



LEXICOGRAPHIC INTERPRETATION OF LEXICAL ARCHAISMS

Usmonova Umida

Tashkent State Uzbek language and literature

University independent researcher

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10408642>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 12th December 2023

Accepted: 19th December 2023

Online: 20th December 2023

KEY WORDS

Archaism, lexical archaism, historism, historical word, lexeme, semema, obsolete word, period of use delimited word, neutral lexicon, obsolete lexicon, new lexicon.

ABSTRACT

This article explores issues related to the phenomenon of lexical archaism and the linguistic interpretation of lexical archaisms of the Uzbek language, lexicographic description, semantic classification. Also described are archaism, lexeme archaism, semema archaism, historism, linguistic features within the framework of historical word concepts, commonalities and particularities in relations. Opinions were made on the types, classification of archaism, the causes and factors of their occurrence, methodological features.

The development of the era, the change in social life is reflected in all areas of the language, especially since the lexical system is present for such changes. Such a change is much more noticeable at the lexical level of the language. Changes in the linguistic lexical system necessitate regular research on the lexical system and its units. According to some sources in our linguistics, four cases are observed in this. "Firstly, when certain words are seen to wear out and fall out of consumption, and secondly, words that have already gone out of consumption are re-"revived", "resurrected", thirdly, new-new words appear, and fourth, inactive words are activated, the range of consumption is expanded, a change in their spiritual nature occurs."(Sayfullaeva and o., 2009: 112) accordingly, it is recommended to classify and research the lexicon of the Uzbek language in terms of the point of historicity in the form of neutral lexicon, obsolete lexicon, new lexicon.

In studies, words are classified according to different foundations. In particular, according to the degree of application: general consumption and limited lexicon; according to the period of application: obsolete word, modern word and neologism; according to the scope of application: it is divided into such types as dialectism, professionalism, jargon. "The study of the relationship of the lexical unit to being is one of the important aspects of lexicology. In this, their attitude to the life of a person, to the period in which they are acting is revealed. For example, while in the recent past there was a negative shade in the word [merchant], today in wide consumption as a word with a positive dye" [Sayfullayeva and o., 2009: 78].

In the lexical system, the phenomenon of wear associated with dictionary units the SEMAS of dictionary units are also involved. "The expression SEMAS of the lexemes in the line of meaningfulness are different. Some of them are: 1) positive or negative assessment or



attitude sema; 2) sema indicating the period of application of the lexeme: “outdated”, “new”, “too new”, “archaic”, “historical”. 3) sema indicating the scope of application of the lexeme: “dialect specific”, “colloquial specific”, “biblical”, “ascension”, etc.”[Sayfullaeva and o., 2009: 104]. It seems to us that the separation of obsolete, archaic, historical SEMAS recorded in the SEMA order indicating the period of application of the lexeme in the archaic and historical sema style is sufficient, the SEMA that is obsolete is in a position of hyperonymy for archaic and historical SEMAS, forming an archaic and historical reciprocal evconimical, and a hyponymic attitude towards the obsolete.

In interpretations related to the meaning of nouns of lexical units, however, the relationship is also observed: “lexical meaning changes both qualitatively and quantitatively throughout the progress of a language. On this basis, lexical meanings can be grouped into two, current lexical meaning and former lexical meaning. The lexical meaning, which belongs to the stage of the past development of the language, does not participate in the structure of the current vocabulary wealth, is called the former lexical meaning. The former lexical meaning is of two types: 1) the old lexical meaning, 2) the etymological lexical meaning” [Rahmatullayev, 2006: 59]. In this place, the presupposition of the semen of obsolescence on the basis of the previous term of lexical meaning does not require excessive annotation.

Linguist Sh.Rahmatullayev, as part of his interpretation of the phenomenon of wear associated with the meaning of the lexeme, notes: “in some cases, the firstborn head meaning of the lexeme actually turns out to be the derived meaning. The earlier lexical meaning of such a lexeme would be forgotten and become etymological meaning or old meaning. Accordingly, now comes the derived meaning in the case of the firstborn head meaning. For example, the initial meaning of the verb “tila” - connects with the meaning of the language lexeme “speech”, “member of speech” (“say”). But this meaning of the verb “tila” is now forgotten.”[Rakhmatullayev, 2006: 60] it seems that the phenomenon of wear is also observed within one of the meanings of the ambiguous lexeme.

