

**TOSHKENT DAVLAT SHARQSHUNOSLIK UNIVERSITETI
HUZURIDAGI ILMY DARAJALAR BERUVCHI
DSc.03/30.12.2019.Fil/Tar.21.01 RAQAMLI ILMY KENGASH**

TOSHKENT DAVLAT SHARQSHUNOSLIK UNIVERSITETI

SATTOROVA ZILOLA ISMOILOVNA

**“DEVONU LUG‘ATI-T-TURK” ASARINING O‘ZBEK TILIDAGI
NASHRLARI VA ULARNING QIYOSIY-MATNIY TADQIQI**

10.00.10 – Matnshunoslik va adabiy manbashunoslik

**Filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) dissertatsiyasi
AVTOREFERATI**

Toshkent – 2024

UO‘K: 801.82:811.512.133:930.2
KBK: 81.2-4/6:63.2(5Uzb)
S-24

**Filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) dissertatsiyasi
avtoreferati mundarijasi**

**Contents of the abstract of dissertation on Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
on philological sciences**

**Оглавление автореферата диссертации доктора философии (PhD)
по филологическим наукам**

Sattorova Zilola Ismoilovna

“Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlari va ularning
qiyosiy-matniy tadqiqi..... 3

Sattorova Zilola Ismoilovna

Uzbek editions of “Devonu lugati-t-turk” and their comparative-textual
research..... 29

Сатторова Зилола Исмоиловна

Узбекские издания “Девону лугати-т-тюрк” и их сравнительное-
текстологическое исследование..... 55

E‘lon qilingan ishlar ro‘uxati

List of published works
Список опубликованных работ..... 59

**TOSHKENT DAVLAT SHARQSHUNOSLIK UNIVERSITETI
HUZURIDAGI ILMY DARAJALAR BERUVCHI
DSc.03/30.12.2019.Fil/Tar.21.01 RAQAMLI ILMY KENGASH**

TOSHKENT DAVLAT SHARQSHUNOSLIK UNIVERSITETI

SATTOROVA ZILOLA ISMOILOVNA

**“DEVONU LUG‘ATI-T-TURK” ASARINING O‘ZBEK TILIDAGI
NASHRLARI VA ULARNING QIYOSIY-MATNIY TADQIQI**

10.00.10 – Matnshunoslik va adabiy manbashunoslik

**Filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) dissertatsiyasi
AVTOREFERATI**

Toshkent – 2024

Falsafa doktori (PhD) dissertatsiyasi mavzusi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasida B2021.2.PhD/Fil1896 raqam bilan ro'yxatga olingan.

Dissertatsiya Toshkent davlat sharqshunoslik universitetida bajarilgan.

Dissertatsiya avtoreferati uch tilda (o'zbek, ingliz, rus (rezyume)) Ilmiy kengash veb sahifasida (www.tsuos.uz) va «Ziyonet» Axborot-ta'lim portalida (www.ziyonet.uz) joylashtirilgan.

Ilmiy rahbar: Omonov Qudratulla Sharipovich
filologiya fanlar doktori, professor

Rasmiy opponentlar: Islomov Zohidjon Mahmudovich
filologiya fanlar doktori, professor

Shodmonov Nafas Namozovich
filologiya fanlar doktori, professor

Yetakchi tashkilot: O'zbekiston Respublikasi Fanlar akademiyasi O'zbek tili,
adabiyoti va folklori instituti

Dissertatsiya himoyasi Toshkent davlat sharqshunoslik universiteti huzuridagi ilmiy darajalar beruvchi DSc.03/30.12.2019.Fil/Tar.21.01 raqamli ilmiy kengashning 2024-yil «24» fevral soat 10⁰⁰ dagi majlisida bo'lib o'tadi (Manzil: 100047, Toshkent, Mirobod tumani, Shahrizabz ko'chasi, 16-uy. Tel.: (99871) 233-45-21; faks: (99871) 233-52-24; e-mail: info@tsuos.uz).

Dissertatsiya bilan Toshkent davlat sharqshunoslik universitetining Axborot-resurs markazida tanishish mumkin (29 raqam bilan ro'yxatga olingan). Manzil: 100060, Toshkent, Mirobod tumani, Amir Temur ko'chasi, 20-uy. Tel.: (99871) 233-45-21.

Dissertatsiya avtoreferati 2024- yil «2» fevral kuni tarqatildi.

(2024-yil «2» fevral dagi 29 raqamli reyestr bayonnomasi).



A.M.Mannonov

Ilmiy darajalar beruvchi ilmiy kengash raisi
filol.f.d., professor

R.A.Alimuxamedov

Ilmiy darajalar beruvchi ilmiy kengash
kotibi, filol.f.d., dotsent

M.M.Is'hoqov

Ilmiy darajalar beruvchi ilmiy kengash
qoshidagi ilmiy seminar raisi v.v.b. tar.f.d.,
professor

Mannonov

KIRISH (falsafa doktori (PhD) dissertatsiyasi annotatsiyasi)

Dissertatsiya mavzusining dolzarbligi va zarurati. Jahon turkologiyasida muhtasham ilmiy, adabiy obida Mahmud Koshg'ariyning "Devonu lug'ati-t-turk" asari butun islom olamiga turkiy tillar, turkiy xalqlarning madaniyati, urf-odati, turmush tarzi, xalq og'zaki ijodi haqida ma'lumot berishni ko'zlab yozilgani uchun umumturkiy xalqlarning mushtarak badiiy merosi sifatida e'tirof etiladi. Turkologiyada mazkur asarga doir tadqiqotlarning salmog'i keng bo'lib, ularning dastlabkisi matn tarixi va asar ilmiy-tanqidiy matnini tayyorlash bilan bog'liq bo'lgan.

O'tgan yuzyillarda dunyo turkologiyasida dastlab asar qo'lyozmasidan emas, balki uning tahrir qilingan bosma nusxasi asosidagi ilmiy nashrlari e'lon qilindi. "Devonu lug'ati-t-turk"dagi she'rlar birinchi bo'lib, 1927-yilda Abdurauf Fitrat tomonidan o'zbek tilida tabdil va talqin etilib, nashrga tayyorlandi. Solih Mutallibovning tarjimasi va talqinidagi o'zbek tilidagi ilk nashri (1960-1963- yillar) dunyo miqyosida uchinchi, Osiyo davlatlarida birinchi marta amalga oshirilgani bois ko'p yillar butun mintaqa uchun yagona tadqiqot manbai bo'lib xizmat qildi. Nashr jahon turkologlari tomonidan e'tirof etilgan, tavsiflangan, biroq matnshunoslik obyekti sifatida qo'lyozma bilan bevosita qiyosiy tadqiq etilmagan. Bugungi kunda qo'lyozmaning sifatli faksimile nusxalari tayyorlangani bois bosma nashr asosida qilingan tadqiqotlar, xususan, matnning ilk o'zbek tilidagi nashrlarida qo'lyozma bilan ma'lum tafovutlar borligi sezilmoqda.

Yangilanayotgan O'zbekistonda ilm-fanni rivojlantirishga qaratilgan e'tibor yangi bosqichga ko'tarilmoqda. Xususan, matnshunoslik va adabiy manbashunoslik tadqiqotlarini qo'lyozma manbalar asosida chuqur o'rganish yil sayin alohida ahamiyat kasb etib bormoqda. Shunday ishlar sirasida o'zbek matnshunosligida yangi natijalarga erishish uchun "Devonu lug'ati-t-turk" matnining qo'lyozma asosidagi yangi nashrlariga ehtiyoj yuzaga keldi. Bugungi kunda asarning o'zbek tilidagi nashri ikki marta qayta tahrirlanib, 2016-yilda Alibek Rustamov, Hamidulla Boltaboyev, Baxtiyor Isabekov hamda 2017-yilda Qosimjon Sodiqov tomonidan nashrga tayyorlandi. Matnshunoslik tadqiqoti o'zidan keyingi tilshunoslik, adabiyotshunoslik, tarixshunoslikka oid ilmiy ishlarga asos bo'lib, tadqiqotlarning sifati va ishonchliligini ta'minlaydi. Shu bois ushbu nashrlarni o'zaro qiyosiy-matniy tadqiq etish va original matn xususiyatlari ochiqdanganini belgilash mavzuning dolzarbligini ifodalaydi.

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining 2022-yilning 28-yanvaridagi "2022-2026-yillarga mo'ljallangan Yangi O'zbekistonning taraqqiyot strategiyasi to'g'risida"gi PF-60- son¹, 2022-yil 10-fevraldagi "Qadimiy yozma manbalarni saqlash va tadqiq etish tizimini takomillashtirishga doir qo'shimcha chora-tadbirlar to'g'risida"gi PQ-126-son² qarori hamda mazkur faoliyatga tegishli boshqa me'yoriy-huquqiy hujjatlarda belgilangan vazifalarni amalga oshirishda dissertatsiya tadqiqoti muayyan darajada xizmat qiladi.

¹ <https://lex.uz/docs/5841063>

² O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Sh.M.Mirziyoyevning 2017-yil 24-maydagi PQ-2995 son "Qadimiy yozma manbalarni saqlash, tadqiq va targ'ib qilish tizimini yanada takomillashtirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida"gi Qarori.// Xalq so'zi, 2017-yil, 25-may.

Tadqiqotning respublika fan va texnologiyalari rivojlanishining asosiy ustuvor yo‘nalishlariga bog‘liqligi. Mazkur tadqiqot Respublika fan va texnologiyalarni rivojlantirishning I. “Axborotlashgan jamiyat va demokratik davlatni ijtimoiy, huquqiy, iqtisodiy, madaniy, ma’naviy-ma’rifiy rivojlantirishda innovatsion g‘oyalar tizimini shakllantirish va ularni amalga oshirish yo‘llari” ustuvor yo‘nalishi doirasida bajarilgan.

Muammoning o‘rganilganlik darajasi. “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” qo‘lyozmasi topilib, ilmiy jamoatchilikka yetkazilgan kundan boshlab, jahon miqyosida keng o‘rganilgan. Matn tarixi va uning tekstologik xususiyatlariga oid aksar tadqiqotlar uning tarjimon va noshirlari tomonidan tadqiq etilgan bo‘lib, XX asrda *nemis, turk, o‘zbek, ingliz, uyg‘ur* va *qozoq* tillariga tarjima qilingan³. Mazkur tadqiqotlar 2000-yildan keyin ham jadallashib, *fors, xitoy, ozarbayjon, rus, qirg‘iz, turk* va *o‘zbek* tillarida qayta ishlangan va yangi nashrlari e‘lon qilindi⁴. O‘zbek tilidagi S.Mutallibov nashrining xususiyatlari, tarjimonning yondashuvlari ushbu xorijiy nashrlarning kirish qismida qisman o‘rganilgan.

A.Kononov, I.Stebleva, A.Rustamov, E.Fozilov, Q.Sodiqov, S.Rustamiy, E.Umarov, J.Xudoyberdiyev, Sh.Sultonaliyev, U.Omurbekova tadqiqotlarida boshqa xorijiy nashrlar bilan qiyoslaganlar va nashrdagi ayrim yutuq va kamchiliklarni ko‘rsatib o‘tganlar⁵.

³ Brockelmann C. Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Mahmud al-Kaşgaris Divan Lughat at-Turk. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica. – Budapest-Leipzig, – No. 1, 1928; *Atalay B.* Divanü Lûgat-it Türk Tercümesi. 3 cilt. – С. 1,2,3. – Ankara: Alâeddin Kırıl Basımevi, 1939, 1940, 1941; Туркий сўзлар девони (Девони луғотит турк). Таржимон ва нашрга тайёрловчи: *С.Муталлибов*. 3 жилд. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон Фанлар академияси, 1960, 1961, 1963; *Mahmud al-Kashgari.* Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Diwan Lugat at-Turk), edited and translated with introduction and indices by Robert Dankoff, in collaboration with James Kelly. Cambridge, Mass. [In: Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures, ed. Sinasi Tekin.] – Part I: 1982 – P. xi + 416. Part II: 1984 (Pp. iii + 381). Part III: 1985 (Pp. 337 + microfile); *Kashgari Maxmut.* Turkiy tillar divani – Divanü lûgat-it-türk. – Urumchi, 1981. – 687 b. 1983. II. – 535 b., 1984. III. – 612 b.; Қашқари Махмут. Түрік сөздігі. 3-том/Аударған А. Егеубай. – Алматы. 1997.

⁴ *Махмуд бин Ал Хусайн АлКашгарий.* Девону луғати-т-турк / Др.Хусайн Мухаммазода Сиддик. Ахтар нашриёти, Табриз-Эрон: Хижрий 1383.; Tu Tszüe Yuy Datsıdyan [“Devonu luğot-it-turk”] – Beyin: Millətlər nəşriyiti, 2002. – I cild. – 554 b., II cild – 378 b., III cild – 442 b.; *Kaşğari Mahmud.* Divanü lûgat-it-türk. Tərcümə edən və nəşrə hazırlayan Ramiz Əskər. – Bakı: Ozan, 2006, – I cild, – 512 s.; – II cild, – 400 s.; – III cild, – 400 s.; IV cild (indeks), – 752 s.; *Махмуд ал-Кашгарий.* Диван Луғат ат-Турк. Перевод, предисловие и комментарии З.-А.М.Ауэзовой. Индексы составлены Р.Эрмерсом. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2005; *Махмуд ал-Кашгарий.* Диван луғат ат-турк (Свод тюркских слов) : в 3 т. / Пер. с араб. А.Р. Рустамова под ред. И.В.Кормушина, прим. И.В. Кормушина, Е.А. Поцелуевского, А.Р.Рустамова; – Москва: Вост. лит., 2010-том 1. – 461 с.; Махмуд Кашгари. Словарь тюркских языков / перевод на кырг. Т. Токоев, К. Кошмоков. – Бишкек, 2011. Т. I. – 906 б, II. 591б, III – 678 б.; *Kaşgarlı Mahmud.* Divānu Lugāti‘t-Türk (Giriş – Metin – Çeviri – Notlar – Dizin). Hazırlayanlar: Ahmet B.Ercilasun, Ziyat Akkoynli. – Ankara: TDK Yayınları. – 1120 s.; *Махмуд Кошгарий.* Девону луғоти-т-турк. 1-3 жилд. (Нашрга тайёрловчилар: А.Рустамов, Ҳ. Болтабоев, Б.Исабеков) – Тошкент: Mumtoz so‘z, 2016.; *Махмуд Кошгарий.* “Девону луғати-т- турк”. Нашрга тайёрловчи: Содиқов Қ. – Тошкент: Фафур Ғуллом, 2007. – 482 б.

⁵ *Кононов А.* Изучение “Дивану луғат ит-турк” Махмуда Кашгарского в советском в СССР. Советская тюркология.1973. – №1. – С.4-5; *Рустамов А.* О переводе “Дивану луғат ит-турк” Махмуда Кашгари на русский язык. Советская тюркология. – Баку, 1972. – №1. – С.129-139.; *Стеблева И.* Развитие тюркских поэтических форм в XI веке. Москва. 1971. – С.111-279; *Фазылов Э.* Об изданиях и издателях «Дивана» Махмуда Кашгари. Советская тюркология. 1972. – №1. – Б.141-149.; *Содиқов Қ.* «Девону луғати-т-турк»да кечган *yelkin-elkin* сўзи ва унинг шеърлий узиндилардаги семантикаси // «Шарк таржимашунослиги: тарихи, ҳозирги кун ва келажак» мавзuidaги Республика илмий-амалий конференция тўплами. – Тошкент: ТошДШИ, 2014. – №2. – Б.24-28; *Рустамий С.* “Девону луғот-т-турк”даги лингвистик атамалар. – Т. 2006. – 92 б.; *Умаров Э.* Девонни янгидан нашр қилмок керак // Махмуд Кошгарийнинг “Девону луғотит турк” асари ва унинг туркий халқлар маданияти ҳамда жаҳон цивилизациясида тутган ўрни. Халқаро конференция материаллари. Самарқанд. 2002. – 98.; *Умаров Э.* “Девону луғотит турк”да чўзиқ унлиларнинг берилиши. Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 2010. – № 5. – Б.74-77.; *Султаналиев И.Ш.* Фонетико-лексические особенности перевода и чтения на тюркских и русском языках словаря Махмуда Кашгари «Дивану луғати-т тюрк» // Научный результат. Вопросы теоретической и прикладной лингвистики. – Т.3, – №2, 2017. – С.42-46.; *Xudoyberdiyev J.* Mahmud Koshg‘ariy hayoti va «Devonu lug‘otit turk» bo‘yicha yaratilgan asarlar ko‘rsatkichi. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2011. – 160 b.; *Omurbekova U.* Divanu lugati-t-turk uzerine Turkiye‘de ve Yurt dıshında yapılmıř çalıřmalar. – Kastamonu, 2020. – s. 78-82.

N.Rahmon, B.To‘xliyev, H.Boltaboyev va S.Hasanov, R.Alimuxamedov o‘zbek tilidagi yangi nashrlar bilan chog‘ishtirilgan ilmiy ishlarini e‘lon qilganlar⁶. Shuningdek, Abdurauf Fitratning matn bo‘yicha tayyorlagan majmuasi turk olimi Y.Avji tomonidan B.Atalayning turkcha nashri bilan qiyosiy o‘rganilgan bo‘lsa, o‘zbek olimasi O.Hamrayevaning ilmiy ishida manbashunoslik tadqiqi amalga oshirilgan⁷. Biroq o‘zbek tilida e‘lon qilingan ilmiy nashrlar o‘zaro va qo‘lyozma bilan bevosita qiyosiy-matniy tadqiq etilmagan.

Dissertatsiya mavzusining dissertatsiya bajarilgan oliy ta‘lim muassasasining ilmiy-tadqiqot ishlari bilan bog‘liqligi. Dissertatsiya tadqiqoti Toshkent davlat sharqshunoslik universitetida amalga oshirilgan “Audiomanuskript.uz platformasini yaratish” (2022-2023), “IZ-2020102832 - “Yevropa fondlarida saqlanayotgan, O‘zbekistonda mavjud bo‘lmagan turkiy qo‘lyozmalarning ma‘lumotlar bazasini va “Yevroturcologica.uz” elektron platformasini yaratish” (2021-2023) nomli ilmiy loyihalari doirasida bajarilgan.

Tadqiqotning maqsadi “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarini o‘zaro qiyosiy-matniy baholash, matniy tafovutlarni aniqlash, qo‘lyozma bilan chog‘ishtirish hamda nashrlarning qo‘lyozma xususiyatlarini aks ettirishini ochib berishdan iborat.

Tadqiqotning vazifalari quyidagilardan iborat:

qo‘lyozmaning matniy xususiyatlariga oid bahsli masalalariga munosabat bildirish;

“Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarining statistik tahlilini amalga oshirish;

o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarda muqaddima qismiga oid matniy tafovutlarni qo‘lyozma bilan chog‘ishtirib, matnning xususiyatlari ochiqqlanganini belgilash;

nashrlarda turkiy matnlarning yozilishi va o‘qilishiga oid matniy-ma‘naviy farqlarning paydo bo‘lishiga ta‘sir etgan omillarni oydinlashtirish, tasniflab tahlil qilish;

nashrlarda turkiy she‘r va maqollarni qiyosiy-matniy tadqiq etish, Abdurauf Fitrat tadqiqoti va qo‘lyozma bilan qiyoslab, original matn xususiyatlari ochiqqlanganini belgilash.

Tadqiqotning obyekti “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining 1960-1963, 2016, 2017-yillarda e‘lon qilingan o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlari, 1927- yilda nashr qilingan Abdurauf Fitratning majmuasi va asar qo‘lyozmasining 2008- yilda tayyorlangan faksimile nusxasi tashkil etadi.

Tadqiqotning predmeti sifatida “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarini qiyosiy-matniy tadqiq etish belgilangan.

Tadqiqotning usullari. Tadqiqot uchun to‘plangan materiallarning o‘ziga xos xususiyatlaridan kelib chiqib, matniy qiyoslash, tavsiflash, tasniflash, chog‘ishtirish, semantik va statistik tahlil asosida o‘rganildi.

⁶ *Насимхон Раҳмон*. Туркологияда дадил кадам. “Ўзбекистон адабиёти ва санъати”. 27 сентябрь, 2017 йил. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337812439_Turkologiada_dadil_kadam; *Тўхлиев Б.* “Девону луғати-т-турк”ка оид айрим мулоҳазалар // *Turkologiya*. – Т: TDSHU, – № 3. 2021. – Б.26-36.; *Ҳасанов С., Болтабоев Ҳ.* “Девону луғот-т-турк”нинг янги нашрини тайёрлаш принциплари // “Девону луғоти-т-турк” – туркий халқларнинг ноёб ёзма ёдгорлиги” халқаро илмий анжуман материаллари. – Т., 2018. – Б.7.; *Алимухамедов Р.* Проф. Қ.Содиқов томонидан тайёрланган “Девону луғати-т-турк” асарининг янги нашри // “Девону луғоти-т-турк” – туркий халқларнинг ноёб ёзма ёдгорлиги” мавзуидаги халқаро илмий анжуман материаллари. – Т., 2018. – Б.122.

