

UDC 811

<https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/115/93>

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PHONETIC AND ORTHOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK MUSICAL TERMINOLOGY

©Yusupova G., International School of Science, Finance and Technology,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan, yusupovagulizebo@gmail.com

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ФОНЕТИЧЕСКИХ И ОРФОГРАФИЧЕСКИХ ОСОБЕННОСТЕЙ АНГЛИЙСКОЙ И УЗБЕКСКОЙ МУЗЫКАЛЬНОЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ

©Юсупова Г. Ю., Международная школа науки, финансов и технологий,
г. Ташкент, Узбекистан, yusupovagulizebo@gmail.com

Abstract. Compares the phonetic and orthographic characteristics found in the musical vocabulary of English and Uzbek languages. It investigates how musical words are sounded and written in both languages, stressing the effects of their individual sound systems and writing customs. The paper looks at loanword adaptation, the depiction of comparable musical ideas using various phonetic and orthographic structures, and the issues caused by transliteration and translation. The research intends to offer insights into the connection between language and music across several cultural settings by means of a comparison of these linguistic features, hence supporting a better knowledge of musical vocabulary from a linguistic angle.

Аннотация. Сравниваются фонетические и орфографические характеристики, обнаруженные в музыкальном словаре английского и узбекского языков. В ней исследуется, как музыкальные слова звучат и пишутся в обоих языках, подчеркивая влияние их индивидуальных звуковых систем и обычаев письма. В статье рассматривается адаптация заимствованных слов, изображение сопоставимых музыкальных идей с использованием различных фонетических и орфографических структур, а также проблемы, вызванные транслитерацией и переводом. Целью исследования является предоставление информации о связи между языком и музыкой в различных культурных условиях посредством сравнения этих языковых особенностей, тем самым поддерживая лучшее знание музыкального словаря с лингвистической точки зрения.

Keywords: musical terms, comparative languages, transliteration.

Ключевые слова: музыкальные термины, сравнительные языки, транслитерация.

Musical terminology is studied not only in terms of meaning and origin but also in terms of phonetic (pronunciation) and orthographic (spelling) realization. A comparative study of these characteristics in English and Uzbek, two languages with different sound systems and writing norms, is the main emphasis of this paper. Effective communication, translation, and cross-cultural awareness in the domain of music depend on a grasp of these distinctions and commonalities. English, a Germanic language with a Latin-based alphabet, and Uzbek, a Turkic language with a changed Latin and historically Cyrillic script, provide an interesting case study for exploring the interaction between language and musical expression.

A focused corpus of musical terminology was gathered from reliable English and Uzbek sources. This covered: Music encyclopedias and standard English dictionaries (e.g., The New Grove

Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Oxford English Dictionary). Dictionaries of English-Uzbek and Uzbek-English, as well as specialist glossaries of musical words in Uzbek (where applicable). Musical vocabulary found in academic papers, musical scores, and journalistic writing in both languages. Phonetic transcriptions for English words mostly relied on the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) as shown in reliable dictionaries and phonetics tools. Where differences occurred, the more frequent or standard pronunciations were recorded. Considering the phonetic values of the letters in the present Latin script, phonetic transcriptions for Uzbek words were founded on the generally acknowledged pronunciation norms of modern Uzbek. Where dialectal or regional variances in pronunciation are known to occur for certain musical terminology, they were recorded for possible debate. A comparative study was done to find similarities and variations in the phonetic realisation of cognate terms — words having a same origin — and loanwords taken in by each language. This included looking at stress patterns, syllable structure, and vowel and consonant inventory. The musical terminology's regular spellings in both English and Uzbek (using the present Latin script) were documented. To grasp the history of its written form, historical variances in orthography — especially when phrases may have been once written in the Cyrillic script — were taken into account for Uzbek. A comparative study emphasizing the link between spelling and pronunciation in both languages, the representation of comparable sounds using distinct graphemes (letters or combinations of letters), and the orthographic adaption patterns seen in loanwords. Using a comparative linguistic method, this paper examined the phonetic and orthographic characteristics of musical vocabulary in English and Uzbek. The approach included the following main steps:

Phonological Systems: A Short Comparison

Feature	English	Uzbek
Vowel inventory	12 pure vowels + diphthongs	6 vowel phonemes
Consonants	Rich in fricatives, clusters (e.g., /ʃ/, /θ/)	Simpler consonant clusters
Stress	Lexical stress (can change meaning)	Mostly predictable stress (often final syllable)
Loanword adaptation	Minimal changes	Phonological nativization common

Example: English: symphony/'sɪm.fə.ni/

Uzbek: simfoniya [sim.fo.ni.ya] — vowel epenthesis is added to break up consonant clusters.

Orthographic Features and Issues Loanwords in Uzbek and English: Adaptation Musical words acquired from English and Uzbek both change their spelling to different degrees. Especially from Romance languages, English keeps the original spelling of loanwords. Uzbek usually alters the spelling more closely to its phonetic system, which might cause orthographic modifications making the source less instantly clear to a speaker of the source language. For example, a very straight phonetic and orthographic translation of the Russian word “симфония” (simfoniya) in Uzbek Latin script is “simfoniya”. To show the phonetic and orthographic variations, let us look at some instances of musical terminology in both languages:

Musical Term	English Phonetic Transcription (IPA - Approximate)	English Orthography	Uzbek Phonetic Transcription (Approximate)	Uzbek Orthography (Latin)
Note	/noʊt/	note	[nɒtə]	nota
Melody	/'mɛlədi/	melody	[melodi'ja]	melodiya
Rhythm	/'rɪðəm/	rhythm	[ritm]	ritm
Symphony	/'sɪmfəni/	symphony	[sɪmfəni'ja]	simfoniya
Maqom	/'mɑ:kɑ:m/ (approximate)	maqam	[maqɒm]	maqom
Usul	/'u:su:l/ (approximate)	usul	[usu:l]	usul

These instances show how different sounds and spellings reflect similar or identical musical ideas because of the unique phonetic and orthographic systems of English and Uzbek. Though the degree of orthographic adaptation may differ, loanwords — especially those of international origin — often experience phonetic adaptation in both languages. The variations in phonetic and orthographic characteristics create difficulties in the translation and transliteration of musical vocabulary between English and Uzbek:

Phonetic Approximation: Because each system has its own sounds, it can be hard to find exact phonetic matches between two languages when transliterating words. A lot of the time, transliterations use the best match they can find, which can mean that some sound details are lost.

Consistency in spelling: For clarity and consistency, it is important to set uniform spelling rules for copied words. It's important to think carefully about whether to keep the original spelling (which is what most people do in English) or change it to fit the orthographic rules of the target language (which is what most people do with Uzbek phonetic adaptation). While this piece is mostly about phonetics and orthography, it's important to keep in mind that the cultural and historical background of musical terms can also make it harder to translate them in a way that is semantically equivalent. Even if two words look or sound the same, they might have different meanings or refer to slightly different singing practices.

It is well known that English orthography is “non-phonemic”, which means that writing does not always match speech. As an example, choir is pronounced /'kwaɪər/, while bass is pronounced /beɪs/ in music but is spelled like “bass” (the fish).

On the other hand, Uzbek spelling is based more on sound, especially in the Latin and Cyrillic systems: Most of the time, what is written is what is said. There are still some differences, though, mostly with loanwords. Examples.

<i>Term (English)</i>	<i>Uzbek Equivalent</i>	<i>Spelling in Uzbek</i>	<i>Phonetic Adaptation</i>
Orchestra	Orkestr	orkestr / оркестр	Cluster simplified if needed
Melody	Navo	navo / наво	Semantic substitution, not transliteration
Note	Nota	nota / нота	Phonetic spelling adapted to Uzbek sounds
Jazz	Joz	joz / жоз	Spelled phonetically to match Uzbek phonology

Common Patterns of Adaptation in Uzbek. Uzbek musical terminology has been subjected to a process of adaptation that has been influenced by Russian, Arabic-Persian, and, to a greater extent, English sources. In order to accommodate Uzbek phonotactics (i.e., the permissible sound combinations), Uzbek speakers naturally adapt foreign terms. This is due to the disparities in phonological systems. The following are the most frequently observed strategies during the adaptation process. Several patterns are observed when English or Russian musical terms are borrowed into Uzbek: Epenthesis (Vowel Insertion) To disrupt consonant clusters:

Piano → pianino (via Russian);

drum → baraban (adapted from Russian).

