

## ELEMENTS OF THE KIPCHAK DIALECT IN ANCIENT TURKIC LANGUAGE

(In the example of the lexicon of the “OltunYoruk” work)

**Kilichov Nazarbai Radjapbayevich**

Ph.D. (PhD), associate professor

Karakalpak State University

e-mail: nkilichovr@mail.ru

**Abstract.** This article describes the dialectal lexicon in the lexicon of the work “Altun Yaruk”, an excellent example of the ancient Turkic language, in particular, the lexical units specific to the Kipchak dialect. The words belonging to the Kipchak dialect in the work are compared with the lexicon of modern Turkic languages.

**Key words:** “Altun Yaruk”, ancient Turkic language, Kipchak dialect, Turkic languages, dialectal lexicon.

The fact that modern Turkic languages had dialectal differences even in ancient times is known from the researches of the ancient written sources of the Turkic language, in particular, “OltunYoruk”, “Devonu Lugoti-t-Turk” works on language features. Such differences can be seen in the system of phonetic-level sounds in the language of written sources (like öpkä~öfkä~övkä; ot~oot; ben~men) and in the reflection of such differences in the graphic system (like n/ñ/ŋ), in the emergence of inter-dialect synonymy at the lexical level (kent ~baliq; ög~ana; eshit~tñla) can be seen. At the stages of separation of Turkic languages from the ancient Turkic language, such linguistic differences became signs that distinguished those languages from other languages. Of course, here we are far from the idea of distinguishing one Turkic language from another based on dialectal differences, on the contrary, we emphasize that the ancient Turkic sources are a common source for all these languages, determine the stages of general development and specific development of these languages, phonetic, lexical, we have taken into account the organization of grammatical general-dialectal differences.

The study of ancient Turkic dialects allows not only to clarify the formation and differentiation of Turkic languages, but also to determine the ethnogenesis, culture, and lifestyle of those peoples. Especially in this regard, we consider it appropriate to compare their lexicon with the linguistic layer of modern Turkic languages on the basis of the lexicon of separate works of the Turkic languages, typical of the old Turkic period. In this sense, we will analyze the relation of the linguistic units in the composition of the lexicon of the “OltunYoruk” work to

some words specific to the Kipchak dialect of the Uzbek language and to the Karakalpak and Kazakh languages, which belong to the Kipchak group of Turkic languages.

It is important to compare the lexicon of “OltunYoruk” with the lexicon of modern Turkic languages and the linguistic composition of their dialects, and to base the development of the lexicon of Turkic languages on this basis. It should be emphasized that when talking about ancient Turkic dialects, the dialectal signs of the words specific to the lexical layer of that period should be classified by taking into account the phonetic structure, semantics, and valence possibilities of the lexical layer in modern Turkic languages. It is possible, it is reasonable to prove the dialectal affiliation. For example, the famous linguist Ahmad Ishayev, in his article about the words to be included in the dictionary of Uzbek dialects, divides the lexical units of Uzbek dialects into the following groups according to the literary language and inter-dialect relations:

1. Pure lexical-dialectal words.
2. Ethnographic-dialectal words.
3. Lexical-semantic dialectal words.
4. Lexical-phonetic dialectal words.
5. Lexical-derivative dialectal words.
6. Morphological-dialectal words [Ishaev, 1998, p.37-42].

Therefore, the dialectal layer that arose on the basis of the lexical differences in the work “OltunYoruk” can be traditionally studied as units of Qarluq, Kipchak, and Oghuz. Since “OltunYoruk” is a work of translation, the translators made effective use of the linguistic units characteristic of all dialects of the ancient Turkic language, which have been preserved for a short time, in order to ensure the alternative in the translation. This created a unique panorama of ancient Turkic dialects. The units of the Turkic dialects, Qarluq, Kipchak, and Oghuz, can be studied separately.

In fact, the analysis of the lexeme also shows that even in the period of the ancient Turkic language, there was a noun naming men based on the *ariy* lexeme: *ariy* tegin “noble prince” [DS, 1969, p.52]. Names with nouns based on the narrowing of the meanings of these lexemes we can observe its formation in modern Turkic languages as well. That is, in the modern Karakalpak language, the names of women and girls *Arıw*, *Arıwkhan* [Sayymbetov, 2000, p.34] are active. The adjective *ariyis* is used in Karakalpak and Kazakh languages to express the beauty of people - women and girls. In the old Turkic language, it was used for persons, water, air, and objects.