Fading, obsolescence of the nominative meaning in lexical units is mainly observed in lexemes that have passed to the historical layer: “basir (Arabic, meaning: “seer”: “Basir bulgur” – from the “reverse” crows of women); “Bakhsh” (Tajik, meaning: “atash”: Bakhsh et); “bahra{ (Arabic, meaning: “contribution”, “share”, “profit”: “bahra ol”); “yit” (disappear-leave); “sun” (Boysun < neck sun). [Rakhmatullayev, 2006: 62]

The vocabulary content of any language is in regular change. In vocabulary wealth, it is important to distinguish between the modern layer and the contemporary layer. Within the framework of the modern layer, it is advisable to note active lexemes in today's language activity and practice, since they will not be available to the paint of old age and novelty. Recording in this layer is based on the position of the lexical unit in the speech of a person, and not on the amount of use in speech, but on the position of the unit in general, in general.

It is also not an important condition that the lexeme, which is recorded within the framework of the modern layer, be familiar to all members of the owners of this language, be used in the speech of all. For example, although the terms are not actively used in the general world, they are recorded within the framework of the modern layer. The most important thing is that the lexeme, which is included in the modern layer, does not have the color of novelty and old age. "Lexemes with novelty or old-fashioned coloring form a contemporary



layer of vocabulary wealth. Such a layer will exist at each stage of development of the language, since the vocabulary wealth is constantly growing and changing. For this reason, a contemporary layer also lives in the vocabulary. There are phenomena in the contemporaneous layer where one of the two is the opposite of the other: the novelty paint has lexemes and the old-fashioned paint has lexemes" [Rahmatullayev, 2009: 87].

It is known that in linguistics, the old – fashioned meaning paint, the sign of the existing language unit is named by the term archaism (from the Greek arshaios - "ancient"). Archaism in the system of lexemes is referred to as lexical archism. Lexical or lexical archaism, in its essence, is distinguished into two types: (A) there will be archaism in the integrity of the lexeme. This is observed to be called archaism-lexeme: "sas", "yitmok", "zamla", etc. (B) one of the sememes of the ambiguous lexeme will have the mark of obsolescence. This state of aging is called by the term archaism-semema: "tikmoq" (in the sense of sowing plant seeds).

Both types of lexical archaism, as noted above, seem to be based on the give a name (lexical) meaning of the lexeme. Accordingly, it is advisable to take into account that archaism-lexeme occurs as a result of complete obsolescence of a single-meaning lexeme, and archaism-semema as a result of obsolescence of one of the sememes of a multi-meaning lexeme, as well as to name them on this basis.

Both types of recorded archaism arise in connection with the changes, progress of language, society. While attention is paid to the stages of development and historical period of the language, the amount of archaism-lexeme in relation to archaism-semema is the majority. The specificity of archaic (obsolete) units is also determined by the fact that archaisms exist in the dictionary of the current language, having an old-fashioned dye from other dictionary units.

The assessment of lexical units belonging to the past stage of language development, which are completely out of use now on the issue of language unit obsolescence, from the point of view of today, also assumes a specific approach. Units with such obsolescence, historicity paint, or Mark are lexical units of the past, and their lack of archaism or archaism is assessed in relation to that stage of language development. For example, lexemes such as "ulus" (people), "oqcha" (money), "qusur" (deficiency, defect), the meaning of the point lexeme "place", "side", the meaning of the et lexeme "meat" – the historical lexicon of our language, are considered to belong to the dictionary of the past. Such lexical units will also be featured in sources, works, and dictionaries regarding the historical lexicon of the language. We witness that lexemes like this color of the historical period are also actively used in the text of modern works, in order to generate truthfulness of the realities of history.

Cases of the use of words or consonants in speech are sometimes found, which are not present in both modern Uzbek and the history of the Uzbek language. Such words are observed as a result of being taken from a foreign language dictionary. In particular, it can be observed that the "zufof" lexeme (originally from the Arabic "zifofun" – a lexeme meaning "wedding wedding"), the "tulup" lexeme, is derived from the Russian language and is used in the sense of "skin". It is not advisable to apply the concept of a historical or outdated word or semema to a phenomenon like this.

