Article

Linguistic and Terminological Interpretation of the Noun Category Terms in Uzbek and Kazakh Languages

Qodirova Barno*¹

1. Docent, doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD), Samarkand State University, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
* Correspondence: kodirova.b86@gmail.com

Abstract: One of the urgent tasks of modern linguistics is the systematization of linguistic terminology and the software of scientific consistency of Turkic languages. Despite the genetic proximity of Uzbek and Kazakh, as well as the typological similarity of two languages, absolute differences and variations in designating grammatical categories are observed, especially in the category of noun. Abstract The paper deals with the description and interpretation of the notions of noun category terms in Uzbek and Kazakh linguistics, which implies that the equivalent grammatical phenomena are described under the name of different national labels and theoretical descriptions. The knowledge gap this article fills is that, compared to those nouns, relevant terminology is not often described comparatively as a single terminological system, especially in terms of number, possession, case categories, and predicative forms. While these categorizations have been discussed previously, and sometimes even in cross-linguistic perspectives, with a strong emphasis on school grammar traditions framed within each language, overall terminological equivalence, divergence and functional overlap remains poorly explained. Comparative typological and structural semantic analysis, where definitions of Uzbek and Kazakh grammar works are compared and the functional functioning of nouns; This analysis is based on grammatical concepts such as the common and proper nouns, concrete and abstract nouns, plural and collective meaning, the possessive, the case, the auxiliary nouns, the predicative suffix. The results show that most of the meanings of noun category terms of Uzbek and Kazakh are similar, although the terminology is different, but some categories have structural differences. The most prominent difference is the Kazakh instrumental case, which has no direct morphological counterpart in Uzbek (where it corresponds functionally to constructions with bilan). These results point to a need for greater terminological standardization and more effective comparative description, with ramifications for Turkic grammar writings, the development of philological terminology, and terminology in textbooks.

Keywords: Uzbek Language, Kazakh Language, Noun Category, Linguistic Term, Terminology, Comparative-Typological Analysis, Grammatical Category, Singular and Plural, Case, Possession, Turkic Languages

1. Introduction

In modern linguistics, systematizing national terminologies, studying them on a comparative-typological basis, and ensuring scientific and terminological consistency among Turkic languages are considered important scholarly tasks. In particular, despite the genetic proximity of Uzbek and Kazakh, certain differences, variations, and divergences in explanations are observed within the system of linguistic terms that denote

their grammatical categories [1]. This situation underscores the need to establish a unified approach to the use of terms in scholarly literature, textbooks, and research studies.

The noun category is one of the most fundamental and universal grammatical categories of language, expressing essential grammatical and semantic relations such as number, possession, case, and collectivity. A comparative study of the linguistic content, structural-semantic features, and scope of terms related to this category in Uzbek and Kazakh allows for the identification of both general and specific aspects of Turkic language grammar. Moreover, such research contributes to the systematic organization of philological terminology on a scientific basis, clarifies the relationship between national and international terms, and facilitates the process of terminological standardization.

In the context of globalization, the intensification of scientific information exchange, collaborative research, and academic integration has made ensuring the consistency and precision of scientific terminology across Turkic languages increasingly important [2]. From this perspective, a comparative study of the linguistic and terminological interpretation of noun-category terms in Uzbek and Kazakh holds both theoretical and practical significance, serving as an important scholarly resource for the development of Turkic linguistics, comparative grammar, and terminological studies.

The Uzbek language is not only genetically related to its cognate, Kazakh, but also shares common typological features. For example, one of the independent parts of speech, the noun, is defined in Uzbek as: "A noun is an independent word that denotes a person, object, or place and answers the questions 'Who?', 'What?', and 'Where?'" [3]. In Kazakh, it is defined similarly: "A noun is a word that denotes an object and answers the questions 'Who?' or 'What?'" [4].

