QO‘QON DAVLAT PEDAGOGIKA INSTITUTI ILMIY XABARLARI
(2026-yil 10-son)
FILOLOGIYA
PHILOLOGY
https://doi.org/10.70728/b.series.fil.v08.i10.056

COMPARATIVE AND TYPOLOGICAL FEATURES OF PERSIAN AND UZBEK: LEXICAL, MORPHOLOGICAL, AND SYNTACTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Husainova Gulnoza
University of world economy and diplomacy
Persian teacher
Email: *ghusainova@uwed.uz*

Abstract This article examines the comparative and typological features of Persian and Uzbek at the lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels. The primary objective is to identify the structural differences between these languages, which belong to different language families, as well as the similarities and features that have emerged through historical language contact. Persian belongs to the Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family, whereas Uzbek belongs to the Karluk branch of the Turkic language family. These classifications provide an important theoretical basis for comparing their grammatical systems. The article analyzes the Persian ezafe construction, the marker *-rā* used with direct objects, analytic grammatical structures, and the agglutinative morphology, case markers, and word-formation patterns of Uzbek. It also examines lexical borrowings from the Persian-Tajik linguistic environment into Uzbek, focusing on their phonological and semantic adaptation and their functions within the Uzbek linguistic system. The study employs comparative-descriptive, typological, componential, and historical-comparative approaches. The findings indicate that certain syntactic similarities between Persian and Uzbek do not demonstrate genetic relationship; such similarities may instead be explained by typological tendencies and prolonged language contact.

Keywords: Persian language, Uzbek language, comparative linguistics, linguistic typology, language contact, lexical borrowing, agglutination, ezafe, morphology, syntax, Persian-Tajik vocabulary.

In contemporary linguistics, the comparative study of genetically related and unrelated languages plays an important role in identifying the structural principles of language systems, distinguishing universal features from language-specific characteristics, and explaining the consequences of linguistic interaction. The study of languages that have coexisted within the same geographical and cultural environment for extended historical periods represents a particularly significant area of comparative linguistics.

Persian and Uzbek have played important roles in the historical, cultural, and literary development of Central Asia. Although these languages belong to different genetic groups, they have maintained extensive historical contacts through cultural exchange, literary traditions, trade, urban development, and multilingual communities. These interactions have left noticeable traces in their lexical systems, and numerous words and expressions have become established elements of the Uzbek vocabulary.

Persian belongs to the Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family. Its historical development encompasses Old Persian, Middle Persian, and New Persian. Modern Persian is historically and linguistically related to Dari and Tajik, although these languages have developed distinct literary standards and regional characteristics. Consequently, their similarities and differences must be considered when discussing the Persian-speaking linguistic environment.

Uzbek, by contrast, belongs to the Karluk branch of the Turkic language family. It is characterized by agglutinative morphology, the expression of grammatical meanings primarily through suffixes, and productive word-formation patterns. Throughout its historical development, Uzbek has interacted with Persian-Tajik, Arabic, and other languages. These contacts have contributed substantially to its vocabulary without changing its fundamental genetic classification.

Three concepts are particularly important when comparing Persian and Uzbek: genetic relationship, typological similarity, and contact-induced change. Genetic relationship refers to descent from a common ancestral language. Typological similarity concerns structural parallels between languages regardless of their genetic origins. Contact-induced change refers to linguistic developments resulting from prolonged interaction, bilingualism, and cultural exchange.

The relevance of this study lies in the need to examine lexical similarities, grammatical correspondences, and syntactic patterns in Persian and Uzbek without relying solely on surface resemblance. A comprehensive analysis must distinguish structural similarities from historical borrowing and genetic relationships.

The aim of the study is to identify the similarities and differences between Persian and Uzbek at the lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels and to describe the influence of historical language contact on the Uzbek linguistic system.

The following objectives are established to achieve this aim:

1. To describe the genetic classifications and typological characteristics of Persian and Uzbek.
2. To compare the principal means of expressing grammatical meanings in both languages.
3. To examine the syntactic functions of the Persian ezafe construction and the *-rā* marker in comparison with corresponding Uzbek structures.
4. To analyze Persian-Tajik lexical borrowings in Uzbek from lexical and semantic perspectives.
5. To explain the possible historical and structural factors underlying the identified similarities and differences.

