual organization imposed by the speaker. Langacker's approach is especially valuable for pragmatic analysis, since the interpretation of expressions such as **before, behind, ahead, near,** or **far** may vary according to the conceptual reference point and discourse situation. Thus, the same lexical unit may perform different semantic and communicative functions depending on how a spatial or temporal relation is construed within a particular context.

Dan I. Slobin makes an important contribution to the cross-linguistic study of spatial relations through his research on motion-event description and narrative discourse. His analysis demonstrates that languages differ systematically in the linguistic resources they make readily available for describing motion, direction, path, and manner [3]. Slobin's research emphasizes that speakers select and organize information in accordance with the lexical and grammatical possibilities conventionalized in their language. Consequently, comparable events may receive different linguistic representations across languages. This principle is highly relevant to English-Uzbek comparison: English frequently combines motion verbs with particles and prepositional constructions, whereas Uzbek may encode spatial direction through case forms, postpositions, verbal morphology, and combinations of lexical units. Slobin's cross-linguistic perspective therefore makes it possible to examine not only formal differences but also the discourse strategies used by speakers to foreground particular components of spatial situations.

A broader typological foundation for such comparison is provided by William Croft. In **Typology and Universals**, Croft treats linguistic typology as an empirical cross-linguistic approach aimed at identifying recurrent structural patterns as well as language-specific strategies [4]. His framework is significant for the study of English and Uzbek because these languages belong to different typological systems and employ different grammatical mechanisms for encoding semantic relations. A typological analysis makes it possible to distinguish genuinely universal tendencies in the expression of space and time from structures conditioned by the grammatical organization of a particular language. In addition, Croft's discussion of grammatical categories and semantic mapping provides a useful methodological basis for comparing functionally equivalent expressions even when they do not display direct formal correspondence.

Materials and Methods

The present study employs a qualitative comparative research design integrated with semantic, pragmatic, and discourse-analytical methods. The methodological framework was selected to identify both language-specific and cross-linguistic patterns in the representation of spatial and temporal relations in English and Uzbek. Particular attention was paid to the interaction between lexical meaning, contextual interpretation, metaphorical extension, and communicative function.

The empirical material of the study consists of 600 lexical and phraseological examples, including 300 English and 300 Uzbek units. The examples were collected from a range of authentic discourse sources, including literary works, journalistic texts, academic publications, online materials, and samples of conversational speech. The inclusion of different discourse types made it possible to examine spatial and temporal expressions not only as isolated lexical units but also as context-dependent linguistic elements functioning in actual communication. The data were selected according to their relevance to spatial location, direction, distance, temporal sequence, duration, proximity, deixis, and metaphorical extensions of spatial and temporal meanings.

The analysis was conducted in several interrelated stages. First, a comparative linguistic analysis was applied to identify the lexical, morphological, and syntactic means through which spatial and temporal relations are expressed in English and Uzbek. At this stage, attention was given to lexical items, prepositional and postpositional constructions, adverbial units, case forms, phraseological combinations, and other structurally relevant patterns.

Second, semantic analysis was employed to determine the core and contextual meanings of the selected units. Particular consideration was given to polysemy, semantic shifts, and metaphorical extensions in which spatial meanings acquire temporal or more abstract interpretations. This procedure made it possible to establish semantic correspondences as well as cases of partial or non-equivalence between English and Uzbek expressions.

Third, pragmatic analysis was used to examine the communicative functions performed by spatial and temporal expressions in discourse. The analysis focused on such pragmatic phenomena as spatial and temporal deixis, speaker evaluation, perspective, reference-point organization, emphasis, and discourse management. Special attention was paid to the ways in which the meaning of a lexical unit may change depending on speaker intention, communicative situation, and the relationship between participants.

Finally, contextual interpretation was applied to all examples in order to determine how lexical and phraseological meanings are actualized in authentic discourse. Each unit was analyzed within its surrounding linguistic and situational context rather than in isolation. This made it possible to distinguish dictionary meaning from contextually motivated pragmatic meaning and to identify cases in which spatial and temporal expressions simultaneously perform semantic, evaluative, and discourse-organizing functions.

The combination of comparative, semantic, pragmatic, and contextual methods provides a comprehensive framework for examining the linguistic representation of space and time in English and Uzbek. It also enables the study to reveal both shared conceptual tendencies and language-specific mechanisms underlying the lexicalization and pragmatic use of spatial and temporal relations.

