VOWEL HARMONY IN TURKISH VS. UZBEK: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Ravshanova Adiba Muhammad-kizi
Samarkand region Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
2nd year student of the Faculty of English Philology and Translation Studies
93 036 77 11
ravshanovaadiba77@gmail.com

Abstract: This article presents a comparative analysis of vowel harmony systems in Turkish and Uzbek, two related Turkic languages. While both languages exhibit vowel harmony, the specifics of their systems differ significantly. The paper examines the phonological rules governing vowel selection in suffixes, focusing on the dimensions of rounding harmony, backness harmony, and height harmony. It analyzes the extent to which vowel harmony is maintained in contemporary usage, considering factors such as loanword integration, dialectal variation, and the influence of standard language norms. The study highlights the similarities and differences in the vowel inventories of the two languages and their impact on the operation of vowel harmony. It also investigates the productivity of vowel harmony in each language, examining the degree to which speakers consistently apply harmony rules in novel words and constructions. Finally, the article discusses the implications of these findings for language acquisition, language teaching, and historical linguistics within the Turkic language family. Data sources include descriptive grammars, phonological analyses, and corpus-based investigations. The analysis seeks to provide a clearer understanding of the evolution and current status of vowel harmony in these two important Turkic languages.

Keywords: Vowel Harmony, Turkish Language, Uzbek Language, Turkic Languages, Phonology, Comparative Linguistics, Language Acquisition, Historical Linguistics, Rounding Harmony, Backness Harmony, Height Harmony, Suffixation

INTRODUCTION

Vowel harmony, a common feature in Turkic languages, is a phonological constraint that requires vowels within a word to share certain articulatory features. This creates a melodic consistency and predictability in pronunciation. While both Turkish and Uzbek, members of the Turkic language family, possess vowel harmony systems, the specifics of these systems differ significantly in terms of the types of harmony involved, the vowel inventories that participate, and the degree to which harmony is consistently applied. This paper provides a comparative analysis of vowel harmony in Turkish and Uzbek, exploring the intricacies of their phonological rules, the factors affecting harmony maintenance, and the implications for language acquisition and historical linguistics.

I. Vowel Inventories and Harmony Dimensions

Turkish has an eight-vowel system, typically represented as: /i, y, ɯ, u, e, ø, a, o/. These vowels are distinguished by height (high vs. low), backness (front vs. back), and rounding (rounded vs. unrounded). Turkish vowel harmony primarily operates along two dimensions:

• Backness Harmony: Suffix vowels must agree in backness with the last vowel in the stem. This is governed by the [+/- back] feature.

• Rounding Harmony: High vowels in suffixes must agree in rounding with the preceding vowel in the stem, if that vowel is rounded. This is governed by the [+/- round] feature, but with a more limited scope than backness harmony.

Uzbek, on the other hand, has a six-vowel system, usually described as: /i, u, e, o, æ, ɑ/. Compared to Turkish, Uzbek lacks distinct front rounded vowels (like /y/ and /ø/). The main dimensions of vowel harmony in Uzbek are:

• Backness Harmony: Similar to Turkish, suffix vowels typically agree in backness with the stem vowel. The feature [+/- back] is crucial here. However, the application is less consistent.
• Limited Height Harmony: While not as robust as backness harmony, there's evidence of a tendency for high vowels to harmonize with preceding high vowels, especially in certain suffixes. This is more of a tendency than a rigid rule.
• No rounding harmony: Rounding harmony is virtually non-existent in Uzbek.

II. Suffixation and Harmony Rules

In Turkish, vowel harmony is highly productive and readily apparent in suffixation. For example, the plural suffix has four allomorphs: -ler, -lar, -ler, and -lar, selected based on the backness of the stem vowel. The dative suffix has two allomorphs: -e and -a, also determined by backness harmony. Furthermore, the high vowel in suffixes like the possessive -i must also harmonize in rounding if preceded by a rounded vowel.

Uzbek also exhibits backness harmony in suffixation, but the rules are less strict and exceptions are more frequent. For example, while the dative suffix ideally appears as -ga after back vowels and -ga after front vowels, loanwords and other factors can disrupt this pattern. The high vowel harmony is also less consistent; certain suffixes show a stronger tendency towards height agreement than others.