⁷ *Avci Y.* Türk Edebiyatının en eski örnekleri. Kesit Yayınları. – Istanbul. 2014. – S.9-12.; *Ҳамроева О.* XX аср бошлари ўзбек матншунослиги тараққиётида Фитрат мажмуаларининг ўрни: Фил. фан. бўйича фалс. д-ри (PhD)... дис. – Т., 2018. – 173 б.

Tadqiqotning ilmiy yangiligi:

Abdurauf Fitratning “Eng eski turk adabiyoti namunalari” majmuasida “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk”dan olingan she‘riy parchalar nashri uchun asarning bosma nusxasi asos bo‘lganiga qaramasdan she‘riy matnlarning qo‘lyozmaga mos shakli to‘g‘ri tiklangani dalillangan;

S.Mutallibov nashrida oltita so‘z-maqola hamda qator diniy tushuncha va kalimalar tushirib qoldirilgani, shuningdek, matnning o‘qilishi va talqini bilan bog‘liq xatolar keyingi tadqiqotlarda ham takrorlangani ochiqdangan;

“Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk”ning H.Boltaboyev boshchiligida tayyorlangan nashri S.Mutallibov yondashuvlari asosida ekanligi, matnning tiklangan o‘rinlari A.Rustamovning ruscha nashriga asoslanilgani, Q.Sodiqov nashrida esa o‘zigacha bo‘lgan nashrlarda tushirib qoldirilgan qo‘lyozma buyurtmachisining so‘zboshisi hamda sakkizta so‘z-maqola tiklangani isbotlangan;

o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarda aniqlangan 650 ga yaqin tafovutlar qo‘lyozma bilan solishtirilib tasniflangani, farqlarning asosiy qismi turkiy matn bilan bog‘liq ekanligi ko‘rsatilgan hamda qo‘lyozmada keltirilgan turkiy so‘zlar talqinida S.Mutallibov arabcha matnga, Q.Sodiqov esa turkiy matnga asoslanganligi dalillangan.

Tadqiqotning amaliy natijalari quyidagilardan iborat:

“Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlari o‘zaro qiyoslanib, matniy tafovutlar aniqlangan va qo‘lyozma bilan chog‘ishtirilgan, natijada tafovutlarning eng ko‘lamlisi turkiy matnlarning o‘qilishiga va qisman talqinga oid ekani aniqlangan; so‘zlar, tovushlar, talqin, turkiy she‘rlar va maqollar doirasida besh guruhga ajratilib tahlil qilingan, ayrim farqli o‘rinlar xorijiy nashrlar bilan ham qiyoslangan;

o‘zbekcha nashrlardagi so‘z-maqola vazifasida kelgan so‘zlar statistikasi hisoblangan va natijalarning har xilligiga ta‘sir etgan omillar ma‘lum qilingan, o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlar, shuningdek Abdurauf Fitrat majmuasidagi turkiy she‘rlar qo‘lyozma bilan qiyoslanib, mualliflarning matn xususiyatlarini nashrlarda aks ettirish mahorati ochiqdangan; aniqlangan 650 ga yaqin matniy tafovutlar mavzuiy guruhlariga ajratilib, tadqiqot so‘nggidagi ilovalarda ko‘rsatilgan.

Tadqiqot natijalarining ishonchiligi dissertatsiya matnshunoslik va adabiy manbashunoslik tadqiqotlarining metodologiyasi va usullari asosida bajarilganligi, sohaga oid 200 dan ziyod adabiyotlardan foydalanilganligi, xulosalarning amaliyotga joriy etilganligi, olingan natijalarning tegishli tuzilmalar tomonidan tasdiqlanganligi bilan ta‘minlangan.

Tadqiqot natijalarining ilmiy va amaliy ahamiyati. Tadqiqot natijalarining ilmiy ahamiyati “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlaridagi matniy-ma‘naviy farqlar bevosita qo‘lyozma bilan qiyoslanib tasniflanishi, ilk bor Abdurauf Fitratning majmuasiga kiritilgan she‘rlar asl manba bilan chog‘ishtirilgani, qo‘lyozmadagi noaniq o‘rinlar nashrga tayyorlovchilarning matn bilan ishlash mahoratlari bilan tiklanganining asoslanishi, tadqiqot natijasida olingan xulosalar turkiy tillarni tadqiq etishni yanada boyitishga ilmiy-nazariy manba bo‘lib xizmat qiladi.

Tadqiqot natijalarining amaliy ahamiyati kelgusida “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk”ka oid tilshunoslik, adabiyotshunoslik, matnshunoslik tadqiqotlari, matnning yangi nashrlari,

manbashunoslik va matnshunoslik bo'yicha qo'llanmalar, o'quv adabiyotlarini tayyorlashda manba bo'lib xizmat qiladi.

Tadqiqot natijalarining joriy qilinishi. “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlari va ularning qiyosiy-matniy tadqiqi” mavzusi yuzasidan olib borilgan ilmiy izlanishlar asosida:

“Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining qo‘lyozmasi, uning matniy xususiyatlari, asarning o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlari, turkologiyada asar talqinini mukammallashtirishga bo‘lgan urinishlar bilan bog‘liq tahlillardan Toshkent davlat sharqshunoslik universitetida 2021-2023-yillarda bajarilgan IZ-2020102832 raqamli “Evropa fondlarida saqlanayotgan, O‘zbekistonda mavjud bo‘lmagan Turkiy qo‘lyozmalarining ma‘lumotlar bazasini va “Evroturcologica.uz” elektron platformasini yaratish” mavzusidagi innovatsion loyihada foydalanilgan (Toshkent davlat sharqshunoslik universitetining 2023-yil 15- noyabrdagi 02-04/2217- son ma‘lumotnomasi). Natijada “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk”ning Turkiyada saqlanayotgan yagona nusxasi 1266-yilda damashqlik Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr Damashqiy tomonidan Mahmud Koshg‘ariyning o‘z qo‘li bilan yozgan nusxadan ko‘chirilganligi to‘g‘risidagi qarashlarni asoslashga xizmat qilgan;

“Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining o‘zbek tilidagi ilk nashrlari va keyingi yillardagi qayta nashrlarining qiyosiy-matniy tadqiqi, matniy farqlarning qo‘lyozmada qanday shaklda kelgani bilan bog‘liq xulosalardan O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Yoshlar siyosati va sport vazirligi huzuridagi Yoshlar ishlari agentligining 2023-yil birinchi yarim yillik ish rejasini ishlab chiqishda foydalanilgan (O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Yoshlar siyosati va sport vazirligi huzuridagi Yoshlar ishlari agentligining 2023-yil 4-avgustdagi 1 13-21-2157-son ma‘lumotnomasi). Tadqiqot asosida tayyorlangan ish rejasi yangi ma‘lumotlar bilan boyitilgan hamda targ‘ibot va tashviqot ishlarida “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk”ning o‘zbekcha nashrlari haqidagi tasavvurlarni boyitishda nazariy-metodologik manba vazifasini bajargan;

“Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarining bugungacha o‘zbek tilida tayyorlangan nashrlari tadqiqiga oid tahlillardan O‘zbekiston milliy teleradiokompaniyasi “O‘zbekiston tarixi” telekanalining “Taqdimot” ko‘rsatuvi ssenariysini tayyorlashda foydalanilgan (O‘zbekiston milliy teleradiokompaniyasi “O‘zbekiston tarixi” telekanalining 2023-yil, 28-noyabrdagi 06-28-1778-son ma‘lumotnomasi). Ko‘rsatuvda o‘zbek koshg‘ariyshunosligi bevosita Abdurauf Fitratdan boshlangani, ilk o‘zbekcha nashrlar asarining qo‘lyozmasidan emas, balki tahrir qilingan bosma nusxa asosida amalga oshirilgani va so‘nggi yillarda asar ikki marta qayta nashrga tayyorlangani, mazkur nashrlar o‘zaro va qo‘lyozma bilan solishtirilib matniy tafovutlar aniqlangani ilmiy asosda yoritilgan.

Tadqiqot natijalarining aprobatsiyasi. Tadqiqot natijalari 4 ta ilmiy-amaliy anjumanda, jumladan 2 ta xalqaro va 2 ta respublika miqyosidagi konferensiyada aprobatsiyadan o‘tgan.

Tadqiqot natijalarining e‘lon qilinishi. Dissertatsiya mavzusi bo‘yicha jami 17 ta ilmiy ish, jumladan, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasining doktorlik dissertatsiyalari asosiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlarda 8 ta maqola (ulardan 4 tasi respublika va 4 tasi xorij jurnallarida) nashr qilingan.

Dissertatsiyaning tuzilishi va hajmi. Tadqiqot kirish, uchta bob, xulosa va foydalanilgan adabiyotlar ro‘yxatidan iborat. Dissertatsiyaning umumiy hajmi 150 betni tashkil etgan.

DISSERTATSIYANING ASOSIY MAZMUNI

Kirish qismida dissertatsiya mavzusining dolzarbligi va zarurati asoslangan, dissertatsiyaning maqsadi va vazifalari, obyekti va predmeti tavsiflangan, uning respublika fan va texnologiyalari rivojlanishining ustuvor yoʻnalishlariga mosligi koʻrsatilgan, tadqiqotning ilmiy yangiligi va amaliy ahamiyati ochib berilgan, tadqiqot natijalarini amaliyotga joriy qilish, nashr etilgan ishlar va dissertatsiyaning tuzilishi boʻyicha maʼlumotlar keltirilgan.

Dissertatsiyaning **I bobi “Devonu lugʻati-t-turk”:** Turkologiyada asar talqinini mukammallashtirishga boʻlgan urinishlar boʻlib, ikki tuzilmasida asarning manbashunoslik va matnshunoslik tahlili, Abdurauf Fitrat tadqiqotlari yoritilgan.

X asrda xalifalar saroyida turklarning nufuzi baland boʻlgani turk tilini oʻrganishga boʻlgan maʼnaviy, ilmiy ehtiyojni yuzaga keltirgan va Mahmud Koshgʻariyning turkiy tillar grammatikasi boʻyicha yuqori mahorat hamda tajribaga egaligi ⁸ “Devonu lugʻati-t-turk” (keyingi oʻrinlarda DLT) uning tomonidan yaratilishiga asos boʻlgan.

Mahmud Koshgʻariy shaxsi haqida matnning oʻzidagina ishora qilingan ayrim oʻrinlardan boshqa maʼlumotlar mavjud emas. Biz uning hukmdor sulola vakili ekanligi haqidagi qarashlarga tadqiqotchilar nazaridan chetda qolgan yangi maʼlumot bilan qoʻshilamiz: “*Kök topulğan – bir qushning oti. Aytishlaricha, bu qushning ikki qanotida poʻlat boʻladi va u qanoti bilan oʻzini togʻga urib, bir tomondan boshqa tomonga teshib oʻtadi. Bu soʻzni menga xizmat qilib yurgan bir kishi aytgan.*”(MK.259/4-7)⁹.

DLTning yagona nusxasi Mahmud Koshgʻariyning oʻzi bitgan nusxadan ikki yuz yil oʻtgach, 664-yil, shavvol oyining 27- da (1266-yil 1-avgust) sovalik, soʻng damashqlik Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr Damashqiy nomli kotib tomonidan koʻchirilgan. XIV asrga kelib, Muhammad Xatib Darayyaga oʻtgan (D-K.8)¹⁰. Misrni bosib olgan turk sultoni Yavuz Sulon Selim barcha oʻljalarni suv yoʻli orqali Topqopi saroyiga yuborgan va DLT usmonlilar saroyiga kelib qolgan. XX asr boshida Ali Amiriy nomli kitob ixlosmandi ajdodlari uzoq vaqtlar mobaynida saroyda posholik qilgan Nazif poshoning qarindoshi boʻlgan bir ayoldan qoʻlyozmani sotib olgan¹¹ va shu tariqa asar ilk bor ilmiy jamoatchilikka eʼlon qilingan. Hozirda Millat kutubxonasi 4189 raqam bilan saqlanadi.

Matnda asosan qora, qizil siyoh ishlatilgan. Kuzatishimizcha, faksimilening 25-200 sahifalarida och jigarrang siyohda oʻzgartirishlar kiritilgan, yaʼni *zamma*, *fatha*, *kasra*, *sukun*, *taʼdid*, *tanvin* va baʼzi harflarning nuqtalari qoʻyib chiqilgan. 30/11- satr, arabcha matnda جز deb yozilgan soʻzning oxirida *tanvin fatha* bilan toʻgʻirlangan va sukun qoʻyilgan. Bir oʻrinda turkiy soʻzga ham *tanvin fatha*

⁸ (..biz bularni *Javahiru-n-nahvi fi lugʻati-t-turki*” [“Turk tillarining nahviga oid gavharlar”] otli asarimizda berdik” (MK.18)

⁹ *Mahmud bin al-Husayn bin Muhammad al-Kashgʻari*. Kitâbu dîvânu lugʻâtiʼ-*t-türk*. Tipkibasim-Türkçe Sözcükler, Özel Adlar Dizini. – Istanbul: Yayina hazirlayan Şaban Kurt. 2008. – 638 s. (Tadqiqot davomida qoʻlyozmaning mazkur faksimile nusxasidan foydalanildi).

¹⁰ *Mahmud al-Kashgari*. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Diwan Lugat at-Turk), edited and translated with introduction and indices by Robert Dankoff, in collaboration with James Kelly. – Cambridge, Mass. / In: Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures, ed. Sinasi Tekin. Part I: 1982 – 416 p. – Part II: 1984. – 381 p. – Part III: 1985. – P.337.

¹¹ Chichekli Ali. *Kashgarli Mahmut*. DIVAN-U LUGAT-IT TURK. May yayinlari genel kultur kitapları 2. 1970. – S.2

qo'yilganiga duch keldik. Ba'zi olimlarning tahrir qilgan kishi yoki kotib turkiy tilni arab tilchalik bilmagan deb baho berishlari,¹² balki, shu vajdandir. 77/16-17- qatorida *من أندا أشنو كليم* *men anda aşnu keldim* birikmasidagi ikkinchi so'zning oxiriga *tanvin fatha* yozilgan. Bu o'rinda nun ن yozsa ham shu ma'no chiqishi, *andan* o'qilishi mumkin edi. Biroq, matn ko'rinishini iloji boricha buzmaslikka, kamchiliklarni sezdirmasdan tuzatishga harakat qilingan ko'rinadi. Shuningdek, 32-sahifada 6 ta ك ning ustiga uchta nuqta qo'yilib, turkcha so'zlar tarkibidagi jarangsiz ك [k]ning jarangli ك [g] talaffuz qilinishi ta'minlangan.

Qo'lyozma bitgach, uni keyinchalik boshqa bir kishi tuzatib chiqqan ko'rinadi. Tadqiqotchilar kotib abu Bakr Damashqiy va Xatib Darayya bilan birga 15 kishining qalami borligini taxmin qilishgan (D-K,15). Bizningcha ham boshqa qo'l izlari bo'lishi mumkin. Chunki, qizil siyohdagi ba'zi sarlavha (8/14-qator) va arabcha o'rindlarda to'q qora rang bilan harakatlar qo'yilgan. Bu qatorida qizil sarlavha ustida kotib qalamidan farqli to'q qora siyohda ham qalin va yotiqroq zamma qo'yilgan. Bu jigarrang siyoh egasining "zamma"siga ham o'xshamaydi. 3,9,10,12-sahifalar hoshiyalaridagi yozuvlar ham kotibning dastxatidan farqli — biroz o'ngga qiyalangan. Biroq olimlarning matnda 15 ta qalam egasining izi bor deyishi biroz bahsli masaladir. Sababi hajman katta asarni yozishda siyohning tugashi va almashinishi tabiiy. Bizningcha, qo'lyozmani ustidan tahrir qilgan shaxslar yo boshqa nusxasiga qarab tuzatmoqchi bo'lgan yoki o'quvchiga tushunarliroq yana bir variantini chiqarmoqchi bo'lgan *انى بَشْرًا قَفْتِي* *ani bašra qaqtī* jumlasida *bašra* so'zidagi *-ra* jo'nalish kelishigi ustidan chizilib, *-ka* shaklga o'zgartirishga, ya'ni *bašga qaqqar* birikmasi yasashga urinilgan, chunki eski turkiy tilda qo'shimchaning qadimgi turkiy tildagi *-ra* shakli faol emas edi — MK.412/12).

Sh.Kurtning qayd etishicha, qo'lyozmaning 637- sahifasida *إِنَّجْ inänäč* so'zi bor va u DLTning birona nashrida uchramaydi¹³. Biz bu fikrga to'laligicha qo'shila olmaymiz. Chunki bu yerda *ishonarli, e'tiqod* ma'nosida izohlangan birlikdagi ingichka [ä] unlisi hisobga olinmasdan *إِنَّجْ inänč* o'qilgan. K.Rifatni ham tanqid qilish noo'rin bo'lsa kerak. *Inänč* so'zi turkiy tillarda faol bo'lgan. Shuningdek, جلي g'unnalilar bobida barcha so'zlar نج bilan yakunlangan. Ko'kturk bitiglarida bu ikki tovush birgalikda bitta maxsus harf bilan ifodalangan. Qo'lyozmada bu so'zning yozilishi Sh.Kurt keltirganidek, 637- sahifaning 14- qatorida *إِنَّجْ inänäč* yozilgan, ya'ni ikkinchi ن nun *fatha* bilan harakatlangan. Davomidan *inänč beg* birikmasi so'zni yanada aniqlashtirish uchun kiritilgan. Lekin bu safar "o'sha *fatha*" qo'yilmagan. Bu birikma shu holatda matnda takror kelgan. Qolaversa, "Qutadg'u bilig" ning arab yozuvli Namangan nusxasida o'sha davrlarda *inänč beg* nomli maxsus unvon bo'lgani qayd qilingan¹⁴. Demak, bu o'rinda kotib tomonidan qo'yilgan *fatha* harakatini beixtiyor qo'yib yuborilgan deb xulosa qilish mumkin.

Matnning ilk sahifasidagi 15 qatorli so'zboshi haqida ikki xil qarash shakllangan: 1. *K.Rifat so'zboshi Ahmad Xatib Darayya tomonidan 1400-1401-yillarda yozilgan deb xulosa qilgan*. Chunki sahifa yuqorisiga ushbu shaxsning nomi, imzosi va shu sana yozilgan edi. 2. *So'zboshi kotib abu Bakr Saviy Damashqiy tomonidan*

¹² Рустамий С. "Девону луғоти-турк"даги лингвистик атамалар. – Т., 2006. – Б.25

¹³ Şaban Kurt. Özel Adlar Dizini. – Istanbul, 2008. – S.17.

¹⁴ Содиқов Қ. "Қутадғу билиг" сўзлиги [Матн]. – Т., 2020. – Б.108.

1266-yilda yozilgan. Denköff-Kelli asar sarlavhasidagi *Allah* va imzoning *bi-l-qahira* soʻzidagi *ha* harfining ikki xil yozilgani bilan bu fikrga keladi. Bizningcha, ikkinchi mulohaza asosli. Faksimilega koʻra, yozuv xususiyatlari, harflarning qayrilish burchaklari, 15- satrdagi qizil siyohda nuqtachali doira va uchta qizil nuqta qoʻyilgani asosiy matn bilan bir xil. Soʻzboshi haqidagi soʻnggi xulosamiz – kitobni koʻchirtirgan buyurtmachining qoʻlida Mahmud Koshgʻariyning avtograf nusxasi boʻlgan va u oʻz mulohazalarini shu sahifaga bitishini kotibdan soʻragan.

1915-1917- yillarda matnni ilk bor tahrir qilib, bosma nusxaga tayyorlagan Amiriyning shogirdi K.Rifat boʻladi. U ayrim oʻchgan harflarni, soʻzlarni tiklagan, shu bilan birga ikki xil harakatlangan harflarning bir variantini tanlab, ikkinchisini matnga kiritmagan va bu bilan qoʻlyozma xususiyatlarini oʻzgartirib yuborgan. Biroq, butun turkologiya asarni shu nashr asosida tanigan, 1982- yilgacha eʼlon qilingan ilmiy nashrlar, jumladan, nemis, turk, oʻzbek tilidagi nashrlarga ham tayanch boʻlgan. 1939-1941-yillarda B.Atalay ham turkcha nashrida ayrim tahrirlarni amalga oshirgan. Xususan, *yim* (zigʻir urugʻi) va *yupaĝu* soʻzi aslida qoʻlyozmada *yitim*, *يُيَاغُو* *buyaĝu* shaklida boʻlishi asosli ekanini qayd qilgan. (BA.III,24,36)¹⁵. Qoʻlyozmaga asosan mazkur izohlar oʻrinli ekani aniqlandi (MK.454/11; 459/15) Unga koʻra, *yitim* soʻzidagi *ت* harfining nuqtalari qoʻyilmagan va K.Rifat bu harfni tushirib *yim* shaklini qabul qilgan. Bu xatolik nashrlarda ham takrorlangan.

