

Ghozi Olim Yunusov on the Vowel System of Uzbek Dialects

Ergashova Gulnoza Shukurovna

Doctoral Student, Tashkent State University Of Uzbek Language And Literature Tashkent City, Republic Of Uzbekistan

Received: 29 March 2025; **Accepted:** 10 April 2025; **Published:** 30 May 2025

Abstract: - The article studies the ideas of the enlightened Jadid writer Ghozi Olim Yunusov about the vowel system in Uzbek dialects. His views on the vocalism and vowel system of Uzbek dialects are critically and analytically assessed.

Keywords: - Phonetic-phonological system, vocalism, variation, diphthong, grapheme, simple vowel, obscene vowel, indifferent vowel, synharmonism.

Introduction: - The issue of the phonetic-phonological system of Uzbek dialects was the subject of research in two works by Ghozi Olim. In the 12th issue of the journal "Maorif va o'qitg'uchi" in 1927, the writer published an article entitled "Voices of the Uzbek language", in which he tried to shed light on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of vowel and consonant phonemes in the Uzbek language, or rather, in Uzbek dialects. He used the reformed Arabic script and transcription based on the Latin alphabet. This source was analyzed in N. Yangibaeva's dissertation on "The process of Uzbek linguistics in the 20s of the 20th century (based on the materials of the journal "Maorif va o'qitg'uchi") [1]. In his work "An experiment in the classification of Uzbek dialects", he notes that he wrote texts from dialects in the "international scientific phonetic alphabet (in which M.F.A. is in brackets)". However, he himself admits that he could not strictly adhere to this alphabet. He attributes this to the difficulties of the printing press. Because "the printing presses did not have letters for scientific spelling" [4;5]. This situation is understandable, since we have an idea of the state of technology at the time when this work was published. Ghozi Olim explains that he could not show the variations of phonemes in dialects or could not find a way to show them as follows: "However, these invisible phonetic features do not have a semantic role in terms of influencing the meaning, they can only be significant in terms of pronunciation [4;5]". In fact, it was clear to Ghozi Olim that every sound is important for

dialectology.

Based on these two sources, Ghozi Olim's views on vowels in the Uzbek language can be analyzed as follows.

He thinks about the very narrow, narrow, medium and wide degrees of vowels. When Ghozi Olim speaks of the three degrees of vowels, he gives explanations that remind us of the principle of the degree of opening of the mouth in the classification of vowels, which is noted in our current literature, but in describing them, one can feel that the idea is about the elongation of vowels, in particular, he explains the vowel "i" as follows:

- in closed syllables, if there is no open syllable before or after it, it represents a "very narrow" (tip of the tongue) sound. He does not give an example of it, but only says that he used it "in collecting examples." This can be understood as follows: in words like олтим, бердек, the vowel i of a very narrow degree is used in the syllables -dim, bir-;

- if there is a closed syllable in an open syllable and before and after it, it is a wider degree, that is, as if the vowel i in the syllables ki-, -di in words like kiş, keldi, etc., is a "wider" degree. It can be understood as an intermediate degree;

- if the open syllable is at the end of the word, there are three degrees of openness (i.e. wide). Continuing this explanation, he says that the vowel "i" is pronounced with an inclination to "e" and considers it a sound close to "e". Perhaps he meant syllables like -ki, -ngi in the old and new words. It seems that in these places we are

not talking about the degree of opening of the mouth, but about the short and long pronunciation of vowels. Even then, what was said should have been reinforced with examples. Indeed, in Uzbek dialects there are places where the vowel “i” is pronounced long. Professor K. Yudakhin, taking into account the fact that the vowel “i” in the Karabulak dialect is pronounced long and in the past tense definite verb, gave a transcription of the text [2;21], but Ghozi Olim does not think about this, but about the three degrees of openness of vowels. Such thinking does not correspond to phonetic theories, otherwise it is not possible to determine three degrees for all vowels depending on the opening of the mouth, but vowels are classified according to the degree of opening of the mouth. He also touched on the importance of observing the three degrees in narrow vowels and says in this regard: “People who do not know the law of opening Uzbek narrow vowels with such three degrees of openness, that is, those who learn the Uzbek language, make very obscene mistakes in pronunciation, spoil the linguistic taste of the Uzbek listener and undermine the effect of their speech [4;6]”. At this point, we find it necessary to dwell on one hint in Ghozi Olim’s comments. However, the numbers 9°, 9>, <9°, <9° were used to determine the degree of openness, so it was not possible to know for what purposes they were used. Therefore, it is believed that these three degrees existed only in narrow vowels.

