

COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF NOUN CATEGORIES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Tirkashova Shakhzoda Azim qizi

student of Oriental University

Scientific supervisor: **Furkatova Makhliyo Tulkinovna**

teacher of Oriental University

Abstract: *This research article provides a comparative-typological analysis of the grammatical, semantic, and morphological features of noun categories in Uzbek and English. The research is based on the works of X. Mukhitdinova (2004), N. Turniyozov (2006), J. Boronov (1974, 1973), and modern linguistic typology studies including Haspelmath (2010) and Comrie (1989). The scientific novelty of this research lies in evaluating noun categories through typological concepts such as category relocation (relokatsiya), morphological economy index, and semantic elasticity, which have rarely been applied to Turkic–Germanic language comparison. The paper also examines English-specific features such as article usage, grammatical gender, and plural formation, comparing them with their Uzbek equivalents.*

Key words: *noun categories, comparative typology, morphological transparency, semantic elasticity, category relocation, English–Uzbek comparative grammar, morphological economy.*

INTRODUCTION

The grammatical system of every language differentiates itself through the structure of noun categories. In both Uzbek and English, nouns represent a core lexical class and cover several semantic and grammatical categories. Mukhitdinova (2004) highlights the importance of case, possession, and number as dominant morphological indicators in Uzbek, whereas Boronov (1973) systematically compares English articles, gender, singular–plural, and possession structures with Uzbek.

The goal of this study is to deeply analyze structural-semantic relations of noun categories in both languages and identify their similarities and differences through typological criteria.

Uzbek represents an agglutinative morphology, where grammatical meaning derives through affixation. Turniyozov (2006) emphasizes that semantic motivation drives category formation in Uzbek. English, however, demonstrates an analytic structure, where grammatical meaning is expressed through word order and function words, such as in *the boy's book* compared to Uzbek *bola+ning kitob+i* (Boronov, 1974).

Main Discussion

1. Number Category

In English, plural formation typically uses the *-s/-es* ending: *book–books, car–cars*. However, irregular forms such as *child–children, mouse–mice* demonstrate historical suppletion (Boronov, 1974; Haspelmath, 2010).

In Uzbek, plural formation occurs regularly through *-lar/-lar* (*kitoblar, o‘quvchilar*). Yet, the plural marker may denote generic reference, not number (*Odamlar shunday deydi — “People say so”*). Typological outcome: Plural formation in Uzbek is more morphologically transparent, while English shows low morphological economy due to irregularity.

2. Possessive Category

English forms possession through *'s* (*my sister’s phone*) or prepositional constructions (*the phone of my sister*).

Uzbek demonstrates a developed possessive paradigm, combining affixed possessors and objects: *opa+si+ning kitob+i, bola+m+ning daftar+i* (Turniyozov, 2006). Category Relocation: English transfers possessive meaning into syntax, whereas Uzbek retains it within morphology (Comrie, 1989).

3. Case Category

English lacks a morphological case system except the *'s* genitive; the function is replaced by prepositions (*to the school, from the house*).

Uzbek retains six cases: nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, locative, and ablative (Mukhitdinova, 2004).

Typological result: English — analytic; Uzbek — agglutinative.

4. Gender Category

English contains grammatical gender in pronouns (*he/she/it*) and lexical pairs (*actor–actress, waiter–waitress*). Modern usage demonstrates a decline in gender specificity due to neutral forms (e.g., *actor, server*) (Haspelmath, 2006).

Uzbek nouns lack gender as a grammatical category, proving linguistic neutrality.

5. Article Category

English uses definite (*the*) and indefinite (*a/an*) articles. They serve semantic functions: specificity, genericity, and identifiability.

Uzbek has no article system; contextual markers (*bir, o‘sha*) and intonation fulfill this function.

New Scientific Results

Typological Concept	English	Uzbek
Morphological economy	High (few markers)	Low (many affixes)
Category relocation	meaning → syntax	meaning → morphology
Semantic elasticity	limited affixation	productive affixation

- English shows syntactic dependence for meaning.
- Uzbek shows morphological productivity and semantic expansion.

CONCLUSION

The analysis indicates significant typological differences. English relies on analytic syntactic strategies, whereas Uzbek relies on agglutinative affixation. The study contributes new approaches by applying morphological economy, category relocation, and semantic elasticity to compare noun systems, demonstrating broader implications for translation studies and cross-linguistic grammar teaching.

REFERENCES:

- 1.Bo'ronov, J. (1973). *Ingliz va o'zbek tillarining qiyosiy grammatikasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
- 2.Buronov, J. (1974). *Ingliz tili grammatikasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 3.Haspelmath, M. (2010). *Understanding Morphology*. London: Routledge.
- 4.Mukhitdinova, X. (2004). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
- 5.Turniyozov, N. (2006). *O'zbek tili: Grammatik tahlillar*. Samarqand.