

Issues of Periodization of the Developmental Stages of Political Discourse in the History of the Uzbek Language

ELBEK UROL UGLI RUZIYEV
Termez State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Research on the history, literature, and culture of Turkic peoples demonstrates that, having their own unique developmental trajectory since ancient times, these peoples have passed through various evolutionary stages in civilization. In the process of systematically and soundly organizing and studying these dynamics, periodization is of paramount relevance.

The periodization of political discourse involves analyzing and revealing the evolving trends in the semantic structure, formal transformations, and stylistic nuances of political speeches across successive eras. This process must inevitably rely on a range of internal and external factors. Specifically, periodization should account for state formation, dynastic successions, transformations in language and writing systems, as well as the scope of diplomatic relations with foreign powers-since the political state of every era is fundamentally reflected in its socio-cultural environment.

Indeed, periodization in the history of the Uzbek language remains one of the critical and complex issues in linguistics. From this standpoint, the primary objective of this article is to identify and periodize the developmental stages of political discourse in the history of the Uzbek language up to the 16th century, based on historical-linguistic criteria.

Keywords: Political speech, political discourse, periodization, Turkic languages, Old Turkic language, diplomatic documentation, oratory, history of the Uzbek language.

INTRODUCTION

In a literal sense, periodization is not merely a historical term; rather, across all disciplines of science, it serves as a periodic measure that illustrates the development, progress, and decline of a given field. In this regard, the field of philology also embodies its own periodic boundaries and laws. Thus, periodization is intrinsically linked to a nation's cultural history, the processes of its ethnogenesis (formation as a people), its state-level structural forms, and its political processes. Literature and history are among the most essential facets of civilization. By studying all creative works that bear witness to the intellectual and emotional development a nation has traversed over long centuries, literature strives to depict its spiritual life as it truly is. One can describe the literature of a people as the most genuine mirror reflecting their national spirituality and life. How does a nation view life? What are its thoughts? How does it feel? This can be seen most accurately and vividly in that nation's ideas and ancient creative heritage.

Among the civilized languages of the world, the Turkic language – and the Uzbek language in particular – boasts a rich history. It is crucial to consider various dimensions of these factors of existence. In particular, this presents the periodization of language and the systematization of periodic characteristics as a fundamental scientific problem. Periodization is one of the methods present across all fields for studying a scientific problem. Before addressing the periodization of the history of Turkic languages – specifically, the developmental stages of political discourse in the Uzbek language – it is appropriate to first examine existing research on the periodization of Uzbek literature. This is because language and literature are intrinsically interconnected, and sources pertaining to political discourse have been preserved through literary works alongside scientific texts. Indeed, the primary sources of political discourse comprise various inscriptions, as well as oral and written literature. Consequently, the formation and evolutionary stages of this discourse are directly tied to a given nation's literature and historical records.

Based on this premise, prior to clarifying the periodization of political discourse, two key aspects should be addressed: the stages of literary periodization, and the periodization of the Turkic and Uzbek languages. In periodizing literature, rather than relying on rudimentary views, it is necessary to ground the study on specific factors, mediums, socio-historical processes, philosophical-religious movements, and various literary categories [1: 4]. Naturally, the socio-historical process serves as the primary criterion in the evolution of language and literature, as well as in the formation of a new era or literary environment.

Pre-Islamic ancient Turkic literature

1. Turkic literature of the Buddhist movement;
2. Turkic literature of the Manichaeism movement;
3. Turkic literature of the Shamanist movement;
4. Ghaznavid era literature;
5. Karakhanid era Turkic literature;
6. Golden Horde literature;
7. Chagatai literature of the Timurid era;
8. Medieval folk literature [1: 4].