The analysis of the lexicon of the work of “OltunYoruk” shows that, together with other Turkic dialectal lexical layers, it also contains a considerable number of units specific to the Kipchak dialect. In particular, *qiytaq* (neighborhood), *qunçuy* (princess), *qut*, *qutlugh* (happiness), *kökqaliq* (heaven, sky), *atagh* (name, title), *aghdar* (to translate), *atīnatap* (to mention the name, special honor to respect), *tatigh* (full), *ötün* (to beg, ask, plead), *ört* (horse, fire), *örtünüturur* (burn, burn), *āmgāk* (work), *āwqapughī/qapīqī* (door), *qaraq* (eye), etc. Let's compare some of these words with current dialects.

**ÖRT.** In all the ancient Turkic written sources (including the Tonyukuk inscription), the word *ört* means “fire”. In the work of “OltunYoruk”, this word expresses the meaning of “fire”, and one of the unique aspects of the work's lexicon is that in this sense, along with the lexical unit, the words *yalin*, *ot~oot* are also used, and these words forms a synonymous line. For example:

*ört yalın üzä örtünü turur ät'özlüglär* – “bodies burning in the flames of a burning flame” (II.33a).

*oot üzä örtänip* – “I burned in the flame of strong emotion” (II. 34b).

*köngülin örtänü oot yalinin yalar tæg* – “like their hearts were mixed and burned in fire (it was)” (X.20a).

The verb *örtä* is formed by adding the verb-forming suffix -ä to the word *ört*:

*ät'özüm busanur busurqanur ootqa örtänip köyär tæg* - My body is in sorrow, in grief, as if burning in fire (X.13b).

In addition, the adjective *-lug* is added to the *ört*, and the quality of the adjective is also made *örtlüg*: *üç yawlagh yolta toghduqta örtlüg buzlugh tamulugh bolmişların* are fiery (and) icy, dozakhi when they get on the three bad roads (IV.50a).

In modern Turkic languages, from the linguistic units of this synonymous line, the word *ört* remains active in the Kipchak dialect; in the Oghuz dialect, the word *yalin* is actively used, as well as the word *ot*; in the Qarluq dialect, the word *ot* is active and the word *ört* is also used in this sense.

In the modern Karakalpak literary language, the word *ört* means "to catch fire, to burn" and has preserved its ancient Turkic meaning: *Adamlardıórtsóndiriwgebólístiripjiberdi* (A. Bekimbetov) [QTTS, 1992. p.464].

**QIY/ QIYTAQ/ QIYTAQI.** In the Uzbek version of “OltunYoruk”, the word *qiytaq* is interpreted as “neighborhood” and the word *qiyçi* means “village”:

*Yänä anta kin ol oq Inçiu baliqta Anqu atl(i)gh qiytaqi Künçing atligh bāgning kishisi bir yil tüni uzun igläp* (I.9a) “And after that, the wife of a beg named Kunching in the **neighborhood**

of Anqu in the city of Inchyu has been married for more than a year. he fell ill, lost food, lost his tongue, lost his mind.

*qïyçin* ärtär yolqï kishitin tiginig tiläp taqïb ulmazärmish tip saw äshitti (X.12a) (he) asked the people passing through the **village** about the prince and heard that he was not found yet.

In the dictionary of the old Turkic language, this word is shown as “*qïy*” and is interpreted as a “town”, “village”, and the above example from “OltunYoruk” is translated into Russian as *qïytaqï*, i.e. “in the village, as well as *qïyça*, which is taken from this source, from ancient Turkic Uyghur texts examples of the obtained *qïy* are presented in the sentences [DS, 1969, p.440]. It seems that this lexical unit is found in ancient Turkic language sources only in texts written in Uyghur script, mainly in the text of “OltunYoruk”. Although in DS the base of this word is explained as *qïy* “town”, “village”, in the words *qïytaq*, *qïyçi* the relationship between the base and the suffix is not divided into clearly meaningful parts. In our opinion, in the Uzbek translation of the work, this word has been correctly translated into the meaning of “neighborhood” and “village”. Studying this with the lexicon of modern Turkic languages in a comparative-historical way allows to draw more accurate conclusions.

