



ON "DEAD WORDS" IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Камбаров Маъруфжан Абдуҳакимович
старший преподаватель кафедры узбекского
языкознания Гулистанского государственного университета

Дехканова Лутфиниса Абдуллаевна-
старший преподаватель кафедры узбекского
языкознания Гулистанского государственного университета
E-mail maribjon_kambarov@mail.ru
Tel. 99 470 9 921

Abstract

In some studies and textbooks devoted to the study of archaic words in Uzbek linguistics, information is provided that the obsolete lexical layer has passed into the ranks of lexical units that were used in the past and are not in common use at all. Lexical units that are completely out of use today, completely incomprehensible to the representatives of modernity, completely unused, belonging to a past stage of language development, cannot be considered archaism from today's point of view. These are lexical units of the past, and their archaism or non-archaism is determined depending on the stage of language development. Such words are called "dead words" in scientific sources. Dead words are words that have fallen out of use in the past, are now almost incomprehensible and are completely dead words from the point of view of the current Uzbek literary language. We want to think about this in our article below.

Keywords: lexical layer, archaisms, archaic words, dead words, academic publication.

Introduction

In the textbook "Modern Uzbek Literary Language" (2020, pp. 112-113) [1], published in co-authorship with one of our Uzbek linguists R. Sayfullaeva and other scholars, vocabulary with a limited period of use is divided into three groups: 1) old vocabulary; 2) obsolete vocabulary (archaic and historical words). 3) Dead words.

We would like to express our opinion on one of these groups, that is, the "dead words" group.

Although there is no special work devoted to the study of the archaic type of obsolete vocabulary in Uzbek linguistics, it is studied in a number of articles and studies. Uzbek





linguists S. Mutalibov [2], Sh. Rakhmatullayev[3], L. Abdullaeva[4], E. Begmatov[5], E. Kilichev[6], K. In the works of Yusupov[7] and others, as well as in textbooks intended for students of higher educational institutions, information is given to a greater or lesser extent that "dead words" were used before, but now they have passed into the ranks of lexical units that are not used in common use at all.

Let us briefly dwell on one of the mentioned cases. This is a section of S. Mutalibov's monograph "History of Archaic Words". It is important that even in the 11th century there is talk of words that were an obsolete lexical layer, i.e. words that passed into the ranks of archaisms and retained their archaism even in the time of Navoi. The author writes: "One of the obvious lexical features of the vocabulary of the eleventh century is archaism... As a result of the fact that some words were closely associated with the conditions of life typical of a very ancient period, as soon as the conditions of life changed, they have long since fallen out of the ranks due to their incompatibility, redundancy and uselessness. For example, at that time, the name of a foal of a baytal (female horse) that ran away from wild stallions was called arkun (Devoni lugotit turk, vol. 1, p. 98). It is clear that this word in its meaning refers to very ancient times, when people were rare. Therefore, the word became useless in the language as soon as conditions changed, and it fell out of order at that time." [8] In support of this idea, the author cites a few words, which became archaisms as early as the 11th century. These are: ovik - a deer that lives in the mountains and rocky areas, chūbon (in our opinion, this word is not an archaism, but historicism - to emphasize ours: M.K.) - an assistant to the village headman; yugush - the name of sacrifice to idols, sep-ohiri - the end of a three-year-old horse, yulmok - that a wife pays a certain amount when divorcing her husband; tado (in our opinion, the word tado is a historical word - our accent: M.K.) - a measure of land, meaning the distance to the point of view, idal - a word meaning "of course", pronounced in response to the word "kings", azrirok - white ears, some parts of the body are black and deer, artut - shoga kilinadigan tortik a gift to the king [9].

The author continues his speech and writes: "Some words were used before Navoi and in the time of Navoi, and then completely fell out of use" [10]... To prove his opinion, the scientist cites the following examples. uylik - khotin, uyichka - husband, sinak - fly, ochun - mir ogirlamok - respect, tuz - rovna, flat, eng - face, englik - upa, which women apply to the face, kirish - kaman or in Andijan this word is bowstring, ulus (lexeme **ulus** is historicism in the sense of "a large feudal state in Central Asia" TSUYA - emphasis ours: M.K.) —people, emgak (in TSUYA it is said that this word is dialectal in this sense, so it is difficult to consider it archaic- - our accent: M.K.) — labor, balik - city, esh (an example confirming the use of the word esh in TSUYA in the meaning





