

Werk

Titel: A late 19th-century Uzbek text in Hebrew script

Autor: Ido, Shinji

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2016

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0020 | LOG_0030

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

A late 19th-century Uzbek text in Hebrew script

Shinji Ido

Ido, Shinji 2016. A late 19th-century Uzbek text in Hebrew script. *Turkic Languages* 20, 216–233.

This paper presents and analyses half a page of Uzbek text that appears in a Tajik-language prose work published at the turn of the 20th century. The Uzbek text was written by a Bukharan bilingual who had Bukharan Tajik as his native language but also possessed competence in Uzbek. The text is a rare example of an Uzbek text written in fully vocalized Hebrew script, and thus provides a rare glimpse into the Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism in the capital area of the emirate of Bukhara in the late 19th century.

Shinji Ido, Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8601 Japan. E-mail: ido@nagoya-u.jp

1. Introduction

This paper presents and analyses half a page of Turkic text that appears in a Tajik-language literary prose work published at the turn of the 20th century. Both the Uzbek text and the prose work *Sefer Tokhen Alilot*,¹ of which the text is part, were written by Simon Ḥakham (1843–1910),² a Bukharan Jew who had the Bukharan variety of Tajik as his first language but also possessed competence in the local Turkic language that had currency in the Bukhara area, hence the half page of Turkic text. As will be evident in the remainder of this paper, the Turkic variety in which the text is written can most readily be identified as a variety of Uzbek, although it exhibits a number of features that distinguish it from the standardized Uzbek language of today.

The Uzbek variety used in the text arguably represents that of late 19th-century Bukharan bilinguals who had Bukharan Tajik as their native language and Uzbek as

1 Ḥakham's *Sefer Tokhen Alilot* is a Bukharan Tajik translation/adaptation (תרגום, i.e. *тарҷума ва интиқол*, in the original wording; Ḥakham 1902/1903: 3rd facing pages) of a dramatic rendition of the biblical story of Joseph and his brothers written in Hebrew by Abraham b. Aryeh Loeb Ḥayyim ha-Kohen of Mogilev. *Sefer Tokhen Alilot* is interleaved in another of Ḥakham's works called *Shāhin Torā*. The reader is referred to Paper (1978: 106, 1982: 339) for more bibliographical information on *Sefer Tokhen Alilot*.

2 Simon Ḥakham שמעון חכם has been variously referred to as Simeon Ḥākhām (Edwards 1922: 67), Šim'ūn Hāxām (Bečka 1989: 200–201), Shim'on Ḥakham (Kaganovitch 2010: 507), etc. in English-language research papers. See Fischel (2007) for Ḥakham's concise biography and bibliography.

their second. Thus the text and analysis presented in this paper provide a rare glimpse into the Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism in the capital area of the emirate of Bukhara in the late 19th century,³ when, incidentally, (Bukharan) Tajik was used in more domains than in subsequent centuries in Bukhara (see Khalid 2015: 129, 135–136, Beeman 2010: 145).

Besides its value as a source of data for the study of the Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism and historical sociolinguistics of Bukhara, the text has a different kind of value that derives from the script in which it is written. The text is presented in fully vocalized Hebrew script and thus provides different (more detailed) information about the vowel phonology of the late 19th-century Uzbek variety that was current in Bukhara than is obtainable from unvocalized Arabic-script sources in which most existing texts of pre-1920s Uzbek are written.⁴

The Hebrew script has been used in writing some Turkic languages such as different varieties of Karaim and Ottoman Turkish (e.g. Marazzi 1980). However, Uzbek has rarely, if ever, been written in Hebrew script, not least because the only users of the script in Transoxiana, namely Bukharan Jews, are traditionally Tajik speaking. Hence the text that is the subject of this paper is also important as a rare example of a Hebrew-script Uzbek text.

2. Terminology

Before we proceed to the analysis of the text, some notes on the terminology employed in this paper are in order.

The half-page Uzbek language text that is the subject of this paper will be referred to either simply as “the text” or as “the *qôyûn*^g text” after the first orthographical word of the text.

In the remainder of this paper, I use the term “Bukharan Tajik” (hereafter BT) in reference to the variety of New Persian spoken in the town of Bukhara and its vicin-

3 To be sure, there are a sizeable number of Uzbek texts written by Bukharan bilinguals during the 1920s and 1930s. In particular, Sadriddin Aynī, who in 1921 acknowledged that he had not dealt with the Uzbek language and Turkic (language) literature (اوزبەكچە و تورکچه ادبیاتی *o'zbekcha va turkcha adabiyoti*) until he turned 28 years of age, wrote a number of texts in Uzbek in the 1920s and 1930s, during which period Uzbek underwent standardization. Aynī's writings in Uzbek exhibit Ottoman Turkish and Tatar traits (see Shimada & Tosheva 2010: xvii–xviii, 286) that are not found in Ĥakham's Uzbek text.

4 Compare, for instance, 'ôzî bîz nî אָזִי בִּיז נִי ‘of ourselves’, which appears in the text in question, with اوزمزنڭ *avzmznŋ* ‘of ourselves’, which appears in one of Sadriddin Aynī's writings (Shimada & Tosheva 2010: 146). The former, in which vowel letters and diacritics are written, is more amenable to phonological transcription than the latter, in which the word-initial *av* could represent any rounded vowel, while the remaining part *zmznŋ* could (theoretically) contain a number ($0 \leq n \leq 4$) of vowels of indeterminable quality.

ity.⁵ BT is the variety that Ḥakham shared with his readers in the Bukhara area and in which he wrote his literary works including *Sefer Tokhen Alilot*,⁶ though Ḥakham predated the introduction of “Tajik” as the name of the Central Asian variety of New Persian (Khalid 2015: xvi, 293)⁷ and refers to the variety not as BT but as “the Persian dialect that is current in the towns of Bukhara”.⁸ Incidentally, BT is still in active use today in the Bukhara area, though it has undergone a number of changes in its lexicon, phonology, morphology, and syntax since Ḥakham’s time.

