The Scale of Archaic Words in the Lexicon of Alisher Navoi's Historical Works

Dilnoza Akramovna Abduvaliyeva
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD)
Lecturer, Department of Methods of Teaching the Uzbek Language
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute named after A. Qodiriy

ABSTRACT: The contribution of the great poet Alisher Navoi to the development, improvement and progress of the ancient Uzbek literary language is incomparable. The Turkish language has acquired a high status thanks to his works. The lexicon used in the work of the thinker, to some extent, serves as the basis for determining the lexicon of the Old Uzbek literary language. Historical works of the author, such as *"Tarihi Muluki Ajam"* and *"Tarihi Anbiyo va Hukamo"*, were selected as the object of research. The article analyzes archaic words in the vocabulary of the mentioned historical works. Archaic words in the vocabulary of historical works are taken not for a time, but for the period in which the works were created (XV century). Archaisms in the lexicon of historical works are determined on the basis of the state and development of lexical units in synonymous relations, and this is scientifically substantiated.

KEYWORDS: Lexicology, lexeme, obsolete words, antiquity paint, archaism, archaism lexeme, archaism semema, ancient Turkic language, old Turkic language, old Uzbek literary language.

INTRODUCTION

The language, especially its vocabulary, is constantly evolving. Such growth does not happen quickly and decisively. Therefore, in terms of modernity, different units coexist. There are two main layers in the vocabulary in terms of modernity: the modern layer and the contemporary layer [1. 100].

The modern layer includes lexemes that are considered common in the practice of language of a certain period. Lexemes in this layer have neither new nor old color. The same is true of most lexemes [1. 100].

The definition of belonging to the modern stratum is based not on the position of the lexeme in the speech of individuals, but on its general position in the language.

The amount of their use in speech is also not taken into account when introducing lexemes into the modern layer. A lexeme commonly used in speech usually belongs to the modern layer.

The lexeme to be introduced into the modern layer does not have to be familiar to all members of the language and used in the language of all. The terminology of each industry is usually familiar only to a representative of that industry, others do not need to know these terms; such terms are not generally used. Nevertheless, the terms can be included in the modern layer.

The lexeme introduced into the modern layer must meet one basic requirement: it must be neither new nor old-fashioned.

Apparently, it would be incorrect to call and describe the modernity of lexemes as active-passive layers. Active-passive is another aspect of lexical richness - a quantitative approach, and such a study of lexical richness certainly leads to important theoretical and practical conclusions.

Lexemes with a novelty or antiquity color form a contemporary layer of vocabulary richness. Such a layer exists at every stage of development of the language, since the richness of the vocabulary is constantly evolving. That is why the contemporary layer also lives in the richness of the dictionary.

The Scale of Archaic Words in the Lexicon of Alisher Navoi's Historical Works

In the contemporary layer there are phenomena that are mutually exclusive: lexemes with the color of novelty, lexemes with the color of antiquity [1. 101].

Below we consider the lexemes of historical works written by Alisher Navoi, which have the color of antiquity according to their time.

An old-fashioned language unit is known as archaism (Greek arshaios – "ancient"). The type in lexemes is called lexical Archaism [1. 101].

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

It's the one thing for a lexeme to be old it's another for it to have an old color. Archaism is specific to the dictionary of the language of the period in which it was consumed and differs from other lexical units in the presence of antiquity.

Lexical units that are completely out of use, belonging to the past stage of language development, cannot be considered archaic from today's point of view. These are lexical units of the past, and whether or not they are archaic is determined by that stage of language development.

