

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2022 Issue: 02 Volume: 106

Published: 26.02.2022 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Gulchekhra Nasirovna Davlyatova

Ferghana State University
Associate Professor, Candidate Of Pedagogical Sciences,
Ferghana City, Uzbekistan

Dilorom Abdusamievna Kholmatova

Ferghana Polytechnic Institute
a teacher of Russian,
Ferghana City, Uzbekistan

HISTORICAL AND GENETIC STRATA OF ETHNOGRAPHIC VOCABULARY OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Abstract: The article under discussion reveals historical and genetic strata of ethnographic vocabulary of the Uzbek language. The authors of the article believe that loanwords are one of the most important factors in the linguistic environment. The role of borrowing the vocabulary of different languages, in the mutual enrichment and interpenetration of different cultures is increasing. Borrowing is a natural way of lexicon enrichment and development of modern languages. The scientific novelty of this study is determined by the fact that it is a multidimensional study that examines the problems of Arabicisms from a historical perspective, and the borrowings are considered on the basis of a systematic and integrated approach.

Key words: ethnographic, vocabulary, Uzbek, medium, loanwords, systemic, approach, Arabic, research, culture, interpenetration.

Language: English

Citation: Davlyatova, G. N., & Kholmatova, D. A. (2022). Historical and genetic strata of ethnographic vocabulary of the Uzbek language. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 02 (106), 585-588.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-02-106-62> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2022.02.106.62>

Scopus ASCC: 3310.

Introduction

In its historical development, the Uzbek language has interacted with many languages. This interaction was caused by territorial proximity and economic and cultural ties of the Uzbek people with a number of peoples.

The study of ethnographic vocabulary of the Uzbek language [10; 11] shows that this language has a number of borrowings from Russian, Arabic, Persian and other languages. However, one should not ignore the fact that no matter how many words of ethnographical lexicon of foreign origin were in the vocabulary of Uzbek language, they could not change the structure of the language. These borrowed words have been subordinated to regularities and rules (especially to its phonetic norms) and to the grammatical structure of the Uzbek language.

Adopting of foreign words happens during all the development of Uzbek language, but their quantity can be different at different periods. Not all borrowings are acquired to the same extent. Linguists distinguish two types of borrowings: assimilated and mastered and assimilated, but not mastered. Such borrowings from the vocabulary of the Uzbek language are difficult to distinguish from native words, and a scientific and etymological analysis is necessary for this [17, p.135].

The words learnt, but not mastered differ from the native Uzbek words in some respects, they are not completely subordinated to phonetic and grammatical structure of the language. Already by structure, without etymological analysis we can determine, that a given word is not indigenous.

As a rule, a borrowed word comes into the language together with new things and phenomena or

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

new concepts, words for which there was no word in the language. In different historical periods foreign words are borrowed in different ways. Before the 20th century, the overwhelming majority of loanwords penetrated into Uzbek language from Arabic language mainly through literature, but later the inflow of words from Russian language. Borrowed words from Arabian and Persian are actively used in Uzbek language as something organic, i.e. as native Uzbek word. These are, mainly, Arab and Persian words-terms, belonging to different thematic groups, namely names of food, drinks and utensils: *tovoq* 'a big copper or cast-iron frying-pan, names of household goods', *gilam* 'a carpet'; religious terms: *jahannam* 'hell', *jannat* 'paradise' and from other thematic groups: *bezak* 'decorations'; *vatan* 'fatherland/motherland'; *qiliq* 'habit' and others.

As scholars note, Arabic loanwords penetrated into the Uzbek language as a result of the Islamization process. The establishment of the enormous State Caliphate in the 8th to the 9th centuries, the involvement of the Central Asian peoples in the formation of Muslim civilization, and the creation of favourable conditions for close linguistic contact ensured the penetration of Arabic loanwords into the Uzbek language. The Arabization of the moral and spiritual, socio-political and scientific-educational life of medieval society led to the Arabization of the Uzbek language. Arabic borrows have taken a stable and dominant position.

Today, Arabicisms constitute a significant part of the Uzbek lexicon. They are successfully and comprehensively introduced in the linguistic structure of the language. But Arabicisms have not turned into a canonized, immutable, once and for all established dogmatic layer of vocabulary. The Uzbek language was developing and changing, and the Arabicisms were developing along with it.