Qoʻlyozmaning bugunga qadar 5 ta faksimile nashri tayyorlangan boʻlib, barchasi Turkiya davlatida amalga oshirilgan (1941, 1990, 2008, 2017, 2018-y). Jahon turkologiyasida birinchi boʻlib, qoʻlyozma asosida matnni tarjima qilgan — oʻzbek olimi A.Rustamovdir. Biz ahamiyat bergan xorijiy nashrlardan qoʻlyozma xususiyatlari toʻlaroq ochilgan deb bilganimiz quyidagilar: R.Denkoff va J.Kellingning inglizcha, A.Rustamovning ruscha va A.Erjilasun va Z.Akkoʻyunlining turkcha nashri boʻlib, ishda nashrlar tavsifini berganmiz.

DLT xorijiy tillar bilan bir qatorda birinchi bor, 1927-yilda oʻzbek tilida nashr etilgan. Asarning yurtimizdagi ilk tadqiqotchisi va noshiri Abdurauf Fitratdir. U shu yili “Eng eski turk adabiyoti namunalari”¹⁶ majmuasiga tartib berdi. Ushbu nashr Sharqshunoslik instituti fondida inv.№16507, Anqaradagi Millat kutubxonasida 5994 raqam bilan qayd qilingan.

Fitrat DLTni toʻliq tabdil va talqin qilmagan. Faqatgina turkiy badiiy parchalar – masnaviy va toʻrtlik shaklidagi folklor namunalari nashr etgan. Majmua uch qism boʻlib, 124 betdan iborat. Sahifalar arab raqamlarida belgilangan. Eski oʻzbek yozuvida yozilgan. Iqtiboslar va ilmiy izohlar sahifa ostiga birlashtirilgan. Kirish qismiga 2-10 sahifalar ajratilgan. Boʻlot Soliyev majmuaga “*Kitob toʻgʻrisida bir-ikki soʻz*” sarlavhali soʻzboshisini yozgan.

Soʻzboshidan keyin muallif nuqtayi nazari bayon etilgan “*Bir ikki soʻz*” maqolasi keladi. Majmua 3 qismdan tarkib topgan: I qism-12-87 bet, *a-a-a-b* tizimda qofiyalangan, 139 ta toʻrtlikdan 14 ta marsiya, munozara, urushlar tasviri va lirik qoʻshiqlarga ajratilgan, sarlavha berilgan: *Alp Er toʻnga marsiyasi*, *Yoz-Qish munozarasi*, *Yoz oʻyunlari* va boshqalar. I qism 88-110 bet, tarbiyaviy-axloqiy mavzudagi 74 ta baytdan 18 ta didaktik ahamiyatli sheʼr tizimlashtirgan: *Nasihati*,

¹⁵ *Atalay B. Divanü Lûgat-it Türk Tercümesi. 3 cilt. – C. 1, 2, 3. – Ankara: Alâeddin Kırıl Basımevi, 1939, 1940, 1941.*

¹⁶ *Фитрат. Энг эски турк адабиёти намуналари. ЎзР ФАШИ, тошбосма, инв. – № 16507. (F)*

Maqtanish, Boylik to'g'risida... kabi. Ayrim soʻzlar maʼnosini shu parchalar tagida lugʻat holida taxlagan. III qism - 111-124 betlarni oʻz ichiga olgan, 132 ta soʻzning izohli lugʻatini keltirib, “Qutadgʻu bilig”, “Hibat ul-haqoyiq”, “Muqaddimat ul-adab”, “Lugʻatoyi chigʻatoyi”, “Ismoil Ogʻa sayohatnomasi” asarlarining qoʻlyozma nusxalarida kelishi bilan qiyoslab, umumiy va farqli jihatlarini koʻrsatgan. “Muqaddimat ul-adab” lugʻatida soʻzning moʻgʻulcha varianti ham keltirilgani bois, Fitrat ayrim soʻzlarni moʻgʻulchasi bilan ham solishtirgan.

Eʼtiborlisi, Fitrat DLT da berilgan toʻrtliklarni shunday olib mazmun, qofiya mosligiga qarab jamlab qoʻymagan, balki ayrim kichik satrlarni boshqa-boshqa sahifalardan olib, birlashtirib, yangi toʻrtlik yasagan. Keyin yana xuddi shunday yaralgan boshqa toʻrtliklar bilan bir turkum ostida jamlagan. Har bir tizimlashtirilgan doston, marsiya va qoʻshiqlar rim raqamlarida, tarkibidagi uzindilar esa arab raqamlarida tartiblangan. Shuningdek devon matni sahifasi va jildi ham oʻrnida qoʻyib borilgan. Namuna matnidan keyin talqin va baʼzi soʻzlarning lugʻati keltirilgan.

Fitrat *fatha, zamma, kasra, tanvin zamma* oʻrnida ا ب ج د belgilarini qoʻllagan. Ingichka soʻzlardagi alifni ham ا ga aylantirgan. Uch nuqtali ف tovushini esa ڤ bilan yozgan. Shuningdek, ingichka soʻzlarda ه belgisidan ham foydalangan (F.VIII).

2017-yilda qirgʻiz turkologi T.Chorotegin monografiyasida ¹⁷ Fitrat matn talqinida yoʻl qoʻygan bir kichik kamchilikni keltiradi. Unga koʻra, S.Malov majmuada bir toʻrtlikning soʻnggi satri notoʻgʻri talqin qilinganini qayd qilgan: “*Bulnadi meni qaraq satri yoʻlda qaroqchi tutib oldi mani*, — deb oʻgirilgan”. Shunday boʻlsa-da, Fitrat Markaziy Osiyoga DLT ni tanishtirgan ilk olim boʻlib, xizmatlari yuqori baholanishini T.Chorotegin qoʻshimcha qilgan va S.Malovning mulohazasini tahlil qilib oʻtirmagan ¹⁸.

Koʻrilayotgan parcha majmuaning 70- sahifasidan joy olgan “*Yana muhabbatka oid*” turkumiga kiritilgan. Sheʼr uch toʻrtlikdan yigʻilgan. Birinchi band bosma nashrning I.315, ikkinchisi I.317 va II.18, uchinchi, yaʼni koʻrilayotgan band esa III.13 va III.27 betlardagi ikkiliklardan yigʻilgan:

اقتورور كوزم يۇلاق	<i>Aqtürür közm yulaq,</i>	Maʼnosi:
يغاق توش قیلور ئردە	<i>Tuş qilur ördak yuğaq.</i>	Koʻzum buloq oqizadir,
ئوغراغم كه ندو يراق	<i>Uğrağm kandü yıraq</i>	Unda oʻrdaklar, yugʻaqlar
بولنادی مه نی قاراق	<i>Bulnadi meni qaraq.</i>	tushadir.
		Qasd etkanim orunning
		oʻzi yiroqda
		Yoʻlda qaroqchi tutub oldi
		meni (F.70).

مَعْنَاهُ شَاوَى بَعِيدَ لَكِنِ الْمُقْلَةُ مِنَ الْحَبِيبِ أَسْرَتْنِي فَمَنْعَتْ عَنِ قَصْرِيهِ يَغَاقُ — *Maʼnāhu šāvā baʼīdun lakinna-l-muqlahu mina-l-ḥabībi asaratini fa-manaʼat an qasrīhi yağāq* (Maʼnosi: maqsadim uzoq edi, seviklimning qora koʻzi meni asir qilib yoʻldan qaytardi) – qoʻlyozmada kelishi shunday. Bu oʻrinda Fitrat *qaraq* soʻzini “qaroqchi” deb talqin qilgan. Soʻzning maʼnosi “*koʻz, qaroq*”dir. “Qutadgʻu bilig” (QBN.223a,7)

¹⁷Чоротегин Т. Махмуд Кашгари Барсканинин «Дивану лугати т-түрк» эмгеги – түрк элдеринин тарыхы боюнча көөнөргүс булак. Илимий басылыш/Редколлегия: К. С.Молдокасымов (төрага), – Бишкек: «Турап» басмасы, 2017. – 376.

¹⁸ Oʻsha manba – B.19.

da shunday keladi: *Firāqin tōkār yaš kōrūgli qaraq* — ko‘ruvchi qaroq(lar) firoq bilan yosh to‘kadi¹⁹. Biroq Fitratning mahorati bu bilan o‘lchanmasligi kerak. Olim bosma nashrda K.Rifat yo‘l qo‘ygan xatoliklarni ham payqagan. Qo‘lyozmani ko‘rmagan bo‘lsa-da, she‘rning arab tilidagi talqiniga va matnni o‘zlashtirish ko‘nikmasiga binoan so‘zning originalini aytib bera olgan. Xususan, *Okräyuki...* so‘zi bilan boshlanuvchi to‘rtlikdagi *tikdağ* so‘zi qo‘lyozmada *tildağ* bo‘lishi kerakligini ta‘kidlab, asos keltiradi (F.14). Aytish o‘rinliki, bosma nashrdagi bu xatolikka B.Atalay ham (*tegdağ*, I.160), S.Mutallibov (*məḥḍağ*, I,174) ham e‘tibor qaratmagan. Qo‘lyozma bilan chog‘ishtirilganda Fitratning mulohazasi to‘g‘ri ekani aniqlandi: تِلْدَاغ *tildağ* (MK.90/15).

II bobda “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” ning o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarida matnga bo‘lgan yondashuvlar tahlil qilingan.

S.Mutallibovning “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk”ni nashrga tayyorlashdagi yondashuvlari. XX asrning ikkinchi yarmida Navoiy tavalludining 500 yilligini o‘tkazish munosabati bilan tuzilgan Navoiy komiteti qoshida matnshunoslik komissiyasining tashkil etilishi, o‘zbek matnshunosligining takomiliga ham katta ta‘sir ko‘rsatib, yangi bosqichga olib chiqqan²⁰. Qo‘mitaga rahbar etib turkiy va arab tilining o‘tkir bilimdoni Solih Mutallibov tayinlangan va olim Navoiyning hamda boshqa ijodkorlarning bir nechta asarlarini ilmiy-tanqidiy matnini tayyorlagan. Mazkur ishlar tadqiqotchining 1960 (I jild)-1961(II jild) va 1963 (III jild)²¹ - yillarda “Devoni lug‘ati-t-turk” asarini *o‘zbek tiliga to‘liq tarjima qilib, nashr etishining muhim omili bo‘lgan*. Dunyo miqyosida uchinchi, sobiq ittifoq davlatlari bo‘yicha birinchi bor amalga oshirilgan ish hozirgi kunga qadar ko‘plab tadqiqotlarga asos bo‘lib kelmoqda.

Nashr ilmiy, ma‘naviy va ta‘limiy ehtiyoj yuzasidan amalga oshirilgan. An‘anaviy uch jild, 3000 nusxada bosilgan. Bizning hisobimizga ko‘ra, tarjimada umumiy 7222 ta (3288, 1447, 2487 ta) so‘z bosh maqolacha sifatida ajratilgan.

Tarjimon qo‘lyozmani ko‘rmagan. 1915-1917-yillarda Istanbulda e‘lon qilingan bosma nashr tayanch bo‘lgani aytiladi²². Biroq muallif bu nusxadan ko‘ngli to‘lmaganini ham bayon qilgan. Faqat turkiy matn transkripsiyaga o‘girilgan. Koshg‘ariyning qiyoslash maqsadida qo‘shgan arabcha izohlari, baytlari, arab maqollari, Qur‘on oyatlari va hadislar arab yozuvida berilib, transkripsiya va o‘zbekcha tarjimasini mavjud emas. *Qur‘on oyatlari, hadislarning tarjima qilinmagani mustabid tizimning siyosiy cheklovlari bilan bog‘liq*. Qo‘lyozma sahifalari qo‘yib borilmagan. Transkripsiyaga o‘girishda o‘zbek va kirill harflari bilan ifodalangan 40 ga yaqin belgidan foydalanilgan. Ba‘zan bir tovushga ikki xil belgi ishlatilgan. Kirish qismidan so‘ng ta‘lif va kotibning so‘zboshisi nashrga kiritilmagan.

So‘nggi tadqiqotlarda S.Mutallibov nashriga B.Atalay bilan deyarli bir xil yozilgan deb baho berilmoqda. (E-A.22)²³. Biz bu fikrga to‘la qo‘shilmaymiz. To‘g‘ri,

¹⁹ Sodiqov Q. “Qutadg‘u bilig” so‘zligi [Matn]: – T. 2020. – B. 208.

²⁰ Сирожиддинов Ш., Умарова С. Ўзбек матншунослиги кирралари. – Т: Академнашр, 2015. – Б.59.

²¹ Маҳмуд Кошгарий. “Девону луғотут-турк”. 1-3- жилдлар. Тарж. ва нашрга тай-ловчи С. Муталлибов – Т: ЎзФА Фан нашриёти. 1960, 1961,1963. (SM).

²² Китабу Дивану луғатит турк. – Т. I-III. – Истанбул, 1333-1335 [1915-1917]

²³ Ercilasun A. B., Akkoyunlu Z. Kâşgarlı Mahmud Dîvânü Lugâti‘t-Türk (Giriş - Metin - Çeviri - Notlar - Dizin), – Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 2014. – 1120 s. (E-A)

muallif B.Atalay yondashuviga ergashgan, buning asosiy sababi — B.Atalay ham bosma nashrdan foydalanib, turkchaga o‘g‘irgan bo‘lsa-da, sahifa ostidagi ba’zi izohlarni yozishda qo‘lyozmaga murojaat qilgan. Chunki, olim turkcha nashrni tayyorlab bitirganda, ya’ni 1941- yilda qo‘lyozmaning ilk faksimile nusxasini tayyorlashga ruxsat olgan. S.Mutallibovda bu imkon bo‘lmagani uchun bosma nusxaning ayrim mavhum o‘rinlarida B.Atalay izohlariga qo‘shilishni ma’qul topgan. Biroq muallif, ayrim o‘rinlarda B.Atalay fikrlariga qarshi chiqib, o‘z qarashlarini asoslagan (SM.I,205). Umumiy 3804 ta sahifa ostiga izoh yozgan bo‘lib, aksari B.Atalay izohlariga munosabat ko‘rinishida, shuningdek, o‘zbek adabiy tili, dialektlari, Navoiy davrida qo‘llanilishi doirasidagi misollar bilan chog‘ishtirib borilgan.

S.Mutallibovning ayrim munosabatlariga, jumladan, “Qutadg‘u bilig” tili masalasiga yondashuvida biroz chalkashliklar bor. Muallif asar chigil lahjasida yozilganini asoslashga uringan (SM.I,10-11). A.Fitratning Mahmud Koshg‘ariyga asoslangan xoqoniya turkchasi haqidagi qarashlarini, Rashiddinning o‘g‘uzlar haqida keltirgan hikoyasini keskin tanqid qilib, *hukmron sinf nuqtayi nazaridan yondashib, qabilalar tilini buzib ko‘rsatganlikda* ayblaydi. S.Mutallibovning bu qarashlari zamirida sovet davri hukmron mafkurasining tazyiqi yotadi. Ya’ni, o‘tmishda ilmiy xulosalar marksizm-leninizm ta’limotiga moslashtirilishi majburiy edi, noshir ham bu siquvdan chiqib keta olmagan.

S.Mutallibov talqinda turkcha matnga emas, Mahmud Koshg‘ariyning arabcha talqiniga asoslangan: *ол нэңнi mandi* jumlasini “*u narsani topdi*” deb talqin qilinishi kerak edi. “*u yo‘qolgan narsani topdi*” (SM.II,5) deb talqin qilingan, ya’ni “yo‘qolgan” so‘zi qo‘shilgan (SM.II,5).

1967-yilda indeks-lug‘ati 2000 nusxada o‘zbek va rus tillaridagi talqini bilan nashr qilindi²⁴. Indeksning asosiy kamchiligi unda qo‘lyozmaning emas, bosma nashrning sahifalari qo‘yib chiqilgan. Transkripsiyada nashrdagi э shakli э bilan, ъ shakli esa ʏ bilan ifodalangan.

1972-yilda o‘zbek, turk va nemis tilidagi nashrlar qiyosiy-matniy tadqiqini olib borgan E.Fozilovning ilmiy maqolasida o‘zbekcha nashrda yo‘q deb ko‘rsatilgan ayrim so‘zlarni nashrda mavjudligini aniqladik: *أ* *a:* (SM.I,75), *الخلق* *a:chlik* (SM.I,137). *Açyq, aryq, artuqluq, arut, äp, äpmäk, ärdam, äräntüz* kabi so‘zlar ham shular jumlasidan.

Nashr dunyoning ko‘zga ko‘ringan turkolog olimlarining e’tirofiga sazovor bo‘lgan. Biroq turkiy so‘zlarning o‘qilishi va talqiniga oid qo‘lyozmaga mos kelmagan ayrim o‘rinlar nashr asosidagi boshqa *lingvistik tadqiqotlarda ham takrorlanganini čumğuş, Terken, ilimğa, Tarkan, oğlaq* so‘zlari tahlilida ko‘rib chiqdik. Xususan, 2002-yilda N.Abdurahmonov ilmiy maqolasida S.Mutallibov nashriga asoslanib, qo‘lyozmadagi *چمغۇق* *čumğuş* (MK.28/7,8; 236/14) so‘zini “chumchuq” deb ko‘rsatgan²⁵.

²⁴ “Девону луғотит-турк”. Индекс-луғат. Тузувчи ва нашрга тайёрловчи С. Муталлибов, Ғ. Абдурахмонов – Т: ЎзФА Фан нашриёти. 1967. – 547 б.

²⁵ *Абдурахмонов Н.* Туркий тилларда ҳарф тушиш ҳодисаси ҳақида // Маҳмуд Кошғарийнинг “Девону луғотит турк” асари ва унинг туркий халқлар маданияти ҳамда жаҳон цивилизациясида тутган ўрни номли халқаро конф. мат-лари. – Самарқанд. 2002. – Б.18.

H.Boltaboyevning “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk”ni nashrga tayyorlashdagi yondashuvlari. 2016-yilda akademik A.Rustamov, professor H.Boltaboyev va B.Isabekov “*Devonu lug‘otit turk*”ning S.Mutallibov tarjimasiga asoslangan qayta nashri²⁶ ni e‘lon qilishdi. Mualliflar asarni 3 jildda taqdim qilgan. Texnik jihatdan ham sifatli.

Hisobimizga ko‘ra, umumiy 6962 ta bosh so‘z (3003, 1542, 2417 ta) izohlangani aniqlandi. Asosiy matn kirill alifbosida terilgan. So‘zboshida H.Boltaboyevning “Ilmi adab ibtidosi” yirik hajmli maqolasi berilgan. Taniqli turkolog N.Rahmon²⁷, B.To‘xliyevlarning²⁸ mazkur nashr tavsifiga oid ilmiy maqolalari ham e‘lon qilingan. H.Boltaboyevning ta‘kidlashicha, S.Mutallibovning tarjimasini va nashriga asoslangan holda tayyorlangan, izohlari, asosan, saqlangan (HB.2016,16). A.Rustamov S.Mutallibov tarjimasini asl bilan solishtirib, matnda tushirib qoldirilgan jumla, so‘z va iboralar hamda harflarni tiklagan.

S.Mutallibovning sahifa ostidagi barcha izohlari saqlangan. Ilovalarda tarjimonning burungi nashrdan joy olgan barcha maqolalalari joylangan. *Ilk bor DLT qo‘lyozmasining sahifalari to‘q rangda (110) qo‘yib borilgan.* Avval tarjimasini keltirilmagan, oyatlar, hadislar, arab tilidagi jumlar, she‘rlar va maqollarning o‘qilishi hamda tarjimasini izohlarda (*) berib borilgan. S.Mutallibovning izohlari raqamli ko‘rsatkich bilan satr ostiga olingan.

Matnda keltirilgan she‘riy to‘rtliklar va masnaviyalar rim raqamlari bilan [XVI] tartiblangan. Bu tartib har bir jildda alohida bo‘lib, I jildda 118, keyingilarida 47 va 76 ta jami 241 ta qo‘shiqlar va she‘rlar jamlangan. I jilddagi maqollar ajratilgan holda yangi satrboshidan yozilgan. II va III jildga kiritilgan maqollar qavs ichida tartiblangan (II jildda 50 ta, III jildda 89 ta).

S.Mutallibov nashrida tarjima etilmay qolgan o‘rinlarni olimlar kirill yozuvidagi transliteratsiyada bergani ko‘rsatiladi. Shulardan biri qo‘lyozmada turkiy tilda qo‘llanadigan harflar haqida Koshg‘ariy 18 ta harfni keltiradi va ularni qo‘shsak quyidagi so‘zlarni qamraydi (MK.6) deb arabcha izoh keltirilgan اخو كه لف سمج نرزق: transliteratsiyasi: *Ахувка лаффа самж назақ базр шутуййа? Сенинг аканг танбал, тенса тебранмас ва кўпол, эси ўзида эмас* (HB.I,25). Bu o‘rinda jumlaning transliteratsiyasi va tarjimasini bir-biriga mos. Biroq, Koshg‘ariyning arab tilidagi izohi aynan qo‘lyozmadagidek ko‘chirilmagan: *базр шутуййа* da ð o‘rniga ن yozilib ketgan va so‘z *банр* deb o‘qilishiga sabab bo‘lgan.

