Published: July 30, 2025 | Pages: 176-179

PHONEME SYSTEMS IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Muxtorova Mohidilxon

Agency for Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article compares the phoneme inventories and core oppositions of Russian and Uzbek within a descriptive–typological framework. We examine vowel and consonant phoneme systems, the role of secondary articulations, the behavior of phonemes in prosodically weak positions, and phonological processes affecting contrast maintenance. Russian is characterized by a six-vowel analysis with extensive unstressed reduction and a robust palatalized vs. non-palatalized consonant contrast, alongside obligatory final devoicing and regressive assimilation of obstruents. Uzbek, in turn, presents a six-vowel system with relatively stable quality across stress conditions, lacks a general palatalization opposition, and contrasts velar vs. uvular series (/k ~ q/, /g ~ g‘/, /x/) that Russian does not possess. The comparison highlights convergences such as shared affricates and fricatives through borrowing, as well as divergences arising from agglutinative morphology and syllable structure preferences in Uzbek versus the morphophonemic alternations driven by stress and reduction in Russian. Implications are drawn for phonological description, second-language acquisition, and orthography-phonology mapping.

KEYWORDS: Russian; Uzbek; phoneme inventory; vowel reduction; palatalization; uvulars; assimilation; final devoicing; Turkic phonology.

INTRODUCTION

Cross-linguistic comparison of phoneme systems illuminates how languages distribute contrastive features to serve lexical distinctiveness and morphophonological transparency. Russian, a Slavic language with rich consonantal oppositions and stress-conditioned vocalism, relies heavily on secondary palatal articulation and on positional allophony in unstressed syllables. Uzbek, a Turkic language with agglutinative morphology, displays a comparatively symmetrical vowel set with limited positional neutralization and an articulatory space that includes uvulars absent from Russian. Understanding these systems side by side clarifies where learners misperceive contrasts, why orthographic conventions diverge, and how prosodic structure conditions phoneme realization in each language.

The study adopts a descriptive–typological method grounded in widely accepted phonological descriptions of Russian and Uzbek and comparative Turkic surveys. We analyze segmental inventories, oppositions, and neutralization patterns, paying attention to distributional facts in strong vs. weak prosodic positions, typical allophones, and recurrent sandhi processes. For Russian, the discussion follows mainstream analyses that posit a contrast between “hard” (non-palatalized) and “soft” (palatalized) consonants and recognize systematic vowel reduction

Published: July 30, 2025 | Pages: 176-179

outside primary stress. For Uzbek, the analysis reflects descriptions of the literary standard with six vowel phonemes and a consonant set that includes voiceless uvular /q/ and voiced fricative /g‘/ alongside velars. The method is qualitative but targets points of contrast that are stable across dialectal variation and are pedagogically salient.

Russian vocalism is commonly analyzed as comprising six vowel phonemes /a, e, i, o, u, ɨ/, with the high central-back unrounded /ɨ/ having no counterpart in Uzbek. Crucially, Russian vowels undergo extensive reduction in unstressed syllables: timbres centralize, quantities shorten, and oppositions partially neutralize, especially in pretonic positions. This positional asymmetry makes stress a primary organizer of vowel quality and contributes to morphophonemic alternations visible in related forms. Uzbek vowels, in contrast, are relatively stable across prosodic contexts: the literary standard is typically described with six phonemes roughly corresponding to /i, e, a, o, u, o‘/, where <o‘> denotes a more open back vowel distinct from <o>. The absence of systematic vowel reduction in Uzbek preserves segmental contrasts across the word, supporting transparent mapping between morphology and surface phonology in agglutinative paradigms.

Consonantal organization reveals the opposite picture. Russian maintains a pervasive opposition between palatalized and non-palatalized consonants across much of the inventory, producing pairs such as /t ~ tʲ, s ~ sʲ, n ~ nʲ/. This secondary articulation is phonemic and lexically contrastive, interacting with following vowel qualities and affecting coarticulatory cues. Uzbek does not exploit a general palatalization contrast; instead, it distinguishes places of articulation that Russian lacks, notably a uvular series. The opposition between velar /k, g/ and uvular /q, g‘/ is salient and lexically contrastive in Uzbek and plays a role in loanword adaptation and morphophonological alternations. The fricative /x/ is robust in Uzbek and participates in the velar–uvular space, whereas Russian /x/ is velar and lacks a uvular counterpart. Russian inventories, on the other hand, include alveolo-palatal and retroflex-like sibilants (/t͡ɕ, ʂ, ʐ/), as well as /ts/, shaping a dense coronal system that contrasts with Uzbek’s more streamlined set where /t͡ʃ, d͡ʒ, ʃ, ʒ/ are present but not split by a systematic palatalization feature.

