A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC CLASSIFICATION OF LEXICAL CATEGORIES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Elmirzayeva Maftuna Dusmurodovna

Karshi State University, Foreign Language Faculty

Teacher of Practical English Department

Email: maftunaelmirzayeva7@gmail.com

Eshmirzayeva Madina Narzullo qizi

Student of Karshi State University

Foreign Language Faculty

Email: madinaeshmirzayeva80@gmail.com

Abstract

This article provides a comparative linguistic analysis of the classification of parts of speech in English and Uzbek. The study explores the morphological, syntactic, and semantic criteria used in categorizing words into different parts of speech in both languages. It highlights similarities and differences in the traditional and modern linguistic approaches, considering the influence of typological features, historical development, and structural characteristics of English and Uzbek. The analysis aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic grammatical frameworks and offers insights for language learners, teachers, and researchers involved in comparative linguistics and translation studies.

Keywords: Parts of speech, English language, Uzbek language, comparative linguistics, morphology, syntax, grammatical classification, typology, translation studies

Introduction

Parts of speech represent the core elements of grammatical structure in any language, serving as the foundation for the analysis and construction of meaningful sentences. These categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and others are essential for understanding how words function within the syntactic and semantic systems of a language. The classification of words into parts of speech is

not merely a matter of tradition, but a reflection of deeper linguistic principles, including morphology, syntax, semantics, and, in some cases, phonology.

English and Uzbek, though both serving as rich and fully developed languages, belong to different typological groups: English is an analytical language, while Uzbek is an agglutinative one. These typological differences have a significant influence on the grammatical structure and, consequently, the classification of parts of speech. In English, grammatical relationships are often expressed through word order and the use of auxiliary verbs or function words. In contrast, Uzbek relies heavily on inflectional morphology and suffixation to convey grammatical meaning.

Historically, the classification of parts of speech in both languages has undergone various transformations. Traditional grammar, influenced by Latin, provided a fixed set of categories in English, which modern linguistics has refined and expanded. Similarly, in Uzbek linguistics, native and Russian-influenced grammatical traditions have shaped how word classes are defined and described. While the basic parts of speech may appear similar on the surface, a closer analysis reveals important divergences in their definitions, usage, and theoretical underpinnings.

This paper aims to conduct a comparative linguistic analysis of the classification of parts of speech in English and Uzbek. It will explore how different criteria—morphological, syntactic, and semantic are applied in both languages, and how these criteria reflect each language's structural characteristics. Furthermore, the study will examine the implications of these differences for linguistic theory, language teaching, and translation. Through this comparison, the paper seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic grammatical systems and to highlight the importance of typological awareness in the study of language.

Methods

This study adopts a **qualitative comparative research design**, which is commonly used in linguistic typology and contrastive grammar studies. The primary objective of this methodological approach is to identify, describe, and analyze the similarities and differences in the classification of parts of speech in English and Uzbek. The research is grounded in both **descriptive** and **analytical frameworks**, allowing for

an in-depth exploration of the morphosyntactic structures and theoretical models in each language.

The data were collected from a variety of **reliable academic sources**, including contemporary grammar textbooks, peer-reviewed journal articles, and linguistic reference materials written by experts in English and Uzbek grammar. In addition, electronic linguistic such as the British National Corpus (BNC) for English and the Uzbek National Corpus (UzNC) where available—were used to examine authentic usage patterns of various word classes in both written and spoken forms.

The analysis proceeded in several stages:

1. **Descriptive Stage** – The grammatical categories (parts of speech) in both languages were first identified and described based on standard linguistic sources. This involved outlining the traditional and modern classifications, definitions, and subcategories of each word class (e.g., noun, verb, adjective, adverb, etc.).

2. **Structural-Functional Analysis** – Each part of speech was analyzed in terms of its morphological structure (e.g., inflection, derivation), syntactic function (e.g., sentence position, combinability with other elements), and semantic roles. Special attention was given to language-specific features such as case markers in Uzbek nouns or auxiliary constructions in English verbs.

3. **Comparative Evaluation** – The final stage involved a side-by-side comparison of the parts of speech in both languages. Key parameters included:

Word formation patterns (agglutinative vs. analytical structures),

Inflectional morphology (e.g., tense, number, case),

Syntactic distribution (e.g., subject-verb-object order, modifier placement),

Lexico-semantic roles (e.g., aspectual distinctions, modality, animacy).

Throughout the research process, a **contrastive linguistic approach** was applied to highlight not only the structural differences but also the pedagogical and translational implications of those differences. This methodological framework ensured that the findings would be applicable to both theoretical linguistics and practical fields such as second language acquisition and translation studies.

Results

The comparative analysis demonstrated that both English and Uzbek grammars classify words into fundamental parts of speech such as **nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions/postpositions, numerals, and**

interjections. However, the structural realization, categorization criteria, and functional applications of these word classes differ significantly due to the typological nature of each language.

One of the most prominent findings is the difference in **morphological complexity**. Uzbek, being an **agglutinative language**, relies extensively on affixation to express grammatical relations. For instance, a single Uzbek word may convey information about tense, aspect, mood, person, and case, all through attached suffixes. In contrast, English, as an **analytical language**, expresses most grammatical relationships through **auxiliary verbs, prepositions, and fixed word order**, rather than through inflection.

Another significant result concerns **syntactic flexibility**. Uzbek allows a relatively free word order due to its rich inflectional system, whereas English relies on a more rigid **subject-verb-object (SVO)** sentence structure to maintain clarity and grammatical correctness. This difference influences the role and identification of parts of speech in each language. For example, in English, word order often determines whether a word functions as a noun or a verb (e.g., "run" in *to run* vs. *a run*), while in Uzbek, suffixes carry this distinction.