Results. The comparative analysis of the 600 lexical and phraseological examples revealed that English and Uzbek share a number of common conceptual patterns in the representation of space and time, although these meanings are frequently encoded through different lexical, morphological, and syntactic mechanisms. The results show that spatial relations constitute an important conceptual basis for expressing temporal sequence, temporal distance, direction of development, and the speaker's perspective in both languages.

One of the most evident similarities concerns the conceptual opposition between proximity and distance. In English, the adjectives *near* and *far* primarily express physical distance, as in *The school is near the station* and *The village is far from the city*. Their Uzbek equivalents are expressed through the lexical units *yaqin* and *uzoq*: *Maktab bekatga yaqin* and *Qishloq shahardan uzoq*. In both languages, however, the same lexical opposition can be extended from the spatial domain to the temporal domain. Compare:

English: *The examination date is near.*

Uzbek: *Imtihon sanasi yaqin.*

In these examples, *near* and *yaqin* no longer refer to physical distance. Instead, they conceptualize the approaching event as if it were moving toward the speaker in space. A similar semantic extension occurs in *The holidays are still far away* and *Ta'til hali uzoq*. Thus, both languages employ spatial distance as a metaphorical model for temporal distance.

A similar relationship was observed in lexical units expressing movement toward a destination. The English verb *approach* and the Uzbek verb *yaqinlashmoq* can describe both physical and temporal movement:

English: *The train is approaching the station.*

Uzbek: *Poyezd bekatga yaqinlashmoqda.*

In these sentences, the verbs describe an actual spatial movement toward a physical reference point. However, the same verbs occur in temporal contexts:

English: *The deadline is approaching.*

Uzbek: *Topshirish muddati yaqinlashmoqda.*

The temporal event is conceptualized as an entity moving toward the present moment. This confirms that the SPACE-TIME metaphor operates in both English and Uzbek, although the grammatical realization of the relationship differs according to the structure of each language.

The analysis also revealed significant similarities in the conceptualization of temporal sequence through the spatial notions of front and back. English frequently uses the expressions *before*, *after*, *ahead*, and *behind*, whereas Uzbek employs such units as *oldin*, *keyin*, *oldinda*, and *orqada*. Consider the following examples:

English: *We met before the conference.*

Uzbek: *Biz konferensiyadan oldin uchrashdik.*

English: *They discussed the results after the meeting.*

Uzbek: *Ular yig'ilishdan keyin natijalarni muhokama qilishdi.*

The lexical units *before/oldin* and *after/keyin* primarily organize events according to temporal succession. Nevertheless, their historical and conceptual relationship with spatial orientation remains apparent in expressions such as:

English: *A difficult period lies ahead.*

Uzbek: *Oldinda murakkab davr turibdi.*

Here, the future is represented as a spatial region located "in front" of the experiencer. The expression does not describe an actual physical location; rather, the spatial concept *ahead/oldinda* is metaphorically projected onto future time. The parallel construction in both languages demonstrates a shared cognitive strategy for conceptualizing future events.

Another important pattern was observed in expressions based on the concept of being behind. In English, *behind* may indicate physical location, as in *The car is behind the house*, but it can also express delayed temporal or procedural progress:

English: *The project is behind schedule.*

A functionally equivalent Uzbek construction is:

Uzbek: *Loyiha jadvaldan ortda qolmoqda.*

Although Uzbek does not reproduce the English construction word for word, the underlying conceptual model is similar: insufficient progress is interpreted as occupying a position behind an expected point. This example illustrates that conceptual equivalence does not necessarily require structural equivalence.

The comparison also identified important typological differences in the grammatical encoding of spatial relations. English relies extensively on prepositions, while Uzbek frequently combines case suffixes and postpositions. For instance:

English: *The book is on the table.*

Uzbek: *Kitob stol ustida.*

English: *She went into the room.*

Uzbek: *U xonaga kirdi.*

English: *He came from the university.*

Uzbek: *U universitetdan keldi.*

In the first example, English uses the preposition *on*, whereas Uzbek employs the postpositional form *ustida*. In the second and third examples, English uses the prepositions *into* and *from*, while Uzbek encodes the corresponding direction through the case suffixes *-ga* and *-dan*. Consequently, identical spatial concepts may be lexicalized analytically in English and morphologically in Uzbek.

