

THE ROLE OF MOTIVATION IN ETYMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Kakharov Shukhratbek Tursunovich,
Teacher of Andijan State University

ANNOTATION

The article discusses the role of the nature of motivation in the etymological analysis of lexical units on the example of the lexeme "kömir - coal". This lexeme is analyzed from the general comparative and historical point of view within the Turkic languages. Special attention was also paid to changes in the phonetic structure of the word during the analysis.

Keywords: etymology, etymological meaning, motivation, extralinguistics, coal, charcoal, Turkic languages, comparison.

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается роль характера мотивации в этимологическом анализе лексических единиц на примере лексемы «kömir - уголь». Данная лексема анализируется с общесопоставительно-исторической точки зрения в рамках тюркских языков. Особое внимание также уделялось изменениям в фонетической структуре слова в ходе анализа.

Ключевые слова: этимология, этимологическое значение, мотивация, экстралингвистика, ископаемый уголь, древесный уголь, тюркские языки, сравнение.

INTRODUCTION

The etymology of words has fascinated people since ancient times. Even the ancient Greek philosophers are known to have debated the relationship between word and object, to what extent the name reveals the essence of the subject.¹ Etymology as a branch of linguistics deals with the restoration of the original form of lexical and grammatical units. Of course, over time, the connection between the form and meaning of certain lexical and grammatical units becomes incomprehensible to language owners. The older the word, the harder, if not impossible, to determine its etymology. This is due to changes in phonetic, grammatical and semantic structure. Restoring etymological meaning does not always yield a positive result. In particular, the etymology of primitive lexemes such as: *iş, baş, qol, kel, ket, aq, tez, az*, cannot be explained.² In fictional words, the situation is a little lighter, even if it is historically fictitious. In determining the etymology of words, in addition to linguistic elements, extralinguistic features - The achievements of history, archeology, ethnography are taken into account. Etymological analysis is of a practical nature, such as the compilation and enrichment of existing etymological dictionaries, the determination of the nature of motivation, the determination of the historical features of naming. Below we analyze the etymology of the word *kömir*

There are two types of coal: fossil coal (ископаемый уголь) and charcoal (древесный уголь). The first is the product of the decomposition and transformation of organic plant residues, which lie in the form of layers between sedimentary rocks. Its layers range from the surface of the earth to a depth of several thousand meters, and the existing deposits are believed to have formed over millions of years. The second is the product of human labor, and the wood (*yog'och*)

is burned in an airless or slightly airy environment. Typically, the wood is partially burned in a pit, covered with soil or sand, and ready in a few days. Aristotle's "Meteorology" contains information about coal. His follower, Theophrastus, in his "Treatise on stone", speaks of coal, recalling charcoal: "u ham xuddi yog'och ko'mir kabi yonadi" and calls it "yonar tosh -antraks."

³ Yes, both types of coal have been known to humans since ancient times. A radical turning point in the historical development of mankind was undoubtedly the discovery of the metal. The discovery of coal was a necessity for metalworking. So the word *kömir* has a very long past. Therefore, when this lexeme is compared on the basis of the materials of sister Turkic languages, it is like a prime number (bir, ikki, üç ...), like the pronouns (men, sen, biz, siz, ...), like a lexicon of kinship (ata, ana, o'g'il, qiz ...), like the names of human body parts (baş, qol, ayaq, köz ...) seem to have a common denominator: Uzbek charcoal *kömir* in Turkish, Turkmen, Azeri, Gagauz, Karachay, Kumik, Kyrgyz, Uyghur, Altaic languages *kömür*; in Kazakh, Karakalpak, and Nogai languages *kömär* in Tatar, Bashkir languages *kümer*; in Tuva language *xömür* in Yakut language *ko'mir*; in Chuvash language *kamrak*; in Shore language *köbür* in Khakas language *köbir*.⁴ The lexical meaning is the same in all. The antiquity of the concept of coal can also be seen in the Indo-European languages when it is formed on the basis of a separate common etymology. For example, P.Ya. Chernix shows that the (уголь) lexeme is associated with a common basis with some phonetic differences in form when compared in Slavic, Germanic, Iranian, Baltic, Albanian, Greek languages. However, P.Ya. Chernix says the etymology of this word is not clear.⁵ So, based on the generality of the *kömir* lexeme within the Turkic languages, the similarity in the phonetic structure, it can be said that at that time there was no differentiation between the Turkic languages.