2. Materials and Methods

The freshness of the material and the novelty of the research lies in that the methodology of this study is based on comparative linguistic and terminological comparison to reveal the formation, substantivization, and features of usage of noun category terms in Uzbek and Kazakh linguistics as well. The terms chosen in the two languages represent combinations of the lexicon of both scholars and educators, in that the material was drawn from modern grammar textbooks, academic reference sources, and comparative grammar studies [5]. To better understand the noun category in each language, this study first uses a descriptive and definitional analysis drawing on core grammatical concepts like common and proper nouns, concrete and abstract nouns, singular and plural, collectivity, possession, and case. Following the definitional basis, the research uses comparative typological analysis to study structural and especially semantic equivalence between terms, aiming to find out whether different labels mean the same thing or terminological variation points to real grammatical variation. We focus on morphological markers and their variations, for instance, plural suffixes conditioned by vowel harmony in Kazakh, possessive endings in both languages, as well as case suffix systems, extra instrumental case in Kazakh and the functional correspondence with Uzbek constructions with "bilan". Furthermore, it applies functional analysis to investigate the functioning of terms in grammatical description including so-called predicative forms and nominal auxiliaries, where divergent patterns of classification between Uzbek and Kazakh have been attested [6]. The results are organized by means of generalization and synthesis, enabling the research to find relevant common terminological bases, specific linguistic differentiations, and aspects needing a common terminology for stable scientific and pedagogical use.

3. Results and Discussion

Nouns that denote the general name of a class of persons, objects, or places – or that serve as proper names for individuals, objects, or locations – are classified as **turdosh ot** in Uzbek and **жалпы есім** in Kazakh (common nouns), and as **atoqli ot** in Uzbek and

жалқы есім in Kazakh (proper nouns). These terms refer to the same conceptual category. Similarly, definitions of **aniq ot** (Uzbek) – **деректі зат есім** (Kazakh) and **mavhum ot** (Uzbek) – **дерексіз зат есім** (Kazakh) demonstrate conceptual equivalence. For instance: "Nouns that denote objects perceivable through our senses are called specific (concrete) nouns" [7]; "Нақтылы тануға болатын зат атаулары деректі зат есім деп аталады." Likewise: "Nouns that denote objects not directly perceivable through our senses, but understood through thought and imagination, are called abstract nouns"; "Көзге көрінбегенмен, адамның ойлауы нәтижесінде ғана танылатын құбылыс, ұғым атаулары дерексіз зат есім деп аталады."

It is evident that, although these terms are expressed with different labels, they convey the same meaning, and the examples provided in their definitions correspond closely across both languages.

It is well known that nouns are used in singular and plural forms. The singular form (*e.g., kitob, daftar*) represents the basic, lexemic form of a noun and does not carry a specific grammatical marker. The plural form, on the other hand, is created by adding a plural suffix to the noun stem in order to indicate the multiplicity of objects or phenomena. While a comparison of plural forms reveals a general similarity between Uzbek and Kazakh, the Kazakh language follows the law of vowel harmony; therefore, the Uzbek plural suffix *-lar* appears in Kazakh as *-лар, -лер, -дар, -дер, -тар, or -тер*, depending on phonological context.

In Turkic languages, the plural meaning is not always expressed morphologically. In some cases, plural or collective meaning arises even without the addition of a plural suffix [8]. In particular, in Kazakh and Uzbek, certain compound or paired nouns semantically convey plurality: *do'st-yoron, tanish-bilish, ota-ona, bola-chaqa, qozon-tovoq, xotin-xalaj* (qiz-qirqin), *yer-yemish, oziq-ovqat*, and others.

Additionally, in both languages, some simple nouns inherently carry the semantic feature of collectivity or generality. Such nouns – *mol, sut, tuz, qaymoq, muhabbat, do'stlik*, and others – express plurality or generality semantically, and therefore typically do not take a plural suffix. Thus, in these cases, the plural meaning is conveyed through a lexical-semantic rather than a grammatical means.

Furthermore, nouns that follow numerals in Kazakh and Uzbek are grammatically used in the singular form and do not take a plural suffix. For example: bitta olma, o'nta olma ("one apple," "ten apples"). This indicates that the plural meaning can also be expressed through a syntactic-contextual device, namely numerals [9].