It is often difficult to explain the cause of Archaism. Archaism arises as a result of one aspect of the original lexical unit becoming obsolete and giving way to another lexical unit. This process happens for a variety of reasons. Archaism is generally based on synonymy, so the interpretation of the emergence of archaism should be based on the state and development of lexical units in a synonymous relationship. The main reasons for this are:

1) Due to the fact that synonyms are not used in the same way in speech, some of them become archaic: a lexical unit that was previously used more or equally with others is used less in speech than its synonym (s) and becomes archaic. For example, Navoi's historical works TAH [2. 705a-728b] ("*Tarihi Anbiyo va Hukamo*") and TMA [2. 729a-743b] (*"Tarihi Muluki Ajam"*) in the dictionary to express the meaning of "sun" (TMA 729b11) - *quyaš* (TAH 711a1) - *günäš* (TMA 737a14) -– *künäs* (TMA 737a14) – *mehr* (TMA 736a29) used synonyms. If we pay attention to the frequency of use of lexemes that form this series of meanings, in the lexicon of both works Uyghur- Qarluq, Kipchak dialects *quyaš* 6 times, its Oghuz phonetic variant *günäš* 5 times, *künäs* variant 1 times, the Arabic word *mehr* 2 times means "sun" can be seen. By the time of the Old Uzbek literary language, the ancient Turkic language and the lexeme *künäs*, which were actively used in the Old Turkic language, began to become archaic.

2) The semantics of a polysemous lexeme has its own synonym, on the one hand, under the influence of the presence of such a synonym, on the other hand, under the influence of another semantic of the same polysemous lexeme. As a result, the position of both such semantics and synonyms in the language changes. For example, in the lexeme of fine, the meaning of "penalty" became more and more archaic: *Raáyaya xirojnï artturdï va sipáhïya juzviy jarima üčün qatlnï lázim tuttï* (TMA 740a27). In the text of historical works, the historian has effectively used lexemes such as *ayb* (TAH 720a21) – *gunáh* (TMA 740a25) – *yazuɣ* (TAH 717b29) – *xatá* (TMA 737a4) to express the meaning of "penalty".

The above circumstances do not provide an in-depth explanation for the emergence of archaism. Determining the root causes of the emergence of archaism requires complex research. Indeed, the emergence of archaism is associated with semantic developments, changes inherent in the phenomena and lexemes that occur in language. Such a process, on the one hand, cannot be studied in the context of the current stage of language development alone; second, every process that leads to archaism requires an individual approach each time [1. 107].

It is known that lexical archaism is divided into groups such as archaism-lexeme, archaism-semema [1. 104].On this basis, we analyze the units that belong to the archaic layer in consumption in the historical works of Alisher Navoi.

Archaism-lexemes, in an archaism-lexeme, the lexeme becomes obsolete as a whole. In the text of historical works, the meaning of "god, creator, god" is in Turkish *teŋri* (TMA 729b 24), Arabic *iláh* (TAH 713b7) – *xáliq* (TAH 718b29) – *haq (q)* (TAH 719a15) – *alláh* (TAH 706b24), Persian and Tajik *xudáy* (TMA 742b21) – *yazdán* (TAH 719a13) – *parvardigár* (TAH 708b13) expressed using lexemes such as. The author uses the spring archaism-lexeme in this nine-word semantic series as a methodological tool: *Har kimni xalás qïlsa eldin yazdán, Ne taŋ aŋa umrï abadiy bolsa nihán* (TAH 719a13)*.* Observations have shown that in the vocabulary of historical works, the lexeme *yazdán* belonging to this semantic nest is the least productive (1 time) and the lexeme *haq (q)* is the most actively used (91 times).

In the text of the works the meaning of "*cho'l, dasht, biyobon, sahro*"is expressed by the following words: *biyábán: ... anïŋ sipáhi Jálut vahmidin biyábánda isiy havá šiddatidin mutafarriq bolub, üč yüz on kiši bilä Jálutqa yetišdi* (TAH 719b17); *bádiya*: ... *ta haq taálá ul qavmnï qïrq yïl ul bádiyada azáb bilä halák qïldï* (TAH 717a4); *dašt*: *Va Yunus a.s. tifl erdi, neča kundin soŋra yana taɣ-u dašt azimati qïldï* (TAH 719a3); *sahrá*: *Baytul-muqaddasnïŋ sahrásï ustiɣa kelib, bošlarïn yaloŋ qïlïb tazarru' qïldïlar* (TAH 721a1); *yazï*: *Va sekizinči balá ul erdikim, yazï vuhuš va sibáïnï haq taálá alarɣa musallat qïldïkim, azáb qïldïlar* (TAH 716a10)*.* Observations have shown that the original Turkic language used in the semantics of *"cho'l, sahro, tekis yer"* is originally

The Scale of Archaic Words in the Lexicon of Alisher Navoi's Historical Works

in Turkish *yazï* (DTS, 251) the lexemes of the Persian-Tajik and Arabic languages became archaic as a result of the assimilation and activation of the lexemes into the old Uzbek literary language.