Research object: The lexical and grammatical systems of contemporary standard Persian and Uzbek.

Research subject: The similarities and differences in word formation, grammatical marking, phrase structure, and sentence construction, together with the lexical consequences of Persian-Tajik–Uzbek language contact.

Research methods: The study employs comparative-descriptive analysis, linguistic typology, componential analysis, and historical-comparative approaches. Historical interpretations are based on established linguistic scholarship, while the examples illustrate representative grammatical patterns.

The scientific contribution of this article lies in its integrated approach to distinguishing lexical borrowing, structural typology, and prolonged language contact as possible explanations for similarities between Persian and Uzbek. The contribution is primarily analytical and synthetic; it does not claim new corpus-based or statistically verified findings.

The comparative study of Persian and Uzbek draws on several related areas of linguistic research, including the historical grammar of Persian, the historical and contemporary grammar of Uzbek, linguistic typology, lexical borrowing, and contact linguistics.

Research on the historical development of Persian examines continuity and change across its Old, Middle, and New Persian stages. The *Encyclopaedia Iranica* entry “Persian Language: Early New Persian” discusses the historical development of Persian, including phonological and morphological changes and the development of nominal and verbal systems [1]. This source provides an important foundation for understanding the analytic characteristics of modern Persian in their historical context.

The grammatical functions of Persian case-related constructions, object marking, and prepositions are discussed in Gernot Windfuhr’s article “Cases” [2]. This study provides a basis for examining the Persian *-rā* marker and comparing its functions with those of the Uzbek accusative case. However, the grammatical distributions of these two markers are not identical.

Studies of Persian-Tajik vocabulary in Uzbek also provide important theoretical background. Research by N. Nuriddinov and S. Elboyev examines Persian-Tajik lexical material in Uzbek, including lexical and word-formation features of borrowed vocabulary [3]. Such research demonstrates the importance of studying borrowed words not merely as isolated lexical items but as elements integrated into the recipient language.

Kh. V. Mirzakhmedova’s article on common words and terminology in Persian and Uzbek discusses shared lexical items and their historical and semantic relationships [4]. These studies help identify lexical correspondences, although not all formally similar words necessarily entered Uzbek through the same historical pathway. Some may be direct borrowings, others may have spread through intermediary languages such as Arabic, and still others may belong to international terminology.

N. Murodov’s research on words and grammatical elements borrowed from Persian into Uzbek draws attention to the possibility that contact-related influence may extend beyond vocabulary to certain derivational elements and constructional patterns [5]. Such cases require

careful differentiation between the function of an element in the source language and its function in the recipient language.

Contact linguistics also demonstrates that language influence is not limited to lexical borrowing. Under particular social and historical conditions, contact may affect pronunciation, grammatical patterns, word order, and discourse strategies. Nevertheless, geographical proximity alone is insufficient to establish contact-induced change. Historical documentation, systematic linguistic evidence, and sociolinguistic context must also be considered.

The literature reviewed here indicates that several aspects of Persian-Uzbek relations have already received scholarly attention. However, a systematic comparison of lexical contact and grammatical typology remains important, particularly when distinguishing surface similarities from historical influence. The present article addresses this issue through an integrated comparative framework.The study is based primarily on comparative-descriptive and typological approaches. Comparative-descriptive analysis identifies the grammatical characteristics of each language and compares them according to common criteria. Typological analysis examines structural similarities and differences independently of whether the languages are genetically related.

The analysis covers three principal linguistic levels:

- **Lexical level:** Borrowings, shared lexical items, semantic correspondences, and differences in meaning.
- **Morphological level:** The expression of grammatical meanings through suffixes, independent grammatical words, and analytic constructions.
- **Syntactic level:** Word order, modifier-head relationships, object marking, and the position of the verb within the sentence.

