



THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF VERBAL MORPHOLOGY 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
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18512957>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 28th January 2026
Accepted: 04th February 2026
Online: 05th February 2026

KEYWORDS

Verbal morphology, English language, Karakalpak language, agglutination, analytic structure, tense, aspect, mood, contrastive linguistics.

ABSTRACT

This article presents a detailed comparative analysis of verbal morphology in English and Karakalpak languages. The study focuses on the morphological expression of core grammatical categories of the verb, including tense, aspect, mood, voice, negation, and person-number agreement. English, as a predominantly analytic language, encodes most verbal meanings through auxiliary verbs and syntactic constructions, whereas Karakalpak, as an agglutinative Turkic language, expresses grammatical meanings mainly through suffixation within the verb structure. Through systematic comparison and illustrative examples, the article demonstrates how grammatical information is distributed differently across verbal forms in the two languages while fulfilling similar communicative functions. The findings highlight typological contrasts that have significant implications for contrastive linguistics, translation, and language teaching, particularly in the context of English-Karakalpak bilingualism.

INGLIZ VA QORAQALPOQ TILLARIDA FE'L MORFOLOGIYASINING QIYOSIY TADQIQI

Jumabaeva Aysara Esenbay qizi

Berdaq nomidagi Qoraqalpoq davlat universiteti Tarjima nazariyasi va amaliyoti kafedrası Qiyosiy tilshunoslik, Lingvistik tarjima mutaxassisligi 1-bosqich magistranti
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18512957>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 28th January 2026
Accepted: 04th February 2026
Online: 05th February 2026

ABSTRACT

Mazkur maqolada ingliz va qoraqalpoq tillarida fe'l morfologiyasi qiyosiy tahlillanadi. Tadqiqotda fe'lning asosiy grammatik kategoriyalari, jumladan zamon, aspekt, mayl, nisbat, inkor va shaxs-son ko'rsatkichlarining ifodalanish usullari tahlil qilinadi. Ingliz tili asosan analitik til bo'lib, fe'l ma'nolarini yordamchi fe'llar va sintaktik konstruksiyalar orqali



KEYWORDS

Fe'l morfologiyasi, ingliz tili, qoraqalpoq tili, agglutinatsiya, analitik tuzilma, zamon, aspekt, mayl, qiyosiy tilshunoslik.

ifodalaydi, qoraqalpoq tili esa agglutinatív xususiyatga ega bo'lib, grammatik ma'nolarni fe'l tarkibida qo'shimchalar yordamida ifodalaydi. Qiyosiy tahlil natijalari har ikki tilda fe'l kategoriyalarining ifodalanishidagi tipologik farqlarni ochib beradi hamda ularning tarjima, til o'qitish va qiyosiy tilshunoslikdagi ahamiyatini asoslaydi.

Introduction. Verbal morphology represents one of the most structurally and functionally loaded domains of grammar, since verbs encode not only the notion of action or state, but also temporal reference, aspectual interpretation, modality, polarity, and participant roles [2, 183-187]. In this regard, English and Karakalpak exemplify two contrasting morphological strategies. English, as an analytic language, externalizes grammatical meaning through auxiliaries and syntactic configurations, whereas Karakalpak, as an agglutinative Turkic language, internalizes grammatical meaning within the verb by means of systematic suffixation. Consequently, a comparative examination of verbal morphology in these languages reveals fundamental differences in grammatical organization while simultaneously demonstrating functional equivalence.

To begin with, English verbal morphology is characterized by morphological minimalism. Inflectional variation is restricted primarily to tense and limited agreement, while most grammatical distinctions are expressed syntactically. For instance:

I write articles.
She writes articles.
They wrote articles.

Here, tense is marked by -ed, while agreement is restricted to the third-person singular -s. Importantly, the verb itself carries little grammatical information beyond these markers.

In contrast, Karakalpak verb morphology is cumulative and transparent. A single verb form can encode tense, person, number, negation, and mood simultaneously. Consider the verb stem *kel-* "to come":

Men keldim – I came
Sen keldiñ – You came
Ol keldi – He/She came
Bizler keldik – We came

Morphologically, these forms can be segmented as:

kel- (verb stem) + *-di* (past tense) + *-m / -ñ / Ø / -k* (person-number).

Thus, grammatical relations are encoded directly in the verb, reducing the need for explicit subject pronouns.

English tense opposition is fundamentally binary (present vs. past), with future time reference expressed analytically. For example:

I study linguistics.
I studied linguistics.
I will study linguistics next year.

Notably, *will* does not function as an inflectional marker, but as a modal auxiliary that introduces futurity. Therefore, English lacks a morphologically distinct future tense.



Karakalpak, by contrast, encodes temporal distinctions through suffixation. For instance:

Men oqıyman – I read

Men oqıdım – I read (past)

Men oqıyman – I will read [4].

Here, tense is directly attached to the verb stem oqı- “read”. As a result, tense marking in Karakalpak is more explicit and morphologically grounded.

