

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUDING DIALECTAL WORDS IN AN EXPLANATORY DICTIONARY

Khasanov Abdumannon Majidovich,

Senior Researcher Institute of the Uzbek Language, Literature and
Folklore of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8656-0521>

abdumannonhasanov3137@gmail.com

Abstract

This article deals with the inclusion of dialect words in explanatory dictionaries that describe the lexical norms of the Uzbek literary language. Lexicographic experiments on the inclusion of dialect words in the standard dictionary are studied and their general criteria are described. The experience gained on this issue was analyzed and proposals were made on some of its aspects.

Keywords: Vocabulary, lexical standard, dialect, explanatory dictionary, dialect word, literariness, lexical development.

Introduction

It was realized at the beginning of the 20th century that the lexical standards of the Uzbek literary language and the need to rely on folk dialects in this process. In particular, at the Language Reform and Spelling Conference held in Samarkand in May 1929, along with improving spelling, a number of proposals were made to define the lexical norms of the literary language, for example, to study the Uzbek folk dialects and create the lexicon of the literary language on this basis. an attempt was made to classify (and form). The decisions of this conference also clearly indicate the conditions for the acceptance of dialect words into the literary language:

"4- It is possible and necessary to enrich the Uzbek literary language with new words and forms taken from any dialect of any of the regions of Uzbekistan, only the following new words and forms It is desirable that they comply with the following conditions:

- 1) those words and forms are understandable for all Uzbek people,
- 2) those words and forms are understandable to the majority of the Uzbek people,
- 3) those words and forms are necessary for the growth of the entire Uzbek language, understandable to the people and for the richness of the language" [12, 4].

As a result of the efforts made by modern and advanced linguists, the general vocabulary of Uzbek folk dialects has stabilized as the core of the lexicon of the Uzbek literary language. Of course, it is acceptable to admit that writers-creators, media workers have their place and service in this process as well as scientists. Over the next century, the possibilities of folk dialects to fill certain gaps in the literary language have been effectively used.

Especially in the second half of the 20th century, as a result of the serious research of folk dialects, it became clear that many words are important for the lexicon of the literary language, and they should be slowly included in the lexicon of the literary language. In this situation, the creation of an explanatory dictionary describing the lexical standards of the Uzbek literary language also played an important role in solving this problem.

METHODS

It is known that "in order to create a normative dictionary and correctly define the norms of the literary language in it, the entire lexical wealth of the language should be selected and carefully studied using all sources, including dialects and colloquial language" [13, 11]. That is, the word to be included in the dictionary should be active in folk dialects, exceeding the dialectal standard, important and consistent with the laws of the literary language. On the contrary, the introduction of words that do not have such characteristics into the explanatory dictionary undermines at least the normative (normative) nature of the dictionary.

In the process of studying the lexicon of dialects, a lot of dialectal words are identified, in which the use of these words by the people of the dialect and its active use in speech situations seem very bright and important to the dialectologist, and as a result, the linguist researcher needs to literaryize such words, tries to give his conclusions and suggestions about the need to include in the dictionaries. However, the literaryization of dialectal words recommended by dialectologists is not easy either. After all, any dialectal word appeared as a result of a specific linguistic need of the people of the Sheva dialect, but it may not be so important for the lexicon of the literary language.

About forty thousand dialectal words are noted in linguistic studies and dictionaries [6, 158]. Although various dialectological studies recommend many dialect-specific words that are important for literary language, very few of them "succeed" in becoming literary. Because most of the recommended words are synonyms (alternatives) to certain words in the literary language, they cannot be included in standard dictionaries.

R. Jomonov, who researched "Principles of choosing words from dialectisms for an explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language and their assignment" on the example of an explanatory dictionary published in 1981, evaluates the amount of dialectal words in this dictionary as low [5, 142]. Such an opinion is certainly natural for the multi-dialect Uzbek language. After all, in various dialects, words suitable for enriching the lexicon of the literary language can be found at will, and this cannot be denied. As a result of his observations, at the end of the dissertation, the scientist recommends more than 500 An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language (in the following places - EDUL) dialect-specific words to be included in the explanatory dictionary. In 2006-2008, completed and republished EDUL included the following words: *go'mma* (152)[next, the page number is shown in parentheses], *jo'gi* (156), *ijkilamoq* (175), *iqtibos* (157), *kadi* (158), *kuliklash* (in EDUL *kulliklash*) (160), *ko'gan* (160), *ko'ganlamoq* (160), *ko'kay* (160), *ko'lik* (161), *meng* (162), *mengzamoq* (162), *sermamoq* (168), *chakana* ("aholining kichik mollari suruvi")