It is well known that assimilation is treated as a result of international relations, on the one hand, and as a source of language distortion, on the other. Neighborhood, trade, diplomatic relations, etc. in a particular region, historical connections give rise to assimilations in one language or another. It is impossible to find any language that is free of assimilations [3. 28].

The meaning of "city, village, dwelling" is understood in the text of the works with the help of Sogdian city and Arabic *šahr [4. 108]*. The above semantic works are expressed in the vocabulary, mainly through the lexeme of the *šahr* (89th place). The word *Kent* is relatively unproductive and has been used 9 times. This shows that the ancient Turkic language and the *Kent* lexeme, which were actively used in the Old Turkic language, became somewhat archaic by the time of the old Uzbek literary language.

The Turkish lexeme *egrim*[5. 166], used in Old Turkic and Old Turkic to mean "a place where water collects, a whirlpool", gradually began to give way to Persian-Tajik *girdáb*: *Samud qavmïnï fasád va makáni egrimidä yarqa qïlyan yergä yetib, suv tiläb ičkändin soŋra hamul girdábqa čömdi* (TAH 707b24).

The meaning of "benefit" is in the text of centuries *asïy – maslahat – naf' – sud – fáyda* expressed using synonyms: *Kišigä bolsa kökkä čïqmoq fan, Ne asïy körsä áqibat madfan* (TMA 729b3); *Áqïl uldurkim, bu qïsqa umrnï bir nimägä sarf qïlyaykim, zaruratroqdur, ya'ni áxirat maslahati va teŋri taálá rizásï* (TAH 728b6); *Ilyás a.s. čun alarya üčräb dedikim, ey nádán qavm, bu jamádlardïn heč naf' va zarar yoqdur* (TAH 718b28); *Va Málik bu savdádïn masrur erdikim, Misrda aniŋ bahásïdïn sud mutasavvar erdi* (TAH 711a11); *Čun fáydasi yoq erdi* (TMA 738b17). At this point, the author uses his high artistic skills and uses the Turkish asykh archaism-lexeme to elevate the speech, to give a delicate spirit, the lexeme lives as a methodological tool. In turn, the word is obsolete under the influence of Arabic and Persian-Tajik meanings in the era of the old Uzbek literary language.

In TAH, the meaning of "bag, sack" is expressed using the Turkish lexemes *tobra* and the Arabic *xarita*: *Va men ul tašnï alïb tobraya saldïm* (TAH 720a3); *Sáhirlär kelib, iki yïlan xaritadin čïqardïlarkim, iki uy boldïlar* (TAH 726b25). This meaning is also expressed in the works of Navoi in the Old Turkic language and the word *sanač[6. 24]*, which is used in the Old Turkic language, but this word is not observed in the text of historical works.

In this play, the Persian-Tajik *baxšiš* [5. 89], which is used in the ancient Turkic language in the sense of "tuhfa, ehsan", is used as a "hadya, tuhfa, in'om, ehson; muruvvat, karam, marhamat" (gift). *Jabrail a.s. kelib, baxšiš bašáratin keltürüb dedikim, Uryánïŋ rizásïn hásil qïl, teŋri taálá karami bilä xud gunáhiŋdin ötti* (TAH 720b17^18). The meaning of "hand" is rich in both works *ilik – qol – dast – yad* expressed using lexical units in a series of semantics: *… turunj kesärya ilikläridä bičaqlar erdi* (TAH 711a23); *Čïqardï jahán mulkïdïn váyasïz, Qolï kám naqdïdïn máyasïz* (TMA 733b24); *… zor dast bilä Rustamni tutqay* (TMA 732a11^12); *Čun boldï bihišt sarï ma'vásï aniŋ, Ne qaldï asá, ne yadï bayzásï aniŋ* (TAH 717b14). The Turkish lexeme *ilik[5. 207]* differs from the synonymous Turkish kal, Persian-Tajik *dast*, yad in Arabic meaning "hand" (the word *yadï bayzá* used to mean "white hand, shiny hand" in relation to the hand of the Prophet Moses) is old-fashioned.

