

**SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN WORD FORMATION BETWEEN  
AGGLUTINATIVE LANGUAGES (TURKIC LANGUAGES) AND FUSIONAL  
LANGUAGES (ENGLISH)***Ismoilova Charos Shuhrat kizi**English teacher, Independent researcher,  
University of Economics and Pedagogy, Samarkand kampus  
Samarkand, Uzbekistan*

**Abstract.** This article examines the processes of word formation in Turkic languages, with particular focus on Turkish and English, highlighting the similarities and differences between agglutinative and fusional language types. Agglutinative languages are characterized by the linear addition of affixes to a root word, where each affix typically expresses a single grammatical feature. In contrast, English, as a fusional language, often combines multiple grammatical meanings within a single affix. The study investigates the morphological structures, affixation patterns, syntactic influences, and semantic changes in these language families. Findings indicate that although both language types use affixes in word formation, the ways grammatical words and phrases function and are used in a foreign language differ significantly due to variations in syntactic structure, inflection, and derivation.

**Keywords:** agglutinative, fusional, word formation, Turkic languages, English, morphology, affixation, inflection, root.

**Introduction.** Word formation plays a crucial role in shaping both the structure and meaning of language, making it a vital area of linguistic study. Around the world, different languages exhibit various word formation processes that vary according to their grammatical structures. Two prominent language families that illustrate distinct methods of word formation are the agglutinative and fusional language families. According to Spencer (2003), word formation is not only a fundamental part of syntax but also a mechanism for expanding a language's lexicon. Agglutinative languages, including those in the Turkic language family, exhibit morphological structures where affixes attach linearly to a root word, each affix usually expressing a single grammatical category. In contrast, fusional languages like English use fusional morphemes, where one affix may encode several grammatical meanings simultaneously.

This article explores the similarities and differences in word formation between Turkic languages (representatives of the agglutinative family) and English (a member of the fusional family). The study aims to compare morphological systems and focus on how words are formed, altered, and function in each language. Comparing these two language families not only enhances our understanding of their linguistic structures but also deepens our insight into the diversity of human languages.

Agglutinative languages are characterized by the clear and consistent attachment of affixes to a root word. These affixes generally do not significantly alter the root's meaning but express specific grammatical categories such as tense, mood, person, or number. The Turkic language family—which includes Turkish, Uzbek, Kazakh, and Kyrgyz—serves as a prime example of agglutinative languages.

In Turkic languages, affixation follows highly regular patterns, where each affix typically corresponds to one grammatical meaning. For example, the plural marker "-ler" or "-lar" in

Turkish attaches to a noun without changing its core meaning, and possessive suffixes like "-im" (my) function similarly. This morphological pattern contrasts with that of fusional languages, where affixes often combine multiple meanings (Greenberg, 1963).

Words in agglutinative languages primarily form through the addition of various affixes to a root, with each affix serving distinct grammatical functions. Despite some variations in nominal and verbal morphology among Uzbek, Turkish, Kyrgyz, and Karakalpak, these languages share similar morphological forms. In these languages, nouns (nominal morphology) and verbs (verbal morphology) possess separate affixes.

For example, in Turkic languages such as Uzbek, Turkish, Kyrgyz, and Karakalpak, noun cases are marked by specific suffixes. The most common nominal cases include:

- Nominative (subject case): The noun functions as the subject of the sentence and takes no suffix.

Examples:

- Uzbek: Ev katta. (The house is big.)
  - Turkish: Ev büyük. (The house is big.)
  - Kyrgyz: Үй чоң. (The house is big.)
  - Karakalpak: Үй ulı. (The house is big.)
- Accusative (direct object case): Typically marked by the suffix "-i."

Examples:

- Uzbek: Kitobni o'qidim. (I read the book.)
  - Turkish: Kitabı okudum. (I read the book.)
  - Kyrgyz: Kitapnı okudum. (I read the book.)
  - Karakalpak: Kitapnı o'qidim. (I read the book.)
- Dative (directional case): Marked by the suffix "-e."

Examples:

- Uzbek: Maktabga bordim. (I went to school.)
  - Turkish: Okula gittim. (I went to school.)
  - Kyrgyz: Mektepke bórdım. (I went to school.)
  - Karakalpak: Mektepke bórdım. (I went to school.)
- Genitive (possessive case): Marked by suffixes such as "-in," "-im," or "-ning."

- Uzbek: Mening kitobimni unutding. (You forgot my book.)
- Turkish: Benim kitabımı unuttun. (You forgot my book.)
- Kyrgyz: Menin kitabymdı unuttun. (You forgot my book.)
- Karakalpak: Mening kitobımnı unuttun. (You forgot my book.)

**Morphology.** In Turkic languages, nominal morphology clearly specifies the grammatical roles of nouns through suffixes. Each case has its own suffix, which varies between languages but follows common structural patterns. For instance, the accusative suffix "-i" is used in Uzbek and Turkish, whereas Kyrgyz and Karakalpak have slightly different forms. The verbal morphology in Turkic languages is also agglutinative. Verbs are modified by sequentially adding multiple suffixes that express different grammatical features. For example, in Turkish, the verb "yaz" (to write) can be altered to express tense, mood, and person. The word "yazacağım" means "I will write," where "-acak" marks future tense and "-ım" denotes the first person singular. Each suffix is added in sequence, preserving the core meaning and rendering the word formation process transparent (Kiparsky, 1982). Various suffixes express different tenses: present, past, and future.