ma'nosida) (173), *cho'lp*i (175), *shivit* (175), *shumqadam* (176), *qoruvli* (179), *havasak* (181). When these words were included in the 2006-2008 edition, only such words were included. *pometta* is placed: *ijikilamoq*, *kadi*, *ko'kay*, *ko'lik*, *mengzamoq*, *sermamoq*, *ulgi*, *chakana*, *shivit*, *havasak*. The fact that the rest of the words are not "decorated" with such a word indicates that they have already become a unit of literary language. This means that dialect words that are actively used in various speech situations are used for a long time, which causes them to rise to the level of literary standards.

It is known that "one or another type of a dialectal word is given in explanatory dictionaries, it also means that such words deserve to be used in the literary language, to become a means of expression" [5, 55]. In other words, such recognition "allows" the use of dialectal words as a unit of literary language. However, if the dialectal word included in the dictionary does not have the necessary linguistic value, it remains only the property of the dictionary. If it becomes popular quickly, if it is actively used in the speech process, then it can be considered a literary language unit.

Comparing the copies of EDUL published in 1981 and 2006-2008, it can be seen that the percentage of dialectal words in the content of its next edition has increased (according to our calculations, 1177 dialect-specific words in the next edition of EDUL noted; this amount is 1.6 times more than in the previous edition). The expanded and revised edition of the annotated dictionary, published in 2023, also has a large space for dialectal words. In particular, in the 2nd volume, 319 dialect-specific words are described, and most of these words are included in the explanatory dictionary from the point of view of describing concepts that do not have a specific denominator in the literary language.

It is clear that "even the most well-constructed dictionaries cannot cover all words. Because in the process of gradual development of the language, its vocabulary also improves" [10, 569]. In the non-stop process called time, the lexicon of the language is constantly developing. That is probably why there is always a need to describe the vocabulary content, which is the main indicator of the language's vitality and changeability.

Sh. Shoabdurahmanov, a dialectologist, has incomparable services in enriching the lexicon of the literary language with dialect words. The scientist's research on the relationship between the Uzbek literary language and the Uzbek folk dialect served as a program for the work of other researchers in this field. Sh. Shoabdurahmanov also has an initiative and leadership role in researches aimed at studying the lexicon of various Uzbek dialects.

If we look at his experience of adding dialectal words to explanatory dictionaries, "in general, from the point of view of the process of enriching the literary language at the expense of the dialectal and colloquial lexicon, dialectal and colloquial language words can be divided into the following three layers: 1) dialects and words that remain characteristic of the colloquial language (for example, *innaykin*, (after it in the literary language), *ja* (very in the literary language)); 2) words in the process of transition to literary language; 3) words transferred to the literary language" [13, 11]. The first category of words in this classification does not deserve to be literary (because no matter how widely used they are, they are a dialectal form of a literary linguistic unit, inconsistent with literary norms). The

third category is words that have become literary (that is, they have reached the standard level). So, the intermediate between these two categories is the second category, i.e., the inclusion of words in the process of transition to the literary language (which can be transferred) into explanatory dictionaries and literaryization is more complicated and at the same time useful for the lexicon of the literary language. is considered

RESULTS

Observations show that the process of selecting dialectal words for an explanatory dictionary is very complicated and requires great accuracy and intelligence. At the same time, there are other aspects that should be followed in this process, which, in our opinion, can be shown as follows:

1. When adding dialectal words to EDUL, it is necessary to analyze the important dialectal words determined by the comparison of the lexicon of the literary language and dialects, and more precisely, dialect words that are a lacunar unit for the literary language in the process of comparison. After all, as a result of this comparison, a place (gap) in the lexicon of the literary language is defined as a lacuna and a dialectal word suitable for this place is determined at the same time. This also helps to describe when the word of the considered dialect is suitable for this place.
2. The dialectal word included in the lexicon of the literary language should be capable enough to embody most of the features of the literary language units. That is, a new word that enters the lexical system should show the features of this system and be able to enter into a lexical-grammatical relationship with other elements [9, 369]. It is difficult to "live" in the lexicon of a literary language for a dialectal word that cannot incorporate these features.

