



Article

Ghozi Olim Yunusov's Classification Of Uzbek Dialects And Principles Of Classification

Ergashova Gulnoza Shukurovna

1. Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature PhD student Tashkent city, Republic of Uzbekistan
- * Correspondence: gulnoza86ergashova@gmail.com

Abstract: This article analyzes the classification of Uzbek dialects proposed by Ghozi Olim Yunusov, focusing on the underlying principles and criteria guiding his approach. It offers a critical evaluation of Yunusov's objections to earlier classifications, particularly those by E.D. Polivanov and A.N. Samoylovich, and assesses the validity of his arguments regarding dialectal features such as synharmonism, lip harmony, and diphthongs. The study also scrutinizes Yunusov's methodological standpoint and theoretical assertions about the historical origins of Uzbek dialects and the development of the literary Uzbek language. Although influenced by the ideological climate of the 1930s, Yunusov's contributions remain significant in the discourse of Uzbek dialectology. However, his assertions often lacked empirical grounding and sometimes contradicted established linguistic evidence. The article concludes that while Ghozi Olim's dialect classification introduced influential concepts, it also reflects the ideological pressures and academic limitations of its time.

Keywords: dialect, mestizatsiya, dialect, diphthong, synharmonism, lip harmony, classification principles, language contacts, Chigatai language, hybridization.

1. Introduction

To date, the classification of Uzbek dialects has been studied in a number of works. These works also provide the classification of Ghozi Olim, but not all of his ideas in the work "An Experiment in the Classification of Uzbek Dialects", which we are analyzing, are fully reflected. Before recommending his classification, Ghozi Olim analyzes the views of scholars of his time [1]. He first expresses serious objections to the classification of Prof. E.D. Polivanov.

His justified criticism. He criticizes E. Polivanov for dividing dialects into groups such as Iranized and non-Iranized, Turkmenized, and Kazakhized. Of course, this criticism is justified. Indeed, as our dialectologists have noted, he attributed the Uzbek dialects to external influence, but such criticism continued in subsequent years, but it had certain theoretical shortcomings [2], [3]. As is known, the development of languages and dialects is based on contact, that is, on the interaction that occurs in their border zones, which is recognized in world areal linguistics. Ghozi Olim himself recognizes this [4], [5]. He writes: "No nation is confined to its environment. It is constantly in contact with other nations. This contact opens the way to reciprocal influence. Therefore, the influence of other nations on the language of one nation should also be recognized as a factor of change and growth". Thus, he does not forget about external influence in the development of a language.

Citation: Shukurovna, E. G. Ghozi Olim Yunusov's Classification Of Uzbek Dialects And Principles Of Classification. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2025, 6(3), 458-463

Received: 15th Apr 2025
Revised: 29th May 2025
Accepted: 21th Jun 2025
Published: 12th July 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

2. Materials and Methods

His inappropriate criticisms:

1. He criticizes E. Polivanov's opinion that the number of vowels in Iranized dialects decreased from 9 to 6. In this case, the criticism is incorrect, because the existence of 6 vowels in dialects that lost synharmonism and its subsequent strong position in the Uzbek literary language were reflected in the literature.
2. He also criticizes the fact that he called dialects with six vowels dialects without synharmonism, which, of course, was also inappropriate.
3. E. Polivanov included dialects that were completely different from each other in one section only based on their synharmonism. This is a mistaken analysis, as E. Polivanov emphasized that the division of dialects into synharmonious and non-synharmonious and Iranized and non-Iranized dialects is only possible within the Chigatai (modern-day Karluk-Chigil-Uyghur or Karluk dialect) dialect.
4. He expresses the critical opinion that the Kipchak or original Uzbek group includes "the dialects of the majority of the rural population of Uzbekistan and the dialects of nomadic Uzbeks". When we got acquainted with E. Polivanov's work, we did not come across such an opinion, but rather, E. Polivanov, while talking about the emergence of differences in the languages of the Uzbek Kipchaks and Kazakhs, thought that they were more sedentary than the nomadic Kazakhs, based on irrigation, and were closer to the dialects of the local Oghuz and Karluks (so-called "chigatai") and differed from the Kazakh language, but also had common features with the Kazakh language. It seems that G. Olim criticized E. Polivanov's ideas here without fully understanding them. Indeed, E. Polivanov showed that the Kipchak dialects were mainly rural dialects, of course, this cannot be a basis for objection in principle.
5. The features of the Kipchak dialect cited by the scholar E.D. Polivanov include: the transformation of the consonant *q* (present-day *r'*) into the sound *u*; the dropping of the sounds *u*, *q*; the replacement of the sound *ç* with the sound *j*; the replacement of the suffixes *-lar*, *-nar*, *-din*, *-tin*; the appearance of the sound *q* instead of the sound *x*; the appearance of the vowels *a* in hard (meaning that the back vowels are present) words, and *æ*, *ə* in soft (meaning that the front vowels are present) words; the appearance of labial harmony; and the occurrence of the diphthongs *ue*, *ëö*, *yo*, *ıj* at the beginning of words.
6. Unfortunately, these facts could not be found in E. Polivanov's classification but might have been taken from his other works. However, we emphasize that most of the above facts are characteristic of the Kipchak dialect's speech. Only some of them require explanation and correction: the change of the consonant *q* (now *g'*) to the sound *u* is groundless. If E. Polivanov held such a view, then he was mistaken because this phenomenon is not supported by examples from the dialects. The idea of the interchange of the suffixes "*-lar*, *-nar*, *-din*, *-tin*" needs clarification; that is, *-lar* and *-nar* do not interchange but rather function as variants in their respective places. The suffixes *-din* and *-tin* are also variants, but these are not features of the Kipchak dialects, rather characteristics of Old Uzbek and present-day Northern Uzbek Qarluq and Oghuz dialects. At this point, the question of who is mistaken remains open. Other indicated facts, as well as those criticized mockingly with the word "emish," are typical of the Kipchak dialect and do not leave room for criticism.
7. Khozi Olim criticizes E. Polivanov for stating that lip harmony is characteristic only of the Kipchak dialects, while claiming that it exists in all our dialects. This criticism is also unfounded because, in his article on the Turkistan (Qarluq) and Iqan (Oghuz) dialects, Polivanov analyzed the features of vowel harmony in those dialects as well.
8. Khozi Olim criticizes E. Polivanov for classifying diphthongs as belonging to the Qirq dialect and lip harmony as characteristic only of the Kipchak dialect. First of all, Polivanov does not discuss principles of dialect classification; rather, he describes the

characteristics of dialects and subdialects. In other words, he does not claim to have classified the dialects. Moreover, we have not encountered his assertion that diphthongs and lip harmony are exclusive to those dialects and subdialects. There is ample literature supporting the existence of both phenomena across our dialects..

9. Both E. Polivanov and current educational literature have been criticized for the view that the Tashkent dialect has 6 vowels and Andijan has 7 vowels. However, while indicating that the Tashkent dialect has 8 vowels, a table lists 12 vowels, and the Andijan dialect has 15 vowels. It is known that in the textbook *Uzbek Dialectology*, the Andijan and Shahrikhon dialects are reported to have 9–10 vowels, and in S. Ibrohimov's monograph, there is evidence of 10 vowels. Therefore, it is understood that further research on this issue is appropriate and necessary.

Ghozi Olim, in A. Samoylovich's work "*Some Additions to the Classification of Turkic Languages*", states that Uzbek dialects are divided into two groups and completely criticizes this classification. In fact, this classification was not of Uzbek dialects but of Turkic languages in general. His critical remarks include the view that Samoylovich grouped completely different languages together and failed to correctly define the relationships between Uzbek dialects. Some of these criticisms are justified, while others are not; we leave this issue to those who study A. Samoylovich's works.

3. Results and Discussion

Principles Used by Ghozi Olim in Dialect Classification

He refers to these as the "Ghozi Olim classification criteria." They are as follows:

1. "Features affecting meaning, that is, differences (phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactic) that hinder mutual understanding between representatives of dialects and subdialects during communication." Except for some awkward expressions, this approach is generally correct. However, the phrase "features affecting meaning, that is, differences that hinder mutual understanding between representatives of dialects and subdialects during communication" lacks scientific precision [6], [7], [8].
2. "Not using features that do not affect meaning as classification criteria." Certainly, this idea alone could not fulfill the role of a classification principle. In reality, classifications are based on commonalities and similarities in language and dialects. Ghozi Olim, on the other hand, argued for basing classifications on differences in language and dialects [9]. Of course, as mentioned above, his "foundations" never reached a scientific level and he was unable to clearly define his own classification.

It should be noted that there is no universally accepted principle or approach for dialect Classification [10]. Only some authors discuss the bases of classification. In the textbook *Uzbek Dialectology*, the criteria selected by scholars for classification are presented, including:

1. K. Yudakhin's focus on the presence or absence of vowel harmony in dialects;
2. E. Polivanov's concepts of metisization (mixing of related languages) and hybridization (mixing of unrelated languages);
3. Borovkov's emphasis on phonetic features of dialects, relationships among Uzbek dialects, and their historical-linguistic characteristics;
4. V. Reshetov's focus on historical-linguistic features of Uzbek dialects and their relationships with surrounding languages [11].

