CONTRASTIVE FEATURES OF THE VERB IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Karimjanova Shakhlohon Ravshanovna
Associate Professer of the Department
Of Practical English Course at FDU,
Doctor of Philological Sciences
Akhmedova Zukhrahon Sherzod kizi
Faculty of Foreign Languages of FDU
Philology and Language Teaching:
first-year students majoring in English

Abstract: The article compares the verb in English and Uzbek with attention to the grammatical categories and forms in which the two languages differ most. English builds most of its verbal categories analytically, with auxiliary verbs, while Uzbek attaches voice, negation, tense, mood and person to the verb stem as a chain of suffixes. The paper examines person and number, the tense and aspect system, the category of voice, negation, mood and modality, non-finite forms and auxiliary (ko‘makchi) verbs. Uzbek has five voices, an inferential past (-ibdi, -gan ekan) and a system of converbs that have no direct grammatical counterparts in English; English has the perfect, the continuous as a regular aspectual form and a class of modal verbs, which Uzbek expresses by other means. The findings are intended for teachers of English in Uzbek-speaking audiences and for translators.

Keywords: verb, contrastive grammar, tense, aspect, voice, mood, evidentiality, non-finite forms, auxiliary verbs, English, Uzbek.

The verb carries more grammatical information than any other part of speech in both English and Uzbek, but the two languages package this information in different ways. English is predominantly analytical: of its verbal categories only person and number (in the third person singular of the present), tense (the past -ed) and the participial forms are expressed inside the word, and everything else is built with auxiliaries [1; 3]. Uzbek is agglutinative, and a single verb form may contain a stem, a voice suffix, the negative affix, a tense or mood marker and a personal ending, each with one meaning: yoz-dir-il-ma-di-m "I was not made to write" [8; 9]. An English sentence needs four or five words to say what one Uzbek word says, and this fact shapes most of the contrasts described below.

Person and number are almost lost in the English verb. Apart from the forms of to be, only the suffix -s in the present simple (she writes) distinguishes the third person singular, so the subject pronoun is obligatory. In Uzbek every finite form carries a personal ending: yozdim, yozding, yozdi, yozdik, yozdingiz, yozdilar. Because the

ending identifies the subject, the pronoun is usually dropped: Kecha xat yozdim "I wrote a letter yesterday". Uzbek also has two sets of personal endings, the possessive type (-m, -ng, -k) after -di and -sa and the predicative type (-man, -san, -miz) after most other forms [8; 10]. English learners from Uzbek backgrounds sometimes drop the subject in English for the same reason.

The tense and aspect system shows the largest structural gap. English traditionally has three tenses combined with the simple, continuous, perfect and perfect continuous forms, all but the simple forms built with be and have [1; 2]. Uzbek has a rich set of past forms: -di (yozdi) for a witnessed or definite past, -gan (yozgan) for a past whose result is relevant, -(i)b (yozibdi) and -gan ekan for a past the speaker did not witness, -ar edi and -(a)di edi for habitual past [7; 8]. The present has -yap, -yotir and -moqda with progressive meaning (yozyapman, yozmoqda) and the form -a/-y with present-future meaning (yozaman). The future is expressed by the same -a/-y form, by -(a)r (yozar "will probably write") and by the intentional -moqchi (yozmoqchiman "I intend to write").

Uzbek has no category of perfect. The English Present Perfect is translated by -di or by -gan depending on context: I have read this book is Bu kitobni o‘qiganman when the speaker means experience, and Kitobni o‘qib bo‘ldim when completion is meant. Learners who equate the Present Perfect with any single Uzbek form make predictable errors, for instance using the Present Perfect with a past time adverbial (*I have seen him yesterday) because Uzbek Kecha uni ko‘rdim allows it. The progressive is closer: both languages have a regular continuous form, be + -ing in English and -yap/-moqda in Uzbek. Comrie notes that English restricts the progressive with stative verbs [4], and Uzbek has a similar but weaker restriction: Men uni bilyapman is colloquially possible, whereas *I am knowing him is not.

The inferential past has no grammatical counterpart in English. Uzbek -ibdi and -gan ekan show that the speaker learned of the event from someone else or concluded it from its result: U Toshkentga ketibdi "He has gone to Tashkent, (I hear / it turns out)". Johanson describes this indirective category as typical of Turkic languages [6]. English conveys the same meaning lexically, with apparently, it turns out, I am told or with reporting verbs. A translation that ignores the Uzbek form loses information about the source of knowledge, and one that renders every -ibdi with apparently becomes heavy, so the translator has to judge each case.

Voice is a small category in English and a large one in Uzbek. English grammars recognize the active and the passive, the latter built with be (or get) and the past participle [1; 2]. Uzbek grammars describe five voices: aniq (active), majhul (passive, -il/-in: yozildi), o‘zlik (reflexive, -n/-in: yuvindi "washed himself"), birgalik (reciprocal-cooperative, -sh: yozishdi "wrote together" or "wrote to each other") and orttirma (causative, -dir, -t, -giz, -ir, -ar: yozdirdi "made someone write") [8; 9]. The

English equivalents of the last three are lexical or syntactic: a reflexive pronoun (washed himself), each other or together, and causative constructions with make, have, let or get (had the letter written). Voice suffixes in Uzbek can also be combined, as in yozdirildi "was caused to be written", which English can render only with a clause. The agent of a passive is expressed in English with by; in Uzbek the agent is normally omitted, and the postposition tomonidan is used mainly in official and scientific style.