A.Rustamov tomonidan S.Mutallibov nashrida tushib qolgan ayrim o‘rinlar ham tiklangan. Qo‘lyozmaning ayni shu sahifasida turkiy so‘zlarning qo‘llanilishidan oldin bir jumla bor (MK.3). Joriy nashrdan bu jumla tiklangan: “*Yo Rabbim, niyatimga yetishga imkon ber! O‘zingagina suyanaman. Zotan O‘zidan o‘zga Qodir qudrat yo‘q! O‘zi niyatlarga yetkazuvchi, O‘ziga himoyachidir*”(HB.I,25). Nashrning yutuqlaridan yana biri ilk bor *Qur‘oni Karimdan keltirilgan oyatlar va hadislar transliteratsiyasi va o‘zbek tilidagi tarjimasini o‘z o‘rnida berib borilgan.*

²⁶ Маҳмуд Қошғарий. Девону луғоти-т-турк. 1-3 жилд. (Нашрга тайёрловчилар: А.Рустамов, Ҳ. Болтабоев, Б.Исабеков) – Т.: MUMTOZ SO‘Z, 2016. (HB).

²⁷ Nasimxon Rahmon. Turkologiyada dadil qadam. “O‘zbekiston adabiyoti va san‘ati”. 27-sentyabr, 2017-yil https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337812439_Turkologiyada_dadil_kadam

²⁸ Тўхлиев Б. “Девону луғати-т-турк”ка оид айрим мулоҳазалар // Turkologiya. – Т.: 2021/3. – Б. 26-36

Sarlavhalar Moskva nashri²⁹ bilan qiyoslanib, shu nashrdagi yondashuv asosida o‘zgartirilgan. B.Isabekov matnni qozoq olimasi M.Alaviyaning ruscha tarjimasini va V.Radlov tarjimasini bilan qiyoslagan, zarur o‘zgarishlarni qayd etdi deyiladi kirish qismida. Biroq, “Radlov tarjimasiga”ga havola ko‘rsatilmaydi. Shuningdek, olim matnni “Qadimgi turkiy til lug‘ati” bilan ham solishtirgan va izohlarda qayd etib borgan³⁰.

Unlilar transkripsiyasida 9 ta belgi — *a, ä, ə, i, ĩ, y, j, o, ö*; Undoshlar uchun 25 ta — *б, w, z, d, e, ж, з, j, к, л, l, м, н, ң, п, р, с, т, ф, х, ч, ш, қ, э, җ* harf ko‘rsatilgan (HB.I,19-20). Unlilardan [ə] belgisi [ä] bilan bir xil talaffuz etilishiga qaramay, ishlatilgan o‘rinlarda saqlanib qolingani aytilgan. Aslida S.Mutallibov nashridagi [ë] o‘rnida [ə] dan foydalanilgan: *Эмдї узїн узүндї* (SM.I,209) — *Эмдї узїн узүндї* (HB. I,149).

Shuningdek, *E, e* – bu belgi bilan o‘zbek kirill alifbosidagi *ë+ə* emas, balki [ë] ning o‘zigina ifoda etilganligi qayd qilingan (HB.I,19). Biroq matnda bu belgi hech bir o‘rinda aniqlanmadi. [ë] deb berilishi ham noaniq, bu belgi ham joriy transkripsiyada mavjud emas. *ë+ə* tovushi o‘rnida lotincha [j] ishlatilgan. [Z] belgisi ta’riflanganda ham shunday noaniqlik bor: “*Ushbu nashrda [z] harfi bilan til-tish undoshi va oldingi nashrda arabcha j harfi bilan ifodalangan tovush aks ettiriladi*” (ko‘rsatilgan sahifa). Bu yerda *j* emas, *z* ta’riflanmoqda.

Undoshlar bilan bog‘liq shunday xilma-xillik ham uchraydi. Mazkur jildning 229-dan 234- sahifasigacha [j] belgisi “*й*” ni emas, “*ж*” ni ifodalagan va bu holat 239- sahifada ham kuzatildi. Nashr ko‘rsatkichlarida *ج* transkripsiyasida [j] belgisi nazarda tutilgan. S.Mutallibov kabi *ج* uchun ikki xil – *l, л* tovushlaridan foydalanilgan. Shuningdek, buning aksi, ikki xil undosh tovush bir xil belgi bilan transkripsiyaga olingan: *z* uchun [з] va [z] belgilari ishlatilgan. *z* va *j* uchun ham [э] belgisi olingani sabab ayrim o‘rinlarda ma’no farqlanishiga ham olib kelgan.

Qo‘lyozmaning ba’zi sahifalari qo‘yilmagan (57, 59, 60, 61, 83, 104, 622, 633, 635, 637, 638). I jild 71- sahifadan *з* va *z* transkripsion belgi sifatida bir tovush uchun qo‘llangan, aksariyat ikki tovushga bir belgi qo‘llangan: *z* uchun bitta *з* olingan. 239-272 sahifalarda misoli keltirilayotgan harflar yozilmay qolgan.

To‘rtliklar va masnaviy shaklidagi parchalarning arab yozuvida berilishi I jild 179- sahifagacha S.Mutallibov nashridan aynan nusxalangan. Ayrim o‘rinlarda esa mualliflar tomonidan she’rning transkripsiyasiga kiritilgan tuzatishlar bilan tafovutga olib kelgan:

كَلْدَى مَنكَا تَاتْ

قُشَقَا بُلْبُ آبْ

Кэлдї меңә тат,

Қушқа бўлуб әт,

أَيْدِمُ أَمْدَى يَاتْ

سَنَى تَلَارْ أَسْ بُرَى

Ајдїм әмдї јат,

Сені тиләр үс бүрї. (HB.I,44)

Qo‘lyozmaga ko‘ra, she’rdagi *أسْ* so‘zi *أسْ* shaklida (MK.30/10). Bu ikki so‘z oldin-keyin to‘rtlikdan oldin lug‘atda keladi. Biroq S.Mutallibovda “*ac*”, ya’ni *йиртқич ҳайвонларга теккан парча гўит; ўлимтик* (SM.I,72) ma’nosidagi so‘z

²⁹ *Махмуд ал -Кашиғари. Диван лугат ат-турк (Свод тюркских слов) : в 3 т. / Пер. с араб. А.Р. Рустомова под ред. И.В. Кормушина, прим. И.В. Кормушина, Е.А. Поцелуевского, А.Р.Рустомова. – М: Вост. лит., 2010-том 1. – 461 с. (R-K)*

³⁰ *Древнетюркский словарь. – Л.: Наука, 1969.*

“*us*”, *ya*’ni *karкас қуши; бурғум* (SM.I,72) so’zi o’rnida qo’llangan. Mazkur so’zlar nashrda omonim qilib berilgan. Originalda keyingi so’z va to’rtlikdagi birlik “*us*” (MK.30/9,10).

Maqolalar ketma-ketligi tartibi almashgan o’rinlar ham bor: *očüm* – ўч, қасос, *азум* – кафт, бир кафтга сиғарлик (HB.I,54). S.Mutallibovda ham ayni tartib saqlangan (SM.I,84). Bu so’zlar ketma-ketligini Mahmud Koshg’ariy nusxasi bilan qiyoslaganimizda esa *očüm* so’zi va unga berilgan ta’rif bu sahifada mavjud emasligi aniqlandi. H.Boltaboyev satrosti izohida bu so’z Moskva nashrida tushib qolganligini ko’rsatgan. Biroq, mazkur so’z qo’lyozmaning ko’rsatilgan 36-sahifasida emas, keyingi 37-sahifasida *ارت ات* (harakatlar qo’yilmagan) so’zidan keyingi o’rinda ekanligi va Moskva nashrida ham mavjud ekanligi aniqlandi. Shuningdek, ayrim o’rinlarda bosh so’zlar va ularning izohi uchun berilgan birliklarda xilma-xillik mavjud: *ämilgän* – *Мэниң йиім эзгүлүгүн әmilgän ол.* (HB.I,12), *үкдi* – *Ол жармақ өкдi* (HB.I,29).

Qosimjon Sodiqovning “Devonu lug’ati-t-turk”ni nashrga tayyorlashdagi yondashuvlari. 2017-yil “Devoni lug’ati-t-turk”ning o’zbek tilida Solih Mutallibov tarjimasida asosida qayta ishlangan, to’ldirilgan, o’zgarishlar kiritilgan mukammal nashri (QS.2)³¹ turkologiyaning yetuk olimlaridan professor Qosimjon Sodiqov tomonidan chop qilindi. R.Alimuxamedovning qayd etishicha: “Domla Qosimjon Sodiqovning ayni kitob ustida o’n bir yildan buyon ter to’kib mehnat qilayotganliklarining shaxsan guvohiman”³².

Nashr bir jild, 2000 nusxada bosilgan. Asosiy matn kirill alifbosida, umumiy 482 sahifadan iborat. Bizning hisobimizga ko’ra, 7596 ta bosh so’z izohlangan. Badiiy namunalarning umumiy hajmi esa 243 ta (856 misra). Shundan 185 ta to’rtlik va 58 tasi ikkilik baytlardir. Maqollar esa I.Mirzaaliyevning hisobicha, 298 ta.³³ Shundan 42 ta maqol takror kelgan. Sahifa ostida jami 91 ta izoh berilgan.

192-195 betlar orasida qo’lyozmaning uyg’ur harflari keltirilgan 6-sahifasi, Mahmud Koshg’ariyning yer yuzi xaritasi va 474- beti faksimile nashrdan aynan sifati o’zgarmagan holda nusxalanib, yangi varaq bilan biriktirilgan. Ushbu nashrni tayyorlashda muallif DLT qo’lyozmasining 1990 va 2008-yillarda chop qilingan faksimile nusxasidan foydalangan.

Maqolalar *أُكُ oçaq (ўчак)* – ўчоқ; fe’lli birikmalar [*كُجُردى köçürdi (күчурди)*-кўчириб ёзди] *ол битиг көчүрди* – у китоб ёзди — ko’rinishida berilgan. Turkologiyada qabul qilingan lotin yozuvi asosidagi transkripsiya belgilaridan foydalanilgan: Unlilar – *ä, a, e, i, ï, o, ö, u, ü*; Undosh tovushlar uchun – *b, p, d, t, q, k, ğ, g, x, z, s, š, č, y, l, m, n, ŋ, r* harflari hamda *و -v, ف/ف – w, ژ — ž, ذ — δ* belgilaridan foydalanilgan. Shuningdek, arabcha atamalar (*manqūš*), shaxslar (*İbrahīm, δū-l-qarnayn*), joy nomlari (*Čanbaliq*), alohida ma’nosi ajratilgan so’zlar, arab harflari, iboralari (*axtardi* - ... bu so’zdagi *xā* harfi *ğayn* harfi o’rniga almashib kelgandir) transkripsiyaga o’girilgan.

³¹ Махмуд Кошгарий. “Девону луғати-т-турк”. – Т: Фафур Гулом. Нашрга тайёрловчи Қ. Содиков 2007. – 482 б.

³² Алмухамедов Р. Проф. Қ.Содиков томонидан тайёрланган “Девону луғати-т-турк” асарининг янги нашри // “Девону луғоти-т-турк” – туркий халқларнинг ноёб ёзма ёдгорлиги” мавзuidaги халқаро илмий анжуман материаллари. – Т., 2018. – Б. 122.

³³ Мирзаалиев И. Қадимги туркий мақоллар семантикаси ва стилистикаси. (“Девону луғоти-т-турк” материали мисолида): Фил. фан. бўйича фалс. д-ри (PhD) дис. автореф. – Т., 2020. – Б. 14.

Turkiy matnda yo‘g‘on aytiladigan so‘zlardan keyin jo‘nalish kelishigi qo‘shimchasining – *qa* shakli (*Itqa uwut etsä (yetsä?)*, *uldañ yemäs* (QS.59) kelgani uchun ham muallif jarangli, sonor undoshlar hamda unilardan keyin *-ka* variantini olgan: *Ötrük ütün oğrīlayu yüzkä baqar; ...Bulmaduq nāñkā sewinmāñ...* (QS.168) “Qutadg‘u bilig”ning Namangan nusxasida, O‘rxun yodnomalarida – *qa*, *-ka* shaklida kelgani ³⁴ uchun ham shunday yo‘l tutilgan. So‘zning yo‘g‘on va ingichka aytilishidan qat‘i nazar birinchi va ikkinchi shaxs birlikda shaxs-son qo‘shimchalarining *-men*, *-sen* shakllari olingan: *Idimni oğār-men...Bulmīš nāñig sewār-sen...*(QS.445). Bunda muallif Ko‘kturk matnlariga tayangan. Talqinda Mahmud Koshg‘ariy bir jumla tarzida bergan izohlar S.Mutallibov tomonidan ikki jumlagacha o‘zgartirilgan. Q.Sodiqov aslyyat kabi yana bir jumla holida talqin qilgan.

Qo‘lyozmada 61 ta masdar birato‘la ham qāf ق , ham kāf ك bilan قى ligaturasida yakunlangan. K.Rifat buni xato hisoblab, ikkisidan birini olgan. B.Atalay 27 o‘rinda maxsus izohlar qo‘shgan va u ham harflarni birini tanlagan³⁵. Ingliz tadqiqotchilari R.Denkoff va J.Kelly tadqiqotida harflar kombinatsiyasining 36 tasida avval ك , so‘ng ق yozilgan. 21 o‘rinda aksincha, ق oldin, ك esa keyin (jami 57 ta) qo‘llangan (D-K.64,65). Masdarlarning ikki xil yakunlanishi ayrim lahja yoki shevalarga xos xususiyat bo‘lishi mumkinligi taxminlangan. Q.Sodiqov bu masalaga yetarlicha e‘tibor bergan, qo‘lyozmaga binoan ligatura bilan yakunlangan masdarlarning 51 tasini nashrga kiritgan.

Lug‘atda bosh so‘z vazifasida kelgan ayrim birliklarda undosh ustida ham fatha, ham kasra yoki zamma va kasra qo‘yilgan. Shuningdek, so‘z o‘rtasida kelganda yozilishi bir xil, faqat nuqtalari o‘rni va soniga ko‘ra farqlanadigan undoshlarda aynan ost-ust nuqtalari baravar qo‘yilgan. K.Rifat faqat bitta variantni qoldirib, qolganini xatolik deb bilgan bo‘lsa, A.Rustamov *сэвук/севук* va *бэк/бек* kabi bir so‘zning turli variantlari deb qabul qilgan (AR.I,19) ³⁶ . A.Erjilasun va Z.Akko‘yunlilar ularni ham kotibga, ham keyingi asrlarda matnни tahrir qilgan boshqa kotibga tegishli deb hisoblaydi.

Q.Sodiqov matnning bu xususiyatini aynan kotibning qalamidan chiqqani, u matnни xato ko‘chirishi mumkin emasligini, balki Mahmud Koshg‘ariy so‘zning dialektal variantini ko‘zda tutganini ta’kidlaydi va nashrga ikki variantni ham kiritadi. *تَقْلَدِي/تَقْلَدِي* *tiqildi / taqildi – et šišqa tiqildi / tāqildi – go’sht six* va boshqa narsalarga taqildi (QS.246).

Matnda o‘n to‘rtinchi o‘g‘uz qabila nomi كَادْ ga keyingi fatha va kasra jigarrang siyohda qo‘shilgan. Bu esa so‘zning ham *igdar*, ham *igdir* o‘qilishini ta’minlaydi. (MK.40/14). S.Mutallibovda *-izdäp* (SM.I,90) va boshqa nashrlarda, ya’ni turkcha (BA.I,57), inglizcha (D-K. I,102), ruscha (R-K,96), M.Auzeva ruschasi (MA.I,92) da – *igdir* olingan. 2009-yilda ozarbayjon olimi B.Xelilov “Mahmud Koshg‘ariyning “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asarida etnonimlar”³⁷ monografiyasida F.Sumarning “O‘g‘uzlar” tadqiqotiga murojaat qilgan. DLT bilan deyarli bir davrda yozilgan tarixchi Rashididdin va Y.Aliyaning asarlarida keltirilgan o‘g‘uz

³⁴ Алиев А., Содиқов Қ. Ўзбек адабий тили тарихидан. – Т., 1994. – Б. 58.

³⁵ Şaban Kurt. Özel Adlar Dizini. – Istanbul, 2008. – S.17.

³⁶ Маҳмуд ал Каушари. Диван лугат-ат-турк. (Свод тюркских слов). Перевод с арабского языка А. Рустамов. под редакцией С.Хасанова, Ш.Хасановой, С.Рустамий, М.Рустамова и др. Том III – Т: Мумтоз сўз. 2018.

³⁷ Xəlilov B. Mahmud Kaşgarinin “Divani lügət-it-türk” əsərində etnonimlər.”Garisma” mms. – Baki.2009. – S.110

qabilalarining tasnifi bilan qiyoslangan. Unga ko‘ra, qabila nomi DLT da — *igdir*, Rashididdinda — *yigdir/iqdir* shaklida qayd etilgan. B.Xalidov mazkur qabila etimologiyasini shunday keltirgan: “Katta ehtimol bilan bu etnonimning ilk varianti *yigdir* bo‘lgan. Bunda *iq//yiq//yiqd* variantlari *igid* so‘zining fonetik variantlaridir. *iqdir* etnonimi “ulug‘lik, g‘urur” ma’nosini anglatishi ham buni tasdiqlaydi. *Iqdir* etnonimidagi “*ir*” qismi “kishi, odam, er” ma’nosinin bildiradigan *är* so‘zining fonetik variantidir³⁸. Bundan Koshg‘ariyning qabila nomini ham *igdar* ham *igdir* ekanligiga ishora qilgan deb taxmin qilish mumkin. Q.Sodiqov nashrida esa shunday keladi: “... ўн тўртинчи қабилә игдәр/игдир – игдарлардур”. (QS.37) *er ištīn/ištān qizğutlandi*, تَرْمُتْلاندى *tarmutlandi* (*turmutlandi?*) tahlilida ham shunday xulosalar olindi. Hozirgi jonli nutqda ham buni ko‘rishimiz mumkin : *urish / urush, kulgi / kulgu* kabi. Xususan, “kulgi” so‘zi matnda ikki harakatli : كُنج / كُنْج *külünč / külinč* — кулги (QS.450). Shuningdek, salmoqli o‘rinlarda ikki variantlilik qo‘shimchalar doirasida kelgani kuzatildi. Nashrdagi asosiy qusur qo‘lyozma sahifalarining qo‘yilmagani va turkiy jumla, birikmalar arab yozuvida berilmaganidir. Biroq 2021-yilda ushbu kamchilik tuzatilib, nashr Istanbulda turk olimlari tomonidan qayta chop qilindi³⁹.

III bobda “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” asari o‘zbekcha nashrlarining matnlardagi tafovutlari va o‘ziga xosliklari tadqiq qilingan. Biz o‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarni o‘zaro qiyoslaganimizda, 3000 ga yaqin matniy tafovutlarga duch keldik. Ularni 650 tasini saralab, tasniflashtirdik va qo‘lyozma bilan ham qiyosladik. Natijalar katta hajmli jadvalga joylashtirildi va ish so‘nggida ilova qilindi. She’riy parchalarning tahlilida esa Fitratning majmuasi ham ilk bor qiyosiy tahlilga tortildi va qo‘lyozma bilan chog‘ishtirildi.

Nashrlarda muqaddima qismi bilan bog‘liq matniy tafovutlari. Qiyosiy tahlilida 50 ga yaqin matniy tafovutlar borligi ko‘rindi (1-ilovaga qarang). Bu tafovutlarning birinchisi lug‘at nomi bilan bog‘liq: “*Девону луғотим турк*”- “*Девону-луғоти-т-турк*”- “*Девону луғати-т-турк*”. Qo‘lyozmada: ديوان لغات الترك — *Divānu luğāti-t-türki*.

Mahmud Koshg‘ariy turklar haqida ishonchli buxorolik va nishopurlik olimdan⁴⁰ eshitgan bir hadisni keltirgan. S.Mutallibov ushbu hadisni aytgan roviyning *payg‘ambarga nisbat berganligi* ni yozgan (SM.I,42; HB.I,22). Q.Sodiqov nashrida bu jumla *payg‘ambarga nisbat berib, sanadi bilan aytgan edilar* ko‘rinishida yozilgan (QS.14). Matnda : كِلَاهُمَا رَوِيَا بِإِسْنَادٍ لَّهُمَا عَنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ *kilāhumā ravayā bi isnādi lahumā ‘an rasūli-l-lahi šalla-l-lohu ‘alayhi va sallama*, ya’ni *har ikkisi ham Rasululloh s.a.v haqida u ikkisining sanadi bilan rivoyat qiladilar*, deyiladi (MK.2/16).

Mahmud Koshg‘ariy arab tilidagi itboq harflar turkiy birorta qabila tilida ham uchramasligini, bu harflardan ث *sā* ni yozish uchun turkcha dāl suratida yozilib *ustiga nuqta qo‘yiladi* (تَنْقَطُ عَلَيْهَا — *tunqatu a‘layhā* MK.7/13) deb yozadi. Shu o‘rin S.Mutallibov va H.Boltaboyev tarjimasida *ustiga qo‘sh nuqta* (ya’ni ikkita nuqta)

³⁸ O‘sha manba. – B. 104-105.