Final vowel addition to align with Uzbek word structure:

Rock → rok → rok musiqa (compound to contextualize the meaning).

Phoneme Substitution, Sounds that are absent from Uzbek are replaced: /θ/, as in theatre, frequently undergoes a transformation into /t/ or /s/. However, /ʃ/ and /ʒ/ from Russian are preserved (e.g., joz). **Translation vs. Transliteration** Certain terms are borrowed phonetically, while others are semantically translated:

Melody → navo (semantic match), while Symphony → simfoniya (transliteration).

Phonetic Adaptation: Uzbek phonetic principles are applied to the pronunciation of foreign musical terms, including vowel harmony tendencies, consonant substitutions, and a stress transfer to

the final syllable. The concluding inflection in the Uzbek word “simfoniya” is derived from the Russian word “симфония” (simfoniya). The word “jazz” in English is pronounced with Uzbek consonant sounds. Morphological Adaptation: The integration of foreign musical terms into Uzbek grammar is achieved by utilizing Uzbek plural suffixes (-lar), case endings, and the formation of verbs with auxiliary verbs such as qilmoq (to do). “Nota” (derived from Latin) is rendered as “notalar” (notes). “Aranjировка qilmoq” (to arrange — derived from the Russian words “аранжировка” and “qilmoq”). Semantic Adaptation: The meaning of borrowed musical terms may be condensed, expanded, or adopt slightly different nuances in the Uzbek musical context. The term “klassik” (from the Russian/international language) encompasses both the Western classical music and the Uzbek classical maqom tradition.

Incorporation of Musical Elements from Other Cultures into Uzbek Music This reading emphasizes the musical material itself. Though having deep native origins, Uzbek music has also been affected by and incorporated aspects from various musical heritages over time. Interactions with adjacent civilizations along the Silk Road most certainly resulted in the acquisition and modification of certain melodic patterns, scales, or ornamentation techniques. Especially important is the impact of Persian and Tajik music, which share modal systems and melodic contours. **Rhythmic Influences:** Although Uzbek music has its own intricate rhythmic cycles (usul), interaction with other cultures may have affected or introduced certain rhythmic patterns or tools. **Instrumental Adoption and Adaptation:** Uzbek musical groups include instruments of both native provenance (such as the dutor, tanbur, sato, rubob, doira) and those taken and modified from other countries (such as the gijjak, which has Central Asian ancestors). The Uzbek musical aesthetic has absorbed the playing methods and functions of these instruments into the group. In some kinds of Uzbek popular and contemporary music, often mixed with traditional melodic and rhythmic structures, aspects of Western harmony (chords, chord progressions) have started to emerge with more interaction with Western musical traditions, especially during the Soviet era and in modern times. This is a continuous region of change. Although the maqom tradition has its own unique shapes (e.g., shashmaqom), modern genres might borrow or modify Western song structures, instrumental piece forms, or hybrid forms combining Eastern and Western components. **Phonetic and orthographic variations can lead to:** Pronunciation difficulties for Uzbek students of English (e.g., “rhythm”/’rɪðəm/), Spelling problems with English vocabulary in Uzbek literature, Difficulties in translation: deciding between a native equivalent and a loanword.

The phonetic and orthographic traits of English and Uzbek musical vocabulary show the unique linguistic qualities of both languages. English, with its complicated vowel system and historically affected spelling, differs from Uzbek's more phonemic writing system and diverse set of defining sounds. Loanword adaptation and the portrayal of common musical ideas show how every language fits and incorporates musical terminology. Accurate communication, efficient translation, and a greater awareness of the linguistic variety inside the worldwide scene of music all depend on an understanding of these phonetic and orthographic distinctions. Further study might investigate the perceptual elements of these phonetic and orthographic differences and their influence on the knowledge and learning of musical vocabulary across language boundaries.

