Dilnoza Kholmurodovna Kholmurodova
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
teacher of English

COGNITIVE GRAMMAR IN ENGLISH LESSONS

Abstract: Every English teacher who teaches Uzbek-speaking students knows that the main grammatical difficulties they face in the classroom are related to the acquisition of articles, prepositions and grammatical forms of the verb. As for articles, everything is clear: there are no articles in Uzbek, so the student should understand why they are needed in English and what their function is. The situation with prepositions is somewhat different: prepositions are also present in Uzbek, but the student is usually confused by their large number and the peculiarities of their use in English. Finally, as for the so-called tenses – or rather, the form of the verb-many students experience significant difficulties in mastering the skills of their correct use for a simple reason that we describe in this article.
Key words: cognitive grammar, sensory contextualization, observer, view, time.
Language: English
Citation: Kholmurodova, D. K. (2020). Cognitive grammar in English lessons. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 04 (84), 390-392.
Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-68   Doi: crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.68
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Conventional descriptive and pedagogical grammars that interpret the meaning of various grammatical phenomena based on so-called semantic categories often do not help to shed light on the mystery of the functioning of the same articles or verb forms. That is why, as for the reliance on the native language in explaining the phenomena of another language, we do not have to talk about it at all, since there is simply no such reliance – especially given the fact that universities are increasingly preferring authentic textbooks published in England or America. At the same time - and this is also a fact-in foreign universities, when hiring teachers of English as a foreign language, preference is usually given to those for whom English is not their native language.

The logic here is simple: those who have mastered a foreign language themselves will be better able to take into account and help overcome the difficulties that students face in the learning process, and if the native language of students is the same as that of the teacher, the teacher can very effectively organize the educational process, based on their own experience of mastering a foreign language and overcoming difficulties caused by significant inter-linguistic differences. If, in addition, it will also rely on modern achievements in the field of language research as a cognitive activity, many of the so-called difficulties that students face will turn out to be imaginary and easily overcome. However, to do this, we need to understand well why such categories as, say, time and type are needed in a language at all, in order to clearly and simply explain the principles of functioning of the corresponding forms. This understanding provides a cognitive approach to language as an activity rooted in sensory experience.

The imaginary and real difficulties

Anyone who speaks Uzbek as a native language knows that there are three tenses, so when they start learning English and learn that there are twelve tenses, the student finds himself in a state of perplexity, which often remains with him for life, preventing the functional mastery of verbal grammar. However, if you ask the question, what other tenses are there in the English language besides the present, past, and future, it turns out that it is impossible to answer it positively - because what is commonly called "tenses", in fact, are not tenses, but species-modern forms (see table. 1), which are classified very inconsistently in grammars.

The name of any of the twelve English "tenses" begins with one of three words: Present, Past, Future. There are four types of present, four types of past, and four types of future, which are known as Simple,

Progressive, Perfect, and Perfect Progressive. The term "simple tense" (in the American grammatical tradition) indicates the formal principle of classification: the form is simple, because it consists of an infinitive, to which a suffix can be added. We are describing the morphological forms of the present and past tense. Although in theoretical grammars, *will + Infinitive* is not considered as a tense forms of the verb, functionally this construction is nevertheless included in the system of expression of tense forms relations, so it can be considered as a conditionally simple form-especially in cases of neutralization of the modal shade in the meaning of the verbs will and shall in the clitic 'll. However, grammarians say "A", they don't say "B", and they don't call the other forms complex, even though they consist of two or more words. Similarly, in the British tradition, simple forms are called "indefinite tense", but the concept of uncertainty in relation to these forms is not disclosed, just as there is no opposite concept, and the corresponding term "definite tense". The statement often found in grammars that an indefinite form is used when the time of an action or event is not defined or specified does not correspond to reality, as the following example well shows: He arrived in Samarkand at exactly 11 a.m. on the 28th of March, 2020.