³⁹ Маҳмуд Қошғарий. Туркий сўзлар девони. Нашрга тайёрловчи Қосимжон Содиков. Академик Kitaplar. – Istanbul. 2021. – S.776

⁴⁰ Qo‘lyozmada “olim” so‘zi o‘rinda “imom” keladi.

qo‘yiladi deb yozilgan (SM.I,49; HB.I,26). Q.Sodiqov bu o‘rinni qo‘lyozma asosida tuzatgan (QS.17). Shuningdek, S.Mutallibov nashridagi *табзади, жазмур, жавар, чумчук, бэжэнэк, жазм, қузурғун, јізан, јізај, азгір, ол эwgä барғулуқ эрди, ол киши ол бізгә кәләгән* kabi so‘zlar tarkibidagi matniy tafovutlar aniqlangan.

Lug‘at qismining nashrlardagi qiyosiy-matniy tafovutlari.

O‘zbekcha nashrlarning qiyosiy tahlilidagi ilk tafovut lug‘at statistikasi bilan bog‘liq. Hisobimizga ko‘ra, S.Mutallibov nashrida 7222 ta, H.Boltaboyev nashrida 6962 ta, Q.Sodiqov nashrida esa 7596 ta bosh so‘z aniqlandi. Bu tafovutni ikki omil yuzaga chiqargan:

1) Matnda noshirlar o‘z yondashuvlariga asosan ko‘p ma‘noli yoki omonim so‘zlarni bir maqola tarkibida bergan yoki aksincha, ular alohida olingan.

2) Nashrlarda lug‘atning ayrim leksik birlik sifatida izohlanayotgan so‘zlari va ularning izohi tushib qolishi bilan bog‘liq holatlar aniqlandi. Qo‘lyozmaning 579-hamda 580- sahifalarida kelgan beshta maqola *يَلْنَادِي , يَشْنَادِي , يَمْلَادِي , يَمْلَادِي , يَمْلَادِي* (*yikladi, yamladi, yimladi, yashnadi, yelnadi*) bosh so‘zlari, ular birikkan jumlar va arab tilidan tarjimai DLT ning S.Mutallibov va H.Boltaboyev nashriga kiritilmagan. Q.Sodiqov qo‘lyozma asosida tiklagan (QS.428). Shuningdek, H.Boltaboyev nashriga matnning 318/3 sahifasidagi *الْ اِنْكَ بَرْلَا كِ كَرَشْدِي* ⁴¹ *ol anig birlä kerisdi* (HB.II/66), 418/3 sahifasidagi *الْ اِنْكَ قُلْنِ كُرْتِي* *ol anig qulin kuratti* (HB.II/203) birikmalari, shuningdek, 104/7 sahifadagi *Ölišdi näñ* maqolasi har ikki nashrga kiritilmagan (SM.I,196; HB.I,142).

Nashrlardagi keng ko‘lamli tafovutlarni “so‘z” va “tovush” doirasida tahlil qildik.

“So‘z” doirasiga tafovutlar

1. *So‘zlarning tushishi yoki orttirilishi.* Matnda kelgan “ol” olmoshining nashrlarda orttirilishi ikki omil asosida yuz bergan: a) Matnda “ol” olmoshi ko‘p o‘rinlarda *bu, aňar* olmoshlari bilan birga kelgani uchun noshirlar qo‘shib yuborgan bo‘lishi mumkin: *ол мәнә суwлуқ сарлашди* (SM.II,2494; HB.II,141) — *meňa suwluq sarlaşdi* (QS.273) — *مَنْكَ سَلْقُ سَرْلَشْدِي* (MK.374/5). b) Keltirilgan o‘rnaklarning barchasidan oldin arabcha izohda *يُقَالُ yuqālu* (deyiladiki, aytiladiki) so‘zi kelgan va turkiy matn shu o‘rindan boshlanib ketgan. *يُقَالُ yuqālu* so‘zining so‘nggi ل va uning zamma harakati *ال ol* so‘ziga juda o‘xshash yozilgan va bir qarashda *ال ol* deb o‘qib yuborish mumkin. Jadvaldagi 6 ta birikmani B.Atalay nashri bilan solishtirdik. 4 nafari S.Mutallibov bilan bir xil. Demak, olmoshlarning tushirib qoldirilishi yo B.Atalay yoki K.Rifatning harakati. H.Boltaboyev S.Mutallibov kabi yozgan. Q.Sodiqov qo‘lyozma asosida tiklagan.

Bu namunalarda esa *ol olmoshi nashrda tushirib qoldirilganini* ko‘rish mumkin: *эп іјінді* (SM.I,265)- *эп іјінді* (HB.I,189)- *ol er iyindi* (QS.113). Matnda kelishi: *ال آر ايندي* ⁴² (MK.138/8).

2. Birikmalar tarkibidagi so‘zlarning almashinishi

1) Tarkibidagi so‘z boshqa so‘zga almashgan, biroq talqinda qo‘lyozmadagi holat aks etgan: *ол аниң өпкасин эмүртти — у бекнинг газабини тинчлатди*

⁴¹ Al so‘zida alif ustida zamma qo‘yilmagan.

⁴² Al so‘zining zamma harakati qo‘yilmagan. Birikmadagi boshqa harakatlar va sukun jigarrang siyohda qo‘yilgan.

(SM.III,226; HB.III,282) — *ol beg öpkäsin amurtti- у бекнинг газабини тинчлатди* (QS.470) — *أَل بَاكُّ أَبْكَاسِنِ أُمْرَتِي* (MK.630/1).

2) Tarkibidagi soʻz ham, talqini ham boshqa soʻzga almashgan: *Ол мөндә тўнәди* – у менинг ёнимда тунади (SM.III,289; HB.III,187) — *Ol munda tünädi* – у бу ерда тунади (QS.417).

3) Qoʻlyozmaning oʻzida soʻz va uning talqini almashgan, shu sabab nashrlarda ham almashgan: *اي انه⁴³ أَحْسَانِي الْمَرْقَةَ وَ غَيْرَهُ - أَل مَنكَ سُوْتِ أُبْرَدِي* (MK.97/15,16) – yaʼni, *ay anahu ahsāni-l-maraqata va ğayrahu* — *Ol meñä sūt öpürdi* — u menga shoʻrva va undan boshqasini ichirdi. Oʻzbekcha nashrlarda: *Ол мәнә мүн үнүрди* – У менга шўрва ичирди (SM.I,186; HB.I,134) — *Ol meñä sūt öpürdi* - У менга сүт ичирди (QS.84).

Bu yerda S.Mutallibov arabcha talqin asosida turkiy matnni oʻzgartirgan boʻlsa, Q.Sodiqov turkiy matn asosida arabcha talqinni oʻzgartirgan. Kotibning bu yanglishishiga sabab — matnda *öp* asosli feʼllar har doim yo *sut*, yo *mün* (shoʻrva) soʻzi bilan yonma-yon qoʻllangan.

3. Talqinga oid tafovutlar. Oʻzbekcha nashrlarda turkiy matn talqiniga oid tafovutlar ancha kam boʻlib, 20 tachasini aniqladik va 8 – ilovada qoʻlyozmadagi talqini bilan koʻrsatdik.

1) *ол әни тамгақладі* – birikma talqini S.Mutallibov av H.Boltaboyev nashrida tushirib qoldirilgan (III.362; 231) Q.Sodiqov tiklagan - у унинг томоғидан бўғди (QS.441). Matnda *اي انه ضَرْبُهُ عَلَى حَافِهِ* yaʼni, *ay anahu ğarabahu ʼalā ħalqihī* – u uni boʻyniga (halqumiga) urdi (MK.598/5).

2) Talqin qoʻlyozmaga mos kelmagan holatlar: *јағиш – ислом динидаги одамларнинг бутларга назр қилиб сўядиган қурбонлари* (SM.III,18; HB.III,9) — *yağış – жоҳилия давридаги кишиларнинг бутларга сизиниб, уларга атаб сўядиган қурбонликлари* (QS.327) — *اهلُ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ aḥlu-l jaḥiliyaḥī* yaʼni *johiliya ahli* (MK.448/17). Keyingi namunada esa, matn talqini S.Mutallibov va Q.Sodiqovda bir xil, H.Boltaboyev oʻzgartirgan: *баш туттү – яра оғрумтү* (SM.II,337; QS.229) — *баш туттү – бош оғриди* (HB.II,194). Qoʻlyozmada *بَاشٌ تُتِّي أَي أَمْضُ الْجُرْحَ بِضَرْبَانٍ* (MK.411/17) – *baš tutti* — *ay amaḍḍa-l-jurḥa bi-ġarabānin*, yaʼni *yaraga zarba berib ogʻritti*. Aniqlashimizcha, matnning boshqa bobida (510/14) bir oʻrinda ikki marta *baš* soʻzining maʼnosi izohlangan: 1. *بَاشُ الرَّاسِ baš* — *ar-raʼsu* (*bosh*); 2. *بَاشٌ الْجَرَاةُ baš* — *al-jarāḥatu* (*jarohat*). Soʻzning omonimligi ikkinchi nashr mualliflarini chalgʻitgan boʻlishi mumkin.

3) Qoʻlyozmaning oʻzida talqin noaniq, shu sabab nashrlarda talqin uch xil: *ол көчүт көчүрди* — “у отни бир жойдан бошқа жойга кўчирди” (SM.II,79) — у нарсани бир жойдан бошқа жойга кўчирди (HB.II,51) — у ўтни бир жойдан бошқа бир жойга кўчирди (QS.229). Qoʻlyozmada: *أَي أَنَّهُ نَقَلَ الْفَرَسَ مِنْ مَوْضِعٍ إِلَى آخَرَ - أَل كُجْتُ كُجْرَدِي* – yaʼni, *ol koçut köçürdi ay anahu naqala-l-farasa min mavḍiʼin ila axar* – yaʼni, *u otni bir joydan boshqa joyga koʻchirdi*. Bu yerda S.Mutallibov arabcha izohga, Q.Sodiqov turkcha matnga qarab talqin qilgan. Bizningcha, kotib talqinda *farasa* (ot, toychoq) soʻzini yozishda bitta harfga yanglishgan. Agar *غَرَسَ ğarasa* deb yozganida turkiy matn va talqin mos tushar edi. Chunki *ğarasa* soʻzi

⁴³ Mazkur soʻz arab tilidagi *أَل* yuklamasi boʻlib, qoʻlyozmaning aksariyat oʻrinlarida uning *ن* harfi taʼdid belgisiz yozilgan (dissertatsiya va ilovada shu holatda koʻrsatdik).

“ekin, ko‘chat” degan ma‘noni bildiradi. Katta ehtimol bilan Mahmud Koshg‘ariy avtografida *ğarasa* yozilgan deb taxmin qilamiz.

“Tovush” doirasidagi tafovutlar

1. Unli tovushlarning tushishi. Turkiy o‘rnaklarda unli tovushlarning matn o‘qilishida tushib qolishi asosan fe‘l boblariga to‘g‘ri keladi. Qo‘lyozmada (MK.483/3,4,5) va nashrlarda (SM.III,102; HB.III,62) – (QS.354,355) kelgan 4 ta *yelpirādi* fe‘lida qo‘lyozmada ۋ fatha olgan, sukun bitta. Bu ikki nashrda ۋ ustida ham, ۋ ustida ham sukun qo‘yilib, *jālnip̄di* o‘qilishi ta‘minlangan va bir unli tushirib qoldirilgan. H.Boltaboyev harakatlar qo‘ymagan. Bizningcha, S.Mutallibov boshqa jihatga e‘tibor qaratgan. Mazkur fe‘llar “To‘rt harflilar” bo‘limining *fa‘laldī* qolipidagi turli harakatlarda talaffuz etiladigan so‘zlar bobiga oid. Bu o‘lchovga esa *yelpirādi* so‘zi mos emas, bir unli ortiqcha. *Yelpirdi* bo‘lsagina mos keladi. Mazkur bobda shu to‘rtta fe‘lli birikmadan keyin keladigan barcha so‘zlar *fa‘laldī* qolipiga mos tushadi. Bunday fe‘llardan 20 yaqin aniqlandi va ilovalarda ko‘rsatildi. Shuningdek, ismlarga oid tovush tushishdagi tafovutlar ham tahlil qilingan.

2. Unli tovushlarning orttirilishi. Keyingi fe‘lda esa Q.Sodiqov nashrida tovush orttirilgan: *كَجْرُشْدِي kečürüşdi* so‘zida ikkinchi *zamma* orttirilgan. Birikma esa quyidagicha o‘qilgan: *olar bir-birniñ yazuqin kečuruşdi.* (QS.275). Qo‘lyozmada yozilishi: *أَلَزْ بِيْرِنِكْ يَزُوْقِنْ كَجْرُشْدِي* (MK.378/1). S.Mutallibov va H.Boltaboyev nashrlarida esa qo‘lyozmadagi kabi olingan: *олаp бiр-бiрiң жазуқиn кэчрүшди* – (SM.II,258; HB.II,147). Shuningdek, *بِيْرِنِكْ* so‘zi nashrlarda *бiр-бiрiң* — *bir-birniñ* tarzida o‘qilgan.

3. Unli tovushlarning har xil o‘qilishi. O‘zbek nashrlarida unlilar quyidagicha har xil o‘qilgan: *ə-ā-a, a-ə-a, y-y-o, ȳ-ȳ-o, ȳ-ȳ-ō, a-a-e, ȳ-ō-ō, o-y-u, a-a-ü, ö-ö-u, i-ī-e, ə-ə-i, ə-ȳ-o.* Bu farqli holatlar 3 guruhga ajratildi:

1) Yozilishi qo‘lyozmaga mos, o‘qilishi (transkripsiyasi) har xil: *أَرْكْ* (MK.33/14) — *əpк* (SM.I,78) – *äpк* (HB.I,49) – *erk* (QS.31) - erk; podshohlik va buyruq o‘tkirliги.

2) Yozilishi ham, o‘qilishi ham qo‘lyozmaga mos emas: *أَغْرَشُقْ aęypuақ* (SM.I,165) — *أَغْرَشُقْ aęypuақ* (HB.I,117) - *أَغْرَشُقْ oęurşuq/oęirşuq* (QS.74).

3) Qo‘lyozmada harakati qo‘yilmagan tovushlarning o‘qilishi masalasi. *Somon va kepak aralashtirib beriladigan yemish ma‘nosidagi اشبار* so‘zining birinchi harfi harakatsiz (MK.71/12). Nashrlarda: *اشبار iuḅap* — (SM.I,140; HB.I,96) — *اشبار ašbar* (QS.60). Aniqlashimizcha, bu so‘z matnning 439- sahifasida ham takror kelgan va harakati qo‘yilgan: *أَلْ أَتْقَا أَشْبَارِ بَلْبَتِي ol atqa ašbar yelpitti* (MK.439/1).

Undosh tovushlarning o‘qilishidagi tafovutlar

1. Undosh tovushlarning tushishi yoki orttirilishiga : *боғмақладі* (SM.III,362; HB.III,231) — *boğmaqlaldī* (QS.441) — *بُغْمَقْلَادِي* (MK.598/4). Bu o‘rinda turkiy so‘zning yozilishida ham, o‘qilishida ham undosh tovush tushirilgan. *армут қатыттi* (SM.II,328) – *армут қатыттi* (HB.II,187) — *armut qatutti* (QS.296)- *أَرْمُتْ قَاتُتِي* (MK.408/9). Bu birikmada matndagi tashdid o‘qilmagan.

2. Undosh tovushlarning har xil o‘qilishi. Mazkur qism tadqiqotimizda keng ko‘lamli tahlil qilingan bo‘lib, quyidagicha guruhlarga ajratilgan, farqlarni yuzaga keltirgan omillar aniqlangan:

1) **Undoshlarning yozilishi qo‘lyozmaga mos, faqat o‘qilishida farq qiladi.** Nashrlarda eng ko‘p tafovut mazkur tipga oid: *b-p, g-k, j-č, w-f, δ-z.*

b / p — Bu tovushlar arab, uygʻur yozuvli turkiy matnlarda bir harf bilan⁴⁴, Oʻrxun-Enasoy manbalarida esa maxsus harflar bilan alohida ifodalangan⁴⁵. Xususan, ilk nashr I jildidagi 12 ta soʻzni Q.Sodiqov nashrida tuzatilgan holatini tahlilda berdik. Shuningdek, S.Mutallibov va H.Boltaboyev matnda kelgan ravishdosh qoʻshimchalarini *-b, -ib, -yb/ÿb*; Q.Sodiqov esa *-p, -ip, -up/ÿp* tarzida oʻqigan va bu yondashuv ham maʼlum qarama-qarshi oʻrinlar koʻlamini kengaytirgan.

g / k – S.Mutallibov nashrining I jild 155-168 sahifalari ichida 12 soʻzda shunday farqlar belgilandi va keyingi ikki nashrda tuzatilgan oʻrinlar ishda tahlil qilindi. *Ol ölykkä joğladï* (SM.III,324; HB.III,208) jumlasidagi *ölykkä* soʻzi Q.Sodiqov nashrida *Ol ölügka yoğladi* oʻqilgan (QS.428). Qoʻlyozmada *أَلْكَكَا يُغْلَادِي* (MK.579/7). Eʼtiborli jihati *أَلْكَكَا* soʻzida ikkita *kaf* harfi ketma-ket yozilgan. Demak, bu ikki harf ikki xil tovushni ifodalagan, yaʼni biri — jarangli [g], biri — jarangsiz [k]. Aks holda Mahmud Koshgʻariy yoki kotib bitta *kaf* yozib, ustida taʼdid belgisini qoʻygan boʻlar edi. Qiyoslang: *أَزَّتِي* *uzatti* – uzaytirdi (MK.113/3). Shuningdek, *Sālim* ismlar kitobidagi besh harfli soʻzlarda *-lig/-lik* qoʻshimchalarining oʻqilishiga oid 11 ta birikma qiyosiy-matniy tahlil qilindi.

j / č tovushlari arab yozuvida ج bilan ifodalangan. Koʻkturk va uygʻur yozuvlarida [č] maxsus belgiga ega, sof turkiy tovushdir. Gʻ.Abdurahmonov va A.Rustamovlarning taʼkidlashicha, qadimgi turkiy tilda [j] undoshi yoʻq⁴⁶. Q.Mahmudov [j] tovushini eski turkiy til manbalarida oʻzlashgan soʻzlar tarkibidagina uchrashini yozgan⁴⁷. Bundan, ج bilan yozilgan soʻzlarda koʻproq [č] faol boʻlganini tushunish mumkin. Q.Sodiqov S.Mutallibov [j] oʻqigan koʻpgina soʻzlarni [č] oʻqigan. H.Boltaboyev nashrida ilk nashrdagi bu yondashuv deyarli oʻzgarishsiz qolgan⁴⁸. I jildda 21 ta matniy tafovut aniqlandi va ishda koʻrsatildi.

w / f tovushlari qoʻlyozmada ف/ف bilan yozilgan. Hozirgi oʻzbek tilida ikkisi ham faol boʻlsa-da, til tarixi olimlari qadimgi turkiy tilda sirgʻaluvchi lab undoshi [f] yoʻqligini⁴⁹ oʻzlashgan soʻzlar tarkibidagina uchrashini taʼkidlashadi⁵⁰. T.Barovkova arabcha [f] portlovchi, Mahmud Koshgariy turk tilida uni zaif (sirgʻaluvchi) deb izohlagani uchun ف yozganida [f] ni emas, [w]ni nazarda tutganini⁵¹, J.Kelli va R.Denkoflar [f] tovushi arab-fors tilidan oʻzlashgan va onomatopik soʻzlarda uchraydi degan xulosalarni bergan (D-K.55). Q.Sodiqov uygʻur alifbosiga oid tadqiqotlari⁵² asosida matndagi ف harfining w oʻqilishi kerakligini uqtirgan va S.Mutallibov [f] oʻqigan barcha soʻzlardagi ف/ف tovushlarini lab-lab [w] bilan transkripsiyaga oʻgʻirgan. Biz nashrlarda 27 ta shu kabi soʻzlarni aniqlab, ilovaga kiritdik. Shuningdek, “*qaftan*” soʻzining etimologiyasini devon materiallari asosida aniqlashtirishga harakat qildik.

⁴⁴ Содиқов Қ. Махмуд Кошғарий келтирган уйғур алифбоси: ҳарф ва товуш муносабатлари // Turkologiya. 2021, – №3. – Б.13.

⁴⁵ Махмудов Қ. Ўзбек тилининг тарихий фонетикаси. – Т., 2006. – Б. 56-60.

⁴⁶ Абдурахмонов Ф., Рустамов А. Қадимги туркий тил. – Т., 1982. – Б.8.;

⁴⁷ Махмудов Қ. Ўзбек тилининг тарихий фонетикаси. – Т., 2006. – Б. 63.

⁴⁸ Jarangli va jarangsiz [ج] tovushi uchun S.Mutallibov j-ч, H.Boltaboyev j-ч, Q.Sodiqov j-č shaklini olgan.

