

## Comparison of the General Grammatical Meaning in the Voice Category of English and Uzbek Languages

S. K. Khasanova

«PROFI UNIVERSITY» Navoi Branch

### ABSTRACT

The article is dedicated to a comparative analysis of the general grammatical meaning in the voice category of Uzbek and English languages. The article examines the main features of grammatical meaning, specifically the concepts of general grammatical meaning (GGM), intermediate grammatical meaning (IGM), and specific grammatical meaning (SGM). While GGM is general for linguistic units, it is abstract and linguistic in nature. SGM, on the other hand, is specific to speech units and is realized in speech. IGM serves as an intermediate stage between GGM and SGM.

In the article, the GGM, IGM, and SGM of the voice category, which expresses the relationship between an action and its performer in the verb category, are compared in Uzbek and English languages. As a result, similarities and differences between the two languages are identified. It is emphasized that related languages tend to have more similarities and fewer differences in their morphological and syntactic features. However, it is natural that there are more differences between languages belonging to different families, such as Uzbek and English. Therefore, the article provides valuable insights for linguistics and other fields through a comparative analysis of grammatical categories in these languages.

### ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 11 Jun 2024

Received in revised form

10 Jul 2024

Accepted 29 Aug 2024

**Keywords:** general grammatical meaning (GGM), intermediate grammatical meaning (IGM), and specific grammatical meaning (SGM).

---

Hosting by Innovatus Publishing Co. All rights reserved. © 2024

---

It is known that grammatical meaning is a set of generalized and abstract meanings of linguistic units that participate in the formation of speech. The generality of grammatical meaning, unlike lexical meaning, is manifested in its relevance to a large number of linguistic units. Thousands of words like *run*, *think*, *look* and *write* share a general meaning in terms of “expressing action and state”. Without grammatical meaning, the realization of a lexeme is impossible. Grammatical meaning can either pre-exist in a lexeme or be formed with the help of specific means. In linguistics, it is customary to classify grammatical meaning into general grammatical meaning (GGM), intermediate grammatical meaning (IGM), and specific grammatical meaning (SGM). Here, GGM is non-material and linguistic in nature, as it belongs to the language. SGM, being inherent in the units realized in speech, is considered a speech meaning. Naturally, the GGM of a lexeme does not directly materialize. The process of realizing the GGM of a lexeme in speech, up to the expression of SGM, is considered an intermediate grammatical meaning (IGM). This is, in fact, a reflection of the dialectical categories of generality-specificity-particularity in linguistics. Because “Generality is the manifestation of a variety of properties and features common to individual, distinct phenomena in the world in a unified manner. The connection, relevance, and relationship between particularity and generality are expressed through the category of specificity”.

The analysis of the general, intermediate, and specific grammatical meanings of the category of voice, which expresses the relationship between action and its performer in the verb category, and comparing

them with their English equivalents, allows us to identify the similarities and differences in the voice forms between the two languages, as well as in the verb category as a whole. In related languages, morphological and syntactic features have many similarities and few differences. However, it is natural that the differences increase between languages belonging to different families, such as English and Uzbek. Therefore, the comparison of grammatical categories in Uzbek and English languages is beneficial for linguistics and other fields, considering the fact that these languages belong to different language families.

The verb categories are formed based on the general grammatical meaning of the category. In Uzbek linguistics, the general grammatical meaning (GGM) of the verb is identified as “expressing action and state as a process<sup>1</sup>”. This GGM is also applicable to the verb category in the English language. In this regard, it is appropriate to cite the following idea: “The verb is an important category that expresses a dynamically developing process, action. In this case, the verb category not only expresses real actions (to work, to build), but also states, existence (to be, to become, to lie), and various relationships (to love, to appreciate)”. Through this general grammatical meaning, lexemes related to the verb category are realized in speech<sup>2</sup>. Naturally, the GGM leaves its traces in each speech realization. The voice category is one of the nine grammatical categories distinguished in Uzbek linguistics. Like every grammatical category that has its own components, the voice category plays an important role in revealing the essence of the verb, particularly in showing the relationship between the performer and the action. Because “generality is restored based on eliminating differences in individually observed particularities and generalizing similarities. The essence, like in all categorical meanings, is determined not based on individually observed particularities but by examining the system of the object whose essence is being defined and its relations with its paradigmatic counterparts in linguistic phenomena<sup>3</sup>” In Uzbek, the voice category is distinguished as a classificatory category of the verb. The GGM of the voice form is defined as “expressing the relationship of the action to the subject (performer)”. The five members of the voice category in Uzbek are formed based on this general grammatical meaning.

