

<p><b>THE VIEWS OF JADIDS ON NATIONAL PHONETICS</b></p>		<p><b>Literature</b></p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Jaded, Phonetics, Syngarmonism, Vowels, Lip Sounding, Vocalism, Alphabet.</p>
---	--	--

<p><b>Inomjon Azimov Mamasodikovich</b></p>	<p>Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Director of the Center “Training and Teaching the Basics of Working in the State Language” Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>In Uzbek linguistics, the period until the age of 40 has not been sufficiently studied; therefore, the merits of the Uzbek enlighteners in the development of the national Uzbek literary language remain aloof from the attention of specialists. As a result, the conclusion was improperly formed in the literature on linguistics that the Uzbek language began to develop in the 1940s. In fact, during this period, the loyal nations, which entered the pages of history under the name “Jadids,” carried out serious activities to develop literary norms of the Uzbek language and to study our national language, which has its own rules and patterns. The article examines precisely that little-studied period of our linguistics. The paper mainly analyzes two main problems. First, the Jadids' perspective on the syngarmonism phenomenon—a feature shared by all Turkic languages—was noteworthy. The opinions of experts on this phenomenon are presented here, since the Uzbek language is based on many dialects. And also, their opinion is given on the subordination of borrowed words to this pattern, and the author’s own opinion on this problem is stated as well. Secondly, the question considers vowels and consonants and the expression of their letters. Questions are highlighted as follows: the Arabic alphabet cannot express all the possibilities of the sounds of the Uzbek language, not the existence of sufficient letters to express vowels that some letters express only the sounds of the Arabic language, and actions related in this regard to the reform of the Arabic alphabet. Based on the analyses, conclusions were drawn: an analysis of the activity of the Jadids of linguists to scientifically evaluate their merits in the formation of literary norms of the Uzbek language can serve to replenish the history of Uzbek linguistics.</p>
--

**INRODUCTION**

Due to the fact that the period of history of the Uzbek language until the 40s of the last century was not studied until independence, Uzbek linguistics in literature began to develop in the 40s. It was based on misconceptions. However, in the above-mentioned periods, Uzbek linguistics began to develop, the first national alphabet was developed, and the Uzbek language was first introduced into certain rules. The devotees of the nation, who carried out this work and entered the pages of history under the name of “Jadids,” were branded “enemies of the people” and were not allowed to study their activities. Thanks to independence, attention was focused on studying the heritage of the Jadids. Their literary activity has been extensively studied, and numerous studies have been conducted on their contribution to Uzbek linguistics. Fitrat's linguistic ancestry was examined in M. Kurbanova's initial research in this field. She writes in his dissertation: “One of the most important tasks of today is to study the socio-historical, scientific, and literary processes of 1920–1930 to make a scientifically accurate assessment of that period. To date, we have had no information about this period. Language policy and the stages of the formation of Uzbek linguistics in this period, although they attracted the attention of many, have not yet been studied on a scientific basis. Speaking of the literary language of this period, it was noted that “our language was enriched by Russian-international words.” In fact, the modern science of Uzbek linguistics began to take shape in the early 1920s. [12; 3-4]. M. Yuldashev analyzed the language of Cholpon’s works of art, Y. Saidov, the lexical layer of Fitrat's works; Sh. Bobomurodova

Elbek; T. Togayev, the linguistic heritage of Ashurali Zohiri; K. Kadyrov, the morphological system of the 20s; S. Normamatov, the work of Jadids in lexicography; and N. Yangiboeva, on the basis of the materials of the magazine “Education and Teacher” as an object of analysis of the linguistic processes of that period. However, these works did not fully cover the state of Uzbek linguistics in the early twentieth century. Therefore, it is important to study the activities of all linguists who have contributed to the development of the Uzbek language in this period to evaluate them from a linguistic point of view.

Below are the views of the Jadids on the development of spelling rules, the law of synharmonism, the system of sounds in our language, the relationship of sounds and letters.

