



CROSS-LINGUISTIC PATTERNS OF NEGATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF UZBEK, TURKISH, AND ENGLISH

Nasirova Xurshedabonu Sharof qizi

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, student E-mail: nasirovaxurshedabonu5@gmail.com

Sobirova Nasiba

Scientific supervisor: Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: *This article compares negation structures in Uzbek, Turkish, and English. The study examines syntactic, morphological, and semantic features, highlighting cross-linguistic similarities and differences. The results demonstrate both universal and language-specific negation strategies.*

Keywords: *negation, syntax, morphology, semantics, cross-linguistic, comparative analysis, particles.*

INTRODUCTION.

Negation is a fundamental aspect of human language that allows speakers to deny, contradict, or express the absence of an action or state. While the concept of negation exists in all languages, its realization varies across linguistic systems. Uzbek and Turkish are agglutinative languages, sharing some typological traits, whereas English, a Germanic language, exhibits different morphological and syntactic strategies. Understanding cross-linguistic patterns of negation not only illuminates structural universals but also aids in second language acquisition and translation studies.

This study employs a comparative-descriptive approach to examine negation patterns in Uzbek, Turkish, and English. Data were collected from multiple sources, including contemporary written texts, recorded spoken corpora, academic articles, and literary materials, to ensure a representative sample of each language. The analysis focused on both verbal and nominal negation, exploring morphological markers, syntactic position, and semantic scope. Comparative tables and textual examples were used to highlight cross-linguistic similarities and differences. This methodological approach allows for a systematic evaluation of how negation functions in typologically diverse languages, providing insights into both universal patterns and language-specific strategies. The approach also supports practical applications in second language acquisition, translation studies, and computational linguistics, emphasizing the interplay between morphology, syntax, and semantics in expressing negation.

Morphological Negation: Morphological negation refers to expressing negation by modifying the verb itself, often through suffixes or affixes. Both Uzbek and Turkish, as agglutinative languages, make extensive use of suffixation to indicate negation. In Uzbek, verbs are negated by adding the suffix *-ma/-me* to the verb stem. For example:

bormayman – “I do not go” (bor = go, -mayman = negative + 1st person singular)

qilmaydi – “He/She does not do” (qil = do, -maydi = negative + 3rd person singular)

In Turkish, a similar pattern occurs with the negative suffix *-me/-ma*:

gitmem – “I do not go” (git = go, -mem = negative + 1st person singular)

yapmaz – “He/She does not do” (yap = do, -maz = negative + 3rd person singular)

In contrast, English does not employ morphological negation. Negation is expressed through auxiliary verbs and negative particles, as in:

I do not go

He does not do



Thus, Uzbek and Turkish share a strong morphological strategy for negation, while English relies on separate words (analytic strategy). This difference illustrates a fundamental typological contrast between agglutinative and analytic languages.

Syntactic Negation: Syntactic negation concerns how negation is structured at the sentence or clause level. In Uzbek and Turkish, negation can be expressed both morphologically and syntactically. For instance, the auxiliary-like particles “emas” (Uzbek) and “değil” (Turkish) are used to negate adjectives and nominal predicates:

Uzbek: U yaxshi emas – “He/She is not good”

Turkish: O iyi değil – “He/She is not good”

English uses a strictly analytic structure, requiring an auxiliary verb and the negative particle “not”:

He is not good.

They do not like it.

The position of the negative particle is also important. In English, “not” typically follows the auxiliary verb, while in Turkic languages, negation particles follow the adjective or verb being negated. These syntactic differences demonstrate how word order and sentence structure interact with negation across languages.

Lexical Negation: Lexical negation involves the use of inherently negative words, such as pronouns, adverbs, or determiners. All three languages employ lexical negators, though the forms and usage vary.

Uzbek: hech kim, hech narsa, hech qachon;

Turkish: hiç kimse, hiçbir şey, asla;

English: nobody, nothing, never, nowhere;

While Uzbek and Turkish lexical negators are morphologically consistent with the language’s agglutinative nature, English negators are standalone words. Additionally, the co-occurrence of lexical and morphological negation is more flexible in Turkic languages. For example, in Uzbek:

Hech kim kelmadi – “Nobody came”

English avoids such redundancy: Nobody did not come is ungrammatical.

