

SECTION 29. Literature. Folklore. Translation Studies.

SOME NOTES OF VARIABILITY IN THE UZBEK LINGUISTICS

Abstract: *The article devoted to issues of variability, its forming stages in new period and scientific interpretation. In the article also specified, that wasn't specially researched variability phenomenon in Uzbek linguistics and only in several glossary and terminological dictionaries, and even in them leaned on interpretations from Russian linguistics.*

Key words: *variability, invariant, orthographical principle, orthography, punctuation, glossary, orthography vocabulary, norm, lexical phenomenon, literary language.*

Language: English

Citation: Bozorova DB (2015) SOME NOTES OF VARIABILITY IN THE UZBEK LINGUISTICS. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science 04 (24): 135-138.

Soi: [http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS*04\(24\)22](http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS*04(24)22) **Doi:**  <http://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2015.04.24.22>

The first period of variability corresponds to unlegalized period of orthography rules - to the period up to 1956, that is, to the period up to accept of the "Rules of main orthography and punctuation of Uzbek". Orthography of this period characterized with individuality, predominance of disorder and absence of unique orthography criteria. Especially, that time, inability to express of Uzbek pronounce possibilities and features in Arabian alphabet reasoned very wide application of variability. Also, absence of unique literary language demand brought to exacerbation of this problem. Especially, reforming of Arabian alphabet in the first quarter of the 20th exacerbation of orthography variability problem beyond boundary.

Of course, departure from optionality, rejecting variability also can be related with ideological environment and totalitarian regime policy of that period. Departure from variability in language adapts to literary language demands. But, it doesn't put it way both of to fully departure and fully permit. Of course, fully departure ratherish shadows to diversity of language possibilities, also, brings to rejecting of methodical environment in using a word and possibility of using of lingual beauties on the basis of speech condition, speech situation and methodical appropriateness demands. This was interpreted as "democracy" of methodical flexibility, limited optionality too (3, p. 209). As stated M.V. Panov, variability can be permitted, on conditions, that they are used to expressing delta states in language (11, p.

90). As famous methodologist O.S. Axmanova recognized, such orthography error in schooling related with tragic poor progress of pupils in classes (2, p. 144). Also, V.V. Vinogradov mentioned, that sometimes can be permitted variability: "So long as there are variants and fluctuations in oral literary speech, they can be permitted in written speech too". Maybe, this stating underlies the thesis "orthographical correct writing has exaggerating and overstating in a way". Also, there is a rule, on the basis of which should to write as **надындивидуальный, предыстория**. But, also it is not incorrect to write them as **надиндивидуальный, предистория!** Exactly such differ can be observed in words **не радостный** and **нерадостный** [5].

Globalization, social-economical and political changes in the turn of the 20th century brought to development, interaction of languages and strengthening of orthographical "democracy". Initiated in 90th of the last century first period of orthographical "growth" characterized with giving state language status to the languages, changing the orthography, particularly, changes, which were result of admitting of the script, based on Latin as Uzbek written language.

Impetuosity of new word incoming to languages brought to unsuccessfulness in their registration into lexical systems. And this, in turn, brought to instability and disorderliness, in other words, "orthographical chaos". Even, began

adaptation tendency of already existing European words in Uzbek into Uzbek pronunciation. This, especially, could be obviously observed in periodical publications, for example, as following: *газета – газит; Иркутск – Эркүт; Сибир – Сувбор; журнал – жўрнал*. And this can be estimated as excitement of national sentiments, unaccustomed liberal feelings, of course. By essence, retrospective codification does not always can orthographically “print” all of the new words, what is brings to new orthographical condition in time of weakening the censure and auto-censure” [12, p. 7]. “Orthographical perfect texts lose their former value, and at present days, even accustomed mistakes in advertising materials, shopboards and mass media publishes evidences of this. Even orthographical vocabularies (of course, in commercial publishes) recommended various orthographical variants of one word” [7, p. 35; 8, p. 103-104; 4, p. 114-120].