During the Soviet period, Arabicisms faced a targeted policy of their rejection and removal from the Uzbek language. Arabicisms were viewed as an archaic legacy of the feudal past. Many of them were replaced by equivalents from other languages. Vocabulary relating to the religious sphere began to fall out of use. During the period when Uzbekistan became independent (1991) similar processes began to occur in borrowings from Russian language and international vocabulary [13, p.143; 25]. For borrowings from Arabic there was a time of revival. Linguistic orientation has also undergone changes. Uzbek was declared the sole State language. It was decided to switch to the Latin script. A Terminology Committee was established to purge the Uzbek language of the dominance of international Russian vocabulary. During this period, many international words borrowed through the Russian language and widely used in the Soviet period were replaced by their Arabic equivalents. It was the second, after the medieval period, less powerful wave of introduction

of Arabicisms. At the same time, Arabicisms that had previously fallen out of the language began to be reintroduced into the language. Therefore, the question of the status of Arabicisms in the Uzbek language is multifaceted and complex.

The problem of the study of Arabicisms in the Uzbek language has its own prehistory. Lexicography in Turkology has its origins in the dictionary of Mahmud Kashgari (11th century), *Diwanu lugati-t-turk* (Dictionary of Turkic Words). The Arabic-Uzbek dictionary "Asasu-1-balaga" ("Fundamentals of Eloquence") and the Arab-Uzbek-Persian-Mongolian dictionary "Muqaddamatu-1-'adab" ("Fundamentals of Word Sciences") by Mahmud Zamakhshari (11th century) are among the first lexicological works that studied the Arabic and Uzbek languages comparatively. The explanatory dictionary of Turkic words "At-tuxfatu-z-zakiyyatu fi-lugati-t-turkiyya" ("Gifts of meanings of Turkic words") was created in the XIII century, the dictionary of Chagatai and Persian words "Bada'iyyu-1-luga" ("Beauty of words") by Tole Imani Hiravi preserved from the XV century. Alisher Navoi (15th century) wrote a treatise "Muxakamatu-1-lugatayn" ("Comparison of Two Languages") and a dictionary of Arabic "Sab 'atu abxur" ("The Seven Seas"). The Chagatai Turkish dictionary "Abusqa" was created in the 16th century, the Chagatai/Persian dictionary "Sanglax" by Mirza Mahdihan in the 18th century, and the Uzbek-Persian dictionary "Kelurnoma" by Yakub Chingi ("The Tale of Return") in the 17th century; *Muntaxabu-1-lugat* ("Dictionary of Selected Words") by Muhammad Rizo Hoksor in the 18th century; and Sulaymon Bukhari's "Lugat-i chigatayi wa turk-i 'usmani" ("Lexicon of Chagatai and Turkish-Ottoman Words") in the 19th century [24, p.46; 22; 12, p.19; 8].

The history of the Arabic language and the peculiarities of Arabic borrowings have been considered in the works of many scholars. Linguists G.Sh. Sharbatov, V.E. Shagal, V.M. Belkin and A.G. Belova made a great contribution to the study of the Arabic language and the problem of Arabism borrowing [20;21;3;4]. Borrowing theory has been studied by both foreign and domestic scholars. A. K. Borovkov and S. S. Yudakhin are the first to study the vocabulary of the Uzbek language [5;6;23]. A. Gulyamov dealt with word formation in the Uzbek language. A specific study of Arabicisms in the Uzbek language begins with the work of F. Abdullaev "Arabicisms in the Uzbek language" [1]. Further, the questions of phonetic-morphological and lexico-semantic analysis of Arabicisms in the poetic language of Alisher Navoi (A. Rustamov, A. Kh. Nishanov), the lexicon of A. Navoi's works (B. Bafoev, I. Nasyrov), the principles of compiling manuscript dictionaries to the works of A. Navoi (B. R. Khasanov), the issues of transformation in the semantic structure of Arabic borrowings (T. Rakhmanov), the relationship of Arabicisms to

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

paradigmatic assimilation (B. Kh. Eshonkulov). A dictionary of Arabic and Persian words of the Uzbek language was published in the mid-90s [14, p.20; 15, p.17; 2].

Sh. Rahmatullaev successfully worked on the systemic study of the Uzbek language, the study of Turkic layer in the vocabulary composition of the language, and the compilation of explanatory dictionaries of homonyms, antonyms, etymological dictionary, and dictionary of active vocabulary. The official written Old Turkic language, a book language, also facilitated the penetration of Arabic language elements. Unlike borrowings from other languages, Arabic words did not penetrate into all spheres of life. Most of them are represented in the following lexical categories.

