

THE GRAMMATICAL VERB CATEGORIES IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Muhammedova Navruza

Aniq va Ijtimoiy fanlar universiteti

Xorijiy til va adabiyoti fakulteti (magistratura)

nmukhamedova93@gmail.com

Supervisor: Erdanova Zebiniso Abulkasimovna (Phd)

Abstract: Verbs constitute one of the most essential components of grammatical structure in both English and Uzbek, functioning as the core of clause formation and the primary means for expressing actions, states, processes, and events. While English and Uzbek share several universal grammatical categories, such as tense, aspect, mood, voice, and modality, their realization within each language's verb system is markedly different. These differences stem from the typological divergence between English, a predominantly analytic language with a fixed word order and extensive use of auxiliary verbs, and Uzbek, an agglutinative language that employs rich morphological suffixation and allows for more flexible syntactic arrangements.

This article presents a detailed comparative analysis of the verb systems in English and Uzbek, with particular attention given to their morphological structures, syntactic patterns, and semantic roles. Through examining how tense, aspect, mood, voice, and modality are expressed and function in each language, the study reveals both structural parallels and significant contrasts that influence how meaning is conveyed. Additionally, the paper explores how these linguistic differences impact second language acquisition, particularly for learners transitioning between the two systems, as well as the challenges they pose for accurate translation and interpretation across languages.

By drawing on descriptive grammar, typological studies, and pedagogical insights, the findings of this analysis contribute to a deeper understanding of verb usage in cross-linguistic contexts. The paper also offers practical implications for language teaching, translation studies, and linguistic theory, underscoring the importance of comparative grammar in developing effective instructional methods and improving intercultural communication.

Keywords:

Verbs, Grammatical Categories, English, Uzbek, Tense, Aspect, Mood, Voice, Modality, Comparative Linguistics, Language Pedagogy, Translation Studies, Verb System Typology.

Introduction:

Verbs are fundamental components of grammatical structure in all languages, and this is particularly evident in both English and Uzbek. As carriers of meaning that indicate action, existence, or condition, verbs provide the dynamic element of sentence construction. Despite their shared function, the way

verbs are structured and categorized varies greatly between languages. English, a Germanic language, and Uzbek, a member of the Turkic language family, provide an interesting ground for comparative linguistic analysis due to their distinct origins and structural characteristics.

The aim of this study is to explore how grammatical verb categories are realized in English and Uzbek. A special focus is given to five major categories: tense, aspect, mood, voice, and modality. By examining these categories, the study seeks to understand how each language encodes temporal and modal nuances, and how these differences can influence second language learning, translation accuracy, and grammatical competence.

Understanding the contrastive grammar of English and Uzbek verbs not only deepens our knowledge of these two languages but also contributes to applied linguistics, particularly in language pedagogy and translation studies.

Methods:

This research is grounded in a comparative linguistic approach that involves both descriptive and analytical methods. The steps of the study include:

1. Corpus Compilation: A selection of sentences and verb phrases from English and Uzbek texts were gathered. The corpus included literary texts, spoken discourse, and academic writing to ensure a range of verb usage.

2. Category Identification: The study identifies the five primary grammatical categories in both languages, based on traditional and contemporary grammar frameworks.

3. Contrastive Analysis: Verb structures are compared morphologically, syntactically, and semantically. Differences and similarities are systematically highlighted.

4. Pedagogical Implication Assessment: A brief discussion on how these grammatical features can influence language learning and translation is provided.

Results and Discussion:

1. Tense

Tense, as a grammatical category, indicates the temporal location of an action, event, or state relative to the time of speaking. In English, tense is primarily expressed through a combination of verb inflection and auxiliary verbs. The English verb system formally distinguishes three primary tenses **present**, **past**, and **future** each of which can be further subdivided by aspect (see next section). For instance:

Present Tense: *I eat*

Past Tense: *I ate*

Future Tense: *I will eat*

The formation of the future tense relies on modal auxiliaries such as *will* or *shall*, as English lacks a dedicated inflectional future tense marker.

