SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN OFFICIAL DOCUMENT TEXTS OF THE UZBEK AND TURKISH LANGUAGES

Z. Bakhtiyarova
Lecturer, Department of Uzbek and Oriental Languages, Mamun University
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18677137

Abstract. *This article presents a comparative analysis of the linguistic, stylistic, and structural features of official document texts in the Uzbek and Turkish languages. The study examines state documents, official correspondence, directives, orders, contracts, applications, and decisions as illustrative materials. The terminological systems, syntactic structures, lexical units, and stylistic norms of document texts in both languages are identified, and their similarities and differences are analyzed on a scientific basis. The results reveal the common Turkic roots of Uzbek and Turkish document language, contemporary trends in the development of official style, and factors related to national language policy.*

Keywords: *document text, official style, comparative study, Uzbek language, Turkish language, terminology, official discourse, syntax, stylistics, document language.*

Introduction. In modern society, documents constitute an essential component of public administration, legal relations, economic interactions, and social life. Through documents, legal norms are established, social relations are regulated, and official communication is carried out. Therefore, the study of the linguistic features of document texts is regarded as one of the important areas of linguistics. The Uzbek and Turkish languages belong to the same language family and share a common Turkic foundation. Nevertheless, as a result of historical development, political systems, and cultural environments, official styles and document texts in these languages have developed in distinct ways. The main objective of this article is to conduct a comparative analysis of document texts in Uzbek and Turkish, to identify their common and distinctive features, and to reveal the development trends of modern document language. The methodological framework of the study includes the comparative-historical method, descriptive analysis, structural-semantic analysis, discourse-based approach, and functional-stylistic analysis.

Characteristics of Official Document Texts in the Uzbek Language. The language of official documents in Uzbek is based on the principles of clarity, conciseness, precision, and normativity. From a lexical perspective, official terminology predominates, with frequent use of units such as decision, directive, obligation, authority, assignment, regulation, procedure, and legal basis. Syntactically, Uzbek official documents are characterized by complex sentences, multi-component constructions, the use of imperative and passive verb forms, and standardized constructions typical of official discourse (e.g., be approved, be determined, be implemented).

Stylistically, Uzbek document texts are neutral, emotionally unmarked, and employ an objective mode of presentation. *Characteristics of Turkish Official Document Texts*. Turkish document texts are likewise based on the principles of formality, clarity, and normativity. The terminological system is stable and standardized, with active use of terms such as karar (decision), yönetmelik (regulation), talimat (instruction), sözleşme (contract), başvuru (application), yetki

(authority), and yükümlülük (obligation). Alongside formality, Turkish document language exhibits relatively simpler syntactic structures.

Comparative Analysis. In the course of the comparative analysis, Uzbek and Turkish document texts were examined across several linguistic levels—lexical, morphological, syntactic, stylistic, and pragmatic. This approach allows for a deeper understanding of both the internal structure and the functional characteristics of document language. The results of the comparative analysis indicate that, although Uzbek and Turkish document texts share a common Turkic foundation, their official styles have developed differently under the influence of contemporary language policy and documentation practices. While traditionality and structural complexity dominate Uzbek document language, simplicity and functionality occupy a leading position in Turkish document language.

Lexical-Level Comparative Analysis. The lexical layer of document texts primarily consists of official terminological units. Although Uzbek and Turkish share common Turkic roots, document terminology in the two languages has evolved differently due to historical, political, and social factors. In both languages, official-terminological units form the core lexical layer of document texts. In Uzbek documents, terms such as decision, directive, order, obligation, authority, execution, and responsible are widely used. In Turkish documents, their equivalents—karar, talimat, emir, yükümlülük, yetki, yürütme, and sorumlu—are actively employed.

For example, Uzbek documents frequently use expressions such as:

"The responsibility for ensuring the execution of this decision shall be assigned to the head of the department."

In Turkish document texts, the equivalents of these units are actively used, such as *karar, talimat, emir, yükümlülük, yetki*, and *sorumlu kişi*. For example: *"The responsible unit is in charge of the implementation of this decision."*

Comparative analysis shows that Uzbek document language predominantly contains terms borrowed through Russian (e.g., *commission, protocol, control, plan*), whereas Turkish document language places particular emphasis on the nationalization of terminology. Words borrowed from French and English are adapted to the phonetic and grammatical system of Turkish, such as *komisyon, prosedür,* and *organizasyon*. This practice increases the level of clarity and comprehensibility of Turkish document texts.

Morphological-Level Comparative Analysis. From a morphological perspective, Uzbek document texts are characterized by the predominant use of passive verb forms, such as *be approved, be determined, be executed,* and *be implemented*. These forms contribute to objectivity and formality by concealing the subject of the action.

Passive voice is also actively used in Turkish document texts, for example, *onaylanmıştır* (has been approved), *yürürlüğe girmiştir* (has entered into force), and *uygulanır* (is implemented). However, Turkish verb forms tend to be more concise and precise, with fewer redundant constructions. As a result, the semantic density of the text is increased and comprehension is facilitated.

Morphologically, the use of passive verb forms is one of the key features of document texts in both languages. In Uzbek documents, forms such as *be approved, be determined, be executed,* and *be implemented* are widely employed. For example: *"This regulation shall be approved in the prescribed manner."* These forms enhance the formality and objectivity of documents by obscuring the subject. A similar tendency is observed in Turkish documents, as seen in forms like

onaylanmıştır, yürürlüğe girmiştir, and *uygulanır*. For example: *"This regulation has entered into force."*

The main difference lies in the fact that Turkish verb forms are generally shorter and more compact, with fewer auxiliary constructions, whereas Uzbek frequently employs auxiliary verb constructions such as *is carried out* and *is executed*.