- 5 This appellation is not intended to imply homogeneity among the lects that are collectively called Bukharan Tajik in this paper. Minor differences between lects are reported to exist within Bukharan Tajik, which has been the primary or dominant language for members of different ethnic backgrounds (chiefly Tajik, Jewish, and Eroni residents of such towns as Bukhara, G’ijduvon, Kogon, and Vobkent). For example, according to Mardonova (1970: 99), the language variety of the Eroni residents in Zirotod, which is located 12 kilometres south-east of the town of Bukhara, has less in common with the Tajik of Tajiks in Bukhara than does the variety of Eroni residents in Bukhara.
- 6 Ḥakham wrote and published his books in Jerusalem, to which he migrated in 1890, and from which his books were sent to Bukhara and Samarkand. Ḥakham was a native of the Bukhara area, where he resided until he emigrated to Jerusalem at the age of 47. Ḥakham’s books published in Jerusalem “were sent to Bukhara and Samarkand where he had some representatives in every town”, according to Mordekhay Bachaev, interviewed in Loy (2008: 130).
- 7 According to Khalid (2015: xvi), “the term *Tajik* was never used before 1924 for the Persian language spoken in Central Asia, which was referred to as Persian (*fārsī*)”.
- 8 In the original wording (Ḥakham 1902/1903: 3rd facing pages), this is לפזי פארסיי ראייגהי שחר האיי בוכארא (αφzu φopcuu pouyau uaxpxou Бухоро in present-day Tajik orthography). What בוכארא ‘Bukhara’ in this passage refers to is not clear, as it could refer to the emirate of Bukhara, the town of Bukhara, or an area comprising the town, such as the capital district/province of Bukhara. However, we can fairly safely assume the referent to be an area comprising the town of Bukhara and its vicinity in which there are smaller towns such as G’ijduvon and Kogon, because Ḥakham aimed his works primarily at his brethren in towns in the Samarkand and Bukhara areas (see Footnotes 5–6 as well as Paper 1978: 105, Loy 2015: 312). We can further speculate that he mainly had ‘the Persian dialect’ of Bukhara rather than that of Samarkand in mind when he made reference to ‘the Persian dialect that is current in the towns of Bukhara’, because Bukhara was particularly densely populated by Jews (and hence by readers of Ḥakham’s works) in the 19th century. In a travelogue called *A journey from Orenburg to Bokhara in the year 1820*, von Meyendorf (1870: 34) noted that “of all the towns of Central Asia, Bokhara contains the greatest number of Jews, and may be looked upon as their principal residence in East” and that “the Jews own in Bokhara about 800 houses”. Likewise, a Japanese traveller observed in 1902 that Jews in Turkestan lived mainly in the town of Bukhara (Inoue 1903: 163). In contrast, according to Levin (2015: 11), the number of Jewish residents in the Samarkand province grew from 2,000 to 12,380 between 1873 and 1914, allowing us to assume that Samarkand was still in the process of developing into a major centre of Bukharan Jews when Ḥakham emigrated from Bukhara to Palestine in 1890.

“Bukharan bilinguals” refers in this paper to BT-Uzbek bilinguals who have BT as their native or dominant language. Today most BT speakers are bilingual in BT and Uzbek, but Ḥakham’s comment on the BT-Uzbek bilingualism in Bukhara (see §5) indicates that a sizeable number of native BT speakers in the late 19th century possessed little or no proficiency in Uzbek.

I use the term “Uzbek” to collectively refer to the written and spoken Uzbek of Uzbekistan and its late 19th-century predecessors. Accordingly, the language variety in which the *qôyûnʹg* text is written may be referred to as a pre-standardized Uzbek variety used by Bukharan bilinguals (of whom Ḥakham was one) in the late 19th century.⁹ On the other hand, I use the expression “the Bukhara dialect of Uzbek” to refer specifically to Bukharan bilinguals’ Uzbek, i.e., the Uzbek variety spoken by Bukharan bilinguals. Accordingly, in this paper, “the Bukhara dialect of Uzbek” (hereafter BbU) does not comprise the Uzbek dialect(s) spoken in the Bukhara area by monolingual Uzbek speakers.¹⁰ Since monolingual Uzbek speakers in the Bukhara area mostly reside in the countryside, BbU could be viewed as the more urban of the two types of Uzbek dialects spoken in the area.

3. The transcription

The present paper attempts to transcribe the *qôyûnʹg* text in such a way that the transcription represents how the text would have been read aloud by a late 19th-century Bukharan bilingual, or indeed by Ḥakham himself.

The *qôyûnʹg* text was initially reported in a conference paper by Paper (1982). The paper contains a Roman transcription of the text which, with such symbols as *ă*, *ĩ*, *ö*, *ü*, *č*, *š*, and *h*, is in line with conventional transcription methods for Chagatay (e.g. Eckmann 1969: 25–27). However, there is ample evidence that the Chagatay-style transcription does not reflect how the text would have been read aloud by Bukharan bilinguals in the late 19th century.

9 I use the term “Uzbek” in reference to the Turkic variety that had currency in the late 19th century in Transoxiana partly because, according to Khalid (2015: xv–xvi), “the term Uzbek was in common use for the contemporary literary Turkic language of Transoxiana before the revolution ...” (See Line 32 of the *qôyûnʹg* text where אִיזְבֵּק *ʾôzʹhak* is apparently used in reference to the Turkic variety in which the text is written.) This is not to say that there was no terminological confusion involving the term in the late 19th to early 20th centuries. For instance, in 1913, Behbudiy (1999: 150) used *oʻzbekiy* ‘Uzbek’ as an alternative to *turkiy* ‘Turkic’. See also Uzman (2005: 51) who describes the eclectic use of various terms for the “mother tongue” of the local populace of Transoxiana in the early 20th century.

10 Mirzaev (1969: 22) makes effectively the same distinction, stating the following about the dialects of the Bukhara area: “‘Бир тилли’ шевани проф. Е. Д. Поливанов айтиб ўтган ‘максимум эронлашган’ шевалар билан тенглаштириш тўғри бўлмайди” ‘It is not right to equate monolinguals’ dialect to the “maximally Iranized” dialects to which Prof. E. D. Polivanov has made reference’.

For example, Paper's Chagatay-style transcription utilizes 11 vowel symbols (*ä, i, ö, ü, a, i, u, o, e, ö, and â*), though it is unlikely that Bukharan bilinguals distinguished so many vowels in their speech in BbU or in BT. While some Uzbek dialects do utilize 10 vowel phonemes¹¹ (Reshetov & Shoabdurahmonov 1978: 45, Rajabov 1996: 99),¹² the so-called "Iranized" dialects of Uzbek, of which BbU is one, have consistently been described as having a relatively small inventory of six vowels (Polivanov 1928: 308, Reshetov & Shoabdurahmonov 1978: 45, Mirzaev 1969: 28, Rajabov 1996: 99). Perhaps more importantly, only six vowel letters/diacritics (◌◌◌, ◌◌◌, ◌◌, ◌◌, ◌◌, ◌◌) are used in the *qôyûn^g* text. It therefore seems more appropriate to employ a transcription system with six vowel symbols for the text if one is attempting, as this paper does, to present how the text was read aloud by Bukharan bilinguals in the late 19th century.