The active voice in Uzbek is determined by the absence of other voice forms within the verb. In linguistic literature, the active voice is also referred to as the basic voice of the verb. The general grammatical meaning of this voice in Uzbek linguistics is standardized as “expressing whether the action is performed or not performed by the person or object indicated by the subject”. It is natural that this form is also based on the relationship of the action to the performer. The voice category in Uzbek is considered constant. This means that the essence of the voice category manifests in any verb that appears in speech. The constancy of the category for the words of the group indicates the presence of a zero-form member. In the voice category of the Uzbek language, this zero form generates the active voice. In fact, the realized, spoken form of a lexeme is called a word form. Generally, the general grammatical meaning of the category is more prominently expressed in word forms with a zero form. The same situation can be observed in the active voice. “A grammatical category is a system of grammatical forms that express this meaning with one or more grammatical meanings that are taken in comparison to each other”, and the zero form can constitute one of the members in this system. In grammatical categories with a zero-form member, the members are divided into two groups based on form: those with a specific form and a member that does not have a special form expressing the category. The zero-form member is defined by the absence of a grammatical form. Members with specific forms clearly express a certain part (form) of the general grammatical meaning of the category. The zero-form member, however, may reveal the meaning of other members of the category as well. From this perspective, the active voice can also express the meanings conveyed by other voice forms. For example, in the sentence “Yig‘ilishda muammoga aloqador xodimlar qatnashdilar” (“Employees related to the issue attended the meeting”), we witness that the collective voice meaning is expressed through the active voice.

The general grammatical meaning of the active voice verb in Uzbek encompasses not only the performance of the action and state by the subject but also its non-performance. In other words, the active

---

<sup>1</sup> Musulmonova N. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tilida grammatik ma’no tarkibi. – Toshkent: GlobeEdit, 2023. – B.11. – 92 b.

<sup>2</sup> Казанцева Я.Н., Немчинова Н.В., Семенова Е.В, Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. – Красноярск: Сибирский федеральный университет, 2015. – С.50. – 135 с.

<sup>3</sup> Sayfullayeva R. va boshq. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2010. – B.191. – 404 b.

voice category does not differentiate between the positive or negative nature of the action and state expressed by the verb. For example, in the sentence “Bugun mashg‘ulotda butun jamoa qatnashmadi” (“Today, the whole team did not attend the training”), the active voice indicates that the action expressed by the verb was not performed in the past tense. It is clear that the active voice in Uzbek expresses the performance or non-performance of the action and state expressed by the verb in one of the three tenses. At the same time, it can fulfill the functions of other voice forms depending on the context. This can be considered an inherent feature of the general grammatical meaning of the active voice.

In English, the voice category is also divided into two parts: active and passive voices. “In English, the active voice manifests in the indicative form and includes tense forms. Therefore, the active voice in this language is formed as follows: Subject (agent) + first form of the verb + receiver of the action<sup>4</sup>”. This template can produce thousands of sentences in the active voice, such as “Ravshan teaches people”, “Karim is translating the novel”, “I call my father”. In all these examples, we can see that tense forms participate as indicators of the active voice. The participation of tense forms is essential. The specific type of tense involved is irrelevant for the active voice to manifest. The sentences mentioned above also involve different tense forms. Therefore, apart from tense forms, the participation of the subject and object, their status in the sentence, and other factors actively contribute to the emergence of the active voice. When discussing verb voices, it is also necessary to clarify issues such as the subject of the action and how it is referred to in linguistic literature. In most sources, the subject of the action is also referred to as the agent (in Russian, “agens”). In nominative structured languages (languages based on the opposition between the subject and the object), the subject of the action appears as the subject in the sentence. Therefore, in the template mentioned above, the subject and agent are equated. It should be noted that “the agent is considered the most important semantic category in linguistics, fulfilling the most fundamental semantic functions. This semantic category is the active participant in the situation, the performer of the action, or its controller”. It is understood that the main characteristics shaping the general grammatical meaning of the active voice include “the necessity of the agent's participation and its status as the subject”. True, the fact that words appear in a certain sentence part, their inevitable participation in sentences, and other factors may seem a bit complex when considered as a general concept. However, these characteristics are the main conditions for the manifestation of the active voice in English. Summarizing the ideas, we can formulate the general grammatical meaning of the active voice in English as “an action performed (or not performed) by an agent in the subject position at a certain time”.