⁴⁹ Абдурахмонов Ф., Рустамов А. Қадимги туркий тил. – Т.1982. – Б.8.

⁵⁰ Махмудов Қ. Ўзбек тилининг тарихий фонетикаси. – Т., 2006. – Б. 60.

⁵¹ Боровкова Т.А. О губных согласных в Дивану лугат-ит-турк Махмуда Кашгари // Тюркологический сборник. – Москва.: 1966. – С.25

⁵² Содиқов Қ. Махмуд Кошғарий келтирган уйғур алифбоси: Ҳарф ва товуш муносабатлари // Turkologiya. – № 3., 2021. – Б. 4-15.

z / δ tovushlari qo‘lyozmada ikki harf (ز, ذ) bilan ifodalangan. Matnda ذ bilan yozilgan so‘zlar S.Mutallibov nashrida ustida nuqtasi bor [3] bilan, Q.Sodiqovda tishora [δ] bilan transkripsiyaga olingan. H.Boltaboyev nashrida esa o‘qilish jadvalida lotincha [z] ko‘rsatilgan. Biroq nashrda ذ bilan yozilgan so‘zlarning aksariyati [3] o‘qilgan. [3] aslida ز ning transkripsion belgisi sifatida ko‘rsatilgan. Xullas, nashrda ز va ذ bilan yozilgan so‘zlar ayrim o‘rinlarda farqlanmagan. Bu esa ham matniy, ham ma’naviy farqlarga sabab bo‘lgan: “*kiyimlarni o‘ftobda yoyib quritish; tarqalmoq; ichiga narsa qo‘ymoq, tiqmoq*” ma’nosida kelgan uch omonim so‘z ذ bilan يَدَلِشْدِي jazliuidi o‘qilgan. ز bilan yozilgan “*tugunni yechmoq*” ma’nosidagi يَزْلِشْدِي ham jazliuidi o‘qilgan. Shunda jÿmzak jazildï – “*tiqildi, ichiga narsa qo‘yildi*” (HB.III) birikmasi aks ma’noda “*bo‘g‘cha yoyildi*” bo‘lib o‘zgarishi mumkin.

n / ŋ III jildda S.Mutallibov va Q.Sodiqov [ŋ] o‘qigan o‘rinlarni ba’zan H.Boltaboyev [n] o‘qigan. Biroq arabcha matnda uchala nashrda ham nazal نك birikmasi yozilgan: قنكلى (MK.609/16)– қаңли (SM.III,389) – қанли (HB.III,251) – қаңли (QS.452) kabi. Shuningdek, Q.Sodiqov يگت قانگا كُرسدى yigit qanga kürsdi - yigit qonga to‘ldi, semirdi (468) birikmasidagi قانك so‘zini qanqa o‘qigan. Biroq matnda bu o‘rinda ن sukun olgan va qan so‘ziga jo‘nalish kelishigi qo‘shilgan (MK.626/13).

2) Undoshlarning yozilishi ham, o‘qilishi ham qo‘lyozmaga mos kelmaydi:

قَاغُون (MK.411/6) — tozaligi ketib, yungdek, paxtadek, lattadek bo‘lib qolgan qovun birikmasi nashrlarda: كِنزِگَاك قَاغُون — кінізгак қағун (SM.II,335; HB.II,193)- كِنزِگَاك قَاغُون kedizgäk qağun (QS.298) o‘qilgan. Yoki Dizrutin (MK.509/15) nomli shahar shu kungacha S.Mutallibov nashri orqali Дізрутин (SM.III,164; HB.III,101) hisoblangan. Bu kabi holatlar 6- ilovada ko‘rsatilgan.

3) **Matnda shaklan o‘xshash nuqtalari tushib qolgan yoki o‘chib ketgan undoshlarni o‘qish masalasi.** Qo‘lyozmaning 604/16 qatoridagi “havo” deb izohlangan so‘z نكك (transliteratsiyasi -nkk) shaklida yozilgan bo‘lib, birinchi harfning nuqtalari va harakatlari qo‘yilmagan. S.Mutallibov va H.Boltaboyev cözük, (SM.III,377; HB.III,243). Q.Sodiqov ي harfi bilan yeyäk (QS.447) o‘qigan. So‘z matnda takror kelmagan, shu bois “havo” ma’nosiga yaqin kelgan fe’li birikmalarni aniqladik. Bular quyidagilar: قُش تَنْدِي quş teñdi (MK.614/6); oq teñdi – er oqin teñütti (MK.616/14) – تَنْجُج teñüç (MK.610/17) So‘zning to‘g‘ri varianti teñük deb xulosa qildik va bizning taxminimiz o‘zbek nashrlari bilan mos kelmadi.

4) **Tovushlarning o‘zaro o‘rin almashishi.** Nashrlarning II, III jildida uchraydi: Qo‘lyozmaning 528/7- qatoridagi يُغرت so‘ziga ikkinchi zamma qo‘yilmagan va ikki nashrda jozypm o‘qilgan (SM.III,207; HB.III,132) Bu so‘z 361/4 da qaytarilgan va bunda ر harfi zamma olgan — يُغْرُتْ. Demak, ikki o‘rinda ham so‘zni yoğrut o‘qish maqsadga muvofiq. Q.Sodiqov qo‘lyozmadagi kabi yozgan. Bu kabi so‘zlardan 10 ta aniqladik va qo‘lyozmadagi holati bilan ishda ko‘rsatdik.

Nashrlarda turkiy she’r va maqollarning qiyosiy-matniy tahlili

Biz matndagi she’rlarni qiyosiy o‘rganishda o‘zbek turkshunosligida devonni ilk bor tadqiq etgan olim Abdurauf Fitratning “Eng eski turk adabiyoti namunalari”⁵³ majmuasidagi parchalar bilan chog‘ishtirdik.

⁵³ *Fitrat. Энг эски турк адабиёти намуналари. ЎзР ФАШИ, тошбосма, инв.№16507; keyingi o‘rinlarda (F.24) kabi sahifa raqami yozilgan holda qisqartirildi.*

Q.Sodiqov nashrining 199- sahifasida kelgan quyidagi she'rdagi bir so'zning yozilishi qo'lyozmaga mos kelmagani kuzatildi. Xususan, *Nāḥin tutar beklāyū, ōzi yemās...* misrasidagi *Nāḥin* so'zi qo'lyozmada نَکِن (MK.251/17) *nekin/negin* yozilgan. S.Mutallibov va H.Boltaboyev nashrlarida qo'lyozmaga mos o'qilgan: *Нэгин тутар бэклэјј өзи јэмäs* (SM.I,462; HB.I,331). Tarjimadagi matnda bu so'z "mol-dunyo" ma'nosida izohlanmoqda. Aslida ham bu so'zning asl ma'nosi "narsa, buyum"dir. Bu o'rinda, ehtimol, kotib yanglishgan, muallif esa qo'lyozmadagi noaniqlikni arab tilidagi talqinga ko'ra tiklagan. Baytning mazmuni (o'zi yemay molini baxillik qilib qattiq tutadi) *Nāḥin* so'zi bilan ko'proq moslashadi. Fitrat ham xuddi shunday fikrga kelgan va bu so'z – "ناکِن *nākin* ning to'g'risi نائک *nāḥ* bo'lishi kerak" ligini uqtirgan (F.99-100).

Shuningdek, ishda, *Јүкүнүб мәңä imlädi, Қочингар тэкä cәwıldi, Јай барубан әркүзи, Булмадiқ нэңка сәwинмәң Эндiк кiшi тiмiлсүн, Ајдум аңар сәwүк, Ўтпүк утун ағрiлају јүзгä бақар, Эрдәм тiла өгранiн болма күwаз* satrli she'rlar qiyosiy-matniy tahlil qilingan. Nashrlarning I jildiga kirgan 21 ta she'r tarkibida aniqlangan 23 ta matniy tafovutning tuzatilgan shakli va qo'lyozmadagi holati bilan ishda ko'rsatildi. II-III jilddagi shu kabi matniy, ma'naviy tafovutlar she'rlarning to'liq varianti bilan 7-ilovada ko'rsatildi.

Mahmud Koshg'ariy matnda keltirgan maqollar va hikmatli so'zlarning barchasi o'zbek tilidagi nashrlarga kiritilgan. Nashrlarda tafovutli kelgan 7 ta quyidagi maqollar qiyosiy-matniy tahlil qilinib, qo'lyozma bilan chog'ishtirildi va farqlarni yuzaga keltirgan omillar oydinlashtirildi: *Usuqmişqa saqiğ qamuğ suw körünür*(MK.104/16); *Taşiğ isrumasa, öpmiş kerak* (MK.92/1); *Eriñänä elik qari bözün/bözün üm tikämäs/tukämäs* (MK.71/6); "*Qadaş*" *temiş qaymadiq, "qadın" temiş qaymiş* (MK.203/9); *Sabanda sandiriş bolsa, örütkindä irtäs bolmas* (MK.203/2). *Tüzün birlä urus, utun birlä tiräşmä* (MK.203/2); *Puşmasar, boz quş tutar, ewmäsar, örün quş tutar* (MK.269/15).

XULOSA

1. "Devonu lug'ati-t-turk" qo'lyozmasini ko'chirgan kotibning mahorati yuqori bo'lib, tadqiqotchilar ochiqdagi matndagi noaniqliklarga beixtiyor yo'l qo'ygan. Matn ustida olib borilgan tahrir esa so'zning ikkinchi variantiga ishora qilgan hamda ayrim noaniqliklarni tuzatishni maqsad qilgan. Matn so'zboshisidagi mulohazalar kitob buyurtmachisining tilidan kotib qalami bilan yozilib, Mahmud Koshg'ariyning o'z qo'li bilan ko'chirgan nusxasiga ishora qilgan.

2. Abdurauf Fitrat birinchilardan bo'lib, matndagi turkiy she'rlarni o'zbek tilida nashrga tayyorlagan. Uning nashriga qo'lyozma emas, balki bosma nusxa asos bo'lgan. Olimning matnni o'zlashtirish mahoratining yuqoriligi shundaki, qo'lyozmani ko'rmasdan bosma nusxadagi ayrim xatoliklarni qo'lyozmadagi kabi tiklagan.

3. S.Mutallibovning o'zbek tilidagi nashri dunyo miqyosida ikkinchi bor to'liq nashrga tayyorlangan bo'lib, o'tgan asrda butun sobiq ittifoqda yagona tadqiqot manbasi bo'lib xizmat qilgan. S.Mutallibov qo'lyozma bo'lmagani uchun qayta tahrirlangan bosma nusxadan foydalanishga majbur bo'lgan va B.Atalayning turkcha

nashridagi yondashuvlariga ergashgani, B.Atalayning satrosti izohlarining aksariyati qo‘lyozmaga tayanilgani hisobidandir.

4. S.Mutallibovning nashrida qo‘lyozma sahifalari qo‘yilmagan va o‘tgan asrdagi siyosiy cheklovlar tufayli Qur‘on oyatlari va hadislar tarjima qilinmagan. Transkripsiya tizimida 40 ga yaqin belgilardan foydalanilgan bo‘lib, *Tarkan, o‘glaq* so‘zlarining talqini, *čumğuq, ilimğa* so‘zlarining o‘qilishidagi xatoliklar boshqa lingvistik tadqiqotlarda ham takrorlangan. E.Fozilovning ushbu nashrni xorijiy nashrlar bilan qiyoslagan ilmiy maqolasida S.Mutallibovning nashrida yo‘q deb ko‘rsatilgan *açyq, aryğ, artuqluq, arut, äp, äpmäk, ärdam, äräntüz* kabi so‘zlar aslida nashrda mavjuddir.

5. Hozirgacha matnning faksimile nusxasi besh marta tayyorlangani qo‘lyozma asosidagi yangi nashrlarni tayyorlash imkoniyatini kengaytirdi va turkologiyadagi yutuqlar yangi nashrlariga ehtiyoj tug‘dirdi. 2016-2017-yillarda S.Mutallibov nashri asosida to‘ldirilgan va qayta ishlangan ikki o‘zbekcha yangi nashr e‘lon qilindi.

6. Alibek Rustamov, Hamidulla Boltaboyev va Baxtiyor Isabekov tomonidan tayyorlangan nashrda Qur‘on oyatlari va hadislar tarjima qilingan, muqaddimadagi xatboshi tiklangan. Ayrim so‘zlar xorijiy ikki nashr va lug‘atlar bilan qiyoslanib, sahifa ostida qayd etilgan. Mualliflar talqin va so‘zning o‘qilishiga oid mulohazalarini yozib borganlar. Qo‘lyozma sahifalari qo‘yib borilishida o‘ndan ortiq sahifa raqami beixtiyoriy tushirib qoldirilgan (57, 59, 60, 61, 83, 104, 622, 633, 635, 637, 638). Ayrim o‘rinlarda so‘zlarning o‘qilishida birinchi tovushlar shu so‘zlarning izohi uchun keltirilgan jummalarda o‘zgargan va qo‘lyozmada kelish tartibi ham almashgan o‘rinlar kuzatildi. Transkripsiyaga o‘g‘irishda *ë, ə, j, z* belgilarining qo‘llanilishida noaniqliklar bor. To‘rtliklar va masnaviy shaklidagi parchalarning arab yozuvida berilishi I jild 179- sahifagacha S.Mutallibov nashridan aynan nusxalangan bo‘is kiritilgan o‘zgarishlar ushbu she‘rlarning arabcha matnida aks etmay qolgan.

7. Qosimjon Sodiqovning bir jildli yirik hajmli nashrida turkiy o‘rinlar qo‘lyozma bilan solishtirib chiqilgan. Matnning birinchi sahifasidagi so‘zboshi tarjima qilinib, nashrga kiritilgan; turkiy matn, barcha atoqli otlar, arab harflari, istilohlar lotin yozuvidagi qat‘iy transkripsiyaga o‘girilgan. Matnda ikki xil harakatlangan so‘zlarning har ikki varianti, qo‘lyozmada 61 o‘rinda kelgan كق ligaturasi bilan yakunlangan masdarlarning 51 tasi, matnda ikki o‘rinda xato yozilgan masdarning Koshg‘ariy keltirgan qoidaga binoan to‘g‘irlangan varianti nashrga kiritilgan. So‘zlarning kelishik va shaxs-son kategoriyalarini belgilashda Ko‘kturk bitiklarida qo‘llanilishi hisobga olingan. Orfografik me‘yorlarga qat‘iy amal qilingan. Qo‘shimcha yuklamalar, juft va takroriy so‘zlar ajratilgan. Nashrda she‘rlar va maqollar arab yozuvida ko‘rsatilmagan hamda qo‘lyozma sahifalari qo‘yib borilmagan.

8. O‘zbek tilidagi nashrlarda muqaddimaga oid 50, lug‘at qismga oid 600 ga yaqin tafovutlar qo‘lyozma bilan solishtirildi va farqlarning paydo bo‘lishiga ta‘sir etgan omillar ochib berildi. So‘z-maqolalari soni uch nashrda farqli ekanligi (7222, 6962, 7596 ta) ko‘p ma‘noli va shakldoshlarini alohida yoki bir maqola sonida berilishi va 6 ta maqola S.Mutallibov, 8 ta maqola H.Boltaboyev nashrlarida tushirib

qoldirilishi bilan bog‘liq (*yiklädi, yamladi, yimlädi, yašnädı, yelnädı, ölišdi näñ, ol anig birlä kerışdi, ol anig qulin kürätti*).

9. Matniy tafovutlarning eng ko‘lamlisi turkiy matnning o‘qilishi bilan bog‘liq bo‘lib, turkiy so‘zlar, unli va undosh tovushlarning orttirilishi, tushirilishi, almashinishi kabi guruhlarga ajratilib, tasnif qilindi, farqlarni yuzaga keltirgan omillar oydinlashtirildi.

10. Nashrlarda fe‘llar doirasidagi unli tovushlarning tushishi qo‘lyozmada qanday yozilgan bo‘lsa, shunday o‘qish yoki so‘zni sarlavhadagi vazn qolipiga moslashtirish uchun bir unlini tushirib o‘qish yondashuviga asoslangan, talqinga oid matniy tafovutlar tahlilida kotibning beixtiyor yanglishgani qo‘lyozmada turkiy matn va uning arabcha talqini zid kelishiga sabab bo‘lgan. Bu o‘rinda S.Mutallibov arabcha talqin asosida turkiy matni, Q.Sodiqov turkiy matn asosida talqinni o‘zgartirgan.

11. Turkiy she‘rlar tadqiqida Fitrat (qo‘lyozmani ko‘rmagan holda *neñin, eñar*) Q.Sodiqov (*neñin, başra qa qar*) va H.Boltaboyev (*eñar*) so‘zning asl shaklini tiklagan. Fitrat va S.Mutallibov nashri uchun bir manba tayanch bo‘lgan.

**SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL AWARDING SCIENTIFIC DEGREES
DSc.03/30.12.2019.Fil/Tar.21.01 UNDER
TASHKENT STATE UNIVERSITY OF ORIENTAL STUDIES**

TASHKENT STATE UNIVERSITY OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

SATTOROVA ZILOLA ISMOILOVNA

**UZBEK EDITIONS OF “DEVONU LUGATI-T-TURK” AND THEIR
COMPARATIVE-TEXTUAL RESEARCH**

10.00.10 – Textology and literary source studies

**DISSERTATION ABSTRACT
of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in philological sciences**

Tashkent – 2024

The theme of the dissertation of the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) was registered at the Higher Attestation Commission with number B2021.2.PhD/Fil1896.

The doctoral thesis has been carried out at the Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies.

The abstract of the dissertation has been posted in three languages (Uzbek, English, Russian (resume)) on the website of the Scientific Council (www.tsuos.uz) and Information-educational portal «Ziyonet» (www.ziyonet.uz).

Scientific supervisor: **Omonov Qudratulla Sharipovich**
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor

Official opponents: **Islomov Zohidjon Mahmudovich**
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor

Shodmonov Nafas Namozovich
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor

Leading organization: **Institute of Uzbek language, literature and folklore of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan**

The defense of the dissertation will be held on «24» February 2024 at 10:00^{am} at the session of Scientific Council DSc.03/30.12.2019.Fil/Tar.21.01 at the Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies. (Address: 100047, Tashkent, Shakhrisabz Street, 16. Phone: (99871) 233-45-21; Fax: (99871) 233-52-24; e-mail: info@tsuos.uz).

The doctoral dissertation is available at the Information-Resource Centre of the Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies (registered under № 29). (The address: 100060, Tashkent, Amir Temur Street, 20. Phone: (99871) 233-45-21.)

The abstract of the dissertation was distributed on «2» February 2024.
(Registry protocol No 29 of «2» February 2024).



A.M.Mannonov
Chairman of the Scientific Council awarding scientific degrees, Doctor of Philology, Professor

R.A.Alimukhamedov
Scientific Secretary of the Scientific Council awarding scientific degrees, Doctor of Philology, Associated Professor

M.M.Is'hoqov
Acting Chairman of the Scientific Seminar at the Scientific Council awarding scientific degrees, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor

INTRODUCTION (abstract of the PhD thesis)

Relevance and necessity of the dissertation topic. Mahmud Koshgari's "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" is a magnificent scientific and literary monument in the world of Turkology, and it is recognized as a common artistic heritage of all Turkic peoples because it was written with the aim of informing the entire Islamic world about Turkish languages, the culture of Turkic peoples, customs, lifestyles, and folklore. In Turkology, the weight of research on this work is wide, and the first of them was related to the history of the text and the preparation of the scientific-critical text of the work.

In the last century, scientific publications based on edited printed copies of the work were published in the world Turkology. The poems in "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" were first translated and interpreted in Uzbek by Abdurauf Fitrat in 1927 and prepared for publication. The first publication in the Uzbek language translated and interpreted by Solih Mutallibov (1960-1963) was the third in the world and the first in Asian countries, and served as the only source of research for the entire region for many years. The publication was recognized and described by world Turkologists, but it was not directly compared with the manuscript as an object of textual studies. Today, due to the fact that high-quality facsimile copies of the manuscript have been prepared, research based on the printed edition, especially in the first Uzbek language editions of the text, shows that there are certain differences with the manuscript.

Attention to the development of science in modernizing Uzbekistan is rising to a new level. In particular, in-depth study of textual studies and literary source studies based on manuscript sources is gaining special importance year by year. In the course of such work, in order to achieve new results in Uzbek textology, there was a need for new manuscript-based editions of the "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" text. Today, the Uzbek edition of the work has been re-edited twice and prepared for publication in 2016 by Alibek Rustamov, Hamidulla Boltaboev, Bakhtiyor Isabekov, and in 2017 by Qosimjon Sodiqov. Textual research is the basis for subsequent scientific works on linguistics, literary studies, and historiography, and ensures the quality and reliability of research. Therefore, comparative-textual research of these publications and determining that the features of the original text have been revealed is the relevance of the topic.

The dissertation research serves to a certain extent in the implementation of the tasks defined in the decree of PD-60¹ of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated January 28, 2022 "On the development strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022-2026", PD-126² February 10, 2022 "Additional measures to improve the system of preservation and research of ancient written sources" and other regulatory legal documents related to this activity.