The transcription in this paper is carried out by mapping the reconstructed phonemes of late 19th-century BT onto the graphemes (letters and diacritics) appearing in the *qôyûn^g* text. Thus the transcription rests on the premise that BbU phonemes constitute a subset of BT phonemes. Admittedly, this premise is not beyond question, but seems fairly reasonable on the basis of the following facts.

First, in *Sefer Tokhen Alilot*, Hakhham uses the same set of letters and diacritics for both BT and BbU. In other words, he puts his orthography to dual use as both BT orthography and BbU orthography, which suggests general agreement of the phonology of BbU with that of BT. Second, the vowel system of the Tashkent-Bukhara dialect group of Uzbek described in the early 20th century (Polivanov 1928: 308) is broadly similar to the vowel system of late 19th-century BT reconstructed by Ido (2017: 15–17). This suggests that, in terms of the vowel system, BT and BbU were in general phonological correspondence in the late 19th century, as in fact they are today (Ido 2014: 90). Third, many Bukharan bilinguals use BT phonemes for Uzbek phonemes that BT lacks. Indeed, Mirzaev (1969: 34) identifies the use of the BT phoneme /f/ for Uzbek /f/ as a feature of BbU.¹³ Similarly, Bukharan bilinguals replace Uzbek /ŋ/ with /ng/ or /nk/¹⁴ (Mirzaev 1969: 36–37) which consists only of BT phonemes.

The mapping of late 19th-century BT phonemes to graphemes used in the *qôyûn^g* text results in a transcription of the text that differs radically from that presented in Paper (1982: 342–343). For instance, unlike Paper's transcription, in

11 If one counts long vowels as phonemes, this number can rise to 18 (see Shoabdurahmonov 1971: 397).

12 According to Uzman (2005: 84), there even existed a short-lived and little-used Uzbek alphabet with 10 vowel letters in 1926.

13 Recent descriptions of Uzbek phonology do not accord bilabial fricatives the status of phonemes, treating them as allophones of their labio-dental counterparts. See, for example the descriptions of <f> and in Jamolxonov (2009: 144).

14 These are phonetically [ŋg] and [ŋk], respectively.

which 11 vowel symbols are used, only six vowel symbols (*a, i, o, u, e, and ɔ*) appear in the transcription in the present paper.

The transcription involves reconstructed late 19th-century BT phonemes. Accordingly, an overview of the reconstruction is in order.

The reconstruction is based on an analysis of Ḥakham's BT orthography as well as on existing descriptions of BT phonemes. The fully vocalized Hebrew script in which the *qôyûn^g* text is written follows the orthographical rules that Ḥakham devised for BT. As a result, as is apparent from Table 1, the phoneme-grapheme correspondence is very transparent in Ḥakham's orthography, which renders it largely alphabetic. Accordingly, most of the graphemes that appear in the text can be converted more or less directly into late 19th-century BT phonemes.

The BT consonant phonemes of the late 19th century are assumed here to be basically identical with those of present-day BT, except for the voiceless fricative and affricate in the alveolar-palatal region (see below). On the other hand, the vowel system of BT is known to have undergone a chain shift where Early New Persian /ā/ and /ō/ moved to the positions of /o/ and /ə/, respectively. It is therefore important to determine which stage of the chain shift BT was at in the late 19th century. Following Ido (2017), this paper assumes that, in the late 19th century, BT was at an intermediate stage of the chain shift, i.e. that it had /ɔ/ and /o/ instead of present-day BT /o/ and /ə/ and accordingly had a vowel system consisting of /e/, /i/, /u/, /o/, /ɔ/, and /a/.¹⁵ The assumption that the fronting of /o/ was yet to take place in the late

15 Another piece of evidence supports the assumption that present-day BT /ə/ was /o/, and hence that BbU probably also lacked /ə/ in the 19th century. In the early 1930s, there was a semi-standardized written language called *zavoni jahudihoji Azijoji Mijona* 'Central Asian Jews' language' (hereafter ZJ), which was based on the Tajik dialect(s) of the Jews of the Zarafshan river valley (Polivanūf 1934: 29). The language was similar to BT because the river valley comprises Bukhara and Samarkand. Polivanūf (1934: 21) regarded the ZJ sounds represented by the letters ⟨a⟩, ⟨o⟩, and ⟨u⟩, the last of which corresponds to present-day BT /ə/ (see below), to be the same as those represented by ⟨ə⟩, ⟨a⟩, and ⟨o⟩ respectively in the Uzbek orthography of the early 1930s. On the other hand, according to von Gabain (1945: 20), ⟨ə⟩, ⟨a⟩, and ⟨o⟩ in the Uzbek orthography of the early 1930s represent vowels comparable to German (open) *ä*, (back) *a*, and (very close) *o*, respectively. In other words, ⟨a⟩, ⟨o⟩, and ⟨u⟩ in ZJ represented vowels comparable to German (open) *ä*, (back) *a*, and (very close) *o*. This is to say that (provided that the other vowel letters of ZJ, namely ⟨i⟩, ⟨e⟩, and ⟨u⟩ represent vowel phonemes qualitatively approximating [i], [e], and [u], respectively) it had a vowel system with a back vowel /o/ in the place of present-day BT /ə/. For example, *rūj* 'face' in ZJ, which corresponds with present-day BT /roj/ 'face', was probably /roj/; present-day Bukharan bilinguals pronounce the Uzbek word for 'much, many' as /kəp/, but their late 19th-century counterparts probably pronounced it as /kop/. Similarly, present-day BT /intə/ (standard Tajik *ин таар*) 'in this manner' (Kerimova 1959: 54) contrasts with late 19th-century BT ⟨תור אין תאר⟩ /in to/ 'in this manner' (Ḥakham 1902/1903: 98th facing pages). The syllable

19th century actually contributes to a better translation of the *qôyûn*²g text than is provided in Paper (1982: 343). For example «ٲٲٲ», which is transcribed as *kôf* in Paper (1982: 342), is transcribed in this paper as /kop/, which is readily identifiable as the Uzbek word for ‘much, many’ (*ko* ‘p’ /kop/ in present-day Uzbek orthography).