Also, in order for this dialectal word to reach the level of the literary norm, first of all, it is important that the dialectal word has reached the level of the dialectal norm, is actively used in the communication process of the Sheva people, has been in the lexicon of the language (dialect) for many years, and is used in everyday life. It should be a literary word.

3. A dialect-specific word should not be included in the language lexicon if there is an alternative word for it in the literary language. For example, the word "sir", which is used in the Dialects to refer to frost formed by the freezing of moist air particles on tree branches as a result of severe cold, is not considered a literary language unit. Because this concept can also be expressed by the word *bulduruk*. Therefore, there is no need to include the word "secret" in the lexicon of the literary language. It is necessary to introduce an important dialectal word for which there is no alternative in the literary language into the lexicon of the literary language. After all, when registering dialectal words in literary language dictionaries, first of all, it is necessary to pay serious attention to whether they can occupy a certain position in the language lexicon [6, 156]. For example, the word *porimaq* [13, 217], which is used in most dialects, is used as a word expressing that something (usually, food) has a good effect on a person (body), it is pleasant. In the literary language, this word has no synonym or alternative. This makes it necessary to include this word in the lexicon

of the language.

4. Dialectal words included in EDUL should be easy to use, as pure Uzbek as possible, and at the same time should be widely popular. Especially in this regard, giving special preference to words used in the old Uzbek language (or Turkish language) that have a pure Turkic tone is a very correct way. In this way, as the purity of the language is ensured, the harmony of the Uzbek language with the Turkic languages will also increase a little.

Let's take the word *shuvat* used in the dialects of different regions of Uzbekistan. The word "*shuvat*" means rain falling in the form of particles (not drops!) [15, 201]. Purely Turkish, this word also exists in related languages.

In the same way, the word *qoqim*, which refers to the dirt, dust, garbage, etc. in the place that has not been swept, cleaned, and collected, is purely Turkic and is one of the words that is understandable to the majority of the Uzbek people at the moment. It is also known to many that this word is derived from the verb *qoqimoq*, which is used in a similar way to it. This shows that words with this characteristic can be introduced into the literary language without hesitation.

5. The dialectal word included in EDUL should be easier, more understandable and more possible than other units (or borrowings) that are equivalent to it. In the common language, the word *sprain*, which is the name of an injury expressed by a few words, has such characteristics. Word *toyishmoq* is distinguished by its ease compared to other equivalents, which makes it possible to introduce it into the literary language. In the same way, the word *erati*, which is used in the sense of temporarily acquired things, is more convenient than units such as *rent*, *someone's thing*. Also, this word is actively used in Kipchak and Oghuz dialects and is understandable to many people. The presence of the term "use without payment" in this word also shows that it is significantly different from the word *rent*. Each of the options chosen for the literary language fully demonstrates its capabilities in such comparison processes.

The words used in the current Uzbek literary language and recognized as literary norms are, in fact, the result of certain choices [3, 42]. When choosing the most suitable among several options that express a certain concept, it is better to choose the option that is understandable to the general public as much as possible. Also, in the process of selection, the form of the word should be taken in accordance with literary norms [3, 42]. After all, the elevation of the chosen word to the level of a literary language unit depends on its ability to comply with literary standards.

In the process of the formation of the Uzbek literary language, all the possibilities of the multi-dialect Uzbek language were used effectively. As a result, in the literary language there are only a few words with the same meaning that name a concept. The selection of an option as a standard among universal units is also a complicated process. Their use or refusal to use them is at the discretion of the people who are the creators and consumers of the language [8, 1026]. A word chosen from among alternatives can become a linguistic unit in active use only when it is acceptable to the users of the language (and begins to be widely used).

6. The dialectal word included in EDUL should be socially and linguistically important. It is not appropriate to try to popularize a word that is used in a very narrow field and names concepts that are not important enough for the public. In particular, the word *parish*, which means that the silkworm begins to spin silk, does not have much social significance. Although this word names a specific process, it does not have much significance for the whole nation. Because the people engaged in silk production make up a very small share (part) of the whole nation.

