

Morphosyntactic Structure of Verb Forms in English And Karakalpak Languages

Jumabaeva Aysara Esenbay qizi

1st year master's student in Comparative Linguistics, Linguistic Translation specialty, Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh, Uzbekistan

Received: 24 January 2026; **Accepted:** 20 February 2026; **Published:** 12 March 2026

Abstract: This article examines the morphosyntactic structure of verb forms in English and Karakalpak languages from a comparative linguistic perspective. The study analyzes how grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, mood, voice, person, and number are expressed in both languages. Since English belongs to the analytic language type and Karakalpak is an agglutinative Turkic language, their verbal systems demonstrate important structural differences. English typically expresses grammatical meanings through auxiliary verbs and analytical constructions, while Karakalpak verbs encode many grammatical categories through suffixation attached to the verb stem. The results indicate that English relies more on syntactic mechanisms, whereas Karakalpak shows a richer morphological structure of verbs.

Keywords: Morphosyntax, verb forms, English language, Karakalpak language, comparative linguistics, verbal categories.

Introduction: The verb occupies a central place in the grammatical system of any language because it expresses action, process, state, development, and predication. In fact, the verb serves not only as a lexical unit naming an event but also as a grammatical nucleus around which sentence structure is organized. Therefore, the study of verb forms has always held a special place in linguistic theory. Scholars of general linguistics, morphology, syntax, and typology have repeatedly emphasized that the verb is one of the most complex and multifunctional parts of speech, since it unites lexical meaning with grammatical categories and syntactic functions.

From the viewpoint of modern linguistics, morphosyntax has become an especially productive field of inquiry because it investigates the interaction between morphological marking and syntactic organization. In other words, morphosyntactic analysis does not isolate form from function; rather, it explores how grammatical meaning is distributed between word structure and sentence structure. Thus, when verb forms are analyzed morphosyntactically, attention is paid not only to inflectional and derivational markers

but also to the syntactic environments in which those forms operate.

A number of scholars have contributed to the theoretical foundations of verbal studies. Traditional English grammarians such as Quirk and Crystal described the formal categories and syntactic behavior of English verbs in great detail [9]. Likewise, Palmer and Huddleston clarified the relationship between tense, aspect, modality, and auxiliary systems in English grammar [7;8]. In the broader typological tradition, Comrie, Bybee, and Dixon demonstrated that verbal categories vary significantly across languages depending on typological structure, grammaticalization patterns, and functional needs [3;4;5]. Meanwhile, Turkic linguistics has paid special attention to the agglutinative nature of the verb, the productivity of suffixation, and the close relationship between verbal morphology and predication. In studies of Karakalpak and related Turkic languages, researchers have highlighted the importance of personal endings, tense-mood suffixes, participial and converbal forms, and the syntactic mobility of verbal constructions.

Nevertheless, despite the existence of many studies

devoted separately to English grammar and Turkic verbal morphology, comparative research on the morphosyntactic structure of verb forms in English and Karakalpak remains insufficiently systematized. This gap is significant because the two languages belong to different typological groups. English is predominantly analytic, with relatively poor inflection and a strong reliance on auxiliaries and word order. By contrast, Karakalpak, as a Turkic agglutinative language, expresses many grammatical meanings through regular suffixation attached to verbal stems. As a result, similar semantic notions such as tense, mood, person, or voice may be encoded through fundamentally different structural means.

Accordingly, the relevance of this study lies in the need to compare how morphology and syntax cooperate in the formation of verb forms in these two languages. Such a comparison is important not only for theoretical linguistics but also for language teaching, translation practice, and contrastive grammar. More specifically, learners often experience difficulty when transferring verbal structures from one language to the other because equivalent meanings do not necessarily correspond to equivalent forms.

METHODOLOGY

The present research is based on a comparative-descriptive methodology combined with structural, functional, and typological approaches. First of all, the comparative method makes it possible to identify similarities and differences in the formation and usage of verb forms in English and Karakalpak. Secondly, the descriptive method is used to present the grammatical categories and structural models of verbal forms in each language in a systematic manner. Thirdly, structural analysis allows the internal composition of verbal forms to be examined, including stem structure, inflectional markers, auxiliary components, and personal endings. Finally, functional analysis reveals how these forms operate within sentence structure and how they contribute to predication, temporal reference, modality, and syntactic relations.

The material of the study consists of standard grammatical patterns and representative verb constructions described in English and Karakalpak grammatical sources. The analysis is not limited to isolated words; on the contrary, verbal forms are observed within phrase and clause structures in order to clarify their morphosyntactic status. Special attention is given to finite and non-finite forms, tense-aspect-mood categories, voice constructions, and person-number agreement.

In methodological terms, the article proceeds from the assumption that morphology and syntax are

interdependent levels of grammar. Consequently, a verb form is treated not merely as a formal paradigm item, but as a grammatical unit whose shape and syntactic behavior must be interpreted together. Such an approach is particularly appropriate for comparing an analytic language like English with an agglutinative language like Karakalpak, since grammatical meanings may be distributed differently across the two systems.