Reiterating that the classification above not only categorizes literary works but is also directly relevant to the periodization of political discourse under our study, we consider this classification to be more comprehensive compared to others.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

In this study, complementary scientific methods were employed to determine the stages of formation and development of political discourse in the history of the Uzbek language, as well as to periodize it based on historical-linguistic criteria. Utilizing the historical-comparative method, scientific views and written sources pertaining to Turkic languages, the Uzbek literary language, classical literature, and Old Turkic diplomatic documentation were comparatively analyzed. This method made it possible to identify the developmental trends of political

discourse across various historical stages and to substantiate their correlation with the evolution of statehood.

By employing the descriptive method, the lexical, stylistic, and semantic characteristics of political discourse were characterized, and their transformations across different historical periods were elucidated. Furthermore, analysis and synthesis, as well as inductive and deductive approaches, were applied to summarize the existing scientific literature and to formulate the author's overall conceptual framework.

Addressing the periodization of the historical stages of the Uzbek language, it is appropriate to cite several classifications proposed by linguists. Scholars such as S. Y. Malov, A. N. Samoylovich, A. M. Shcherbak, O. Usmonov, G. bdurahmonov, U. Sanaqulov, Q. Sodiqov, among others, have put forward various classifications regarding the periodization of Turkic languages, particularly the Uzbek literary language. The issue of periodizing the history of the Uzbek language has long attracted the attention of Turkologists. Views expressed to date regarding the origins and historical development of the literary language vary considerably, and a definitive consensus has yet to be reached on this matter [2: 13]. In particular, summarizing the views expressed by various scholars on periodization, the linguist U. Sanaqulov emphasizes that the development of the Uzbek literary language can be periodized as follows:

1. **The Ancient (early) Common Turkic period of the Uzbek Literary Language (5th-10th centuries):** The 5th-7th centuries of this period represent a stage intrinsically linked with the Altaic and Hunnic language eras, possessing distinct characteristics that differentiate it from the language of later periods, particularly the 10th-13th centuries. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the language of this era maintains a relative unity with the earliest ancient language.
2. **The Old Turkic Literary Language Period (10th-13th centuries):** This period serves as a defining link between the ancient and the newly emerging Turkic languages.
3. **The Old Uzbek Literary Language Period of the Uzbek Literary Language (Late 13th century-early 20th**

century). This era is characterized by the development of the Uzbek language alongside regional dialects and political division into khanates. Nevertheless, the language of this period maintained a distinct, cohesive unity.

4. **The Transition Period to the All-National Uzbek Literary Language or Modern Uzbek Literary Language** (1930s-1940s to the present day) [3: 104].

Highlighting that a consensus has yet to be reached on the periodization of language history and that the classifications proposed by A. N. Samoylovich, F. Köprülü, A.M. Shcherbak, and J. Eckmann are considerably progressive, the Turkologist Qosimjon Sodiqov emphasizes that it is preferable to study the history of the Uzbek literary language by dividing it into eight distinct stages [2].

1. **Stage I:** This stage encompasses the period from the pre-Christian era up to the 5th century CE. In contemporary scholarly works, the most ancient period of the Turkic language is designated as the Altaic period, followed by the Hunnic period. The history of the common Uzbek spoken language originates in this Altaic era; hence, it is appropriate to commence the history of the written literary language from the subsequent stage.
2. **Stage II:** This stage of our language's history encompasses the 6th to 10th centuries. In scholarly works, textbooks, and manuals, the written literary language of this interval is referred to as "Old Turkic" (or "Ancient Turkic").

The written monuments created during this period can be divided into two groups based on their chronology and specific linguistic features:

1. The language of the Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions in the Old Turkic runic script, as well as the Tuvan, Talas, and Fergana written monuments remaining from the First and Second Turkic Khaganates;

2. The language of Turkic monuments in the Old Turkic, Uyghur, Manichaean, and Brahmi scripts remaining from the era of the Uyghur Khaganate and its successor states.
3. **Stage III:** This stage covers the period from the 11th century to the beginning of the 13th century. In scholarly literature, textbooks, and manuals, the written literary language of this period is termed "Middle Turkic" (or "Old Turkic"), "Karakhanid", "Karakhanid Turkic", or "Khagani Turkic". This was the written literary language of the Karakhanid era, utilized up until the Mongol invasion.
4. **Stage IV:** The language of written monuments created between the second half of the 13th century and the 1370s. In scholarly literature, the written literary language of this interval is also referred to as the "Early Chagatai period".
5. **Stage V:** The language of written monuments created from the 1370s through the 16th century. This constitutes the Old Uzbek classical written literary language, also designated in scholarly literature as "Chagatai Turkic", "Chagatai Turkic language", or "Classical Chagatai".

