European International Journal of Philological Sciences

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 61-63
DOI 10.55640/eijps-05-04-14

Check for updates

Accentual Features in Uzbek And Turkish: An Axiolinguistic Approach

Boymatova Dilnoza Baxtiyorovna

Associate Professor at Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITED 23 February 2025
ACCEPTED 20 March 2025
PUBLISHED 22 April 2025
VOLUME Vol.05 Issue 04 2025

Abstract: This study examines the accentual features in Uzbek and Turkish from an axiolinguistic perspective. Accent, as a prosodic feature, plays a crucial role in meaning formation and communicative intent [1]. The study explores the functional and perceptual aspects of stress patterns in both languages, highlighting their axiological implications. By employing a comparative analysis, the research identifies similarities and differences in accentuation, revealing the influence of sociocultural values on prosody [2]. The findings contribute to a broader understanding of linguistic evaluation mechanisms in Turkic languages. Additionally, this paper delves into historical linguistics and the diachronic development of stress patterns in these languages, providing a more comprehensive view of the phonological evolution of Uzbek and Turkish [3].

Keywords: Accentuation, Uzbek, Turkish, axiolinguistics, stress patterns, prosody, sociocultural values.

Introduction: Accentuation, as an essential prosodic element, significantly impacts linguistic meaning and sociocultural identity [4]. In Turkic languages, including Uzbek and Turkish, stress placement varies and serves as a key differentiator of phonological structures. Axiolinguistics, a branch of linguistics concerned with language evaluation and values, provides a valuable framework for examining the role of stress in communication [5]. This study aims to analyze how accentual patterns in Uzbek and Turkish reflect cultural and linguistic values, offering insights into their functional and evaluative dimensions. Additionally, the research investigates how language reforms and phonetic shifts have influenced stress patterns in modern usage [6]. The study also discusses the phonological adaptation of borrowed words in both languages, considering their impact on contemporary spoken discourse [7]. Furthermore, the study takes into

account sociolinguistic factors that influence accentual variation, such as education level, media exposure, and bilingualism [8].

METHODOLOGY

The study employs a comparative linguistic approach, analyzing phonetic data from native speakers of Uzbek and Turkish [3]. A qualitative assessment of recorded speech samples was conducted to identify dominant stress patterns and their communicative significance [2]. Additionally, secondary sources, including linguistic studies on Turkic prosody, were reviewed to contextualize the findings. The research also integrates an axiolinguistic framework to interpret the sociocultural impact of accentual features [1]. Furthermore, diachronic linguistic analysis was applied to trace the historical development of stress patterns in these languages [6]. Statistical methods were employed to determine the frequency of different stress patterns in various discourse types [7]. The study also included a perception-based experiment to evaluate how native speakers interpret stress shifts in different communicative contexts [5]. Additionally, sociolinguistic interviews were conducted to assess how speakers perceive the role of stress in expressing emotions, politeness, and authority [8].

RESULTS

Accentuation in Uzbek. Uzbek, a stress-final language, generally places primary stress on the last syllable of words [4]. However, stress variation occurs in borrowed words and emphatic speech [6]. The stress pattern affects semantic interpretation, influencing formal and informal discourse styles [2]. Historical influences from Persian and Russian have introduced phonetic variations, leading to subtle shifts in prosody [3]. Furthermore, the stress placement in Uzbek affects syntactic structures, particularly in question formation and sentence emphasis [7]. The analysis also indicates that dialectal differences within Uzbek contribute to minor variations in stress placement, particularly in regional speech communities where phonetic influences from neighboring languages are stronger [5]. Additionally, Uzbek speakers use stress modulation to highlight emotional intensity, which is often observed in poetry and public speeches [8].

Accentuation in Turkish

Turkish follows a more flexible stress system, with stress typically occurring on the last syllable of native words but shifting in compounds and certain suffixations [1]. Stress placement in Turkish also carries pragmatic weight, affecting politeness strategies and speaker intent [4]. Additionally, Ottoman Turkish had a more variable stress system, which evolved into the modern standardized patterns observed today [3]. In contemporary Turkish, stress can be used to differentiate between lexical categories, such as nouns and verbs, further highlighting its linguistic significance [5]. The study also finds that stress shifts in Turkish often correspond to syntactic boundaries and play a role in discourse-level intonation patterns [7]. Furthermore, regional dialects of Turkish exhibit slight variations in stress placement, particularly in Anatolian Turkish, where stress modulation is more prominent in conversational speech [8].

Comparative Analysis

Both languages exhibit stress-final tendencies but differ in their stress flexibility [6]. While Uzbek maintains a rigid final stress rule, Turkish allows variations based on morphological and pragmatic factors [2]. These differences reflect underlying cultural attitudes toward formality, emphasis, and expressivity [3]. Moreover, stress variation in Uzbek is largely influenced by lexical borrowing, while in Turkish, it is more influenced by syntactic and morphological structures [5]. Additionally, stress shifts in Turkish serve as a tool for emotional and rhetorical expression, whereas in Uzbek, stress is more systematically bound to phonological constraints [7]. Further analysis reveals that the adaptability of stress placement in Turkish enables speakers to use prosody as a means of nuanced social signaling, while Uzbek retains a more rigid structure that prioritizes phonological clarity over expressive flexibility [4]. Additionally, the role of stress in humor and irony is observed more prominently in Turkish than in Uzbek, where tonal shifts often accompany pragmatic meaning shifts [8].

DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that accentual patterns in Uzbek and Turkish align with broader axiological structures [3]. The strict final stress rule in Uzbek may be associated with a preference for structural consistency, whereas the variability in Turkish stress placement suggests a more dynamic approach to meaning modulation [1]. From an axiolinguistic perspective, these patterns indicate distinct communicative priorities and sociolinguistic tendencies [6]. Furthermore, the presence of stress variation in borrowed words highlights the interaction between language contact and phonetic adaptation [5].

CONCLUSION

This study highlights the significance of accentual features in the linguistic and cultural frameworks of Uzbek and Turkish [2]. The comparative analysis reveals that stress patterns serve not only as phonological markers but also as indicators of sociocultural values [4]. The diachronic perspective provides insights into the evolution of stress in these languages, demonstrating

the interplay between historical influences and linguistic adaptation [3]. Future research may expand on these findings by incorporating experimental phonetic analyses and exploring the role of stress in other Turkic languages [7].

REFERENCES

Johanson, L. (1998). "The Structure of Turkic Languages." Routledge.

Comrie, B. (1981). "The Languages of the Soviet Union." Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, G. (2002). "The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success." Oxford University Press.

Van der Hulst, H. (1999). "Word Prosodic Systems in the Languages of Europe." Mouton de Gruyter.

Beckman, M. E. (1986). "Stress and Non-Stress Accent." Foris Publications.

Boersma, P., & Hamann, S. (2009). "Phonetic and Phonological Perception in Language Learning." Palgrave Macmillan.

Underhill, R. (1976). "Turkish Grammar." MIT Press.

Yavaş, M. (2011). "Applied Turkish Phonetics." John Benjamins Publishing Company.