The Persian examples illustrate common grammatical patterns in contemporary standard Persian, while the Uzbek examples follow the norms of contemporary standard Uzbek. Persian examples are presented in the original Arabic-based script, simplified Latin transliteration, and English translation. The transliteration is intended for accessibility rather than as a comprehensive phonetic transcription.

The following criteria are used in the comparison:

1. The grammatical meaning expressed by a particular construction.
2. The position of the grammatical marker within the phrase or sentence.
3. Whether the grammatical meaning is expressed through a bound morpheme or an independent element.
4. The semantic interpretation of the construction.
5. The possible source of the similarity: typological convergence, genetic relationship, or language contact.

One limitation of this study is that it does not claim to use a large parallel corpus, statistical frequency measurements, or questionnaire data. Accordingly, its conclusions are primarily descriptive and theoretical. Claims concerning the precise historical period of a borrowing or the direct Persian influence on a particular Uzbek grammatical feature require additional historical evidence.

The first issue in comparing Persian and Uzbek is their genetic classification. Persian belongs to the Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family, whereas Uzbek belongs to the Karluk branch of the Turkic language family. Their principal grammatical systems therefore developed within different historical and linguistic traditions.

Throughout its historical development, Persian has lost or transformed many morphological characteristics associated with earlier Indo-European stages. In modern Persian, grammatical relationships are frequently expressed through word order, prepositions, independent grammatical elements, and verbal forms. Uzbek, by contrast, expresses a substantial proportion of grammatical meanings through suffixes attached to word stems.

For example, the Uzbek form *kitob-lar-im-dan* (“from my books”) contains several grammatical elements:

- *kitob* — book;
- *-lar* — plural;
- *-im* — first-person singular possessive marker;
- *-dan* — ablative case marker.

This structure illustrates agglutination, in which grammatical meanings are expressed through a sequence of relatively distinct affixes.

In Persian, plurality is commonly expressed through the suffix *-hā*, while some nouns also use *-ān*. Possessive relationships can be expressed through independent possessive pronouns or constructions involving ezafe. Source and separation relationships are commonly expressed through prepositions and related constructions.

These differences demonstrate that the morphological structures of Persian and Uzbek are not identical. However, morphological differences do not prevent similarities at the syntactic level. Both languages, for example, commonly employ subject–object–verb (SOV) order in neutral declarative sentences.

The similarity in word order does not, by itself, demonstrate genetic relationship. It may reflect a typological tendency, prolonged language contact, or a combination of factors. Establishing direct historical influence requires additional evidence.

Persian and Uzbek differ considerably in their sound systems. Contemporary standard Persian has a vowel system distinct from that of Uzbek. Persian is commonly described as having vowel phonemes represented as /æ/, /e/, /o/, /ɒː/, /iː/, and /uː/, although their detailed phonetic description depends on the analytical framework used.

Uzbek has its own vowel inventory and pronunciation patterns, including regional variation. Historically, vowel harmony was an important feature of Turkic languages, including earlier stages of Uzbek. In contemporary standard Uzbek, however, vowel harmony is not as systematic as in many other Turkic languages.

The weakening of vowel harmony in Uzbek has sometimes been discussed in connection with Persian-Tajik influence. Nevertheless, explaining this development solely through external influence would be methodologically inadequate. Internal phonological change, historical developments within Turkic, and prolonged multilingual contact must all be considered.

Persian loanwords incorporated into Uzbek may undergo phonological adaptation. This may involve changes in pronunciation, the neutralization of certain sound distinctions, or the emergence of alternative pronunciations. The historical development of individual words, however, must be established through etymological dictionaries and historical textual evidence.

The comparison therefore demonstrates that present-day phonetic similarity cannot independently establish the origin of a word. Reliable etymological conclusions require the combined analysis of historical forms, sound correspondences, and semantic development.

One of the most visible relationships between Persian and Uzbek occurs at the lexical level. Historical contact has introduced numerous Persian-Tajik words into Uzbek. Some are widely used in everyday communication, while others belong primarily to literary, historical, cultural, or professional contexts.