Before classifying Uzbek dialects, Ghozi Olim, while explaining the possibilities of using transcription signs for the examples given, provides information about the articulation and acoustic characteristics (pronunciation and audibility) of vowels and consonants (which he also calls phonemes) in Uzbek dialects. Ghozi Olim also uses the terms letter and sound as synonyms, and this thinking is also connected with the tradition of the time, in the work “Ways of Agreement” published by “Chigatai Gurungi” in 1919, the term letter was used in the sense of sound [6;13]. Thus, Ghozi Olim used this term within the framework of tradition.

Description of vowels. Ghozi Olim, relying on the tradition of the time, divides vowels into simple and complex vowels. He does not express an opinion on the nature of these terms, but uses them as a tradition of the time. In fact, the term *basit* (given as *basit*) meant simple vowels, while the term *complex* meant diphthongs and letter combinations *uv*, *yy*. We will study the description of these vowels by comparing them with his initial ideas in the article “An Experiment in the Classification of Uzbek Dialects” and “The Sounds of the Uzbek Language” published in 1927 [3; 49-55]. True, in “*Tasnif*” Ghozi Olim abandons the classification published in the journal “*Maorif va uksitguvchi*” in 1927, but this does not mean that he also abandoned

his ideas about vowels in this article.

Description of simple vowels. He says that “i” is a narrow, very short sound that comes from the front of the tongue [4; 5]. In his previous article, he only mentioned that it is a “short and thin consonant.” Ghozi Olim also emphasizes that this sound has three degrees of opening in all dialects.

The vowel “u”. We express the labialized vowel *i* with this grapheme, he says [4;6]. This is a mistaken idea, since the vowel *i* can never be labialized, and moreover, it cannot answer the question of why the vowel *i* should receive the vowel *u*. In the previous article, he used this letter to represent the sound represented by the grapheme *ü* in the transcription based on the current Latin alphabet [1;15]. According to him, if it is open in the first degree, it represents the most narrowly labialized tip vowel, if it is open in the second degree (in the middle), if it comes in the last syllable with a third degree of opening, it represents a sound close to the labialized vowel *e*. In our opinion, such thinking is not appropriate in the present day. phoneticians. In this case, it would have been sufficient to recognize that it is a front vowel (in the opposition *u – ü*), but if necessary, it should have been described from the point of view of sound correspondence in the speech process. Apparently, the fact that the law of sound correspondence was not yet recognized at that time was the reason for using the concept of proximity to other vowels (*i* and *e*).

The sound “u”. He describes it as a back, narrow, lipped vowel and admits that it is used in all dialects. In this respect, he is correct, but it is not difficult to understand that it is illogical to think about three degrees of openness (wide) while calling this vowel a narrow vowel.

When describing the vowel *ь* - he uses the phrase “it takes on three different pronunciations” and shows its following features:

this vowel, in his opinion, if it occurs in a closed syllable and there is no open syllable before or after this closed syllable, this sound represents the narrowest, shortest, unlippped back vowel *u* [4;5]. This description can be imagined as follows, that is, as if this vowel was used in the words *aqtim* (no open syllable before the closed syllable), *qilg’an* (no open syllable after the closed syllable). Of course, the absence of an open syllable before and after a closed syllable could not reveal the nature of the vowel *i*, but rather the use of a short *i* vowel at the back of the tongue is a phonetic feature of synharmonic dialects;

The vowel *ь* - is explained as “when it occurs at the beginning or in the middle of a word in an open syllable, it expresses the sound *ь* with a second degree of

openness" [4;6]. The idea that the vowel transitions to the vowel ɤ and its second degree of openness was unfounded;

When this vowel occurs in an open syllable at the end of a word, it expands to the third degree and expresses the sound (<9) [4;6], it was difficult to understand what the idea was about, because we did not know what the sign (<9) meant.

