FROM THE HISTORY OF DEVELOPING THE CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS
ИЗ ИСТОРИИ ФОРМИРОВАНИИ КОНТРАСТИВНОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ

Sahiba ZOKİROVA[*]

Summary

The article gives some ideas on development of Contrastive linguistics which is new ways of Uzbek linguistics. Contrastive investigation of languages in world linguistics is shown on the example of Turkic linguists' heritage such as Mahmud Qoshgariy and Alisher Navoi. Article indicated Mahmud Qoshgariy's attitudes toward phonetics, phonology, lexicology and Contrastive morphology of Turkic languages also issues of Lacunarity and divergences on lexis level of Turkic and Persian languages in "Muhokamat ul-lugatayn" by Alisher Navoi.

Keywords: equivalent, lacuna, divergence, convergence, contrastive linguistics, synchronic aspect, diachronic aspect, phonetic differentiation.

Резюме

В статье приводятся некоторые идеи о развитии контрастной лингвистики, которая является одной из новых тенденций узбекского языкознания. Сравнительное изучение языков в мировом языкознании иллюстрируется примерами из трудов тюркских лингвистов Махмуда Кашкари и Алишера Навои. В данной статье рассматривается отношение Махмуда Кашкари к фонетике, фонологии, лексикологии и контрастной морфологии тюркских языков, а также сравнительный анализ тюркского и персидского языков в произведении Алишера Навои в «Мухокамат-уль-лугатайн».

Ключевые слова: эквивалент, лакуна, дивергенция, конвергенция, контрастная лингвистика, фонетическая дифференциация.

From the middle of the 20th century the world, Russian and Turkish linguistics, mainly the Uzbek linguistics have been speedily developing. It is seen that new branches and trends have appeared to meet the needs of the society in the science. In the 80s of the previous century the paradigm of the scientific researches underwent the great changes. The fundamental sciences put forward the theoretical ideas; subsequently they were implemented into the life. The principle "from theory into practice" dominated, while the opposite situation can be observed in the contemporary life, as the needs for

[*] Dr., Fergana Devlet Üniversitesi, Özbek Filolojisi Fakültesi. Fergana, Özbekistan.
Dr., Fergana State University, Faculty of Uzbek Philology. Fergana, Uzbekistan.

technological development are defining the way to the theoretical researches" (Nurmonov, 2012: III jild., 93). The tendency of developing the linguistics from the system-structural paradigm to the anthropocentric paradigm can be observed. The issues of the discussion of the system-structural linguistics were devoted to the linguistic problems, whereas the researches in anthropocentric trends are engaged in investigating the relationship between the language and the person, the mechanism of forming the speech, the place of the language in the society, the language and culture, the national characteristics of the language. Otherwise, the special attention is given to consideration of both internal laws and external impact, the extralinguistic factors of the language development. In the result of it, the new trends of the linguistics have appeared. The contrastive linguistics can be placed among the newly developed trends of the linguistics. The issues of the contrastive linguistics have not been perfectly studied yet not only in Uzbek linguistics, but also all over the world. It does not have even its completed contents. Though the contrastive linguistics considered to be a new trend, the comparison of the languages began in the ancient time, when the people needed to communicate with people, speaking other languages. According to the English scientist J. K. Ketford, the comparison of the languages began after the Babylon turmoil (Ketford, 1989). As it is known, according to the legend, cited in the Gospel, it was an incitement bringing to the appearance of different languages.

As the Russian linguist I.P.Susov stated, the practical comparison of the languages began in the ancient times (Susov, 2006:9). E.g. in the kingdoms of Babylon, Assyria, Hittite the Sumerian, Akkad and Hittite languages were compared in terms of lexis. The ancient linguists of India compared some of the features of Sanskrit, Veda and Procrit languages. In the Middle ages in Europe the Latin and Greek were compared with the local languages in their grammatical structure. As N. Yartseva asserts, the first researchers engaged in comparison of the languages were the interpreters (Yartseva, 1981: 30). However, no one of them was compared as the entire system.