Arabisms have been studied in relation to Turkish, Azeri, Bashkir, Kazakh, Dari, Uighur, Tajik, Persian, Kumyk, Gagauz, East Caucasian languages as well as Uzbek. But the lexical-semantic state of Arabisms in each of these languages has its own specificity. Different languages differ from each other in the ways of penetration and peculiarities of their assimilation.

Unlike other languages, not all areas of Uzbek life were infiltrated with Arabic words. Most of them are present in the following lexical classes: in words denoting religious notions: *Allah* 'God'; *tasbeh* 'rosary'; *Qur'on* 'The Quran'; names of individual rituals, customs, beliefs: *nikoh* 'to perform the Muslim rite of marriage', *sunnat to'y* 'rite of circumcision'; *sandiq* 'wooden stand for folding bedding'; *sham* 'candle', 'firepot'; *qabr* 'grave'; *salla* 'Muslim man's headwear'.

Besides Arabic, Persian elements in the Uzbek vocabulary constitute a small layer of words. Usually in Uzbek linguistics Arabic and Persian borrowings were considered together, although it was noted, their penetration into Uzbek language is different: if the Arabic words were mostly borrowed through the book language, the Persian words were borrowed by means of live communication between the two peoples, mostly on the basis of trade relations. At the same time one cannot ignore the fact that a certain number of words could be borrowed through other Turkic languages and also through literature.

In different studies, the same words are referred to as Arabisms or Farsiisms. This is due to the fact that the relationship between the Arabic and Persian languages is not taken into account. Observations of Persian loanwords show that they are heterogeneous in their role and, accordingly, in their usage. Farsiisms in ethnographical layer of Uzbek language confirm the linguists' opinion about two types of loanwords:

1) borrowings, caused by the entry into the everyday life of the thing itself, and 2) borrowing words that are synonyms used simultaneously with words at the same time as the words of the mother tongue. A part of Farsi words has come into Uzbek

language together with realities, which haven't been used in nomadic life could not be used by the Uzbek.

The other part of Persian loanwords bears a stamp of literary character. They are either words of poetic or book style. For a long time they have existed with Uzbek words, being limited in their usage. Many of them have now passed into the realm of the passive vocabulary and function in the language as obsolete.

Most of the Arabo-Persian words, having penetrated into Uzbek language, have undergone semantic changes, which are insufficiently studied. These changes went along the lines of narrowing or broadening of meanings, and loss of old meanings and appearance of new meanings: narrowing of meanings is a characteristic semantic feature which often accompanies loanwords. One of reasons for narrowing of meanings, as noted by L.A. Bulakhovsky [7, p.73], is the fact that words are usually borrowed in isolation, in particular instances of their use, rather than by the etymological groups by which they live in their native soil.

Among the borrowings of Arabic-Persian vocabulary in Uzbek words with a narrower meaning make up about a quarter of the total borrowings from the Arabic-Persian language: Pers. *lagan* 'a copper basin'; Arabic, *oyat* 'sign, mark, wonder, the Quran's verse'; Pers. *kasa* 'bowl, cup, box, nest' - Uz. 'piala, bowl' and others.

In other Turkic languages, e.g. Kazakh, "the absolute majority of words of Arabic and Iranian origin consist of words denoting abstract concepts and they are mostly subject to extensions while words denoting the concepts of concrete objects do not as a rule expand their scope [19, p.74].

Thus, the new meanings of the words may appear, retaining the original meanings of the prototypes, which are not always connected. New meanings in borrowed words can appear while preserving the original meanings of the prototypes, the semantic connection with which can be traced - not always clearly, but nevertheless traceable. Usually, revealing this relationship is facilitated by revealing the history of the development of a particular word.

Conclusion

Borrowing is one of the most important factors of the linguistic environment. The role of borrowing the vocabulary of different languages, in the mutual enrichment and interpenetration of different cultures is increasing. Borrowing is a natural and natural way of lexicon enrichment and development of modern languages. However, so far the issue of the theoretical understanding of loanwords has not been finally resolved, especially regarding the definition of the linguistic characteristics of loanwords - what they are and what their main features are. There are different definitions and points of view. In our opinion, the phenomenon of borrowing is still a more extensive,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 9.035	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

deep, versatile and complex phenomenon than its scientific comprehension.