It is known that this word is the name of a place in any of the meanings such as *town*, *village*, *neighborhood*. Therefore, the further development of meaning in Turkic languages should be based on this concept. This can be more clearly demonstrated by the example of the lexicon of the modern Karakalpak and Kazakh languages. In the current literary language of Karakalpak, “*qıytaq*, *qıytaqjer*” is considered a scientific term and means “homestead, homestead land”. For example: Dear farmers and farmers, owners of land! Today, in the regions of our republic, 5 million farmers, 16 million farmers and 342 farmers are serving [<https://joqargikenes.uz/qr/19534.html>]. We can know that this word has been used in the Karakalpak colloquial language since early times, and that it is a unit of an active lexical layer from the following verse taken from the poems of the poet IbrayimYusupov: *Tiymegen bir qıytaq egis jer barma?*”. Therefore, this word was later adopted into scientific terminology based on its meaning in the vernacular.

In the Kazakh literary language, the word *қытақ* (*qıtaq*) is interpreted as “small irrigated land, arable land, part of a field”: *Нұрпейіс қаниа ертелеп келседе, кішкене қытақ атыздарды әрең суарыпты* [ҚӨТС, 2011, p.576].

From these examples taken from the Karakalpak and Kazakh languages, it can be concluded that the units *qïy*/ *qïytaq*/ *qïytaqï* were used in ancient Turkic dialects as place names in the meanings of “neighbourhood”, “village” and are still used in a limited sense to this day.

*QUNÇUY.* This word was reduced to the ancient Turkic language from the Chinese language and was used in the sense of “princess”, “the younger sister of the khan”, “a woman of high lineage” [DS, 1969, p.466]. She is also a “princess” in “OltunYoruk”.

*Ötrü antada kin ol qunçuylar kün küningä ädgü bolup öngräkidägigsiz käm(siz bol)tı* (I.10b) “After that, the princess became better day by day and became healthy as before”.

In the current Kazakh language, this word is used in the form of “Қаншайым” as a first name (a name for women and girls) and as a word of respect for women in general, that is, in the sense of the word “begoyim” in Uzbek.

In general, the differentiation between the dialects of Turkic languages began in the period of the ancient Turkic language and created specific differences, including synonymy, in the lexicon of modern Turkic languages (at the same time, phonetic and grammatical levels). In particular, a comparative study of the semantics of linguistic units with Turkic languages and their dialects on the basis of the lexicon of the “OltunYoruk” work lays the groundwork for determining the development of word meaning and dialectal differences.

## REFERENCES

Ишаев А. Шевалар луғатига киритиладиган сўзлар/ Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 1998 йил 2-сон. 37-42-бб.

DS – Древнетюркский словарь, -Л.:1969, С.52.

Сайымбетов О.Т. Қарақалпақ тилиндеги меншикли адам атлары. –Нөкис: «Билим», 2000. 34-б.

QTTS – Қарақалпақ тилинің түсіндірме сөзлігі. 4 томлық, IV том. -Нукус: «Қарақалпақстан», 1992. Б.464.

Kilichov, N. R., & Durdona, A. (2022). Vocabulary in the old turkish language.

Rakhmonov, N., Kurbaniyazov, M., & Kilichov, N. (2020, December). SOME NOTES ABOUT CLASSIC POETICS. In Конференции.

Radjabbaevich, K. N. (2019). LINGUOAESTHETIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LEXICS OF MONUMENT “OLTUN YORUG”. ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies, 8(6), 35-42.

Киличов, Н. Р. (2019). ЗАЙМСТВОВАННАЯ ЛЕКСИКА В ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИИ "ЗОЛОТОЙ БЛЕСК" ("АЛТУН ЯРУК"). In ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ НАУКЕ (pp. 34-38).