The reconstructed BT phonemes that are used in transcribing the *qôyûn*²g text are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Graphemes that appear in the *qôyûn*²g text and corresponding late 19th-century Bukharan Tajik phonemes

Consonants	Transliteration	Grapheme	Late 19 c. BT
	b	ب	/b/
	<u>b</u>	ب	/b/
	g	گ	/g/
	<u>g</u>	گ	/ʁ/
	č	چ	/tʃ/~tʃʰ/
	d	د	/d/
	<u>d</u>	د	/d/
	h	ه	/h/
	w	و	/v/
	<u>w</u>	و	/v/
	z	ز	/z/
	y	ي	/j/
	<u>y</u>	ي	/j/
	k	ک, ق	/k/
	<u>k</u>	ک	/x/
	<u>l</u>	ل	/l/
	l	ل	/l/
	m	م, م	/m/
	n	ن, ن	/n/

/to/ in present-day BT /into/ ‘in this manner’ also contrasts with *ZJ tûr* /to/ in *un tûr* /un to/ ‘such’ (Polivanûf 1934: 14).

	s	ס	/s/		
	c	ע	syllable boundary		
	p̄	ף, פ	/f/ and /p/		
	q	ק	/q/		
	r	ר	/r/		
	š	ש	/ɕ/~ʃ/		
	t̥	ת	/t/		
Vowels	Transliteration	word-final	word-medial	word-initial	Late 19 c. BT
	ê	יֵ	יֵ	אֵ	/ɛ/
	î	יִ	יִ	אִ	/i/
	û	וּ	וּ	אֻ	/u/
	ô	(i)	י	אִ	/o/
	āʾ	אָ	אָ	אָ	/ɔ/
	a	הֶ	ֶ	אֶ	/a/
	ə		ֶ		no/reduced vowel

⟨י⟩ does not appear word-finally in the text, hence the brackets in Table 1.

⟨אֶ⟩ is used in the text primarily to mark vowellessness, but is also used for reduced vowels. Since vowels prone to reduction in (Bukharan) Tajik are /i/, /u/, and /a/, the diacritic ⟨אֶ⟩ could be identified as a marker for reduced /i/, /u/, /a/, and vowellessness.

⟨ף⟩, ⟨פ⟩, ⟨ר⟩, and ⟨ק⟩ are the word-final forms of ⟨פ⟩, ⟨מ⟩, ⟨נ⟩, and ⟨ב⟩, respectively. ⟨פ⟩/⟨ף⟩ is assumed here to represent /f/ and /p/ although early descriptions of Uzbek (Kononov 1960: 28, Sjöberg 1962: 8, 11) accord the bilabial rather than the labiodental voiceless fricative the status of a native Uzbek phoneme.

⟨ש⟩ is shown to represent /ɕ/~ʃ/ in Table 1. This is because alveolo-palatal /ɕ/ is prevalent in present-day BT while post-alveolar /ʃ/ is widespread in the present-day Tajik used in the media in Tajikistan.¹⁶ It is conceivable that a shift from /ɕ/ to /ʃ/ took place in BT after or around the time of the 1929 secession of Tajikistan from Uzbekistan, while standard Tajik, which has BT as the primary basis of its

¹⁶ This observation is based on a cursory analysis of data obtained by this author from native Tajik speakers, most of whom were television or radio presenters, in Dushanbe in 2012. A paper in which this pool of data is analysed is currently in preparation. Although Bukharan Tajik served as a basis for standard Tajik, it has been autonomous enough from the standardized Tajik of Tajikistan to have developed into a variety whose mutual intelligibility with the latter is rather limited (see Beeman 2010: 145, Ido 2012: 13–14).

phonological norms (Ido 2015: 87), retained to date the /ʃ/ that it may have inherited from BT. However, it is similarly conceivable that a shift from /ɛ/ to /ʃ/ occurred in standard Tajik. We therefore cannot tell with any certainty which alveolar-palatal voiceless fricative BT had in the late 19th century, hence the symbol ‘~’ in /ɛ/~ʃ/. For the same reason, the late 19th-century BT phoneme represented by the letter ‘ג’ is assumed to be /tɕ/~ʃ/. However, in §4, I use /ɛ/ and /tɕ/ for /ɛ/~ʃ/ and /tɕ/~ʃ/, respectively, for the sake of readability.

In the text, <ו> appears only in Arabic loans, while <ו> appears in BbU words, representing /v/. One may hence be tempted to consider that <ו> represents a different phoneme than /v/, such as /w/. However, in *Sefer Tokhen Alilot*, <ו> appears not only in Arabic loans but also in BT words such as *ḏavīdah* <דוידה> (Ḥakham 1902/1903: 100th facing pages) ‘running’, in which it arguably represents /v/, while <ו> also appears in words of Arabic origin such as *tavalūd* <תוולוד> (Ḥakham 1902/1903: 99th facing pages) ‘birth’. Accordingly, I assume that in the late 19th century there was no BT or BbU phoneme represented by <ו> distinct from that represented by <ו>.

4. The *qôyûn^g* text

The *qôyûn^g* text consists of 11 lines and appears in the 99th pair of facing pages in Ḥakham (1902/1903), which is unpaginated. In Table 2, the text is divided by punctuation marks into 38 sections, each of which is assigned a unique number. In the “Transcription” column of the table, the two personal names <יהודה> ‘Judah’ and <יששכר> ‘Issachar’, both of which are written in accordance with (unpointed) Hebrew orthography, and reduced vowels (see §3) are left untranscribed.

Table 2. The *qôyûn^g* text with transliteration and transcription

Original		Transliteration
קויונג לר.	1.	<i>qôyûn^g lar.</i>
נימה אוג'ון בלה ני פונוני ני סינדורסיו לר.	2.	<i>nîmah 'ûčûn ḥalah nî kaw'nî nî sîn^gdûrasîz lar.</i>
ביןלר כי אוז פונוני ביז ני סינדורמאק פירד.	3.	<i>bîz^glar kî 'ôz kaw'nî bîz nî sîn^gdûr^gmā'q kêrak.</i>
תא קג'ן גה ג'ה.	4.	<i>tā' qačan gah čah.</i>
פירר איתיב.	5.	<i>pîkîr 'êtîb.</i>
אוזי ביז ני קילג'ן ימאן אישי ביז דן אויג'אמ'יביז.	6.	<i>'ôzî bîznî qîl^ggan yamā'n 'îšî bîz dan 'ûyā' t^gmay^gbîz.</i>
אוז כוזי ביז גה כורה יאיתיב ביז.	7.	<i>'ôz kôzî bîz gah kôrah yā'tîb bîz.</i>
בול מינן.	8.	<i>ḥûl mînan.</i>
אוג' מרתבה.	9.	<i>'ûč mar^gtabah.</i>
כנדאי תעאלא.	10.	<i>kûdā'yî t^g'ā' lā'.</i>