Phonological processes further differentiate the systems. Russian obstruents obligatorily devoice word-finally, and regressive assimilation across word boundaries neutralizes voicing within clusters, aligning with Slavic typological profiles. These processes interact with stress-driven reduction to produce notable surface alternations that learners must decode. Uzbek shows less categorical final devoicing in the literary norm and a stronger tendency to maintain phonemic voicing contrasts across morpheme boundaries, aided by agglutinative morphology and a preference for simpler syllable margins. As a result, clusters that trigger sandhi in Russian are less frequent word-internally in Uzbek native lexicon, though Persian, Arabic, and Russian borrowings introduce greater complexity and expand the consonantal set, especially for /f, v, ts/ in educated speech.

The interaction between phoneme systems and prosody is also distinct. In Russian, stress not only conditions vowel quality but also provides a perceptual anchor for palatalization contrasts through coarticulation with front vowels and the distribution of “soft-sign” contexts. In Uzbek, word stress is predominantly phrase-final and weakly contrastive at the lexical level; consequently, it has limited impact on the stability of vowel timbres. The transparency of Uzbek

Published: July 30, 2025 | Pages: 176-179

suffix chains is supported by consistent vowel qualities and by the retention of uvular vs. velar place distinctions irrespective of prosodic strength. These typological choices align with each language's morphological profile: Russian alternations contribute to morphophonemic compactness but obscure invariants for learners, whereas Uzbek's segmental stability helps signal concatenative morphology clearly.

Convergences do exist. Both languages employ affricates and postalveolar fricatives that facilitate mutual loanword accommodation, and both have /x/ and /ʒ/ in educated registers, although their distributional histories differ. Both languages also admit phonemic inventories that expand at the margins under the influence of borrowing and sociolinguistic prestige, which complicates neat categorical descriptions. Yet for teaching and recognition, the decisive divergences remain the Russian reliance on palatalization and unstressed reduction versus the Uzbek reliance on place oppositions involving uvulars and on vowel stability across morphological domains.

For second-language acquisition, these structural facts predict asymmetrical difficulties. Uzbek learners of Russian may struggle with the /ɨ/ vs. /i/ contrast, with recognizing and producing palatalized consonants, and with decoding lexical identity under heavy vowel reduction. Russian learners of Uzbek may initially neutralize /q/ and /gʻ/ to velars and introduce unwarranted reduction, thereby obscuring lexical contrasts and morphological transparency. Orthography reflects and sometimes obscures these differences: Russian graphemics encodes palatalization and stress indirectly, whereas Uzbek Latin script marks uvulars explicitly with <q> and <gʻ> and maintains near-phonemic consistency for vowels.

Russian and Uzbek allocate phonological contrast along different axes: Russian weights secondary palatalization and stress-conditioned vocalism, while Uzbek privileges place distinctions in the dorsal region and vowel stability across prosodic positions. These choices shape how morphology surfaces in the speech stream, how learners acquire contrasts, and how orthographies track phonemic structure. Comparative description thus supports both theoretical generalization—showing alternative solutions to the economy of contrast—and practical pedagogy, by identifying the contrasts and processes most likely to impede intelligibility in cross-language contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Аванесов Р. И. Русское литературное произношение. М.: Просвещение, 1984. 240 с.
2. Бондарко Л. В. Фонетика современного русского литературного языка. Л.: Наука, 1977. 256 с.
3. Трубецкой Н. С. Основы фонологии. М.: Аспект Пресс, 2000. 352 с.
4. Wells J. C. Accents of English. Vol. 1: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 674 p.
5. Johanson L.; Csató É. A. (eds.). The Turkic Languages. London: Routledge, 1998. 588 p.
6. Sjöberg A. F. Uzbek Structural Grammar. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963. 300 p.
7. Madvaliyev A. (ред.). Hozirgi oʻzbek adabiy tili: Fonetika. Toshkent: Oʻqituvchi, 2005. 312 b.

Published: July 30, 2025 | Pages: 176-179

8. Xudoyberganova D. O‘zbek tili fonetikasi. Toshkent: Fan, 2010. 256 b.