Negation is analytical in English and morphological in Uzbek. English negates a finite verb with not and, in the absence of another auxiliary, needs the dummy do: I did not write. Uzbek places the negative affix -ma- right after the stem and voice suffixes: yozmadim, yozdirmadi. Negated participles and nominal predicates use emas and yo‘q: yozgan emas, yozgani yo‘q. Do-support is therefore an entirely new mechanism for Uzbek learners, and errors like *I not wrote come from the Uzbek model, where negation does not change the rest of the verb form.

Mood and modality differ in their means as well. English has the indicative, the imperative and the subjunctive, the last expressed by a few synthetic remnants (if I were, I insist that he go) and by analytical forms with should, would and might [3; 5]. Uzbek has the indicative, the imperative-optative (yoz, yozay, yozsin, yozing) and the conditional mood in -sa (yozsam, yozsang); the -sa form expresses condition inside the verb, where English uses the conjunction if: Vaqtim bo‘lsa, yozaman "If I have time, I will write". Unreal conditions are built with -sa and edi or with -gan bo‘lardi: Bilganimda, aytgan bo‘lardim "If I had known, I would have told you". English modal verbs form a separate class with defective morphology: can, may, must, should take no -s and have no infinitive [2; 5]. Uzbek expresses the same meanings with analytical constructions: -a oladi (can), -ishi kerak or -ishi shart (must), -sa bo‘ladi (may), -ishi mumkin (possibility). Here the Uzbek forms are periphrastic and the English ones are single words, the reverse of the usual relation between the languages.

The non-finite forms are numerous in both languages but are distributed differently. English has the infinitive, the gerund and two participles [1; 3]. Uzbek has the verbal noun (harakat nomi: -sh, -moq, -(u)v), the participle (sifatdosh: -gan, -yotgan, -(a)digan, -ar, -mas) and the converb (ravishdosh: -(i)b, -a/-y, -gach, -guncha, -gani, -ganda) [7; 8]. The Uzbek participle takes over the work of the English relative clause: men o‘qigan kitob corresponds to the book (that) I read, and o‘qiydigan kitobim to the book I am going to read. The converb links actions in a chain inside one sentence: Uyga kelib, ovqatlanib, darsga o‘tirdi "He came home, had dinner and sat down to his lessons". English normally uses coordinated finite verbs or a participial phrase here. The verbal noun is close to the English gerund and infinitive, but it takes possessive and case suffixes (yozishim kerak "I have to write", yozishga boshladi "began to write"), which English expresses with prepositions and word order.

Uzbek auxiliary verbs (ko‘makchi fe‘llar) are a further point of contrast. Combined with a converb in -(i)b or -a, the verbs chiqmoq, qo‘ymoq, bermoq, olmoq, yubormoq, ketmoq, qolmoq and others add aspectual or attitudinal meaning: o‘qib chiqdi "read through", yozib qo‘ydi "wrote down (for later)", aytib berdi "told (for someone)", kulib yubordi "burst out laughing", uxlab qoldi "fell asleep" [8; 10]. English conveys several of these meanings with phrasal verbs (read through, write down, burst out) and others with adverbs or not at all. Phrasal verbs and Uzbek auxiliary verb constructions are thus partial equivalents, and a contrastive list of them is one of the most useful tools in teaching translation.

Word order and object marking complete the picture. The English verb stands after the subject and before the object (SVO), and its position signals grammatical relations. The Uzbek finite verb ends the clause (SOV), and grammatical relations are marked by case suffixes. The accusative -ni marks a definite object (Kitobni o‘qidim "I read the book"), while an indefinite object stays unmarked and stands directly before the verb (Kitob o‘qidim "I read a book / I did some reading"). This contrast corresponds roughly to the English opposition of the definite and indefinite articles, so the Uzbek verb phrase encodes definiteness through case where English uses determiners [11].

The comparison shows where Uzbek-speaking learners and translators should expect difficulty. The perfect, do-support and modal verbs are English categories without direct Uzbek counterparts. The inferential past, the reciprocal and causative voices, the converb and the auxiliary verb constructions are Uzbek categories that English renders with words or whole clauses. These pairs are the natural content of exercises in contrastive grammar, and teaching them as correspondences between a grammatical form and a lexical or syntactic means gives better results than teaching each language's verb system separately [11].

REFERENCES:

1. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. – London: Longman, 1985. – 1779 p.
2. Huddleston R., Pullum G.K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – 1842 p.
3. Blokh M.Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 2000.
4. Comrie B. Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
5. Palmer F.R. Mood and Modality. – 2nd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
6. Johanson L. Evidentiality in Turkic // Studies in Evidentiality / ed. by A.Y. Aikhenvald, R.M.W. Dixon. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. – P. 273–290.

7. Kononov A.N. Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka. – Moskva; Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1960.
8. O‘zbek tili grammatikasi. I tom. Morfologiya. – Toshkent: Fan, 1975.
9. Shoabdurahmonov Sh., Asqarova M., Hojiyev A., Rasulov I., Doniyorov X. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. I qism. – Toshkent: O‘qituvchi, 1980.
10. Tursunov U., Muxtorov J., Rahmatullayev Sh. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 1992.
11. Buronov J.B. Ingliz va o‘zbek tillari qiyosiy grammatikasi. – Toshkent: O‘qituvchi, 1973.