



Article

Conceptual Foundations of Verb Typology in English and Uzbek Languages

Yodgorova Nozima Nodir Qizi

1. A master's student of the department of English Literature at the Asia International University
- * Correspondence: yodgorovanozima@gmail.com

Abstract: The present study is a comparison-typological analysis of the conceptual structures of English and Uzbek verb typology. Through assessment of structural and semantic features, including morpho-syntactic complexity, transitivity, tense–aspect–mood, voice, and lexical aspect, the study finds both cross-linguistic tendencies and language-specific solutions in verbal realization. Results tell us that English, as an analytic language, relies on syntactic constructions and auxiliaries while Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, encodes grammatical categories morphologically through affixation. In shedding light on the relationship between typological features and grammatical expression, the results have important implications for theoretical linguistics, language pedagogy, and translation studies. An extension of this analysis would be to undertake a quantitative approach, as well as including more languages, which may unveil greater cross-linguistic regularities in the verb types used.

Keywords: verb typology, English verbs, Uzbek verbs, transitivity, valency, tense–aspect–mood, typological comparison, argument structure

1. Introduction

Verbs constitute one of the most essential categories in the grammatical and semantic organization of natural languages, functioning as the core elements through which actions, processes, states, and relations between event participants are expressed [1]. Because verbs carry the communicative load of predication, their structural and semantic properties often reflect deeper patterns in a language's typological profile. Consequently, the typology of verbs should provide a particular perspective on the universal tendencies and language-specific mechanisms of encoding verbal meaning, becoming a core interest of contemporary research in linguistics [2].

While all languages use verbs to denote similar conceptual domains, there is considerable cross-linguistic variation in the encoding of grammatical categories, including tense, aspect, modality, valency and voice. Two extremely different typological systems can be revealed under the English and Uzbek language. As an analytic Indo-European language, English has a predominantly analytic argument structure—syntactic devices are relied upon to a large extent (fixed word order, auxiliary verbs, and periphrastic constructions—to mark grammatical distinctions and structure the argument structure of constituent) [3]. On the contrary, Uzbek (an agglutinative Turkic language) exhibits a very rich verbal morphology, with all tense–aspect–mood categories, agreement markers and voice forms being expressed by means of affixation. These typological differences are therefore manifestations of very different approaches to organizing verbal information [4].

Citation: Qizi, Y. N. N. Conceptual Foundations Of Verb Typology In English And Uzbek Languages. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2026, 7(1), 204-210.

Received: 03rd Sep 2025

Revised: 11th Oct 2025

Accepted: 29th Nov 2025

Published: 19th Dec 2025



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Despite the extensive linguistic literature on English and Uzbek separately, comparative typological research specifically focused on the conceptual foundations of verb typology in these two languages remains relatively underdeveloped. Most existing studies tend to describe surface grammatical features without examining the deeper conceptual parameters that motivate cross-linguistic variation. This gap highlights the need for a more systematic investigation of the theoretical principles—such as transitivity, valency, argument mapping, Aktionsart¹, and voice phenomena that shape how verbal structures function within each language [5].

The present study aims to address this gap by exploring how English and Uzbek conceptualize and organize verbal categories within their respective typological frameworks. The project will explore event coding and grammatical meaning both at the structural level and as a cognitive phenomenon by examining universal principles as well as language-specific patterns. These comparative aspects enrich not only the theoretical exploration of typology, but also its application in typologically relevant fields such as translation studies, language teaching, and bilingual lexicography.

Since the importance of communicating /dialogo across lingual boundaries and teaching language to Janpidomeh in the New Zealand aspect of focuses the usage of English and Uzbek in the UI-determination sphere, the applied spirit of understanding the typological properties of these two languages give a specific impact due to their development feature. These results will provide clarification on how learners from different linguistic backgrounds comprehend verbal categories, leading to better interpretations by instructors and translators of verbal semantics. Finally, by placing both language in a cross-linguistic perspective, this study contributes to our understanding of how grammatical form, meaning, and cognition interrelate in the domain of motion events. In the current study, a comparative-typological approach is used to study the conceptual basis of verb typology in English and Uzbek. The research follows a qualitative, descriptive design, focusing on structural, semantic, and functional aspects of verbal systems in both languages. This design allows for the identification of universal tendencies as well as language-specific strategies for encoding verbal meaning.

