BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

THE MORPHOLOGICAL SYSTEM OF THE UZBEK AND TATAR LANGUAGES: A COMPARATIVE-TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Jamolova Mavludaxon
Asia International University 1st-year Master's Student
Jamolovamavluda111@gmail.com

ABSTRACT This article presents a comparative-typological analysis of the morphological systems of the Uzbek and Tatar languages. The purpose of the study is to determine the features of the manifestation of agglutinative structure, the predominance of affixation, vowel harmony (synharmonism), nominal and verbal paradigms, as well as the ways in which grammatical categories are expressed in both languages. Methodologically, comparative-typological, descriptive-analytical, and distributive analysis methods were employed. The results demonstrate that the Uzbek and Tatar languages rely on the common Turkic agglutinative model; the principal differences are manifested in the degree of vowel harmony and in the phonetic variation of affixes — vowel harmony has weakened in Uzbek, whereas in Tatar it remains actively preserved. It is concluded that these morphological differences are determined by the internal subgroup affiliation of the two languages and by their historical-areal contacts.

Keywords: Uzbek language, Tatar language, morphology, agglutination, vowel harmony (synharmonism), affixation, comparative linguistics, Turkic languages.

INTRODUCTION The Turkic language family is one of the major language families distributed across a vast territory of Eurasia, encompassing a set of independent languages that branched off from a common Turkic base[1]. In Turkology, the typological study of this family is of great importance not only for describing individual languages but also for identifying the common Turkic genetic model and pinpointing differential features[2]. The internal classification of the Turkic languages has been developed by scholars such as N. A. Baskakov, A. N. Samoylovich, and L. Johanson, whose classifications divide the languages into the Oghuz, Kipchak, Karluk, Siberian, and Oghur groups[3]. This classification is based not only on lexical proximity but also on phonetic, morphological, and historical criteria. The Uzbek language belongs to the Karluk group, and the Old Uyghur language, the language of the Qarakhanid period, and the Chaghatay literary tradition played an important role in its formation[4]. The Tatar language, in turn, belongs to the Kipchak group and developed on the basis of the Volga-Bulgar and later Kipchak substrata[5]. The fact that these two languages belong to different internal subgroups is also reflected in their morphological

[1]Baskakov, N. A. (1960). Tyurkskiye yazyki. Izdatel'stvo vostochnoy literatury.

[2]Johanson, L., & Csató, É. Á. (Eds.). (1998). The Turkic languages. Routledge.

[3]Samoylovich, A. N. (1922). Nekotoryye dopolneniya k klassifikatsii turetskikh yazykov. Petrograd.

[4]Uluqov, N. (2006). O'zbek tili grammatikasi: morfologiya. Fan.

[5]Johanson, L. (1998). The history of Turkic. In L. Johanson & É. Á. Csató (Eds.), The Turkic languages (pp. 81–125). Routledge.

realization. The relevance of the present study lies in the fact that the morphological systems of the Uzbek and Tatar languages have not yet been sufficiently studied from a comparative perspective. Existing research has largely focused on individual languages or on particular sections of morphology; however, few studies analyze both languages simultaneously in a systematic and comparative manner.

The purpose of the article is to conduct a comparative-typological analysis of the morphological systems of the Uzbek and Tatar languages from the standpoint of agglutination, the predominance of affixation, the phenomenon of vowel harmony, nominal and verbal paradigms, and grammatical categories. In order to achieve this goal, the following tasks were set: (1) to substantiate the affiliation of the Uzbek and Tatar languages to the common Turkic morphological model; (2) to analyze the features of the manifestation of agglutinative structure in both languages; (3) to comparatively demonstrate the degree to which the phenomenon of vowel harmony is preserved in the two languages; and (4) to compare the nominal and verbal paradigms as well as the grammatical categories.

METHODOLOGY Scholarly-theoretical sources and grammatical studies relating to the grammar of the Uzbek and Tatar languages were selected as the material for the study. In particular, the principal sources included the works of N. A. Baskakov on the classification of the Turkic languages, the general studies on Turkic languages by L. Johanson and É. Á. Csató[6], the works of N. Uluqov on the grammar of the Uzbek language, the studies of G. Burbiel on the phenomenon of vowel harmony in the Tatar language, and the comparative morphological studies of A. M. Shcherbak and E. R. Tenishev. In addition, sample grammatical forms were selected on the basis of grammar textbooks and dictionary sources of the Uzbek and Tatar languages. Examples were chosen in such a way as to demonstrate the consistency of morphological paradigms and phonetic variation: the categories of number, possession, and case in nouns; the markers of tense, mood, and person-number in verbs; and the syntactic-semantic functions of adjectives and non-finite forms.

