

TYPOLOGICAL FEATURES OF SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Quronboyeva Mashxura

Urganch RANCH texnologiya universiteti Jahon tillari kafedrası Lingvistika
(ingliz tili) yo'nalishi 1-bosqich magistranti
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17855541>

Annotation

This paper provides an expanded comparative analysis of sentence typology in English and Uzbek, focusing on structural, morphological, and functional mechanisms. English is an analytical SVO language, whereas Uzbek is an agglutinative SOV language. This typological opposition affects word order, interrogative structures, the formation of complex sentences, the role of morphology, and the degree of syntactic flexibility. Using descriptive and comparative methods, the paper illustrates major differences with examples and references, highlighting implications for translation, teaching, and cross-linguistic interference.

Keywords: *English, Uzbek, sentence typology, syntax, SVO, SOV, agglutinative morphology, comparative linguistics.*

Аннотация

В данной работе представлен расширенный сопоставительный анализ типологии предложений в английском и узбекском языках с акцентом на их структурные, морфологические и функциональные механизмы. Английский язык является аналитическим языком с порядком слов SVO, тогда как узбекский относится к агглютинативным языкам с порядком слов SOV. Это типологическое противопоставление влияет на порядок слов, способы построения вопросительных конструкций, формирование сложных предложений, роль морфологии и степень синтаксической гибкости. С использованием описательного и сравнительного методов в работе приводятся основные различия с примерами и источниками, подчеркивая их значение для перевода, преподавания и предупреждения межъязыковой интерференции.

Ключевые слова: *английский язык, узбекский язык, типология предложений, синтаксис, SVO, SOV, агглютинативная морфология, сопоставительная лингвистика.*

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillarida gap tipologiyasining kengaytirilgan qiyosiy tahlili keltiriladi. Tahlil struktura, morfologiya va funksional mexanizmlarga asoslanadi. Ingliz tili analitik SVO til hisoblanadi, o'zbek tili esa agglutinatativ SOV tizimiga ega. Ushbu tipologik qarama-qarshilik so'z tartibiga,

so'roq gaplarning tuzilishiga, murakkab gaplarning shakllanishiga, morfologiyaning roliga va sintaktik moslashuvchanlik darajasiga sezilarli ta'sir ko'rsatadi. Deskriptiv va qiyosiy metodlar yordamida maqolada asosiy farqlar misollar va manbalar bilan yoritiladi hamda ularning tarjima, o'qitish jarayoni va tilshunoslikdagi interferensiyani kamaytirishdagi ahamiyati ta'kidlanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: *ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, gap tipologiyasi, sintaksis, SVO, SOV, agglutinativ morfologiya, qiyosiy lingvistika.*

The typological study of English and Uzbek sentences holds significant value in determining how languages encode grammatical relations and structure meaning. English belongs to the Indo-European Germanic group and reflects analytical tendencies with limited inflectional morphology. Uzbek, a member of the Turkic language family, relies on extensive agglutinative suffixation to express grammatical categories. Such genealogical differences, as noted by Comrie [1], shape the core syntactic behaviors of both languages. One of the most fundamental distinctions lies in basic word order. English follows a fixed SVO pattern: She bought a car. Uzbek uses SOV, as in U mashina sotib oldi. Because Uzbek words take case markers such as -ni (accusative) and -ga (dative), the word order becomes highly flexible. For example, Mashinani u sotib oldi or U mashinani sotib oldi preserve the same grammatical meaning due to the role of morphology in signaling syntactic relations, a characteristic typical of agglutinative languages [2]. Interrogative sentence formation further illustrates typological divergence. English forms questions by inversion (Do you like tea?) or by using auxiliary verbs (Are they coming?). Wh-questions require fronting and auxiliary support: Where do you live? Uzbek, however, forms general questions using the particle -mi: Sen choy yoqtirasanmi? Wh-questions simply insert the question word without inversion: Qayerda yashaysan? Thus, English employs a syntactic mechanism, while Uzbek uses a morphological-particle system, a structural difference emphasized by Johanson [3]. Negative structures also differ sharply. English uses an auxiliary verb + not: I do not understand. Uzbek employs a morphological negation marker -ma/-me: Tushunmayman. Another type of negation in Uzbek uses emas: Bu to'g'ri emas, which parallels the English "is not" structure, though semantically and syntactically it functions differently. Furthermore, tense, aspect, and modality highlight additional typological contrasts. English relies on auxiliary verbs—will, have, be—to construct perfect (She has finished) or progressive (They are studying) forms. Uzbek expresses these categories through verb-affixation such as -di, -ayotgan, -gan, -ar, producing transparent morphological sequences typical of agglutinative structure; for example, kelayotgan edi ("was

coming”) combines aspect and tense within a single verbal complex. Modality is similarly conveyed through suffixes like *-sa* (conditional) and modal words such as *kerak* and *mumkin*. These patterns show that while English develops grammatical nuance syntactically through auxiliaries, Uzbek embeds the same information directly within its verbal morphology, reinforcing the distinct structural strategies of the two languages.

