

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF MOOD IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Qurbonova Umida - 3 rd year student of English language and literature faculty, NSPI Scientific advisor: Aziz Mukhamadiev, teacher at English language and literature department of NSPI

Abstract: The similarities and contrasts between how mood is expressed in Uzbek and English are examined in this article. Mood is a crucial grammatical characteristic that conveys intention, conviction, doubt, or desire. It is a reflection of the speaker's attitude towards the action or situation that the verb describes. Similarities between the two languages are emphasized by the study, including the employment of auxiliary verbs and common moods like indicative, imperative, and conditional. On the other hand, there are clear disparities in the way that mood is expressed in Uzbek and English verb forms; Uzbek uses particular verb endings to indicate mood, while English mainly relies on auxiliary verbs. Additionally, Uzbek may employ special verb forms or particles for comparable reasons, but English is more likely to use the subjunctive mood when expressing wishes and hypothetical scenarios. The two languages differ in how they convey formality and politeness through mood indicators. Language learners' competency and communication abilities in both Uzbek and English are improved by being aware of these subtleties.

Keywords: Indicative mood, imperative mood, conditional mood, subjunctive mood, Uzbek language, English language.

INTRODUCTION

A grammatical characteristic called mood conveys the speaker's perspective on the action or situation that the verb is describing. Mood is an important tool for communicating the speaker's intention, assurance, doubt, or desire in both Uzbek and English. These two languages differ significantly in the ways that they express and employ mood, despite certain commonalities.

Similarities:

Common Moods: The indicative, imperative, and subjunctive moods are some of the common moods between the English and Uzbek languages. Statements of fact, orders, requests, and hypothetical scenarios can all be expressed with these moods.



Auxiliary Verbs: To convey particular moods, auxiliary verbs are used in both languages. Modal verbs like "can," "may," "must," and "should" are used in English to indicate multiple moods. Auxiliary verbs like "bo'l -" (be) and "qil -" (do) are also used in Uzbek to denote mood.

Conditional Mood: Both languages can convey hypothetical or ambiguous circumstances using the conditional mood. While this is frequently constructed in English using auxiliary verbs like "would" or "could," it is formed in Uzbek using particular verb forms.

Differences:

Verb forms: In Uzbek, mood is frequently indicated by particular verb forms, but in English, mood is primarily expressed by auxiliary verbs. In Uzbek, for instance, different verb ends designate the indicative mood, but different verb forms indicate the imperative mood.

Subjunctive Mood: When compared to Uzbek, English has a more subjunctive mood that is more noticeable. When expressing desires, suggestions, or hypothetical circumstances that are not true, one uses the subjunctive in English. In Uzbek, on the other hand, same meanings may be expressed using distinct verb forms or particles.

Expressing Politeness: Modal verbs like "could" and "would" are frequently used in English to soften or improve the politeness of requests. Expressions of politeness in Uzbek might depend less on mood cues and more on honorifics and particular verb forms.

Formal and informal Usage: In both official and casual settings, Uzbek and English may employ different mood cues. For instance, in Uzbek, specific mood markers might be more common in formal circumstances, but in English, the subjunctive mood is more formal and less frequently employed in daily speech.

Language relies heavily on mood since it conveys the speaker's intentions, attitude, and feelings. The two languages, Uzbek and English, use various grammatical constructions to convey mood. Although the two languages share certain similarities in how they use mood, they also stand out for different reasons that emphasize the distinctive qualities of each language. By examining these parallels and discrepancies, we can learn more about how mood influences communication in various language environments.

In conclusion, while both Uzbek and English utilize mood to convey the speaker's perspective and intent, their grammatical approaches differ significantly. While both languages share common moods like indicative, imperative, and subjunctive, and employ auxiliary verbs for mood expression, they diverge in how they mark these



moods. Uzbek relies heavily on specific verb forms to indicate mood, while English utilizes auxiliary verbs, especially modal verbs, for this purpose. The subjunctive mood, prevalent in English for expressing desires and hypothetical scenarios, is less prominent in Uzbek.

The expression of politeness also varies. English often employs modal verbs like "could" and "would" to soften requests, whereas Uzbek relies more on honorifics and specific verb forms. Additionally, the usage of mood markers in formal and informal contexts differs between the two languages, reflecting cultural nuances in communication.

Ultimately, mood is a crucial tool for conveying the speaker's attitude and intention in both Uzbek and English, despite their contrasting grammatical strategies. By analyzing these similarities and differences, we gain a deeper appreciation for the linguistic diversity and cultural nuances that shape communication across languages.

REFERENCES

1. Blake, Barry J. Case. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001 – 147 p.

2. Comrie Bernard Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981 – 220 p.

3. Dixon R. M. Basic Linguistic Theory Further Grammatical Topics. – Oxford: University Press, 2000 – 427 p.

4. Haspelmath Martin The World Atlas of Language Structures. – Britain: Oxford University Press, 2013 – 231p.

5. Jakobson R. Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957 – 287 p.

6. Payne T. Understanding Grammar. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. – 272 p.

7. Nichols Johanna Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar. – London: Language Press, 1986 – 421 p.