This stage can be further divided into the following sub-periods:

- From the 1370s to the first half of the 15th century (the pre-Navoi period);
 - The second half of the 15th century (the era of Alisher Navoi);
 - The 16th century (the era of Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur and Muhammad Shaybani Khan).
6. **Stage VI:** The language of written monuments created from the 17th century to the first half of the 19th century. This represents a continuation of the classical Old Uzbek literary language, encompassing works created during the era of the Khiva, Bukhara, and Kokand khanates.
 7. **Stage VII:** The language of written monuments created in the Old Uzbek language from the second half of the 19th century to the early 20th century.

8. **Stage VIII:** Modern Uzbek literary language. This refers to the literary language utilized from the 1915s-1920s to the present day [2: 16].

In our view, the aforementioned classification is valuable compared to others due to its thoroughness and because it was developed through a comprehensive study of the lengthy historical-linguistic processes involved in the formation of the Uzbek language. The issue of periodizing language history is naturally foundational to periodizing Turkic political discourse as well. Overall, a unified consensus has yet to be reached regarding language periodization. Discussions surrounding the spread of Turkic languages highlight the necessity of a methodical approach to periodizing their entry into Central Asia and, specifically, the territory of Uzbekistan.

In this regard, researcher E. Asanov notes: "On a linguistic level, Uzbeks and the Turkic-speaking peoples of the region are the successors of the tribes that dispersed after the Turkic Khaganate." He further adds: "The older dialects of the Turkic group were reduced to small relict populations during the reign of Islamic dynasties and were entirely eliminated or displaced as a result of the Mongol invasion; their minor remnants entered contemporary Turkic peoples as ethnographic groups" [4: 3].

When reflecting on the history and periodization of political discourse, it is also appropriate to address official diplomatic documentation and the emergence and refinement of formal Turkic speech. This is because many written sources pertaining to political discourse are closely tied to and interconnected with official administrative and diplomatic records. Indeed, the influence of political, social, ethnic, religious, ideological, and cultural processes that unfolded throughout the history of Turkic peoples cannot be denied. Nevertheless, Turkic peoples and their language have consistently preserved their identity, emerging intact through these processes. Therefore, it is essential to keep these factors in mind when delimiting the developmental stages in the history of Turkic languages [5: 35].

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The periodization of political discourse provides an opportunity to thoroughly understand the stages of formation and development of this genre of speech. In this regard, the historical-linguistic analyses in this article demonstrated that the formation and evolution of political discourse in the history of the Uzbek language occurred in intrinsic connection with the development of statehood, the refinement of the written literary language, and the expansion of diplomatic relations. Therefore, when delimiting political discourse into historical stages, it is necessary to comprehensively consider both linguistic development and socio-political factors.

The scholar Kudratulla Omonov, who conducted extensive research on Old Turkic diplomatic documentation, notes in his monograph 'Old Turkic Diplomatic Documents: A Historical-Philological Analysis' that the refinement and periodization of the formal Turkic style should be studied through the following stages:

1. Documentation of the ancient period (3rd century BCE-6th century CE).
2. Documentation of the Turkic Khaganate period (6th-9th centuries CE).
3. Documentation of the 9th-13th centuries.
4. Documentation of the 13th-16th centuries. This stage of Turkic documentation is subdivided into the following periods:
 1. Documentation in force within the Chagatai Khanate (13th-14th centuries);
 2. Documentation of the Golden Horde and subsequent khanates (from the first half of the 14th century to the second half of the 16th century);
 3. Documentation of the Timurid era (from the second half of the 14th century to the 16th century);
 4. Documentation of the early Ottoman Empire (from the second half of the 15th century to the 16th century) [5: 36].