There are the following views on the etymology of the *kömir* lexeme. G. Ramstedt, K. Brokelman and M. Ryasanyan *kömmäk* (зарывать) connect⁶ to the verb help. Sh. Rakhmatullaev also *kömir* connects⁷ the etymology of *kömmäk* to the verb to help. A. Vamberi and A. fon Gaben connect⁸ it with the verb *küymäk* (гореть). German scientist A. fon Gaben quotes the following three words from the verb (-mir, -mur) based on ancient Turkic texts: *yağmur* (from the verb *yağ-*, (yomg'ir); *almir* (from the verb *al-* (qattiq istak), *kömür* (from the verb *köy-* (yonmoq) *kömir*)⁹. The use of the form *küymir* in Tatar dialects also reinforces this view.¹⁰ Another view is given in A.V. Dibo's dictionary, in which the *k'ume "qora kömir" form reconstructed by the English scientist S.E. Martin and the Korean scholars Liu Chang Ton and Hong Mong Chhoi for the bobooltoy language. In the ancient Korean language, the form *kəm- "qora bo'lmoq" is proposed.¹¹

The etymology of *kömir* is derived from the process of preparation of charcoal. The binding of fossil coal with auxiliary *kömmäk* (зарывать) is less successful. The character of the motivation is not appropriate. Given that burial is a process of action performed on a thing (object) under the influence of a person (subject), the disadvantage of this type of nomination for fossil coal seems to be bord. As for the attitude to charcoal, there are many things that are buried by a person throughout his life, in everyday life, in the process of work. According to the facts of the Turkmen language, we can see in the example of the facts of the Turkmen language that the word *kömir* is not associated with *kömmäk*, but with burning *küymäk* (гореть): *kömür*, *gömmäk*, *küymäk*¹². In this case, the substitution of the phoneme k for the phoneme g in the word *gömmäk* brings the word *küymäk* closer to the word *kömür*.

The etymology of the words *kömäç* (o'choqda cho'qqa ko'mib pishiriladigan non), *kömüç* (xazina) in the dictionary of M. Kashgari can be connected with *kömmäk*. For the second component of the word *kömäç*, there are those who explain¹⁴ -äç = aş (yegulik, ovqat). However, the issue of -äç = aş seems a bit controversial.

In Arabic, too the fact that the word *dafina* (xazina) is derived from the verb¹⁵ *dafana* (ko'mmoq) reinforces the connection between the word *kömüç* (xazina) and the character of motivation to help. And in the process of naming, the associations that are formed as a result of the reflection of things and events in the objective reality in the human mind in the form of linguistic units reflect the typological features of the laws of occurrence. While a new reality is named on the basis of the name of a known reality, the human mind is based on certain associative connections. As A.A. Potebnya noted, the laws of formation of a sequence of concepts in the human mind are association and unification. Also, a successful etymological analysis of an unknown word inevitably leads to the discovery of a concept that connects the meaning of that word with the meaning of the previous word. In turn, this preceding word is also connected with the preceding word in the same order, and so on.¹⁶

For humans, the first association when it comes to "ko'mir" is often "yonmoq". Because the first sign of coal is its flammability. Only an expert in the field knows how to bury and prepare it. For ordinary linguists who call reality, coal is a fuel, a combustible product. It is only because of the phonetic structure of the *kömir* lexeme that the assumptions of a number of Turkic scholars have been in favor of *kömmäk* (зарывать). In the Turkic languages, the lexeme "küymak" is mainly used in the style of "küy- and köy". However, due to the difference y - n (y - n) in the Khalaj language, M. Ryasyanen suggests the form *kön-reconstruction for the ancient Turkic language: *kömäk - könmäk - köymäk - küymäk*. There are similar examples of y - n (y - n) exchange in Mahmud Kashgari: *köndi* (kuydi), *otuñ köndi* (o'tin kuydi). This is the word for argues, *argals* replace y with n, Kashgari¹⁷ says.

From the point of view of phonetic phenomena, we think that the weak position of the phoneme y caused the word *köymür* to become *kömür*. Initially, it was reduced by the weakening of the articulation of the sound, and later it did not burn due to elision *köymür-kömür* change. Note the articulation of the y phoneme in the weak position in the pronunciation of the following examples: *buyruq, büyräk, möyläv, so'yla, qiyma, jiyda*. The reduction of the consonant y is clearly felt.