of "comrade, comrade, companion, partner" is given from the novel "Maple" by A. Mukhtor: Soon after, he entered primary school in the new city as a teacher, He made friends with educated Russian and Kazakh boys. However, its "pair", "the remnant of the membrane that fell off after the birth of the child; It is noted that the meaning of the word "sputnik" is a dialect word. Therefore, this word cannot be called archaic: friend, interlocutor (underline ours: M.K.) ; **yovuk** (it is noted that the lexeme yovuk in OTIL is obsolete, and the following example is given: At that moment , a shot was heard nearby, and he was surrounded by smoke bandits and guards. (S.Ainyi, Slaves). In our opinion, this word is not an archaism, but a dialect word specific to the Khorezmian dialect. Let's remember the verse of one of the once famous songs: "He has come a long way, now there is no dream in his heart." Also, in one of the textbooks, the lexeme yovuk is archaic: the sound of a rifle could be heard from a gun, and its smoke enveloped bandits and guards (S. Ainyi, Slaves). In our opinion, this word is not an archaism, but a dialect word specific to the Khorezmian dialect. Let's recall the verse of one of the once famous songs: "He chose a short way, and now his dreams are not in his heart." Also, one of the textbooks notes that the lexeme "yovuk" is archaic. It is difficult to agree with this opinion. See: M. Mirzaev, S. Usmanov, I. Rasulov, Uzbek language, p. 44. - Nearby and others.

The following words of S. Mutalibov also deserve attention: "Some words fell out of use in the 11th century and became archaic not because they were unfit for use, but because they were replaced by words from the languages of neighboring peoples. For example: p̄zi – food, pand- sovet, orzuv, yori, telva, biebon, posh, ravon, xavo, nard, zhahon and such Tajik words, even connecting aids such as -gar were used. Attoki"[11].

Let's take the word "Telva". 7 illustrative examples from the works of such writers as A. Kadiri, A. Kahhor, Oybek, I. Sultan, H. Gulom can confirm that it is used in the form of "telba". In addition, the telva form of this lexeme in the "telva-teskari" (incongruent) word pair also proves the correctness of this idea.

The same can be said for the panda token (advice). Because in the Uzbek language it is often used as part of such idioms as pand-emok (to damage), pand-bermok (to suffer), pand-nasiqat (advice) (or its variant pandu nasiqat (advice)). Consider the following example: Never fall in love with an unfaithful traitor! He will suffer one day, sooner or later! (Shukhrat); Eat sugar from the good, you suffer from the bad (Folk proverb).

Now let's turn to the following evidence: in the Uzbek language, dashtu byobon (steppe-desert): We entered the sahara, the steppe-desert, the soul. Tuygun; The lands that had been desert for thousands of years turned into green cotton fields. XS .98(9)





and their steppes - the presence of double lexical units, such as *biyobon* (Those who live in the steppe-byobon touched the soul. SHU. 96(5), and *chul-biyobon* (desert) (land consisting of a desert, an arid desert, from the interpretation of the Kholistan lexeme TSUYA), the word desert of the lexeme **biyobon** (desert) (very few or no plants, an endless steppe without water. (Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language - TSUYA, I., p. 386) and the word **sagro** "desert" ("vast steppe with very little or no vegetation) is used as a seme in the explanation. TSUYA, I., p. 31). The use of the lexeme **biyobonii** (in the sense of "desert" inhabitant of the desert"), finally, a number of arguments, for example, the fact that *biebon* was taken as the main dictionary article in TSUYA, probably do not require the inclusion of this lexical unit in the ranks of archaists (those living in the wilderness are also called desert, *Tuygun*). which, contrary to the above, are indeed archaisms. Some of them include: "tablog" - to agree; *turkug-ir* — to be ashamed, embarrassed *knot-ud* (musical instrument) *ughur* — time, Hebrew — utensils used for washing hands, *tildog-justification* [12] and others.

Such lexical units can be categorized as "dead words". We confirm our opinion on the basis of the following source: "Some words may be completely incomprehensible to the representatives of the present era, they may completely disappear from use: *ymiz* (*kykrak*), (*breast*), *budun* (people of the halk), *bitik* (book of *kitob*) words have this property. Such words are called "dead words"[13].