Words commonly discussed in connection with the Persian-Tajik lexical layer include *bahor* (“spring”), *barg* (“leaf”), *bog‘* (“garden”), *daraxt* (“tree”), *do‘st* (“friend”), *gul* (“flower”), *xona* (“room”), *shahar* (“city”), *obod* (“prosperous; developed”), and *ozoda* (“clean; neat”). The etymological status and historical pathway of each item should be verified individually, since some words may have entered Uzbek through intermediary languages or undergone complex historical development.

Once a borrowed word enters a recipient language, its grammatical behavior often adapts to the rules of that language. For example, the Uzbek forms *do‘stlar*, *bog‘lar*, and *xonalar* express plurality through the Uzbek suffix *-lar*. Although the lexical bases may belong to the Persian-Tajik layer, their grammatical inflection follows Uzbek morphological rules.

Similarly, forms such as *do‘stlik* (“friendship”), *bog‘bon* (“gardener”), and *gulzor* (“flower garden”) illustrate word-formation processes in Uzbek. These examples demonstrate the integration of borrowed lexical material into the recipient language. Nevertheless, the historical origin of each element in a derived word must be examined independently rather than inferred solely from its modern form.

Three aspects of lexical adaptation are particularly important:

- **Phonological adaptation:** Adjustment of a borrowed word to the pronunciation patterns of Uzbek.
- **Morphological adaptation:** The ability of a borrowed word to accept Uzbek plural, possessive, case, and derivational suffixes.
- **Semantic adaptation:** Broadening, narrowing, or stylistic specialization of the word's meaning.

For example, Persian دوست (*dust*, “friend”) corresponds closely in form and meaning to Uzbek *do‘st*. In Uzbek, this lexical base appears in forms such as *do‘stlik*, *do‘stona*, and *do‘stlashmoq*. These derivatives illustrate Uzbek word-formation processes rather than reproducing the entire grammatical structure of the source language.

Persian-Tajik borrowings can therefore be understood as an important historical layer of the Uzbek lexicon. Their widespread use demonstrates that many borrowed words have become conventional elements of contemporary Uzbek vocabulary.

Words that are formally similar in Persian and Uzbek do not necessarily have identical meanings. During language contact, some lexical items retain their original meanings, while others undergo semantic broadening, narrowing, or specialization.

Semantic comparison may reveal several types of relationships:

1. **Full or close semantic correspondence:** The words share substantially similar core meanings.
2. **Semantic broadening:** A word develops a wider range of meanings in one language.
3. **Semantic narrowing:** The word becomes restricted to a more specific context.
4. **Stylistic differentiation:** A word may be neutral in one language but literary, historical, or dialectal in another.
5. **False equivalence:** Words that resemble one another in form do not correspond fully in meaning.

These distinctions are also important for translation. When translating from Persian into Uzbek, selecting a word solely because it resembles the source-language form may result in semantic imprecision. Translators must consider context, collocations, register, and communicative function.

Another important distinction concerns etymological origin and contemporary linguistic status. A historically borrowed word may be widely used in modern Uzbek, readily accept Uzbek suffixes, and no longer be perceived by speakers as foreign.

One of the principal differences between Persian and Uzbek concerns the expression of grammatical meanings. Uzbek is generally classified as an agglutinative language, in which grammatical meanings are commonly expressed through suffixes attached sequentially to a stem. Persian, by contrast, frequently employs analytic constructions, prepositions, and verbal forms to express grammatical relationships. This distinction should not be treated as absolute, since both languages possess morphological and analytic resources.

Consider the Uzbek expression:

uy-lar-imiz-da — “in our houses.”

Its components are:

- *uy* — lexical stem;
- *-lar* — plural;
- *-imiz* — first-person plural possessive marker;
- *-da* — locative case marker.

Several grammatical meanings are expressed within a single word. This is a typical example of Uzbek agglutinative morphology.

In Persian, plurality is commonly expressed through *-hā*:

- *ketāb* — کتاب — book;
- *ketāb-hā* — کتاب‌ها — books.

Possession can be expressed through a construction such as *ketāb-e man* — کتاب من (“my book”). Here, *man* means “I,” while *-e* functions as the ezafe marker. Persian also has other ways of expressing possession, including possessive enclitics; therefore, this example should not be regarded as the only possible construction.