CONCLUSION

the etymological analysis of the *kömir* lexeme in the diachronic aspect by comparative-historical and comparative methods was emphasized, and it was emphasized that the verb *küyämäk* (гореть) can be an etymology of this lexeme. In terms of associativity, its sound structure was analyzed in terms of its semantics and phonetic phenomena. Evidence has been given that the charm of the *kömir* lexeme is *küymäk*.

REFERENCES

1. Откупщиков Ю. В. К истокам слова: Рассказы о науке этимологии. М.: Просвещение, 1973. С.22-23.
2. Турсунов У., Мухторов А., Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1992.
3. <http://energetika.in.ua/ru/books/book-1/part-2/section-7/7-1/7-1-1;>
4. https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/каменный_уголь#cite_note-1 .
5. Левитская Л.С., Дыбо А.В., Рассадин В.И. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. – М.: «Языки русской культуры», 1997. -С.102-103; Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. Том 9 (дополнительный). Этимологический словарь базисной лексики тюркских языков / Составитель Дыбо А.В. Астана: ТОО “Prosper Print”, 2013. – С.86-87.
6. Черных П.Я. Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка. Том 2. М.: Русский язык, 1999. С.282.
7. Левитская Л.С., Дыбо А.В., Рассадин В.И. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. – М.: «Языки русской культуры», 1997. -С.102-103.
8. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг этимологик луғати (туркий сўзлар). Т.: Университет, 2000. Б.227.
9. Левитская Л.С., Дыбо А.В., Рассадин В.И. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. – М.: «Языки русской культуры», -С.102-103.
10. Gabain A. von. Eski Türkçenin Grameri. Ankara. 1988. Б.53.
11. Hasan Eren. Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü. Ankara, 1999. S.256-257.
12. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. Том 9 (дополнительный). Этимологический словарь базисной лексики тюркских языков / Составитель Дыбо А.В. Астана: ТОО “Prosper Print”, 2013. – С.86-87.
13. Туркменско-русский словарь. М., 1968. С.199, 411.
14. Кошғарий М. Девону луғотит-турк. 1-том. Т., 1960. Б.341.
15. Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican. maç /meç Eki Üzerine. İstanbul Üniv. Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi. с. 21.1975. 83-88.
16. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг этимологик луғати II (араб сўзлари ва улар билан ҳосилалар). Т.: Университет, 2003. Б.105.; Баранов Х.К. Арабско-русский словарь. –М.: Русский язык, 1985. –С.257.
17. Потебня А.А. Собрание трудов. Мысль и язык. М.: Лабиринт, 1999. С.114, 211.
18. Кошғарий М. Девону луғотит-турк. 2-том. Т., 1963. Б.38.

REFERENCES

1. Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican. maç /meç Eki Üzerine. İstanbul Üniv. Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi. с. 21.1975.
2. Gabain A. von. Eski Türkçenin Grameri. Ankara. 1988.
3. Hasan Eren. Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü. Ankara, 1999.
4. Баранов Х.К. Арабско-русский словарь. –М.: Русский язык, 1985.
5. Кошғарий М. Девону луғотит-турк. 1-том. Т., 1960
6. Кошғарий М. Девону луғотит-турк. 2-том. Т., 1963

7. Левитская Л.С., Дыбо А.В., Рассадин В.И. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. – М.: «Языки русской культуры», 1997.
8. Откупщиков Ю. В. К истокам слова: Рассказы о науке этимологии. М.: Просвещение, 1973.
9. Потемня А.А. Собрание трудов. Мысль и язык. М.: Лабиринт, 1999.
10. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг этимологик луғати (туркий сўзлар). Т.: Университет, 2000.
11. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг этимологик луғати II (араб сўзлари ва улар билан ҳосилалар). Т.: Университет, 2003.
12. Туркменско-русский словарь. М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1968.
13. Турсунов У., Мухторов А., Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1992.
14. Черных П.Я. Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка. Том 2. М.: Русский язык, 1999.
15. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. Том 9 (дополнительный). Этимологический словарь базисной лексики тюркских языков / Составитель Дыбо А.В. Астана: ТОО “Prosper Print”, 2013
16. <http://energetika.in.ua/ru/books/book-1/part-2/section-7/7-1/7-1-1;>
17. https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/каменный_уголь#cite_note-1 .