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In the middle of the eighties Kemal Karpat wrote a fascinating article about the aftermath of the Turkish language reform entitled ‘A Language in Search of a Nation: Turkish in the Nation-State’. It is about the cultural isolation of Ottoman Turkish, the language of the Ottoman Empire and the vehicle of a vast literary culture, and about its gradual disuse as a means of literary expression or everyday communication. The article reminds us that the splendid rise of Modern Turkish, a plain but lexically and grammatically very expressive literary language, has led to rapid detachment of the Modern Turkish generation from the classical literary heritage of the Ottoman Empire. While the new Turkish idiom, the language of the Turkish Republic, has been very effective in fighting illiteracy and creating new literary and cultural values, it provides no direct access for its speakers to works written in Ottoman Turkish: A Turkish student of today would probably have to use a dictionary to fully understand the poems of Tevfik Fikret (1867-1915) or even of the more recent Ahmed Haşim (1885-1933). It is Ottoman Turkish that in Karpat’s symbolic title is in search of a nation.

If this is the status of Ottoman Turkish, it is justified to ask: What happened to the Eastern counterpart of this literary idiom known in historical linguistics as Chagatay, the language of the classical literature of the Central

Asian Turks from Ahmad Yasavi (1083-1166)\textsuperscript{2} to Amir Khan’s flourishing literary circle in Kokand,\textsuperscript{3} or, for that matter, to the fall of the Emirate of Bukhara in the early twenties?\textsuperscript{4} With the creation of new standard languages for the Turkish republics and autonomous regions of the Soviet Union or, in consequence of the pervasive cultural reform and aggressive minority policy of the Soviet leaders designed to erase the Islamic heritage and national identity of their Central Asian minorities, has this language and the cultural heritage it was a vehicle of also been abandoned? Is Chagatay, like Ottoman Turkish, also in search of a nation? To answer these questions, we must take a new look at the status of Chagatay and its relationship to Modern Uzbek.

We may still remember that close to the end of the fifties Uzbek scholars began to use the term “Old Uzbek” for what was commonly accepted as Chagatay, Khorazmian Turkic, and Mamluk-Kipchak language and literature. In the sixties they went even further and expanded the realm of Old Uzbek to include works from the Karakhanid period, i.e., Balasaghuni’s Qutadgu Bilig\textsuperscript{5} (1069), Kâshgâri’s Divan Lugat at-Turk\textsuperscript{6} (1073), Yükünaki’s Atabatu’l-haqa’iq\textsuperscript{7} (cca, 12th century), the interlinear Qur’an translation of Qarshi, and

\textsuperscript{2} The Karakhanid literature, as represented by the Qutadgu Bilig, the Divan Lugat at-turk, and, to some extent, by the Atabatu’l-haqa’iq, was a learned, court literature in a high-style literary expression called Karakhanid or Khaqani. Ahmad Yasavi, composing his poems in the Karakhanid period about a few decades after the completion of the Qutadgu Bilig, used a simple language and a popular poetic expression representing the language layer from which Chagatay of the early fifteenth century emerged.

\textsuperscript{3} This was the last and most brilliant phase of Chagatay literature since the late Timurid and early Shaybanid period excelling by a typical blend of traditional expression and modern topics with an unmistakable shift toward personal tone (Nâdira, Mahtûna) and critical-political attitude (Muqüми, Frurq) foreshadowing such twentieth-century talents as Hamid Olimjon, Cholpan, Hamza Hakimzode, or Erkin Vohidov.

\textsuperscript{4} For the latest period of the Chagatay Literature see B. Hayit, “Die jüngste özbekische Literatur”, CAJ VII (1962), pp. 119-152.


\textsuperscript{6} The Turkish material of the Lexicon has been published by B. Atalay, Divân-i Lugat-ı türk Dizini-Indeks. Ankara. 1943.
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the Eastern-Turkic versions of Zamakhshari’s *Muqaddimatu’l-Adab*. What the Uzbeks claimed for themselves in those days was nothing less than the entire Central Asian Turkic, also called as Eastern Middle-Turkic, literary-cultural heritage.