References:

1. Crystal, D. (2018). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge university press.
2. Dzhuraev, Kh. (1981). *Foneticheskie i leksicheskie osobennosti tyurk-kaltataiskikh govorov uzbekskogo yazyka*. Tashkent.

3. Odilova G. K. (2021). *Teoriya perevoda (Vvedenie v spetsializatsiyu)/Vvedenie v perevodovedenie*. Toshkent.
4. Wells, J. C. (2016). *Sounds fascinating: Further observations on English phonetics and phonology*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. J. (2015). *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge.
6. Boeschoten, H. (2021). The speakers of Turkic languages. In *The Turkic Languages* (pp. 1-12). Routledge.
7. Shermamatova, S. (2024). Problems of Translating Navoy's Lyrics into Foreign Languages. *Academia Open*, 9(1), 10-21070. <https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.9.2024.8436>
8. Schlyter, B. N. (1998). New language laws in Uzbekistan. *Language problems and language planning*, 22(2), 143-181. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.22.2.03sch>
9. Roach, P. (1992). *English Phonetics and Phonology: A Practical Course*. Cambridge.
10. Crystal, D. (2018). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge university press.
11. Katamba, F. (2015). *English words: Structure, history, usage*. Routledge.
12. Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1968). The sound pattern of English.
13. Adkins, M., & Cummings, S. (2019). *Music beyond Airports: Appraising ambient music* (p. 254). University of Huddersfield Press.
14. Grove, G., Sadie, S., Tyrrell, J., & Levy, M. (1980). The new Grove dictionary of music and musicians.
15. Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210-231. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410058>

Список литературы:

1. Crystal D. The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language. Cambridge university press, 2018.
2. Джураев Х. Фонетические и лексические особенности тюрк-калтайских говоров узбекского языка. Ташкент: Фан, 1981. 144 с.
3. Odilova G. K. *Teoriya perevoda (Vvedenie v spetsializatsiyu)/Vvedenie v perevodovedenie*. Toshkent. 2021.
4. Wells J. C. *Sounds fascinating: Further observations on English phonetics and phonology*. – Cambridge University Press, 2016.
5. Johanson L., Csató É. J. *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge, 2015.
6. Boeschoten H. The speakers of Turkic languages // *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge, 2021. P. 1-12.
7. Shermamatova S. Problems of Translating Navoy's Lyrics into Foreign Languages // *Academia Open*. 2024. V. 9. №1. P. 10.21070/acopen. 9.2024. 8436-10.21070/acopen. 9.2024. 8436. <https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.9.2024.8436>
8. Schlyter B. N. New language laws in Uzbekistan // *Language problems and language planning*. 1998. V. 22. №2. P. 143-181. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.22.2.03sch>
9. Roach P. *English Phonetics and Phonology: A Practical Course*. Cambridge. 1992.
10. Crystal D. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge university press, 2018.
11. Katamba F. *English words: Structure, history, usage*. Routledge, 2015.
12. Chomsky N., Halle M. *The sound pattern of English*. 1968.
13. Adkins M., Cummings S. *Music beyond Airports: Appraising ambient music*. University of Huddersfield Press, 2019. P. 254.

14. Grove G. et al. The new Grove dictionary of music and musicians. 1980.

15. Haugen E. The analysis of linguistic borrowing // Language. 1950. V. 26. №2. P. 210-231.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/410058>

*Работа поступила
в редакцию 09.04.2025 г.*

*Принята к публикации
17.04.2025 г.*

Ссылка для цитирования:

Yusupova G. A Comparative Analysis of the Phonetic and Orthographic Features of English and Uzbek Musical Terminology // Бюллетень науки и практики. 2025. Т. 11. №6. С. 736-741.
<https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/115/93>

Cite as (APA):

Yusupova, G. (2025). A Comparative Analysis of the Phonetic and Orthographic Features of English and Uzbek Musical Terminology. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 11(6), 736-741.
<https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/115/93>