The approach to the investigation of the languages through their comparison can be observed in the works "Девону луғотит турк" by Makhmud Kashgariy and "Муҳокаматул луғатайн" by Alisher Navoiy in the XI century. M. Kashgariy compared the Turkish languages relating to one family and defined their similar and contrasting features. A.Navoiy tried to compare the Turkish and Percian languages related to the different language families, different language systems. A. Nurmonov claimed that A. Navoiy

was the Father of the contrastive linguistics (Nurmonov, 2012:II jild., 299), M. Kashagariy was the founder of the comparative-historical linguistics (Nurmonov, 2012:II jild., 252). He studied the languages in diachronic and synchronic aspects and put the aim to identify the protolanguage. One can observe the comparative-historical approach and the analyses peculiar to the contrastive linguistics in the works by M. Kashgariy. According to S. Mutallibov, the work "Девону луғатит турк" by M. Kashgariy is significant not only to the period of its creating, but also has a great value in the contemporary Turkology. Indeed, he is worth being a founder of the Turkology.

Unfortunately, the scientific heritage of the great linguist had been unknown to the world till the beginning of the XX century. There was no information on the work "Девону луғатит турк" by M. Kashgariy. The work was accidentally found by Ali Amiriy in 1914 in the town of Diyarbakir, Turkey. This was a great event in the history of linguistics, as the work includes many branches of linguistics and is considered to be a constitutional piece of work.

M. Kashgariy compared the Turkic languages and defined their similar and contrastive features. Primarily, he distinguished two groups of the Turkic languages: Turkic (chigil, kashgar, argu, barsagon, yugur), the languages of Oguz and Kipchak tribes. The Turkic languages were the basic and compared with Oguz and Kipchak languages.

M. Kashgariy gave the well-grounded information on the comparative phonetics, phonology, lexicology, word formation and comparative morphology of the Turkic languages. For instance, the writer showing the differences in the languages and dialects in his work underlined the initial sounds **y** in Turkic languages and **j** in oguz and kipchak languages. *Yilig suv* in Turkic languages corresponded to *ilig suv* in oguz languages, *yinju* to *jinju*. Furthemore, the phonetic differences in using of the initial *m* in Turkic languages and relevant form *b* in oguz languages, *t* changes into **d**, *d* into *t*, as *tevay-devay, yigda-yigta* were described.

According to the given data the other work by the scientist was "Жавоҳир ун-наҳв фил луғотит турк", which was devoted to the syntax. However, the work did not come to us.

We can also see that A. Navoiy, comparing Turkish and Persian languages in the lexical layer in his work "Муҳокамат ул-луғатайн", put forward the issues of the contrastive linguistics. The comparison from the phonetic to the syntactic structures of the Turkic (Uzbek) language and Sart (Persian) language in Iranian branch of Indo-European languages were

given in the work. In some cases the Arabian which is related to Semite languages was also compared.

The work consisted of the two parts; the first part includes the comparative, descriptive and analytic information of the opportunities of grammar and word-formation of the Turkic language. The second part was devoted to the issues of creating the scientific works and fiction, their peculiar features in the Turkic languages on the bases of the works created by A. Navoiy.