Source or separation relationships are also expressed differently. Uzbek uses the ablative suffix in *uy-dan* (“from the house”), whereas Persian uses a prepositional construction such as *az xāne* — از خانه (“from the house”).

The comparison shows that Uzbek often expresses grammatical meanings morphologically within a word, whereas Persian frequently uses independent elements and linking constructions. This distinction is one of the principal morphological differences between the two languages.

One of the characteristic grammatical features of Persian is the ezafe construction. Ezafe marks a relationship between a noun and a following modifier or possessor. In contemporary Persian, the marker is generally not represented by a separate letter in ordinary writing, although it is pronounced, commonly as *-e* or *-ye*, depending on the phonological environment.

Examples include:

- *ketāb-e xub* — کتاب خوب — “a good book”;
- *ketāb-e Ali* — کتاب علی — “Ali's book”;
- *dar-e xāne* — درِ خانه — “the door of the house.”

In these examples, ezafe links the head noun to a following adjective or noun. In Persian, attributive adjectives normally follow the nouns they modify.

In Uzbek, attributive adjectives generally precede the nouns they modify:

- *yaxshi kitob* — a good book;
- *katta uy* — a big house;
- *yangi maktab* — a new school.

Possessive relationships are commonly expressed through a genitive-possessive construction:

- *Alining kitobi* — Ali's book;
- *uyning eshigi* — the door of the house;
- *talabaning daftari* — the student's notebook.

Thus, Persian *ketāb-e Ali* and Uzbek *Alining kitobi* can express a similar possessive relationship, but their grammatical structures differ. Persian uses ezafe to link the head noun with the possessor, whereas Uzbek generally employs a genitive-possessive construction.

Ezafe should not, however, be interpreted exclusively as a marker of possession. It also connects nouns with adjectives and may express material, affiliation, and other relationships. Consequently, Persian ezafe cannot be equated completely with either the Uzbek genitive case or the Uzbek attributive construction.

The comparison can be summarized as follows:

Feature	Persian	Uzbek
Position of attributive adjective	Usually after the noun	Usually before the noun
Possessive relationship	Ezafe and a following possessor	Genitive-possessive construction

Feature	Persian	Uzbek
Grammatical device	Ezafe marker	Case and possessive suffixes or word order
Example	*ketāb-e xub*	*yaxshi kitob*
Possessive example	*ketāb-e Ali*	*Alining kitobi*

This comparison demonstrates that attributive relationships in Persian and Uzbek may be semantically similar while differing in their formal expression and word order.

The Persian marker *-rā* plays an important role in marking definite direct objects. It generally follows the noun phrase functioning as the direct object.

For example:

Man ketāb-rā xāndam.

من کتاب را خواندم.

“I read the book.”

In this sentence, *ketāb* (“book”) functions as the direct object, while *-rā* marks it as a grammatically specified object.

In Uzbek, a similar relationship is commonly expressed through the accusative suffix *-ni*:

Men kitob-ni o‘qidim.

“I read the book.”

The two examples have comparable semantic functions, but the grammatical distribution and status of the markers are not identical. In Persian, the use of *-rā* is associated with object definiteness, contextual identifiability, and discourse conditions. In Uzbek, the accusative marker is also associated with the referential properties of the object, but its distribution is governed by Uzbek case marking and syntactic conventions.

It is therefore inappropriate to treat *-rā* and *-ni* as exactly equivalent grammatical units. Persian *-rā* is commonly described as a postpositional object marker, whereas Uzbek *-ni* is a bound case suffix attached to a noun or noun phrase. Although their syntactic functions overlap in certain contexts, their morphological status and distribution differ [2].

This comparison illustrates a broader methodological principle: a grammatical marker in one language may be translated through its closest functional equivalent in another language without implying that the two markers share all grammatical properties.

In neutral declarative sentences, Persian and Uzbek commonly exhibit subject–object–verb order. However, similarity in basic word order does not mean that the two languages have identical syntactic systems.

Uzbek:

Men kitobni o‘qidim.

“I read the book.”