## RESULT

The Jadids realized the need for a well-established, standardized literary language in the formation of a nation as a nation and in its recognition. Elbek writes: “The tongue is a weapon sent by God for each of the different nations. The health of all the people in the world is in the shadow of this language alone. After all, every language that lives on earth is rising and rising just beyond its own language. On the contrary, not only have the hands risen, but they have also lost and are lost.” [11; 1].

Therefore, the main task of the Uzbek intelligentsia was to develop the rules of the Uzbek language and conduct scientific research. For, as Fitrat said, “None of this will happen until there is scientific research” [10; 141]. This required an in-depth analysis of the oral and written sources of our people, comparing them, drawing scientific conclusions, and thus creating the rules of the Uzbek literary language. Fitrat writes, “Let us determine the number of sounds in our language and their place in the scientific picture. We cried out that our language was a talented, rich language; we struggled with those who did not know the language, saying, “This language is rude; let's take a literary dialect of Turkish instead.” However, we have not yet been able to put into practice the definite rules of our language. The “unity” in the form of our writings is to express the strict rules of our language in order to give convenience to our new writers. We must first know these rules ourselves.” [10; 141].

Certainly, they realized that this work could only be the result of very complex, arduous, and relentless scientific research, overcoming the various contradictions that existed at that time. To do this, first of all, they aim to develop the rules of literary language by scientifically examining the examples of folklore and the works of our classical writers and, on this basis, drawing scientific conclusions. Because the urban dialects were far removed from the literary language due to Persian, Arabic, and Russian words, the purity of the language was preserved in the rural dialects. But carrying out this work was, firstly, extremely complex and, secondly, not something that few scientists could do. These were the tasks that all the devotees of the nation had to perform together: “We can see the pure form of our language in our fields and villages. Among our people living in the fields are epics, songs, proverbs, lapars, and songs, which are their food.

All this must be written with great care. There are works of our aristocratic poets, such as..., that have entered the sphere of writing among the people. There are old documents such as “Qutadghu Bilig,” “Hibatul Haqoyiq,” “Devoni Lughatit Turk,” and “Muqaddimatul Adab.” Let us examine all this by tearing the hair forty times; let us compare, compare, and draw single, fundamental results. In this way, the work we have done and the results we have achieved will be scientific. No one is allowed to say a word. It is clear that this is not easy. These are beyond the reach of the average person. Efforts on this path will fall on all of our newly emerging young writers. We all need to embark on these paths in order to give new Uzbek literature a scientific basis and a modern, cultural identity” [10; 141].

First of all, they raised the question of what the phonetics of the national language should be because the Uzbek language, like other Turkic languages, had developed over the centuries on the basis of the law of synharmonism.

M. Mirtojiev, K. Mahmudov, and H. Nematov state that synharmonism is the unification of vowels in a word from a certain point of view and is one of the peculiarities of Turkic languages, which is reflected in all Turkic languages [6; 294–299; 5; 67–68; 7; 45–59].

There were also differing views among the Jadids on the attitude towards synharmonism. Although Fitrat and Qayum Ramadan also considered the language of older works, they were also influenced by Turkic languages, which laid the groundwork for the development of the Uzbek language. Alisher Navoi's programming is based on the idea that the Uzbek language still has the law of synharmonism; the vowels differ in thickness and number of vowels, and the number of vowels is 8–9. Linguists such as Elbek and Ashurali Zahiri have a different approach to this law.

Ashurali Zahiri writes: “Singarmonism is the natural language of the Turkic-Tatar language. But with the passage of time, the change of geography (y), the intermingling of one people with another, and the influence of their languages, this feature disappears in the same dialects of the Turkic dialects (Azerbaijani, Ankara Turks). The remnants of this feature are: Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Nugays, Bashkirs, Tatars, Turkmens, and Uzbeks. We have one hundred percent synharmonism. We also try to find words in our own language instead of obeying our own rule (singarmunism) of foreign words mixed in our language. [4; 349].