T.M. Grigoreva and S.V. Ponomareva on the assumption of stating variants, in their work “Norm and variability in Russian orthography” classified variable words in work “Glossary of Russian of the turn of the 20th century: Lingual changes” [12], under the editorship of G.N. Sklyarevskaya. Particularly, stated, that there are 65 variable vocabulary articles in vocabulary. And, 23 of them based on differing of sounds *э/е: лЭйбл – лЕйбл; прайвЕси – прайвЭси*.

In vocabulary priority has traditionalism, which is can be estimated on the basis of “vocabulary→vocabulary→vocabulary”. Because, any vocabulary in the majority of cases bases on the vocabularies, composed before it, and rarely can be observed complying with orthography principles and regular occurrences in this process. For example, in nowadays can be observed tendency of “presenting” mistakes in vocabularies, complying at present. And this witnesses of “elevating” vocabulary practice to the variability propagandizing level, straddling over variability itself.

Also, can be observed trending of variability on the basis of lingual norms in Russian linguistics. Particularly, it is observable research of K.S. Gorbachevich issue of word variability and lingual norms on the basis of Russian materials [6]. In his work analyzed accentologic, phonetic and morphology variants in historical-functional aspects and determined their normative and methodical values. In researching of variants “competition” and appropriate concluding and creating of dynamic norm theory it is important to designating of literary language development tendency. In the work word variability evaluated as lexical-grammatical event, and discussed the questions on the fact, that formal overindulgence is the main feature of living literary language, also, factors originating variability, events of variability elimination and its other contiguous questions, particularly, their relations with synonyms, their classification.

Researches of V.V. Vinogradov and A.I. Smirnitsky on theoretical analyzing of variants considered as the first theoretical work on estimating their classification criteria. Particularly, by V.V. Vinogradov, unique of word on the basis of notion root should be origin of the classification criteria. The scientist by singling out paronymous, but morphologic, phonetic structure, accent, phonomorphologic variants, he stated, that they carry out different tasks and accounts methodical factor as regularity of variability existence and action [5, p. 12-17].

A.I.Smirnitsky advanced two following criteria of variants specification: 1) express possession to general root part and lexical-semantic generality in close to phonetic frame in spite of differs; 2) optionality of material expressing and equivalence of lexical-semantic distinctions in them simultaneously [13, p. 24].

In a word, regards variant as “phonetic declension beyond grammatical form distinction of word” [13, p. 20].

A.I. Smirnitsky sorted out two types of pure variant: 1) lexical-semantic variants; 2) phonomorphologic variants. Also, in turn, phonomorphologic variants divided into two groups: 1) phonetic variants; 2) morphologic variants. And, lexical-semantic variants divided into followings: a) grammatical-morphologic variants; b) grammatical variants; c) word forming variants [13, p. 42].

Besides, classification theory on the basis of teachings of the A.I. Smirnitsky was proceeded by such scientists, as F.P. Filin, K.S. Gorbachevich and L.K. Graudina.

V.M. Solncev has especial viewpoint on variants classification. Particularly, he sorted out speech and lexical-speech variant, and our mentioned variants (speech, orthographical) interpreted as exact meaning expressing, effecting in orthography, various forms of one lexical units in the term of possession to orthogonal formal structures and took this as main basic.

The scientist paid individual attention to grammatical variants and sorted out their three types: 1. Wordforms variability: a) gender forms variability; b) case forms variability; c) participle forms variability. 2. Word forming forms variability. 3. Syntactic variability, consisting of government, concordant and parataxis relations [14, p. 337-338].

Variance, variability are related with many subject areas and they being used widely in linguistics. Term variant is interpreted in 2 volume “Glossary of Uzbek language” as following: “**ВАРИАНТ** [p<lat.] Type of project, plan, scientific, art, literary work, mechanism and etc., created in a different way or other worked out copy. Project, completed in two variants. Variant of epos “Alpomish” written out from Fozil shoir” [15, p.