Persian:

Man ketāb-rā xāndam.

من کتاب را خواندم.

“I read the book.”

In both examples, the subject precedes the object, and the verb occurs at the end of the sentence. Both languages therefore display SOV order in these examples.

Nevertheless, the languages differ in the position of modifiers, the use of grammatical particles, ezafe constructions, object marking, and the organization of topic-comment relationships. In both languages, word order may also vary according to context, emphasis, and communicative purpose.

A comprehensive comparison of word order must therefore include different sentence types and discourse situations rather than relying on a single example. The examples presented here illustrate general grammatical patterns but do not claim to describe every possible word-order arrangement in either language.

The verbal systems of Persian and Uzbek also differ morphologically and syntactically. Uzbek expresses tense, mood, person, number, and negation through various suffixes and auxiliary constructions. Persian likewise has an inflectional verbal system, but the formation of tense and aspect, the placement of person markers, and the use of auxiliary verbs follow language-specific patterns.

Consider the Uzbek form *kel-di-m* (“I came”), consisting of the stem *kel-* (“come”), the past-tense marker *-di*, and the first-person singular marker *-m*.

The Persian form *āmad-am* — آمدم (“I came”) expresses a similar meaning through a different morphological structure.

These examples demonstrate functional correspondence between the verbal forms of the two languages, although their internal structure and formation rules differ. Translating a verb from one language into another requires more than matching tense labels: context, aspect, discourse function, and verb complementation must also be considered.

Persian and Uzbek also possess means of expressing negation, commands, wishes, and conditional meanings. However, the forms and conditions governing their use are not identical. Comparative grammar must therefore distinguish the grammatical meaning from the formal device used to express it.

Although historical contact between Persian-Tajik and Uzbek is clearly reflected in the lexicon, identifying grammatical influence is more complex. The borrowing of a lexical item can often be investigated through its form, meaning, and historical documentation. Demonstrating that a grammatical construction was borrowed requires stronger evidence.

The following factors are particularly relevant when investigating grammatical influence:

- The duration and geographical distribution of bilingualism.
- The social relationships between speakers in contact situations.
- The earliest historical attestations of the relevant feature.
- The distribution of the feature across other Turkic languages.
- The possibility that the development resulted from internal grammatical change.

Certain derivational elements and constructional patterns in Uzbek may be investigated as potential outcomes of Persian-Tajik contact. However, their existence does not change the fundamentally agglutinative structure of Uzbek. Borrowed elements may become integrated

into the recipient language, combine with other suffixes, and participate in new word-formation processes.

Similarly, the weakening of vowel harmony or the presence of particular syntactic patterns should not automatically be attributed to Persian-Tajik influence. Such interpretations require historical documentation, comparative evidence, regional data, and consideration of alternative explanations.

The most appropriate approach in contact linguistics is therefore to describe the observed similarity, investigate its possible origins, and avoid strong causal conclusions when the evidence is insufficient.

The comparison of Persian and Uzbek demonstrates that their lexical, morphological, and syntactic systems exhibit both similarities and differences. Some of these similarities may be explained by typological tendencies, while others are associated with historical language contact.

First, Persian-Tajik lexical material represents an important component of Uzbek vocabulary. Many borrowed words have adapted to Uzbek phonological and morphological patterns. This process reflects the historical development of the Uzbek lexicon and the linguistic consequences of cultural interaction.

Second, the principal morphological difference between the two languages concerns the means by which grammatical meanings are expressed. Uzbek is characterized by agglutinative morphology, whereas Persian frequently uses analytic constructions, prepositions, ezafe, and language-specific verbal forms.

Third, certain syntactic similarities occur, particularly the widespread use of subject–object–verb order in neutral declarative sentences. Nevertheless, the languages differ significantly in modifier placement, possessive constructions, and object marking.

Fourth, the grammatical adaptation of borrowed words demonstrates the active role of the recipient language. Persian-Tajik lexical items can accept Uzbek plural, possessive, and case suffixes and participate in Uzbek word-formation processes.