In the sentence “The scientist did the research”, the action (did the) performed by the agent (the scientist) in the past on the object (the research) produces the active voice<sup>5</sup>. The general grammatical meaning of the active voice (active voice) is expressed in the example mentioned above with certain specificities (such as the involvement of the past tense (did), the choice of the word “scientist” as the agent, and the object (the research) appearing as the complement). Because any GGM, when realized in speech, passes through the prism of intermediate and specific meanings. In this process, it acquires certain specificities. Only after that does it become a speech unit. Grammatical forms, especially verb voices, also have a unique role in the realization, i.e., the division and emergence of their general grammatical meaning in speech. However, “grammatical forms, as fluctuators and bifurcators of grammatical meaning, often hold a dominant value. But this should not lead to the absolutization of their capabilities. Since synergy is one of the main qualities of living systems, non-linguistic factors cannot remain neutral and occupy a passive status as lifeless elements of the system when linguistic factors are in motion<sup>6</sup>. “We can agree with M. Ernazarova's idea that grammatical meaning, including general grammatical meaning, can never retain its pure form when realized. The ideas mentioned above are also relevant to the realization of the active voice in English. In general, when comparing the GGMs of the active voice in Uzbek and English, we can see that they share several common features. Namely, in the active voice, in both languages, the subject is

---

<sup>4</sup> Хамраева М. Категория залога в русском, узбекском и английском языках // So‘nggi ilmiy tadqiqotlar nazariyasi. Vol.5. №1. 2022. – В. 290-294.

<sup>5</sup> <https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Агeнс> [Elektron manba:] Murojaat sanasi: 22.06.2024.

<sup>6</sup> Эрнazarова М.С. Грамматик маъно лисоний ва прагматик омиллар ҳамкорлигида: Филол. фанл. д-ри дисс. – Самарқанд, 2018. – Б.96. – 242 б.

an active participant in the speech process, it appears in the subject position in the sentence; the object functions as a complement; tense forms serve as one of the indicators of the active voice; and the active voice can freely express both positive and negative actions. At the same time, it is important not to overlook certain differences in the grammatical essence of the active voice in English and Uzbek. For example, in Uzbek, it is possible to omit the subject in sentences where the performer of the action is logically clear, thus forming subjectless sentences. Therefore, the participation of the subject in the sentence is not necessarily included in the GGM of the active voice in Uzbek. However, this cannot be said about the GGM of active voice verbs in English. This can be explained by the unique grammatical characteristics of each language.

When comparing the general grammatical meanings of the members forming the voice category, it is essential to consider the unique role that the voice forms play among the verb's classificatory forms. In Uzbek, the voice forms are more closely related to lexical meaning compared to other morphological forms, which arguably defines their status within the language's grammatical system. Voice forms are observed to “blend with lexical meaning due to their complex semantic nature, often being indistinguishable from word-forming elements, and as a result, some lexicographical sources always treat word forms generated by voice forms as primary words”. Paying attention to these aspects when comparing the voice category with that of unrelated languages ensures effective analysis. We will continue the comparison of the GGMs of the voice category in Uzbek and English with the members present in both languages. The passive voice is one such shared member.