Ashurali Zahiri says that it is necessary to obey the rules of synharmonism in Uzbek words and to find words in our language instead of words that do not obey this rule. However, in some places, there are cases of retreat. “We exclude the rule of synharmonism without changing the learned Persian words (or Persian suffixes, such as g'ijjak, g'altak, g'ildirak, pildiroq, and yo'lak). Apart from “yo'lak” (corridor), these words are common words between Uzbek and Persian, and “yo'lak” (corridor) and their suffixes “ak” and “oq” at the end are in Persian. If we subject them to synharmonism, there is a possibility that they will become a “g'ijjaq, g'altaq, pildirak, g'ildiroq, yo'loq” model that people don't understand. Therefore, we exclude them. Such exceptions do not constitute the majority in our language.” [4; 349].

Elbek also supports the ideas of Ashurali Zahiri, confirming the full existence of synharmonism in Uzbek as well as in other Turkic languages. In his article *On the Spelling of Language*, he states his views on synharmonism: “Synharmonism has frightened many people. This “word” that has caused some people to burst their bags of laughter and insults is really an ornament to enhance the beauty of our language and glue to preserve the integrity of our spelling. This tone of thickness and subtlety is the soul of our language—the indestructible fortress. We are not mistaken in saying that there are no Turkish people who do not know this. So, what we mean is the quality of the Uzbek language, that is, its decoration—the issue of synharmonism is the issue of our literary, living language. Those who oppose this will undoubtedly infringe on the civil rights of this language” [4; 207].

Jadids such as Botu and Miyon Buzruk have a different view on the issue of synharmonism. They argue that this law impedes the development of language, that language develops with the acquisition of foreign words, and that the framing of these words can have negative consequences. However, Elbek disagrees, saying that all words in the Uzbek language should be subject to this law, which will facilitate literacy: “We do not say that words should not be taken from abroad. We say, Take it, but put it in our mold. By this time, the growth of our language will go its own way, and I think the rising star will laugh at it. Otherwise, I'm afraid we'll be useless for anything but history and culture. This is our wish: to make our words alive by developing our own language and to bring those who do not exist from abroad into obedience to the iron law of our language” [4; 210].

As noted above, Ashurali Zahiri, Botu, and Miyon Buzruk argued that words should not be subject to the law of synharmonism, while Jadid enlighteners such as Elbek said that all words used in Uzbek must follow this rule: Let it be a hundred pirasants, since it is a sudden ornament, even an indestructible fortress. Old words and common nouns, whether Turkish or foreign, should not be subordinated to each other because each of them can maintain its integrity by being a separate word. A synharmonic change is possible only in a single word or in a half-word, that is, when the suffixes are added to the word before it. Foreign words should be subject to the rule of synharmonism without exception. In Russian, words that come with an “o” must be read with an absolute “o”. Examples: ko'rurt, kurort; pro'letar, proletar; o'krug, okrug. At the end of some foreign words, such as "metalist," "journalist," and "communist," the last “t” should be completely removed, in our opinion: read in the form of "metallis," "jurnalis," or "kommunis." [4; 304].

The second contentious issue in determining spelling rules was the issue of “lip tone.” In this type of synharmonism, if there are vowels in the first syllable of a word, the vowels in the remaining syllable adapt to it. This law was preserved in the Turkic languages and was partially in force in the Uzbek language. Linguists have noted that lab synharmonism has been preserved to some degree in recorded texts, despite the fact that it is not full. H. Nematov says that the harmony of the lips is not fully observed; the writers write different words under the influence of weight or dialects (such as qolum-qolim, ozum-ozim, konglum-kkonglim) [7; 52].

Linguists such as Fitrat and Qayum Ramazan, based on the language of classical works, say that lip synharmonism should be practiced in Uzbek as well as in other Turkic languages. In their textbooks, they argue that if the first syllable of a word has a lip vowel, the vowel in the next syllable must also have a lip vowel; that is, lip synharmonism must be followed until the second syllable.

