

THE COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGY OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Rustamova S.M.¹

Scientific advisor: Vafaeva Z.K.

Abstract:

This article explores the comparative typology of English and Uzbek, focusing on their phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical differences. English belongs to the Indo-European family and is an analytic language, while Uzbek is a Turkic, agglutinative language. Despite these structural differences, both languages have experienced lexical borrowing due to globalization. The study provides insights into their linguistic features, which are essential for translation studies, language learning, and cross-linguistic analysis.

Keywords: Comparative typology, English, Uzbek, phonetics, morphology, syntax, lexical borrowing, agglutinative, analytic, language families.

Language typology is a crucial area in linguistic studies, providing a structural comparison of languages from different families. English, a Germanic language, and Uzbek, a Turkic language, differ significantly in their phonetic, morphological, and syntactic structures. While English is an analytic language that relies on word order and auxiliary verbs, Uzbek is an agglutinative language that uses suffixes to express grammatical relations. Despite these differences, the increasing globalization and technological advancements have led to notable lexical exchanges between the two languages. This article examines their typological distinctions and similarities.

Phonetic Differences and Similarities English has a complex phonetic system with a significant number of vowel sounds, including diphthongs (e.g., “time” /taɪm/) and unstressed schwa sounds (e.g., “sofa” /ˈsəʊ.fə/) [1,19]. In contrast, Uzbek follows a vowel harmony system, meaning vowels within a word tend to harmonize based on frontness or backness [2, 34]. Consonant clusters are common in English (e.g., “strength”), whereas Uzbek tends to avoid them by inserting vowels or modifying borrowed words (e.g., “student” becomes “talaba”) [3, 20].

Morphological Typology. English is predominantly an analytic language, meaning it relies on auxiliary verbs and word order rather than inflectional morphology to indicate grammatical relationships⁴. For instance, tense is expressed using auxiliary verbs (“She will go”) rather than suffixes. In contrast, Uzbek is an agglutinative language, meaning it adds multiple suffixes to a root word to indicate grammatical relations (e.g., “Men boraman” – “I will go,” where “bor-” is the root, “-a” marks tense, and “-man” marks the subject [5, 22]). Unlike English, Uzbek does not use articles (the/a/an), and definiteness is inferred from context.

Syntactic Structure English follows the Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order, as in “She reads a book. Uzbek, however, follows a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) order, meaning the same sentence would be structured as “U kitob o‘qiydi” (“She book reads”) [4, 53]. Another key syntactic difference is the use of prepositions in English (“in the house”), whereas Uzbek uses postpositions (“uyda” – “in the house,” where “-da” is the locative suffix) [3,29].

Lexical Borrowings and Influence Both languages have undergone lexical influence from other languages. English has borrowed extensively from Latin, French, and Greek due to historical events such as the Norman Conquest [2,16]. Uzbek, on the other hand, has borrowed words from Arabic, Persian, Russian, and more recently, English. Many modern terms in technology and business have been adopted into Uzbek, such as “internet” and “market” [7,98].

The typological differences between English and Uzbek highlight their unique linguistic structures. While English is analytic and relies on word order, Uzbek is agglutinative and rich in suffixation. Their phonetic, morphological, and syntactic variations make them distinct, yet

¹*Rustamova Sabrina Mirshakarovna, Student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

globalization has facilitated lexical exchanges. Understanding these typological contrasts is crucial for linguists, translators, and language learners.

References:

- [1]. Comrie, B. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. University of Chicago Press-1989.-134p.
- [2]. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. (1998). *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge.-2014.-98p.
- [3]. Payne, T. E. *Exploring Language Structure: A Student's Guide*. Cambridge University Press. 2006.-145p.
- [4]. Campbell, L. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. MIT Press. -2013.-301p.
- [5]. Uzbek Academy of Sciences. *Grammar of the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent Publishing House. 2010-139p.
- [6]. Matras, Y. *Language Contact*. Cambridge University Press.-2009.-124p.
- [7]. Givón, T. *Syntax: An Introduction*. John Benjamins Publishing. 2017.-302p.
- [8]. Crystal, D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University Press. 2010.-231p.
- [9]. Vinogradov, V. *History of the Russian and Turkic Languages: Mutual Influence*. Moscow State University Press.-1986p.
- [10]. Boltakulova, G. (2024, February). Turli Tillar Tizimida Vaqt Konseptining Lingvistik Tadqiqi. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 238-240).
- [11]. Axtamova, F. (2024). *Technology-Enhanced Language Learning In Teaching Foreign Languages*. *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit*, 80-82. <https://doi.org/10.2024/jy7bwj79>
- [12]. *The Impact of Communicative Approach on Developing Students` Speaking Skills*. RS Sharifovna *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 2 (10), 173-176.
- [13]. Aziza, P., & Erkin, K. (2024). *Leveraging Modern Technologies For Enhancing Listening Skills In Foreign Language Teaching*. *Science and innovation*, 3(Special Issue 19), 392-395.
- [14]. Karimova, S., & Ergasheva, N. (2023). *The Impact of Connotations in Effective Communication*. *Journal of Language Pedagogy and Innovative Applied Linguistics*, 1(4), 101-103.
- [15]. Boltakulova, G. (2024). *Conceptualization of Language Units Representing Time in Different Language Systems*. *Journal of Language Pedagogy and Innovative Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 64-70.
- [16]. Sitora Mardonova. (2022). *The Semantic Development Of The Verbs "Feorrian, Fyrsian, Feorsian"* In *Old English*. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(5), 824-827. Retrieved from <https://giirj.com/index.php/giirj/article/view/3151>;
- [17]. Фарходова, Ш. (2024). *Принцип вежливости в английской и узбекской речевой адаптации*. *Зарубежная лингвистика и лингводидактика*, 2(1/5), 390-395.
- [18]. Yarqulova, D. M. (2024). *Zamonaviy Badiiy Asarlarda Makon Va Zamon Konseptlarining Ifodalanishi*. Issue 2 of 2024 (144/2), 2(153), 5-8.
- [19]. Valieva, K. S. (2023). *The use of interactive methods in teaching foreign languages*. *Asia Pacific Journal Of Marketing & Management Review* ISSN: 2319-2836 Impact Factor: 8.071, 12(02), 34-38.
- [20]. Anorqulov, S. I. (2020). *Toponyms as culturally significant language units*. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (9), 442-447.
- [21]. Ruzimuratova, N. (2025). *O'zbek Va Ingliz Tillarida "Mehnatsevarlik" Konseptining Leksik Va Semantik Birliklar Orqali Ifoda Etilishi*. *Education And Research In The Era Of Digital Transformation*, 1(1), 605-609.
- [22]. Бегматов, К. (2021). *Иккинчи чет тили ўқитувчисининг касбий-педагогик сифатлари ва функциялари*. *Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование*, (2 (79)), 84-87