2. Materials and Methods

The present study employs a comparative-typological methodology to examine the conceptual foundations of verb typology in English and Uzbek [6]. The research follows a qualitative, descriptive design, focusing on structural, semantic, and functional aspects of verbal systems in both languages. This design allows for the identification of universal tendencies as well as language-specific strategies for encoding verbal meaning. The analysis is based on a diverse and systematically curated set of linguistic materials, including:

1. Descriptive and theoretical grammar books of English and Uzbek
2. Scholarly typological studies addressing verb classification, argument structure, and valency
3. Authentic language materials such as textbooks, corpora, dictionaries, and academic linguistic descriptions
4. Selected examples from the British National Corpus (BNC), the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), and the Uzbek National Corpus where available

These sources collectively provide reliable, representative, and contextually grounded data for cross-linguistic comparison.

To ensure consistency and comparability, data were selected according to the following criteria:

1. Relevance to typological parameters such as TAM, valency, voice, and morphological complexity

2. Frequency and productivity, focusing on commonly used and typologically representative verb forms
3. Authenticity, prioritizing naturally occurring examples from corpora and established linguistic descriptions
4. Comparability, ensuring that equivalent semantic and structural verb categories were extracted for both English and Uzbek

Only forms that clearly illustrate typological contrasts or convergences were included in the final dataset.

The analytical framework is organized around key verbal parameters widely recognized in linguistic typology. These include:

1. Morphological structure: inflection, derivation, affixation, and periphrastic forms
2. Transitivity and valency: argument mapping, argument reduction and expansion, and verb-participant relationships
3. Tense–Aspect–Mood (TAM): grammatical encoding strategies and functional distinctions
4. Voice categories: active, passive, causative, reflexive, reciprocal, and other voice-related markers
5. Lexical aspect (Aktionsart): event structure properties across lexical verb classes [7].

Each parameter is first described independently for English and Uzbek and then evaluated comparatively.

The analysis was conducted through a multi-stage procedure:

Linguistic data are based on language corpora, descriptive grammars and typological studies. Verbs in each language are then systematically categorized by their morphological, semantic, and syntactic properties. It is on the basis of this that the analysis will be oriented towards the specific typological features characterized by English and Uzbek. These are sequentially compared amongst languages to find common patterns, language specific differences, and in-between configurations. Lastly, this functional interpretation of the structural differences is done by relating them to communicative needs and cognitive structuring of events.

Descriptions were checked against typological principles established in the works of Comrie, Dixon, Croft, Haspelmath, and from Uzbek scholars *A.Nurmonov, N.Mahmudov, Sh. Rakhmatullayev* and other leading scholars.

The study integrates the following comparative techniques:

1. Structural comparison, analyzing how grammatical categories are formally expressed
2. Semantic comparison, examining how languages conceptualize and categorize events
3. Functional interpretation, explaining the communicative rationale behind grammatical structures

This triangulated approach strengthens the validity of the typological claims.

Several measures were taken to ensure accuracy and reliability:

1. Triangulation of data sources, using multiple independent scholarly descriptions
2. Cross-checking examples with corpora to ensure authenticity and natural use
3. Use of established typological frameworks, ensuring that analysis is theoretically grounded
4. Consistent classification criteria, applied uniformly across both languages to minimize researcher bias

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents the comparative findings of the study by examining core typological characteristics of English and Uzbek verb systems. The results reveal both shared conceptual categories and distinct strategies for encoding grammatical and semantic properties of verbs.

1. Morphological expression of grammatical categories

The two languages demonstrate contrasting approaches to marking grammatical categories. English employs predominantly analytic means, expressing tense, aspect, and mood through auxiliary verbs (*be, have, will*) and fixed word order. Its inflectional morphology is limited to third-person singular present (-s) and regular or irregular past-tense forms (-ed) [8].

Example: *She is writing a letter.*

Uzbek exhibits a markedly agglutinative system in which verbal categories are expressed through sequential suffixation. A single verb may encode tense, aspect, mood, person, number, and negation simultaneously [9].

Example: *U xat yozayapti* ("He/She is writing a letter"), where *-ayapti* marks progressive aspect and agreement.

Thus, while both languages encode comparable grammatical meanings, English depends on syntactic structure, whereas Uzbek relies on rich morphology.

2. Transitivity and valency patterns

English associates transitivity with syntactic structure; the presence or absence of objects determines verb class, and valency alternation often requires lexical or syntactic adjustments:

The door opened vs. She opened the door.