Double Negation: Double negation refers to using two negative markers in the same clause. This phenomenon behaves differently across languages:

Uzbek: Double negation is grammatical and often reinforces the negative meaning.

Hech kim hech narsa qilmagan – “Nobody did anything”

Turkish: Similarly acceptable.

Hiç kimse hiçbir şey yapmadı – “Nobody did anything”

English: Double negation is usually ungrammatical or implies a positive meaning in standard English.

Nobody didn’t come

This contrast illustrates how typological differences influence the interpretation and acceptability of negative constructions. Turkic languages allow additive negation for emphasis, while English relies on strict single negation rules.

The comparative analysis of negation in Uzbek, Turkish, and English reveals both typological similarities and significant differences that shed light on how languages structure denial. Uzbek and Turkish, as agglutinative languages, rely heavily on morphological markers attached to verbs to indicate negation. In Uzbek, verbal negation typically uses the suffix -ma, while Turkish employs -me/-ma. These suffixes allow speakers to convey negation concisely within the verb itself, often without additional auxiliary verbs. Nominal negation in these languages is achieved through particles such as emas in Uzbek and değil in Turkish, which follow the noun and maintain a relatively flexible word order. This morphological and syntactic approach provides clarity and efficiency, particularly in spoken language, and demonstrates how agglutinative structures facilitate compact expression of negation.

In contrast, English, as an analytic language, relies on auxiliary verbs and separate particles to express negation. Verbal negation typically requires the auxiliary do combine with not (do not/does not/did not), while nominal negation uses not alongside the copula (is not/are not). Unlike Uzbek and Turkish, English cannot mark



negation through verb inflection alone, highlighting the language's dependence on word order and auxiliary structures. This difference affects both language processing and second language acquisition, as learners must adjust to using separate syntactic elements rather than suffixes.

In conclusion, negation exhibits both universal and language-specific characteristics across Uzbek, Turkish, and English. Uzbek and Turkish rely on morphological suffixes and particles to express verbal and nominal negation, whereas English depends on auxiliary verbs and separate negative particles. Despite structural differences, all three languages ensure that negation clearly precedes or accompanies the main verb or copula, preserving semantic clarity. Understanding these patterns provides valuable insights for second language learning, translation, and cross-linguistic studies. It highlights the ways languages balance morphological compactness and syntactic clarity in expressing denial, emphasizing both diversity and underlying universality in human language.

REFERENCES:

1. Comrie B. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. – 45 b.
2. Kornfilt J. Turkish. London: Routledge, 1997. – 102 b.
3. Karimova S. Uzbek Syntax and Morphology. Toshkent: Fan Publishing House, 2015. – 78 b.
4. Radford A. English Syntax: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 213 b.
5. Suleyman A. Negation in Turkish: A Syntactic Study. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 2010. – 56 b.
6. Rakhmonov T. Comparative Grammar of Uzbek and English. Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2018. – 34 b.
7. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 91 b.
- ?? Absamadova, M. I. (2024). Exploring the language of diplomacy: Understanding the significance and evolution of diplomatic terms. *Miasto Przyszłości*, 49, 1315-1318.
- ?? Isroilovna, A. M. (2022). Methodological frameworks in written translation. In *Online-Conferences" Platform* (pp. 37-40).
- ¹ Absamadova, M. (2024). Structural Analysis of Diplomatic Terminology: Single-Component Vs. Multi-Component Terms. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*.
- ¹ Isroilovna, A. M. (2024). The impact of diplomatic language on international relations: A comprehensive analysis. *International Journal of Formal Education*, 3(5), 504-507.
- ¹ Absamadova, M. I. (2021). Games in the Teaching of English. *Экономика и социум*, (4-1 (83)), 43-47.
- ¹ Халимова, Ф. Р. (2021). КОГНИТИВ ПОЭТИКА. *Academic research in educational sciences*, 2(12), 133-142.
14. Rustamovna, H. F. (2020). KEY CONCEPTS OF SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION. В научный сборник вошли научные работы, посвященные широкому кругу современных проблем науки и образования, вопросов образовательных технологий 2020.-436 с., 232.