Western scholarship, insofar as it took notice of the new terminology, dismissed the use of “Old Uzbek” as unhistorical, brought into circulation either by Soviet eccentricity or by Uzbek local patriotism and kept on using the traditional names for the historical periods in question. Soviet scholars, and a few Turcologists of the satellite countries went along with the Uzbeks’ change of terminology more out of political solidarity than out of conviction. Western politicians and the media would sometimes give direct or indirect support to the Uzbek claim. President Reagan, for example, in his speech in Soviet television used a quotation from Mir Alishir Navai, referring to him as an Uzbek humanist. Irrespective of the validity of the terminology, many of us agreed in those days that with this claim the Uzbeks would be allowed to use their resources for the exploration of the classical literature of the Turks of Central Asia.

This presumption proved to be correct: Starting in the late fifties, the Uzbeks put out more and more text editions and translations of Classical Central Asian Turkish works. They prepared glossaries for individual pieces, lexicons for a group of works from the same period, or for the complete works of a single author, and produced articles and books on what they called Old


9 A major figure of Central Asian Renaissance (b. 1441, d. 1501). Not an Uzbek by origin.
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Uzbek Grammar.¹³ Not only would they print critical editions of yet unpublished manuscripts, but they would also redo, in their own own fashion, critical editions published in the west, including, sometimes, the works of Russian scholars. At the same time the cult of great personalities of the Classical past became stronger and stronger, not only from the so-called democratic period,¹⁴ but from as far back as the times of Abu Nasr al Farabi (878-950), Abu 'Alî Ibn Sinâ (980-1037), Abu Rayhûn Bîrûnî (973-1048), and Mîr Alishîr Navâî (1441-1501). A broad-scale ideological-cultural awareness of the Turkic heritage was created which in the eighties made a few Soviet ideologists shake their heads.¹⁵

Under the surface of this fascination with the Islamic-Turkic past and of what since the mid-seventies has become called the revival of Uzbek national


¹⁴ Term used in Soviet scholarship to denote, broadly speaking, the Uzbek literature of the second half of the 19th century and the beginning two decades of the 20th. Poets such as Zokirjon Kholmuhammad Furqat (1858-1909), Muhammad Aminkhoja Mirza Khojaoghli Muqimi (1850-1903), and Ubaidullo Solihoghli Zavki (1953-1920) were the major representatives of this period.

¹⁵ In 1981 a group of Soviet literary critics, in a joint article on the state and future tasks of the study of folklore and literature of the Turkic peoples in the Soviet Union, charted a new course for the treatment of classical tradition in the national literatures. They stated that “the major classical literary works of the Turks do not belong to one people alone but are a common property shared by the people that created (these) outstanding works and by the nations that lived in the same historical period.” On this basis the authors insists that “the practice of studying and assessing national literatures in an isolated fashion apart from federal literary trends should be discontinued.” Laziz Qayumov, Izzet Sultanov, Zakiy Ahmetov, Matyoqub Qushjonov, Abdulqodir Sodiqov, and Tura Mirzoev, “Совет иттифокида туркиян халклар адабиёти хамда фольклорини ўрганишинг ахволи ва вазифалари.” Sharq Yulduzi, 1981:2, pp. 113-116.
there was a trend to enrich, revitalize, and de-sovieticize the Uzbek language and make it competitive in literary expression with Russian, the prestige language in the Soviet Empire. This trend very subtle and almost unnoticed at first, spontaneous at the beginning but organized and directed later on, can be called, in retrospect and with some reservation, the Uzbek language reform, the result of which can be seen in recent linguistic works and in literary publications. In order to understand the status of Chagatay in relationship to Ottoman, on the one hand, and to Modern Uzbek, on the other I propose to compare the recent developments of Modern Uzbek with the Turkish language reform with an eye more on the differences than the similarities between the two.

The two language reforms differ from one another in three fundamental aspects: theoretical basis, cultural-political motivation, and historical-political setting.

The Turkish language reform, as far as its theoretical basis is concerned, grew out of the late period of the historical-comparative school of linguistics, represented by Herman Paul, and Antonie Meillet. Members of the great generation of European Turcologists, such as Jean Deny, Martti Rässänen, Wilhelm Bang, Julius Németh, Louis Ligeti, to mention but a few, were schooled in historical and comparative linguistics the tenets of which constituted the theoretical framework for their scholarship. Some of the main figures in Turkic linguistics of the Turkish Republic obtained their trainings in linguistics in the West. Reşit Rahmeti Arat, for example, was a student of Bang. He took interest in old and early Middle Turkic documents and, with his text editions, established the standards of Turkic textology. Hasan Eren,


17 The peculiar nature of this “language reform” comes from the complexity of problems Modern Uzbek was faced with. Not only was it to respond to modern needs in literary expression and to preserve the classical literary heritage but it also had to recover from earlier waves of Soviet Russification. (See E. Allworth, Uzbek Literary Politics. The Hague: Mouton, 1964) and cope with the oddities of normalizations of grammar, lexicon, and orthography in the forties and early fifties.