Complex sentence formation highlights even deeper typological distinctions between English and Uzbek. English frequently employs a wide range of conjunctions—*because, if, although, when*—as well as complementizers such as *that* and *whether*: *I know that he will come*. Uzbek, on the other hand, forms complex sentences primarily through verbal nouns, converbs, and participial constructions, which allow subordinate clauses to be condensed into compact morphological forms. For instance, the English relative clause *The book that I read* corresponds to Uzbek *Men o‘qigan kitob*, where the participle *o‘qigan* replaces an entire clause. This high degree of participial productivity is widely observed in Turkic grammars [4], enabling Uzbek to form intricate subordinate relations without explicit complementizers. Another example illustrates temporal subordination: English *When he arrived, we started the meeting* becomes *U kelganda yig‘ilishni boshladik*, where the suffix *-ganda* encodes the meaning of “when” without requiring a separate conjunction. Uzbek also employs other converbal forms such as *-ib, -gancha, -guncha*, allowing it to express sequence, manner, and purpose compactly: *kulib gapirdi* (“he spoke while smiling”) or *kelguncha kuting* (“wait until he comes”).

Functional sentence types—declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory—are present in both languages, though their structural realizations differ significantly. Declaratives in English follow a relatively rigid subject–verb structure, while Uzbek allows considerable freedom due to its case system; for example, *Kitobni o‘qidim men* is entirely grammatical and emphasizes the subject *men* placed at the end. Imperatives in English rely on the bare verb (*Sit down*), whereas Uzbek exhibits a richer paradigm with nuanced politeness levels and pragmatic subtleties: *O‘tiring* (polite singular), *O‘tiringlar* (polite plural), *O‘tir-chi* (softened or persuasive), and *O‘lma!* (strong prohibition). Exclamatory structures also show typological divergence: English often begins with *What/How* (*What a nice day!*, *How beautiful!*), while Uzbek relies on *qanday, naqadar*, or simply intonation: *Qanday chiroyli kun!* or *Voy, juda ajoyib!*

Cross-linguistic interference is particularly strong among Uzbek learners of English due to typological mismatches at the morphosyntactic level. The absence

of articles in Uzbek leads to frequent omission or confusion of *a*, *an*, and *the*. Likewise, reliance on SOV structures results in errors such as *He me saw* instead of *He saw me*, reflecting direct syntactic transfer from Uzbek. Because Uzbek forms interrogatives without auxiliaries, learners often produce *Where you live?* instead of *Where do you live?*. Payne emphasizes [5] that such interference is predictable when analytic languages like English are learned by speakers of agglutinative languages, where grammatical information is expressed through suffixation rather than syntactic devices. Conversely, English speakers learning Uzbek face difficulties with case markers (*-ni*, *-ga*, *-dan*) and agglutinative verb morphology, particularly complex forms such as *ketayotganmidingiz?*, which combine tense, aspect, negation, person, and politeness in a single verbal chain.

Despite these structural differences, both languages exhibit universal sentence functions and share common strategies for expressing propositional meaning, such as marking tense, modality, and participant roles. These parallels make comparative typological studies valuable not only for theoretical linguistics but also for practical fields, including translation studies, second-language acquisition, lexicography, and the design of bilingual instructional materials. Such research ultimately helps educators anticipate learner difficulties, create more accurate teaching resources, and improve cross-linguistic competence in multilingual contexts.

In conclusion, the typological comparison of English and Uzbek shows that their major differences stem from their distinct structural types. English depends on fixed SVO word order and auxiliary-based constructions, while Uzbek expresses grammatical meaning through extensive suffixation and allows freer syntax. These contrasts affect sentence formation, subordination, negation, and interrogative patterns in both languages. Understanding such differences is essential for improving translation accuracy and reducing cross-linguistic interference in language learning. It also supports the development of clearer teaching materials for learners of both languages. As noted in the works of Comrie, Crystal, and Payne [1,2,5], comparative typological studies remain important for explaining how different language systems achieve similar communicative functions. Continued research in this area will help strengthen theoretical linguistics and practical language pedagogy.

References:

- 1.Comrie, B. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- 2.Crystal, D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- 3.Johanson, L. The Turkic Languages. Routledge, 1998.
- 4.Rahmatullayev, Sh. O'zbek tilining grammatikasi. Tashkent: Fan, 2010.
- 5.Payne, T. Describing Morphosyntax. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- 6.Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S. A Grammar of Contemporary English. Longman, 1973.