Uzbek employs more systematic morphological processes to alter valency, using productive voice suffixes:

1. Causative: *o'qimoq* → *o'qitmoq* ("make read; teach")
2. Passive: *yoqmoq* → *yozilmoq* ("be written")

These findings show that Uzbek encodes valency primarily through morphology, whereas English more frequently applies syntactic strategies.

3. Tense–Aspect–Mood (TAM) system

In English, TAM distinctions are expressed through auxiliary constructions:

1. Progressive: *is working*
2. Perfect: *has worked*
3. Modality: *can/must work*

Uzbek marks TAM categories mainly through suffixes, supplemented by auxiliary forms when needed:

1. Progressive: *-yapti* (e.g., *kelayapti* – "is coming")
2. Perfect: *-gan* (e.g., *kelgan* – "has come")
3. Mood markers: *-sin, -ar, -moqchi*

Although the conceptual distinctions overlap, English and Uzbek differ significantly in structural realization.

4. Voice and argument alignment

English contrasts active and passive voice, expressed analytically (*is written*).

Uzbek possesses a more elaborate voice system, including:

1. Passive (*-il, -in*)
2. Causative (various suffixes)
3. Reflexive (*-in*)
4. Reciprocal (*-ish*)

These markers frequently alter a verb's valency, demonstrating that voice plays a more central morphological role in Uzbek than in English.

5. Lexical aspect and semantic verb classes

Both languages categorize verbs according to Aktionsart :

States: *know, love / bilmoq, sevmoq*

1. Activities: *run / yugurmoq*
2. Achievements: *find / topmoq*
3. Accomplishments: *build / qurmoq*

However, English often expresses aspectual nuances through periphrastic constructions, while Uzbek encodes many of these distinctions morphologically (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek Verb Morphology and TAM System

Parameter	English (Analytic)	Uzbek (Agglutinative)
Morphological type	Analytic; limited inflection	Agglutinative; rich affixation
Expression of Tense–Aspect–Mood (TAM)	Mainly through auxiliaries (<i>be, have, will</i>)	Mainly through suffixes (<i>-yapti, -gan, -moqchi</i>)
Verb inflection	Minimal: 3rd person <i>-s</i> , past <i>-ed</i>	Extensive: TAM, person/number, negation, voice
Word order dependence	High reliance on fixed SVO	Freer word order due to morphology
Voice system	Active/Passive (analytic passive)	Rich voice morphology: passive, causative, reflexive, reciprocal
Valency changes	Mostly syntactic alternations	Productive morphological markers (<i>-t, -dir, -il</i> , etc.)
Aspect marking	Periphrastic: <i>is writing, has written</i>	Suffixal: <i>yozayapti, yozgan</i>
Argument structure	Determined by syntax and prepositions	Often encoded through verb morphology
Auxiliary usage	Highly frequent	Less central; affixes carry grammatical load
Lexical aspect	Often expressed with constructions	Often encoded directly in verb morphology

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to examine the conceptual foundations of verb typology in English and Uzbek, with particular attention to how structural and semantic features encode verbal meaning across these typologically distinct languages. The comparative-typological analysis of morphological expression, valency patterns, TAM categories, voice, and lexical aspect revealed several important findings.

The results confirm that both English and Uzbek encode similar verbal concepts—such as tense, aspect, mood, voice, and argument structure—but do so using fundamentally different grammatical mechanisms. Although English, an analytic language, uses many auxiliary verbs and specific syntactic configurations, Uzbek, an agglutinative language, expresses grammatical categories morphologically by means of extensive affixation. This lends itself to cross-linguistic typological theories proposing that analytic languages favor syntactic strategies and agglutinative languages make use of morphological richness to mark grammatical relations.

An analysis of transitivity and valency showed that while English uses syntactic strategies like causative alternations that can change argument structure (i.e. the relation between verbal argument and grammatical function), Uzbek is rather rich in productive (mostly morphological) causative and passive suffixes. Likewise, while many TAM and aspectual distinctions in English are largely periphrastic, Uzbek encodes many of these nuances directly in the verb complex. Such patterns indicate that typological distinctions in the structure of verbs are associated with higher-order cognitive and discourse strategies for the information organization of events [10].

