

# **ROLE OF JADID REPRESENTATIVES IN THE FORMATION OF PRESENT UZBEK LITERAL LANGUAGE NORMS**

**Inomjon Azimov**

*Nizami Tashkent State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan*

*Article History:*

*Submitted: 13.06.2015*

*Accepted: 25.06.2015*

## **Abstract:**

Language is the mirror of a nation. All changes occurring in the life of a nation, undoubtedly, find their reflection in language. In this regard, patriots and eminent figures of a nation have always considered language as good means of self-apprehension, elevation of its greatness and glory, reservation and reiteration of spirituality during hard times. Particularly during the first quarter of the XX century, known in history as the National Renaissance, academicians and scholars paid a lot of attention to language as they believed it was engendering national spirituality and elevation of national ideology in people. They considered language to be an invaluable pearl which indicates the existence of a nation. In this regard, in the view of development of our own language, we have accumulated all the facilities and initiated elaboration of rules of Uzbek language.

## **1. Introduction**

From the history of our science it is known that Uzbek linguistics till the 30s of the past century, with its scientific-theoretical, practical-stylistic features, and social-cultural contradictions is one of the actual issues subject to studying. Particular aspects of Uzbek linguistics of that period are not studied much. Till our Independence an opinion that Uzbek linguistics have started forming in the 40s prevailed, while Uzbek linguistics of the 20s and 30s was not considered at all. Whereas, during the initial period following the October revolution scholars such as Fitrat, Shokirjon Rahimiy, Qayum Ramazon, Elbek, Gozi Olim Yunusov, and others have contributed much to the development of Uzbek linguistics.

Due to various disputes among academicians in regards to a variety of views towards language orthography, education of mother language in schools was in poor condition. There was a shortage of school manuals – ABCs and other books, while available ones did not correspond to requirements. There was not any scientific research on the rules of Uzbek

language and there was not any manual on Uzbek Language Grammar. The following is a quote by Hoji Muin in the article on “*Til masalasi*” (Issue of language) in the 29<sup>th</sup> issue of 1918 of “*Mehnatkashlar ovushi*” (Voice of labour): “We cannot blame present scholar and interpreter friends for not knowing Turkic rules, they are unplumbed in this regard. As none of them and us have not studied in particular school. Education of language rules is usually given at specialized schools, but such schools are not yet opened in our Turkistan. And education of morphology and syntax of Turkic language has not yet started in new schools. Our Turkic language is still a un-researched language and there is not any single Tractate on its morphology and syntax. Our preceptor friends are not aware of language rules in detail, which is evident from the books and school manuals written by them [1,92].

At that time the grammar of Turkic language was taught in the majority of Jadid schools. Fitrat ruled that our schools and letters remain under Ottoman influence. In his speech at *Qurultay* (Council) of Language and Orthography in 1921 mentions that the majority of hours given to teaching/learning of mother language in the courses opened at Tashkent are presented in Ottomanic; in the First Teachers’ Courses opened in Samarqand there is no inherence of mother language at all; decision of Education Council Session of 1918 and Teachers’ *Qurultay* of the past year stipulates education of mother language during initial three years only, then after general Turkish language (Ottoman Turkish language) is to be taught; disputes of teachers attending the course of Uzbek language taught under Ottoman Turkic Sheikh Vosifiy’s *izofai lamiya*, *izofay bayoniya*, *izofai tashbehiya* from “*Qavoyidi lisoni usmoniy*” elevated from Arabic language - all of these insulting and showcasing disrespect towards our language [2, 234-135].

Of course, there were objective and subjective reasons for this condition. First of all, there was a shortage of skilled teachers. Vadud Mahmud, a Uzbek scholar, writes the following: “If so, there is not any single school we can indicate; upbringing is so important for us – education establishments are in worst conditions; notwithstanding amount of educated people in the faculty, faculties are disgusting. We do not have any establishment preparing any teacher in adjusted system. At worst, we do not have any single magazine leading proper education and upbringing. Frankly speaking, we don’t have anything with proper background” [3, 115].

He mentions that schools are being closed for the reason that majority of teachers, who studied at Teachers’ Course, are not educated enough, with no particular goal, working just to let time pass and teaching almost nothing to children. He says that if situation remains same, illiteracy will continue further: “We have reverted back to past condition this

year! I.e., how we were before revolution, we are in worse condition now. 5-6 teachers left the country and busy with other work. Thus, we degraded again” [3, 113].

