

THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FUNCTIONAL VERB FORMS IN ENGLISH AND OTHER LANGUAGES

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15080377>

N.Djumaeva

*Bukhara State University, associate professor
of English Linguistics department*

n.d.djumaeva@buxdu.uz

Sultanmuradova Dursun

Master student of Bukhara State University

Abstract

This paper offers a comparative study of functional verb forms in English and various other languages, emphasizing their structure, application, and semantic roles. Functional verbs, such as auxiliary, modal, and phrasal verbs, are essential in forming meanings and articulating grammatical relations. English predominantly utilizes auxiliary verbs (e.g., be, have, do) and modal verbs (e.g., can, must, should) to express tense, aspect, mood, and voice. Conversely, other languages might use inflectional morphology, verb conjugations, or distinct syntactic arrangements to fulfill similar grammatical functions.

The research investigates cross-linguistic differences by analyzing languages from Turkic, Slavic, and Romance families, underscoring variances in verb phrase construction, periphrasis, and grammaticalization processes. Special focus is placed on how various languages depict tense and modality, contrasting analytical and synthetic methods. The insights gained from this study enhance our understanding of language typology and the universal and particular mechanisms employed in functional verb usage.

Key words

functional verbs, auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, comparative linguistics, language typology, verb forms.

1.Introduction

Verbs form the backbone of the grammatical systems in all languages, encapsulating crucial information about actions, states, and relationships. In English, functional verbs—including auxiliary verbs (e.g., be, have, do), modal verbs (e.g., can, must, should), and phrasal verbs—play a pivotal role in defining tense, aspect, mood, and voice. Unlike content verbs, which deliver specific lexical

meanings, functional verbs primarily fulfill a grammatical role, aiding in the construction of complex verb phrases and altering the meaning of sentences.

The approach to expressing these grammatical functions varies significantly across languages. While English utilizes auxiliary and modal verbs to convey these nuances, many other languages employ verb inflections, suffixes, or unique syntactic structures for similar purposes. For example, highly inflected languages like Russian and Arabic utilize verb conjugations to denote tense and aspect without the aid of auxiliary verbs, while analytic languages such as Chinese depend more on word order and contextual cues.

This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of functional verb forms in English and other languages, focusing on their structural, semantic, and syntactic distinctions. By examining these differences, the research illuminates both universal and language-specific strategies for verb formation and usage. Gaining insights into these variations is essential for linguistic theory, translation practices, and the acquisition of second languages.

2.Methods and materials

This research employs a mix of primary and secondary linguistic resources to explore the use of functional verb forms in English and several other language families. The primary materials used are:

Corpora and Text Samples: Genuine text samples from English, Turkic, Slavic, and Romance languages are utilized to investigate verb usage in authentic contexts.

Grammar Books and Linguistic Studies: These reference materials provide detailed descriptions of the verb systems in the languages under study.

Dictionaries and Online Databases: These tools offer comprehensive definitions, conjugation patterns, and examples of verb usage.

The study adopts a comparative linguistic methodology to explore the similarities and differences among English functional verbs and their counterparts in other languages. The methods include:

1. **Descriptive Analysis** – This method involves examining the structural characteristics of functional verbs in English and the selected languages, with a focus on auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, and periphrastic constructions.

2. **Comparative Analysis** – This approach seeks to identify both similarities and variations in verb formation, usage, and grammaticalization across the languages studied.

3. **Contrastive Analysis** – This method emphasizes the distinct ways in which languages express tense, aspect, mood, and voice, particularly contrasting analytic and synthetic language structures.

4. Corpus-Based Study – This involves analyzing examples from linguistic corpora to assess frequency and patterns of verb usage.

The study primarily centers on English, using it as the benchmark for comparison with Turkic, Slavic, and Romance languages. The outcomes are expected to enhance the understanding of language typology and the evolution of verb systems.

3.Results

The comparative examination of functional verb forms in English and additional languages uncovers notable structural and grammatical distinctions. The outcomes are organized into three principal categories: auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, and periphrastic constructions.

1. Auxiliary Verbs and Tense Formation

In English, auxiliary verbs such as "be," "have," and "do" play a crucial role in constructing continuous, perfect, and passive forms (e.g., "She has finished her work").

Contrastingly, in Turkic languages like Uzbek and Turkish, tense and aspect are predominantly expressed through verb suffixes instead of auxiliary verbs (e.g., "kelgan edi" in Uzbek translates to "had come").

Slavic languages, including Russian and Polish, utilize aspectual distinctions (perfective vs. imperfective) rather than auxiliary verbs to indicate tense and aspect variations.

