COMPARATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Intizor Bekchanova
Teacher at Mamun University
E-mail: ibekchanovaa@gmail.com

Keywords: contrastive linguistics, degrees of comparison, morphology, syntax, agglutinative structure, analytical language, language typology, language teaching, translation studies.

Abstract. The study of comparative constructions is an essential area in linguistic typology and contrastive linguistics, as it reveals how different languages encode similarity, difference, and gradation of properties. Comparison is a universal cognitive and grammatical category that allows speakers to evaluate objects, persons, and phenomena in relation to one another. Although English and Uzbek belong to different language families and typological systems, both languages possess well-developed mechanisms for expressing comparative meanings.

This paper provides a detailed contrastive analysis of comparative constructions in English and Uzbek, focusing on morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects. It examines how comparison is expressed in adjective and adverb systems, how comparative and superlative degrees are formed, and how comparative relations are structured within sentences.

The research is based on a descriptive-comparative method, using theoretical analysis of linguistic literature and grammatical descriptions of both languages. The findings indicate that English and Uzbek differ significantly in their structural realization of comparison, despite sharing similar communicative functions. These differences are especially evident in morphological marking, syntactic rigidity, and the use of analytical versus agglutinative strategies.

Introduction. Comparative constructions are among the most frequently used grammatical structures in natural languages. They serve not only to compare physical and abstract qualities but also to express evaluation, emphasis, and stylistic meaning. In linguistic theory, comparison is considered a universal category; however, its realization varies across languages depending on typological features.

English is classified as an analytic language with partial inflectional features, while Uzbek is an agglutinative language characterized by extensive use of suffixes and postpositions. These typological differences create distinct systems of expressing comparative meaning, making English–Uzbek comparison a valuable subject for contrastive analysis.

Theoretical Background. According to traditional grammar, comparison is divided into three degrees: positive, comparative, and superlative. In English, these degrees are expressed through both inflectional and periphrastic means, while in Uzbek they are primarily formed through agglutinative suffixation and lexical markers.

Comparative linguistics emphasizes that differences in grammatical structure often lead to difficulties in second language acquisition. Therefore, analyzing comparative constructions helps to identify potential areas of interference for learners.

Methodology. This research adopts a qualitative descriptive-comparative approach. The data were collected from standard English grammar references (Quirk et al., Huddleston & Pullum, Biber et al.) and Uzbek linguistic sources (O‘zbek tili grammatikasi, Nurmonov, Karimov). The analysis focuses on:

- Morphological formation of comparison
- Syntactic patterns of comparative sentences
- Semantic and pragmatic functions

The comparative method was used to identify similarities and differences between the two languages.

Analysis and Discussion

1. Morphological Expression of Comparison

In English, comparative forms are created through two main mechanisms:

- **Synthetic form:** suffix -er / -est
  - tall → taller → tallest
  - fast → faster → fastest
- **Analytical form:** more / most
  - beautiful → more beautiful → most beautiful

Additionally, English contains a large number of irregular forms:

- good → better → best
- bad → worse → worst

In Uzbek, comparison is mainly expressed through:

- **Suffixation:** -roq
  - katta → kattaroq
  - tez → tezroq
- **Superlative marker:** eng
  - eng katta
  - eng chiroyli

This shows that Uzbek relies more on agglutinative morphology, while English uses a mixed system of inflection and periphrasis.

2. Syntactic Structures of Comparison

English comparative sentences follow relatively fixed syntactic patterns:

- as…as → She is as tall as her brother.
- more…than → This book is more interesting than that one.
- the more…the more → The more you study, the more you learn.

Word order is strict, and grammatical markers are obligatory.

Uzbek, however, uses more flexible structures:

- u akasidan ko‘ra balandroq
- bu kitob undan qiziqarliroq
- qancha ko‘p o‘qisang, shuncha ko‘p bilasan

Here, postpositions such as -dan ko‘ra, qaraganda, and nisbatan play a major role in marking comparison.

3. Semantic and Pragmatic Functions

In both languages, comparative constructions are not limited to grammatical comparison. They also serve:

- Emotional evaluation (more beautiful / juda chiroyliroq)
- Emphasis (far more important / ancha muhimroq)
- Persuasion in discourse
- Stylistic enhancement in academic and literary texts

However, English tends to encode these meanings in fixed grammatical structures, while Uzbek relies more on context and lexical variation.