The article calls the vowel "a short and thick consonant that is common to all Uzbek dialects and occurs only in bold words," and cites the words *kiliq* and *qir* as examples. Here, Ghozi Olim discusses the use of the vowel *i* in all dialects, which can be interpreted in two ways: 1) After the Language and Spelling Conference of 1929, when synharmonistic dialects were adopted as the basis for the Uzbek literary language, representatives of urban dialects also tried to use this vowel in their speech. This was the basis for using the phrase "in all Uzbek dialects"; 2) Ghozi Olim did not know that the indifferent vowel *i* (*i+i* = *i*) existed in urban dialects. In Ghozi Olim's statement: "Uzbek-speaking Tajiks use this short and thin letter even in bold words, since (*i*) is not a short, thick letter in Persian" [6;51], Ghozi Olim, although he himself did not think about it, N. Yangibaeva correctly noted that in this case it is necessary to talk about an indifferent sound [1;25]. It is known that in urban dialects, in Uzbek transcription based on Russian graphics, *ə* was an indifferent sound represented by the Latin letter *u*.

The letter "e" (sound). This vowel was described at the level of current concepts, that is, it is said that it is a mid-wide, front row, but it is considered labialized [4;7]. The article does not discuss the labialization of this vowel. As we have said above, N. Yangibaeva is right to accuse Ghozi Olim of not understanding the law of sound correspondence. Unlike his previous article, in this work, the Kipchaks of Fergana, who live in Kurgan-Tepe and Ayim, teach that in the speech of the Kipchaks of Fergana, in the syllables after the first syllable, one should read *Σ* without reading *e*. He does not describe what sound the sign *Σ* represents, but only mentions that this sign is wider than the vowel *e*.

The letter "ö" (sound). He says that he used this sign not for the lipped sound, but for the lipped sign *Σ*. In the article, he gave a correct assessment of this vowel. In this work, he states the idea that in dialects with this vowel, it starts with a narrow *u* (trans. *u*) sound at the beginning of a word, then expands one by one, and becomes *œ* in many of our dialects. From this idea, the sign *œ* represents a diphthong (complex). He does not provide information about this sign, and no examples are given of where it appears. In his opinion, this vowel should be read as a diphthong in the first syllable in

Fergana Kipchak dialects, and as a simple one in subsequent syllables. There is a certain amount of truth in this idea, but the concept of the first syllable should be understood as at the beginning of a word. It has been said in the literature that the vowel *ö* is diphthongized at the beginning of a word in dialects with synharmonism [5;41]. Another issue. Ghozi Olim does not think about labial synharmonism, but explains the situation in which he deviates from it in a different way: "...in the last syllable (when *ə* occurs in the previous syllable), *ə* (*ə*) should be read. He also states that if the vowel *ə* (*œ*) occurs again at the end of the word, it should be read as *ə* and gives the "or" option: *ə//ə* or *ə*. Such an explanation can also be considered a characteristic of his time, but it remains unclear to us how scientific an idea it was for linguists of his time.

The vowel "ə". He says that it is front, wide, and unlabialized, and that he used it for the sound *ə*. In fact, Ghozi Olim distinguished between the vowels *ə* and *ə*. According to him, in the Kipchak dialects, the vowel *ə* is narrower than the sound *ə* in the syllables that come after the first syllable, and shorter than the sound *ə* wider, but pronounced with an inclination to the sound of *e*. This interpretation is fully consistent with current views. The vowel *ə* was described by E.D. Polivanov in his early articles [7]. In modern literature, the grapheme *ε* is used for this sound in transcription, and this vowel is still used in the Namangan dialect. In the Oghuz dialects (according to him, Khiva-Urgench), the vowel *ə* is wider than the vowel *ə* and narrower than "ə" and is pronounced with an inclination to the sound of *ə* in all syllables [4;7].

In the Karluk dialects (according to him, Turkic-Barlos), the letter *ə* represents the sound of *ə* at the beginning of a word and the narrower sound of *Σ* in the second syllables [4;7].

No examples of the use of these vowels are given in the Kipchak, Oghuz, and Karluk dialects.