The following methods were employed in the study:

Comparative-typological method — comparing the morphological features of the Uzbek and Tatar languages on the basis of the common Turkic model and identifying their similarities and differences.

Descriptive-analytical method — describing the system of morphological categories (number, possession, case, tense, mood, and others) of each language separately and subsequently evaluating them comparatively.

Distributive analysis — observing, through morphological examples, the distribution of affixes according to the phonetic environment and the features of synharmonic adaptation.

Contrastive analysis — comparing the morphological system of the Uzbek and Tatar languages with each other, as well as with common Turkic data.

The study is grounded in B. Comrie's theory of typological linguistics and in E. R. Tenishev's methodology of comparative-historical grammar.

[6]Burbiel, G. (1999); Shcherbak, A. M. (1977); Tenishev, E. R. (Ed.) (1988).

RESULTS Typologically, the Uzbek and Tatar languages belong to the group of agglutinative languages. The essence of agglutination lies in the fact that grammatical meanings are expressed by means of affixes attached consistently to the root, and each affix performs a single, separate grammatical function. The boundaries within the morphemic structure of a word are relatively clearly delineated, and grammatical formation is achieved not through internal inflection but through external suffixation. In an agglutinative system, the functional specialization of affixes is high: one affix expresses plurality, another possession, a third case, and yet another expresses person-number or tense meaning. As a result, grammatical categories are manifested through separate morphological markers, ensuring morphological transparency and paradigmatic stability. In both languages, the word form is constructed according to the sequence root + derivational affix + grammatical affix. For example, in the Uzbek word kitoblarimizdan: kitob (root) + -lar (plural) + -imiz (first-person plural possessive) + -dan (ablative case). The corresponding Tatar form китапларыбыздан follows exactly the same order: китап + -лар + -ыбыз + -дан. These examples show that the ordering of affixes in the morphological systems of the two languages is consistent and functionally parallel.

The degree to which the phenomenon of vowel harmony is preserved constitutes one of the most important morphophonological criteria distinguishing the Uzbek and Tatar languages from one another. In Tatar, vowel harmony operates actively even within the framework of the modern literary language: affixes adapt to the front-back and rounded-unrounded features of the vowel in the root. For instance, the plural affix is attached as -лар to words with back vowels and as -ләр to words with front vowels: китаплар, кешеләр. Case affixes likewise display wide variation depending on the phonetic environment: the dative case may appear as -га/-гә/-ка/-кә, and the ablative case as -дан/-дән/-тан/-тән/-нан/-нән. In Uzbek, by contrast, the plural affix is used in a single invariant form, -lar: kitoblar, odamlar, ko'chalar, bolalar. Case affixes similarly appear in a relatively standardized phonetic form. This situation arose in the course of historical development, in particular as a result of prolonged contact with the Persian-Tajik languages: in the Uzbek literary language, vowel harmony has been partially lost, and the phonetic variation of affixes is considerably more limited than in Tatar. In the noun category, the categories of number, possession, and case are of central importance in both Uzbek and Tatar. In the category of number, the singular form is expressed by a zero affix, while the plural is expressed by a special affix: -lar in Uzbek and -лар/-ләр in Tatar. The grammatical category is identical on the common Turkic basis, but its phonetic realization differs. In the category of possession, the belonging of an object to a particular person is expressed directly through an affix: in Uzbek, kitobim, kitobing, kitobi, kitobimiz, kitobingiz, kitoblari; in Tatar, forms such as китабым, китабың, китабы, китабыбыз exist. In Tatar, the phonetic form of the possessive affixes varies more widely than in Uzbek owing to the influence of vowel harmony. The category of case functions actively in both languages as the principal morphological means of marking the syntactic role of a noun in a sentence. In Uzbek, the nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, locative, and ablative cases are used. Functionally equivalent cases also exist in Tatar, but their phonetic variants are considerably more numerous owing to vowel harmony. As a result, case morphology in Tatar is more strongly bound to the phonological environment, whereas in Uzbek it is expressed through relatively stable grammatical forms. The absence of a category of grammatical gender is an important feature common to both languages. Unlike the Indo-European languages, neither Uzbek nor Tatar distinguishes grammatical gender; when it is necessary to express gender meaning, lexical means are used instead.