18 H. Paul’s Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte (3rd edition, Halle 1898) and A. Meillet’s Introduction à l’étude comparative des langues indo-européennes (Paris: Librarie Hachette et Cie, 1908) were among the basic manuals for this generation.

19 His critical editions of Yusuf Haş Hâjib Balasaghunî’s Qutadgu Bilig and Adîb Ahmad
honorary student of the Eötvös College in Budapest, worked with Németh and Ligeti. He specialized in Turkish historical lexicography and became the leading authority in the Turkish language reform.

The Uzbek language reform is a somewhat younger phenomenon. Its theoretical foundation rests on traditional Russian linguistics which had much in common with the European historical-comparative school. One relevant difference was that traditional Russian linguistics laid much greater emphasis on descriptive lexicography (phraseology, semantics, lexical structure). The postwar generation of Uzbek scholars grew up partly on this tradition and partly on new trends of applied linguistics which were especially strong in the Soviet Union. One of the notable historical linguists of the Uzbeks, Ergash Fazylov, obtained part of his training in Hungary in the early sixties. There he learned about the principles of Turkish textology, very much influenced by Arat, and became familiar with a new dimension of historical linguistics, the content-oriented analysis of the language of written records, which strongly affected his text editions and lexicographic works.

The cultural-political objectives of Turkish language reform were part of a larger, nationwide program: One was the creation of a simple idiom and a plain style to fight illiteracy, the second, the secularization of the Turkish vocabulary.

The Uzbeks pursued entirely different cultural-political objectives. By the end of the late fifties, illiteracy ceased to be a problem in Uzbekistan, thanks to the effective Soviet educational system. The tendency to deislamicize the vocabulary existed, but it was part of the Soviets’ cultural policy and was not favored by the native Uzbek population. What the Uzbek intelligentsia wanted to achieve in the last thirty years was to enrich the Uzbek grammar and lexicon from the vast storehouse of the classical Central Asian Turkish literary heritage, to streamline modern developments in the language with traditional features, and solidify the norms of grammatical and lexical expression.

In regard to its historical and political milieu, the Turkish language reform Yüknägi’s ‘Atabatt’un-Haq‘a‘iq not only have laid down the foundations of Karakhanid studies but have also served as models for generations to come. Cf. fn. 5 and 7.

20 See fn. 10
21 See fn. 11.
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was carried out in a sovereign state as part of the Turkish Republic's cultural-political program. It was done systematically, in an organized fashion, with the government's authority behind it. The reform, therefore was prescriptive and to a great extent imperative leading to dramatic changes in all segments of the language.

In Uzbekistan, the native tongue has been in a minority position existing in the shadow of Russian, the prestige language for the Uzbeks because of its cultural standing, and the dominant literary expression because of its political status. The Uzbek language reform, therefore, was more concerned about the survival of the Uzbek language, the preservation of its existing values, and the revivial of values in their classical heritage. It was part of a subtle cultural-political trend culminating in the rise of national awareness at the close of the eighties. It was born of the Uzbeks' desire to establish their historical roots and reaffirm their national identity by strengthening their ties with the Islamic Turkic heritage and by closing the gap between their modern idiom and the language of the classical literature.

This explains Uzbek scholars' unrelenting eagerness to study Turkish classical documents from the entire Islamic period of Central Asia. Their efforts, naturally, center around the preparation of critical editions of texts and the use of materials these sources offer for all segments of Uzbek culture. This is, basically, what the Turks have been doing from the early fourties to the present day. There is, however, a small but essential difference between the Turkish and the Uzbek treatment of the language of written records.