The study also found notable distinctions in **complex categories** such as **participles, gerunds, and modal constructions**. In English, participles and gerunds often serve dual grammatical functions, acting as both verbs and nouns/adjectives, which leads to overlapping categorizations. In contrast, Uzbek tends to maintain clearer boundaries between such forms due to the language's morphological clarity and the use of distinct verbal noun and adjective suffixes.

Moreover, the category of **prepositions** in English does not have a direct equivalent in Uzbek. Instead, Uzbek employs **postpositions** or relies on **case suffixes** to express similar relationships. This structural difference reflects deeper conceptual and grammatical divergence in how spatial, temporal, and logical relations are encoded.

Overall, the results indicate that while the **core inventory of parts of speech** is largely similar, the **criteria for their classification, their internal structure, and their syntactic behavior** diverge notably between English and Uzbek. These findings highlight the importance of a language-specific approach to grammatical analysis and reinforce the need for typologically aware teaching methods and translation strategies.

Discussion

The findings of this study highlight the significant impact of **typological differences** on the classification and interpretation of parts of speech in English and Uzbek. These distinctions are not merely theoretical; they have far-reaching implications for linguistic analysis, translation, pedagogy, and language acquisition.

Uzbek's **agglutinative structure**, characterized by extensive use of suffixation, allows for more **transparent morphological distinctions** among word classes. For example, verb forms in Uzbek can be clearly identified by specific tense, aspect, and person markers, which are regularly attached to a root morpheme. This makes the identification of grammatical categories more systematic and consistent, contributing to clearer **category boundaries**.

In contrast, English's **analytical nature** means that much grammatical information is conveyed through **function words and syntactic position** rather than morphological markers. As a result, parts of speech in English often exhibit **greater functional overlap**. For instance, a word like *"walking"* can function as a verb (*He is walking*), a noun (*Walking is healthy*), or an adjective (*walking stick*), depending entirely on context. This syntactic dependence results in **more fluid and context-sensitive classifications**, which can complicate the process of assigning fixed categories to words. Moreover, these differences underscore the **non-equivalence of grammatical categories** across languages. Attempting to draw direct one-to-one correlations between English and Uzbek parts of speech may lead to misinterpretations, particularly in translation or language instruction. For example, while both languages have equivalents to adjectives and adverbs, the rules governing their formation, placement, and agreement differ significantly.

The implications of these findings are especially relevant for **second language acquisition**. Learners may struggle when transferring grammatical expectations from one language to the other. An Uzbek speaker learning English may expect more consistent morphological markers, while an English speaker learning Uzbek may need to adjust to a highly inflected system. Recognizing these challenges can inform **more effective teaching strategies**, such as explicitly contrasting grammatical categories and offering targeted practice with syntactic structures.

In the field of **translation studies**, the absence of one-to-one correspondence between word classes necessitates a flexible and context-aware approach.

Translators must account for both **structural and functional aspects** of grammatical elements, especially when dealing with verbal nouns, participial constructions, or relational expressions such as prepositions and postpositions.

In sum, this discussion reinforces the idea that **grammatical classification systems are language-specific**, shaped by a language's typology, historical development, and usage patterns. Cross-linguistic comparisons must therefore consider both form and function, avoiding simplistic equivalences and aiming instead for a nuanced understanding of each system in its own linguistic and cultural context.

Conclusion

This comparative linguistic analysis has shown that while English and Uzbek share a number of fundamental grammatical categories—such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs—their **systems of classification differ significantly** due to underlying **typological, morphological, and syntactic** distinctions. These differences are not superficial but reflect each language's unique structural logic and historical development.

In Uzbek, grammatical relationships and word categories are largely determined by **morphological markers**—particularly suffixes—which provide consistent and explicit cues for identifying parts of speech. English, on the other hand, relies more heavily on **word order, syntactic position, and functional words**, resulting in more **context-dependent and flexible categorizations**. This contrast underscores the importance of language-specific approaches when analyzing grammatical structures.

The findings of this study emphasize the need for **typological awareness** in both theoretical and applied linguistics. For researchers, understanding these distinctions deepens insights into the **diversity of language structures** and enriches comparative grammatical theory. For educators and translators, it highlights the importance of avoiding direct equivalence and instead focusing on **functional correspondence** and **contextual adaptation**. Ultimately, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how languages organize their grammatical systems and offers practical implications for **second language acquisition, contrastive grammar studies, and translation methodology**. Recognizing and respecting these structural differences not only enhances

linguistic competence but also fosters more effective and culturally sensitive communication.

References

1. Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? Journal of Pragmatics, 31(7), 931-952.

2. Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.

3. Blakemore, D. (2002). Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.

4. Aijmer, K. (2013). Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach. Edinburgh University Press.

5. Redeker, G. (1991). Linguistic markers of discourse structure. Linguistics, 29(6), 1139-1172.

6. Elmirzayeva, Maftuna D. "THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT OF LANGUAGE CONTACT IN THE MAIN ISSUES OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS IN THE BROAD AND NARROW SENSES." American Journal Of Philological Sciences 3.02 (2023): 42-48.

7. Elmirzayeva, Maftuna. "PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL PROTECTION TERMS IN LINGUISTICS." CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES 4.10 (2023): 30-35.

8. Elmirzayeva, Maftuna. "LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE TERM" SOCIAL PROTECTION" IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES." European International Journal of Philological Sciences 3.10 (2023): 24-28.

9. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. Mouton de Gruyter.

10. Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Discourse Strategies. Cambridge University Press.