

## Simultaneous Interpreting: Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek Languages

**Olimova Dilfuza Zokirovna**  
Bukhara State University

**Abstract.** *In the context of globalization, the role of simultaneous interpretation as a means of interlanguage communication is becoming particularly important. Real-time translation requires not only high language skills, but also a deep understanding of the differences between the structure, semantics, and pragmatics of languages. This article is devoted to the analysis of the features of comparative translation between English and Uzbek in the context of simultaneous interpretation. The main grammatical, lexical, syntactic, and cultural differences are considered, and strategies for overcoming typical difficulties faced by translators are proposed. The material is based on theoretical works in the field of translation linguistics and includes specific examples of translation from English to Uzbek and vice versa.*

**Key words:** *simultaneous interpreting, comparative analysis, English, Uzbek, interpretation, intercultural communication.*

### Introduction

In the era of digitalization and active international integration, translators act as intermediaries between cultures, ensuring accurate and timely transmission of information. This is especially true for simultaneous interpretation, when the message must be interpreted almost simultaneously with its utterance. The interlanguage pair "English — Uzbek" is of particular interest to researchers, since the languages belong to different language families — Indo-European and Turkic, respectively, which causes significant differences in their structure, the system of expression of temporal and specific categories, word formation and pragmatics. The purpose of this article is to conduct a detailed comparative analysis of English and Uzbek in the context of simultaneous interpretation. The object of the study is linguistic features that influence translation strategies. The subject is the specific difficulties that arise in the process of synchronous interpretation between English and Uzbek.

### Theoretical Foundations of Comparative Translation

Comparative translation is based on an analysis of the differences and similarities between the two languages in order to identify potential difficulties in transmitting information. In the context of simultaneous interpretation, these difficulties are compounded by time constraints and the need for instant decision-making. The main provisions of comparative linguistics and translation theory (Nida, Vinay and Darbelnet, Komissarov, Aslon Abdullaev) form the theoretical basis of this research. According to Komissarov, translation correspondence is not a literal correspondence, but a functional-dynamic equivalent. This is especially important when translating from English to Uzbek, where the same meaning can be expressed using different linguistic means.

## Structural Differences Between English and Uzbek

One of the main problems in synchronous interpretation between English and Uzbek is the difference in basic word order. English typically follows a Subject–Verb–Object (SVO) structure, while Uzbek prefers a Subject–Object–Verb (SOV) structure.

### Example:

EN: *The Minister addressed the audience.*

UZ: *Vazir tinglovchilarga murojaat qildi.*

This requires the interpreter to retain information in short-term memory until the end of the English sentence before forming the Uzbek equivalent.

Additionally, Uzbek is an agglutinative language, where grammatical relations are expressed through affixes, unlike English, which uses prepositions and word order. This creates syntactic transformation challenges during simultaneous interpreting.

## Pragmatic and Cultural Barriers

Cultural norms significantly influence translation. Uzbek speech is rich in formalities, honorifics, and politeness formulas, particularly when addressing elders, officials, or in formal settings. The translator must render neutral English expressions in a way that reflects cultural sensitivity in Uzbek.

### Example:

EN: *Let's move on to the next point.*

UZ: *Marhamat, navbatdagi masalaga o'taylik.*

Here, “*Marhamat*” (please/go ahead) adds a respectful and formal tone appropriate to Uzbek discourse.

## Phonetic and Grammatical Aspects

Phonetic systems differ significantly. Uzbek lacks diphthongs and favors open syllables, while English uses reduced vowels and complex consonant clusters, impacting clarity and speech segmentation.

Grammatically, Uzbek lacks articles, which forces interpreters to rely on context.

➤ EN: *A teacher* → UZ: *bir o'qituvchi*

➤ EN: *The teacher* → UZ: *o'sha o'qituvchi* or simply *o'qituvchi*

Modal verbs, perfect aspects, and phrasal verbs also pose difficulties due to a lack of direct equivalents.

## Syntactic Transformation and Semantic Correspondence

Simultaneous interpretation requires dynamic restructuring of sentences, especially when translating passive constructions. Uzbek favors active or impersonal constructions.

### Example:

EN: *The decision has been made.*

UZ: *Qaror qabul qilindi.*

The interpreter must quickly identify the syntactic type and adapt it to target-language norms without losing content or fluency.

## Cognitive Features of a Simultaneous Interpreter

Simultaneous interpreting imposes high cognitive demands. The interpreter must simultaneously listen, process, reformulate, and speak—all under time pressure. Differences in sentence length, word order, and cultural expectations add to this burden.

Key skills include:

- Divided attention
- Short-term memory training
- Anticipation of meaning
- Emotional stability under stress

### Examples of Real Translation

#### Original (EN):

*We must act quickly to ensure sustainable development for the next generation.*

#### Interpretation (UZ):

*Keyingi avlod uchun barqaror taraqqiyotni ta'minlash uchun biz tezda harakat qilishimiz kerak.*

This shows structural adjustment, lexical substitution, and cultural rhythm adaptation.

### The Role of Technology and Automation

While AI and translation software are evolving, human interpretation remains superior, especially for distant language pairs like English and Uzbek. Machine systems struggle with intonation, metaphor, politeness formulas, and context-driven semantics.

Thus, professional interpreters remain irreplaceable in high-stakes settings.

### Methods

This study used a mixed-methods approach combining:

- **Comparative linguistic analysis**
- **Observation of interpreter performance** (12 professionals, academic/diplomatic contexts)
- **Structured interviews**
- **Real-time interpretation tasks**

Performance was measured by accuracy, delay, and cultural adaptation in live or recorded sessions. Text sources included conference speeches, news, and educational broadcasts.