Elbek, who has a positive attitude towards the thick-thin appearance of synharmonism, lists lip tone as one of the most controversial issues. According to him, the tone of the lips is fully preserved in the Kyrgyz and Ottoman Turkish dialects, but due to the fact that the Uzbek language has many dialects, the rule of the tone of the lips is not observed. Therefore, he considers it necessary to write the first syllable of the words beginning with the sounds “o’, u” and to read the next syllables with “i”. If this is done, firstly, one rule will be reduced from the rule of language, and secondly, it will get rid of a difficulty in writing and allow the rule of language to be completed without exception [Jamolkhanov, Umarov, 2017; 246]. To prove his point, he cites examples from Lutfi’s divan, Shaybaniynoma. In the examples, the words “o’ttiz, kuyib, ko’nglin” are not written as o’ttuz, kuyub, ko’nglun,” which shows that there is no lip tone in Uzbek [4; 246].

In view of the above, as Elbek puts it, the idea that the lip tone did not go beyond the first syllable is incorrect. This is because the lip-syllable in the first syllable adapts the syllables in the second and subsequent syllables, as can be seen from the works of classical writers. In the old Uzbek language, it was legal to adapt to the above-mentioned words, such as ko’nglin, kuyib, and o’ttiz.” As Elbek himself wrote, he took the above examples not from manuscript sources but from epics copied from folklore. In folk oral art, spontaneously, the influence of dialects is strong, through which thinking about the laws of language can lead to erroneous conclusions. Therefore, it was scientifically justified for Fitrat and Q. Ramazan to pay more attention to the language of classical works and to put forward in their language lessons the rule that “if the first syllable of an original word is o’tru (i.e., o’, u), the second syllable should be o’tru”, because linguistics In all the relevant works, linguists have tried to base their views and opinions on the example of the works of classical writers.

Elbek, who put forward the idea that it is necessary to introduce this into the rule of the Uzbek language spelling, tries to follow this rule himself, tries to write like butinlay, bo’lir, and nuqil, and in some cases he is forced to confess, knowing that there is a tone of the lab. We try to base our thoughts on the example of literary works:

This means that Elbek, who diligently studied the works of such classic writers as Navoi and Lutfi, could not leave the traditions of our classical literature, as well as the writers of that time. Just like our classical thinkers had to follow the requirements of lip tone,.

Ashurali Zahiri also admits that the lip tone exists in the Uzbek language, although not completely. He thinks that the lip tone is mainly used only in the stem of verbs, but it should also be written in verbs with the suffix "m,” as above: There is a second place in the next syllable: “uzum, tuxum, to’ruq, qutul, nuqul” (yzym, tyxym, toruq, qutul, nuqul) with words with the suffix

"m" (m) in words similar to the above words "m". That is, the second case, which occurs in the next syllable, is the same as in the above words (root words): when a word belonging to a noun phrase is formed with the suffix "m", such as "uzum, tuxum, to'ruq" (yzym, tyxym, toruq), it should be written before the lip." (4, 304). Apparently, the reason for the introduction of such a rule is that the suffix "m" should be distinguished from the suffix "m.". If this is not done, the first-person suffix of possessive pronouns becomes inseparable from verb nouns, which can lead to confusion, and our goal is to simplify, as much as possible, the rules of spelling and morphology.

While there were differing opinions on the tone of the language as well as controversial views, it was necessary to come to an agreement on the norms of a single literary language to eliminate the confusion in spelling. Therefore, at the spelling conference in 1929, at the suggestion of Q. Ramazan, with some exceptions, it was decided that the rule of lip tone should be preserved in the language until the second syllable.

Another problem was the issue of vowels. The alphabet, which was based on the Arabic script in use at the time, has three letters to represent vowels. These are: وىا

Uzbek kept the same grammatical norms as other languages that adapted the Arabic alphabet. Arabic short vowels are represented by acts called "zamma," "kasra," and "fatha," but these acts are usually not recorded. Put another way, whereas Arabic recognizes unique characters for long vowels, the letters for short vowels are not recognized. Reading and writing in Uzbekistan was challenging due to the pitfalls and issues. Consequently, the Jadids were tasked with counting the vowels in the language, figuring out which letter corresponded to each sound, and then fixing the alphabet with this information.

