

Comparative-Linguistic Analysis of Objectivity and Boundedness Meanings in Verb Combinations

Inamova Dilfuza Ergashevna

“English applied translation” department, Translation faculty
Uzbekistan state university of world languages

Abstract: The creative processes of the Kokand Khanate period, the intellectual collaboration of scholars from Namangan, and their literary traditions are analyzed. Based on historical and literary sources, Namangan is presented as a historically significant cultural center that has long produced prominent poets and enlightened thinkers. The life and creative activity of Nodim Namangoniy, his attitude toward the socio-political events of the colonial period, as well as his satirical and didactic views, are examined on a scholarly basis. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of the role of the Namangan literary environment in the history of Uzbek literature and the significance of Nodim Namangoniy as an enlightened poet.

Key words: objectivity, boundedness, verb combinations, transitivity, telicity, verb semantics, English, Uzbek, comparative linguistics.

Introduction

Verb combinations play an important role in the semantic and syntactic organization of language. A verb does not function as an isolated unit in speech. Its meaning becomes clear through its connection with objects, modifiers, prepositions, particles, auxiliary verbs, and contextual elements. This is why the study of verb combinations is especially important in comparative linguistics.

The topic of objectivity and boundedness is closely related to the broader categories of transitivity and aspect. In traditional grammar, objectivity is connected with the ability of a verb to take an object. For example, in the English sentence *She wrote a letter*, the verb *wrote* is connected with the object *a letter*. In Uzbek, the sentence *U xat yozdi* expresses a similar object relation.

Boundedness, however, refers to whether the action is understood as having a limit or endpoint. For example, *write a letter* is bounded because the action ends when the letter is completed. By contrast, *write letters* may be interpreted as unbounded because the sentence does not specify a single completed object.

Bernard Comrie explains aspect as the way the internal temporal structure of a situation is viewed, which is directly relevant to bounded and unbounded action meanings. Hopper and Thompson also argue that transitivity is not only the presence of an object, but a complex relation involving agency, affectedness, punctuality, and telicity.

Theoretical Background

Objectivity is mainly associated with the relationship between the verb and the object. If the action is directed toward an object, the construction becomes object-oriented. However, this object may be affected in different degrees. For example:

- *He touched the door.*

- *He opened the door.*
- *He broke the door.*

All three sentences have an object, but the degree of affectedness is different. In *touched the door*, the object is weakly affected. In *opened the door*, the object changes its state. In *broke the door*, the object is strongly affected and the action is clearly resultative.

This shows that objectivity is not merely syntactic. It also has semantic depth. Hopper and Thompson's theory of transitivity supports this view because it treats transitivity as a scale consisting of several components, including participants, telicity, punctuality, volitionality, and affectedness of the object.

Boundedness is related to the aspectual structure of the action. Zeno Vendler's classification of verbs into states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements is important here. Activities such as *run* and *swim* are usually unbounded, while accomplishments such as *write a letter* and achievements such as *arrive* are bounded because they involve an endpoint or result.

Objectivity and Boundedness in English Verb Combinations

In English, objectivity is usually expressed through direct object constructions. The object may be definite, indefinite, countable, uncountable, singular, or plural. These features influence the boundedness of the whole verb combination.

For example:

- *She read books.*
- *She read a book.*
- *She read the book.*
- *She read the whole book.*

The verb *read* remains the same, but the object changes the aspectual meaning of the sentence. *Read books* may express a general or repeated activity. *Read a book* is more bounded because one book gives the action a possible endpoint. *Read the whole book* is strongly bounded because the object is complete and the action is presented as finished.

Table 1. Objectivity and boundedness in English

Verb combination	Objectivity	Boundedness	Explanation
<i>write letters</i>	+	weak	Plural indefinite object, repeated or general action
<i>write a letter</i>	+	strong	Singular countable object creates endpoint
<i>read books</i>	+	weak	General activity without clear endpoint
<i>read the book</i>	+	strong	Definite object strengthens completion
<i>drink water</i>	+	weak	Mass object does not define a limit
<i>drink a glass of water</i>	+	strong	Quantified object creates a boundary
<i>run</i>	-	weak	No object or endpoint
<i>run to the station</i>	-	strong	Directional phrase creates endpoint

In English, boundedness is often created through the entire verb phrase rather than the verb alone. Friedrich, Xue, and Palmer note that aspectual meaning concerns how the internal temporal structure of situations is presented, including whether the situation is finished, ongoing, habitual, or viewed as a whole.

