TYPOLOGICAL CONTRASTS IN SYNTAX AMONG ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND TWO TURKIC LANGUAGES

Uzakova Aziza Kuatbaevna

M.A. Student, Department of English Linguistics

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Abstract

This article presents a comparative analysis of syntactic structures in four languages from three distinct branches: English (Germanic), Russian (Slavic), and Uzbek and Karakalpak (Turkic). The study focuses on fundamental syntactic features, such as word order, sentence structure, case marking, agreement, and the expression of grammatical relations. Despite sharing some universal traits, the languages under comparison demonstrate significant typological divergence. English and Russian, both Indo-European languages, differ notably in terms of flexibility and dependency on morphology, while Uzbek and Karakalpak, as Turkic agglutinative languages, exhibit a different syntactic logic altogether. The analysis highlights both language-specific strategies and broader cross-linguistic patterns.

Keywords: Comparative typology, syntax, English, Russian, Uzbek, Karakalpak, word order, case system, agreement, agglutination.

Introduction

Comparative syntactic typology explores how different languages encode syntactic relations. This study examines English, Russian, Uzbek, and Karakalpak, which represent three linguistic traditions: Germanic, Slavic, and Turkic, respectively. These languages differ greatly in morphological complexity, word order flexibility, and case usage, and together they exemplify both universal and language-specific strategies [1]. By comparing them, we gain insights into their unique structures and broader tendencies in human language.

English is predominantly a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) language, relying on a mostly analytic structure to maintain clear syntactic relations through fixed positions.

- She reads books every day.

Such a strict adherence to SVO arises from minimal case marking on nouns and a preference for indicating grammatical roles via word order.

Russian also defaults to an SVO arrangement, yet it allows more permutation due to an extensive morphological case system.

- Она читает книги каждый день.

- Книги она читает каждый день.

Even when word order changes, syntactic roles remain clear because case endings prevent ambiguity.

Uzbek and Karakalpak follow a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) pattern typical of many Turkic languages.

- Uzbek: U har kuni kitob o'qiydi.

- Karakalpak: Ol har kúni kitap oqiydi.

Although the SOV sequence is generally dominant, occasional shifts in the placement of sentence elements may occur to highlight emphasis or focus [2]. For instance, in Uzbek, the neutral sentence U har kuni kitob o'qiydi ("He reads a book every day") may be altered to Kitobni u har kuni o'qiydi to emphasize the object (kitobni – "the book").

English shows relatively minimal flexibility in rearranging sentence elements, as changes to the canonical order often lead to shifts in meaning or reduced clarity.

- John loves Mary. vs. Mary loves John.

Russian, however, is able to reorder components without losing clarity.

 Мама любит сына

 Сына любит мама

(The mother loves the son).

Uzbek and Karakalpak permit moderate variation but usually keep the verb in final, retaining their characteristic SOV structure.

English indicates grammatical roles primarily through word order, prepositions, and a minimal pronominal case system (I/me, he/him). Russian, by contrast, employs six grammatical cases (nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, instrumental, and prepositional), which give it significant flexibility in constituent placement.

Accusative:

- Я вижу брата (I see my brother).

Dative:

- Я иду к брату (I'm going to my brother).

These endings ensure syntactic clarity even when elements are reordered, thereby making word order more variable overall [3].

Uzbek and Karakalpak rely on agglutinative suffixes to mark grammatical relations, including nominative (unmarked), accusative, dative, locative, ablative, and genitive.

- Uzbek: Men akamni ko'rdim.

- Karakalpak: Men ajag'amdi kórdim.

(I saw my elder brother).

Each case function is expressed by a distinct suffix, reflecting the regular, layered nature of agglutinative morphology.

English exhibits **limited** subject-verb agreement, primarily in the third-person singular present tense (He reads). Russian, in contrast, displays a broader range of agreement in gender, number, and person, which is reflected in both verb forms and the concord between adjectives and noun phrases.

Он купил новый дом (He bought a new house).

Она купила новую машину (She bought a new car).

Uzbek and Karakalpak maintain regular verbal agreement with the subject in person and number, and sometimes include an evidential marker.

- Uzbek: Men yozdim.

- Karakalpak: Men jazdim.

(I wrote).

This layered suffixation is a core hallmark of agglutinative languages, making each morphological piece serve a specific grammatical function [5].