¹ <https://lex.uz/docs/5841063>

² O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Sh.M.Mirziyoyevning 2017-yil 24-maydagi PQ-2995 son "Qadimiy yozma manbalarni saqlash, tadqiq va targ'ib qilish tizimini yanada takomillashtirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida"gi Qarori.// Xalq so'zi, 2017-yil, 25-may.

Dependence of the research on the main priorities of the development of science and technology of the republic. This study has been carried out within the framework of the priority direction of the development of science and technology of the Republic I. “Formation of a system of innovative ideas and ways of their implementation in the social, legal, economic, cultural, spiritual and educational development of the information society and the democratic state”.

The degree of study of the problem. The manuscript of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” has been widely studied worldwide since the day it was discovered and delivered to the scientific community. Most of the studies on the history of the text and its textological features were researched by its translators and publishers and were translated into German, Turkish, Uzbek, English, Uyghur and Kazakh languages in the 20th century³. These studies were accelerated even after 2000, reworked and new editions were published in Persian, Chinese, Azerbaijani, Russian, Kyrgyz, Turkish and Uzbek languages⁴. The characteristics of the Uzbek edition of S. Mutallibov, and his approaches have been partially studied in the introduction to these foreign editions.

A. Kononov, I. Stebleva, A. Rustamov, E. Fozilov, Q. Sodiqov, S. Rustamiy, E. Umarov, J. Khudoyberdiyev, Sh. Sultanaliyev, U. Omurbekova compared with other foreign publications in their research and pointed out some achievements and shortcomings⁵.

³ Brockelmann C. *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Mahmud al-Kāshgari's Divan Lughat at-Turk*. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica. – Budapest-Leipzig, – No. 1, 1928.; *Atalay B. Divanü Lûgat-it Türk Tercümesi*. 3 cilt. – С. 1,2,3. – Ankara: Alâeddin Kırâl Basımevi, 1939, 1940, 1941; Туркий сўзлар девони (Девони луғотит турк). Таржимон ва нашрга тайёрловчи: *С.Муталлибов*. 3 жилд. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон Фанлар академияси, 1960, 1961, 1963; *Mahmud al-Kashgari*. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Diwan Lugat at-Turk), edited and translated with introduction and indices by Robert Dankoff, in collaboration with James Kelly. Cambridge, Mass. [In: Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures, ed. Sinasi Tekin.] – Part I: 1982 – P. xi + 416. Part II: 1984 (Pp. iii + 381). Part III: 1985 (Pp. 337 + microfile); *Kashgari Maxmut*. Turkiy tillar divani – Divanü lûgat-it-türk. – Urumchi, 1981. – 687 b. 1983.II. – 535 b., 1984.III. – 612 b.; Қашқари Махмут. Түрік сөздігі. 3-том/Аударған А. Егеубай. – Алматы. 1997.

⁴ *Махмуд бин Ал Хусайн АлКашгарий*. Девону луғати-т-турк / Др.Хусайн Мухаммазода Сиддик. Ахтар нашриёти, Табриз-Эрон: Хижрий 1383.; Tu Tszüe Yuy Datsidyuan [“Devonu luğot-it-turk”] – Beyin: Millətlər nəşriyati, 2002. – I cild. – 554 b., II cild – 378 b., III cild – 442 b.; *Kāshgari Mahmud*. Divanü lûgat-it-türk. Tərcümə edən və nəşrə hazırlayan Ramiz Əskər. – Bakı: Ozan, 2006, – I cild, – 512 s.; – II cild, – 400 s.; – III cild, – 400 s.; IV cild (indeks), – 752 s.; *Махмуд ал-Кашгарий*. Диван Луғат ат-Турк. Перевод, предисловие и комментарии З.-А.М.Аузэвой. Индексы составлены Р.Эрмерсом. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2005; *Махмуд ал-Кашгарий*. Диван лугат ат-турк (Свод тюркских слов) : в 3 т. / Пер. с араб. А.Р. Рустамова под ред. И.В.Кормушина, прим. И.В. Кормушина, Е.А. Поцелуевского, А.Р.Рустамова; – Москва: Вост. лит., 2010-том 1. – 461 с.; Махмуд Кашгари. Словарь тюркских языков / перевод на кырг. Т. Токоев, К. Кошмоков. – Бишкек, 2011. Т. I. – 906 б, II. 591б, III – 678 б.; *Kāshgarlı Mahmud*. Divānu Lugāti`-t-Türk (Giriş – Metin – Çeviri – Notlar – Dizin). Hazırlayanlar: Ahmet B.Ercilasun, Ziyat Akkoynlu. – Ankara: TDK Yayınları. – 1120 s.; *Махмуд Кошгарий*. Девону луғоти-т-турк. 1-3 жилд. (Нашрга тайёрловчилар: А.Рустамов, Ҳ. Болтабоев, Б.Исабеков) – Тошкент: Mumtoz so‘z, 2016.; *Махмуд Кошгарий*. “Девону луғати-т- турк”. Нашрга тайёрловчи: Содиқов Қ. – Тошкент: Фафур Ғуллом, 2007. – 482 б.

⁵ *Кононов А.* Изучение “Дивану луғат ит-турк” Махмуда Кашгарского в советском в СССР. Советская тюркология.1973. – №1. – С.4-5; *Рустамов А.* О переводе “Дивану лугат ит-турк” Махмуда Кашгари на русский язык. Советская тюркология. – Баку, 1972. – №1. – С.129-139.; *Стеблева И.* Развитие тюркских поэтических форм в XI веке. Москва, 1971. – С.111-279; *Фазылов Э.* Об изданиях и издателях «Дивана» Махмуда Кашгари. Советская тюркология. 1972. – №1. – Б.141-149.; *Содиқов Қ.* «Девону луғати-т-турк»да кечган *yelkin-elkin* сўзи ва унинг шеърлий узиндилардаги семантикаси // «Шарк таржимашунослиги: тарихи, ҳозирги куни ва келажак»мавзуйидаги Республика илмий-амалий конференция тўплами. – Тошкент: ТошДШИ, 2014. – №2. – Б.24-28; *Рустамий С.* “Девону луғот-т-турк”даги лингвистик атамалар. – Т. 2006. – 92 б.; *Умаров Э.* Девонни янгидан нашр қилмок керак // Махмуд Кошгарийнинг “Девону луғотит турк” асари ва унинг туркий халқлар маданияти ҳамда жаҳон цивилизациясида тутган ўрни. Халқаро конференция материаллари. Самарқанд. 2002. – 98.; *Умаров Э.* “Девону луғотит турк”да чўзик унлиларнинг берилиши. Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 2010. – № 5. – Б.74-77.; *Султаналиев И.Ш.* Фонетико-лексические особенности перевода и чтения на тюркских и русском языках словаря Махмуда Кашгари «Дивану лугати-т тюрк» // Научный результат. Вопросы теоретической и прикладной лингвистики. – Т.3, – №2, 2017. – С.42-46.; *Xudoyberdiyev J.* Mahmud Koshgari hayoti va «Devonu lugotit turk» bo'yicha yaratilgan asarlar ko'rsatkichi. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2011. – 160 b.; *Omurbekova U.* Divanu lugati-t-turk uzerine Turkiye'de ve Yurt disinda yapilmis calismalar. – Kastamonu, 2020. – s. 78-82.

N. Rahmon, B. Tokhliev, H. Boltaboev and S. Hasanov, R. Alimukhamedov announced their scientific works combined with new publications in the Uzbek language⁶. Also, the textual complex of Abdurauf Fitrat was comparatively studied by the Turkish scientist Y. Avji with the Turkish edition of B. Atalay, while the research of source studies was carried out in the scientific work of the Uzbek scientist O. Hamrayeva⁷. However, scientific publications published in the Uzbek language have not been directly compared and textually researched with each other and with the manuscript.

The connection of the thesis topic with the research work of the higher education institution where the dissertation has been completed. Dissertation research has been carried out at the Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies within the framework of scientific projects such as “Audiomanuskript.uz platformasini yaratish” (2022-2023), “IZ-2020102832 -“Yevropa fondlarida saqlanayotgan, O‘zbekistonda mavjud bo‘lmagan turkiy qo‘lyozmalarining ma‘lumotlar bazasini va “Yevroturcologica.uz” elektron platformasini yaratish” (2021-2023).

The purpose of the research is to conduct a comparative-textual research of the Uzbek editions of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”, identify textual differences, classify them, compare them with the original source, and reveal the characteristics of the manuscripts of the editions.

The tasks of the research are as follows:

reacting to controversial issues related to the textual features of the manuscript;
performing statistical analysis of the Uzbek language editions of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”;

comparing the textual differences of the preface with the manuscript, determining that the features of the text have been revealed in Uzbek-language publications;

classifying and analyzing the factors that influenced the emergence of textual-spiritual differences regarding the writing and reading of Turkish texts in publications;

researching comparative-textual Turkish poems and proverbs in the publications, comparing them with Abdurauf Fitrat's research and the manuscript, and determining whether the features of the original text have been revealed.

The object of the research is the Uzbek language editions of the work “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” published in 1960-1963, 2016, 2017, the collection of Abdurauf Fitrat published in 1927, and a facsimile copy of the manuscript of the work made in 2008.

The subject of the research is a comparative textual study of the Uzbek language editions of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”.

The methods of research. Based on the characteristics of the materials collected for the research, it was studied on the basis of textual comparison, description, classification, comparison, semantic and statistical analysis.

⁶ *Насимхон Раҳмон*. Туркологияда дадил кадам. “Ўзбекистон адабиёти ва санъати”. 27 сентябрь, 2017 йил. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337812439_Turkologiada_dadil_kadam; *Тўхлиев Б.* “Девону луғати-т-турк”ка оид айрим мулоҳазалар // *Turkologiya*. – Т.: TDSHU, – № 3. 2021. – Б.26-36.; *Ҳасанов С., Болтабоев Ҳ.* “Девону луғот-т-турк”нинг янги нашрини тайёрлаш принциплари // “Девону луғоти-т-турк” – туркий халқларнинг ноёб ёзма ёдгорлиги” халқаро илмий анжуман материаллари. – Т., 2018. – Б.7.; *Алимухамедов Р.* Проф. Қ.Содиқов томонидан тайёрланган “Девону луғати-т-турк” асарининг янги нашри // “Девону луғоти-т-турк” – туркий халқларнинг ноёб ёзма ёдгорлиги” мавзуидаги халқаро илмий анжуман материаллари. – Т., 2018. – 122 б.

⁷ *Avci Y.* Türk Edebiyatının en eski örnekleri. Kesit Yayınları. – Istanbul. 2014. – S.9-12.; *Ҳамроева О.* XX аср бошлари ўзбек матншунослиги тараққиётида Фитрат мажмуаларининг ўрни: Фил. фан. бўйича фалс. д-ри (PhD)... дис. – Т., 2018. – 173 б.

The scientific novelty of the study:

It was proved that Abdurauf Fitrat's collection of "Samples of the Oldest Turkish Literature" shows that despite the fact that the printed copy of the work was the basis for the publication of the poetic fragments from the "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk", and the form of the poetic texts was correctly restored to the manuscript.

It was revealed that six words and articles and a number of religious concepts and words were omitted in the publication of S. Mutallibov, as well as mistakes related to the reading and interpretation of the text were repeated in subsequent studies.

It is proved that the edition of "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" prepared under the leadership of H. Boltaboev has been based on the approaches of S. Mutallibov, the restored parts of the text are based on the Russian edition of A. Rustamov, and K. Sodikov in his edition has restored the preface of the manuscript and eight articles which were omitted from previous editions;

About 650 differences found in Uzbek publications were compared with the manuscript and classified, it was shown that most of the differences are related to the Turkish text, and it was proved that the interpretation of the Turkish words in the manuscript was based on the Arabic text by S. Mutallibov, and on the Turkish text by Q. Sodikov.

The practical results of the research are as follows:

The Uzbek editions of "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" were compared, the textual differences were identified and compared with the manuscript. As a result, it was determined that the most significant differences are related to the reading and partial interpretation of the Turkish texts, words, sounds, interpretation, Turkish poems and proverbs are divided into five groups and analyzed, some differences are compared with foreign publications;

The statistics of the words appearing as articles in the Uzbek language publications were calculated and the factors affecting the diversity of the results were reported;

Publications in Uzbek, as well as Turkish poems in the Fitrat complex, are compared with manuscripts, and the authors' ability to reflect text features in publications is revealed;

About 650 identified textual differences are divided into thematic groups and shown in the appendices at the end of the study.

The reliability of the research results is ensured by the fact that the dissertation was carried out on the basis of the methodology and methods of textual studies and literary source studies, more than 200 literatures related to the field were used, the conclusions were put into practice, and the obtained results were confirmed by the relevant structures.

Scientific and practical significance of research results. The scientific significance of the research results is that the textual-spiritual differences in the Uzbek editions of the work "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" are classified by direct comparison with the manuscript, that the poems included in Abdurauf Fitrat's collection for the first time were compared with the original source, and that the unclear places in the manuscript were restored by the skills of the text editors, the conclusions obtained as a result of the

research serve as a scientific-theoretical source to further enrich the research of Turkic languages.

The practical significance of the research results will serve as a source for the preparation of linguistics, literary studies, textual studies, new editions of the text, manuals on source studies and textual studies, and educational literature on “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” in the future.

Implementation of research results. Based on the “Uzbek editions of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” and their comparative-textual research”:

The textual features of the manuscript of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”, general opinions about approaches to the text in the Uzbek language editions of the work, the researcher's analysis of the scientific publications of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”, attempts to perfect the interpretation of the work in Turkology has been used in a practical project on “Yevropa fondlarida saqlanayotgan, O‘zbekistonda mavjud bo‘lmagan Turkiy qo‘lyozmalarning ma’lumotlar bazasini va “Yevroturcologica.uz” elektron platformasini yaratish (No IZ-2020102832) completed at Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies in 2021-2023 (Reference number 02-04/2217 dated November 15, 2023 of the Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies). As a result, the only copy of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” preserved in Turkey served to substantiate the analysis that in 1266 Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr Damascus of Damascus copied it from the handwritten copy of Mahmud Koshgari;

As a result of the comparative-textual research of the first edition “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” in the Soviet period and the reprints in the years of independence, it was found that there are differences between the editions and the manuscript source, based on the determination of the level of correspondence between the textual and spiritual differences with the manuscript, the Youth Policy of the Republic of Uzbekistan and was used in the development of the 2023 first half-year work plan of the Youth Affairs Agency under the Ministry of Sports (Reference number 1 13-21-2157 dated August 4, 2023 of the Youth Affairs Agency under the Ministry of Youth Policy and Sports of the Republic of Uzbekistan). The work plan prepared on the basis of research was enriched with new information. It acted as a theoretical-methodological source in the formation of ideas and concepts about the Uzbek editions of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” in propaganda work;

The analyses of the comparative textual research of the editions of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” in Uzbek until today have been used in the preparation of the script of the program “Taqdimot” of the TV channel “O‘zbekiston tarixi” of the national television and radio company of Uzbekistan. (Reference No. 06-28-1778 dated November 28, 2023, of the National Television and Radio Company of Uzbekistan “O‘zbekiston tarixi”). In the program, it was explained on a scientific basis that the study of Uzbek poetry began directly with Abdurauf Fitrat, that the first Uzbek edition of the work was not based on the manuscript, but on the basis of an edited printed copy, and that the work was remade twice in recent years, that these publications were compared and textually compared with each other and with the manuscript, and that textual differences were identified.

Approval of research results. The research results were approved at 4 scientific-practical conferences, including 2 international and 2 Republican conferences.

Publication of research results. A total of 17 scientific works on the topic of the dissertation, including 8 articles (4 of them in Republican and 4 foreign journals) have been published in scientific publications recommended to publish the main results of doctoral dissertations of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

The structure and pages of the thesis. The study consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a list of references. The total volume of the dissertation is 150 pages.

THE MAIN CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

In the introduction, the relevance and necessity of the dissertation topic are based, the purpose and tasks, object and the subject of the dissertation are described, its compatibility with the priority directions of the development of science and technology of the republic is shown, the scientific innovation and practical significance of the research are revealed, the implementation of the research results into practice, the published works and the dissertation information on its structure is presented.

Chapter I of the dissertation **“Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”**: attempts to perfect the interpretation of the work in Turkology”, the source and textual analysis of the work in two structures, Abdurauf Fitrat's studies are highlighted.

In the 10th century, the high influence of Turks in the palace of the caliphs created a spiritual and scientific need to learn the Turkish language, and Mahmud Koshgari's high skill and experience in the grammar of Turkic languages was the basis for his creation of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” (hereinafter DLT).

There is no information about the person of Mahmud Koshgari other than some places indicated in the text itself. We agree with the view that he is a representative of the ruling dynasty with new information that has eluded the researchers: “*Kök topulğan* – the name of a bird. It is said that this bird has two wings of steel, and it pierces itself from one side to the other by striking itself against the mountain with its wing. *Bu soʻzni menga xizmat qilib yurgan bir kishi aytgan (This word was said to me by a servant).*”(MK.259/4-7)⁸.

The only copy of the DLT was copied two hundred years after Mahmud Koshgari's own copy, on Shawwal 27, 664 (August 1, 1266), by a scribe named Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr Damascus from Sowa, then from Damascus. By the 14th century, Muhammad Khatib Darayya bought it (D-K.8)⁹. Yavuz Sultan Selim, the Turkish Sultan who conquered Egypt, sent all the spoils by water to the Topqopi Palace, and DLT arrived at the Ottoman Palace. At the beginning of the 20th century, a book lover named Ali Amiri bought the manuscript from a woman who was a relative of Nazif Pasha, whose ancestors had been pashas in the palace for a long time¹⁰ and

⁸ Mahmud bin al-Husayn bin Muhammad al-Kashg'ari. Kitābu dīwānu lug'āti'-t-türk. Tipkibasim-Türkçe Sözcükler, Özel Adlar Dizini. – Istanbul: Yayına hazırlayan Şaban Kurt. 2008. – 638 s. (Tadqiqot davomida qoʻlyozmaning mazkur faksimile nusxasidan foydalanildi).

⁹ Mahmud al-Kashgari. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Diwan Lugat at-Turk), edited and translated with introduction and indices by Robert Dankoff, in collaboration with James Kelly. – Cambridge, Mass. / In: Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures, ed. Sinasi Tekin. Part I: 1982 – 416 p. – Part II: 1984. – 381 p. – Part III: 1985. – 337 p.

¹⁰ Chichekli Ali. Kashgarli Mahmut. DIVAN-U LUGAT-IT TURK. May yayinlari genel kultur kitaplari 2. 1970. – C. 2

thus the work was announced to the scientific community for the first time. It is currently stored in the National Library with number 4189.

Black and red ink were used in the text. We noticed that on pages 25-200 of the facsimile, changes were made in light brown ink, i.e. *zamma*, *fatha*, *kasra*, *sukun*, *tašdid*, *tanvin* and dots of some letters were added.

30/ line 11, at the end of the word written in the Arabic text as *حَزْر*, corrected with *tanvin fatha* and silenced. In one place, we came across the Turkish word *tanvin fatha*. Perhaps it is because of this fact that some scholars estimate that the person who edited¹¹ or the secretary did not know the Turkish language as well as the Arabic language.

77/16-17 line *مَنْ أُنْدَا أَشْنُو كَلِيم* *men anda ašnu keldim* *tanvin fatha* is written at the end of the second word in the compound. Even if nun ن is written in this place, it could express the same meaning, it could be read as “*andan*”. However, an effort seems to have been made to keep the text visible as much as possible. Also, on page 32, three dots are placed above *ك*, and *ك* [k] in Turkish words is pronounced with *گ* [g].

When the manuscript was finished, it was later corrected by another person. Researchers estimated that 15 people had pens, including the scribe Abu Bakr Damascus and Khatib Darayya (D-K,15). We also think there may be other handprints. Because some headings in red ink (line 8/14) and Arabic positions have actions in dark black. In this line, a bolder and bolder *zamma* has been written above the red title in dark black ink, which is different from the scribe's pen. This brown ink does not resemble the owner's "zamma" either. The inscriptions in the margins of pages 3, 9, 10, 12 are also different from the scribe's signature - slightly tilted to the right. However, the fact that scholars say that there are traces of 15 pen holders in the text is somewhat controversial. This is because it is natural for ink to run out and change when writing a large work.

In our opinion, the people who edited the manuscript either wanted to correct it based on another copy, or wanted to produce another version that would be more understandable to the reader (the sentence *انى بَشْرًا فَفْتَى* was drawn over the transitive agreement -ra in the word *bašra* and tried to change it to the form -ka, that is, to make a combination of *bašra*, because in Old Turkic, the Old Turkic -ra form of the suffix was inactive— 412/12).