Objectivity and Boundedness in Uzbek Verb Combinations

In Uzbek, objectivity is commonly expressed through the relation between the verb and its object. The accusative marker **-ni** plays an important role when the object is definite:

- *U kitob o'qidi.* He/she read a book or books.
- *U kitobni o'qidi.* He/she read the book.

The object **kitobni** is more definite than **kitob**, and this definiteness strengthens the object-oriented meaning of the sentence. However, boundedness in Uzbek is often expressed even more clearly through auxiliary verb constructions.

For example:

- *U kitobni o'qib chiqdi.* He/she read the book completely.
- *U xatni yozib bitirdi.* He/she finished writing the letter.
- *U choyni ichib bo'ldi.* He/she finished drinking tea.

The Uzbek tense-aspect-modality system describes **verb-IB CHIQ-** as expressing completion of an action in its full extent, from beginning to end. It also describes **verb-IB BIT-** / **BITIR-** as expressing completion at the terminal point of an action, and **verb-IB BO'L-** as a basic form for full completion.

Table 2. Objectivity and boundedness in Uzbek

Uzbek verb combination	Objectivity	Boundedness	Meaning
<i>kitob o'qimoq</i>	+	weak	To read a book/books
<i>kitobni o'qimoq</i>	+	medium	To read the book
<i>kitobni o'qib chiqmoq</i>	+	strong	To read the book completely
<i>xat yozmoq</i>	+	medium	To write a letter
<i>xatni yozib bitirmoq</i>	+	strong	To finish writing the letter
<i>choy ichmoq</i>	+	weak	To drink tea
<i>choyni ichib bo'lmoq</i>	+	strong	To finish drinking tea
<i>piyolani sindirib qo'yimoq</i>	+	strong	To break the cup with resultative meaning

Uzbek auxiliary constructions make boundedness more explicit than in English. The construction **-ib qo'y-** expresses an action that causes a change of state and has lasting relevance, while **-ib yubor-** and **-ib tashla-** may express sudden, intense, and completed action.

Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek

English and Uzbek both express objectivity and boundedness, but they use different linguistic tools. In English, objectivity is mostly shown through word order and direct object position. In Uzbek, objectivity is often supported by case marking, especially **-ni**.

Compare:

- English: *She read the book.*
- Uzbek: *U kitobni o'qidi.*

In both sentences, the object is definite. However, Uzbek marks this definiteness morphologically through **-ni**, while English uses the definite article *the*. Mana shu yerda tillar o'z xarakterini ko'rsatadi: ingliz tili artikl bilan, o'zbek tili qo'shimcha bilan ish bitiradi.

Boundedness also differs. English often depends on object type and context:

- *He drank water.* Unbounded or weakly bounded.
- *He drank a glass of water.* Bounded.

Uzbek may express the same difference through object marking and auxiliary constructions:

- *U suv ichdi.* He/she drank water.
- *U bir stakan suvni ichib bo'ldi.* He/she finished drinking a glass of water.

Table 3. Comparative features of English and Uzbek

Feature	English	Uzbek
Main object marker	Word order, articles	Word order, accusative marker -ni
Main boundedness marker	Object type, quantifier, preposition, aspect	Auxiliary verb construction, object marking, context
Weakly bounded action	<i>read books</i>	<i>kitob o'qimoq</i>
Strongly bounded action	<i>read the whole book</i>	<i>kitobni o'qib chiqmoq</i>
Resultative action	<i>break the cup</i>	<i>piyolani sindirib qo'yimoq</i>
Completion	<i>finish writing a letter</i>	<i>xatni yozib bitirmoq</i>
Directional endpoint	<i>run to the station</i>	<i>bekatgacha yugurib bormoq</i>

Semantic Interaction Between Objectivity and Boundedness

Objectivity and boundedness are closely connected because the object often determines the endpoint of an action. If the object is countable, definite, and affected, the action is more likely to be bounded.