- | | |
|---|--|
| באשי ביז גה. | 11. bā'sī bīz gah. |
| שונדאקה דושקאר לר ני סאלדי. | 12. šūn°dā'qah dūš°qā'r lar nī sā'l°dī. |
| קרקגי ליד קילגני ביז אוגיון. | 13. qaraq°čī līk qīl°ganī bīz 'ūčūn. |
| ביז לר ני קרקגי דידי. | 14. bīz lar nī qaraq°čī dēdī. |
| כומוגי גה סאתגני ביז דן אוגיון. | 15. kômûč gah sā't°ganī bīz dan 'ūčūn. |
| קאף לרי ביז גה. | 16. qā'p larī bīz gah. |
| כומוגי יולקאטי. | 17. kômûč yôl°qā'tī. |
| כי שונג'ה קורקדוג. | 18. kī šūn°čah qôr°qadûg . |
| ינה. | 19. yanah. |
| אמה ביז גה אג'יק כבר בירגני ביז אוגיון. | 20. 'ā'tah bīz gah 'ačiq kaḅar bēr°ganī bīz 'ūčūn. |
| אינדי בול אג'יק כבר באשי ביז גה תושתי. | 21. 'indī būl 'ačiq kaḅar bā'sī bīz gah tūš°tī. |
| בול סוז לר המה סי. | 22. būl sôz lar hamah sī. |
| כונדאי דן תוגרי ביןלר גה קילה יאמגן. | 23. kûdā'yī dan tôg°rī bīz°lar gah kēlah yā't°gan. |
| דם אותורונג לר. | 24. dam 'ôturûn°g lar. |
| כוף בו בלה גה. | 25. kôp bū baḷah gah. |
| גף אורמנג. | 26. gaḅ 'ûr°man°g. |
| יהודה. | 27. ihwdh. |
| בול כישכינה אוכה ביז כו. | 28. būl kīš°kīnah 'ûkah bīz kû. |
| אול נקתי סאתמאק. | 29. 'ûl waq°tī sā't°mā'q. |
| ביןלר מינו יוק ידי. | 30. bīz°lar mīnan yôq yīdī. |
| בול נימה אוגיון בלא גה יולקאטי. | 31. būl nīmah 'ūčūn baḷā' gah yôl°qā'tī. |
| יששכר אונבך איתר דור. | 32. yšškr 'ôz°ḅak 'ay°tar dūr. |
| יכשי ני שראפתי. | 33. yaḱ°šī nī šarā'pātī. |
| ימאן ני כסאפתי. | 34. yamā'n nī kasā'pātī. |
| ביןלר ני כסאפתי ביז בונגה מיגדי. | 35. bīz°lar nī kasā'pātī bīz ḅun°gah tēg°dī. |
| ינה קאלי כונדאי בילר דור. | 36. yanah hā'lē kûdā'y bīlar dūr. |
| בלכי בול ני קויה בירסונ. | 37. baḷ°kē būl nī qôyah bēr°sūn. |
| וביז לר ני תותסון. | 38. w°bīz lar nī tūt°sūn. |
-

Transcription	Transcription in present-day Uzbek orthography
qojung lar	1. Qo'yinglar.
nima uteun bala ni kavni ni sindurasiz lar	2. Nima uchun bolani kavni sindirasizlar.
bizlar χ i oz kavni biz ni sindurm \acute{o} q kerak	3. Bizlar ki o'z kavnimizni sindirmoq kerak.
t \acute{o} qatean ga tea	4. To qachongacha
fikir etib	5. fikr etib
ozi bizni qilgan jamon iei biz dan ujt \acute{o} majbiz	6. o'zimizni qilgan yomon ishimizdan uyalmaymiz.
oz kozi biz gah kora jotib biz	7. O'z ko'zimizga ko'ra yotibmiz.
bul minan	8. Bu bilan
ute martaba	9. uch martaba
χ ud \acute{o} ji t \acute{o} lo	10. xudoyi taolo
b \acute{o} ei biz ga	11. boshimizga
eund \acute{o} qa dueq \acute{o} r lar ni soldi	12. shunaqa dushxornlarni soldi.
qaraqtei lik qilgani biz uteun	13. Qaroqchilik qilganimiz uchun
biz lar ni qaraqtei dedi	14. bizlarni qaroqchi dedi.
komute ga sotgani biz dan uteun	15. Kumushga sotganimizdan uchun
q \acute{o} p lari biz ga	16. qoplarimizga
komute jol \acute{o} q \acute{o} ti	17. kumush yo'liqdi
ki euntea qorqadug	18. ki shuncha qo'rqdik
jana	19. Yana
\acute{o} ta biz ga atei \acute{o} q xabar bergani biz uteun	20. otamizga achchiq xabar berganimiz uchun
indi bul atei \acute{o} q xabar b \acute{o} ei biz ga tueti	21. endi bu achchiq xabar boshimizga tushdi.
bul soz lar hama si	22. Bu so'zlar hammasi
χ ud \acute{o} ji dan t \acute{o} g \acute{r} i bizlar ga kela jotgan	23. xudoyidan tog'ri bizlarga kelayotgan.
dam oturung lar	24. Dam o'tiringlar.
kop bu bala ga	25. Ko'p bu bolaga
gap urmang	26. gap urmang.
<i>ihwdh</i>	27. Yahudo.
bul kiekina uka biz ku	28. Bu kichkina ukamiz-ku.
ul vaqti sotm \acute{o} q	29. U vaqt-i sotmoq

bizlar minan joq jidi	30. bizlar bilan yo‘q edi.
bul nima uteun balo ga jol‘qoti	31. Bu nima uchun baloga yo‘liqdi.
yšškr ozbak ajtar dur	32. Issaxor o‘zbek aytadur.
jaxei ni ʻarofati	33. Yaxshini sharofati
jamon ni kasofati	34. yomonni kasofati.
bizlar ni kasofati biz bunga tegdi	35. Bizlarni kasofatimiz bunga tegdi.
jana hōle xudoj bilar dur	36. Yana hali xudoy biladur.
balke bul ni qoja bersun	37. Balki buni qo‘ya bersin
vʻbiz lar ni tutsun	38. va bizlarni tutsin.

I present below a translation of the *qōyūnʻg* text, which is partially based on Paper (1982: 343).

