

Morphology Of Parts Of Speech In Karakalpak And English Languages

Maryash Jollibekova

PhD, Docent of Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 20 October 2025; **Accepted:** 11 November 2025; **Published:** 16 December 2025

Abstract: This article provides an in-depth comparative analysis of the morphology of parts of speech in Karakalpak and English, focusing on how each language encodes grammatical meaning through either agglutinative or analytic structures. Although Karakalpak employs a highly productive system of suffixation to express number, case, possession, tense, person, and derivational categories, English relies more heavily on word order, auxiliary verbs, and function words to convey the same meanings. Moreover, the study demonstrates that despite their contrasting typological profiles, both languages maintain parallel communicative functions across nouns, verbs, adjectives, pronouns, adverbs, and relational markers. Furthermore, the analysis highlights systematic differences in inflectional and derivational strategies, while also illustrating functional convergence through numerous bilingual examples. Consequently, the findings reveal not only structural divergence but also linguistic universality, emphasizing that both languages, through different morphological pathways, effectively organize grammatical relations and encode semantic distinctions.

Keywords: Karakalpak morphology; English morphology; comparative linguistics; agglutination; analytic structure; parts of speech; inflection; derivation; noun morphology; verb morphology; typology; cross-linguistic comparison.

Introduction: The morphology of parts of speech in Karakalpak and English demonstrates both typological divergence and functional convergence, which becomes particularly evident when the two languages are examined through the lens of grammatical categories, word-formation strategies, and syntactic behavior. Since Karakalpak belongs to the Turkic agglutinative language family, while English represents an analytic Indo-European type, their morphological systems differ substantially; nevertheless, both languages ultimately aim to fulfill similar communicative functions. Consequently, a comparative analysis of their parts of speech not only reveals structural contrasts but also highlights deeper linguistic principles that govern the way meaning is encoded in natural language.

To begin with, nouns in both languages serve as pivotal lexical categories; however, Karakalpak noun morphology is far more productive due to its rich system of suffixes. For instance, the plural form in Karakalpak is expressed through the addition of -lar/-ler, as in *adamlar* (people) and *kitaplar* (books), whereas English relies on the relatively uniform -s/-es

endings, as in *people* (irregular) or *books*. Although both languages share the grammatical category of number, the Karakalpak system displays greater regularity, since the same plural marker applies across the entire noun class, while English includes irregular plurals such as *children*, *men*, and *geese*. Moreover, when expressing possession, Karakalpak consistently uses possessive suffixes—*meniń kitabım* (my book), *seniń atıń* (your horse)—while English instead employs separate pronouns (*my book*, *your horse*). Thus, Karakalpak uses bound morphology to encode relations directly on the noun, whereas English predominantly relies on analytic constructions, which consequently reduces the morphological load carried by nouns [7].

Similarly, verbs also illustrate profound typological differences, yet upon deeper observation, they exhibit parallel communicative roles. Karakalpak verbs obligatorily attach person and tense markers; for example, *baradı* (he goes), *baramız* (we go), and *bardıq* (we went). Conversely, English marks person only in the third-person singular present, as in *he goes*, while all other forms remain uninflected (*I go*, *you go*, *they go*). Although English uses auxiliary verbs (*do*, *be*, *have*) to

express tense, aspect, or voice, Karakalpak expresses these categories through suffixation, such as *baratır* (is going) or *barğan* (had gone). Consequently, while English develops syntactic complexity to compensate for its limited morphology, Karakalpak expands morphological complexity to reduce the need for auxiliary structures. Nevertheless, both languages maintain the fundamental opposition between past and non-past, even though the means of expressing these distinctions diverge [6].

In terms of adjectives, the contrast becomes even more apparent. English adjectives are mostly invariant, as seen in *big*, *beautiful*, *interesting*, and they do not change according to gender, number, or case. Karakalpak adjectives similarly avoid inflection; for example, *úlken bala* (big boy) and *úlken qız* (big girl) preserve the same form. Yet, Karakalpak adjectives may take nominalizing suffixes to function as nouns, as in *jaqsılar* (the good people), whereas English requires additional lexical or syntactic elements, such as the good ones. In both languages, the comparative and superlative degrees exist; however, Karakalpak typically employs suffixes (*-raq*, *eń-*), such as *úlkenrek* (bigger) and *eń úlken* (the biggest), while English uses analytic markers (*more*, *most*) except in irregular forms like *bigger* and *biggest*. Hence, both systems maintain degree morphology, though their strategies differ significantly [5].