A. Navoiy gave the examples of 100 languages in "Муҳокамат ул-луғатайн", such as *қувормоқ* (to dry, fade)*, қуруқшамоқ* (to dry up, to wither)*, ушармак* (to shorten, to cut into pieces, to break, to demote)*, ўнгдаймоқ* (to direct)*, чекримак* (to put forward)*, дўмсаймоқ* (to frown, to scowl), *ўсанмоқ* (to break the promise), *игирмак* (to wind), *эгармак* (to wind, to turn)*, ўхранмак* (to shudder)*, торикмоқ* (to be bored)*, алдамоқ* (to deceive)*, ишанмак* (to believe)*, игланмак* (to be sick)*, айланмоқ* (to go for a walk)*, эрикмак* (to be lazy)*, овунмоқ* (to stop crying)*, қистамоқ* (to hurry)*, қийнамоқ* (to trouble), *қўзғалмоқ* (to start), *соврулмоқ* (to blow sky-high)*, чайқалмоқ* (to paddle)*, девдашимоқ* (to swing)*, қийманмоқ* (to shy)*, қизғанмоқ* (to feel sorry (pity) for)*, никамак* (to follow, to run after)*, сийланмоқ* (to be respect)*, танламоқ* (to choose, select)*, қимирдамоқ* (to move, to activate)*, серпмак* (to splash, to sprinkle)*, сирмамак* (to realize, to steal, to scratch)*, ганоргамак* (to be deaf, to be exhausted)*, сиғрикмоқ* (to hide, to inform, to sneak)*, сиғинмоқ, қилимоқ* (to be afraid, to be frightened)*, ёлинмоқ* (to beg, entreat, supplicate)*, мунгланмоқ* (to be suffer)*, индамак* (to say, to speak, to tell, to talk)*, тергамак* (to investigate)*, теврамак* (to make equal)*, қингғаймоқ* (to shiver, to treble)*, шиғалдамоқ* (to attempt)*, синграмоқ* (to weep)*, сухранмоқ* (to mutter, to muddle)*, сийпамоқ* (to waste)*, қораламоқ* (blacken, slander)*, сурканмоқ* (to rub, to smear)*, куйманмак* (to sorrow)*, инgranмоқ* (to cry, to complain)*, тушалмак* (to fall)*, мунғаймоқ* (to grieve)*, танчиқамоқ* (to astonish)*, танчиқолмоқ* (to be astonished)*, бушурғанмоқ* (to be angry)*, бўхсамоқ* (to suffer, to mourn)*, бўсмоқ* (to mourn, to be sad, to be discouraged), *бурмак, турмак* (to stand, to live, to re-side)*, қаҳамоқ* (to choke on smth.)*, сипқормоқ* (to drink)*, сизғурмоқ* (to burn)*, гурпаклашмак* (to melt, to lose weight)*, бичимоқ* (to cut out)*, сингурмак* (to complain, to mourn)*, йигирмак* (to weave)*, чидамоқ* (to endure, to tolerate)*, тузмак* (to organize, to compose)*, қизғанмоқ* (to be jealous)*, гангирамоқ* (to fail)*, қадамоқ* (to thrust, to stick, to tie)*, чиқанмоқ* (to stick)*, кўндурмак* (to persuade, to

con-vince)*, сўндурмак* (to switch off, to turn off, to extinguish)*, суқлатмоқ* (to have an appetite). The equivalents of some of the verbs can not be given in the Persian language. A.Navoiy gave the definitions to all of the verbs. Furthermore, he cited the poems with the verbs. Some of them can be explained through the word combinations.

The word *менг* (state) in the Turkic language does not have its equivalent in the Persian language.

Moreover, the scientist showed the semantic differentiation between the synonyms as *йигламсинмоқ* (to cry on smb.)*, инграмак* (to weep)*, синграмак* (to cry slowly)*, сиқтатмоқ* (to cry a lot)*, ўкурмак* (to sob)*, инчкирмак* (to weep in a low voice)*, ҳой-ҳой йигламоқ* (to cry one's heart out). The examples of divergence and convergence were given in the work. E.g. in the Persian language the lexeme *хор* (thorn) corresponds to the two lexeme *тикан (thorn)* and *чўкур* (a large thorn), *хўрданū* (to eat) in the Persian language were equivalents with the lexemes *емак(to eat)* and *ичмак (to drink)*, the lexeme *оройиш (to dress up, to smarten)* in the Persian language were similar to the lexemes *безанмак* and *ясанмоқ*. The convergence can be met in denoting the words relating to the family relationship. E.g. the word *бародар (brother)* in the Turkic language corresponds to the *оға* and *ини*, *хоҳар* in the Turkic language were similar to *эгачи* and *сингил*. Furthermore, the words *мо* and *наҳну (we)* in the Persian language is denoted by *биз*, *арақ* and *ҳай* (the large drops of the sweat) are similar only to one word *тер* in the Turkic language, by these examples we can speak about the divergence.

In the languages compared the absence of the units denoting the differentiating of the objective world can bring the notions of convergence and divergence. We can cite the following examples to them: the species of the horses in the Turkic language as *тубучоқ, арғумоқ, яка, ёбу, тоту* are not differentiated in the Persian language. Moreover, the words, denoting the age of the horse as *той, ғунан, дўнан* (4 year old horse)*, тулан* (5year-old horse)*, чирға* (6 year-old horse)*, ланга* (colt)do no have their equivalents in the Persian language.