RESULTS

The comparative analysis demonstrates that verb forms in English and Karakalpak exhibit both universal grammatical functions and language-specific morphosyntactic realizations. Although both languages employ verbs as the central element of predication, the formal structure of these verbs differs considerably because English belongs to the analytic language type, while Karakalpak belongs to the agglutinative Turkic language group.

In English, verb morphology is relatively limited. A typical verb paradigm contains only a few inflected forms. For example:

write – writes – wrote – written – writing

Because of this limited inflectional system, English frequently relies on auxiliary verbs to express grammatical meanings.

Example: She is writing a letter.

Here the progressive meaning is expressed through the auxiliary *is* and the participle *writing*.

In contrast, Karakalpak verbs demonstrate a rich agglutinative morphology in which several grammatical meanings are expressed through suffixes attached to a verb stem.

Example: Men kitap jazıp atırman. (I am writing a book.)

Structure: jaz- (verb root) + ıp (converb suffix) + atır (progressive marker) + man (1st person singular)

Thus, the entire grammatical meaning of the progressive action and person is encoded within a single morphological complex.

Another example: Ol kitap jazdı. (He wrote a book.)

Here *jaz-dı* expresses past tense through the suffix *-dı*.

Consequently, while English distributes grammatical meaning across several words, Karakalpak integrates these meanings into one morphologically complex verb form.

The category of tense and aspect represents one of the most significant differences between English and Karakalpak verbal systems. English tense is primarily organized around present and past oppositions, while future meaning is usually expressed analytically.

Example: She will write the report tomorrow.

Here the future meaning is expressed through the auxiliary will.

English also strongly grammaticalizes aspect:

She writes (simple present). She is writing (progressive). She has written (perfect). She has been writing (perfect progressive).

In Karakalpak, however, tense and aspect are often encoded through suffixation.

Example: Men kitap jazıp atırman. (I am writing a book.)

Example of future tense: Men erteń kitap jazaman. (I will write a book tomorrow.)

Structure: jaz- (root) + a (future marker) + man (1sg ending)

Example of past tense: Men kitap jazdım. (I wrote a book.)

Structure: jaz- (root) + dı (past suffix) + m (1sg ending)

Thus, tense and person agreement are encoded directly within the verb.

Mood in English is relatively limited morphologically. Modal meanings are typically expressed through auxiliary verbs.

Examples: She can write quickly. You must finish the work. They should come earlier.

Here can, must, should function as modal verbs expressing possibility, obligation, or advice.

In Karakalpak, modal meanings are frequently expressed through verbal suffixes or morphological constructions.

Example: Ol keliwi mümkin. (He may come.)

Example expressing desire: Meniń bargım keledi. (I want to go.)

Structure: bar- (go) + ğım (verbal noun with possessive) + keledi (want)

Example of imperative mood: Kitaptı jaz! (Write the book!)

Thus, modal meanings in Karakalpak are often embedded within verbal morphology or derived constructions.

In English, person and number marking on verbs is minimal. Only the third person singular present tense contains a special marker.

Example: I write. You write. They write. He writes

Therefore, English syntax relies heavily on subject pronouns.

Example: She reads a book.

In Karakalpak, verbs obligatorily express person and number through suffixes.

Examples: Men jazaman. – I write. Sen jazasan. – You

write. Ol jazadı. – He/she writes. Bizler jazamız. – We write. Sizler jazasız. – You (plural) write. Olar jazadı. – They write.

Here the suffixes -man, -san, -dı, -mız, -sız express person and number.

Because of this rich agreement system, Karakalpak sentences may omit subject pronouns.

Example: Jazaman. (I write.)

The subject is understood through the verbal suffix -man.

English voice constructions are usually formed analytically.

Example: The letter was written by her. Structure: auxiliary was + participle written [7, 143-150].

In Karakalpak, voice is often expressed through derivational suffixes.

Passive example: Kitap jazıldı. (The book was written.) Structure: jaz- (root) + ıl (passive marker) + dı (past)

Causative example: Ol kitap jazdırdı. (He made someone write the book.) Structure: jaz- (write) + dir (causative) + dı (past) [2].

Thus, voice categories are morphologically integrated into the verb.

English contains several important non-finite forms: infinitives, gerunds, and participles.

Examples:

Infinitive	Gerund	Participle
She wants to read.	Reading improves knowledge.	The student writing the report is tired.

Karakalpak also has non-finite forms such as participles and converbs.

Example (converb): Ol kitap jazıp otır. (He is sitting while writing a book.)

Example (participial form): Kitap jazğan adam. (The man who wrote the book.)

Structure: jaz- (write) + ğan (past participle)

Thus, participial constructions in Karakalpak frequently function as attributive clauses.

English typically follows a Subject–Verb–Object (SVO) order.

Example: The student wrote the report.

Karakalpak usually follows Subject–Object–Verb (SOV)

order.

Example: Student esabat jazdi. (Student report wrote.) [11].

Because the verb appears at the end of the sentence, it functions as the syntactic culmination of the clause.

Therefore, the verb in Karakalpak collects grammatical information such as tense, person, and voice in one final morphological unit.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study demonstrate that the morphosyntactic structure of verb forms in English and Karakalpak is determined not merely by isolated grammatical rules but by the overall typological character of each language. In this respect, the comparison confirms a broader linguistic principle: grammatical categories may be universal in function, yet language-specific in form.