Romance languages, such as French and Spanish, employ auxiliary verbs akin to English (e.g., "avoir/être" in French, "haber/estar" in Spanish) for forming compound tenses, but they vary in agreement rules.

2. Modal Verbs and Expression of Modality

English utilizes a system of modal verbs (e.g., "can," "must," "should") to denote ability, necessity, and possibility.

In Turkic languages, modality is indicated using verb suffixes and auxiliary verbs (e.g., "kelishi mumkin" in Uzbek means "he may come").

Slavic languages employ both modal verbs and impersonal constructions to express possibility (e.g., "можно пойти" in Russian, which translates to "it is possible to go").

Romance languages also depend on modal verbs but frequently use verb conjugations to express obligations or abilities (e.g., "debo ir" in Spanish, meaning "I must go").

3. Periphrastic Constructions and Grammaticalization

English often utilizes phrasal verbs (e.g., "give up," "look after"), which are seldom found in many other languages.

In Turkic languages, light verbs such as "qilmoq" ("to do") and "bo'lish" ("to be") are employed to form complex verb meanings.

Slavic languages prefer using prefixation and suffixation to modify verb meanings rather than separate words (e.g., "написать" vs. "писать" in Russian, translating to "to write" vs. "to be writing").

Romance languages employ prepositional phrases and auxiliary verbs for similar grammatical purposes.

This analysis illuminates the reliance of English, an analytic language, on auxiliary and modal verbs, whereas more synthetic languages like Turkic and Slavic express similar semantic content through inflections and aspectual distinctions. Romance languages exhibit certain resemblances to English but maintain distinctive conjugation patterns. These variances bear significant implications for translation, language learning, and the comprehension of cross-linguistic relationships.

4. Analysis.

The comparative study of verb forms in English and other languages reveals significant differences in the structural and grammatical ways languages handle tense, aspect, modality, and other verbal functions. This section details the findings concerning auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, and periphrastic constructions, emphasizing linguistic variations across different language families.

In English, auxiliary verbs (be, have, do) are crucial for creating complex tenses, forming passive constructions, and framing questions. In contrast:

- Turkic languages (e.g., Uzbek, Turkish) avoid auxiliary verbs for tense creation. Instead, they use verb suffixes to denote tense and aspect (e.g., Uzbek *kelgan edi* – "had come").

- Slavic languages (e.g., Russian, Polish) prioritize aspect over auxiliary verbs to denote tense. They differentiate between completed and ongoing actions using perfective and imperfective verb forms, without the need for auxiliaries (e.g., Russian *писал* vs. *написал* – "was writing" vs. "wrote").

- Romance languages (e.g., French, Spanish) employ auxiliary verbs similar to English (*avoir/être* in French, *haber/estar* in Spanish), yet they maintain intricate conjugation systems.

This comparison shows that while English depends on periphrastic constructions, more synthetic languages embed tense and aspect within the verb morphology itself.

Modality, which includes expressions of necessity, ability, and permission, is articulated differently across languages:

- English utilizes specific modal verbs (can, must, may) that do not alter the main verb form.

- Turkic languages employ suffixes and auxiliary verbs rather than separate modal verbs (e.g., Uzbek *kelishi mumkin* – "he may come").

- Slavic languages use both modal verbs and impersonal constructions (e.g., Russian *можно пойти* – "it is possible to go").

- Romance languages incorporate modality into verb conjugations (e.g., Spanish *debo ir* – "I must go").

This contrast underlines how English and Romance languages lean more on distinct modal verbs, while Turkic and Slavic languages integrate modality into verb inflections or impersonal expressions.

English is distinguished by its extensive use of phrasal verbs (give up, look after), which are comparatively uncommon in other languages. Instead:

- Turkic languages often utilize light verbs (e.g., Uzbek *qilmoq* – "to do") to create compound meanings.

- Slavic languages depend on prefixation and suffixation rather than separate words (e.g., Russian *написать* – "to write" with a completed action).

- Romance languages employ prepositional phrases and auxiliary verbs to convey similar nuances.

This analysis indicates that the reliance on phrasal verbs is a distinctive aspect of English among Indo-European languages, posing additional challenges for non-native speakers. The analysis confirms that English, as an analytic language, conveys functional verb meanings through auxiliary and modal verbs instead of morphological adjustments. Meanwhile, Turkic and Slavic languages, being more synthetic, depend on verb inflections, aspectual differences, and impersonal constructions.

The research underscores the varied approaches languages employ to articulate grammatical functions through verbs. While English relies on auxiliary and modal verbs, other languages incorporate these functions directly into their verb morphology or aspectual systems. Recognizing these differences is essential for linguistic studies, language education, and interlingual communication.