- **Present tense:** The verb receives suffixes such as “-iyor” or “-yap.”

Examples:

- Uzbek: O‘qiyotganman. (I am reading.)
- Turkish: Okuyorum. (I am reading.)
- Kyrgyz: Oquvatam. (I am reading.)
- Karakalpak: O‘qıp turamın. (I am reading.)

- **Past tense:** The verb is suffixed with “-di” or “-ti.”

Examples:

- Uzbek: O‘qidim. (I read.)
- Turkish: Okudum. (I read.)
- Kyrgyz: Okudum. (I read.)
- Karakalpak: O‘qidim. (I read.)

- **Future tense:** The verb receives the suffix “-ecek.”

Examples:

- Uzbek: Kelaman. (I will come.)
- Turkish: Geleceğim. (I will come.)
- Kyrgyz: Keləm. (I will come.)
- Karakalpak: Kelēm. (I will come.)

**Verb Formation and Differences:** Verb formation also varies across Turkic languages. Each language forms different tenses and persons through suffixes and auxiliary words, clearly marking verbal categories such as tense, person-number, and plurality. These changes are expressed through affixes that highlight the agglutinative nature of the language (Lewis, 2000).

**Syntactic Effects:** Agglutinative languages like Turkish allow flexible word order due to the clear grammatical relations marked by affixation. While the typical word order is Subject-Object-Verb (SOV), this can vary for emphasis or other communicative purposes by using appropriate affixes.

**Similarities:** Despite the structural differences between agglutinative and fusional languages, there are certain similarities in their word formation processes. Both language types rely on affixation—either through agglutination or fusion—to express grammatical meanings. Moreover, both systems involve the use of roots that serve as the base for word formation (Greenberg, 1963; Haspelmath & Sims, 2010). Another similarity lies in the use of affixes to mark grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, mood, and number. Both languages use affixation to alter the meaning of words based on these categories, although the mechanisms and rules may differ (Spencer, 2003; Hock, 2007).

**Differences.** The most significant difference between agglutinative and fusional languages lies in the structure of their affixes. In agglutinative languages like Turkic languages, affixes are added linearly, each carrying a separate grammatical meaning. In contrast, fusional languages such as English often use fusional affixes that combine multiple meanings within a single affix (Johanson, 1998; Lewis, 2000). Furthermore, the complexity of inflection in English is generally less overt compared to Turkic languages, where multiple affixes are stacked upon each other to form very specific grammatical forms. In English, complex meanings are mainly expressed through auxiliary verbs and word order, whereas Turkish employs a rich system of suffixes within a single word that convey various grammatical nuances (Yükseker, 2010; Tamer, 2012).

**Conclusion.** In conclusion, a comparative study of word formation in Turkic (agglutinative) and English (fusional) languages reveals significant differences alongside some interesting similarities. Agglutinative languages rely on affixes that each express a single grammatical meaning directly attached to root words, while fusional languages often use more complex affixes that express several grammatical features simultaneously.

**References:**

1. Adnan Öztürel, Tolga Kayadelen and Isin Demirsahin.2019. A Syntactically Expressive Morphological Analyzer for Turkish.
2. Greenberg, J. H. (1963). Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. In *Universals of Language* (pp. 73-113). MIT Press.
3. Hock, H. H. (2007). *The History of English and the Evolution of Its Morphosyntactic Structures*. Oxford University Press.
4. Kiparsky, P. (1982). From Cyclic Phonology to Lexical Phonology. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 9(3), 171–202.
5. Lewis, G. (2000). *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
6. Spencer, A. (2003). *Introduction to Morphological Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Comrie, B. (1981). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. University of Chicago Press.
8. Haspelmath, M. (2002). *Understanding Morphology*. Oxford University Press.
9. Johanson, L. (1998). *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge.
10. Yükeker, D. (2010). *Turkish Morphology: An Overview*. The Linguistic Society of America.
11. Matthews, P. H. (2007). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
12. Blake, B. J. (2001). *Case*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Bickerton, D. (2009). *Language and Species*. University of Chicago Press.
14. Witzel, M. (2016). The Evolution of Agglutination. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 26(3), 201-215.
15. Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press.
16. Haspelmath, M., & Sims, C. (2010). *Understanding Morphology: A Guide to Word Formation*. Oxford University Press.
17. Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: An Introduction*. John Benjamins Publishing.
18. Reh, M. (1984). Agglutination in Language Typology. *Studies in Language*, 8(2), 163-202.
19. Sadler, L., & Spencer, A. (2001). Syntax and Morphology of the Turkic Languages. *Journal of Linguistics*, 37(1), 45-62.
20. Tamer, S. (2012). Turkish Morphology and Syntactic Structures. *Turkic Language Studies*, 17(4), 40-58.