Historical linguists of the Turkish Republic were interested most of all in the Turkish materials (native Turkish words or derivatives from foreign words by Turkish means of derivation) of written sources. Foreign elements, mostly Arabic and Persian loans, were not included in their glossaries and lexicons. Since Turkish scholars used the data derived from these sources for the study of etymologies of native Turkish words, phonetic changes affecting single sounds, or morphological changes in the word structure, they would prepare, in the majority of cases, word indexes for their text editions with stems, roots, and particles as main entries under which they would list the suffixes or derivational elements with which the entries occur in their texts.23

---

23 For this type of glossaries B. Atalay's word index to the Divan Lugat at Türk (see fn. 6) served as a model. Thirty-six years later, a group of Turkish scholars prepared an index to Arat's critical edition of the Qutadgu Bilig (see fn. 5) in the same style (K. Eraslan, O. http://www.turkdilleri.org
For their perception of the role of historical linguistics, this practice was quite satisfactory. The materials they brought to the surface served their aspirations well and provided them with a solid data base for the language reform.

The Uzbeks developed a more comprehensive and integrating concept of the word materials of written records. Not only did they include words of foreign origin in their lexical studies, but they also treated them with the same care and consideration they devoted to native Turkish words. Ergash Fazylov, whose text editions and lexicons established the format and set the norms for the Uzbeks in the use of written records, put to work the method of historical text analysis with which he had become familiar with while studying in Budapest. The salient points of this method were: The word material of written records was to be considered as a whole in its numerical and formal entity. Individual elements—words, phrases, idioms—were to be established in three dimensions: by their status or position within the lexical system, of the document, by their relationship to other elements within this system, and by the nature and depth of their cultural content. The definition of entries was to rest on internal evidence with illustrations by relevant contexts and on external proofs from reliable and relevant sources. Fazylov’s own works, and the four-volume Nava’i dictionary which was produced under his direction by a group of native Uzbek linguists, were prepared, in general terms, according to these requirements. Along with native Turkish words, Persian and Arabic elements and derivatives based on these elements have been discrimination included in the lexicon without discrimination. The items are defined in Russian or Uzbek and the definitions are illustrated by text segments sufficient to give a complete spectrum of the morphological and semantical involvement of the entry. It is important to note here, that the Uzbeks did not lose touch with the Arabic writing system: The fourth volume of Fazylov’s Nava’i dictionary has an Arabic-Cyrillic orthographical glossary, while his text editions and his two-volume dictionary of Khorazmian and Kipchak documents give the entries also in Arabic characters.

It is obvious that the data base Uzbek historical linguists have created from Turkish written records goes beyond the eclectic and word-structure
oriented representation of the lexicon. It tends to project a comprehensive picture of the classical vocabulary with definitions that reflect their cultural content.27

Here we come to an essential, and for the development of the two languages quite decisive point. As is well known, there is a trend in the cultural policy of the Turkish Republic to keep language and culture distinctly apart as two different fields covered by two different disciplines.28 In scholarship this means that linguistics is expected to deal with linguistic facts disregarding the cultural components of the language. This, of course, is not without consequences. A language stripped off its cultural content, and, in the formal analysis, dismembered into stems, roots, formants, signs, and markers finds itself reduced to a state where its components can easily be manipulated: words of foreign origin can be removed and reform elements can be put in their places. One only has to make sure that the speakers know the “meanings”, i.e., the rules of proper use,29 of the new elements. These rules can be very simple, something like “from now on use tanrı instead of Allah, ayrılık instead of hicr, öykü instead of hikaye”, and so on. But as soon as we consider the contextual meanings of the old terms, their position in their respective semantic fields, and their cultural content, we will not be able to ignore the roots these terms have both in the lexico-semantic system of the language and in the cultural heritage of its speakers. We can replace Allah by Tanrı, but for the idiom allah allah “My God!” we cannot say tanrı tanrı30 because there is no such idiom or usage in the Turkish language. Ayrızk and qavuşma do not replace