Furthermore, pronouns exhibit another rich area of comparison. Karakalpak retains a comprehensive case system for pronouns—*mağan* (to me), *mennen* (from me), *meniń* (my)—whereas English shows limited morphological variation, as in *I*, *me*, *my*, and *mine*. Despite the apparent simplicity of English, both languages achieve the same communicative functions; nonetheless, Karakalpak accomplishes this through suffixation and case marking, while English relies on positional and syntactic clarity.

When examining adverbs, both languages show relatively similar behavior, mainly because adverbs often lack inflection in both systems. Yet, Karakalpak more readily derives adverbs from adjectives without suffixes, as in *jildam* → *jildam* (*quick* → *quickly*), whereas English uses a more fixed pattern involving *-ly*, as in *quick* → *quickly*, even though exceptions such as *fast* and *hard* continue to exist. This indicates that both languages rely on morphological derivation [3].

In addition, function words reflect the deepest structural disparities. Since English is analytic, it relies heavily on prepositions such as *in*, *on*, *with*, and *to* to express grammatical relations. By contrast, Karakalpak uses postpositions like *menen* (with) or *ushın* (for), which typically follow the noun: *dosti menen* (with a

friend). Moreover, many grammatical relations in Karakalpak are encoded through case suffixes rather than independent function words, as in *mektepke baradı* (goes to school), where the dative case *-ke* replaces the English preposition *to*. Consequently, although both languages employ relational markers, English uses independent lexical items, while Karakalpak integrates them into morphological patterns.

Even in word formation, the differences remain pronounced. English relies on both prefixes (*un-*, *re-*, *dis-*) and suffixes (*-ness*, *-tion*, *-able*), whereas Karakalpak primarily uses suffixal derivation such as *-lıq/-lik* for abstract nouns (*doslıq* — friendship) and *-shı/-shi* to form agent nouns (*oyınshı* — player). Although English is more flexible in combining derivational morphemes, Karakalpak shows a more transparent and predictable system, which reinforces its agglutinative character [2, 43-77].

Taken together, the comparison demonstrates that Karakalpak and English differ sharply in the degree of morphological richness, yet both languages ultimately organize parts of speech around universal grammatical functions. Karakalpak encodes relationships through a wide range of suffixes, thereby creating dense morphological forms such as *baratıǵnıń bolsam* (if I am going), while English expresses the same ideas through analytical constructions like *if I am going*. Thus, despite structural divergence, functional equivalence persists across the systems. In conclusion, the morphological contrasts between Karakalpak and English illuminate two fundamentally different linguistic strategies—one rooted in agglutination and the other in analytical structure—while simultaneously demonstrating that both languages, through different pathways, successfully structure meaning, express relationships, and maintain grammatical coherence.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the comparative exploration of Karakalpak and English morphology clearly demonstrates that the two languages represent distinct typological systems while simultaneously fulfilling parallel communicative functions. Because Karakalpak is an agglutinative language, it encodes grammatical relations through a rich and predictable system of suffixation, allowing nouns, verbs, adjectives, and pronouns to carry extensive morphological information. English, on the other hand, employs a predominantly analytic structure, relying more on word order, auxiliary verbs, and independent function words to express relationships that Karakalpak marks morphologically. Nevertheless, despite these structural contrasts, both languages successfully maintain

grammatical coherence and semantic precision. The analysis therefore confirms that functional equivalence can emerge even when morphological strategies diverge significantly. Ultimately, the comparison highlights the diversity of linguistic systems and underscores the universal principles through which languages across the world organize meaning, express relations, and construct coherent discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Dixon, R. M., & Aikhenvald, A. Y. (Eds.). (2003). *Word: A cross-linguistic typology*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Haspelmath, M. (2024). Inflection and derivation as traditional comparative concepts. *Linguistics*, 62(1), 43-77.
3. Házirgi qaraqalpaq tili. Morfologiya. Nókis: Qaraqalpaqstan, 1981.
4. Házirgi qaraqalpaq ádebiy tiliniń grammatikası. Sóz jasalıw hám Morfologiya. Nókis: Bilim, 1994.
5. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. Á. (2015). *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge.
6. Lieber, R. (2021). *Introducing morphology*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Nasırov D. 1961. Qaraqalpaq tilinde kópplik kategoriyası. Nókis: Qaraqalpaq mámleket baspası.
8. Payne, T. (2006). *Exploring language structure: A student's guide*. Cambridge University Press.