



## SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF MOOD IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Student: **Kholmamatova Anora**

Scientific supervisor: **Mukhamadiyev Aziz Shavkatovich**

**Abstract:** When expressing a speaker's attitude toward the activity or situation that the verb is indicating, mood—a grammatical category—is extremely important. It's an essential component of many languages, like Uzbek and English, and allows speakers to express a variety of nuances, including wishes, possibilities, orders, and assertions. Recognizing the ways in which these two languages employ mood differs and similarly offers important insights into their respective cultural settings and syntactic and semantic structures. The imperative, subjunctive, and indicative moods are the three main ones in English. Statements of facts and opinions belong in the indicative mood; orders and requests belong in the imperative mood; wishes, fictitious scenarios, and actions that are not true to reality belong in the subjunctive mood. Despite its limited usage, the subjunctive mood in English is still a crucial part of the language's grammatical structure.

An extension of the Turkic language family, Uzbek similarly uses the indicative, imperative, and subjunctive moods, but it also has the optative and conditional moods. In contrast to the imperative mood, which gives directives, the indicative mood works similarly to its English counterpart. Nonetheless, Uzbek uses the subjunctive mood more frequently, frequently covering situations where English would use conditional structures. One of Uzbek's distinctive moods, optative, conveys wishes and desires, expanding the expressive possibilities of the language. We are better able to understand the similarities and distinctive qualities of each language when we compare these components of mood in



Uzbek and English. This comparative analysis illuminates the linguistic diversity that influences human communication in addition to improving our comprehension of their grammatical systems.

**Key words:** Indicative mood, imperative mood, conditional mood, subjunctive mood, Uzbek language, English language.

## INTRODUCTION

The way verbs are utilized to convey the speaker's attitude toward the activity or state they are describing is known as mood in linguistics. This encompasses the manifestation of actuality, aspiration, requirement, duty, potential, or uncertainty. The extensive systems of verbal moods found in both Uzbek and English reflect the distinct linguistic and cultural settings from which they originate. These languages provide an attractive comparative study because of their striking variances and surprising similarities in their mood structures, despite their disparate geographical and cultural backgrounds.

Three primary forms are used in English to communicate mood: indicative, imperative, and subjunctive. Statements that are factual or pose inquiries are best expressed in the indicative mood (e.g., "She is reading a book"). Commands or pleas, such as "Read the book!" are expressed in the imperative mood. Subjunctive moods convey wishes, fictitious scenarios, or behaviors that are not true, even if they are less common in modern usage (e.g., "If she were here, she would read the book").

On the other hand, a more complex system of moods is employed in Uzbek, a Turkic language that is spoken in Uzbekistan and its surrounding areas. Similar to English, Uzbek has two moods: imperative for demands (like "Kitobni o'qi!" - "Read the book!") and indicative for assertions of fact (like "U kitob o'giyapti" - "She is reading a book"). But Uzbek also has the conditional mood, which depicts hypothetical or contingent acts (e.g.,



"Agar u kelsa" - "If she comes") and the optative mood, which expresses hopes or desires (e.g., "U kelsa edi" - "If only she would come").

The two languages' usage of the indicative and imperative moods is one of their main points of similarity. The indicative mood is mostly used in Uzbek and English to ask inquiries and narrate factual information. Similar directives are given in both languages using the imperative mood, indicating a same linguistic technique for giving instructions. The use and intricacy of the conditional and subjunctive moods, however, show a notable distinction. English, especially in its current form, uses modal verbs (e.g., "should," "would," and "could") to convey similar nuances more frequently than it does the subjunctive mood. In English, the subjunctive is mostly used in formal or literary situations and has essentially gone obsolete. On the other hand, Uzbek takes a more methodical and clear approach to circumstances and potentialities by deliberately using the conditional mood to indicate hypothetical situations.

Furthermore, Uzbek's optative mood—which lacks an English equivalent—highlights the language's and culture's emphasis on expressing wishes and desires via a particular grammatical structure. This mood emphasizes how language may convey cultural attitudes and values in complex ways; in this example, it highlights the significance of aspirations and optimistic sentiments in Uzbek communication.

In summary, the indicative and imperative moods are fundamentally comparable in both English and Uzbek, but the treatment of the subjunctive, conditional, and optative moods differs greatly between the two languages. Uzbek has intricate and varied mood structures, which contrast with English's current inclination to simplify and employ less subjunctive mood, reflecting wider language and cultural distinctions. Recognizing these parallels and discrepancies helps us better understand how each language functions as well as the manner in which other cultures use language to communicate truth, possibility, and desire.

## CONCLUSION



In conclusion, both similarities and differences between the moods of the English and Uzbek languages can be seen, highlighting the distinctive linguistic traits and cultural backgrounds of each language. Both languages exhibit a fundamental similarity in expressing basic communicative intents by using the indicative and imperative moods to convey factual assertions and orders. This resemblance highlights a common language approach used by various language families to provide instructions and important information. On the other hand, there are notable distinctions between the hypothetical and desirable states' expression. English typically uses modal verbs to express nuances of possibility and need because of its comparatively simplistic and increasingly antiquated use of the subjunctive mood. This represents a shift in modern usage toward grammatical economy and a less formal style. On the other hand, Uzbek preserves a strong system of mood, which includes a clear conditional mood for hypothetical situations and a clear optative mood for expressing wishes. The intricacy of the mood structure points to a language focus on accurately defining different gradations of potential and desire, which is indicative of cultural norms that place a premium on the clear presentation of expectations and constraints. These distinctions show how Uzbek and English have evolved differently, but they also show how linguistic patterns can reflect and influence cultural beliefs. Thus, a comparative analysis of mood in various languages offers important new insights into the linguistic structures of each language as well as the cultural foundations influencing its communication patterns. Our understanding of the rich tapestry of human language and the ways in which it encodes human experience is enhanced when we comprehend these dynamics.



## 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.