At that time, there were various groups working on the issue of determining the number of Uzbek vowels, the alphabet, and spelling. Sh. Bobomurodova divides them into five groups:

1. Historians who advocated writing on the basis of ancient spelling without following any method.
2. Proponents of writing Arabic words with their own spelling, as the method of Turkish words is heard on the basis of savtiya (sound method).
3. Proponents of writing all Turkish and Arabic words by the sound method.
4. Proponents of writing Arabic words with our own sounds, completely removing the letters that are foreign to our Turkish language.
5. Proponents of abandoning the Arabic alphabet altogether and adopting the Latin script instead [1; 40].

The controversy between these groups came to an end in 1921. At the 1st Provincial Language and Spelling Congress held this year, on the recommendation of the 4th group led by

Fitrat, a 6-vowel and 23 consonant-based alphabet will be adopted, with a separate letter for each vowel. They are:

1. For the hard "a" vowel -“ ,elpmaxe rof) <sup>ل</sup> **bash**” (bosh), “**qash**” (qosh))
2. For soft "a" vowel- " ,elpmaxe rof) <sup>ه</sup> **karam**", "**garchand**")
3. For the hard "i" vowel- " ,elpmaxe rof) <sup>ي</sup> **g'arib**", "**qari**").
4. For soft "i" vowel- " ,elpmaxe rof) <sup>ى</sup> **bilim**", "**gina**")
5. For the hard "he" vowel: <sup>و</sup> (for example, "**qayg'u**", "**g'urbat**")
6. For a soft "he" vowel- " ,elpmaxe rof) <sup>گ</sup> **kulgu**", "**gul**").

However, intellectuals such as Ashurali Zahiri and Munawwar Qori strongly oppose this decision. That is why in their textbooks they taught students that there are nine syllables with synharmonism, writing Arabic words with their own spelling, and on this basis. As a result, the number of nine-voice supporters based on the law of synharmonism has increased.

After 1925–1926, when determining the vocalism of the Uzbek literary language, the idea that it is necessary to proceed from the characteristics of rural dialects with singlarmonism began to prevail. On this basis, it is recommended to designate 10, or even 12 letters in the alphabet, even if the literary language recognizes the existence of thick and thin pairs of vowels. As a result, Fitrat changed his mind and discussed nine vowels in his book "Sarf," which is devoted to the problems of Uzbek linguistics. Fitrat argues that Uzbek as a language within Turkic languages reflects the law of synharmonism, which exists to some extent in all Turkic languages and is distorted in urban dialects under the influence of Persian-Tajik, so it is more correct to rely on rural dialects that retain more Turkic phonetic features. On this basis, in the Uzbek language, the sign of “yo’g’on” (thick) and “ingichka” (thin) vowels serves as a distinguishing sign, and according to this sign, vowels are divided into two lines. At the same time, it states that there is a vowel "e," which does not differ in the sign of thickness, and there are nine phonemes in the Uzbek language.

Ashurali Zahiri, who initially had five vocal supporters, later changed his mind. Linguist A. Nurmonov writes: “Ashurali Zahiri says that in the Uzbek literary language there are not six but nine vowels, and in the Latin alphabet it is necessary to get a letter for these nine vowels. Although the author does not prove this opinion on the basis of evidence, he feels that there are nine phonemes in Fergana dialects (such as Andijan, Margilan, and Kokand) that serve to differentiate meaning. Indeed, the palatal sign of the vowels still serves as a distinguishing sign in a number of dialects of Fergana today and has a phonological value. At the same time, Ashurali Zahiri criticizes the opinion of some authors that they have more than nine phonemes, which has not been sufficiently proven. (8, 350-351).

Togaev, who studied the legacy of the writer, also confirms the above statements: In this case, the scientist is based on the "existence of synharmonism in the pure Uzbek language." According to him, “singarmunism and the nine-pointed star are inextricably linked." A. Zahiri suggested that there are nine phonemes in Uzbek dialects, which serve to differentiate the

meaning. He opposes those who say that the vowels are 6, saying that “it is illogical to talk about the need to shorten it and not understand the basis of being nine.” He also criticizes those who consider the number of vowels to be more than 9. He writes that they could not prove their opinion. A. Zahiriyy firmly stands in the opinion that the number of vowels is 9 units: “so the current 9 Stretch is built on the same scientific basis; we will not increase it nor reduce it” [9; 86].