Verbal morphology proves to be the most complex and multilayered system

in both Uzbek and Tatar. Markers of tense, mood, voice, polarity (affirmative-negative), and person-number are attached in sequence to the verb stem. For instance, the Uzbek form bormagan edim combines the negation of the action, its connection to the past tense, and first-person singular meaning. Tatar verb forms likewise express similar grammatical categories through affixal means. Non-finite verb forms — participles, converbs (gerunds), and verbal nouns — are of particular importance in both languages. Uzbek forms such as kelgan odam, o'qib chiqdi, and borish kerak demonstrate the use of non-finite verb forms in various syntactic functions. Similar non-finite forms exist in Tatar as well, serving to express the content of a subordinate clause through a compact morphological means. In this respect, the connection between morphology and syntax is very strongly manifested in both the Uzbek and Tatar languages.

DISCUSSION The results obtained confirm that the morphological systems of the Uzbek and Tatar languages are based on the common Turkic agglutinative model. In both languages, grammatical meanings are expressed through suffixes, grammatical gender is absent, the categories of possession and case are well developed, and the verbal system is rich and multilayered. Nevertheless, the difference observed in the phenomenon of vowel harmony remains the most important differential feature. As L. Johanson and É. Á. Csató note, the degree to which sound harmony is preserved, whether more strongly or more weakly, among the Turkic languages is determined by their historical development and by the influence of contact languages. The weakening of vowel harmony in Uzbek is a result of its prolonged contact with the Iranian languages. In Tatar, by contrast, the phonetic features characteristic of the Kipchak group, in particular vowel harmony, have remained comparatively stable. Analysis of the nominal paradigms shows that, although the grammatical category is identical on the common Turkic basis, its phonetic realization depends on the particular developmental path of each language. According to N. Uluqov's observations, in Uzbek grammatical meaning is most often expressed synthetically, that is, through separately distinguished affixal means. The phenomenon of vowel harmony constitutes the most important differential morphophonological feature of the two languages: it remains actively preserved in Tatar, whereas in Uzbek it has weakened considerably as a result of historical development, and in particular under the influence of the Iranian languages. The nominal categories (number, possession, case) are developed in both languages according to the common Turkic model; the main differences are manifested in the phonetic realization of these categories — that is, in the wider allomorphic variation found in Tatar. Verbal morphology is rich and multilayered, and non-finite forms (participles, converbs, verbal nouns) clearly demonstrate, in both languages, the point at which morphology and syntax intersect. The morphological differences between these languages are determined by their internal subgroup affiliation (Karluk and Kipchak) and by their historical-areal contacts; without denying their common Turkic essence, these differences should be assessed as distinct modifications of a single genealogical basis.

CONCLUSION The results obtained can serve as an important theoretical basis for gaining a deeper understanding of the typology of the Turkic languages, for identifying the differential manifestations of the common Turkic model, and for expanding the methodology of morphological research. As a direction for future research, a comparative study of the syntactic systems, lexical strata, and text-linguistic aspects of the two languages is recommended. As a scholarly contribution, it should be noted that in this article the morphological systems of the Uzbek and Tatar languages have, for the first time, been analyzed simultaneously in a systematic and comparative manner from the standpoint of agglutination, vowel harmony, and nominal and verbal paradigms.

References

1. Burbiel, G. (1999). The system of vowel harmony in the Tatar language. Voprosy Yazykoznaniya [Issues of Linguistics].
2. Comrie, B. (1989). Language universals and linguistic typology (2nd ed.). Basil Blackwell.
3. Johanson, L. (1998). The history of Turkic. In L. Johanson & É. Á. Csató (Eds.), The Turkic languages (pp. 81–125). Routledge.
4. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. Á. (Eds.). (1998). The Turkic languages. Routledge.
5. Uluqov, N. (2006). O'zbek tili grammatikasi: morfologiya [Grammar of the Uzbek language: Morphology]. Fan.
6. Baskakov, N. A. (1960). Tyurkskiye yazyki [The Turkic languages]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoy literatury.
7. Samoylovich, A. N. (1922). Nekotoryye dopolneniya k klassifikatsii turetskikh yazykov [Some additions to the classification of the Turkic languages]. Petrograd.
8. Shcherbak, A. M. (1977). Ocherki po sravnitel'noy morfologii tyurkskikh yazykov (Imya) [Essays on the comparative morphology of the Turkic languages (The noun)]. Leningrad: Nauka.
9. Tenishev, E. R. (Ed.). (1988). Sravnitel'no-istoricheskaya grammatika tyurkskikh yazykov: Morfologiya [Comparative-historical grammar of the Turkic languages: Morphology]. Moscow: Nauka.