



Codification of Uzbek Literary Language Standards during the Soviet Period

Safarov Firuz Sulaymonovich ¹

¹ Doctoral student of Uzbek Linguistics department Bukhara State University

Abstract: The article analyzes the wrongly standardized aspects of the Uzbek literary language during the Soviet period and explains that the primary task facing Uzbek linguistics today is to reform the literary language norms based on the system structure of the native language.

Keywords: colonialism, language policy of the state, Russification, norm, standardization, codification, national spirit.

I. Introduction

In the Soviet system, the inner goal of the state policy and, accordingly, the language policy, was the Russification of the peoples under the guise of rapprochement with their language, so scientists were forced to take the characteristics of the dominant national language as a basis for the standardization of national literary languages. Scientists who did not comply with this requirement were humiliated and severely punished [5, p. 24]. For example, the Turkic scholar Acad. K. K. Yudakhin is dismissed as a petty-bourgeois nationalist for his opinion that there are more differences than similarities between the Kyrgyz and Russian languages [10, p. 9]. However, in the 19th century, the scientist's opinion was consistent with the theoretical opinion that Turkic languages have an agglutinative morphological structure, and Slavic languages have an inflectional characteristic.

II. Literature review

Due to the consistent implementation of this language policy, many linguists are deprived of the national spirit and are forced to act unscientifically. We see that this happened in many cases in Uzbek linguistics. More precisely, the requirement that standardization should help ensure the stability of the language without damaging its structural features (content order) is not observed. Therefore, it cannot be said that standardization was implemented correctly in many respects [5, p. 24]. Let's turn to the evidence.

The letters *e, ë, ю, я, ы* which are not characteristic of the Uzbek language and softening sign (*ь*) were added to the Uzbek alphabet based on the Cyrillic script. There is no special letter for the nasal sound (*һз*) in our language.

During this period, people's names, surnames, and patronymics were mistakenly written in Russian in passports and certificates. As a result, names, surnames, patronymics such as *Ahmed, Dilyarom, Ibragimov, Djumayev, Makhmudovich, Gulyamovich* appeared.

III. Analysis

In enriching the lexicon of the Uzbek literary language, not the internal possibilities of the Uzbek language, but the acquisition of words from the Russian language was used. Efforts were made to create a common vocabulary for all the languages of the former union, thereby bringing languages belonging to these different systems and families closer together. Due to this movement, the use of

Russian and international words spread through the Russian language instead of the words existing in the Uzbek language was politically supported [15, 61 -p.]

Not only lexis, but also grammar; in the codification of the grammatical norms of the Uzbek language, i.e., in determining the grammatical rules of the Uzbek literary language, not the structural features of our native language, but the features specific to the structure of the Russian language were taken as a basis. While V. Humboldt, the founder of theoretical linguistics, the grammatical difference of languages is related to the difference in the grammatical view, perception (grammatische Ansicht) of the peoples, *the spiritual identity of the nation is more reflected in the grammar compared to the dictionary* [4, p. 21] wrote. This valuable opinion was not taken into account [5, pp. 24-25].

Scientist prof. A. Ghulamov, in one place, each personal verb forms a sentence: in this case, the meaning of the subject is also given. He writes that the whole in one word is the simplest form of a sentence [18, p. 87]. This is a correct opinion, and the scientist is based on the grammatical structure of the Uzbek language in determining the standard (rule). However, in his teaching about sentences, A. Ghulamov does not rely on this opinion, but on the following opinion, which contradicts it: The main clauses (possible and participle) are interconnected both in terms of content and form of the sentence; two organizing centers, which are interconnected by a predicative relation. This predicative core, constructive center is the basis of a two-part sentence. Modality, time and person are expressed in it. So, the predicative basis of the sentence is formed by the main clauses [18, pp. 68-69]. This rule reflects the nature of the Russian language. In the interpretation of a simple sentence, A. Ghulamov takes a two-clause sentence and then a one-clause sentence before working on the basis of the next idea. The Russian model is also used as a basis for determining the characteristics and types of a single-clause sentence. These rules, which reflect the syntactic structure of a foreign language, were included in the textbooks of secondary and higher education programs, and took on a universal, universal character [5, p. 25].

A. Ghulamov writes that it is necessary to proceed from the structure of each language when determining grammatical norms: The grammatical construction of each language has certain norms and rules. These norms and rules exist in the structure of the language itself, they are stated in a certain order in the grammar [14, 53 – 54]. But in practice, we observe that the norm is determined based on the grammatical structure of the Russian language, not on the specific features of the grammatical structure of the Uzbek language. For example, the scientist writes on the subject of the adaptation of the participle with the possessive in the textbook published in 1965: In the modern Uzbek language, especially in the language of the press, there is a deviation from the compatibility of the possessive and the participle - even when the possessive is plural. It is rare to use the participle in the singular form. This compatibility is preserved in many cases [p. 17,113].

In fact, the addition of *-lar* to the participle is not typical of the grammatical structure of the Uzbek language. In the Uzbek language, it has been a long time to save the suffix (*-lar*) in the participle when expressing the meaning of the plural. Let's turn to the tales that have come down to us over the centuries: *Девлар бир ухлаганда қирқ кун ухлар экан* (*Giants sleep for forty days when they sleep once*). (From the tale of the woodcutter and the fox), *Қизлар орқада қолибди* (*The girls are left behind*) (From the tale of Tahir and Zuhra). In both examples, no *-lar* is added to the participle because it represents the possessive plural. Therefore, saving *-lar* in the participle when expressing the possessive plural has reached the present generation over the centuries. Therefore, we cannot consider it as an outdated rule.