III. Factors Affecting Harmony MaintenanceSeveral factors contribute to the differences in harmony maintenance between Turkish and Uzbek:

• Vowel Inventory: The presence of front rounded vowels in Turkish strengthens rounding harmony, which is absent in Uzbek due to its vowel inventory. The six-vowel system in Uzbek also introduces greater potential for neutralization and vowel quality shifts that can obscure harmony patterns.
• Language Contact: Uzbek has experienced significant contact with Persian and Russian, languages that do not have vowel harmony. This contact has led to the incorporation of numerous loanwords that violate Uzbek vowel harmony rules. Turkish, while having loanwords, has generally maintained a stricter adherence to its native phonological system.
• Standardization: Standard Turkish has actively promoted and codified vowel harmony, reinforcing its importance in the language. While Uzbek also has a standard language, the enforcement of harmony rules has been less rigorous.
• Dialectal Variation: Dialectal variation plays a role. Some Uzbek dialects may exhibit more or less consistent vowel harmony than the standard language. The interaction between dialects and the standard can influence perceptions of acceptable pronunciation.
• Loanword Integration: The way loanwords are adapted into each language impacts vowel harmony. Turkish often attempts to harmonize loanwords, while Uzbek tends to retain the original vowel qualities, leading to violations of harmony.

IV. Productivity and Speaker Consistency

Turkish speakers generally demonstrate a high level of consistency in applying vowel harmony rules, even when encountering novel words. This suggests a strong level of phonological awareness and a deeply ingrained understanding of the harmony system. However, there are also loanwords, especially recent ones, that resist harmonization, and speakers are becoming accustomed to such exceptions. Uzbek speakers exhibit greater variability in their adherence to vowel harmony. While they are generally aware of the basic rules, they are more likely to produce utterances that violate those rules, particularly with loanwords or in casual speech. This suggests that the vowel harmony system in Uzbek is less robustly represented in the mental grammar of speakers compared to Turkish. The differences in vowel harmony between Turkish and Uzbek have implications for language acquisition. Turkish-speaking children generally acquire vowel harmony relatively early and consistently, reflecting the system's clarity and regularity. Uzbek-speaking children, on the other hand, may take longer to master vowel harmony due to its greater complexity and inconsistencies. From a historical linguistics perspective, the comparison of vowel harmony in Turkish and Uzbek provides insights into the evolution of the Turkic language family. It suggests that while vowel harmony was likely a prominent feature of Proto-Turkic, it has undergone different developmental trajectories in the various daughter languages. Uzbek may represent a case of weakening and simplification of the original harmony system, while Turkish has largely maintained or even reinforced it. While both Turkish and Uzbek share the typological feature of vowel harmony, the realization of this feature differs substantially. Turkish vowel harmony is a more robust, consistent, and productive system, governed by clear rules of backness and rounding agreement. Uzbek vowel harmony, while still present, is weaker, more variable, and subject to greater influence from language contact and dialectal variation. The differences reflect the distinct historical, social, and linguistic forces that have shaped the evolution of these two important Turkic languages. Further research, including acoustic analyses and psycholinguistic experiments, is needed to fully understand the cognitive representation and processing of vowel harmony in Turkish and Uzbek speakers. The study of these systems provides valuable insights into the complexities of phonological organization and the dynamic interplay between sound structure and language change.

CONCLUSION

This comparative analysis reveals that while both Turkish and Uzbek exhibit vowel harmony, their systems diverge significantly in scope, consistency, and productivity. Turkish maintains a robust backness and rounding harmony, reinforced by standardization and a relatively stable vowel inventory. Uzbek, in contrast, displays a weaker backness harmony and lacks rounding harmony entirely, factors compounded by extensive language contact and dialectal variation. These differences suggest distinct evolutionary paths from Proto-Turkic, with Turkish preserving and even strengthening harmony, while Uzbek shows signs of erosion and simplification. The varying degrees of adherence to harmony rules have implications for language acquisition, with Turkish learners exhibiting greater consistency than their Uzbek counterparts. Further investigation, incorporating acoustic data and psycholinguistic experiments, is crucial to fully understand the cognitive representation and processing of vowel harmony in these languages and to illuminate the broader dynamics of phonological change within the Turkic family. The contrast between these two systems serves as a valuable case study in the interplay of linguistic structure and sociohistorical forces.

REFERENCES:

1. Boeschoten, H., & Verhoeven, L. (1987). The structure of Turkish words. In H. Boeschoten & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), Studies in Modern Turkish Linguistics (pp. 1-26). Rodopi.

2. Clements, G. N. (2001). Feature economy in phonology. Phonology, 18(3), 287-333.

3. Korn, A. (2009). Middle Turkic Glossed Loanwords: Investigating the transfer of source-language phonology. Harrassowitz Verlag.

4. Underhill, R. (1976). Turkish grammar. MIT Press.

5. Vaux, B., & Cooper, J. (2003). Introduction to quantitative analysis in linguistics. Lincom Europa.