Naturally, this periodization encompasses the formation of the official-administrative style. Furthermore, considering that the majority of political discourse texts exist in the form of official documents, this periodic classification is likewise essential for our research.

As we elucidate the formation process of political discourse in the history of the Uzbek language—with the aim of specifically examining the developments up to the 16th century – we put forward the scientific view that political discourse in the Uzbek language can be effectively categorized and studied through the following periods:

- Political discourse from ancient times to the 5th century;
- Political discourse of the 6th-10th centuries;
- Turkic political discourse of the 11th-13th centuries;
- Political discourse of the 14th-16th centuries.

The primary reason for proposing this periodic division is that political discourse underwent stylistic transformations driven by statehood systems, social evolution, and national-dynastic-ethnic shifts. In formulating this periodization, the evolutionary dynamics of statehood were thoroughly accounted for.

Specifically, during the period from early times to the 5th century, early state formations – such as Sogdia, Bactria, and the Kushan Empire – emerged across Central Asia. However, sources pertaining to these entities have not survived to the present day in a holistic form. As previously noted, the earliest complete, fully formed manifestations of Turkic—and specifically Uzbek – political-official style and political discourse can be identified in the speeches of heads of state from the 6th to the 10th centuries.

Below, we present a schematic representation of this periodization model (Figure 1). This periodization is offered not as absolute chronological boundaries, but rather as a historical-linguistic model reflecting the formal, semantic, and functional transformations of political discourse.

Political speech periods of the Uzbek language from ancient times to the 16th century		
	Period limit	Features of political speech
I	Political speech from ancient times to the 5th century	The source material of the period has mostly not survived in full, but it has been preserved in Chinese historical sources, diplomatic documents, and records about the Turkic dynasties of the period
II	Political speech in the 6th-10th centuries	• Political speeches of the period mainly emerged in the form of stone inscriptions; • Speech form: martial, call to action, command, proclamation; • Language of expression is poetic, figurative, and in the form of short sentences.
III	Political speech in the 11th-13th centuries	• Widespread use of Arabic and Persian-Tajik vocabulary and stylistic devices; • Expression of political thought, state governance, and concepts of justice on a scientific and philosophical foundation; • The emergence of specialized oratory;
IV	Political speech of the 14th-16th centuries	• Political speeches of rulers were preserved in the form of letters and inscriptions; • Diplomatic correspondence was actively maintained; • The emergence of standard speech formulas among rulers; • The key goals of political speeches were preserving the state and strengthening peace, with a strong emphasis on a martial spirit.

CONCLUSION

From the above considerations, it can be concluded that periodizing the formation and development of political discourse in the history of the Uzbek language from a historical-linguistic perspective holds significant scientific and methodological value not only for language history, but also for the study of political

discourse, formal style, and the history of statehood. Throughout the study, scientific views regarding Turkic languages, the Uzbek literary language, classical literature, and Old Turkic diplomatic documentation were comparatively analyzed, substantiating that the internal laws of political discourse evolution are intrinsically linked to language development and historical-political processes. In this regard, it was scientifically established that political discourse should be evaluated not merely as a product of oratory or an isolated stylistic phenomenon, but as a linguistically mediated expression of statehood, political thought, ideological paradigms, and social relations.

Analyses of periodization concepts proposed by Turkologists and linguists revealed that most were aimed at elucidating the development of the literary language, written monuments, or official documentation, while political discourse was not categorized as an independent object of linguistic research. This situation necessitates a dedicated periodization of political discourse history. On this basis, the historical evolution of political discourse in the Uzbek language up to the 16th century was divided into four main stages. Such a classification allows for a harmonized evaluation of language development, the evolution of statehood, political governance systems, scribal traditions, diplomatic relations, and the advancement of formal style.