Archaism defines the cause and factor of occurrence of the lexeme, the assessment of which acquires a certain complexity. Archaism is caused by the obsolescence of a character-



trait of a lexical unit, freeing its place to another lexical unit, a process or state that arises through the means of various causes and effects. However, it is an important issue for linguistics to determine whether it occurs on the basis of a specific cause and factor that gives way to that wear or other word. "Archaism is based on synonymy in general, accordingly, when interpreting the emergence of archaism, it is necessary to lean on the state, progress of lexical units in a synonymic relationship. Basically, the following reasons are indicated in this:

1) due to the fact that synonyms are not used the same in speech, some of them become archaisms: the lexical unit, which was previously used more or less equally with others, has little use in speech than its own synonym(s), and becomes archaic. For example, from the synonyms help, help lexeme has become archaism.

2) polysemem lexeme has its own synonym sememe, on the one hand, it is influenced by the presence of such a synonym, on the other hand, this polysememe goes out of place under the influence of another sememe of the lexeme. As a result, the position of both such sememas and synonyms in the language changes. For example, as the sememe "educate", "care" becomes dominant in the "boq" lexeme, the sememe "look out" of this lexeme is becoming archaism (the meaning of "look out" is now mainly meant by the look out lexeme)."[Rahmatullayev, 2009: 90-91].

Indeed, the occurrence of archaism inherent in linguistic units, its causes and factors, semantic, lexical-grammatical features are a separate issue, while the use of archaic units in speech, a stable place in the language as a methodological tool, methodological features dictate a different examination and assessment.

At this point, it is worth paying attention to the relationship between archaism and neologism. It is known that neologism is a very relative concept, it is also a unique linguistic phenomenon. Each stage of language development has its own neologism, and it cannot be said otherwise. At the level of the language, in the wealth of the vocabulary, obsolescence and renewal have an inevitable presence, these two events, at two poles, are two different events, although they form a relationship of mutual antonyms, they are associated. If you put a unit that is a neologism for a certain period, it does not have to be a neologism in the second stage, it does not justify itself logically. For example, from the point of view of the period of the 30s of the last century, lexemes such as "shpal", "seyalka", "telefon" are regarded as neologisms, but from the point of view of the modern Uzbek language, they are considered a unit that has lost its neologism. It is also well known that in the 20s of the last century, lexemes such as airplane, which were considered neologisms, became archaisms. Thus, neologism and archaism are similar and at the same time different separate phenomena of one system. From the point of view of today's language, the word "filhaqikat" among the modal units expressing the truth and reality of the thought can be considered obsolete: indeed, really, really, "filhaqikat" (obsolete). Also, "nazaran" (relatively), influence (influence), etc. - archaisms are bookish lexemes.

In the sources, archaism is noted mainly as a phenomenon explained by the laws of the language's own development, in which it is emphasized that the description of archaism or archaism is based on the linguistic factor. The historicism associated with this phenomenon is described and explained on the basis of the history of social, political and cultural development of the society. The factor of emergence of historicism is non-linguistic, and its



emergence is relatively easy to explain. In our opinion, in both cases, the influence of the extralinguistic factor has its place.

In the dictionary of linguistic terms, the concepts of archaism and historicism (historical word) are explained as follows: archaism (Greek: agshaios - ancient). A linguistic unit (word, phraseology, etc.) that has become obsolete for a certain period of time. For example, "surur" (joy), "hayan" (profit), etc. [Hojiev, 2004: 17]. HISTORICAL WORD. The word used in the modern language to name the events of the past: "kulak" (to listen), "bonak", etc. [Hojiev, 2004: 103] It is clear from the lexicographic comments that two separate events and concepts are distinguished by their own characteristics.

Along with commonality between archaism and istorism, characteristic lexical-semantic, methodological character-features are characteristic of each. Therefore, it is advisable to research them on the basis of a separate aspect and approach, noting them as separate phenomena.

The study of phenomena related to the obsolescence and archaicization of lexemes in the vocabulary of any language is of great scientific and practical importance. Archaism is the semantic division of lexemes into lexical archaism, sememe archaism, evaluation of their linguistic properties, and archaism of its own layer according to its relation to the genetic-etymological layer; archaism classification of the acquired layer, presentation of appropriate conclusions regarding the real, objective state of the lexical content are among the urgent tasks related to the research of this issue.

References:

1. Shoabdurahmanov Sh. and others. Modern Uzbek literary language. Textbook. Part I. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1980. - 450 p.
2. Rahmatullayev Sh. Modern literary Uzbek language. - Tashkent: University, 2006. - 464 p.
3. Sayfullayeva R. Modern Uzbek literary language. Study guide. - Tashkent: 2009. - 396 p.
4. An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language. 5 volumes. - Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2020.
5. Hojiev A. Annotated dictionary of linguistic terms. - Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2004. - 164 p.