Secondly, shortage of manuals for schools of new style. Hoji Muin writes the following in this regard: “If one reason for this is absence of books, another would be teachers’ methods, which are totally away from education. Initially few teachers had to implement tartarian books into their schools and some of them - translation of Turkic-Tartarian works for teaching kids. Even, due to absence of books, teachers had no option except teaching with such old books as “*Chor Kitob*”, “*Mantiq ut-tayr*”, “*Huja Hofiz*” and Navoi’s works. [1, 141-142].

“*Usuli savtiya*” by Ismoilbey Gaspirali successfully implemented in express education of children in *Bahchisaray* was approved by Central Asia Jadids. Manuals taught in traditional “*Usuli hijo*” in the region were replaced with “*usuli savtiya*” in new schools. Advantage of this method in practice was quickly noticed and was well appreciated by common. Row of special ABCs were created for teaching in such method. [4, 336].

Y.Abdullaev and A.Nurmonov in their researches mention about such ABCs made during that period [4,5]. A.Nurmonov evaluates Saidrasul Saidazizov’s “*Ustodi avval*” and Munavvar qori Abdurashidkhonov’s “*Adabi avval*” as initial and complicated examples of Uzbek alphabet as well as closely speaks on Saidrasul Saidazizov’s manual. Y.Abdullaev mentions creation of dozens of ABCs till 1917, but abovementioned two works being the most complicated ones. [4, 336].

This is why the most important challenge of Uzbek intelligence was elaboration of Uzbek language rules and execution of scientific researches as “till there is no any scientific research – none of these will remain further” [2, 141].

For this reason it was important to deeply analyze nuncupative and scriptural sources of our nation, to mutually compare, make scientific conclusions and, by this means, to elaborate rules of Uzbek language: “Let us scientifically clarify number of sounds in our language. Let us shout that our language is exemplary and rich; we have struggled and overwhelmed those saying “This language is rude, let us take one of literal dialects of Turkic language”. Hence, we have not yet arranged sign rules of our language. We have to provide “singleness” of our symbols and elaborate concrete rules of our language for the benefit of our writers. First of all we ourselves should know these rules.

Pure shape of our language we shall grab from the language of our people residing in tribal. There are *dostons* (rune), *ashula* (song), *matal* (proverb) and *lapar* (cuplet) which always represented native dialect of tribal people. All of this has to be put down carefully;

hence there are works of aristocratic poets scripted within public. There are ancient historical documents as “*Qutadgu biling*”, “*Hibatul haqiq*”, “*Devoni lugatiti turk*”, “*Muqaddimatul adab*”. Let us meticulously examine all of these; compare to each other, coincide and avail precise and solid results. Efforts and results availed in this regard and shape – would be scientific. And there won’t be anyone commenting the same” [2, 141-142].

But implementation of this work, firstly, was very complicated. Secondly, it was work that few scholars could afford to do. These were duties subject to joint implementation by all nation scholars: “It is obvious this work is to be inconvenient. It can not be done by one person. Challenges faced in this path will fall onto all recently appeared young writers. We all are obliged to give basis, to dedicate contemporary cultural essence to new Uzbek literature” [2, 142].

Scientific Council under Turkistan Education Commissariat disputes in this regard. During the First Council attended by Russian professors as E.D.Polivanov, D.Shmidt, S.Falyev, Kazakh, Tartarian and few Uzbek scholars such as A.Boytursinov, A.Sa’diy, N.Hakim, who were invited from various educational establishments. They listened lectures by Professor S.Falev on Morphology and Orthography of Kazakh dialects prepared by A.Boytursinov, Kazakh linguist; during Second Council they listened E.D.Polivanov’s lecture on “Basics in formation of morphology and orthography of Turkic languages”; at Third Council - “Basics in studying and formation of rules of Turkic languages” by A. Sa’diy.

According to A. Sa’diy, two issues caused disputes during the Council, which were:

“1. Is it possible to follow, take example and refer to languages of other groups during structurizing rules of Turkic languages?

2. Is it expedient to form logical morphology and orthography to the nature of Turkic languages? Either uniform logical morphology and orthography?”

E. D. Polivanov in his lecture underlines his opinion in usefulness of comparison with Russian language either reference to Russian morphology and orthography during formation of morphology and orthography of Uzbek language, showcasing similarities and analogy of two languages. A. Sa’diy would totally reject this opinion and note that Uzbek and Russian languages are totally different. He mentions that Uzbek grammar differs from morphology and orthography of Russian and Arabic languages and mentions origination of totally different morphology and orthography. He also mentions that the grammar is measured narrowly against Turkic languages, appearing as headless, cut-off, not applicable

for implementation in lingual aspect as unworthy clothing; in this regard impossibility of analysis of words. As written by him, professors invited for formation of Uzbek language Grammar did not speak Uzbek, Turkic or Tartarian languages, and there were translators involved for them. Elbek's article on "Discussion on rules of Turkic languages" was written in relation to the Council held, which includes scholar's critics on those professors not knowing any single *kalima* (word) in Uzbek language, but came to form its grammar, and also mentions that formation of rules of Uzbek language is for those familiar with its overall spirit and speaking this language [6, 18].