The meaning of "return" is expressed in the Turkish verb to *yanmaq – qaytmoq*:...*qaysarnïŋ qïzïn qolub, Rumdïn yandï* (TMA 732b25); *Šápur fath va nusrat bilä qayttï* (TMA 735b22) The burning lexeme in the semantic series differs from its synonym in that it has an archaic character. If we pay attention to the frequency of use of these units, we will see that in the text of the works *qaytmoq* is used 22 times, *qaytmoq* 8 times..

The meaning of "bread" is expressed in the text of the works in five places by the Persian-Tajik *nán* and in two places by the archaic lexeme *ötmäk*: *Qalyanïya nán toyrab, itkä berdi ersä, halák boldï* (TMA 735b1); *Hájar andïn yaryučaq bilä un qïlïb, ötmak pïšurdï* (TAH 709a14).

In the Old Turkic language, the lexeme *oylay*, which is actively used in the sense of "goat child, goat" and has become obsolete since the time of the old Uzbek literary language, has a syntagmatic relationship with the lexeme biryan *biryan qïl=* meaning "roast" in the TAH text: *Filhál bir semiz oyláynï biryan qïlïb, Isháq a.s. qašïya keltürdi* (TAH 710a17). Also, the word *biryan* with the lexeme *balïy* means "fried fish": *Ammá máida nán va biryan balïy erdi* (TAH 725b15).

"The meaning of "cow, ox" is expressed by the Turkish lexeme *uy*: *Yusuf a.s. ayttïkim, semiz uylar, taza xašalar toqluy va ziráatlïy yïlya dalildür va aruy uylar bilä quruq xašalar qahatlïqqa dal* (TAH 711b13). It should be noted that the word *uy* is now used in some Kipchak dialects to mean "cow".

Archaism lexical units are evaluated in relation to their mutual synonymous relationship. Since archaism is related to synonymy, it is based on the comparison of units belonging to a synonymous nest, in speech the most appropriate of these synonyms is used selectively [1. 107].

In the vocabulary of historical works, the meaning of "food" is concentrated in the following synonymous components, consisting of their own and assimilated lexemes: *qut (TAH 713a9) – ašlïy (TAH 711b14) – yegülük (TAH 711b23) – yemäk (TAH 725a8) – taám (TAH 725b10) – tu'ma (TAH 727b22) – azuq (TAH 717a8) – zád (TAH 717a10) – máida (TAH 725b9) – rizq (TAH*

The Scale of Archaic Words in the Lexicon of Alisher Navoi's Historical Works

711b26). The lexeme *qut* (DTS, 471) of the Old Turkic language in the series of semantics is characterized by its archaic character: *Va Rahima yá muzdurluq, yá gadáylïq qïlïb, Ayyub a.s.ya qut keltürür erdi* (TAH 713a9).

It is known that the interrogative pronoun *Qayu* is characteristic of the language of monuments of the XIII-XIV centuries and was used in some works in the XV-XVI centuries [1. 156]. This interrogative pronoun is used in TMA in two places to mean "which": *Debankim qayu aldï mulk, Jahán anï ne yaŋlïy etti nihán* (TMA 742b25). To express this meaning, the author basically used which word.

"The meaning of "many, many" is reflected in the TAH text in the lexeme *čak-čoq*: *...barča xalq anïŋ bilä čïqyandïn soŋra, šahrda zuafá dayï čoq-čoq matáflargä sayrya mašyul boldï* (TAH 708b4). It is known that the word *čox*, originally in the Turkic languages of the Oghuz group, was used in Navoi's works to mean "many, abundant, plentiful." This lexeme is "great; many; very "is still used in the biblical style [7. 527]. In the vocabulary of historical works, this meaning is understood mainly using the lexeme *köp*. The meaning of "hundreds, many" *yüzär-yüzär* expressed using an archaic lexeme: *...xalqdïn yüzär-yüzär kiši ayïrib buyurdïkim, kentlär, hisárlar yasadïlar* (TAH 706a3).

