COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGY'S TYPES AND COMPARE OF VERBS IN METAPHORS

Avezova Nigora Safarovna
Senior teacher , PhD
The State university of world languages
nigoraavezova76@gmail.com

Annotation. This article analyzes comparative typology as a branch of general linguistics concerned with the systematic comparison and classification of languages according to structural and functional features. The paper discusses the aims of comparative typology, its major types such as genealogical, structural, and areal typology, and its principal branches across different language levels including phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical typology. It argues that comparative typology provides an essential framework for identifying language universals, explaining linguistic diversity, and supporting translation, language teaching, and cross-linguistic analysis [1][2][3].

Keywords: comparative typology, linguistic typology, language classification, structural typology, genealogical typology, areal typology, phonological typology, syntactic typology, morphology, universals.

Comparative typology is one of the most significant fields of modern linguistics because it allows scholars to compare languages beyond the limits of individual description. Instead of examining a single language in isolation, comparative typology searches for recurring structural and functional patterns across languages. In this way, it helps explain both diversity and similarity in the world's languages. The discipline is valuable not only in theoretical linguistics but also in practical areas such as translation, language teaching, and contrastive grammar [1][2][4]. The central purpose of comparative typology is to classify languages according to shared features and to reveal which structural patterns are common, rare, or universal. Typological research therefore moves from particular observations toward broader generalizations about language structure. It asks how languages organize sounds, words, grammatical categories, and sentence patterns, and whether these organizational principles reflect universal tendencies of human language. Because of this, comparative typology occupies an important place within general linguistics [1][2][3].

One major type of comparative typology is genealogical typology. This type studies languages that are historically related and belong to the same language family. Its goal is to identify inherited similarities and to distinguish them from later innovations. Genealogical typology is closely connected with comparative-historical linguistics because both fields investigate common ancestry, language families, and diachronic development. At the same time, typology uses this historical relationship as one basis for classification rather than as its only object of inquiry [1][3].

Another important type is structural typology, which classifies languages according to their internal organization. This includes such features as word order, morphological structure, phonological systems, and grammatical marking. Structural typology is often considered the central type because it examines how languages are built regardless of whether they are historically related. For example, languages may be compared according to whether they prefer subject-verb-object order or subject-object-verb order, or whether they are mainly analytic, agglutinative, or fusional in their morphological structure [1][2][3][5]. Areal typology, also called regional typology, studies similarities among languages that arise through geographical contact rather than common origin. Languages spoken in the same region often influence one another over long periods, which may result in similar grammatical, lexical, or phonological features. These similarities are especially important when the languages belong to different families but share a geographical area. Areal typology therefore helps scholars understand contact-induced change and distinguish borrowed traits from inherited ones [1][3].

Comparative typology can also be divided according to the levels of language hierarchy it investigates. One of its major branches is phonetic and phonological typology. This branch compares sound systems, vowel and consonant inventories, syllable structures, stress patterns, tonal distinctions, and phonotactic rules. Through this comparison, linguists determine which sound patterns are widespread and which are typologically marked or rare [1][2][6].

Morphological typology is another core branch. It examines how languages form words and express grammatical meanings such as tense, number, case, gender, and person. On the basis of morphological structure, languages are often described as isolating, agglutinative, fusional, or polysynthetic. Although many languages combine features from more than one type, this classification remains useful for comparative analysis because it highlights dominant strategies of grammatical expression [1][2][5].

Syntactic typology focuses on sentence structure and grammatical relations. This branch studies constituent order, alignment patterns, clause linkage, negation, question formation, passivization, and the ways subjects and objects are expressed. One of the most familiar typological parameters is basic word order, but syntactic typology goes much further by examining how whole grammatical systems are organized. It is especially useful in contrastive grammar and translation studies, where structural mismatches between languages often create difficulty [1][2][6].

Lexical typology studies how languages categorize experience through vocabulary. It compares semantic fields such as color terms, kinship systems, motion verbs, body-part vocabulary, and emotion words. This branch is important because languages do not always divide reality in the same way. What one language expresses with a single word may require several words in another. Lexical typology therefore reveals the relationship between language structure, conceptualization, and culture [1][2][6].

Some scholars also distinguish theoretical typology as a separate branch or higher level of analysis. While empirical typology collects and compares data from many languages, theoretical typology explains why certain patterns recur and why others are rare. It deals with language universals, implicational hierarchies, markedness, and explanatory models of cross-linguistic variation. In this sense, theoretical typology provides the interpretive framework through which comparative data become linguistically meaningful [2][6].