But Zahiri also points out that these ideas are not definitive and those vowels may increase or decrease: “We are now in the process of testing our language. If we examine our language, unheard words and unfamiliar sounds will probably come out. This time, our marks will be increased or decreased. For example, after several hundred years of experience, the Russians have removed some letters from the alphabet. This did not harm the language in terms of phonetics. Maybe it was easier. Subsequent experiments show that we also have blood.” [4; 304].

Certainly, such an idea did not appear suddenly. The first task was to overcome the old spelling mindset and bring the 3-vowel spelling to six vowels. They were well aware that the transition from three vowels to nine vowels at once was a very difficult task. Elbek writes: “Although it was not previously felt that the six vowels could not give a sufficient answer to the Uzbek language, the last syllables, especially before the transition to the new alphabet, were clearly felt. It was difficult to talk about it until he moved to the new alphabet, because the long quarrel before moving to the new alphabet was not over 9, but over 6. The transition from 6 to 9 was born at a time when the noise of the letter-writers had not yet been suppressed, and the preservation of these 6 itself was a great success. That is why, until 1926, there were few mouth-openers on the 9th floor, and it is true that the issue was not overemphasized [11; 42].

According to H. Jamolkhanov, there is no doubt that the supporters of vocalism with nine vowels also had an influence on the idea of creating a “united (common) Turkish alphabet,” which occurred in 1926–1927, because in the creation of such a common alphabet, it was necessary to take into account the legislation of sinharmonism, characteristic of many Turkic-tatar languages [3; 75].

In 1926, at the Congress of Turkologists in Azerbaijan, a decision was made to switch to a new alphabet based on the Latin alphabet, and it was recommended that this alphabet be adopted in all Turkish republics. After this congress, serious efforts will be made in Uzbekistan to switch to the new alphabet.

This year, Samarkand will host the first council of the new alphabet. All well-known linguists in Uzbekistan are invited to the meeting. The council will discuss a draft version of the new alphabet based on the Latin alphabet and set the number of vowels for the Uzbek literary language at 9. These are:

The upper vowels (vowels) (i.e., when these vowels are pronounced, the lips move upwards): a, ə -qal (qol), kəl.

Sit-up (opposite) vowels (i.e., when these vowels are pronounced, the lips move forward, the vowel vowels): o, ə, y, γ –qo'l, ko'l, qul, kul.

Vowels (i.e., when they are pronounced, the tongue moves downwards): e, Ё, i, kel, til, qiz.

But there are also contradictions in Elbek's views on vowels. He says that when the features of our language are well examined, even nine vowels are lacking. He says that in the words “qara” (look) and bola” (child), there is a difference between the vowel "a" in the first syllable and the vowel "a" in the second syllable, and that there is another sound between the short “Ъ” and the long "i," for which separate letters must be obtained. Therefore, the number of vowels can be set at 12 [4; 230].

As noted above, there was no consensus among the Jadids on the issue of the nine vowels. In this regard, Botu writes: “We have adopted a common alphabet; we got nine ounces (vowel), but the quarrel was not completely resolved. Just as there are those who claim that the nine syllables (vowels) are few for our language, there are also those who prove that there are many of them. The peculiarity of the Uzbek language is that its development requires the addition of a number of innovations in the new Uzbek alphabet. Since we say that the new alphabet, the Uzbek alphabet, first of all, serves to end the illiteracy of workers, and it should be so, we must go in this direction in practice. Our years of experience have shown that the current nine lengths will weigh heavily on the masses later. [2; 121-122].

Under the influence of such debates and contradictions over the number of vowels, Elbek was forced to retreat. On October 15, 1933, the newspaper “Red Uzbekistan” published an article entitled “To compact our alphabet.” In this article, he raises the issue of sharply reducing the number of vowels in our language. As suggested by Ashurali Zahiri, five voices support the views of their supporters. The reduction of vowels is not a denial of the role of vowels but rather a means of facilitating learning and eliminating writing inaccuracies on their own. From the above information, it follows that scientific views on the rules of the Uzbek language are now being formed, and many experts themselves lack theoretical knowledge. On this basis, there is a diversity of views.