The same typological contrast appears in temporal constructions. Compare:

English: *We will meet in the morning.*

Uzbek: *Biz ertalab uchrashamiz.*

English: *He arrived after lunch.*

Uzbek: *U tushlikdan keyin keldi.*

The English temporal relation is commonly expressed through a preposition or prepositional phrase, whereas Uzbek may use an adverbial lexical unit or a combination of a case-marked noun and a postposition. These findings demonstrate that semantic correspondence between the two languages is frequently accompanied by formal asymmetry.

The analysis of deixis showed that spatial and temporal expressions also perform an important pragmatic function by establishing the speaker's reference point. English *here* and *there* correspond broadly to Uzbek *bu yerda* and *u yerda*:

English: *Come here!*

Uzbek: *Bu yerga kel!*

English: *Put it there.*

Uzbek: *Uni u yerga qo'y.*

The interpretation of these expressions depends directly on the position of the speaker. The word *here* or the phrase *bu yer* cannot be fully interpreted without identifying the spatial location from which the utterance is produced. Their pragmatic meaning is therefore deictic rather than purely lexical.

A comparable relationship occurs in temporal deixis:

English: *I am busy now.*

Uzbek: *Men hozir bandman.*

English: *We were living in Tashkent then.*

Uzbek: *Biz o'shanda Toshkentda yashardik.*

The lexical units *now/hozir* locate an event relative to the moment of speaking, whereas *then/o'shanda* refer to a contextually established time outside the present. Their interpretation consequently depends on the communicative situation and discourse context.

Context was found to play a particularly important role in polysemous spatial expressions. For example, the English word *ahead* may have several contextually determined meanings:

The car ahead stopped suddenly. — physical position;

There are difficult months ahead. — future time;

Our team is ahead of the others. — comparative advantage.

Comparable meanings are expressed in Uzbek through different constructions:

Oldindagi mashina birdan to'xtadi. — physical position;

Oldinda qiyin oylar bor. — future time;

Jamoamiz boshqalardan oldinda. — superiority or progress.

Thus, the meaning of *ahead/oldinda* cannot be determined solely on the basis of its lexical form. Its actual interpretation emerges from the interaction between lexical semantics and discourse context.

The data further revealed that spatial-temporal expressions frequently perform evaluative functions. For example:

English: *The country has moved forward in digital development.*

Uzbek: *Mamlakat raqamli rivojlanishda oldinga siljidi.*

In these contexts, *forward/oldinga* does not denote literal motion. Both expressions conceptualize positive development as forward movement. Conversely:

English: *The reform took the system a step backward.*

Uzbek: *Islohot tizimni bir qadam orqaga olib ketdi.*

Here, backward movement metaphorically represents regression or negative development. The opposition *forward-backward* / *oldinga-orqaga* therefore acquires an evaluative dimension: forward orientation is generally associated with progress, while backward orientation is associated with deterioration or regression.

Another pragmatic function was observed in expressions referring to future planning and expectation:

English: *Looking ahead, the company plans to expand its services.*

Uzbek: *Kelajakni ko'zlab, kompaniya xizmatlarini kengaytirishni rejalashtirmoqda.*

The English expression *looking ahead* explicitly uses spatial orientation to signal a shift toward future planning. Uzbek may render the same pragmatic function through *kelajakni ko'zlab*, *oldinga qarab*, or other contextually appropriate constructions. This demonstrates that pragmatic equivalence may be achieved through different lexical means rather than through literal translation.

Phraseological expressions also provide evidence of the interaction between spatial semantics and abstract conceptualization. Compare:

English: *at a crossroads*

Uzbek: *chorrahada / tanlov oldida*

In a literal context, *crossroads/chorraha* denotes a spatial location where roads intersect. In figurative discourse, however, the expression indicates a critical moment at which an individual or institution must make an important decision:

English: *The organization is at a crossroads.*

Uzbek: *Tashkilot muhim tanlov oldida turibdi.*

The Uzbek equivalent often replaces the spatial image of a crossroads with the construction *tanlov oldida*, yet both forms conceptualize decision-making through spatial positioning.

The results therefore demonstrate three major levels of correspondence between English and Uzbek spatial-temporal expressions. First, the languages display conceptual similarities, particularly in representing temporal distance through spatial proximity, future events through forward orientation, and progress through forward movement. Second, significant structural differences arise from the typological characteristics of English and Uzbek: English predominantly employs prepositions and analytic constructions, whereas Uzbek makes extensive use of case suffixes and postpositions. Third, pragmatic interpretation depends heavily on context, speaker perspective, deixis, and evaluative intention.

