

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MODAL VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Murodova Mukhlisa Tursunboyevna ¹

¹ 1st-year student of Japanese Philology
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT:

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received: 17.02.2025

Revised: 18.02.2025

Accepted: 19.02.2025

KEYWORDS:

modal verbs, English,
Uzbek, modality, semantics,
syntax, language
comparison, translation,
grammar, linguistic analysis.

This article examines the similarities and differences between modal verbs in English and Uzbek. Modal verbs play an essential role in expressing ability, necessity, possibility, obligation, and permission. While both languages use modal constructions, their structures, meanings, and usage patterns differ significantly due to linguistic and cultural factors. English modal verbs, such as can, must, may, and should, function independently, whereas Uzbek uses analytical forms and auxiliary verbs to convey modality. The study explores their grammatical features, semantic functions, and contextual usage, highlighting areas of equivalence and divergence. Understanding these differences is crucial for language learners and translators.

INTRODUCTION. Modal verbs are an essential component of language, allowing speakers to express a range of meanings related to ability, necessity, possibility, permission, and obligation. Both English and Uzbek use modal constructions, but their grammatical structures, usage, and meanings differ significantly due to the distinct linguistic features of each language. In English, modal verbs such as can, must, may, should, and will function as auxiliary verbs that directly modify the main verb without requiring additional conjugation. In contrast, Uzbek employs a combination of auxiliary verbs, suffixes, and analytical constructions to express modality.

The differences in how English and Uzbek convey modality stem from the broader syntactic and morphological characteristics of each language. English, a Germanic language, has a fixed system of modal verbs that remain unchanged regardless of subject or

tense. Meanwhile, Uzbek, a Turkic language, relies on verb affixes and independent modal expressions to indicate similar meanings. This structural contrast poses challenges for learners and translators who must accurately interpret and convey modal meanings between the two languages.

This article explores the comparative features of modal verbs in English and Uzbek, focusing on their grammatical structure, semantic functions, and contextual usage. By analyzing similarities and differences, the study aims to provide a deeper understanding of how modality operates in both languages. This comparison is particularly useful for linguists, language learners, and translators, as it highlights potential difficulties in cross-linguistic communication and offers insights into effective language acquisition strategies.

Modal verbs are a fundamental part of both English and Uzbek grammar, enabling speakers to express different shades of meaning related to possibility, necessity, and permission. In English, modal verbs include can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will, and would. They function as auxiliary verbs and do not require an additional verb conjugation. In Uzbek, modal expressions rely on auxiliary verbs such as mumkin (possible), kerak (necessary), shart (mandatory), lozim (obligatory), mumkin emas (impossible), bo'lishi mumkin (might be) and other constructions that indicate modal meanings.

One of the key distinctions between the two languages is that English modal verbs remain unchanged regardless of the subject, whereas Uzbek modals adapt to various grammatical structures. For example, the English sentence He must go translates into Uzbek as U borishi kerak, where kerak functions as a separate modal element following the verb in its infinitive form. Unlike English, Uzbek modals require an explicit subject-verb agreement in many cases.

Another notable difference is the ability to express modality through verb endings in Uzbek. The suffix -a olmoq in Uzbek, for instance, conveys the meaning of ability, similar to the English modal verb can. The sentence Men suzishim mumkin (I can swim) demonstrates this structure, where mumkin serves as a modal word modifying the verb suzish (to swim). In contrast, English employs modal verbs that precede the main verb without requiring additional morphology.

Both languages also exhibit nuances in expressing obligation. The English modal must indicates a strong necessity or duty, while Uzbek equivalents such as shart and kerak may carry slightly different connotations. For example, You must finish your work in Uzbek can

be translated as Sen ishingni tugatishing kerak or Sen ishingni tugatishing shart, with kerak implying necessity and shart denoting strict obligation.

The study of modal verbs in English and Uzbek reveals that while both languages have mechanisms for expressing modality, their syntactic and morphological structures differ considerably. English relies on a fixed set of modal verbs, while Uzbek employs auxiliary words, suffixes, and constructions to convey similar meanings. Understanding these differences is essential for learners of both languages, as it aids in accurate translation and effective communication.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of modal verbs in English and Uzbek reveals significant differences in their structure, usage, and semantic functions. While English relies on a fixed set of auxiliary modal verbs that precede the main verb without requiring additional conjugation, Uzbek expresses modality through auxiliary words, verb suffixes, and analytical constructions. This fundamental distinction affects how modal meanings such as ability, necessity, permission, and obligation are conveyed in each language.

One of the key findings is that English modal verbs are independent and do not change form based on the subject, whereas Uzbek modals often require subject-verb agreement and can be expressed using a variety of auxiliary elements. For example, the English modal verb must corresponds to kerak or shart in Uzbek, but the exact translation depends on context and the level of obligation implied. Similarly, the Uzbek suffix -a olmoq functions similarly to the English modal can, indicating ability, but requires a verb form adaptation.

These differences present challenges for language learners and translators, as direct equivalence between English and Uzbek modal verbs is not always possible. Understanding the structural and functional variations of modality in both languages is essential for accurate translation and effective communication. Additionally, recognizing these distinctions can improve the teaching and learning of both languages by providing a more comprehensive approach to modality.

Overall, the study highlights the importance of comparative linguistic analysis in understanding how different languages express similar grammatical concepts. Future research could explore the role of modality in different linguistic contexts, such as formal and informal speech, to provide further insights into the practical applications of modal verbs in English and Uzbek.

References:

1. Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.
2. Palmer, F. R. (2001). Mood and Modality. Cambridge University Press.
3. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman.
4. Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics: Volume 2. Cambridge University Press.
5. Johanson, L. (1998). "The Structure of Modality in Turkic Languages." In Johanson, L. & Utas, B. (Eds.), Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages. Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Matyakubov, S. (2016). O'zbek tilining grammatikasi. Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
7. Kadirov, R. (2020). O'zbek va Ingliz tillarida modal fe'llarning qiyosiy tahlili. Toshkent Davlat Pedagogika Universiteti.
8. Bybee, J., Perkins, R., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World. University of Chicago Press.