Our opinion is also confirmed by the opinions expressed in the following source: "Lexical units that are completely out of use now, belonging to a past stage of language development, cannot be considered archaism from today's point of view. These are lexical units of the past, the archaic or non-archaic nature of which is determined depending on the stage of language development..., that is, units belonging to the vocabulary of the past [14]. Such lexical units are used in works created in the past or depicting the past. The textbook's lexical meaning types section defines the former lexical meaning and emphasizes that it refers to "a lexical meaning belonging to a past stage of language development that does not participate in the structure of the current vocabulary." He divided the former lexical meaning into 2 groups, namely: 1) the old lexical meaning and 2) the etymological lexical meaning. The source emphasizes that the old lexical meaning is studied in historical lexicology, and the modern lexical meaning is studied in descriptive lexicology, and also notes that the lexical meaning belonging to the studied stage of language development is called the current lexical meaning. meaning.

In the scientific publication "Lexicology of the Uzbek language" on the basis of examples, the concepts of obsolete words and old words are distinguished. In today's





language, it is not used at all, "although it was historically a feature of the Uzbek language, it is now functionally dead... Dead words have fallen out of use in the past, are now almost incomprehensible, and are completely dead words from the point of view of the current Uzbek literary language." For example, it was used in the language of Alisher Navoi's works. chopun (curtain, barrier), eran (brave men, husbands), abushka (husband, old man), boshmok (sword hilt), bogchol (a kind of duck), tunkotar (night watchman), zhighon (poor), iliklamok (to capture) such words are dead for the lexicon of the modern Uzbek literary language. So, let's divide the obsolete lexical layer into three groups: - Dead words - obsolete words (archaic and historical words); - old words [15].

We agree with this opinion and would like to point out that there are "dead words" in our object of study. For example, **oyok, ayak** (Turkish) – a cup, a dish, a glass, a large bowl: But when you drink, he doesn't drink two or three as before, but four when he increases. he is satisfied with the cup (293); "I drank a cup of milk on Saturday " (Beauburnoma 228.1); "A Short Dictionary to the Works of Navoi" (compiled by B. Hasanov, 1993, p. 14) indicates the meaning of the cup in the form of a cup; Om (Arabic) ethnicity – mass, majority, common, tavan – ethno. – gift (fruits, clothes). In general, S. Mutalibov's comments on archaisms in his monograph and the examples given in it can provide sufficient information, albeit briefly, about the departure of obsolete words from the sphere of speech at the diachronic and synchronic levels, greatly facilitating their distinction. archaisms of historical words.

References

1. Sayfullaeva R. et al. Textbook "Modern Uzbek Literary Language", T., 2020, pp. 112-113.
2. Mutalibov S. Kratkiy ocherk po istorii morphologii i leksiki [A brief essay on the history of morphology and vocabulary]. - Tashkent, 1959, pp. 188-210.
3. Rakhmatullaev Sh. Arkhaism and Historicism // Scientific Works of Tashkent State University. Vol. 211. – pp. 243-249; This is the author. Archaism // Tursunov Y., Mukhtorov Zh., Rakhmatullaev Sh. Modern Uzbek Literary Language, pp. 157-162, 163-164.
4. Abdullaeva L. Leksicheskaya stylistics uzbekskoy khudozhestvennoy literatury [Lexical stylistics of Uzbek fiction]. - Tashkent, 1979. S. 52-55.
5. Begmatov E. Leksicheskie plasty sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka [Lexical layers of the modern Uzbek literary language]. Tashkent, 1985, pp. 76-78. Cm. See also: Lexicology of the Uzbek Language, pp. 147-151.





6. Kilichev E. Archaiz and history in proze S. Aini. -S. 7-14; Kilichev E. Lexical means artistic image, p. 25-32.
7. Yusupov K. Leksiko-semanticheskie i stylisticheskie osobennosti uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka [Lexico-semantic and stylistic features of the Uzbek literary language]. - Tashkent, 1986, pp. 19-29.
8. S. Mutalibov, Handbook, p. 180.
9. S. Mutalibov, Handbook, p. 181.
10. S. Mutalibov, Handbook, p. 181.
11. S. Mutalibov, Handbook, p. 184.
12. S. Mutalibov, Handbook, p. 184.
13. Shoabdurakhmonov Sh., Askarova M., Khodjiev A., Rasulov I., Donierov H. HOT, T. 1980, part 1. Textbook, p. 125.
14. Sh. Rakhmatullayev. Modern Literary Uzbek Language. T., 2006, p. 91.
15. Lexicology of the Uzbek language, Tashkent, 1981, pp. 142-143.