### Discussion

Key challenges identified include:

- **Memory strain** from delayed SOV construction in Uzbek
- **Tone mismatch** between English neutrality and Uzbek formality
- **Structural reordering** demands due to grammar differences

Strategies observed:

- Lexical anticipation
- Reformulation, not literal decoding
- Inserting honorifics where needed
- Active listening and chunking meaning groups

Cultural mediation was found to be just as important as linguistic skill.

### Further Discussion: Semantic Equivalence and Interpreter Strategies

An interpreter's goal is not mere lexical substitution but **semantic equivalence**, where the intent, tone, and informational value are preserved across languages. In English-Uzbek simultaneous interpreting, this often means:

- **Converting passive into active constructions**

- **Replacing idiomatic expressions with functionally similar native phrases**
- **Adjusting level of formality or emotional tone**
- **Restructuring long English sentences into segmented, logically progressive Uzbek utterances**

**For example:**

EN: *This proposal is not without flaws, but it represents a step forward.*

Literal: *Bu taklif kamchiliklarsiz emas, lekin bu oldinga qadamdir.*

Improved (Uzbek logic): *Garchi bu taklifda kamchiliklar bo'lsa-da, u baribir oldinga qadam hisoblanadi.*

In this example, the **logical concessive structure** is reshaped to better fit the rhetorical flow preferred in Uzbek formal discourse.

### **Cognitive Load: Anticipation vs. Lag**

Simultaneous interpreters operate under **lag time** — a short delay between hearing the source and delivering the target language. For language pairs like English and Uzbek, lag tends to be longer due to:

- **Grammatical inversion (SVO → SOV)**
- **Longer Uzbek noun/adjective phrases**
- **Affix-based transformations**

Experienced interpreters reduce this lag by employing **anticipation**, predicting what comes next based on semantic cues, intonation, or knowledge of the domain.

This **predictive processing** is vital in contexts such as:

- Political addresses
- Scientific lectures
- Diplomatic negotiations

### **Interpreter Fatigue and Coping Mechanisms**

Cognitive fatigue significantly affects performance. In sessions longer than 20–30 minutes, interpreters begin to experience:

- Decreased lexical retrieval speed
- Increased omissions and hesitations
- Reduced attention to tone and nuance

To address this, professionals:

- Work in **shifts or pairs** (standard in conferences)
- Use **written prompts** or real-time support tools
- Apply **breathing and focus techniques** to maintain fluency

Training programs are increasingly emphasizing **mental endurance and stress coping**, acknowledging that linguistic skill alone is insufficient for high-stakes environments.

### **Pedagogical Implications and Translator Training**

The comparative insights from this analysis have direct applications in **curriculum design** for interpreter training programs in Uzbekistan and internationally. Key recommendations include:

1. **Contrastive syntax drills** — translating subject/object structures back and forth

2. **Pragmatic rephrasing exercises** — replacing culturally neutral or insensitive expressions
3. **Live simulation labs** — working with real-time video/audio in political, legal, and medical domains
4. **Cultural fluency training** — particularly in honorific speech and non-verbal communication cues
5. **Critical incident analysis** — dissecting real examples of interpreter missteps and recoveries

Future curricula should also address **AI-assisted interpreting**, teaching interpreters to **collaborate with, not compete against**, machine interfaces.

While this study focused on professional interpreting from English into Uzbek, future investigations could explore:

- **Uzbek-to-English simultaneous interpreting** — where the inverse challenges arise (simplification, article insertion, abstract phrase unpacking)
- **Dialectical and regional Uzbek variants** in real-time translation
- **Gender and sociolect considerations** in formal and informal registers
- **Hybrid human-AI models** in live translation environments (e.g., courtrooms, hospitals)

## Results

- In 82% of observed cases, interpreters avoided literal translation in favor of semantic accuracy
- More experienced interpreters showed higher efficiency and smoother delivery
- Formalization strategies were used in over 60% of sentences translated from English
- Technical errors (e.g. missing case endings or aspect markers) were more common among novice interpreters
- Use of note-taking was minimal, but visualization and prosody awareness helped improve performance

Simultaneous interpretation between English and Uzbek presents structural, phonetic, grammatical, and cultural challenges. Effective interpretation demands both linguistic expertise and cultural intelligence.

Training programs should integrate:

- Contrastive grammar
- Short-term memory exercises
- Realistic simulations
- Cultural etiquette instruction

Despite technological advances, human interpreters remain essential to successful intercultural dialogue.

## References:

1. Komissarov V.N. *Theory of Translation (linguistic aspects)*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola Publ., 1990.
2. Nida, E.A. *Towards the Science of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.
3. Zokirovna, Olimova Dिल्фуза. *The specifics of translation actions in simultaneous interpreting*. Middle European Scientific Bulletin 22 (2022): 292–295.
4. Vinay, J.P. & Darbelnet, J. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.

5. Zokirovna, O.D. *On the Peculiarities of Simultaneous Interpreting*. Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT. Vol. 2, No. 5, 2022: 170–180.
6. Shukurov K. *Comparative Linguistics: English-Uzbek Parallels*. Moscow: Universitet Publ., 2017.
7. Gile, D. *Basic Concepts and Models for Teaching Interpretation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2009.
8. Olimova D. Z. SYNCHRONIZATION MECHANISM IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING //Innovative Development in Educational Activities. – 2023. – T. 2. – №. 6. – C. 368-372.
9. Zokirovna O. D. GENERAL CONCEPT OF COGNITIVE MECHANISMS //Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal. – 2022. – T. 3. – C. 735-740.
10. Olimova D. Z. Transfer of modality in translation (modal verbs and their equivalents, modal words). – 2023.