During the Soviet era, the number category feature of the noun was also interpreted on the basis of the Russian language. According to A. G. Ghulomov's treatise on the plural category in the Uzbek language, when we look at the issue logically, *kishilar* (*people*), *ko'p kishi* (*many people*), *oz kishi* (*few people*), and *xalq* (*the nation*) mean a plurality, a totality [16, p. 3]. When we look at it from a grammatical point of view, their expressions and formations are different, and it is understood that they are completely different categories from each other [16, p. 3]. It seems that the linguist, distinguishing between logical and grammatical plurals, does not include all means of expressing this meaning in grammatical plurals.

IV. Discussion

In all subsequent works on the number category in Uzbek linguistics, prof. A. Ghulamov's doctrine was taken as a basis. Academic grammar [14], university textbooks [13; 11; 9] this topic was explained based on the opinions of this scientist. In school textbooks, based on this point of view, a rule was made that the root form of a noun is singular, and the form taken by *-lar* is plural [12, p. 70–71; 1, p. 124].

Turkic scholars V. G. Guzev and D. M. Nasilov shows that considering the form of the noun without *-lar* as a singular form is the result of the application of Indo-European, including Russian grammar, to Turkic languages [2; 3].

During the Soviet era, the difference between the expression of the possessive meaning only with an adverb (*kitobim* – *my book*) and an adverb and a word (*mening kitobim* – *this book is mine*) was not defined, that is, it was not standardized. In the monograph [5], which approaches the language as a psycho-social variety, the expression of ownership in these two ways is interpreted as follows: It is correct to use a pronoun to express the focus in an emotional statement. Connotation is added to the denotative feature of possession, increasing the impact of the expression. In a non-emotional statement, it is not necessary to highlight the focus. It is enough to express the focus only with an adverb [5, p. 294].

In the definition that the noun means object, objectivity [14, 124, 125-p], the word object cannot be said to correspond to the characteristics of the Uzbek language. It will be correct if this word in the definition is replaced by the word *existence*. Because a noun also means the name of a person, and it is no secret that a person cannot be considered an object [5, p. 31].

During the Soviet period, the interpretation of compound sentences was also based on the Russian language. For example, under the influence of the norms of the Russian language, one-part sentences in the Uzbek language, such as “*quyosh chiqqach, atrof yorishdi*” (“the sun rose, the surrounding lighted up”), are interpreted as a compound sentence - a combination of two sentences by force [19, p. 16].

During this period, the rules of punctuation were standardized on the basis of the Russian language. In practice, punctuation marks are used in Uzbek as they are in Russian. In other words, the criteria and rules of punctuation were copied from the Russian language and imitated in the dominant national language [5, p. 453].

In accordance with the ideology of the Soviet kingdom, language was interpreted only as a social phenomenon, and due to the fact that it was not taken into account that it is also a spiritual phenomenon, some grammatical topics reflecting the unique mentality of our people were partially normalized. The meaning of respect, which reflects the spiritual and spiritual character of our people, has not been studied as a category. Absorption, which shows the structural uniqueness of the Uzbek language, is interpreted only as a syntactic phenomenon, as in Russian, and is expressed by morphological means such as *-(i)bdi*, *-gan ekan (emish)*, *-(a)r ekan (emish)*, *-sin ekan (emish)* not codified [5, p. 31].

V. Conclusion

It can be seen from the analysis that in the period of the Soviet period, in the standardization of Uzbek literary language departments, work was done based on the features of the Russian language in many cases. There are many more examples of interpretations and rules that do not correspond to the construction of the Uzbek language. From this, it becomes clear that the rules that do not correspond to the structure of the Uzbek literary language should be reformed based on the stability of the Uzbek language norm and the unique features of the structure of the Uzbek language.

References:

1. Аскарлова М., Қосимова К. Она тили. 5-синф учун дарслик. Еттинчи нашри. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи. 1993.

2. Гузев В. Г., Насилов Д. М. К интерпретации категории числа имён существительных в тюркских языках. Журн. “Вопросы языкознания”. 1975, № 3.
3. Гузев В. Г., Насилов Д. М. Словоизменительные категории в тюркских языках и понятие «грамматическая категория» // Журн. “Советская тюркология”. 1981. №3. С. 22 – 35.
4. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. Москва, “Прогресс”, 1984.
5. Зикриллаев Ф. Рух ва тил. Тошкент, Фан, 2018.
6. Имло луғати. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1978.
7. Истиклол ва она тили таълими (тўплам). Тошкент, Фан, 2000.
8. Ицкович В. А. Языковая норма. Москва, “Просвещение”, 1968.
9. Мирзаев М., Усмонов С., Расулов И. Ўзбек тили. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1978.
10. Нетьматов Х. Социоллингвистика. Бухоро, 2001.
11. Турсунов У., Мухторов А., Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1992.
12. Фузаилов С., Худойберганава М., Ашурова Н. Она тили. Учинчи синф учун дарслик. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1995.
13. Шоабдурахмонов Ш. ва б. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1980.
14. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. I том. Морфология. Тошкент, Фан, 1975.
15. Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси. 12-жилд. Тошкент, Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси Давлат илмий нашриёти, 2006.
16. Фуломов А. Ўзбек тилида кўплик категорияси. Тошкент, Ўздавнашр, 1944. 56 бет.
17. Фуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1965.
18. Фуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Синтаксис. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1987.
19. Фуломов А., Нетьматов Х. Она тили таълими мазмуни. Тошкент, Ўқитувчи, 1995.