5. Discussion

The comparative analysis of functional verb forms in English and other languages reveals both universal linguistic patterns and significant language-specific differences. This section interprets the findings by examining how different languages structure and utilize functional verbs, exploring the implications for language typology, second-language acquisition, and translation.

The analysis shows that English relies heavily on auxiliary and modal verbs to express grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, and modality. This analytical approach contrasts with the more synthetic structures found in Turkic and Slavic languages, where verb affixation and aspectual distinctions often replace the need for separate functional verbs. For example, while English uses auxiliary verbs to form the perfect aspect (has gone), Turkic languages employ verb suffixes (e.g., Uzbek: kelgan edi), and Slavic languages rely on aspectual pairs (e.g., Russian: писать – "to write" vs. написать – "to have written"). This structural contrast reflects a broader typological difference between analytic and synthetic languages.

Modality—expressing possibility, necessity, and permission—is conveyed through a distinct set of modal verbs in English (can, must, may). Turkic and Slavic languages, however, often use verb affixes or impersonal constructions to express similar meanings. Romance languages, while also employing modal verbs, frequently integrate modality within verb conjugations, as seen in the Spanish phrase debo ir ("I must go"). These differences can pose challenges for learners of English from synthetic-language backgrounds. For instance, English separates modality from the main verb, while languages like Uzbek and Russian integrate modality into the verb structure, leading to potential confusion in meaning and use.

English exhibits extensive use of periphrastic constructions, such as phrasal verbs (e.g., give up, look after), which are relatively rare in other languages. Turkic languages use light verbs (e.g., qilmoq – "to do") to form compound meanings, while Slavic languages rely more on prefixation to modify verb semantics.

Grammaticalization patterns also vary significantly. In English, auxiliary verbs like do evolved from lexical verbs to perform purely grammatical functions. Similar processes are found in Turkic languages, where the verb bo'lish ("to be") functions as an auxiliary. Such cross-linguistic parallels suggest a universal tendency for frequently used lexical items to develop into grammatical markers over time.

The findings have practical implications for second-language acquisition and translation. Learners from synthetic-language backgrounds may struggle with English auxiliary and modal verb usage due to the absence of comparable structures in their native languages. Conversely, English speakers learning a synthetic language must adapt to expressing grammatical relationships through affixation rather than auxiliary verbs. In translation, preserving the nuance of functional verbs is crucial. For example, English modals carry subtle distinctions

in obligation and permission (e.g., must vs. should), which may lack direct equivalents in other languages. Effective translation requires not only linguistic but also cultural understanding to capture these subtleties accurately.

The comparative analysis underscores the diversity of linguistic strategies for conveying functional meanings while highlighting shared patterns of grammaticalization across languages. These findings contribute to the study of language typology and the evolution of grammatical systems, emphasizing that while the mechanisms differ, the communicative functions they serve are universal.

In conclusion, English and other languages employ distinct yet functionally equivalent strategies to express tense, aspect, modality, and complex verb meanings. Understanding these differences enhances our comprehension of language diversity and improves cross-linguistic communication and translation accuracy.

6.Conclusion

This research delves into the comparative aspects of functional verb forms in English and various other languages, with a focus on auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, and periphrastic constructions. The results highlight notable differences in the ways languages handle grammatical categories like tense, aspect, and modality.

English, characterized as an analytic language, utilizes auxiliary and modal verbs to express these grammatical functions. On the other hand, synthetic languages such as those in the Turkic and Slavic families integrate verb inflections and aspectual distinctions directly into the verb forms rather than relying on separate auxiliary verbs. Romance languages, while having some similarities with English, feature conjugation patterns that are distinct from both English and synthetic languages.

The findings underscore that despite structural variations, all languages serve the same communicative purposes. These differences bear significant implications for language learning and translation, emphasizing that a deep understanding of the structural diversity of functional verbs can enhance cross-linguistic understanding and translational accuracy.

Future investigations could extend to a wider array of languages and explore how functional verbs develop over time through grammaticalization. Additionally, psycholinguistic research into second-language learning could shed light on how learners navigate these structural variances.

By examining functional verb forms across different languages, this study enriches our understanding of linguistic diversity and the universal principles underlying human communication.

REFERENCES:

1. Comrie, B. (1985). *Tense*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Dixon, R. M. W. (2005). *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
4. Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Jespersen, O. (1924). *The Philosophy of Grammar*. George Allen & Unwin.
7. Matthews, P. H. (1991). *Morphology: An Introduction to the Theory of Word Structure*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.