In contrast, **Uzbek**, an agglutinative language, expresses tense predominantly through the addition of suffixes to the verb stem. The suffixes indicate tense directly without the use of auxiliary verbs. Examples include:

Present Tense: *men yeyman* (I eat / I will eat, context-dependent)

Past Tense: *men yedim* (I ate)

Future Tense: *men yeyman* or *yeyman bo 'ladi* (I will eat, depending on formality and context)

Unlike English, Uzbek sometimes uses the **same verb form for both present and future tenses**, relying on contextual clues, time adverbials, or auxiliary constructions to distinguish meaning. This makes tense identification in Uzbek more context-sensitive, posing potential difficulties for learners from languages with more rigid tense distinctions.

2. Aspect

Aspect refers to the internal temporal structure of an action, specifically, whether the action is ongoing, completed, habitual, or repetitive. **English** explicitly marks aspect through the use of auxiliary verbs (*be*, *have*) in combination with the main verb's participle forms:

Progressive Aspect (ongoing action): *I am eating*

Perfect Aspect (completed with relevance to the present): *I have eaten*

Perfect Progressive: *I have been eating*

In **Uzbek**, aspect is not grammaticalized to the same degree. The language conveys aspectual meaning through verb forms, suffixes, and context. For example:

Ongoing/Progressive: *yeyapman* (I am eating)

Completed: *yeganman* (I have eaten)

Although these forms resemble English aspectual distinctions, they are not generated by auxiliary constructions but through specific verb morphology and lexical semantics. The interpretation of aspect in Uzbek is often more dependent on context and less rigid in structure, allowing for a greater degree of interpretive flexibility but also introducing ambiguity for non-native speakers.

3. Mood

Mood is the grammatical expression of a speaker's attitude toward the action, such as stating a fact, giving a command, or expressing a wish or possibility. In **English**, the primary moods are:

Indicative: used for factual or declarative statements (e.g., *She goes to school*)

Imperative: used for commands or requests (e.g., *Go to school!*)

Subjunctive: used for hypotheticals, wishes, or counterfactuals (e.g., *If I were rich...*)

While the subjunctive mood in English is generally underdeveloped and largely context-driven, **Uzbek** presents mood distinctions more explicitly and with greater grammatical variety:

Indicative: *u boradi* (he/she goes)

Imperative: *bor!* (go!)

Subjunctive/Desiderative: *agar boy bo 'lsam...* (if I were rich...)

Uzbek also employs modal particles and auxiliaries such as *kerak* (necessary), *bo'lsin* (let it be), and *shart* (obligatory), which function to convey mood more overtly. The use of these particles introduces additional layers of meaning that can be absent in English, making mood in Uzbek both structurally diverse and semantically nuanced.

4. Voice

Voice indicates the relationship between the verb's action and the participants involved—typically the subject and the object. **English** distinguishes two primary voices:

Active Voice: *The boy opened the door.*

Passive Voice: *The door was opened by the boy.*

In **Uzbek**, three types of voice are morphologically marked and widely used:

Active: *Bola eshikni ochdi* (The boy opened the door)

Passive: *Eshik ochildi* (The door was opened)

Causative: *Ochidirdi* (He made someone open)

The **causative voice** is particularly productive in Uzbek, formed by adding specific suffixes (e.g., *-dir*, *-tir*) to the verb stem. This structure allows for expressing indirect or caused actions in a way that is less commonly used or structurally marked in English. For learners of Uzbek, especially native English speakers, mastering the causative forms presents a significant challenge due to their frequent use and nuanced meanings.

5. Modality

Modality refers to the speaker's degree of certainty, obligation, permission, or ability in relation to the verb's action. **English** expresses modality primarily through modal auxiliary verbs, such as:

- *can*, *may*, *must*, *should*, *might*, *shall*, *will*, etc.

Example: *He must go.*

These modals precede the base form of the main verb and convey various shades of meaning related to necessity, possibility, or intention.

In **Uzbek**, modality is conveyed through a combination of modal verbs, auxiliary expressions, and particles:

- *kerak* (must/need)
- *mumkin* (may/can)
- *xohlamoq* (to want/desire) Example: *U borishi kerak* (He must go)

Unlike English modal verbs, which are invariant and syntactically fixed, Uzbek modal expressions are more **lexical and flexible**, integrated into the broader sentence structure rather than occupying a fixed grammatical position. This flexibility allows for greater expressive range but also demands a more nuanced understanding of syntax and meaning from learners.