¹ Stop (it). ² Why do you break the heart (lit. world) of the child? ³ It is we who have to break our hearts (lit. our world(s)). ⁴ For how long (lit. until when) ⁵ shall we not reflect (on our faults) and ⁶ be ashamed of our evil deeds? ⁷ We keep seeing (them) with our own eyes—⁸ counting this one, ⁹ three times ¹⁰ God the almighty ^{11,12} inflicted (lit. placed) such difficulties on us (lit. on our heads). ^{13,14} He called us brigands, because we committed brigandage. ¹⁵ Because we sold (Joseph) for silver, ^{16,17} silver met (lit. encountered) our sack ¹⁸ and we became so afraid. ¹⁹ In addition, ^{20,21} this bitter news now befell us because we gave bitter news to our father. ²² All these words ²³ come directly from God to us. ²⁴ Be silent! ^{25,26} Don’t scold (lit. speak much to) this child! ²⁷ Judah: ²⁸ After all, he (lit. this) is our little brother. ^{29,30} He was not with us at the time of (our) selling (Joseph). ³¹ Why did he (lit. this) encounter misfortune? ³² Issachar says in Uzbek: ³³ Good (personality) entails honour, ³⁴ evil (personality) entails evil fate. ³⁵ Our evil fate befell/affected this child. ³⁶ But then again, God knows (this). ³⁷ Let him (even) release him ³⁸ and let him retain us.

5. An analysis

The language of the *qōyūnʻg* text is very colloquial and appears to be free from any conventions of belles-lettres (Chagatay or otherwise). It is incoherent in parts and contains segments that do not conform to the grammar of Uzbek. The (overly) colloquial nature of the language may be ascribed, at least partly, to the fact that the text consists mostly of biblical Issachar’s lines of dialogue, and hence must be meant to represent spoken words. The incoherence and deviation from Uzbek grammar on the other hand could be ascribed to Ḥakham’s obviously limited proficiency in written Uzbek, and possibly in turn to the limited domains in which Bukharan bilinguals in general used Uzbek. Indeed, in his comment accompanying the *qōyūnʻg* text, Ḥakham writes (in BT) that “... male residents of the towns of Bukhara have also learnt

the Turkic language through business (originating) from the non-urban areas of the province”,¹⁷ which implies rather restricted domains in which male Bukharan bilinguals used Uzbek in the years preceding the publication of *Sefer Tokhen Alilot*, i.e., in the 19th century. This in turn shows that in the late 19th century, the onus was on BT speakers, not Uzbek speakers, to be bilingual, despite the emirate of Bukhara being Persianate.¹⁸ Another implication of his comment is that bilingualism was more limited among female BT speakers than among male BT speakers.

Unlike many Uzbek texts from the early 20th century, the *qôyûnʹg* text is free of Tatar or Ottoman Turkish elements such as the subordinating suffix *-(j)arāk/-(j)araq*, which appears in the Uzbek orthography of 1926 (*Til va istiloh* 1926: 44). This supports the observation that such elements became particularly common in (written) Uzbek after 1905 (see Shukurov 1973: 25, Tursunov et al. 1995: 201–202, Uzman 2005: 51–52).

As was stated above, the text contains a number of peculiarities, which are listed below with comments.

Line 2. The noun *kavîʹn* <کڤڤڤن>, which means ‘existence, world’ (Fozilov 1983: 88 and Shamsiyev & Ibrohimov 1972: 298) is not in wide use in today’s Uzbek.

The case marker *nî* <ڤڤڤ> is used here for the genitive case. The use of *-ni* for both accusative case marking and genitive case marking is a feature of Uzbek varieties spoken in the Bukhara area (see Mirzaev 1969: 46–48).¹⁹

Line 3. *kî* <کڤڤڤ> in this line is probably a misspelt *kî* <کڤڤڤ> (see line 18). The use of *ki* as an emphatic complementizer, which the *kî* here seems to represent (though the

17 The comment precedes the *qôyûnʹg* text and starts with the following sentence: כאַנגדע בידאנד . כי ניו מרדאני אהלי שהר האיי בוכאר"א הם כי דר דאדו מועאמילה אז צחראיי האיי וילאייט לפזי טורקי רא יאד גיריפתה הסתנגד (Hakham 1902/1903: 99th pair of facing pages) which in present-day Tajik orthography would be: *хонанда бидонад, ки низ мардони аҳли шаҳрҳои Бухоро ҳам ки дар доду муомила аз шаҳроҳои вилоят лафзи туркиро ёд гирифта ҳастанд* ‘the reader should know that (likewise) male residents of the towns of Bukhara have also learnt the Turkic language through business (originating) from the non-urban areas of the province’. Paper (1982: xxvii) renders the passage into English more freely as “the reader should know that the men of the cities of Bokhara also learned the Turki language (Uzbek) through their business dealings in the countryside”.

18 Kimura (2014: 33) describes the wide diplomatic currency that Uzbek had in Transoxiana in 1880.

19 This feature is shared by a number of contemporary Uzbek dialects. Shoabdurahmonov (1971: 400) notes that the feature is common among “Tashkent type dialects” while Mirzaev (1969: 46–47) lists the use of *-ni* as a genitive case marker as one of the characteristics of the city dialects of Uzbek (of which BbU is one). It is a characteristic that is also observed in a number of texts dating from the late 19th to early 20th centuries, such as the writings of Sadriddin Aynî (see, e.g., Shimada & Tosheva 2010: xvii, xliii), Behbudiy (see Behbudiy 1999), and even a letter addressed to “the Bukharan amir’s *qoşbegi*” (Kimura 2014: 30).

line lacks the necessary verb), is relatively rare in today's Uzbek. The *kī* in this line can alternatively be identified as a relative pronoun, in which case lines 3–6 would roughly mean 'for how long shall we, who should suffer loss of status, close our eyes on our faults and be unashamed of our evil deeds?'

The first person plural suffix *bīz* <בִּיז> in this line is peculiar in having a plosive consonant in its initial position. See also lines 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 28, and 35 in which the suffix appears as *bīz* <בִּיז>. ²⁰

Line 4. The Tajik preposition *tā* <תָּא> 'until' is used here in combination with Uzbek *gah čah* <גַּה צַח> 'until'. ²¹ While this combination is uncommon today, it is within the norms of present-day written Uzbek.

Line 6. As in line 2, *nī* <נִי> is used here for genitive case marking.

The verb *'ūyā'p-* <אוּיָאֵפ> (in *'ūyā'p may' bīz* <אוּיָאֵפ מַי בִּיז>) appears to be the same verb that Clauson (1972: 269) identifies as the modern Uzbek dialectal counterpart of pre-13th-century Turkish *uya:d-* 'to be shamed by', namely *uyat-*. The verb with the sense of 'to be ashamed' in contemporary Uzbek is *uyal-*.

The first person plural agreement suffix *bīz* <בִּיז> in this line is remarkable in having a plosive consonant in its initial position. This may be related to the /m/-/b/ alternation of BbU described in Mirzaev (1969: 35). ²²

Line 7. *gah* <גַּה> in this line may be intended to mean 'with', the present-day standard Uzbek equivalent of which is *bilan*.

As in line 6, the first person plural agreement suffix appears here in the form of *bīz* <בִּיז>.