S. Ashirboev, after analyzing various attempts at dialect classification, considers that the following principles participate in classification:

1. The presence or active use of vowels and consonants specific to Uzbek (Turkic) language;
2. Adherence to certain phonetic laws;
3. The quantity of lexical units related to historical layers and the participation of borrowed words;

4. The influence of related and unrelated languages and dialects on Uzbek dialects, among others.

In this respect, Khozi Olim cannot be blamed for not developing classification principles because this issue remains unresolved to this day [12], [13].

Now, let us turn to his classification of Uzbek dialects. His classification has been cited in all textbooks, manuals, and scientific works created in later periods. These are:

1. Uzbek-Kipchak dialect;
2. Turk-Barlos dialect;
3. Khiva-Urgench dialect.

It should be noted that from Khozi Olim's initial explanations, this classification cannot be considered a classification of all Uzbek dialects. This is not difficult to understand from his own words [14], [15]. When he says "Kipchak," he does not mean the historically formed tribal-union names, but rather the living Uzbek tribe that called itself Uzbek and lived in the Fergana Valley, Zarafshan basin, Khorezm, and along the Amu Darya. Now the question arises: at that time (in the 1930s), only these groups called themselves Uzbek, so how scientific was it for Khozi Olim to name the Kipchak dialects—which are a branch of the Uzbek language—after the name of the Uzbek people in that area, or what phenomenon's correct understanding did this reflect? This remains a problem.

Similar questions can be raised regarding his naming of the "Turk-Barlos" dialect. According to his writing, the term "Turk" was used for groups living in the Fergana Valley, Uzgen, Jala-Kuduk, Marhamat, Osmat in Jizzakh, Qoratepa and Takhta Karača in Samarkand, Kitob in Kashkadarya, and Qoratoğ in Tajikistan, who called themselves Turk, Barlos, Kaltatoy, Tuyachi and considered themselves as part of the Uzbek people. It is true that in these areas there are tribes called Turk-Kaltatoy and Turk-Barlos, and it is said that their dialects belong to the Qarluq group. It is not difficult to feel that Khozi Olim was aware of this issue in his time. Therefore, naming a small part of a dialect after its roof (i.e., naming the whole dialect Turk-Barlos) does not correspond to any truth. It also contradicts historical and scientific views.

He does not comment on naming the third dialect Khiva-Urgench. This naming is also not fully comprehensive because it cannot be applied to all Oghuz dialects. It should be emphasized that Khozi Olim recognized the existence of three dialects in the Uzbek language but could not go beyond a particular approach in naming them, and the names he chose as a basis are not appropriate.

On the Origin of Uzbek Dialects

Khozi Olim puts forward an incorrect idea about the origin of the Uzbek language and its dialects. According to him, the "... Uzbek language" is not composed of old and living dialects and subdialects that have branched out from a single "mother" language, but rather consists of certain languages that participated in the formation of the common Uzbek language. This denies the fact that the Uzbek language branched off from the Turkic language family. The phrase in his subsequent remark, "the old and living dialects and subdialects are certain languages participating in the creation of the common Uzbek language," is far from any scientific perspective. On the contrary, the Uzbek language and its dialects are branches that have sprouted from the Turkic language. There are many scientific discussions on this matter in our academic literature, so it is unnecessary to elaborate here.

Regarding the formation and fate of Uzbek dialects, forced and groundless opinions are combined with motives influenced by the politics of the time (contemporaneity). According to him:

During the feudal period, Uzbek tribal unions clashed with each other, began to interact and influence one another oppositely, and during the era of Russian capitalism, some languages came into even closer contact, gradually losing their differences and becoming more similar. It should be emphasized that firstly, the basis for these claims is not provided, and secondly, Russian capitalism has no relation to the emergence and

development of Uzbek dialects. The idea that dialects disappear during capitalism might have been mentioned in literature of the 1930s. In fact, this idea was encountered in Marxist literature, and therefore, this view was mentioned in Turkic dialectology textbooks and manuals, even as late as the 1970s, for example, in the chapter "Dialects and National Languages in the Era of Capitalism" in the textbook "Turkmen Dialectology".

Recognizing the emergence of language and dialects as a historical category, their origin and development are certainly connected with the development of society; however, a particular political system cannot be considered a necessary stage for their development. Therefore, it is correct to regard the association of the national language and its dialects with capitalism as far from the truth, and the emergence of such ideas in Ghozi Olim's views should also be seen as influenced by Marxist literature.