Pedagogical Implications:

A thorough understanding of verb categories and their grammatical realization is essential for effective language learning and instruction, particularly

in a cross-linguistic context involving structurally distinct languages such as English and Uzbek. For native Uzbek speakers learning English, one of the primary challenges lies in mastering the use of auxiliary verbs to express tense, aspect, and mood. English verbs frequently require the use of auxiliaries such as *have*, *be*, and *do*, which not only serve grammatical functions but also convey subtle distinctions in temporal and modal meaning. These auxiliary constructions, often absent in Uzbek, can be difficult for learners to internalize, especially when they are used in passive constructions, questions, and negative sentences.

Conversely, English-speaking learners of Uzbek may encounter difficulties with the agglutinative nature of the language, in which verb morphology is rich and highly suffix-driven. Uzbek verbs commonly include multiple suffixes to indicate tense, aspect, mood, person, and even causation. The causative voice, in particular, may pose a significant challenge, as it often involves morphological changes to the verb stem that are unfamiliar to learners whose native language does not encode causation morphologically. Furthermore, the relative flexibility of Uzbek word order, combined with its reliance on contextual cues for interpretation, may require learners to develop new strategies for understanding and constructing meaning in communication.

These grammatical differences not only affect the process of language acquisition but also have broader implications for translation and language instruction. In translation, particularly when conducted literally, there is a significant risk of semantic distortion, especially in conveying modality, aspect, and emphasis. For example, directly translating English verb phrases into Uzbek without adapting the structure may result in a loss of intended nuance or even grammatical incoherence. Similarly, translations from Uzbek to English must account for the often implicit grammatical information conveyed through verb suffixes and context, which may not have direct equivalents in English.

Therefore, language educators and translators must place special emphasis on teaching these grammatical features explicitly and contextually. Integrating contrastive grammar analysis into the curriculum, using comparative examples, and employing translation exercises that highlight these differences can significantly enhance learners' awareness and competence. In addition, the development of pedagogical materials that address these specific challenges will contribute to more effective instruction and cross-linguistic understanding.

Conclusion:

This comparative analysis reveals that although English and Uzbek share several fundamental grammatical categories related to verbs—such as tense, aspect, mood, and voice—their expression and functional realization vary significantly between the two languages. In English, grammatical meanings are typically conveyed through the use of auxiliary verbs, such as *do*, *be*, and *have*, along with a relatively fixed word order that plays a crucial role in sentence structure and meaning. In contrast, Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, relies heavily on the use of affixation, particularly suffixes, to convey similar

grammatical nuances. These suffixes attach to verb stems to indicate tense, aspect, mood, and other grammatical features, allowing for greater flexibility in word order. Moreover, context plays a substantial role in the interpretation of verb forms in Uzbek, which can lead to ambiguity for learners unfamiliar with the language's syntactic and pragmatic conventions.

These structural differences between English and Uzbek present both challenges and opportunities in the realms of second language acquisition, comparative linguistics, and language pedagogy. For instance, English learners of Uzbek may struggle with mastering the complex system of suffixation, while Uzbek learners of English might find it difficult to internalize the rigid syntactic rules and the functional use of auxiliary verbs. Nonetheless, such contrasts also offer valuable insights into the cognitive processes involved in language learning and the typological diversity of the world's languages.

Future research could delve deeper into the development and function of auxiliary verbs in Uzbek, particularly in colloquial and regional varieties, or investigate how these grammatical differences impact natural language processing tasks, such as machine translation. By further examining these areas, scholars and educators can contribute to the refinement of teaching methodologies and the enhancement of linguistic technologies that bridge diverse language systems.

References:

1. Comrie, B. (1985). *Tense*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Khodjakov, T. (2011). *The Uzbek Language: Grammar and Syntax*. Tashkent: Tashkent University Press.
3. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
4. Kisling, L. A. (2012). *The English Language and Its Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Saharov, I. (2013). *Contrastive Grammar: English and Uzbek*. Tashkent: Tashkent Publishing.
6. Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
7. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
8. Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English Usage* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
11. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2018). *An Introduction to Language* (11th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning.

12. Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
13. Bybee, J., Perkins, R., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
14. Matyakubov, M. (2014). *Issues in Uzbek-English Contrastive Linguistics*. Tashkent: Fan va Texnologiya.