English uses coordinating conjunctions (e.g., and, but) and subordinators (e.g., because, although) to link clauses.

- I left because it was late.

Russian employs conjunctions such as потому что (because), хотя (although), and когда (when), and it can place subordinate clauses before or after the main clause without ambiguity, due to the presence of morphological marking.

- Потому что было поздно, я ушёл.

Uzbek and Karakalpak form many subordinate constructions through non-finite verb forms, rather than explicit conjunctions.

- Uzbek: Kech bo'lgani uchun, men ketdim.

- Karakalpak: Kesh bolǵanı úshin men kettiń.

This reliance on converbs and participles reflects a preference for more synthetic constructions in Turkic languages.

English typically uses not in conjunction with auxiliaries.

- She does not sleep.

Russian relies on the particle не (not) or the negator нет (no), modifying the sentence at the verbal or nominal level.

- Она не спит.

Uzbek and Karakalpak mark negation via the suffix -ma/-me, directly appended to the verb stem, thereby embedding negation into the morphological structure of the clause.

- Uzbek: U uxlamaydi.

- Karakalpak: Ol uyqlamaydi.

Affixing the negative marker to the verb root aligns with the agglutinative typology, where distinct affixes cumulatively encode multiple grammatical categories.

English forms questions chiefly by auxiliary inversion.

- Do you read?

Russian often uses rising intonation or the particle ли, as in Ты читаешь?. Meanwhile, Uzbek and Karakalpak add interrogative particles (-mi/-ma) to the focal element or directly to the verb, a strategy that allows these markers to function somewhat like clitics.

- Uzbek: U kitob oʻqiydimi?

- Karakalpak: Ol kitap oqiydima?

(Does he read the book?)

Such particles frequently attach to different syntactic hosts while preserving their interrogative force, exemplifying a clitic-like behavior characteristic of many Turkic languages.

English, being analytic, relies heavily on word order to convey grammatical functions. Russian, as a fusional language, encodes various roles (case, number, gender) within the same morphological ending. By contrast, Uzbek and Karakalpak, demonstrating agglutinative structures, layer distinct suffixes for each function. For instance, the Uzbek form:

- Kitoblaringizdanmi?

("Is it from your books?")

illustrates how -lar, -ingiz, -dan, and -mi each encode a separate piece of grammatical meaning. This multi-suffix approach is typical of Turkic morphosyntax, allowing for highly systematic yet flexible expressions of case, possession, and interrogation [4].

English usually marks the passive with the auxiliary be plus a past participle, placing the agent in a by-phrase if needed.

- The book was written by her.

Russian often employs verbal participles (Книга была написана ею) or reflexive forms, using its morphological richness to indicate passivization without extensively altering word order. Uzbek and Karakalpak can use either special verbal suffixes or an agent phrase (tomonidan / tárepinen) to form passives.

- Uzbek: Kitob u tomonidan yozildi.

- Karakalpak: Kitap ol tárepinen jazildi.

These typological distinctions demonstrate how each language adjusts verb valency to create a passive construction while retaining clarity for speakers and listeners.

This comparative analysis underscores the typological diversity of English, Russian, Uzbek, and Karakalpak in relation to word order, case marking, agreement, and subordination. English relies on an analytic system with less extensive morphological marking and a strict SVO order, while Russian's fusional structure allows more freedom in constituent arrangement. Uzbek and Karakalpak exemplify agglutinative languages, employing distinctive suffixes for each grammatical function and following a largely SOV sequence. Despite their contrasts, these languages achieve comparable communicative goals, highlighting the varied pathways by which human languages can organize syntax. Understanding such typological patterns enhances our perspective on language diversity and enriches comparative linguistic analysis.

References

1. Comrie, B. (1981). Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology. Oxford: Blackwell.
2. Dryer, M. S. (2013). Order of Subject, Object and Verb. In: Dryer, M. S. & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.), The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Max Planck Institute.

3. Kibrik, A. E. (1994). Cognitive Typology of Grammatical Constructions. Moscow: Moscow State University.

4. Johanson, L. (2001). Discovering Turkic Syntax: Syntactic Typology and Universals. Turkic Languages, 5(2), 3–20.

5. Dixon, R. M. W. (2010). Basic Linguistic Theory: Volume 2: Grammatical Topics. Oxford University Press.