Similarities can also be observed among the terms that denote plural forms. For instance, the term **"plural form of a noun"** in Uzbek corresponds to **"Зат есімнің көптелуі"** in Kazakh. Moreover, when comparing possessive and case markers that attach to noun stems to link them with other words and form syntactic units, both similarities and certain differences become evident. In particular, possessive forms indicating the association of an item with one of the three persons, which are used in both singular and plural, show this pattern: in Uzbek, these are *-m, -im, -ng, -ing, -i, -si, -miz, -imiz, -ngiz, -ingiz, -lari*; in Kazakh, *-м, -ым, -ім, -ң, -ың, -ің, -сы, -сі, -ы, -і, -мыз, -міз, -іміз, -ыңыз, -іңіз*. These forms are termed **egalik shakli** (possessive form) in Uzbek and **тәуелдік жалғауы** in Kazakh.

Additionally, Kazakh distinguishes between **оңаша тәуелдеу**, which indicates that several objects belong to a single person, and **ортақ тәуелдеу**, which expresses that one or several objects belong to multiple persons [10]. No direct equivalents for these terms exist in Uzbek.

It is known that, in contemporary Turkic languages, the number of case forms does not vary significantly: Tatar, Gagauz, Azerbaijani, Turkmen, Karakalpak, and Uzbek have six cases; Kazakh has seven; Khakas and Chuvash have eight; Yakut and Turkish have

nine. Case suffixes are applied differently depending on whether the stem ends in a vowel or a consonant. In Uzbek and Kazakh, the system of case forms is structured as follows (Table 1):

Table 1. Case Forms in Uzbek and Kazakh

№	Uzbek	Suffix	Kazakh	Suffix
1	Nominative	–	Атау септігі (Nominative)	–
2	Genitive	-ning	Ілік септігі (Genitive)	-ның, -нің, -дың, -дің
3	Dative	-ga	Барыс септігі (Dative)	-қа, -ке, -ға, -ге, -а, -е
4	Accusative	-ni	Табыс септігі (Accusative)	-ды, -ді, -ты, -ті, -ны, -ні
5	Locative	-da	Жатыс септігі (Locative)	-да, -де, -та, -те, -нда
6	Ablative	-dan	Шығыс септігі (Ablative)	-нан, -нен, -дан, -ден, -т
7	–	–	Instrumental	-мен, -бен, -пен

A notable difference is that, in Kazakh, case suffixes are attached to the noun stem in multiple variants according to the rules of **vowel harmony** and **assimilation** [11]. Despite this, a general equivalence in meaning and function of case forms is observed between Uzbek and Kazakh. The only exception is the seventh case in Kazakh – the **Instrumental case** with the suffixes *-мен, -бен, -пен* – which has no direct equivalent in Uzbek. In Uzbek, these forms correspond functionally to constructions using the **auxiliary word category** with the preposition "bilan" (with). A. Rafiyev explains this apparent surplus in the number of Kazakh cases by noting that "it can actually be attributed to the later expansion of functions of the instrumental and other linguistic elements" [12].

In Uzbek, the verbalizing forms that mark nouns for predication – such as the suffixes *-man, -miz, -san, -siz, -dir*—as well as the verbs *bo'lmoq, sanalmoq,* and *hisoblamoq,* are collectively referred to as **copulas**. These copulas can attach to all categories of nouns. In Kazakh, similar forms are treated as **predicative suffixes** (*зат есімнің жіктелуі*), which link a noun to the predicate and, therefore, always function as part of the predicate. Unlike in Uzbek, these suffixes do not attach to all nouns but are restricted to **personal nouns** only. These forms in Kazakh are presented as follows:

Table 2. Predicative (Personal) Suffixes in Kazakh

Person	Singular	Plural
1st person	-мын, -мін	-мыз, -міз
	-бын, -бін	-быз, -біз
	-пын, -пін	-пыз, -піз
2nd person	-сын, -сін	-сындар, -сіндер
	-сыз, -сіз	-сыздар, -сіздер
3rd person	-ды, -ді, -ты, -ті	-ды, -ді, -ты, -ті

In Kazakh, nouns are classified according to their meaning and function into **негізгі зат есім** (primary nouns) and **көмекші зат есім** (auxiliary nouns). Primary nouns carry a complete lexical meaning on their own and can function as full constituents within a sentence (Table 2). In contrast, auxiliary nouns lack independent meaning and are used in combination with primary nouns within compound expressions. Examples include words such *as алды, арт, аст, үст, жан, қас, ара, орта, іш, сырт, бас, бет, шет, төбе, тұс, маң, қыр, ұш,* and others [13].