Overall, the findings indicate that spatial and temporal expressions in English and Uzbek cannot be treated merely as separate lexical-semantic categories. Their meanings form an interconnected system in which physical space provides a productive conceptual source for expressing time, development, evaluation, expectation, and discourse perspective. While the two languages demonstrate considerable similarity at the conceptual level, they frequently differ in the linguistic mechanisms through which these conceptual relations are lexicalized and pragmatically realized.

Discussion. The findings of the present study demonstrate that the linguistic representation of space and time in English and Uzbek is characterized by a combination of conceptual similarity and structural divergence. Although the two languages differ typologically, they frequently employ comparable cognitive mechanisms when expressing spatial distance, temporal sequence, direction, proximity, and movement. This observation supports the view that certain patterns of spatial-temporal conceptualization may be grounded in shared human experience, while their linguistic realization remains dependent on the grammatical and lexical resources of individual languages.

One of the most significant findings concerns the metaphorical extension of spatial meanings into the temporal domain. Expressions such as *near – yaqin*, *far – uzoq*, *ahead – oldinda*, and *behind – orqada* show that both English and Uzbek conceptualize temporal relations through spatial schemas. For example, *The deadline is approaching* and *Topshirish muddati yaqinlashmoqda* represent time as movement toward a reference point. Similarly, *A difficult period lies ahead* and *Oldinda murakkab davr turibdi* conceptualize the future as a spatial region located in front of the experiencer. These patterns are consistent with Talmy's view that spatial relations constitute an important source domain for structuring more abstract conceptual categories [1]. The findings therefore confirm that spatial cognition plays an essential role in the linguistic organization of temporal experience in both languages.

At the same time, the analysis shows that conceptual equivalence does not always result in formal correspondence. English typically relies on prepositions, particles, and relatively analytic constructions, whereas Uzbek frequently encodes comparable relations through case suffixes, postpositions, and morphologically integrated structures. Thus, *into the room* corresponds to *xonaga*, while *from the university* corresponds to *universitetdan*. These examples indicate that similar spatial concepts are grammaticalized differently in the two languages. This distinction can be interpreted within Croft's typological framework, according to which

languages may employ structurally different strategies to encode functionally comparable semantic relations [4]. Therefore, direct formal equivalence should not be treated as the primary criterion in English-Uzbek comparison; functional and conceptual equivalence are equally important.

The results also support Langacker's claim that linguistic meaning is closely related to conceptualization and construal [2]. Spatial and temporal expressions acquire their full interpretation only when the speaker's perspective and the relevant reference point are taken into account. Deictic units such as *here* – *bu yerda*, *there* – *u yerda*, *now* – *hozir*, and *then* – *o'shanda* cannot be interpreted independently of the communicative situation. Their semantic content is therefore inseparable from pragmatic context. This finding suggests that the analysis of spatial and temporal vocabulary should extend beyond dictionary definitions and include the speaker's position, temporal orientation, communicative intention, and discourse environment.

Polysemy emerged as another important feature of the analyzed material. Lexical items denoting spatial orientation frequently acquire temporal, evaluative, and abstract meanings. The English word *ahead*, for instance, may refer to physical position, future time, or comparative advantage. The Uzbek unit *oldinda* demonstrates a similar range of functions. Such examples show that spatial-temporal vocabulary forms a network of interconnected meanings rather than a set of isolated semantic categories. The transition from physical space to abstract meanings is systematic and contextually motivated. This observation further supports cognitive approaches in which lexical meaning is understood as a structured system of related conceptual extensions rather than as a single fixed semantic value.

The findings are also compatible with Slobin's cross-linguistic approach to event representation [3]. His research demonstrates that speakers tend to select linguistic information in ways encouraged by the lexical and grammatical structure of their language. In the present study, English often makes spatial relations explicit through prepositional and particle-based constructions, while Uzbek frequently compresses comparable information into case marking or postpositional forms. This difference affects not only sentence structure but also the way spatial relations are packaged in discourse. Consequently, English and Uzbek speakers may describe the same conceptual situation through different linguistic patterns even when the underlying cognitive relation is broadly equivalent.

A further significant result concerns the evaluative potential of spatial expressions. The oppositions *forward-backward* and *oldinga-orqaga* frequently extend beyond physical movement and acquire axiological meanings. Forward movement tends to be associated with progress, development, and successful change, whereas backward movement is commonly associated with regression or deterioration. Expressions such as *move forward in development* and *rivojlanishda oldinga siljimoq* illustrate how spatial orientation becomes a linguistic resource for evaluating social, economic, technological, or personal processes. This reveals an important interaction between spatial semantics and pragmatic evaluation.