7. When choosing a dialectal word to be included in EDUL, it is necessary to pay special attention to the fact that they are easy to say and have few syllables. As B. Bafojev rightly pointed out, their syllable structure is also of particular importance in the selection of synonymous variants expressing a certain concept in the language as a standard [2, 32].

Polysyllabic words used in dialects such as *jetalatma* "one who follows someone's words, does not have one's own opinion" [11, 181], *hamsizlantirmoq* "insurance" [13, 274] are speech energy. It is clear that it will have a negative effect on economy. After all, "the language strives for options that consume less energy" [7, 101].

It is known that most of the words of the own (Turkish) layer consist of one-syllable words. The modern Uzbek literary language also tries to preserve to a certain extent these features of the Turkish language, which is its first and classic form. This requires that the dialectal word, considered suitable for the lexicon of the literary language, should be short and have few syllables. Paying attention to such aspects and enriching EDUL with necessary and important dialectal words serves to ensure the purity and nationalism of the language.

SUMMARY

In general, the importance of folk dialects in enriching the lexicon of the language due to internal sources is incomparable. In fact, the difference between the lexicon of literary language and dialects is related to the characteristics of generality, standardization, refinement, and selection of literary language. In dialects, all the possibilities of the national language are realized, necessary and necessary concepts have their own names. Literary language is nourished by dialects due to these features. After all, although the literary language is a stable and normative form of the language, it should be regularly enriched with the necessary words from the lexicon of dialects in order to adapt to the linguistic and speech needs of the nation. The inclusion of dialectal words in EDUL is of particular importance in the purposeful implementation of this process. Paying attention to the aspects mentioned above will help this process to take place naturally and gradually.

REFERENCES

1. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. VI jildli. I jild. – T.: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi, 2023. – 964 b.
2. Бафоев Б. Навоий асарлари тилида сўз варианты ва адабий норма // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти, 1988. – №1. – Б. 32.

3. Бегматов Э., Маматов А. Адабий норма назарияси (адабий норманинг шаклланиши ва яшаш қонуниятлари). – Т., 1999. – Б. 42.
4. Гак В. О. О некоторых закономерностях развития лексикографии (учебная и общая лексикография в историческом аспекте) // Актуальные проблемы учебной лексикографии. М., 1977. – С. 12
5. Жомонов Р. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати учун диалектизмлардан сўз танлаш принциплари ва уларнинг берилиши: Филол. фанлари номзоди... дис. – Т., 1991. – 203 б.
6. Majidovich K.A. Features of Dialectal Words That Fill in the Gaps in the Language Vocabulary. International Journal on Integrated Education, 2021, (4(10)). - pp. 157-164.
7. Khasanov A. The linguocultural significance of euphemisms as a speech lacunae. Лисоний маданиятни шакллантириш: тажриба, муаммо ва ечимлар” мавзусидаги илмий-амалий анжуман материаллари, 2020. -pp. 100-105.
8. Khasanov, A.M. METHODS OF FILLING THE LEXICAL GAP USING WORD DERIVATION. Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities, 11(5), 1024-1035. Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities, 2023, (11(5)). -pp. 1024-1035. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7960629>
9. Khasanov A.M. LEXICAL GAPS IN THE LANGUAGE AND THEIR LINGUISTIC. ББК Зауралье III+ 81, 2(30). -р. 369.
10. Хасанов А.М. Комментарии по диалектным словам и отношение литературному языку. Приоритетные направления развития спорта, туризма, образования и науки, 2021, -pp. 568-573.
11. Хасанов А.М. ЗАПОЛНЕНИЕ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОГО ЛАКУНА В УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ ДИАЛЕКТИЗМАМИ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ЖИВОТНОВОДСТВЕННОЙ ЛЕКСИКИ). XXIII Всероссийская студенческая научно-практическая конференция. -2021. - pp. 179-189.
12. Ўзбек адабий тили тўғрисидаги қарор. Манба: “Аланга” журнали, 1929 йил, №5. – Б. 4.
13. Ўзбек халқ шевалари луғати. – Т.: Фан, 1971. – 409 б.