The vowel (letter) "o". It is correctly indicated that it is a back, medium-width, labial sound. He thinks that in the Tashkent dialect this vowel is indifferent, that is, it is pronounced between *o* and *ö*, which is consistent with current understandings. He also thinks that in the Tashkent dialect the sound is in a middle (mikhed) position in terms of the denominator. We consider it necessary to dwell on the significance of this idea here, that is, the fact that the language pronounces it as middle indicates repetition, but it was difficult to understand what issue it was necessary to solve by showing it as mikhed (mixed). In his thoughts about the use of this vowel in the dialects of the Kipchak dialect, there are also places that deviate from the imity. He thinks that it is initially diphthongized at the beginning

of a word, which is also noted in current literature. However, in the syllables after the first syllable, it turns into the vowel *ɔ*, and its transformation into the vowel *u* in many dialects is unfounded and difficult to accept for discussion.

The vowel “a” (it uses only its written version). The language is said to have a back, wide, unlabial sound. This letter represents the vowel *ā* (*ɔ*) in our understanding. Unfortunately, the fact that he cites the word *alma* from the Tashkent and Khiva dialects (languages in the text) as an example causes discussion, because in the Tashkent dialect this word is pronounced as *ālmā*, and in the Khiva dialect as *alma*. Therefore, he made a theoretical mistake in this regard. He emphasizes that this vowel was an independent phoneme in the Tashkent dialect, and he also considers it to exist in all dialects. Of course, the coherence of thought is broken here. The grapheme *ɔ* was chosen for this vowel in the article.

The vowel “a”. He calls it a printed letter. This name was due to the use of the vowel *a* above for a separate sound. It is correct to understand this vowel as the universal Turkic vowel *a*, but it is far from true to say that this vowel is not an independent phoneme in any dialect, but rather, the literature reflects the fact that this vowel is used in all our dialects with synharmonism. Ghozi Olim also provides some real and unrealistic information on this vowel. He noticed that this vowel is used in all syllables of the words *sadaka* in the Tashkent dialect. This is correct, but it is not correct to associate it only with the Tashkent dialect, because this vowel is also used as a phonetic variation in our dialects that have lost synharmonism, sometimes in words with the consonants *q*, *r*’. There is another issue regarding this vowel, in which if the vowel *a* occurs between consonants (in which it is consonantless), it is labialized and becomes *ɔ* inverted, and it is used in all dialects. This idea is not proven by actual examples, and such ideas are not found in subsequent dialectological studies. In this work, Ghozi Olim does not dwell on the sound combinations *-uv*, *uv* (*-üv*), *-иу*, *и*, which are called complex vowels, which are discussed in detail in the article.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, despite the confusion and ambiguity in the descriptions given about the vocalism of Uzbek dialects, studies such as the ones above created by Ghozi Olim have their place in illuminating the issues of studying, describing and classifying the phonetic-phonological system of Uzbek dialects at the beginning of the 20th century. These views of the writer will need to be studied in more detail.

REFERENCES

- Янгибоева Н. XX асрнинг 20-йилларида ўзбек тилшунослиги жараёни (“Маориф ва ўқитғучи” журнали материаллари асосида): Филол. фан. ... фалсафа доктори ... дисс. – Қарши, 2020. -138 б.
- Юдахин К. Тексты. Карабулакский говор. – Ташкент: Фан, 1961. – 221 с.
- Ғози Олим. Ўзбек тилининг товушлари // “Маориф ва ўқитғучи”, 1927. – №12. – Б.49 -55 (араб графикасида).
- Ғози Олим Юнусов. Ўзбек лаҳжаларининг таснифида бир тажриба. – Тошкент: Ўздавнашр, 1935. -68 б.
- Ashirboyev S. O‘zbek dialektologiyasi. –Toshkent: Nodirabegim, 2021. –175 b.
- Ashirboev S., Azimov I. Chig‘atoy gurungi va imlo // Davlat tili taraqqiyoti: muammo va yechimlar. – Toshkent, 2022, - B.13.
- Поливанов Е.Д. Фонетическая система говора кишлака Икан (Туркестанский уезд) // Известия АН СССР, 1929, сер. 7. - №7. – С. 515.