27 The cultural content of the lexicon, a term not used and probably little known in American linguistics, is the direct (contextual) or indirect (System-bound) information the word material builds up in the course of history.
28 This trend, hopefully not long lasting, is in contradiction with Atatürk’s concept of dialectal unity of language and culture. For a detailed analysis of Atatürk’s view in the ties between culture and language see Z. Korkmaz, “Atatürk Düşünsesi Sisteminde Türk Dillerinin Yeri”, presented at the International Congress on the Turkish Language, Ankara, September 26, 1988.
29 S. Telegdi, in his class notes for the course “Introduction to General Linguistics” at the Eötvös Lóránd University, Budapest, defined “meaning” as “the rule of proper use of a word.”
30 I took this example from H. Zulfikar’s lecture on “The Turkish Language Reform” delivered in the Department of Near Eastern Language and Cultures at the University of California, Los Angeles, on May 12, 1972.
hicr and vasıf in the imagery built around this pair and in the semantic field of which they are a part. Öykü will be just a partial replacement (i.e., replacement with semantic loss) for hikaye in a context such as the following quote from Sayf or Saray: Bolmasa hâlibîng bizing teg, ay 'azîz, bil hikâyay tur qatînüda hâlimiz situation is not like ours. O, Respected [Reader], know [full well] that in your presence the state we are in will be [nothing more than] a story [from which to draw a lesson].' (126v:10). In time the reform elements will settle into new idioms and expressions and build their cultural content from new values. The natural consequence is that a gap is created between the new and old, modern and classical, stages of the language. The gap can be so wide that the new idiom does not grant its speakers direct access to written records from the classical period.

The Uzbek scene, as I indicated above, was quite different and so were the trends in the development of the Uzbek language. Arabic and Tajik-Persian loans were accepted as integral parts of the Uzbek lexicon and were never targeted by puristic movements. Even the Soviet imposed secularization and Russification, at times quite aggressive, could not erase the Arabic-Persian segment of the Uzbek vocabulary. Russian words that forced their way into the Uzbek word stock very often had to compete with their Arabic, Tajik, or native Uzbek equivalents with which they were used side by side. E.g., observatöriya and patsadxöna for 'observatory', завод and көрхона for 'factory', звонок and күнгироқ for 'bell', канал and ариқ for 'irrigation canal', and автор and муаллиф for 'author'. In many


33 E. Azlarov, and others, op. cit. In the short piece entitled “Ургенч” the words көрхона; завод; фабрика and комбинат are invariably used.
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cases the Russian words were losings and gradually, at least some of them, already went out of use, due to the cultural cohesiveness of the Uzbek vocabulary and its roots in the classical Central Asian Turkish heritage.\textsuperscript{34}

The slowly but steadily changing political climate since the late fifties and the Uzbeks’ interest in classical Central Asian Turkish works beginning about the same time, gave rise to new trends in the literary expression of the Uzbeks. One of them can be described as the restoration of Islamic terminology. Words that had been labeled as ‘obsolete’, bookish’, or had been put entirely out of use were brought back into circulation. A brief comparison of Borovkov’s \textit{Uzbek-Russian Dictionary} from 1959,\textsuperscript{35} and Ma’rufo\’s \textit{Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language} from about twenty years later\textsuperscript{36} already shows substantial changes with regard to this. Today we know for sure that the comeback of elements from the classical idiom during the time-span considered and after to the present day was more intensive and more pervasive than it seemed at the beginning. It brought about a new situation that descriptive and historical linguistics, lexicology and cultural history, should be equally concerned with.

The other trend, much akin to the first, was the enrichment of Modern Uzbek with materials borrowed from Classical Central Asian Turkish literature. This was not restricted to the lexicon (Arabic and Tajik-Persian elements). Borrowings occurred also from other segments of the language of the primary sources made available in text editions monographs, and lexicons by foreign or native historical linguists. It is difficult to establish at this time with certainty whether the tendency to enrich Modern Uzbek with classical elements was spontaneous or calculated. I am inclined to believe that it happened through calculated efforts. In any case, the result is the same: The classical elements and the Arab-Persian vocabulary of Islam now made part of Modern Literary Uzbek, strengthen the ties of this language with classical Turkish


acrolect of Central Asia.

The enrichment of Modern Literary Uzbek by reinstating Islamic terms and adopting Chagatay elements affected not only the lexicon but also word formation, morphology, syntax, and style as well. In addition, the elements adopted or restored were not left isolated in the modern surrounding but were integrated into appropriate segments of Modern Uzbek. This, in turn, triggered further changes and adjustments in the affected area.

Let us consider two examples, one from the lexicon and one from morphology.

Arabic *iżāz* ‘respect’ is a very common word in Classical Turkish. Sayf of Saray employs it in the phrases *iżāz va ikrām qīl* (14r:12) and *iżāz va ikrām va iḥsān qīl* (35r:8) ‘to respect, honor, bestow favor upon’ (See fn. 31).