Table 1. Simple and complex forms of the English verb in the active voice

TENSE	Simple / Indefinite	[Complex?]/ [Definite?]		
		PROGRESSIVE be + Ving	PERFECT have + Ven	Character of interaction
Present	I fly	I am flying	I have flown	I have been flying
Past	I flew	I was flying	I had flown	I had been flying
Future	I'll fly	I'll be flying	I'll have flown	I'll have been flying

Strange as it may seem, the main real difficulty in mastering English "tenses" is not so much the peculiarities of the functioning of English verb forms as such, but rather the metalanguage knowledge that students have acquired in Uzbek lessons in secondary schools. Orthodox grammatical theory in Uzbek studies imposes on students knowledge about the forms and functions of the Uzbek verb (such as temporal and pledge forms), which has a very remote relationship to the understanding of the cognitive mechanisms underlying their system, that is, determining the features of the functioning of grammatical meaning.

A cognitive approach to time and species

Without dwelling in detail on the criticism of orthodox grammatical theory, we will briefly outline the approach to the categories of verbal tense and type within the framework of the cognitive theory developed by the author and the method of teaching English based on it. With the help of the category of time a person divides the entire world around him into three spheres of experience:

1) experience, directly entering into the sphere of perceived by the senses and perceived reality, or the present (present, from Latin praesens 'that which is before the senses');

2) an experience that persists as a memory of what passed "by" our feelings, or the past;

3) an experience that is predicted based on existing knowledge, or the future.

It is very important to understand that, unlike English, Uzbek does not have an unambiguous correspondence between these concepts and the so-called verb forms.

Thus, every time we talk, we talk either about what we know (without specifying the source of information by grammatical means), or about what we observe (choosing the form in which the reference to the observer is grammaticalized). The "DEFINITE-INDEFINITE (source of information)" juxtaposition forms the basis of species juxtaposition as a grammatical category of a verb word, but this is not the whole story: situations when we talk about what we directly observe can differ significantly depending on what we see (hear, etc.). to express this cognitive meaning, the English language has its own special form of the verb - Perfect. This form is used when we compare what we see with what was before, and based on this comparison we draw a certain conclusion based on background knowledge. Finally, there may be cases where we are talking about a directly observed action, and at the same time we are comparing what we see now with what we saw at some point (or moments) before. Perfect Progressive can be used even when the action itself is not observed at the moment of utterance – if there are observable signs that are closely related to it in time.

The proposed cognitive approach to teaching English grammar allows us to see that there are no fundamental differences in functional nature between the modern forms of English. In other words, the systems of verb forms in the two languages (Uzbek and English) are arranged and function in a similar way. To understand how English verb forms function, just need to understand – at the level of rational understanding-what determines the features of the functioning of verb forms in the Uzbek language. This is the understanding given by the cognitive theory of time and type, which allows us to formulate a simple

algorithm for choosing a particular verb form in discourse, which, unfortunately, traditional grammars are not able to do.

References:

1. Willett, T. (1987). A cross-linguistic survey of grammaticization of evidentiality. *BuffaloWorking Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 87.
2. Kravchenko, A.V. (2012). *Cognitive grammar and EFL methodology: The case for "tenses".* Aktualnyje Problemy filoilogii i pedagogicheskoj lingvistiki - Topical Problems in Philology and Pedagogical Linguistics. Vladikavkaz: North Ossetia University Press.
3. Evans, V., & Melanie, G. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
4. Talmy, L. (2000). T*oward a Cognitive Semantics.* Vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
5. Langacker, R.W. (1982). 'Space Grammar, Analysability, and the English Passive', *Language*, 58, 1, 22-80.
6. Langacker, R.W. (1991). *Concept, Image and Symbol: The Cognitive Basis of Grammar.* (Cognitive Linguistics Research 1.) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
7. Sattonnet, M.-C. (2001). *Étude comparée de la Grammaire Cognitive de Ronald W.* Langacker et des grammaires énonciatives.
8. Taylor, J.R. (2002). *Cognitive Grammar. Oxford Textbooks in Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Newman, J. (2010). Cognitive Grammar.
10. Langacker, R.W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar.* Vol. II: Descriptive Application. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Clarivate Analytics indexed