Line 8. The use of the pronoun *bul* 'this', which *būl* <בּוּל> in this line probably represents, is recorded for the dialect of Qarnob (located some 60 km east of Bukhara) by Rajabov (1996: 182–183). See also lines 21, 22, 28, 31, and 37 in which the suffix appears as *būl* <בּוּל>.

mīnan <מִינַן> in this line is apparently a colloquial form of the postposition that is *bilan* 'with' in present-day standard Uzbek. See von Gabain (1945: 57) in which *minan* is recorded as the colloquial Samarkandi variant of the postposition *bilan* (*bilan* in the orthography of today's Uzbek).

20 I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing out that Shoabdurahmonov (1984: 24), to which I did not have access, records the use of the first person plural possessive suffix in the form of *-biz* in the dialect of Qarnob. Rather surprisingly, Rajabov (1996: 164) identifies the use of the first person plural possessive suffix in the form of *-biz* as a characteristic of the Bukhara dialect of Uzbek (though this may be a typo, judging from the examples accompanying the description).

21 In today's BT, 'until' is the circumposition *mo...(ū)a* (see e.g. Kerimova 1959: 18).

22 See also Mirzaev (1969: 60) who notes that in certain villages in the Vobkent, G'ijduvon, and Sverdlov districts, the first person plural agreement suffix for the non-past form of the verb in the form of *-eyz* (presumably representing something like [βuz] or [vuz]) is found in the speech of populations of Oghuz ancestry.

Line 12. *šûn^odā`qah* שׁוֹנְדָאָה is an alternative form of Uzbek *shunaqa* ‘such’. It also appears in one of Sadriddin Aynī’s writings (circa 1920) in the form of <شونداققا>/<شونداققه>, allowing the assumption that it was the normal form of the word in BbU in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.²³ Incidentally, in an Uzbek dictionary published in 1936, the word in question appears in the form of *šunaqa* (Badalūv & Kalontarūv 1936: 80), suggesting that the form /ɛundɔqa/~ɛundɔq:a/ had come to be perceived as non-standard by the mid-1930s.

Line 15. Judging from the context in which it appears, *kômûč* כּוֹמוּץ must mean ‘silver (goblet)’,²⁴ However, its form does not closely approximate that of Uzbek *kumush* ‘silver’. The reason for this is unclear, though it may be related in some way to (Bukharan) Tajik *кѳмоч* ‘a kind of thick bread baked buried in burning coals’ (Mahmudov & Berdiev 1989: 133), because *кѳмоч* was probably pronounced /komute/~komuʃ/ in the BT of the late 19th century (see §2).

dan ’ûčûn דָן אוֹגֵן, which is the ablative case marker *dan* combined with ’ûčûn ‘for’, seems to be calqued on Tajik *аз барои* ‘for’, which consists of *аз* ‘from’ and *барои* ‘for’.

Line 24. *dam* ’ôûr- דָם אוֹתוֹר- seems to be calqued on Tajik *дам шииштан/нишастан* ‘to keep/be silent’, which is a compound verb consisting of *дам* ‘breath’ and *шииштан/нишастан* ‘to sit’.

Line 25. The pronoun *bû* בּוּ in this line appears to be an allomorph of *bûl* בּוּל ‘this’. See also lines 8, 21, 22, 28, 31, and 37 in which the pronoun appears.

Line 26. The compound verb *gaṗ* ’ûr^o- גָּף אוֹר- , where *gaṗ* and ’ûr^o- mean ‘speech’ and ‘strike’, respectively, is probably calqued on Tajik *зан задан* ‘to speak’, which is a compound of *зан* ‘speech’ and *задан* ‘to strike’.²⁵

Line 28. The adjective *kîs^okînah* כִּישׁכִּינָה, unlike its present-day standard Uzbek counterpart *kichkina* ‘small’, has a fricative as the coda of its initial syllable. This may reflect the fricativization of *ch* before voiceless consonants that Mirzaev (1969: 36) observes in the dialect of Bukhara.²⁶

Line 29. The use of the pronoun *ul* ‘he, she, it; that’, which ’ûl אוּל in this line probably represents, is recorded for the dialect of Qarnob (located some 60 km east of Bukhara) by Rajabov (1996: 184).

23 See Shimada & Tosheva (2010: xviii, xliii, 11, 114, 119).

24 The silver (goblet) is referred to in BT as *kā`saḥî nûq^orah* קָאסָהִי נִוְקָרָה ‘silver goblet’ or *nûq^orah* נִוְקָרָה ‘silver’ elsewhere in *Sefer Tokhen Alilot*.

25 Bukharan bilinguals use a number of Uzbek compound verbs that are in structural correspondence with BT compound verbs. Some of such compound verbs are listed in Tursunova (1979: 32), but *зан задан* is not among them.

26 The original Uzbek wording of Mirzaev (1969: 36) is as follows: [ж]арангсиз ундош олдидан келган ч сиргалувчи товушга ўтади, спирантлашади.

waqʿti sâʿp māʿq «וְקֵתִי סֵאֲתֶמְאֶק» is in the Tajik izafet construction, the use of which is largely limited to the register of belles-lettres in today's Uzbek.²⁷

Line 30. In Uzbek, *emas edi* 'was not' would have probably been preferred to *yoʻq edi* 'was non-existent' in this context. The use of *yôq yîdî* «יֵיֶק יִיֶדִי» here may hence be ascribed to an influence of BT, in which the corresponding expression would be *חֵאֲבֵד* 's/he was not'.

Lines 32 and 36. *ʿayʿtar dūr* «אַיִתֶר דּוּר» and *bîlar dūr* «בִּילֶר דּוּר» probably represent the Uzbek verbs *ayt-* 'say' and *bil-* 'know' in their present tense forms, namely *aytadur* and *biladur*, respectively. The present tense form in *-adur/-ydur* is no longer current in today's Uzbek, in which it has been replaced by the non-past tense form in *-a/-y* (Shukurov 1976: 102).

Acknowledgements

This research was partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research C #25370490 from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan. I would like to thank Mehmet Uzman for generously providing copies of Uzbek periodicals published in the early 20th century.