Comparative typology has important practical applications. In language teaching, it helps identify areas where learners may transfer structures from the native language into the foreign language. In translation, it clarifies why direct equivalence is often impossible and why grammatical restructuring is needed. In descriptive linguistics and lexicography, typological comparison supports more precise classification of forms and meanings. These practical uses show that comparative typology is not limited to abstract theory but also contributes to real communicative and educational tasks [1][3][5].

Another strength of comparative typology is its ability to combine the study of universals with the study of diversity. On the one hand, typological research reveals the remarkable variety of linguistic systems. On the other hand, it identifies repeated tendencies that suggest general principles of human language organization. This dual orientation makes the field particularly valuable in modern linguistics, where scholars seek to respect the individuality of languages while also explaining the common

properties they share [2][6]. Verbs occupy a central place in language because they express actions, processes, states, and events, and they organize the temporal and relational structure of discourse. When verbs are used metaphorically, they do more than denote concrete activity; they project one domain of experience onto another and generate new interpretations. A comparative analysis of grammatical categories of verbs in metaphors is therefore important because it shows that figurative meaning depends not only on vocabulary but also on grammar. This approach connects morphology, syntax, semantics, and cognition in the study of metaphor [1][2][4].

Traditional studies of metaphor often concentrate on lexical transfer, as in expressions such as “time flies” or “an idea came to me,” where a concrete verb is applied to an abstract domain. However, modern linguistic theory demonstrates that metaphor can also operate through grammar. The concept of grammatical metaphor explains that meanings normally expressed in one grammatical form may be recast in another. Thus, processes usually expressed by verbs may appear as nouns, adjectives, or condensed grammatical constructions. This shows that the study of metaphor must include both lexical and grammatical levels of analysis [2][3][5].

One of the most important grammatical categories in metaphorical verbs is tense. Tense places events in time, but in metaphorical discourse it often does more than indicate chronology. Present tense may create immediacy and universality, making abstract statements sound vivid and current. Past tense may create distance or narrative framing, while future forms may project inevitability, expectation, or evaluation. As a result, the same metaphorical predicate may have different interpretive force depending on the tense in which it is expressed [1][4].

Aspect also plays a crucial role in the metaphorical potential of verbs. Aspect determines whether an action is viewed as ongoing, completed, repeated, or developing over time. In metaphorical usage, this category strongly shapes conceptualization. A progressive form may depict an abstract phenomenon as unfolding dynamically, while a perfective form may present it as bounded and result-oriented. For instance, when social change is described as “growing,” “spreading,” or “crystallizing,” aspect contributes directly to the image of duration, movement, and transformation [1][2].

Mood is another grammatical category that influences metaphorical expression. Indicative forms often present metaphorical meanings as facts, which strengthens their rhetorical effect. Imperative forms can make abstract guidance sound active and forceful, while modal and subjunctive forms introduce possibility, uncertainty, obligation, or evaluation. In public discourse and literature, mood helps determine

whether a metaphor appears as description, command, warning, or supposition. Therefore, mood is not a secondary element but an active participant in metaphorical meaning construction [1][3].

Voice, especially the distinction between active and passive constructions, also affects metaphorical organization. Active voice usually foregrounds agency and presents the subject as the visible doer of the process. Passive voice, on the other hand, may background the agent and emphasize the affected entity. In metaphorical discourse, this choice can reshape interpretation significantly. An abstract force may be personified as an agent that "drives," "consumes," or "shapes" events, whereas passive constructions may depict communities or institutions as being acted upon by metaphorical processes [1][2][3].

In conclusion, comparative typology is a major branch of linguistics that studies languages through systematic comparison of their structural and functional features. Its principal types include genealogical, structural, and areal typology, while its major branches include phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, and theoretical typology. Together, these directions help scholars classify languages, identify universals, explain diversity, and apply linguistic knowledge in teaching, translation, and research. Comparative typology therefore remains an essential framework for understanding the organization of human language [1][2][3].

References

1. Mamatov, A. (2024). Comparative typology as a branch of general linguistics. Scientific Journal.

2. Linguistic typology. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistic_typology

3. Overview of comparative typology as a branch of general linguistics. Scribd presentation material.

4. Comparative typology as a branch of general linguistics. Studfile lecture material.

5. Linguistic Typology Definition, Types & Examples. Study.com.

6. Typology - Department of Linguistics, University at Buffalo.