References:

1. Abdullaev, F.A. (1946). *Arabisms in the Uzbek language*. - Tashkent.
2. Bafoev, R. (1989). *The lexicon of the works of Alisher Navoi (lexico-semantic, statistical and thematic studies)*. Author's Dissertation ... D. in Philosophy. Tashkent.
3. Belkin, V.I. (1975). *Arabic lexicology*. - Moscow: MSU Press.
4. Belova, A.G. (1994). *Historical Morphology of Arabic*. -Moscow: Oriental Literature Publishing, RAS.
5. Borovkov, A.K. (1940). Changes in the field of Uzbek vocabulary and a new alphabet based on the Russian script. *Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR*, № 4.
6. Borovkov, A. K. (n.d.). *Lexicographic tradition in the Dictionaries of the Chagatai language*. – Tashkent, 1927-1928.
7. Bulakhovsky, L.A. (1954). *Introduction to Linguistics*. part 2. (p.73). Moscow.
8. Khasanov, B. (1981). *Alisher Navoiyning "Sab'at abhur" lugati*. - Toshkent: Fun.
9. Khasanov, B. R. (1989). *Principles of composing the hand-written dictionary to the works of Navoi*. Author's dissertation ... D. in Philology, -Tashkent.
10. Kholmatova, D. (2021). Peculiarities of kinship terminology in turkic languages. *Universum: filologija i iskusstvovedenie: jelektron. nauchn. zhurn.*, 9(87). <https://7universum.com/ru/philology/archive/item/12273>
11. Kholmatova, D. (2020). Theoretical Aspects of Studying Ethnography as a Scientific Discipline. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, № 6(8), pp. 312-316. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343677260_Theoretical_Aspects_of_Studying_Ethnography_as_a_Scientific_Discipline
12. Khusainov, N. D. (1982). *Lexicographic characteristics of the Sheikh Suleiman Bukhari dictionary "Lugati chagatai va turki usmani"*. Author's dissertation ... Candidate of Philosophy. (p.19). Tashkent.
13. Levitin, L., & Carline, D. S. (1996). *Islam Karimov - President of the new Uzbekistan*. (p.143). Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
14. Nishonov, A. Kh. (1966). *D. in Philology*. Tashkent.
15. Nishonov, A. Kh. (1990). *Phonetic-morphological and lexical-semantic analysis of the Arabicisms in the language of A. Navoi*. Author's dissertation ... Candidate of Philological sciences. (p.17). Tashkent.
16. Nasyrov, I. (1980). *Lexis of "Mazhalilis-un-nafais" by A. Navoi*. Auth. dissertation ... Bishkek.
17. Reformatsky, A.A. (1967). *Introduction to linguistics*. (p.135). Moscow.
18. Rustamov, A. (1966). *Phonetic and morphological features of Alisher Navoi's language*. *D. in Philology*. Tashkent.
19. Rustemov, M.Z. (1963). *Arab-Iranian loanwords in the Kazakh language*. Dis. Candidate of Sciences. (p.74). Alma-Ata.
20. Shagal, V.E. (1958). *Structural and semantic characteristics of substantive word combinations in Arabic*. Author ... D. - Moscow.
21. Sharbatov, G.Sh. (1964). *Russian-Arab Dictionary*. - Moscow.
22. Umarov, E. A. (1994). *Dictionaries of Old Uzbek and the issues of phonetics*. - Tashkent: Fun.
23. Yudakhin, K.K. (n.d.). *Uzbek-Russian dictionary*. - Tashkent: 1927-1928.
24. Umarov, E. A. (1989). *"Badoyi al-lugat" and "Sangloh" as lexicographical monuments and sources of the Old Uzbek language (15th -13th centuries)*. Author's dissertation ... D. in Phil. – (p.46). Tashkent.
25. Zhumayev, R.Z. (1996). *Political System of the Republic of Uzbekistan: Formation and Development*. - Tashkent: Fan.
26. Holmatova, D. (2021). *Funkcionirovanie bi- i polilingvizma v jazykah jetnosov respubliki Uzbekistan*. Materialy mezhd. videokonf. Serija «Evrazijskij perekrestok». Vypusk 15, Orenburg-Hudzhand. pp.51-56. https://www.elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_44948296_46685769.pdf