For example:

- *build houses* - repeated or general activity;
- *build a house* - bounded accomplishment;
- *build the house completely* - strongly bounded completed action.

In Uzbek:

- *uy qurmoq* - to build a house;
- *uyini qurmoq* - to build the house;
- *uyini qurib bitirmoq* - to finish building the house.

The examples show that the same verb can become more or less bounded depending on the object and its grammatical environment. This confirms Vendler's idea that verbs and verb phrases differ according to their temporal and event structure.

In both languages, the strongest boundedness appears when the object is definite, affected, and resultative:

- *He broke the glass.*
- *U stakanni sindirib qo'ydi.*

In these examples, the action changes the object's state. Therefore, objectivity and boundedness become fully connected.

Discussion

The analysis shows that verb combinations are a key area where grammar and semantics meet. Objectivity shows the direction of the action toward an object, while boundedness shows whether the action reaches a limit or result. These meanings are not always separate. In many cases, the object itself becomes the semantic boundary of the action.

English tends to express boundedness through syntactic and lexical means. Articles, quantifiers, prepositions, and object types are very important. Uzbek, on the other hand, often expresses boundedness through auxiliary verb constructions and morphological markers.

This difference is important for translation and language teaching. For example, the English sentence *He read the book* may be translated into Uzbek as:

- *U kitobni o'qidi.*
- *U kitobni o'qib chiqdi.*

The first translation simply states the action. The second translation emphasizes completion. Therefore, translators must pay attention not only to the object but also to whether the action is bounded or unbounded in context. A literal translation may lose the aspectual meaning. Til shunaqa, birgina **chiqdi** qo'shilmasa, butun ma'no yarimta nondek qolib ketadi.

Conclusion

Objectivity and boundedness are important semantic and syntactic categories in English and Uzbek verb combinations. Objectivity refers to the relation between a verb and its object, while boundedness refers to the presence of an endpoint, result, or completion in the action.

In English, objectivity is mainly expressed through direct object position, articles, and noun phrase structure. Boundedness is formed through object definiteness, quantifiers, prepositional phrases, and aspectual interpretation. In Uzbek, objectivity is often marked by the accusative suffix **-ni**, while boundedness is commonly expressed through auxiliary verb constructions such as **-ib chiq-**, **-ib bitir-**, **-ib bo'l-**, **-ib yubor-**, and **-ib qo'y-**.

The comparative analysis shows that both languages express similar semantic relations, but their grammatical mechanisms are different. English relies more on syntactic composition and lexical context, while Uzbek uses morphological and analytical constructions more actively. Therefore, the study of objectivity and boundedness in verb combinations is valuable for comparative linguistics, translation studies, and language teaching.

References:

1. Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Friedrich, A., Xue, N., & Palmer, A. (2022). *A Kind Introduction to Lexical and*

- Grammatical Aspect, with a Survey of Computational Approaches. arXiv.
3. Guérin, H. (2021). The Uzbek Tense/Aspect/Modality System. Center for East European and Russian/Eurasian Studies, University of Chicago.
 4. Hopper, P. J., & Thompson, S. A. (1980). Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language*, 56(2), 251-299.
 5. Smith, C. S. (1997). *The Parameter of Aspect*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
 6. Tenny, C. L. (1994). *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
 7. Vendler, Z. (1957). Verbs and Times. *The Philosophical Review*, 66 (2), 143-160.
 8. Inamova, Dilfuza E. Practicality and Implementation of the Theories in Classroom: Reflection. *Academicia Globe*, vol. 2, no. 6, 2021, pp. 311-314,
 9. Inamova D.E. Bakirova Kh.B. Term as a linguistic unit in terminopole. International Conference on Adaptive Learning Technologies [Vol. 17 \(2025\)](#):
 10. Inamova D.E. Bakirova Kh.B. Peculiarities of Teaching ESP Terminology. International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), January 2025, pp.9-11, URL: <https://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd72673.pdf>
 11. Bakirova H.B. et al. The role of terms of specialty in professionally oriented education //Journal of Hunan University (Natural sciences) Vol. – 2021. – T. 48.
 12. Bakirova H.B. The content of teaching foreign languages //Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching. – 2022. – T. 2. – C. 91-94.