Archaism-semema: It is well known that archaism is not a lexeme in semema, but one of its semantics is archaism. A number of archaic meanings can also be observed in the lexicon of the historical works we are examining: For example, as the Turkish lexeme *asra=* "keep, hide, guard" became more prevalent, the meaning of "capture, occupy, guard" became more and more archaic. *Har kimsäki pok esä dayádïn, Teŋri anï asrasun baládïn* (TAH 728a21); *Bu hazayandïn on yetti oylïnï bir hisárya salïb, mahbus asrab qoymas erdi* (TMA 741b2). "The meaning of "control, captivity" is basically, *band qïl=* understood by the lexeme.

Täŋri lexeme in the ancient Turkic language 1) "the sky"; 2) "god"; 3) "religious, divine, very beautiful, unique"; 4) "ruler, master" used in the sense of [5. 544] (DTS, 544), in the language of Navoi's works, especially in his historical works, the meaning of the word "god" [8. 180] is observed only: *Čun täŋri taálá amrïdïn boyun tolyodï* (TAH 705a14). The remaining meanings in the semantic structure of the word are outdated and they are expressed through their own and other lexical units belonging to the assimilated layer.

In the ancient Turkic language, the word *kiši* 1) "man, peculiar to man"; 2) used in the sense of "wife" [5. 310].By the time of the old Uzbek literary language, the lexeme did not mean "Female, wife" and was used only in the sense of "person, man, human, individual" [4. 121]. (ANATIL, II, 121): *Avval kišikim, náhaq qán qïldï Qábil erdi* (TAH 705b1). "The word "wife" means Arabic in the text of the works *zavja, mankuha, haram* and Sogdian *xátun* manifested in lexemes: *Ittifáqá anïŋ zavjasi bu darvázadïn sayrya ázim erdi* (TAH 708b5); *Tafahhus qïlyándïn soŋra bildikim, Uryánïŋ mankuhasidür* (TAH 720b5); *Yana bir kün öz haramläri bilä zist qïlur erdi* (TAH 720a26^27); *Hamul zamán ul xátunni taláq qïldï, yana birävni nikáh qïldï* (TAH 709b21).

Both types of archaism are based on lexical meaning. Archaism-lexeme occurs as a result of the obsolescence of the monosemem lexeme, and archaism- semema occurs as a result of the obsolescence of one of the s sememas specific to the polysemous lexeme. The occurrence of both types of archaism is related to the language's own path of development (regardless of whether the lexical meaning that becomes archaism is its own lexeme or assimilated lexeme) [1. 105].

In the study, historical works were classified into groups such as archaism-lexeme and archaism-semema, which became obsolete by the time of the old Uzbek literary language. In the course of research in this regard, it was found that in the lexicon of both historical works, archaism-lexemes are quantitatively superior to archaism-semema.

REFERENCES

1) Rahmatullayev Sh. Modern literary Uzbek language.1. –T. A classic word. 2010. –p.100.
2) Navoi College, Istanbul, Suleymaniye Library, Fotix Foundation, № Electronic microfilm of 4050 inverter digital manuscript, Book "Tarihi Anbiyo"–p. 705a-728b.
3) Dadaboev H., Hamidov Z., Kholmanova Z. History of lexicon of Uzbek literary language. Fan. Tashkent: 2007. –p. 28.
4) Annotated Dictionary of the Language of Alisher Navoi's Works, Volume II. - Tashkent: Fan, 1983. –p.108
5) Ancient Türkic dictionary. L .: Nauka, 1969. –p. 166.
6) Egamova Sh. D. Ancient Turkic lexical units in the language of Alisher Navoi's works. Science and technology. Tashkent: 2010. –p. 24.
7) Annotated dictionary of the Uzbek language. 5 volumes. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan. Volume 4, 2008. –p. 527.
8) Annotated Dictionary of the Language of Alisher Navoi's Works, Volume III. Tashkent: Fan, 1984. –p.180