Uzbek's relatively rich morphological system may reflect historical and typological tendencies in Turkic languages whereby complex grammatical information is overtly expressed on the verb, allowing for more flexibility with regard to word order and diminishing reliance on auxiliary constructions. On the other hand, English [11], as an Indo-European language which diverged into analytic formants, retains some level of syntactic flexibility, as well as other ways to express a broadly similar meanings. These differences demonstrate how distantly related languages with typologically different profiles can express similar communicative outcomes via different structural means.

While this comparison study offers a high degree of detail, some limitations have to be considered [12]. This arises first because the analysis is primarily qualitative rather than quantitative, at least in terms of frequency and productivity of particular forms over corpora of significant size. Second, only standard A varieties of English and Uzbek were included; dialectal or regional varieties may behave differently. Last but not least, the study mainly investigated grammatical and semantic features and did not examine pragmatic or discourse-related dimensions of verb, which might provide further information.

These findings have several implications [13]. This work contributes to typological linguistics by providing evidence linking the structure of languages to the grammatical expression of verbs. In doing so, it also helps to clarify how grammatical and semantic characteristics of verbs differ in their grammaticalization in English and Uzbek, which thus provides the theoretical background of applied fields such as language teaching, translation and cross-linguistic studies [14].

In the future, the analysis can be combined with corpus-based quantitative approaches to examine how often verbal forms are used and how productive they are. Research on dialectal variation, second-language learning, and pragmatic contexts could shed light on how verb typology operates in different communicative settings. Comparison with further Turkic or Indo-European languages would also improve the comprehension of typological universals and divergences [15].

4. Conclusion

This study examined the conceptual foundations of verb typology in English and Uzbek, highlighting the ways in which these two typologically distinct languages encode verbal meaning. The comparative analysis demonstrated that while both languages share universal grammatical and semantic categories such as tense, aspect, mood, voice, and argument structure they differ markedly in their strategies for expressing these categories. English, as an analytic language, relies primarily on syntactic constructions and auxiliary verbs, whereas Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, employs rich morphological affixation to convey similar information.

The findings underscore that language-specific strategies in verbal encoding are closely linked to typological characteristics, reflecting broader cognitive and communicative patterns. Morphological richness in Uzbek allows for precise, compact expression of multiple grammatical categories directly within the verb, while English prioritizes syntactic flexibility and periphrastic constructions. These contrasts not only reinforce the typological distinction between analytic and agglutinative systems but also provide insight into cross-linguistic patterns of event conceptualization and argument mapping.

The study has implications for theoretical linguistics, language teaching, and translation studies, offering a clearer understanding of how diverse languages structure verbal information. Future research could extend this analysis quantitatively, explore dialectal and pragmatic variations, and include additional languages to further investigate typological universals and divergences.

In conclusion, the comparative-typological approach applied in this study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how verbs function within different linguistic

systems, situating English and Uzbek within the broader framework of cross-linguistic verb typology.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nurmonov and N. Mahmudov, *O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi (O'zbek tili va adabiyoti yo'nalishi talabalari uchun o'quv qo'llanma)*, Tashkent, 2007.
- [2] Comrie, *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- [3] W. Croft, *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- [4] R. M. W. Dixon, *Basic Linguistic Theory*, vol. 1, Methodology, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [5] H. J. Giegerich, *Lexical Strata in English: Morphological Causes, Phonological Effects*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [6] Z. Vendler, "Verbs and times," in *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca, NY, USA: Cornell University Press, 1967, pp. 97 to 121.
- [7] Sh. Rakhmatullayev, *Hozirgi adabiy o'zbek tili*, Tashkent, 2006.
- [8] R. M. W. Dixon, *Basic Linguistic Theory. Volume 1: Methodology*. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263302926_Dixon_RMW_2010_Basic_Linguistic_Theory_Volume_1_Methodology
- [9] "Pluractionality of Events in Macuxi: A Morpho Syntactic and Semantic Analysis." Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374121236_Pluractionality_of_Events_in_Macuxi_A_Morpho-Syntactic_and_Semantic_Analysis
- [10] "More on the typology of inchoative causative verb alternations." Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/243764686_More_on_the_typology_of_inchoativecausative_verb_alternations
- [11] Levin, *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*, Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- [12] L. Talmy, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, vol. 1, Concept Structuring Systems, Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2000.
- [13] R. Jackendoff, *Semantic Structures*, Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1990.
- [14] Ö. Dahl, *Tense and Aspect Systems*, Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- [15] M. Haspelmath, "The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross linguistic comparison," in *The New Psychology of Language*, vol. 2, Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003, pp. 211 to 242.