Finally, the analysis confirms the importance of distinguishing lexical similarity, grammatical correspondence, and genetic relationship. These distinctions are essential for producing scientifically grounded conclusions in comparative linguistics.

The comparative and typological analysis of Persian and Uzbek demonstrates the need to distinguish genetic classification, grammatical structure, and historical language contact. The findings of this study can be summarized as follows.

First, Persian and Uzbek belong to different language families, and their grammatical systems developed within different historical traditions. The position of Persian within the Iranian branch and Uzbek within the Turkic language family requires genetic and typological criteria to be applied separately. Consequently, similarities in lexical material or syntactic structure cannot independently establish genetic relationship.

Second, historical interaction with the Persian-Tajik linguistic environment has contributed substantially to the development of Uzbek vocabulary. Borrowed words have undergone phonological adaptation, morphological integration, and semantic development.

Their use with Uzbek plural, possessive, case, and derivational suffixes demonstrates that borrowed vocabulary can become integrated into the grammatical system of the recipient language.

Third, morphological analysis identifies important structural differences between the two languages. Uzbek commonly expresses grammatical meanings through sequences of suffixes, whereas Persian employs ezafe constructions, prepositions, plural markers, and verbal forms to express grammatical relationships. These differences show that comparative analysis must consider both the formal structure of grammatical markers and their syntactic and semantic functions.

Fourth, Persian ezafe and Uzbek attributive constructions may express similar semantic relationships, but their formal structures differ. Likewise, Persian *-rā* and Uzbek accusative *-ni* may perform comparable functions in certain contexts, yet their grammatical status and conditions of use are not identical. These distinctions are particularly relevant to Persian language teaching and translation between the two languages.

Fifth, the grammatical consequences of language contact must be evaluated cautiously. The existence of a structural similarity does not establish direct borrowing. Such claims require evidence from historical texts, regional data, comparative linguistic analysis, and sociolinguistic research.

Overall, the findings support an approach in which lexical borrowing, grammatical correspondence, and typological similarity are examined within a common analytical framework while remaining distinct categories. This approach can contribute to a more precise understanding of Persian and Uzbek, improve translation practices, and support the use of comparative grammar in Persian language teaching.

Future research could employ parallel Persian-Uzbek corpora, investigate the frequency and distribution of borrowed lexical items, compare historical texts with contemporary language data, and examine the regional distribution of possible contact-induced grammatical features.

REFERENCES

1. **Windfuhr, Gernot, ed.** *The Iranian Languages.* London and New York: Routledge, 2009.
2. **Lazard, Gilbert.** *A Grammar of Contemporary Persian.* Translated by Shirley Lyon. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers, 1992.
3. **Windfuhr, Gernot.** “Cases.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. V, fasc. 1, 1990, pp. 25–37. Available at: https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/cases/
4. **“Persian Language: Early New Persian.”** *Encyclopaedia Iranica.* Available at: https://doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_11377
5. **Nuriddinov, N., and S. Elboev.** “Analysis of Persian-Tajik Variations in Uzbek Language.” *Oriental Journal of Philology*, 3(03), 2023, pp. 83–88. https://doi.org/10.37547/supsci-ojp-03-03-12

6. **Mirzakhmedova, Khulkar Vasilovna.** “Comparative Analysis of General Words-Terms in Persian and Uzbek Languages.” *Psychology and Education Journal*, 58(1), 2021, pp. 1050–1056. https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v58i1.854
7. **Murodov, Normurod.** “Words and Grammar Categories Borrowed from Persian into Uzbek Language.” *Scientific Journal of Fergana State University*, 29(3), 2023. https://doi.org/10.56292/SJFSU/vol29_iss3/a113
8. **Tursunov, U., and B. O‘rinboyev.** *O‘zbek adabiy tili tarixi* [History of the Uzbek Literary Language]. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi, 1982.
9. **Tursunov, U., A. Muxtorov, and Sh. Rahmatullayev.** *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili* [Contemporary Uzbek Literary Language]. Tashkent: O‘zbekiston, 1992.
10. **Abduazizov, A.** *Tilshunoslikka kirish* [Introduction to Linguistics]. Tashkent: Sharq,