But the elevation of the Uzbek language to the level of literal language, and its conversion into a literal one was a challenge at that time. As there were Farsi-Tadjik traditions in imaginative literature, Arab traditions in scientific literature continuing, opinions on elevation of "populace" Uzbek language onto the level of literal one were virtually nonexistent. Secondly, reference to Ottoman Turkic language in literature was very tough. Vadud Mahmud writes in this regards: "If we count Uzbek as a derivation of chigatay poets dialect, we shall encounter two different dialect".

Some would say it is dialect of Eastern Turkic either Chigatay, this is our main dialect which was written by Navoi, Bobur, Fazliy. Others may be western Turkic either Turkic dialects, which is known for us due to famous lyric poet Fuzuliy. Quby poets followed this. It is considered not strange for us with the importance of first dialect of these two being our language, whereas second one with the reading lovely" [3, 59].

Thirdly, as mentioned by Fitrat, there were many elements of Tartarian words mixed in official language. This is why the majority of scholars could not believe Uzbek language to become a literal language due to mixture of elements of many languages in it.

In such complicated conditions, the nation's scholars lead by Fitrat struggled for development and independency of Uzbek language, wishing for an "independent language in Turkic group and science written in this language" This is why it was a must-to-do for any Uzbek writer to elaborate Uzbek versions of words derived from other languages, attempts in searching Uzbek (Turkic) versions of scientific revelations, to remain versions which could not be replaced, but to moderate them under rules of Uzbek language.

Role of members of "*Chigatoy gurungi*" (Dialect of Chigatay) lead by Fitrat in notification of signs of Uzbek language was irreplaceable. They have put forward the following tasks:

"- there is complete, great, artistic literature of our language. Constancy of our language is not in its Arabism, but in itself. We should reveal this;

- in order to develop our literature, we need to utilize everlasting heritage of our poets and achieve general basics of developed dialects and languages;
- rules of our language to be written not from Tartarian either Ottoman books, but to be taken from our own language. This is why there is a need to collect all the words spoken by common, gather all the fairy tales, proverbs, couplets being a public literature;
- since literature is scriptural science, to form and elaborate writing rules and signs”. [2, 135].

Members of “*Chigator gurunji*” have made a goal to create new Uzbek national literature, literal language, science and culture. They wished to elevate new literature and literal language, being a progeny of chigatay literature, to renew its popularity as during Navoi’s age, to be a sample literature and sample literal language for other Turkic languages.

## 2. Conclusion

Due to our Independence we are able to study works of victimized scholars. Few problems of Uzbek linguistics, the linguistic heritage of Jadid representatives, lexis of their works, literal language style was studied by scholars as A.Nurmonov, S.Zufarov, Y.Abdullaev, K.Nazarov, A.Madaminov, M.Valihonov and M.Qurbonova. Moreover, their role in formation of stylistic norms of our language, serious analysis of their scrupulous work in this regard is very vital.

A detailed study of scientific-imaginative heritage of nations’ patriots - who sacrificed a lot on the way to national independency, struggled for the development of our language, contributed much to the development of Uzbek’s literal language - to have justified and impartial evaluation of their service in the development of Uzbek linguistics is one of the main tasks encountered by our linguists.

## References:

- Hoji Muin. Selected works. –T.: Ma’naviyat, 2010.
- Fitrat Abdurauf. Selected works, Chapter IV. –T.: Ma’naviyat, 2006.
- Vadud Mahmud. Selected works. –T.: Ma’naviyat, 2007.
- A.Nurmonov. Selected works, 3-chapter. 3<sup>rd</sup> Chapter.-T.: Academnashr, 2012.
- Y.Abdullaev. *Birinchi Uzbek alifbosi* (First Uzbek alphabet) // *Uzbekiston adabiyti va san’ati* (Literature and Arts of Uzbekistan, February 6, 1991.

Sh.Bobomurodova. *Uzbek tilshunosigi rivojida Elbekning roli* (Role of Elbek in development of Uzbek linguistics: Dissertation for the Cand.Sc. (Phil.). –T., 2002.