In Uzbek, the GGM of the passive voice is defined as “a voice that separates the verb from the performer of the action and converts the verb into an intransitive verb”. The etymology of the word “*majhul*” (meaning “unknown, uncertain”) relates to the performer of the action. Indeed, in explanatory dictionaries, the term “*majhul*” is defined as “a voice form indicating that the performer of the action is unknown”. This implies that the passive voice minimizes the involvement of the action's performer in the sentence. In Uzbek, converting a transitive verb into the passive voice results in the verb becoming intransitive. This GGM of the passive voice is realized in speech, intermingled with various intermediate and specific grammatical meanings. The passive voice form also exists in English as one of the two voice forms, commonly used when the performer of the action is either unimportant or unspecified. “In English, if the subject represents a person or thing that receives an action performed by another person or object, the verb is used in the passive voice”. This shows that there are similarities in the GGMs of the passive voice in both English and Uzbek. Like in Uzbek, in English, unlike the active voice, the performer of the action (agent) in the passive voice may be unknown or not mentioned in the sentence. Even if mentioned, the agent does not assume the role of the subject in the sentence. Therefore, when sentences in English are converted from the active voice to the passive voice, certain changes occur in the roles of the agent (performer of the action) and the object (the entity to which the action is directed). This can also be expressed in a model form:

ACTIVE: Agent + Verb + Object

PASSIVE: Object + be + Verb3 + by + Agent

Overall, the comparison of the GGMs of the passive voice in English and Uzbek reveals many similarities, particularly in the absence or inactivity of the performer of the action. However, the use of tense forms in the passive voice in Uzbek is somewhat more flexible compared to English. Thus, when expressing the passive voice in both English and Uzbek, the subject and the performer of the action are not conveyed through a single linguistic unit. Instead, they are logically represented by different units, making the introduction of the performer into speech unnecessary or logically impossible.

In Uzbek, there are three additional members of the voice category that do not exist in English: causative, reciprocal, and reflexive voices. Although these voice forms are not recognized in English, they are translated using various means. Therefore, it is appropriate to discuss their GGMs as well. The first of these is the reciprocal voice. The GGM of this voice is “the performer’s collaboration in carrying out the action”. Here, the number of performers of the action and state is more than one. The reciprocal voice stands out in the voice category for its simple semantic structure. The bifurcation of the GGM of the reciprocal voice (bifurcation - Latin ‘*bifurcus*’, meaning “division into two”) into intermediate and



specific grammatical meanings is influenced by lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic factors, resulting in meanings such as reciprocal-equality and reciprocal-cooperation. It becomes clear that in addition to the GGM of collaboration in performing the action, the reciprocal voice can also express cooperation in carrying out the action. The morphological form plays a significant role in this context, as the use of morphological forms in Uzbek indicates the presence of a grammatical category in a phrase or sentence. Sometimes, the meanings conveyed by a phrase or sentence may not include the meaning inherent in the grammatical category. For instance, in the sentence “Besh yoshli qizaloq onasiga kir yuvishdi” (“The five-year-old girl helped her mother wash clothes”), it is logically understood that the action was not performed equally by both. However, the presence of the reciprocal voice is determined by the presence of the morphological form (-ish). Analysis shows that the GGM of “performing an action by more than one subject” in the reciprocal voice is manifested through various intermediate and specific grammatical meanings, such as “cooperation” and “alternating actions”. In other words, “generality is restored based on eliminating differences in individually observed particularities and generalizing similarities, while the essence, like in all categorical meanings, is determined not based on individually observed particularities but by examining the system of the object whose essence is being defined and its relations”. A similar situation can be observed in the realization of the GGM of the reciprocal voice. The reciprocal voice form is translated into English using the active voice. Naturally, the GGM of the reciprocal voice in Uzbek is conveyed in English as the essence of the active voice. Indeed, translation transformation sometimes serves as a solution to translation issues, including the translation of grammatical forms.