Although sources of political discourse from ancient times to the 5th century are limited, they served as the historical foundation for the formation of subsequent political-communicative traditions. In the 6th-10th centuries, the stone inscriptions of the Turkic Khaganate emerged as refined written specimens of political discourse, wherein state independence, national unity, ruler responsibility, and military-political ideology manifested as leading themes. In the 11th–13th centuries, under the influence of Islamic civilization, political discourse expanded semantically in philosophical, moral, and didactic directions, with governance principles being articulated on the basis of scholarly thought. By the 14th–16th centuries, the formation of centralized states, diplomatic correspondence, decrees (*farmans*), royal letters, and political appeals led to the

stylistic refinement of political discourse and established a stable system of official communication.

The results of the research confirm that the evolution of political discourse is directly connected to the development of political power, the consolidation of state institutions, shifts in religious and ideological paradigms, the perfection of writing systems, and the expansion of international diplomatic relations. Therefore, relying on a comprehensive analysis of historical, cultural, social, and political factors rather than strictly linguistic criteria – is the most scientifically sound approach when periodizing political discourse. This approach enables a deeper comprehension of the semantic, pragmatic, and stylistic transformations of political discourse.

The proposed periodization model can be evaluated as one of the initial conceptual approaches serving the systematic study of political discourse history. Its practical significance lies in its role as a methodological foundation for future research in historical linguistics, political discourse analysis, formal style, diplomatic language, and historical pragmatics. Furthermore, this model expands opportunities to linguistically reinterpret historical sources, consistently elucidate the evolution of Turkic political thought, and identify the national developmental stages of Uzbek political discourse.

In future studies, it is advisable to conduct comparative analyses of the developmental trends of political discourse post-16th century, the discursive and pragmatic characteristics of the speeches of statesmen during the khanates and subsequent eras, as well as the processes of continuity and transformation between historical political speech and modern political discourse. This will serve to investigate the multi-century development of Uzbek political discourse as a cohesive system, illuminate its national and universal features on a scientific basis, and enrich the history of political communication with new theoretical insights.

REFERENCES

1. Rahmonov, N. 2016. O'zbek adabiyotini davrlashtirish masalalari. Monografiya. Toshkent: Mumtoz so'z.

2. Sodiqov, Q. 2022. Eski o'zbek yozma adabiy tili. Toshkent: Akademiya nashr.
3. Sanaqulov, U. 2004. O'zbek adabiy tili tarixining ilk davrlari. Toshkent: G'ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi.
4. Асанов Э. Э. 2020. Ўрта Осиё қадимги турк битикларининг манбашунослик томонлари. “XXI аср: фан ва таълим масалалари. илмий электрон журналы. 3.
5. Омонов, Қ. 2015. Эски туркий дипломатик хужжатлар: тарихий. филологик таҳлил. Т.: Extremum-press.
6. Aripova, A. X. 2024. Notqlik san'ati – ijtimoiy-madaniy fenomen sifatida. Toshkent.
7. Апресян Г. З. 1978. Ораторское искусство. М.: МГУ.
8. Анна У. 2019. Стилистические и лингво-прагматические характеристики публичной речи политических лидеров России конца XX и начала XXI веков. Дисс... канд. филол. наук Москва.
9. Пильгун Е. В. 2016. Лингвистические особенности политического дискурса американского варианта английского языка. Минск: РИВШ.
10. Быкова Т. Ю. 2014. Метафорический образ СССР в советском и американском медийных политических дискурсах 1930-1954 гг. Автореф. дисс... канд. филол. наук. Екатеринбург.
11. Боймуродова Л. Қ. 2021. Сиёсий дискурда нутқий стратегия фодаси (Х. Клинтон нутқлари асосида). Журнал Хорижий филология, 1.
12. Гаврилова М. В. 2005. Лингвокогнитивный анализ русского политического дискурса. Автореф... дисс... докт. филол. наук. Санкт – Петербург.

ELBEK UROL UGLI RUZIYEV

PHD STUDENT,

TERMEZ STATE UNIVERSITY,

UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <ELBEK_RUZIYEV@MAIL.RU>