37 Sayf of Saray employs it in the phrases *iżāz va ikrām qīl* (14r:12) and *iżāz va ikrām va iḥsān qīl* (35r:8) ‘to respect, honor, bestow favor upon’ (See fn. 31).

38 Op. cit. 651a (See fn. 35). He includes in the entry the classical phrase *ezzoz-ikrom* *kiılmok* in the sense of to show respect*.


30 Twenty years later Ma’rufov lists *ezzoz* as a fully fledged lexical element and as the base for such derivatives as *ezzoz* *kiılmok, ezzoz* *bermoq* ‘to show respect’, *ezzoz-ikrom* ‘respect’, *ezzolamok* ‘to respect’ *ezzolamnomok* ‘to be respected’, *ezzozi* ‘deserving respect’. The semantic range of *ezzoz* was also widened. In the late eighties Yoqubjon Shukurov uses *ezzolamok* in the sense of ‘for (an animal) to be appreciated (for its usefulness).’

In classical Turkish, verbal nouns in -gu are used in the paradigm of the Categorical Future, e.g., *kelgüm dur* ‘I will surely come’. In Modern Uzbek these forms occurred only sporadically as archaisms. In recent decades, how-
ever, the Categorical Future was accepted into the system of Uzbek tenses to introduce further nuances in the expression of colored futurity sharing semantic coverage with the necessitative future in -ажак and the presumptive future in -р/-мақ. Most recent use with бор instead of дир adds to the expression of the speaker’s insistence that the action be definitely carried out, as in this example: үз озингдан яна бир марта зинги бор. ‘I want to hear it directly from you’ (lit., ‘I insists that I hear it again from your own mouth’). The classical Optative Future in -рай also in Modern Uzbek. Its use, however, is restricted to expressions of curses and good wishes, e.g., үлгайсэн ‘may you die’ and shares function with the mostly lexicalized, participles in -гүрп used in similar role. e.g., күргүрп ‘may you perish’.

As a result of these developments, Modern Uzbek in the last thirty or thirty-five years has obtained new status in international scholarship. It has become the language of a rich and colorful modern literature the relevance of which goes beyond national and Soviet boundaries. At the same time Modern Uzbek has assumed all necessary qualities of being a gateway to the classical literature of the Turks of Central Asia. Speakers of Modern Literary Uzbek have direct access to the works of Navâ’î, Sayf-i Sarayi, Qutb, Khorazmi, Khujandi, Yusuf Amiri, and others. They do not need translations or lengthy commentaries. Even more importantly, Modern Uzbek has taken over the role of being the reference language for Turkish historical and comparative linguistics. Its lexicon that has preserved old elements and has not been diluted with made-up words anachronic or anorganic derivations, documents better than any other modern Turkish language the present formal and functional status of lexemes and idioms as the end result of historical processes.

46 See fn. 43.
48 The following examples show the limits of Turkish lexicon in historical and compara-
All these do not change the fact that the classical idiom called Chatagay was the common literary expression for all Turks of Central Asia at least from the 15th to the end of 19th centuries. There is no need or reason to challenge this historically established term. The ever tightening grammatical, lexical, and cultural linkage between Chatagay and Modern Uzbek in the last twenty-five years, however, cannot be ignored. We must accept the fact that the Uzbeks adopted Chatagay literary culture as their own heritage and revive and perpetuate its values in modern works. For practical purposes, therefore, Chatagay is the classical phase of Modern Uzbek with linguistic and cultural relevance to the Uzbek people.

49 The first genuinely Uzbek literary documents come from the beginning of the 16th century. They are the works of Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān (Divān, Bahru’l-hudā, and Risāla-i Makrīf). Since, however, Shaybānī Khān was educated in the Chagatay literary milieu, his language does not differ much from the language poets of the Timurid era used although there are quite a few noteworthy “Uzbek elements” (i.e., usages also see in Modern Uzbek), grammatical and lexical, in his works.

50 Historical linguists and scholars of Turkish literary history will probably keep the term Chagatay to describe a historical phase of Turkish language and literature. For Uzbek linguistics proper I do not see any reason why we could not use “Classical Uzbek” for the same period. (After all, "Тұн кимни? Кийгани?" Who does the coat belong to? It