The causative voice in Uzbek is an essential member of the category, expressing the performance of an action by another agent. It should be noted that causative voice forms are closely linked to the different grammatical meanings of the verb. This is because the causative voice converts intransitive verbs into transitive verbs. In this case, transitivity is formed within the verb's essence by the addition of a specific means (the causative voice form). For example, in verbs like “yugurtirmoq” (to make run), “sakratmoq” (to make jump), “qo‘rqitmoq” (to frighten), “oqizmoq” (to make flow), “chiqartmoq” (to make go out), the property of transitivity is created by the addition of causative voice forms. In fact, the GGM of the voice category is also manifested in the causative voice. In linguistic sources, the GGM of the causative voice is defined as “adding a performer to the action, introducing an 'extra' performer into the process, and converting an intransitive verb into a transitive verb”. In other words, in the causative voice, the subject performs the action and state at the initiative of another agent. In this process, a chain of performers is formed to realize the action, including the initiator and the performer. For example, in the sentence “Pahlavon bolani kuldirdi” (“The wrestler made the boy laugh”), the action (laughing) is initiated by the wrestler and is realized through the influence on the performer (the boy), resulting in the causative voice. Sometimes, this chain can expand further, where the performer also becomes an initiator, leading to the realization of the action under the influence of a three-step chain of performers (initiators). This situation arises when the causative voice form is added multiple times. For example, when verbs like “yodlattirmoq” (to make memorize), “chiqartirmoq” (to make go out), “so‘rattirmoq” (to make ask), “yodlattirmoq” (to make memorize) are introduced into speech, the chain of performers consists of three steps. The causative voice inherently involves converting intransitive verbs into transitive verbs. If a verb is already transitive, the causative voice form does not alter this grammatical feature. The translation of causative voice forms into English is also done using the active voice. For example, the sentence “The teacher explained the topic to the students” is the English equivalent of a sentence formed with the causative voice in Uzbek. This is explained by the absence of a causative voice form in English.

The reflexive voice is an important member of the voice category, uniting the subject and object. In Uzbek, this voice involves the performer and the object being the same person or entity. Like the causative voice, the reflexive voice is closely linked to the different grammatical meanings of the verb. This is because reflexive voice forms convert transitive verbs into intransitive verbs. In other words, the inherent transitivity in the verb's essence is transformed into intransitivity through the addition of the reflexive voice form. This can be observed in verbs like “artinmoq” (to wipe oneself), “yuvinoq” (to wash oneself), “berilmoq” (to devote oneself), “o‘ylanmoq” (to ponder), “kiyinoq” (to dress oneself), “tortinoq” (to hesitate). Therefore, the GGM of the reflexive voice encompasses the following characteristics: “unifying the subject and object, converting a transitive verb into an intransitive verb”. The unification of the subject and object in the reflexive voice is a feature specific to a certain voice type

in Uzbek, and this form is also translated into English using the active voice. This voice contrasts with the causative voice in its conversion of a transitive verb into an intransitive verb. This contrast continues through the process of transitioning GGMs into intermediate and specific grammatical meanings.

The comparison of the GGMs of verb voices in English and Uzbek shows that they share generality in expressing the relationship between action and performer. However, they differ in terms of their relation to tense forms,

### **USED LITERATURE:**

Here is the translation of the references into English:

1. Hamroyev M. et al. "Mother Tongue." – Tashkent: Iqtisod-moliya, 2007. – p. 74. – 276 pages.
2. Musulmonova N. "The Structure of Grammatical Meaning in Modern Uzbek Literary Language." – Tashkent: GlobeEdit, 2023. – p. 11. – 92 pages.
3. "Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language: 6 volumes, Volume 3." – Tashkent: Gʻafur Gʻulom, 2022. – p. 83.
4. Sayfullayeva R. et al. "Modern Uzbek Literary Language." – Tashkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2010. – p. 191. – 404 pages.
5. "Modern Uzbek Language / Team of Authors." – Tashkent: Mumtoz soʻz, 2008. – p. 444. – 522 pages.
6. Kazantseva Y.N., Nemchinova N.V., Semyonova E.V. "Theoretical Grammar of the English Language." – Krasnoyarsk: Siberian Federal University, 2015. – p. 50. – 135 pages.
7. Kachalova K.N., Izrailovich E.E. "Practical Grammar of the English Language." – Bishkek: Kyrgyz Branch of the California International Academy of Sciences, 2001. – p. 164. – 664 pages.
8. "National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan: 12 volumes, Volume 1." – Tashkent: UzME, 2001. – p. 391.
9. Khamraeva M. "The Category of Voice in Russian, Uzbek, and English Languages." // "The Theory of the Latest Scientific Research." Vol.5. No.1. 2022. – pp. 290-294.
10. Ernazarova M.S. "Grammatical Meaning in the Interaction of Linguistic and Pragmatic Factors: Doctoral Dissertation in Philology." – Samarkand, 2018. – p. 96. – 242 pages.

<https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Агeнc> application date: 22.06.2024