173]. Interpretation of this word in 5 volume Glossary of Uzbek language similar with this.

In “Glossary of linguistics terms” by academic A.Khojiev linguistic nature of term variant expounded as following: “**ВАРИАНТ** (lat. variants, variants -changeable). Form of lingual unit, formed as result of various changes. For example, affix variant, word variant [16, p. 27].

“**АФФИКСНИНГ ВАРИАНТИ**. Phonetic structural type of affix. For example, *обрўйи – обрўси, уйга – теракка – булоққа, кузги – кечки, келгунча – бириккунча – чиққунча каби*” [16, p. 20].

“**СЎЗНИНГ ВАРИАНТЛАРИ**. Word form with specialty the other side. Word can have variants (phonetic, orphoeric, morphologic and other variants) by various sides. For example, *думалоқ – юмалоқ (фонетик вариант), гулдай-гулдек (морфологик вариант), изла-иста (диалектал вариант)* etc.” [16, p. 96].

In “Linguistic encyclopedic vocabulary” under editorship of V.N. Yartseva term variability analyzed comprehensively. Their comprehensively and in detail commented its lexical and speech, methodical, “horizontal” and “vertical” forms, terms variant-invariant [9, p. 80-81].

In the Encyclopedia stated two type comprehending and interpretation of variant notion: 1) various form expressing of one lexical meaning; 2) displaying of one lexical essence as various speech units.

Within the scope of the first mentioned distinguished notions variant and variation; here is declined notion distinguished as some sample, model, norm, and variant – as codification of norm or recession from it. In this case, isn’t distinguished invariant unit concerning variant. For example, affixes *-за, -ка, -қа, -за, -а, -на, -я* are variable forms of dative case and there is no general invariant for all of these forms. Or words *бадтар* and *баттар* are variable, but no one of them or no word in respect of them is not invariant. There is no tradition to relating orthographical variant with invariant.

In such invariant-variant form approaching to the lexical phenomena, at first used unto phonologic surface unit – phoneme in Prague linguistic study group and other linguistic schools. As was abovementioned, phoneme and speech sound are interpreted as variant. Invariant-variant theory, developed in phonology began to use in other lexical areas, and as result, was costumed distinguishing of emic surface units – invariants (phoneme, lexeme, morpheme and construction) and ethic surface units – variants (sound, word, affix, composition or phon (allophone), morph (allomorph), lexe (allolexe) and etc.), and they reduced to the main methodological basic of structural linguistics.

As we can see, all lingual phenomena can be characterized as variable, possession of own invariants and impossibility of going beyond these invariants.

Also, invariance characterized with comparative abstract degree. For example, word *китобни* is the variant of invariant *[китоб]* and word *[китоб]* [noun] is the variant for its invariant, also speech part [noun] is the variant of the invariant *[сўз]*.

Relations of invariant and variant in various surfaces of lexical system displayed various. For example, if in the phonetics relation of invariant (phoneme) – variant (sound) has only form feature, in other surfaces this relation consist of wholeness of the form and essence. As lexeme invariant, its form and sememe has status of invariant unto the form and meaning of the word as variant. Also, these thesis’s are applicable unto morpheme, construction and their variants too.

Relation of lexical invariant and speech variant can exist in the limit of only one surface. So long as, phoneme and sound can exist only in phonetic surface, morpheme and affix – in morphemic surface, also construction and derivative – in derivation or syntactic surface. Relation of invariant and variant in Uzbek, in terms of lexical and speech dichotomy was researched by D.A. Nabieva [10] by example of phonologic surface.

Of course, approaching to variance phenomenon in terms of lexical-speech dichotomy because of its direct relativity with speech, it can’t be unrelated with orphoepic norms, and this brings to relation with literary norms. “To define phoneme system of vowel sounds in Uzbek literary language and identify its representing by various variants, first of all, should to lean on Uzbek orphoepic norm in defining its and phonologic value of vowels.