In Uzbek, functionally equivalent auxiliaries derived from the noun class are expressed with words such as *old, ort, ust, tepa, orqa, yon, ich, ora, bosh, o'rta, tag*, and similar terms. These are studied as part of the **auxiliary word category**, serving as modifiers within compound noun constructions [14] [15].

4. Conclusion

Although the terms related to the noun class in the cognate Uzbek and Kazakh languages are similar in meaning and function, certain differences and distinctions in the internal structure of nouns are evident.

Terms such as *noun class, common noun, proper noun, concrete noun, abstract noun*, and *plural form* are expressed with different labels in the two languages, yet they convey the same underlying concept.

Possessive forms are a grammatical category specific to nouns and are common to both Uzbek and Kazakh.

While the terminology associated with case systems in both languages shows considerable similarity, the Kazakh term **көмектес септік** (Instrumental case) does not have a direct equivalent in Uzbek.

The Uzbek term for predicative noun forms and the Kazakh term **зат есімнің жіктелуі** serve the same functional purpose in linking nouns to the predicate.

Finally, the Kazakh term **көмекші зат есім** (auxiliary nouns) is studied within the noun class as an independent part of speech, whereas in Uzbek, functionally equivalent auxiliary forms – derived from nouns such as *old, ort, ust, tepa, orqa, yon, ich, ora, bosh, o'rta, tag* – are examined within the auxiliary word category.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Zhunisbek, *Qazaq tili fonetikasy*. Almaty, Kazakhstan: Sanat, 2009.

[2] Baitursynuly, *Til qural. Qazaq tilinin sarfy*. Almaty, Kazakhstan: Ana tili, 1992.

[3] N. Mahmudov, A. Nurmonov, A. Sobirov, and others, *Ona tili. Umumiy o'rta ta'lim maktablarining 5 sinfi uchun darslik*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Ma'naviyat, 2015.

[4] Ä. Isabayev, S. Isayev, J. Däuletbekova, and G. Nishanova, *Qazaq tili. 6 synipqa arnalgan oqwlyq*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'zbekiston, 2017.

[5] Kenesbaev, *Qazaq tilinin grammatikasy*. Almaty, Kazakhstan: Gylym, 2002.

[6] Nurmonov, *O'zbek tilshunosligi tarixi*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 2002.

[7] N. Mahmudov, A. Nurmonov, A. Sobirov, and D. Nabiyeva, *Ona tili. Umumiy o'rta ta'lim maktablarining 6 sinfi uchun darslik*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Tasvir, 2017.

[8] Abduazizov, *O'zbek tili fonologiyasi va morfologiyasi*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 2010.

[9] Zh. Jümebaev, M. Eskeeva, N. Zhurakuziev, and N. Kilichov, *Qazaq zhane o'zbek tilderinin salystyrmaly grammatykasy (kesteli sipattamaly): oku quraly*. Almaty, Kazakhstan: Qazaq Universiteti, 2023.

[10] U. Baykabulov, G. Nishanova, and M. Temirbaeva, *Qazaq tili. Jalpy orta bilim beretin mektepterdin 5 synibyga arnalgan oqwlyq*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'zbekiston, 2015.

[11] Sh. Bulekbaeva, "Ona tilini davlat tili bilan kommunikativ-kognitiv asosda qiyoslab o'rgatish (Ta'lim qozok tilidagi maktablar misolida)," PhD Thesis, PhD dissertation, Samarkand, Uzbekistan, 2019.

[12] A. Rafiyev, *Turkiy tillarning qiyosiy tarikhiy grammatikasi*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'zbekiston, 2004.

[13] N. Mahmudov, A. Nurmonov, A. Sobirov, D. Nabiyeva, and A. Mirzaahmedov, *Ona tili. Umumta'lim maktablarining 7 sinfi uchun darslik*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Ma'naviyat, 2009.

[14] R. R. Saifullaeva, Ed., *Zamonaviy o'zbek tili. Morfologiya*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2008.

[15] E. Begmatov, *O'zbek tili terminologiyasi masalalari*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 2001.