The phraseological data further demonstrate that spatial imagery is productive in the conceptualization of abstract situations. The English expression *at a crossroads*, for example, metaphorically describes a situation requiring an important decision. Uzbek may employ *chorrahada* in certain contexts, but more naturally uses constructions such as *tanlov oldida turmoq*. Although the surface forms differ, both expressions conceptualize decision-making through spatial positioning. This indicates that cross-linguistic equivalence often operates at the conceptual and pragmatic levels rather than through literal lexical correspondence.

Another important implication of the findings is that the relationship between space and time should not be reduced to metaphor alone. Spatial and temporal expressions also function as mechanisms of discourse organization. Words such as *before*, *after*, *ahead*, *now*, and *then* help speakers establish sequence, maintain textual coherence, shift between temporal frames, and orient the listener within discourse. Their pragmatic role therefore includes not only reference but also information structuring. Uzbek equivalents such as *oldin*, *keyin*, *hozir*, and *o'shanda* perform similar discourse-organizing functions, although their syntactic distribution may differ.

The comparative evidence suggests that English and Uzbek demonstrate greater similarity at the conceptual level than at the formal grammatical level. Both languages employ spatial schemas to structure temporal relations, future orientation, progress, delay, proximity, and evaluation. However, they differ in the linguistic means through which these meanings are encoded. English generally favors analytic constructions, while Uzbek relies more extensively on agglutinative morphology and postpositional structures. This finding is important for comparative linguistics because it shows that semantic similarity should not be confused with structural identity.

From an applied perspective, these differences are particularly relevant to translation and second-language teaching. Literal translation of spatial-temporal expressions may lead to unnatural or pragmatically inappropriate constructions when formal correspondence is prioritized over conceptual equivalence. For instance, English *behind schedule* is more naturally rendered in Uzbek as *jadvaldan ortda qolmoq* rather than through a direct lexical substitution of every element. Similarly, *looking ahead* may require different Uzbek

equivalents depending on whether the intended meaning is future planning, prediction, or metaphorical orientation. Teaching such expressions through context and conceptual comparison may therefore be more effective than presenting them as isolated lexical equivalents.

Overall, the discussion confirms that spatial and temporal expressions in English and Uzbek are shaped by the interaction of universal cognitive tendencies, language-specific grammatical structures, and context-dependent pragmatic functions. Talmy's semantic framework explains the conceptual organization of spatial relations, Langacker's theory clarifies the role of construal and perspective, Slobin's approach accounts for differences in event packaging, and Croft's typological model provides a basis for interpreting structural variation across the two languages [1–4]. The present findings extend these perspectives by demonstrating how spatial-temporal expressions in English and Uzbek interact simultaneously at lexical, semantic, metaphorical, pragmatic, and discourse levels.

Conclusion

The present study has demonstrated that spatial and temporal expressions in English and Uzbek reveal both significant conceptual similarities and notable structural differences. Despite belonging to different language families and typological systems, the two languages employ comparable cognitive mechanisms to represent spatial location, direction, distance, temporal sequence, proximity, future orientation, and progression. In particular, the analysis confirmed that spatial concepts frequently serve as a conceptual basis for the linguistic representation of temporal and abstract meanings.

REFERENCES

1. Talmy L. Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems. – Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2000. – 573 p. – URL: <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262201209/toward-a-cognitive-semantics-volume-1/>
2. Langacker R. W. Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction. – Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. – URL: <https://academic.oup.com/book/10750>
3. Slobin D. I. The Many Ways to Search for a Frog: Linguistic Typology and the Expression of Motion Events // Relating Events in Narrative. Vol. 2 / ed. by S. Strömquist, L. Verhoeven. – Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004. – P. 219–257. – URL: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781410609694-12/many-ways-search-frog-dan-slobin>
4. Croft W. Typology and Universals. 2nd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/typology-and-universals/D09986F35C708113378BD1B76073E258>
5. Levinson S. C. Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 389 p. – URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/space-in-language-and-cognition/D07AD2885A025E00B1C94ED722071D80>
6. Croft W., Cruse D. A. Cognitive Linguistics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 356 p. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cognitive-linguistics/8CE9230D2E18C120A5274EDE524C606C>
7. Abdurahmonov G'. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2003. – 296 b. – URL: <https://namdu.uz/books/5461>
8. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. Sintaksis. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1995. – URL: <https://cspu.uz/ozbek-tilining-nazariy>