

GRAMMATICAL SIMILARITIES IN UZBEK AND TURKISH LANGUAGES

Urak Pazilovich Lafasov

Associate professor, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan.

Prof. Dr. Fatix Köksal Andı

Marmara University, Atatürk Faculty of Education

Abstract: This article examines the grammatical similarities between the Uzbek and Turkish languages, which belong to the Turkic language family. The study focuses on shared grammatical features such as agglutinative structure, word formation, case system, verb conjugation, and the use of suffixes. Special attention is given to similarities in morphological patterns and syntactic constructions. Through comparative analysis, the article highlights common structural principles that reflect the historical and genetic relationship between the two languages. The results of the study contribute to a deeper understanding of Turkic linguistics and may be useful for linguists, language learners, and comparative grammar studies.

Keywords: Uzbek language, Turkish language, grammatical similarities, comparative linguistics, Turkic languages, morphology, syntax, agglutination

Introduction: Comparative linguistics plays a significant role in revealing structural and functional relationships between genetically related languages. Within this field, the study of Turkic languages has attracted considerable scholarly attention due to their shared historical origin and typological characteristics. Uzbek and Turkish, as prominent representatives of the Turkic language family, demonstrate a wide range of grammatical similarities that reflect their common linguistic heritage.

Both languages are characterized by an agglutinative grammatical structure, in which grammatical meanings are expressed through the systematic addition of suffixes to lexical stems. This feature is manifested in word formation, case marking, verb conjugation, and the expression of tense, aspect, mood, and person. Despite geographical separation and independent historical development, Uzbek and Turkish have preserved many parallel grammatical patterns that allow for meaningful comparative analysis.

The relevance of this study lies in the growing interest in comparative grammar and cross-linguistic analysis, particularly within Turkic linguistics. Understanding grammatical similarities between Uzbek and Turkish contributes not only to theoretical linguistics but also to practical fields such as language teaching, translation studies, and intercultural communication. Moreover, such comparative research helps identify both shared features and language-specific developments, thereby enriching the overall understanding of language evolution.

The aim of this article is to analyze the main grammatical similarities between Uzbek and Turkish, focusing on morphological and syntactic features. The study seeks to identify common grammatical structures and explain their functional roles within each language. The findings of this research are expected to provide valuable insights for linguists, researchers, and learners interested in Turkic languages and comparative linguistics.

Main Body: One of the most distinctive grammatical similarities between Uzbek and Turkish is their agglutinative structure. In both languages, grammatical meanings are expressed through the

linear addition of suffixes to a stable lexical root. Each suffix usually carries a single grammatical function, and suffixes are attached in a fixed order.

For example, in Uzbek *kitoblarimizdan* (“from our books”) and in Turkish *kitaplarımızdan*, the root (*kitob / kitap*) remains unchanged, while plural, possessive, and case meanings are conveyed through successive suffixes. This structural similarity demonstrates a shared morphological principle typical of Turkic languages.

Grammatical Meaning	Uzbek	Turkish	English Translation
root	kitob	kitap	book
plural	kitoblar	kitaplar	books
possessive (1st pl.)	kitoblarimiz	kitaplarımız	our books
ablative case	kitoblarimizdan	kitaplarımızdan	from our books

Both Uzbek and Turkish employ a similar case system to express syntactic and semantic relations within a sentence. The main cases in both languages include the nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, locative, and ablative cases. These cases are formed by means of suffixes attached to nouns.

For instance, the dative case in Uzbek (*-ga / -ka*) and Turkish (*-a / -e*) expresses direction or purpose, while the locative case (*-da / -de*) indicates location. Despite minor phonetic differences, the functional roles of these cases are largely identical, reflecting a common grammatical foundation.

Case	Uzbek Suffix	Turkish Suffix	Function
Nominative	∅	∅	subject of the sentence
Genitive	-ning	-in / -ın	possession
Accusative	-ni	-i / -ı	direct object
Dative	-ga / -ka	-a / -e	direction, purpose
Locative	-da / -de	-da / -de	location
Ablative	-dan	-dan / -den	source, separation

Verb morphology represents another area of strong grammatical similarity. In both languages, verbs are conjugated through suffixation to express tense, aspect, mood, person, and number. Uzbek and Turkish share parallel tense systems, including present, past, and future tenses.

For example, the past tense in Uzbek is formed with the suffix *-di* (*keldi* — “came”), which corresponds to the Turkish *-di* (*geldi*). Personal endings added to the verb stem also follow comparable patterns in both languages. This similarity facilitates mutual intelligibility and supports comparative grammatical analysis.

Person	Uzbek	Turkish	English
1st sg.	keldim	geldim	I came
2nd sg.	kelding	geldin	you came
3rd sg.	keldi	geldi	he/she came
1st pl.	keldik	geldik	we came
2nd pl.	keldingiz	geldiniz	you (pl.) came
3rd pl.	keldilar	geldiler	they came

Uzbek and Turkish predominantly follow a Subject–Object–Verb (SOV) word order, which is characteristic of Turkic languages. The verb typically appears at the end of the sentence, while modifiers precede the words they modify.