Киличов, Н. (2022). Қадимги туркий тилдаги синоним компонентли жуфт отлар семантикаси. Развитие лингвистики и литературоведения и образовательных технологий в эпоху глобализации, 1(1), 40-43.

Киличов, Н. Р. ҚАДИМГИ ТУРКИЙ ТИЛДАГИ СИНОНИМ КОМПОНЕНТЛИ ЖУФТ ОТЛАР СЕМАНТИКАСИ («Олтун ёруғ» асари мисолида).

ABDULLAYEV, S. FRAZEOLOGIZMLAR-MUHIM TIL BIRLIGI SIFATIDA. *АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ НАУЧНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ МИРЕ* Учредители: "Общественная организация" Институт социальной трансформации", 19-21.

Абдуллаев, С. (2023). Структурно-семантические особенности пословиц в узбекском и каракалпакском языках. *Американский журнал языка, грамотности и обучения в области STEM-образования (2993–2769)*, 1 (9), 70–73.

Allambergenovich K. M. History and Tradition in the Stories of Golden Orda Literature //ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies. – 2018. – Т. 7. – №. 4. – С. 52-58.

Allambergenovich K. M., Maftuna A. Development Factors of Medieval Storytelling //INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. 4. – С. 182-184.

Radjapbaevich, K. N., Allambergenovich, K. M., Dauletbayevich, A. S., Adilbayevna, K. Z., & Gulmanovna, Y. N. (2023). The Dialectal Structure of the Work "Oltun Yoruğ". *Telematique*, 7739-7744.

Kurbaniyazov, Makhsud Allambergenovich. "THE DIVERSITY OF THE THEME IN THE RABGHUZIY'S STORY." *Культурология, искусствоведение и филология: современные взгляды и научные исследования*. 2018. 56-59.

Ibragimova, Z. (2023). FORMATION OF SOCIAL COMPETENCE STUDENTS ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE LESSONS. *Science and innovation*, 2(B6), 48-52.

Abdullaev, D. (2022). Expression of mental relationship in phraseologies.

Abdullayev Davronbek. (2023). NUTQNING IJODIY VOQELANISHIDA LUG‘AVIY BIRLIKLAR VAZIFADOSHLIGI. *Scientific Impulse*, 2(13), 63–67.

MASHARIPOVNA, R. K. Formation Of Correct Writing Skills. *JournalNX*, 7(02), 206-210.

Masharipovna, R. K. (2021). THE IMPORTANCE OF DICTIONARIES IN INCREASING LITERACY. *Conferencious Online*, 25-27.

Yuldashevich, O. E. (2023). The Place of Arabic Changes Related to Islam in the Linguistic Landscape of the Turkish People. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 4(7), 83-86.

Oglu, N. O. E. (2020). ETHNOGRAPHIC VOCABULARY OF UZBEK DIALECS IN KARAKALPAKSTAN. *Евразийский Союз Ученых*, (10-4 (79)), 31-32.

Nurjanov, O. Ethnographisms Denoting Children's Games. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 4(1), 126-128.

Yuldashev, O. (2023). STUDY OF FOLKLORE ASPECTS OF UZBEK FOLK PROVERBS. *International Bulletin of Applied Science and Technology*, 3(10), 37-39.

Ashirov, O. (2023). “MUQADIMAT UL–ADAB” QIPCHOQ LAHJASIGA OID QAYDLAR AKS ETGAN MUMTOZ MANBA. *Евразийский журнал академических исследований*, 3(9), 164-167.

Ashirov, O. (2022). DIALEKTLARNING BADIY ASAR TILIDAGI SEMANTIK–STILISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI. *Академические исследования в современной науке*, 1(13), 249-252.

Ruslanovna, A. M. Analysis Of Lexical Units Expressing Spiritual Values In Ancient Written Monuments. *Academicia Globe*, 2(07), 41-45.

Abdullayev, O. (2022). O‘ZBEK VA QORAQALPOQ TILLARIDA AXBOROT-KOMMUNIKATSIYA VA MAISHIY SOHAGA DOIR ZAMONAVIY LEKSIKANING LINGVOKULTUROLOGIK TAHLILI. *Новостиобразования: исследование XXI века*, 1(1), 130-133.