4. Contrastive and Pedagogical Implications

The contrast between English and Uzbek comparative systems creates challenges in second language acquisition:

- Overuse or omission of more/most in English
- Incorrect use of -er/-est with long adjectives
- Difficulty with irregular forms
- Literal translation of Uzbek postpositional structures into English

Therefore, explicit teaching of comparative structures is necessary in EFL classrooms in Uzbekistan.

Conclusion. The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek reveals both universal and language-specific features. While both languages share the communicative function of expressing comparison, they differ significantly in their grammatical realization. English uses a combination of

inflectional and analytical strategies with fixed syntactic patterns, whereas Uzbek relies on agglutinative suffixation and postpositional constructions.

Understanding these differences is essential for linguistic theory, translation studies, and foreign language teaching. A contrastive approach not only clarifies structural differences but also helps learners overcome common errors in language production.

References

1. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman.
2. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.
3. Biber, D., et al. (1999). Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Longman.
4. Furkatovna, N. D. (2025). COMMUNICATIVE NORMS IN ENGLISH PHONETICS: FROM STANDARD TO NON-STANDARD VARIETIES. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING, 3(9), 10-15.
5. Furkatovna, N. D. (2023). Analysis of Definitions of the Concept" Discourse" in Linguistics. American Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences, 12, 22-26.
6. Dildora, N. (2019). English teaching methods. In Bridge to science: research works (pp. 67-69).
7. Gulomjonova, N., Gayubova, K., Saydaliyeva, M., Abdinazarov, U., Mamadiyorova, S., Rasulmukhamedova, D., ... & Normurodova, F. (2025). Philology of marine conservation analyzing the role of language and narrative in shaping public perceptions of marine ecosystems. International Journal of Aquatic Research and Environmental Studies, 689-702.
8. Raxmatova, M., & Toirov, D. (2026). Enhancing Business English Writing Skills Through Mobile Applications: An Esp-Based Experimental Study In Non-English-Speaking Countries. Asian journal of scientific research and innovations, 1(1), 291-293.
9. qizi Hasanova, G. T., qizi Raxmatova, S. B., & qizi Makhmudova, S. J. (2021). The peculiarities of using distance learning and independent work in teaching process.
10. Pryadkina, O., & Raxmatova, M. (2026). FEATURES OF THE GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD. Asian journal of scientific research and innovations, 5(1), 779-781.
11. Murodbek, A. (2026). QIYOSIY ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIKDA URUSH VA TINCHLIK KONSEPTUAL TAHLILINING NAZARIY-METODOLOGIK ASOSLARI. TANQIDIY NAZAR, TAHLILIY TAFAKKUR VA INNOVATSION G ‘OYALAR, 2(7), 429-433.
12. Murodbek, A. (2026). O ‘ZBEK VA INGLIZ ADABIYOTIDA “URUSH” VA “TINCHLIK” KONSEPTLARI ORQALI INSONIYLIK, EZGULIK VA ADOLAT G ‘OYALARINING BADIIY IFODASI. YANGI RENESSANSDA ILM-FAN TARAQQIYOTI, 1(4), 348-351.
13. Sidikova, N. N., Vaxidova, A. A., Murtazina, E. I., & Rakhimullina, F. N. (2026). Peculiarities of Personality Value Orientations in a Situation of Uncertainty. Arpha Proceedings, 11, 657-667.
14. Jahonovna, S. S. (2022). FEATURES OF SEMANTIC AND STYLISTIC TRANSFORMATIONS OF STABLE WORD COMBINATIONS. International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 14(7).
15. Шомуродова, Ш. Ж. (2017). КОНТЕКСТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ПРОЯВЛЕНИЯ СТИЛИСТИЧЕСКОГО ЗНАЧЕНИЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ. Научные школы. Молодежь в науке и культуре XXI в.: материалы междунар. науч.-творч. форума. 31 окт.–3 нояб. 2017 г./Челяб. гос. ин-т культуры; сост. ЕВ Швачко.–Челябинск: ЧГИК, 2017.–394 с. ISBN 978-5-94839-629-3.
16. Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.
17. O‘zbek tili grammatikasi. (2007). Toshkent: Fan.
18. Nurmonov, A., & Yuldashev, B. (2001). Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili.
19. Karimov, S. (2010). Comparative Typology of English and Uzbek Languages.
20. Swan, M. (2005). Practical English Usage. Oxford University Press.