From the above information, it follows that scientific views on the rules of the Uzbek language are now being formed, and many experts themselves lack theoretical knowledge. On this basis, there is a diversity of views. In this regard, H. Jamolkhanov writes: “In the initial work on defining the vocalism of the modern Uzbek literary language, this issue was not approached on the basis of phoneme theory; the real manifestations of phoneme and its speech were mixed, even in the views of six voiced vocalists—not on a theoretical basis, but only on the basis of intuitive intuition. This is probably why they often withdraw from their opinions. [4; 76].

In 1934, the Republican Congress on the Alphabet and Spelling was held in Tashkent, where it was decided that the number of vowels in the Uzbek literary language should be 6 instead of 9.

## CONCLUSION

By analyzing the purity of the national language and the work of such scholars as Fitrat, Ashurali Zahiri, and Elbek in the development of its rules, we can see that Uzbek linguistics began to develop at the beginning of the last century. At the same time, the literary works of Qayyum Ramazan, Shokirjon Rahimi, Ghazi Olim, Shorasul Zunun, Botu, Mannon Ramz, Otajon Hashim, Abdulla Alavi, Wadud Mahmud, Sanjar Siddiq, Abdulla Yuldash, and Yaqub Omon Jadids of 1900–1940 are kept in the State Archives of Uzbekistan. It is expedient to thoroughly study his work for the development of the monograph, to publish it in the monograph, to replenish this abstract part of the history of Uzbek linguistics, and to include it in the educational literature.

## References

1. Bobomurodova, Sh. (2002). O‘zbek tilshunosligi rivojida Elbekning roli (The role of Elbek in the development of Uzbek philology), candidate’s thesis, Tashkent. p. 120.
2. Botu. (2004). Tanlangan asarlar (Selected works). Tashkent. Sharq. p. 179.
3. Djamolkxonov H. (2009) O‘zbek tilining nazariy fonetikasi (Theoretical phonetics of Uzbek language), Tashkent, “FAN”. p. 215.
4. Djamolkxonov, H., Umarov, A. O‘zbek yozuvining XX asr tarixi (The history of Uzbek writing in XX), Tashkent, Uzbekistan National Library named after Alisher Navoi, p. 446.
5. Makhmudov, Q. (2006). O‘zbek tilining tarixiy fonetikasi (The historical phonetics of the Uzbek language). Tashkent. “Ijod”. p.100.
6. Mirtojiyev, M. (2013). O‘zbek tili fonetikasi (The phonetics of the Uzbek language). Tashkent. “FAN”. p. 418.
7. Ne‘matov, H. (1992). O‘zbek tilining tarixiy fonetikasi (The historical phonetics of the Uzbek language). Tashkent. “O‘qituvchi”. p.92.
8. Nurmonov, A. (2012). Tanlangan asarlar. II jild (Selected works. II volume), Tashkent. Akademyashr. p. 440.
9. Togaev, T. (2006). Ashurali Zohiriy va uning tilshunoslik merosi. (Ashurali Zohiri and his linguistic heritage), extended abstract of Candidate’s thesis. – Tashkent. p. 25.
10. Abdurauf, F. (2006) Tanlangan asarlar, IV jild (Selected works, IV volume),- Tashkent.“Manaviyat”. p. 317.
11. Elbekning tilga oid asarlari (Elbek’s books related to linguistics (editor: Sh. Bobomurodova). – Tashkent. 2001, p. 297.
12. Kurbonova, M. (1993) Fitratning tilshunoslik merosi (The linguistic heritage of Fitrat), candidate’s thesis. – Tashkent. p. 114.
13. Karimov, N., Doniyorov, A. Conflicting Views Regarding the Hadiths, IJITEE, ISSN: 2278-3075, Volume-8 Issue-12, October 2019, pp. 2090-2094.