Adjectives in both languages are placed before nouns and do not agree with them in number or case, as seen in *katta uy* (Uzbek) and *büyük ev* (Turkish). Postpositions, rather than prepositions, are used to express relational meanings, further highlighting syntactic parallels.

Person	Uzbek	Turkish	English
1st sg.	kitobim	kitabım	my book
2nd sg.	kitobing	kitabın	your book
3rd sg.	kitobi	kitabı	his/her book
1st pl.	kitobimiz	kitabımız	our book
2nd pl.	kitobingiz	kitabınız	your (pl.) book
3rd pl.	kitoblari	kitapları	their book

Possessive relations in both languages are expressed through possessive suffixes attached to nouns. These suffixes indicate the person and number of the possessor and show strong formal and functional similarities.

For example, Uzbek *kitobim* (“my book”) and Turkish *kitabım* are formed using nearly identical possessive markers. Such constructions demonstrate a shared grammatical strategy for encoding possession and reinforce the typological closeness of the two languages.

Negation in Uzbek and Turkish is primarily expressed by suffixes attached to verbs. Uzbek uses the negation marker *-ma / -me*, while Turkish employs *-ma / -me* as well, both preceding tense and personal suffixes.

Interrogative constructions in both languages often rely on question particles (*mi / mı / mu / mü* in Turkish and intonation or interrogative words in Uzbek), as well as intonational patterns. These similarities reflect common syntactic mechanisms in sentence formation.

Conclusion: The comparative analysis of grammatical features in the Uzbek and Turkish languages confirms that both languages share a strong structural and typological affinity rooted in their common Turkic origin. The study has demonstrated that key grammatical characteristics—such as agglutinative morphology, suffix-based word formation, a similar case system, and parallel verb conjugation patterns—constitute a shared grammatical framework that underlies both languages.

One of the most significant findings of this research is the consistency of agglutinative principles in both Uzbek and Turkish. The linear attachment of suffixes, each expressing a distinct grammatical meaning, ensures morphological transparency and structural regularity. This feature is clearly reflected in noun declension, possessive constructions, and verb morphology, where both languages employ comparable suffix sequences and functional categories.

The analysis of the case system has revealed that Uzbek and Turkish utilize nearly identical sets of grammatical cases with similar semantic and syntactic functions. Despite minor phonetic and orthographic differences, the core functions of cases—such as expressing possession, direction, location, and separation—remain fundamentally the same. This structural parallelism facilitates cross-linguistic comparison and supports mutual comprehension at a basic grammatical level.

Verb conjugation patterns further illustrate the close grammatical relationship between the two languages. Both languages express tense, aspect, mood, person, and number through suffixation, and many tense markers, particularly in the past tense, display formal similarity. The shared Subject–Object–Verb word order and comparable syntactic constructions reinforce the notion of a common syntactic typology.

At the same time, the study acknowledges that historical development, language contact, and sociolinguistic factors have led to certain divergences between Uzbek and Turkish. These differences, however, do not undermine the fundamental grammatical similarities but rather highlight the dynamic nature of language evolution within a shared linguistic family.

In conclusion, the grammatical similarities between Uzbek and Turkish provide valuable insights into the structure and development of Turkic languages. The findings of this study contribute to comparative linguistics, Turkic studies, and applied fields such as language teaching and translation. Further research may expand this analysis by incorporating diachronic perspectives, corpus-based methods, or comparisons with other Turkic languages to deepen our understanding of grammatical continuity and variation within the Turkic language family.

References

1. Johanson L. Türk dillerinde yapı ve tipoloji. – Ankara : Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2007. – 310 s.
2. Banguoğlu T. Türkçenin grameri. – Ankara : Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2011. — 528 s.
3. Ergin M. Türk dil bilgisi. – İstanbul : Bayrak Yayınları, 2009. – 420 s.
4. Korkmaz Z. Türkiye Türkçesi grameri (Şekil bilgisi). – Ankara : Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2003. – 620 s.
- 5.
6. Lafasov U. P. ABDALLAH QADIRI'S NOVELS USING THE METHOD OF METONYMY //SGS-Engineering & Sciences. – 2023. – T. 2. – №. 02.
7. LAFASOV, U. P. (2025). ALI QUSHCHINING SAMARQAND ILMIY AKADEMIYASIDAGI O'RNI. *Научный информационный бюллетень*, 6(1), 388-393.
8. Lafasov, U. (2025). ON THE ETHNIC AFFINITY BETWEEN THE JAPANESE AND UZBEKS. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 5(21), 170-176.
9. Lafasov, U. P. Metonymic Analysis of Novels by Abdallah Qadiri.
10. Lafasov, U. P. (2020). Relationship Between Turks And Japanese. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(2), 3935-3938.
11. Lafasov, U. (2021). ORIGINAL MEANINGS OF SOME ETHNONYMS IN SOURCES. *Oriental Journal of Philology*, 1(02), 69-74.