References

- Badalūv, R. & Kalontarūv, Ja. I. 1936. *Luqʿati ūzæki-jahudigi*. Tashkent: Naşrijoti Davlatiji UzSSR.
- Bečka, J. 1989. A continuator of Judeo-Persian literature. In: Duchesne-Guillemin, J. & Sundermann, W. & Vahman, F. (eds.) *A green leaf: Papers in honour of professor Jes. P. Asmussen*. Leuven: Peeters. 199–204.
- Beeman, W. O. 2010. Sociolinguistics in the Iranian world. In: Ball, M. J. (ed.) *The Routledge handbook of sociolinguistics around the world*. London: Routledge. 139–148.
- Behbudiy, M. 1999. *Tanlangan asarlar*. Tashkent: Maʼnaviyat.
- Clauson, G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Eckmann, J. 1969. *Chagatay manual*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Edwards, E. 1922. *A catalogue of the Persian printed books in the British Museum*. London: British Museum.
- Fischel, W. J. 2007. Ḥakham, Simon. In: Skolnik, F. (ed.) *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 4 (2007). Detroit: Thomson Gale. 262–263.
- Fozilov, E. I. (ed.) 1983. *Alisher Navoiy asarlari tilining izohli lugʻati*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Gabain, A. von 1945. *Özbekische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Ḥakham, S. 1902–1903. *Shāhin Torā* 2. Jerusalem: n.p.
- Ido, S. 2012. *Tajikugo bunnō binran*. [A handbook of Tajik grammar] Sendai: Tohoku University Press.
- Ido, S. 2014. Bukharan Tajik. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 44:1, 87–102.

27 However, the Tajik izafet construction is found in other registers in some fossilized expressions such as *nuqtai nazar* 'viewpoint'.

- Ido, S. 2017. The vowel system of Jewish Bukharan Tajik: With special reference to the Tajik vowel chain shift. *Journal of Jewish languages* 5, 1–23.
- Inoue, M. 1903. *Chūō ajia ryokōki*. [A journey through Central Asia] Tokyo: Min'yūsha.
- Jamolxonov, H. 2009. *O'zbek tilining nazariy fonetikasi*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Kaganovitch, A. 2010. Bukhara. In: Stillman, N. A. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic world* 1. Leiden: Brill. 502–511.
- Kerimova, A. A. 1959. *Govor tadžikov Buxary*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.
- Khalid, A. 2015. *Making Uzbekistan: Nation, empire, and revolution in the early USSR*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kimura, Satoru. 2014. Uzubekisutan denzon no Nishi Tokujirō shokan o megutte. [On the letter of Nishi Tokujirō, preserved in Uzbekistan] *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 88, 5–41.
- Kononov, A. N. 1960. *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Levin, Z. 2015. *Collectivization and social engineering: Soviet administration and the Jews of Uzbekistan, 1917–1939*. Leiden: Brill.
- Loy, T. 2008. About a friend: reflections on the memoir of Mordekhay Bachayev. In: Baldauf, I. & Gammer, M. & Loy, Th. (eds.) *Bukharan Jews in the 20th century: History, experience and narration*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag. 127–144.
- Loy, T. 2015. Rise and fall: Bukharan Jewish literature of the 1920s and 1930s. In: De Chiara, M. & Grassi, E. (eds.) *Iranian languages and literatures of Central Asia: From the eighteenth century to the present*. Paris: Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes. 307–336.
- Mahmudov, M. & Berdiev, B. (eds.) 1989. *Luğati muxtasari lahjahoi Buxoro*. Dušanbe: Doniś.
- Mardonova, A. 1970. Peşoyand va pasoyandho dar şevai eroniyoni Kogon. In: Ğafforov, R. & Jūraev, Ğ. (eds.) *Mas'alahoī ševašinosisi tojik* 1. Dushanbe: Doniś. 99–115.
- Marrazzi, U. 1980. *Tevārīh-i āli-i 'Osmān: cronaca anonima Ottomana in trascrizione Ebraica*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Meyendorf, G. von 1970. *A journey from Orenburg to Bokhara in the year 1820 (translated by Captain E. F. Chapman)*. Calcutta: Foreign Department Press.
- Mirzaev, M. M. 1969. *O'zbek tilining Buxoro gruppasi shevalari*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Paper, H. H. 1978. Judeo-Persian. In: Paper, H. H. (ed.) *Jewish languages: Theme and variations*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Association for Jewish Studies. 103–114.
- Paper, H. H. 1982. Judeo-Tajik: Textual sources for pre-1917 Tajik vowel phonology. In: Aronson, H. I. & Darden, B. J. (eds.) *Papers from the second conference on the non-Slavic languages of the USSR (Folia Slavica 5)*. Columbus: Slavica. 336–343.
- Polivanov, E. D. 1928. Obrazcy ne-singarnostičeskix (iranizovannyx) govorov uzbekskogo jazyka. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR* 5:14, 306–312.
- Polivanov, J. D. 1934. *Mas'alahoī zavoni adasiji jahudihoī mahali*. Tashkent: Naşrijoti Davlatiji UzSSR.
- Rajabov, Nazar. 1996. *O'zbek shevashunosligi*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
- Rešetov, V. V. & Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. 1978. *O'zbek dialektologiyasi*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
- Shamsiyev, P. & Sobirjon, I. (eds.) 1972. *Navoiy asarlari lug'ati*. Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti.

- Shimada, S. & Tosheva, S. (eds.) 2010. *Şadr al-Dīn ‘Aynī, Bukhārā inqilābīning ta’rīkhī*. Tokyo: Department of Islamic Area Studies, Center for Evolving Humanities, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, The University of Tokyo.
- Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. 1971. O‘zbek shevalari va ularni o‘rganish haqida umumiy ma’lumot. In: Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. (ed.) *O‘zbek xalq shevalari lug‘ati*. Tashkent: Fan. 386–407.
- Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. 1984. *O‘zbek xalq shevalari morfologiyasi*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Shukurov, Sh. 1973. Morfologiya. In: Abdurahmonov, G‘. & Shukurov, Sh. *O‘zbek tilining tarixiy grammatikasi: morfologiya va sintaksis*. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi. 27–240.
- Shukurov, Sh. 1976. *O‘zbek tilida fe‘l zamonlari taraqqiyoti*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Sjoberg, A. F. 1962. *Uzbek structural grammar*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Til va istiloh. 1926. *Maorif va o‘qutg‘uchi* 44, 41–45.
- Tursunov, U. & O‘rinboev, B. & Aliev, A. 1995. *O‘zbek adabiy tili tarixi*. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi.
- Tursunova, Husniya. 1979. *Tadqiqi muqoisavii frazeologizmhoi paralleli zabonhoi tojikī va ūzbekī*. Dushanbe: Doniś.
- Uzman, M. 2005. Türkistan’da dil tartışmaları: Özbekçe’nin icat edilişi (1917–1940). Dissertation, Gazi University. Ankara.
- Zand, M. 2007. Bukhara: the origin and sources of the Jewish community. In: Skolnik, F. (ed.) 2007. *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 4. Detroit: Thomson Gale. 258–259.