He states: "With the great advances, growth, and consolidation of socialist construction, the unity between city and countryside has emerged, seemingly eradicating traces of the old lifestyle based on class divisions, and it is also eliminating and will eliminate the differences between Uzbek dialects and subdialects, which are the heritage of that old way of life." Developing this idea further, he says: "This situation will completely eliminate the slight or considerable differences among the dialects of Uzbeks living in all regions of Uzbekistan, expanding a unified understanding for all dialects of our current literary language, leaving no difference among them".

4. Conclusion

It is true that a great deal has been written during the socialist period about eliminating the differences between urban and rural speech. Likewise, there have been speculative views about the "disappearance of dialect features during socialism." Nevertheless, it is clear that such differences still persist (though there is some progress), and it is important to note that the confident statements about completely eliminating urban and rural dialect differences arose under the pressure of political ideology of the time. It should be mentioned that the interaction between languages and dialects is understood in areal linguistics as contactological processes, but Ghozi Olim's prediction about the complete disappearance of dialects is far from scientific truth. However, his view that the literary language does influence dialects is reasonable.

Regarding the role of dialects in the creation of the literary language, Ghozi Olim also had his own opinion. He stated: "... in the construction of the literary language, not one or two dialects alone will participate, but the living dialects and subdialects of all Uzbek proletarians and kolkhoz masses residing in all regions, cities, and villages of Uzbekistan who actively participate in socialist construction will be involved". The idea expressed in this sentence that the literary language should not be created based on just one dialect or subdialect is debatable. In practice worldwide, there are examples where literary languages have been created based on a single dialect or a spoken and written language variety.

Now let us focus on the idea in that sentence that "the living dialects and subdialects of all Uzbek proletarians and kolkhoz masses will participate in the creation of the literary language." This kind of reasoning, apparently, is characteristic of the 1930s, explained by the strong ideological drive to build socialism during that period, which prioritized the material and spiritual needs of the common working people. Such an idea was even reflected in the works of E.D. Polivanov, who also argued that the Uzbek literary language should serve the interests of the Uzbek proletariat and the working peasants from various regions. Apparently, Polivanov's view served as a foundation for Ghozi Olim's thinking. However, there remains a question about how scientifically accurate such reasoning is.

As we have observed above, alongside some of Ghozi Olim's views on the history and complex structure of Uzbek dialects that do not fully withstand the test of time and

ideological influence, there are also opinions he put forward regarding the formation of the literary language that are supported by current scientific understanding.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. V. Reshetov and Sh. Shoabdurakhmonov, **O‘zbek dialektologiyasi**, Tashkent: O‘rta va oliy maktab, 1962, pp. 243.
- [2] G. O. Yunusov, **O‘zbek lahjalarining tasnifida bir tajriba**, Tashkent: O‘zdavnashr, 1935, pp. 68.
- [3] E. D. Polivanov, **Uzbekskaya dialektologiya i uzbekskiy literaturnyy yazyk**, Tashkent: Uzgosisdats, 1933, pp. 232.
- [4] S. Ashirboev, **O‘zbek dialektologiyasi**, Tashkent: Nodirabegim, 2021, pp. 175.
- [5] S. Ibrohimov, **O‘zbek tilining Andijon shevasi**, Tashkent: Fan, 1967, pp. 186.
- [6] Zh. Amansariyev, **Turkmen dialektologiyasi**, Ashgabat: Turkmenistan, 1970, pp. 130.
- [7] N. Baskakov, "Classification of Turkic languages," in **Turkologiya masalalari**, Moscow: Nauka, 1969, pp. 21-34.
- [8] L. N. Kharitonov, **Ocherki po dialektologii tyurkskikh yazykov**, Moscow: Nauka, 1982, pp. 95-113.
- [9] M. Zakiev, "Genesis of Turkic languages," **Kazan Federal University Bulletin**, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 45-59, 1994.
- [10] Borovkov, "Features of Uzbek dialect phonetics," **Vestnik AN SSSR**, vol. 9, pp. 44-52, 1940.
- [11] D. M. Nasilov, **Osnovy tyurkskoy dialektologii**, Moscow: Nauka, 1987, pp. 200.
- [12] E. E. Bert G. de Jong, "On vowel harmony in Uzbek dialects," **Journal of Turkic Linguistics**, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 79-95, 2008.
- [13] T. Kamolov, "Shevalarning fonetik xususiyatlari," **O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti**, no. 3, pp. 21-29, 1980.
- [14] S. Turaev, "Historical layers of Uzbek vocabulary," **Philology Journal**, vol. 5, pp. 33-40, 1987.
- [15] H. Boeschoten and E. Johanson, **Turkic Languages of Central Asia**, London: Routledge, 1998, pp. 54-77.