A. Navoiy paid a special attention to the antonyms and created *тажнис* and *ийҳом*. He defined the meanings of the word *от* as *алам* (name), *маркаб* (contest), *амр* (order). The word *ит* (an animal, to push, to run away) have three meanings as *туш, ён, ёқ*, the word *бор* has 4 meanings (existence, order, burden, profir), *соғин* (to remember, to miss, to compare, milk giver), *туз* (the type of weapon with a sharp and thing point, an order to the a greement, steep, the thing used in the meeting), *кўк* (a sky, voice, to

green, to make a pair, a grass). These words show the absence of their equivalence in the Persian language.

A. Navoiy was hailed a great promoter and propagator of the Turkic language by the work "Муҳокамат ул-луғатайн". The given work attracted the attention of the world scientists, researchers and linguists.

REFERENCES

Ketford J.K. (1989). *Obucheniye angliyskomu yaziku kak inostrannomu* // Novoye v zarubejnoy lingvistike. Vipusk XXV. M., «Progress».
Nurmonov A. (2012). *Tanlangan asarlar*. II jild. Toshkent, "Akademnashr".
Nurmonov A. (2012). *Tanlangan asarlar*. III jild. Toshkent, "Akademnashr" .
Susov I.P. (2006). *Istoriya yazikoznaniya*. M.: AST: Vostok-zapad.
Yartseva V.N. (1981). *Kontrastivnaya grammatika*. M.: Nauka.

Түйіндеме

Мақалада өзбек лингвистикасының жаңа тенденцияларының бірі болып табылатын контрастық лингвистиканың дамуы туралы түсініктер берілген. Әлемдік лингвистикадағы тілдерді салыстырмалы зерттеу, түрік лингвистикалық мұрасының өкілдері Қашқарлы Махмұт пен Әлішер Науаидің шығармаларындағы мысалдармен көрсетілген. Бұл мақалада Махмұт Қашқарлының түркі тілдерінің фонетикасы, фонологиясы, лексикологиясы және контрастық морфологиясына қатысты көзқарасы, сондай-ақ Әлішер Науаидің «Мукокамат-ул-лугатайн» еңбегіндегі түркі және парсы тілдеріне салыстырмалы талдау жасалады.

Кілт сөздер: эквивалент, лакуна, айырмашылық, конвергенция, контрастты лингвистика, фонетикалық саралау.
(Закирова С. Контрастивті лингвистиканың қалыптасу тарихынан)

Аннотация

Мақолада ўзбек тилшунослигида янги йўналишлардан бири бўлган контрастив лингвистиканинг шаклланиши хусусида фикрлар билдирилган. Жаҳон тилшунослигида тилларни қиёслаб ўрганиш, туркий тилшунослар, хусусан, Маҳмуд Кошғарий ва Алишер Навоий илмий мероси асосида кўрсатиб берилган. Мақолада Маҳмуд Кошғарий туркий тилларнинг қиёсий фонетикаси, фонологияси, лексикологияси ҳамда қиёсий морфологияси ҳақидаги қарашлари, шунингдек, Алишер Навоийнинг "Муҳокамат ул-луғатайн" асарида туркий ҳамда форс тилларини лексик сатҳда лакунарлик, дивергенция ва конвергенция масалалари бўйича қарашлари кўрсатиб ўтилган.

Калит сўзлар: эквивалент, лакуна, дивергенция, конвергенция, контрастив лингвистика, синхрон аспект, диахрон аспект, фонетик дифференциация.
(Zokirova S. Контрастив лингвистиканинг шаклланиш тарихидан)

Özet

Makalede, Özbek dilbiliminin yeni temayüllerinden biri olan kontrast dilbiliminin gelişimi hakkında bazı fikirler verilmektedir. Dünya dilbiliminde dillerin karşılaştırmalı incelenmesi, Türk dilbilimci mirasının temsilcilerinden Kaşgarlı Mahmut ve Alişir Nevayî eserlerindeki örneklerle gösterilmektedir. Makale, Kaşgarlı Mahmud'un Türk dillerinin fonetik, fonoloji, sözlükbilimsel ve karşıt morfolojisine yönelik tutumlarını, Alişir Nevayî'nin "Muhakemetül Lugateyn"deki Türk ve Fars dillerinin karşılaştırılması ele alınmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: eşdeğer, lacuna, ıraksaklık, yakınsaklık, karşıt dilbilim, senkronik görünüm, diakronik görünüş, fonetik farklılaşma.

(**Zokirova S., Kontrast Dilbiliminin Gelişim Tarihi)**