Syntactic-Level Comparative Analysis**.** Syntactically, Uzbek document texts are characterized by complex compound sentences and multi-component syntactic constructions. While this serves to ensure legal precision, it may also increase the complexity of the text in certain cases.

In contrast, Turkish document texts favor simple and clearly structured sentences. Information is divided into sections and articles and presented in a clear sequence, which enhances the pragmatic effectiveness of the document. Uzbek document texts are distinguished by the frequent use of complex compound sentences and multi-component syntactic constructions. Although this contributes to legal accuracy, it may complicate textual perception. For example: *"In order to ensure the timely and high-quality implementation of the measures approved by this decision, responsibility shall be assigned to the relevant organizations."*

Turkish document texts, by contrast, are characterized by simple and clear syntactic constructions, as in: *"The implementation of this decision belongs to the relevant institutions."* In Turkish documents, information is presented clause by clause through short sentences, which facilitates easier comprehension and aligns with the requirements of modern documentation practice.

Stylistic-Level Comparative Analysis. From a stylistic perspective, document texts in both languages are devoid of emotional coloring and are constructed in a strictly official style. In Uzbek document language, traditional formal expressions are preserved, such as *in accordance with this decision, the following shall be determined*, and *in the prescribed manner*. In Turkish document language, however, alongside formality, a stronger tendency toward simplification is observed; expressions such as *bu karar kapsamında* (within the scope of this decision) and *aşağıdaki hususlar* (the following matters) are shorter and more precise.

Pragmatic-Level Comparative Analysis. From a pragmatic point of view, the primary function of document texts is to convey legal information clearly, unambiguously, and effectively. In Uzbek document texts, normativity and directive force are strongly emphasized, whereas Turkish document texts prioritize implementation-orientedness and functionality. This difference is clearly reflected in the communicative effectiveness of the documents.

General Conclusions of the Comparative Analysis. The comparative analysis demonstrates that international terms borrowed through Russian (e.g., *protocol, commission, plan*) are more prevalent in Uzbek document terminology. In Turkish, by contrast, terminology is largely nationalized, and lexical items borrowed from French and English (such as *komisyon, prosedür,* and *organizasyon*) are phonologically and morphologically adapted to the Turkish language.

Lexical Level. In both languages, the official-terminological layer occupies a dominant position in document texts. In Uzbek document language, words such as *decision, directive, order, execution, responsible, obligation,* and *authority* are actively used, whereas in Turkish document language, units such as *karar, talimat, emir, yürütme, sorumlu, yükümlülük,* and *yetki* prevail.

Morphological Level. Morphologically, passive verb forms (e.g., *be approved, be determined, be implemented*) are widely used in Uzbek document texts, serving to ensure formality

and objectivity. A similar tendency is observed in Turkish document texts, where forms such as *onaylanmıştır, yürürlüğe girmiştir,* and *uygulanır* reinforce the official tone of the text.

In addition, while nominalized verbs and auxiliary-verb constructions are frequent in Uzbek, Turkish favors more compact forms formed through affixation.

Syntactic Level. The results of syntactic analysis indicate that complex compound sentences and multi-component constructions are widespread in Uzbek document texts. Although such structures contribute to legal precision, they may at times complicate textual perception.

In Turkish document texts, by contrast, simple and clear syntactic constructions are predominant, and information is presented in a sequential and concise manner. This facilitates rapid and easy comprehension of the document.

Stylistic Level. In both languages, document texts are structured in a formal style based on strict norms and free from emotional coloring. However, while traditional formal expressions are more strongly preserved in Uzbek document language, processes of simplification and modernization are more actively observed in Turkish document language.

Pragmatic Level. From a pragmatic perspective, the main function of document texts is to convey legal information clearly and unambiguously. In Uzbek document texts, normativity and directive force are more strongly expressed, whereas in Turkish document texts, implementation mechanisms and functionality are articulated more explicitly.

In this regard, Turkish documentation practice places particular emphasis on communicative effectiveness, while traditional legal forms remain dominant in Uzbek document language.

Discussion. The comparative analysis demonstrates that although official document texts in the Uzbek and Turkish languages share a common Turkic linguistic foundation, national characteristics have emerged in their official styles as a result of contemporary socio-political development. While complexity and traditional formal style are dominant in Uzbek documentation language, simplification and functionality prevail in Turkish documentation language.

Results:

1. Uzbek and Turkish document languages share a common Turkic foundation.
2. Stable norms of official style have been established in both languages.
3. Borrowed layers within the terminological systems differ.
4. National stylistic differences are evident in syntactic structures.
5. Document texts are directly linked to state language policy.

Conclusion. The findings of the study indicate that, alongside shared features, there are also significant differences between official document texts in Uzbek and Turkish. These differences are shaped by historical development, socio-political factors, and national language policy. The results of the comparative research hold important scientific value not only for linguistics but also for documentation practice, translation studies, and the development of official communication culture.

REFERENCES

1. Karimov I. O‘zbek adabiy tili va rasmiy uslub. – Toshkent: Fan, 2018.
2. Mahmudov N. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: O‘qituvchi, 2019.
3. Yaman E. Resmi yazışma dili. – Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2017.
4. Aksan D. Türkçenin söz varlığı. – Ankara: Engin Yayınları, 2016.
5. G‘ulomov A. Rasmiy uslub va hujjatchilik tili. – Toshkent: Universitet, 2020.

6. Ergin M. Türk dil bilgisi. – İstanbul: Bayrak, 2015.
7. Qodirov B. Hujjat matnlarining lingvistik tahlili. – Toshkent, 2021.
8. Demircan Ö. Dilbilime giriş. – Ankara: Papatya Yayınları, 2018.