Furthermore, Karakalpak allows nuanced temporal interpretation through additional suffixes and context, whereas English relies on adverbials and auxiliary constructions. Consequently, temporal reference in Karakalpak is structurally compact but semantically rich.

Aspectual meaning in English is highly grammaticalized and expressed through obligatory auxiliary constructions. Progressive aspect emphasizes duration and incompleteness:

She is writing an article.

They were preparing the report.

Perfect aspect, in turn, highlights result or relevance:

She has written the article.

They had finished the work.

These constructions illustrate how English separates lexical meaning (main verb) from grammatical meaning (auxiliaries).

In Karakalpak, aspectual distinctions are often expressed through suffixes or lexicalized auxiliary verbs that retain semantic weight. For example:

Ol maqala jazıp atır – She is writing an article

Ol maqala jazıp boldı – She has finished writing the article

Here, atır conveys ongoing action, while boldı indicates completion. Unlike English auxiliaries, these elements originate from full lexical verbs and retain aspectual semantics. Therefore, aspect in Karakalpak is less rigidly grammaticalized but more semantically motivated.

Moreover, Karakalpak aspectual forms frequently overlap with evidential or modal meanings, whereas English maintains a clearer functional separation. This difference reflects broader typological contrasts between analytic and agglutinative systems.

In English, modality is primarily encoded by modal auxiliaries:

She can speak English.

You must submit the paper.

He might arrive tomorrow.

These modal verbs are syntactically restricted: they do not inflect, lack non-finite forms, and require a bare infinitive. Consequently, modality in English is structurally peripheral to the verb stem.

In Karakalpak, modal meanings are embedded morphologically. Conditional mood, for example, is expressed through the suffix -sa / -se:

Men barsam, ol keledi – If I go, he will come

Similarly, desiderative and imperative meanings are expressed through verb morphology:

Kel – Come!

Kelsin – Let him come

Barayın – Let me go

These examples show that Karakalpak integrates modality into the verb system itself, thereby reducing dependence on separate modal elements.



English expresses voice predominantly through periphrastic constructions:

The book was written by the author.

The house was built last year.

This passive structure requires auxiliary be and a participle, which again confirms the analytic nature of English.

Karakalpak, on the other hand, employs derivational suffixes to alter voice and valency. Consider causative constructions:

Bala jılaydı – The child cries

Ana balanı jılattı – The mother made the child cry[3].

Here, the causative suffix -t increases the number of participants and directly modifies the verb stem. Similar suffixes are used to express reflexive and reciprocal meanings. Therefore, Karakalpak handles voice and valency morphologically rather than syntactically.

English verbs show minimal agreement:

I work – She works

As a result, subject pronouns are obligatory.

In Karakalpak, person-number agreement is systematic and robust:

Baraman – I go

Barasañ – You go

Baradı – He/She goes

Because agreement markers are embedded in the verb, subject pronouns can be omitted. This allows greater discourse flexibility and contributes to pro-drop tendencies in Karakalpak.

English negation is syntactic and auxiliary-dependent:

I do not understand.

She did not answer.

This do-support phenomenon has no direct morphological counterpart in Karakalpak.

In Karakalpak, negation is expressed by a negative suffix:

Men barmayman – I do not go

Ol kelmedi – He did not come.

Negation is therefore integrated into the verb form itself, reinforcing the morphological density of Karakalpak verbal structures.

From a functional perspective, both languages encode the same core grammatical meanings. However, English distributes these meanings across auxiliaries and syntax, whereas Karakalpak compresses them into the verb. This contrast has direct implications for language acquisition. Karakalpak learners of English often struggle with auxiliary selection, aspectual distinctions, and negative constructions, while English learners of Karakalpak face challenges related to suffix stacking and morphological segmentation.

Conclusion. In sum, the comparative analysis of verbal morphology in English and Karakalpak demonstrates that typological differences profoundly shape grammatical structure. English favors analytic, clause-level strategies, while Karakalpak relies on agglutinative, word-level morphology. Nevertheless, both systems achieve communicative efficiency within their respective frameworks. Therefore, a contrastive approach to verbal morphology not only enhances theoretical understanding but also provides valuable insights for applied linguistics, translation studies, and language pedagogy.



References:

1. Kuatbaevna, U. A. (2025). TYPOLOGICAL CONTRASTS IN SYNTAX AMONG ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND TWO TURKIC LANGUAGES. *EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements*, 1(5), 414-419.
2. Norkulova, M. B. (2022). Stages of Karakalpak and English grammar development, their differences and the phenomenon of interference. *Education and Innovative Research*, 12, 183-187.
3. Ҳэзирги каракалпак адебий тилининг грамматикасы. Соз жасалыў хам морфология/ Ноқис: Билим, 1994. —451 б.
4. Ҳэзирги каракалпак тили. Морфология. Ноқис: Қарақалпақстан баспасы, 1981. — 264 б.
5. Базарбаева, М. (2025). Comparative analysis of grammatical systems of adjectives in the english and karakalpak languages. *Инновации в современной лингвистике и преподавании языков*, 1(1), 166-172.