In defining of phonologic value of vowels should serve as reference point compulsory variant of vowel in strength position, recognized as sample. Collection of definition features of this variant serves as basic for generalized phoneme describing. In describing of modern Uzbek language phonemes two features recognized as main: taking part of leaps and degree of mouth opening. Several features of vowels loose own feature task for modern Uzbek literary language. That’s why, it should to be recognized as relict feature” [10, p. 26].

Generally speaking, there are various viewpoints on variants existence, what is characterized with their frequent contradictoriness. Some scientists states, that the existence of variants can reason complexity in language, but others stated, that their renunciation can bring to impoverishment of the language. Of course, stabling and grinding of the language shouldn’t be accomplished at the expense of renunciation of the variability. Because, this contradicts principle of variety, which supplies

Impact Factor ISRA (India) = 1.344
Impact Factor ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
based on International Citation Report (ICR)
Impact Factor GIF (Australia) = 0.356

Impact Factor JIF = 1.500
Impact Factor SIS (USA) = 0.912
Impact Factor PIHII (Russia) = 0.179
Impact Factor ESJI (KZ) = 1.042

literary language with flexibility, adaptability to condition and situation, and can bring to “lay hands”

to the methodical possibilities, narrowing of wide possibilities of the literary language.

References:

1. Akhmanova OS (1954) Fonologiya. – Moscow. 1954.
2. Akhmanova OS (1966) Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov. – Moscow, 1966.
3. Akhmanova OS (1957) Ocherki po obshchey i russkoy leksikologii. – Moscow, 1957.
4. Bukchina BZ (1997) Orfograficheskiy slovar' – vseгда li zakon? Rus.rech'. – № 1. – 1997. – pp. 114-120.
5. Vinogradov VV (1955) O formakh slova. Voprosy yazykoznaniya, 1955. - № 4. – pp. 12-17.
6. Gorbachevich KS (1978) Variantnost' slova i yazykovaya norma. Na materialakh sovremennogo russkogo yazyka. – Leningrad, 1978.
7. Grigor'eva TM, Ponomareva SV (2001) Norma i variantnost' v russkoy orfografii. – Moscow, 2001.
8. Ivanova VF, Osipov BI (1996) O nedobrakachestvennykh izdaniyakh orfograficheskikh slovarey. Vestnik Omskogo un-ta. –Omsk, 1996. – pp. 103-104.
9. (1990) Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar' / Gl.red. V.N.Yartseva, - Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1990.
10. Nabieva DA (1998) Ўzbek tilida lisoniy birliklarning invariant-variant munosabati: Filol.fan.nomz. diss... avtoreferati. – Toshkent, 1998.
11. Panov MV (1963) Ob usovershenstvovanie russkoy orfografii. Voprosy yazykoznaniya, 1963. - № 2.–pp.89-90.
12. (1988) Sklyarevskaya Tol'kovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka kontsa KhKh v.: Yazykovye izmeneniya» -SPB.: Folio-Press, 1988.
13. Smirnitiskiy AI (1956) Leksikologiya angliyskogo yazyka.– Moscow: Izd.lit. na inostr.yaz., 1956.
14. Solntsev VM (1988) Variantnost'. Bol'shoy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'. Yazykoznanie. Gl.red. V.N.Yartseva – Moscow: Bol'shaya Rossiyskaya entsiklopediya, 1988. – pp.337-338.
15. (1981) Ўzbek tilining izoxli lurati. 2 tomli. 60 000 c'yz va s'yz birikmasi / S.F.Akobirov, T.A.Alikulov, S.I.Ibragimov va boshq.; Z.M.Ma"rufov taxriri ostida.– Moscow: Russkiy yazyk, 1981.
16. Xozhiev A (2002) Tilshunoslik terminlarining izoxli lurati / Mas"ul muxarrir: A.Madvaliev. – Toshkent: Ўzbekiston Milliy entsiklopediyasi, 2002.