First, the English verbal system reflects the logic of an analytic language. Its relatively poor inflectional paradigm is compensated by the extensive use of auxiliary verbs, stable word order, and syntactic constructions. Accordingly, verbal meaning is not concentrated in a single morphological form but dispersed across the verb phrase. Tense, aspect, negation, interrogation, and modality are all strongly dependent on syntactic arrangement. This analytic tendency makes English morphosyntax highly configurational.

Second, the Karakalpak verbal system reflects the logic of an agglutinative language. Here, verbal stems combine with a sequence of suffixes that encode multiple categories simultaneously. As a result, morphology performs a far greater share of the grammatical work. Person, number, tense, mood, voice, and sometimes subtle semantic nuances are overtly visible in the verbal form itself. Therefore, Karakalpak morphosyntax is more internally compact and morphologically transparent.

At the same time, the analysis shows that morphology and syntax cannot be fully separated in either language. Even in English, where analytical structure is dominant, morphology still plays a role through participles, past tense forms, and agreement remnants. Likewise, even in Karakalpak, where agglutinative morphology is central, syntax remains crucial in clause combination, information structure, and the functional interpretation of verbal forms. Thus, the difference between the two languages is not absolute but scalar: English leans more heavily toward syntactic encoding, whereas Karakalpak leans more heavily toward morphological encoding.

Furthermore, this contrast has important implications

for translation and language teaching. English learners of Karakalpak may struggle with the density of suffixal information in a single verbal form, while Karakalpak learners of English may find it difficult to master auxiliary sequences and rigid word order patterns. For example, an English progressive construction requires a separate auxiliary plus participle, whereas an equivalent Karakalpak meaning may be encoded more compactly. Conversely, a Karakalpak form with rich suffixal marking may correspond in English to a full phrase containing tense, modal, and aspectual elements. Therefore, direct formal equivalence is often impossible, and contrastive analysis becomes pedagogically necessary.

In addition, the findings support the view that the verb is the most typologically sensitive component of grammar. Nouns may also vary across languages, but verbs are especially revealing because they interact simultaneously with predication, time, modality, agreement, and clause structure. Hence, a comparative study of verb forms provides insight not only into morphology and syntax, but into the architecture of the language as a whole.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study of the morphosyntactic structure of verb forms in English and Karakalpak languages reveals both functional parallels and profound structural differences. In both languages, verbs serve as the grammatical center of predication and express such core categories as tense, mood, voice, and finiteness. Nevertheless, the formal realization of these categories differs substantially due to typological distinctions between the two languages.

English, as an analytic language, relies primarily on auxiliary verbs, non-finite forms, and fixed syntactic patterns to express verbal meanings. Its morphological paradigm is comparatively limited, and therefore syntax assumes a compensatory role. Karakalpak, by contrast, as an agglutinative language, encodes a broad range of grammatical meanings through suffixation within the verb form itself. Consequently, the verb in Karakalpak is morphologically richer and often syntactically more self-sufficient.

Moreover, the comparative analysis has shown that the interaction between morphology and syntax is organized differently in the two systems. In English, grammatical information is distributed across the predicate phrase, whereas in Karakalpak it is concentrated more heavily in the internal structure of the verb. This difference affects tense-aspect formation, mood expression, agreement, voice marking, non-finite constructions, and overall predicate organization.

Therefore, the morphosyntactic study of English and Karakalpak verbs not only clarifies language-specific grammatical patterns but also contributes to general typological theory. In particular, it demonstrates how languages may achieve similar communicative goals through different structural means. Finally, the results of this study may serve as a useful foundation for further research in comparative grammar, translation studies, language pedagogy, and functional linguistics.

REFERENCES

1. Baskakov, N. (1952). Karakalpakskij jazyk: fonetika i morfologija [Karakalpak language: phonetics and morphology]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR (in Russian).
2. Baskakov, N. A. (1951). Karakalpakskij jazyk. Izdat. Akad. Nauk SSSR.
3. Bybee, J. L. (1985). Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form.-Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins (Typological studies in language 9).(1994):" The grammaticization of zero". Pagliuca (ed.), 235-254.
4. Comrie, B. (1976). Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems (Vol. 2). Cambridge university press.
5. Dixon, R. M. (2010). Basic linguistic theory volume 2: Grammatical topics (Vol. 2). OUP Oxford.
6. Haspelmath, M., & Sims, A. (2013). Understanding morphology. Routledge.
7. Huddleston, R. D., Pullum, G. K., & Bauer, L. (2002). The Cambridge grammar of the English language (pp. 143-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Palmer, F. R. (2001). Mood and modality. Cambridge university press.
9. Quirk, R., & Crystal, D. (2010). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. Pearson Education India.
10. Хэзирги каракалпак адебий тилининг грамматикасы. Соз жасалыў хам морфология/ Нокис: Билим, 1994. —451 б
11. Хэзирги каракалпак тили. Морфология. Нокис: Қарақалпақстан баспасы, 1981. — 264 б.