According to Sh.Kurt, on page 637 of the manuscript, there is the word *اِنْنَجْ* *inänäč* and it is not found in any edition of DLT¹². We cannot fully agree with this view. Because here the thin [ä] vowel in the unit, interpreted in the sense of belief, is read as *اِنْنَجْ* *inänč*. It is probably inappropriate to criticize K. Rifat. The word *Inänč* was active in Turkic languages.. Also, all the words in the chapter on *ج* li gunnalis end with *ج*. In the Kokturk script, these two sounds are represented together by one special letter. According to Sh.Kurt, the spelling of this word in the manuscript *اِنْنَجْ* *inänäč* is written in the 14th line of page 637, i.e., the second ن nun is moved with nun fatha. Further, the combination *inänč beg* was introduced to make the word more precise. But this time "that fatha " was not put. This combination is repeated in the text in this case. In addition, in the Namangan copy of Qutadgu bilig written in Arabic, it is noted that in

¹¹ Рустамий С. “Девону луғоти-турк”даги лингвистик атамалар. – Т., 2006. – Б.25

¹² Şaban Kurt. Özel Adlar Dizini. – Istanbul, 2008. – S.17.

those times there was a special title called *inānč beg*¹³. So, it can be concluded that the *fatha* action put by the secretary at this point was unintentionally released.

There are two views about the 15-line preface on the first page of the text: 1. *K. Rifat concluded that the foreword was written by Ahmad Khatib Darayya in 1400-1401*. Because the name, signature and date of this person were written on the top of the page. 2. *Because the name, signature and date of this person were written on the top of the page*. Denkoﬀ-Kelly comes to this idea with the two spellings of *Allah* in the title of the work and the letter *ha* in the signature word *bi-l-qahira*. Denkoﬀ- In our opinion, the second opinion is justified. According to the facsimile, the features of the writing, the angles of the letters, the dotted circle and three red dots in red ink in line 15 are the same as the original text. Our last conclusion about the preface is that the customer who copied the book had an autographed copy of Mahmud Koshgari and asked the scribe to put his comments on this page.

In 1915-1917, Amiri's student was K. Rifat, who edited the text for the first time and prepared it for printing. He restored some faded letters and words, at the same time he chose one version of two different moving letters and did not include the other in the text, thereby changing the characteristics of the manuscript. However, the entire Turkology recognized the work on the basis of this publication, which was based on scientific publications published before 1982, including German, Turkish, and Uzbek languages. In 1939-1941, B. Atalay also made some revisions in the Turkish edition. In particular, he noted that it is reasonable that the word *yim* (flax seed) and *yupaĝu* are actually in the form of *yitim*, and *buyaĝu* in the manuscript (BA.III,24,36)¹⁴. Based on the manuscript, these comments were found to be appropriate (MK.454/11; 459/15) According to him, the letter *t* in the word *yitim* was not dotted, and K. Rifat dropped this letter and adopted the form *yim*. This error is also repeated in publications.

To date, 5 facsimile editions of the manuscript have been prepared, all of which were made in Turkey (1941, 1990, 2008, 2017, 2018). Uzbek scientist A. Rustamov was the first in the world Turkology to translate the text based on the manuscript. Among the foreign editions that we consider to be important, the following are the manuscripts: R. Denkoﬀ and J. Kelly in English, A. Rustamov in Russian, and A. Erjilasun and Z. Akkoyunli in Turkish.

DLT, along with foreign languages, was first published in Uzbek in 1927. The first researcher and publisher of the work in our country is Abdurauf Fitrat. In the same year, he ordered the “Oldest samples of Turkish literature”¹⁵ complex. This publication is registered in the fund of the Institute of Oriental Studies with number 5994 in the Millat Library in Ankara.

Fitrat did not fully translate and interpret the DLT. He published only Turkish artistic fragments - examples of folklore in the form of masnavi and quatrains. The collection consists of three parts and consists of 124 pages. Pages are marked in Arabic numerals. It is written in the old Uzbek script. Citations and scholarly comments are

¹³ Содиқов Қ. “Қутадғу билиг” сўзлиги [Матн]. – Т., 2020. – Б.108.

¹⁴ Atalay B. *Divanü Lûgat-it Türk Tercümesi*. 3 cilt. – С. 1, 2, 3. – Ankara: Alâeddin Kırâl Basımevi, 1939, 1940, 1941.

¹⁵ *Фитрат*. Энг эски турк адабиёти намуналари. ЎзР ФАШИ, тошбосма, инв. – № 16507. (F)

attached at the bottom of the page. Pages 2-10 are devoted to the introduction. Bolot Soliyev wrote a preface to the collection entitled “A couple of words about the book”.

The preface is followed by the article “One or two words” with the author's point of view. The collection consists of 3 parts: Part I-12-87 pages, rhymed in the a-a-a-a-b system, 14 out of 139 quatrains are divided into marches, debates, images of wars and lyrical songs, the title is given: *Alp Er to'nga marsiyasi, Yoz-Qish munozarasi, Yoz o'yunlari* and others. Part I, pages 88-110, systematizes 18 didactically important poems out of 74 stanzas on educational and moral topics: such as *Nasihah, Maqtanish, Boylik to'g'risida (About Advice, Bragging, Wealth...)*.... He wrote down the meaning of some words in the form of a dictionary under these passages. Part III - pages 111-124, including pages, including an explanatory dictionary of 132 words, of the works “Kutadgu bilig”, “Hibat ul-haqaiq”, “Muqaddimat ul-adab”, “Lug'atoyi chigatoyi”, “Ismail Agha's travelogue” compared with the manuscript copies and showed their common and different aspects. Since the Mongolian version of the word is listed in the “Muqaddimat ul-adab” dictionary, Fitrat also compared some words with the Mongolian version.

It is worth noting that Fitrat did not take the quatrains given in DLT and put them together according to the compatibility of content and rhyme, but took some small lines from different pages and combined them to make a new quatrain. Then he collected them under one category with other quatrains created in the same way. Also, the page and volume of the devan text have been left in place. The sample text is followed by an interpretation and a glossary of some words.

Fitrat *fatha, zamma, kasra, tanvin zamma* used ۴ ۳ ۱ signs. He also changed the alif in small words to ۴. He wrote the three-point ۴ sound with ۳. He also used the sign ۴ in short words (F.VIII).

In 2017, the kyrgyz turkologist T. Chorotegin in his monograph mentions one small flaw in the interpretation of Fitrat's text. According to him, S. Malov noted that the last line of a quatrain was misinterpreted in the collection 1997-yilda qirg'iz turkologi T.Chorotegin monografiyasida¹⁶: He translated as “*Bulnadi meni qaraq satri yo'lda qaroqchi tutib oldi mani (I was caught by a robber on the road.)*”. Nevertheless, Fitrat was the first scientist who introduced DLT to Central Asia, T. Chorotegin added that his services are highly appreciated and did not analyze S. Malov's opinion¹⁷.

The passage under consideration is included in the series “About Love Again” on page 70 of the collection. The poem is composed of three quatrains. The first paragraph is collected from I.315, the second from pages I.317 and II.18, and the third, the current paragraph, from the couplets from pages III.13 and III.27:

اقتورور كوزم يۇلاق	<i>Aqtürür közm yulaq,</i>	Meaning:
يغاق توش قيلور ئرده	<i>Tuš qilur ördak yuğaq.</i>	My eyes are a spring of water,
ئوغراغم كه ندو يراق	<i>Uğrağm kandü yïraq</i>	Ducks and geese fall in it.
بولنادى مه نى قاراق	<i>Bulnadi meni qaraq.</i>	The dream I dreamed of is far away
		A robber caught me on the way
		(F.70).

¹⁶ *Чоротегин Т.* Махмуд Кашгари Барсканинин «Дивану лугати т-түрк» эмгеги – түрк элдеринин тарыхы боюнча көөнөргүс булак. Илимий басылыш/Редколлегия: К. С.Молдокасымов (төрага), – Бишкек: «Турап» басмасы, 2017. – 376 б.

¹⁷ That source – p.19.

مَعْنَاهُ شَاوَى بَعِيدَ لَكِنِ الْمُفْلَةَ مِنَ الْحَبِيبِ أَسْرَتْنِي فَمَنْعَتْ عَن فُصْرِيهِ يَغَاقُ — *Ma'nāhu šāvā ba'īdun lakinna-l-muqlahu mina-l-ḥabībi asaratinī fa-mana'at an qasrīhi yaḡāq* (Meaning: my goal was long, the black eye of my beloved took me away from the path) - this is how it comes in the manuscript. In this place, Fitrat interpreted the word “qaraq” as “robber”. The meaning of the word is “eye”, “look”. In “Qutadgu bilig” (QBN.223a,7) it says: *Firāqin tōkār yaš körügli qaraq* — ko‘ruvchi qaroq(lar) firoq bilan yosh to‘kadi (*the sighted pirate(s) shed tears of joy*)¹⁸. However, Fitrat's skill should not be measured by this. The scientist also noticed the mistakes made by K. Rifat in the printed edition. Although he did not see the manuscript, he was able to tell the original words based on the Arabic interpretation of the poem and his ability to master the text. In particular, the word tikdağ in the quaternary beginning with the word *Okräyukī*..... should be *tikdağ* in the manuscript and gives a reason (F.14). It is worth mentioning that neither B. Atalay (*tegdağ*, I.160) nor S. Mutallibov (*məḥḍağ*, I,174) paid attention to this error in the printed edition. When compared with the manuscript, Fitrat's reasoning was found to be correct: تِلْدَغُ *tildağ* (MK.90/15).

Chapter II analyzes approaches to the text in Uzbek editions of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”.

S. Mutallibov's approaches to preparing “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” for publication. In the second half of the 20th century, the establishment of the Textual Studies Commission under the Navoi Committee, which was formed in connection with the 500th anniversary of Navoi's birth, had a great impact on the improvement of Uzbek textual studies and brought it to a new stage¹⁹. Solih Mutallibov, a keen connoisseur of Turkish and Arabic languages, was appointed as the head of the committee, and he prepared the scientific and critical text of several works of the scientist Navoi and other artists. These works were an important factor for the researcher to translate and publish the work “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” in Uzbek in 1960 (Vol. I)-1961 (Vol. II) and 1963 (Vol. III)²⁰. The work, the third in the world and the first to be carried out on the former union states has been the basis of many studies to this day.

The publication was carried out due to scientific, spiritual and educational needs. Traditional three volumes, 3000 copies printed. According to our calculations, a total of 7,222 (3,288, 1,447, 2,487) words and additions were separated as main articles in the translation.

The translator has not seen the manuscript. A printed edition published in Istanbul in 1915-1917 is said to be the basis²¹. However, the author also stated that he was not satisfied with this copy. Only the Turkish text has been transcribed. The Arabic comments, verses, Arabic proverbs, Qur'anic verses and hadiths added by Koshgari for the purpose of comparison are given in Arabic script, there is no transcription or Uzbek translation. *The fact that the verses of the Qur'an and hadiths are not translated is related to the political restrictions of the established system.* Manuscript pages not inserted. About 40 characters represented by Uzbek and Cyrillic letters were used for transcription. Sometimes two different symbols were used for the same sound. After

¹⁸ Sodiqov Q. “Qutadg‘u bilig” so‘zligi [Matn]: – T. 2020. – B. 208.

¹⁹ Сирожиддинов Ш., Умарова С. Ўзбек матншунослиги қирралари. – Т: Академнашр, 2015. – Б.59.

²⁰ Маҳмуд Кошғарий. “Девону луғотут-турк”. 1-3- жилдлар. Тарж. ва нашрга тай-ловчи С. Муталлибов – Т: ЎзФА Фан нашриёти. 1960, 1961, 1963. (SM).

²¹ Kitabu Dīwānu Lughāti‘t-Türk. I-III. – Istanbul, 1333-1335 [1915-1917]

the introduction, the translation and the author's foreword are not included in the publication.

In the latest studies, S. Mutallibov's edition is evaluated as written almost identically to B. Atalay's (E-A.22)²². We strongly disagree. True, the author followed the approach of B. Atalay, the main reason for this is that although B. Atalay also used the printed edition and translated it into Turkish, he referred to the manuscript when writing some comments at the bottom of the page. Because, when the scientist finished preparing the Turkish edition, i.e. in 1941, he got permission to make the first facsimile copy of the manuscript. Since this was not possible for S. Mutallibov, he preferred to join B. Atalay's comments in some abstract places of the printed copy. However, the author contradicted B. Atalay's opinions in some places and substantiated his views (SM.I,205). A total of 3,804 pages have been written with comments, most of them in the form of reactions to B. Atalay's comments, as well as examples of the Uzbek literary language, dialects, and usage during Navoi's period.

S. Mutallibov's approach to some relations, including the "Qutadgu bilig" language issue, is somewhat confusing. The author tried to justify that the work was written in the Chigil dialect (SM.I,10-11). A. Fitrat sharply criticizes the views of Khaghani Turkic based on Mahmud Koshgari, Rashididdin's story about the Oghuz, and accuses him of distorting the language of the tribes by approaching it from the point of view of the ruling class. At the root of these views of S. Mutallibov lies the pressure of the ruling ideology of the Soviet era. That is, in the past, scientific conclusions had to be adapted to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, and the publisher could not get out of this pressure.

S. Mutallibov's interpretation is not based on the Turkish text, but on M. Koshgari's Arabic interpretation: the sentence of *ол нэңни танди* should be interpreted as "u narsani topdi" ("he found something"). "u yo 'qolgan narsani topdi" ("he found what was lost") (SM.II,5) is interpreted as "lost" (SM.II,5).

In 1967, the index dictionary was published in 2000 copies with interpretations in Uzbek and Russian languages²³. The main drawback of the index is that the pages of the printed edition, not the manuscript, were placed in it. In the transcription, the form of *ö* in the publication is represented by *ə*, and the form *ÿ* is represented by *ÿ*.

In 1972, in the scientific article of E. Fazilov, who conducted a comparative textual study of publications in Uzbek, Turkish and German languages, we found out that some of the words that were not in the Uzbek publication are present in the publication including words like *أ* *a*: (SM.I,75), *الْجَلْفُ* *a:çliq* (SM.I,137). *Açyq, aryq, artuqluq, arut, äp, äpmäk, ärdam, äräntüz*.

The publication was recognized by prominent Turkic scientists of the world. However, in the analysis of the words *çumğuq, Terken, ilimğa, Tarkan, oğlaq*, we will see that some places that do not correspond to the manuscript regarding the reading and interpretation of Turkish words are repeated in other linguistic studies based on the publication: In particular, in 2002, N. Abdurahmanov, in his scientific article based on

²² Ercilasun A. B., Akkoyunlu Z. Kâşgarlı Mahmud Divânu Lugâtî't-Türk (Giriş - Metin - Çeviri - Notlar - Dizin), – Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 2014. – 1120 s. (E-A)

²³ "Девону луғотит-турк". Индекс-луғат. Тузувчи ва нашрга тайёрловчи С. Муталлибов, Ғ. Абдурахмонов – Т: ЎзФА Фан нашриёти. 1967. – 547 б.

S.Mutallibov's publication, showed the word جُمُغُوق *čumğuuq* (МК.28/7,8; 236/14) as “sparrow” in the manuscript²⁴.

H. Boltaboev's approaches to preparing “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” for publication. In 2016, Academician A. Rustamov, Professor H. Boltaboyev and B. Isabekov announced the reprint of “*Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*” based on S. Mutallibov's translation²⁵. The authors presented the work in 3 volumes. Technically it is also of good quality.

According to our calculation, a total of 6962 keywords (3003, 1542, 2417) were found to be annotated. The main text is typed in the Cyrillic alphabet. In the preface, H. Boltaboev's large article “Ilmi adab ibtidosi” is given. Famous Turkologist N. Rahmon²⁶, and B. Tokhliyev's²⁷ scientific articles on the description of this publication have also been published. H. Boltaboyev stated that it was prepared based on S. Mutallibov's translation and publication, and his comments were mostly preserved (HB.2016,16). A. Rustamov compared the translation of S. Mutallibov with the original and restored the sentences, words, phrases and letters that were omitted in the text.

All comments of S.Mutallibov under the page have been saved. Appendices contain all the translator's articles from the previous edition. The pages of the DLT manuscript are left in the dark (110). At first, the translation was not given, but the recitation and translation of verses, hadiths, Arabic sentences, poems and proverbs were given in the comments (*). S.Mutallibov's comments are underlined with a numerical index.

The poetic quatrains and masnavis presented in the text are arranged by Roman numerals [XVI]. This order is different in each volume, 118 in volume I, 47 and 76 in the following volumes, totaling 241 songs and poems. The proverbs in Volume I are separated and written at the beginning of a new line. Proverbs included in volumes II and III are listed in brackets (50 in volume II, 89 in volume III).

In S.Mutallibov's edition, it is shown that the scientists gave the untranslated places in Cyrillic transliteration. One of them is an Arabic comment about the letters used in the Turkish language in the manuscript, where Koshgari gives 18 letters and if we add them, it covers the following words (МК.6) اخو كه لف سمج نرق بنرشتي ا: transliteration of it: *Ахувка лаффа самж назақ базр шутиййа? Сенинг аканг танбал, тенса тебранмас ва қўпол, эси ўзида эмас* (HB.I,25). Here, the transliteration and translation of the sentence are compatible. However, Koshgari's Arabic commentary was not copied exactly as it appears in the manuscript *базр шутиййа*: sometimes ð was written instead of ڻ, causing the word to be read as *банр*.

A. Rustamov has also restored some of the missing places in S. Mutallibov's edition. On the same page of the manuscript, there is a sentence before the use of Turkish words (МК.3). This sentence has been restored in the current edition: “*Yo*

²⁴ Абдурахмонов Н. Туркий тилларда ҳарф тушиш ҳодисаси хақида // Маҳмуд Кошғарийнинг “Девону луғотит турк” асари ва унинг туркий халқлар маданияти ҳамда жаҳон цивилизациясида тутган ўрни номли халқаро конф. мат-лари. – Самарқанд. 2002. – Б.18.

²⁵ Маҳмуд Кошғарий. Девону луғоти-т-турк. 1-3 жилд. (Нашрга тайёрловчилар: А.Рустамов, Ҳ. Болтабоев, Б.Исабеков) – Т.: MUMTOZ SO‘Z, 2016. (HB).

²⁶ Nasimxon Rahmon. Turkologiyada dadil qadam. “O‘zbekiston adabiyoti va san’ati”. 27-sentyabr, 2017-yil https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337812439_Turkologiyada_dadil_kadam

²⁷ Тўхлиев Б. “Девону луғати-т-турк”ка оид айрим мулоҳазалар // Turkologiya. – Т.: 2021/3. – Б. 26-36

Rabbim, niyatimga yetishga imkon ber! O'zingagina suyanaman. Zotan O'zidan o'zga Qodir qudrat yo'q! O'zi niyatlarga yetkazuvchi, O'ziga himoyachidir" ("O Allah, allow me to achieve my intention! I rely on you alone. There is no power other than Himself! He is the deliverer of intentions, He is the protector")(HB.I,25). Another achievement of the publication is the transliteration of verses and hadiths from the Holy Qur'an and their Uzbek translation.

Headings have been compared with the Moscow edition²⁸ and modified based on the approach in that edition. It is said that B. Isabekov compared the text with the Russian translation of the Kazakh scholar M. Alavia and the translation of V. Radlov, and noted the necessary changes in the introduction. However, the link to the Radlov Translation is not shown. The scientist also compared the text with the "Ancient Turkic Dictionary" and noted it in the comments²⁹.

9 characters in vowel transcription — *a, ā, ə, i, ī, y, ŷ, o, ö* ; 25 for consonants — *ḅ, w, z, ḍ, e, ʒ, j, k, l, l, m, n, ṅ, n, p, c, t, ḫ, x, ç, ş, z, ʃ* are shown (HB.I,19-20). Among the vowels, [ə] is said to have been preserved in places where it was used, despite being pronounced the same as [ā]. In fact, [ḙ] was used instead of [ə] in S. Mutallibov's edition: *Әмдї узїн узүндї* (SM.I,209) — *Эмдї узїн узүндї* (HB. I,149).

It is also noted that *E, e* is not *ÿ+ə* in the Uzbek Cyrillic alphabet, but only [[*ě*]] is represented by this symbol (HB.I,19). However, this symbol is not identified anywhere in the text. It is also unclear whether it should be given as [*ě*], this symbol is also not present in the current transcription. Latin [*j*] was used instead of the sound *y+e*. There is also ambiguity in the definition of the [*Z*] symbol: Latin [*j*] was used instead of the sound *ÿ+ə*. There is a similar ambiguity when defining the symbol [*Z*]: "In this edition, the letter [*z*] represents the lingual consonant and the sound represented by the Arabic letter *ج* in the previous edition" (shown page). It is not *ج, ð* is being defined here.

Such a variety is also found in connection with consonants. From pages 229 to 234 of this volume, the sign [*j*] represented "j" and not "y", and this situation was also observed on page 239. The [*ç*] symbol is implied in the transcription of [*j*] in the publication indications. Like S. Mutallibov, two different sounds were used for *ج* - *l, l*. And vice versa, two different consonants are transcribed with the same symbol: The symbols [*ç*] and [*z*] were used for *ð*. The sign [*ç*] was taken for both *ð* and *ج*, which led to a difference in meaning in some places.

Some pages of the manuscript were not placed (57, 59, 60, 61, 83, 104, 622, 633, 635, 637, 638). Volume I from page 71 *з* and *z* are used as transcriptional symbols for one sound, and most of the time, one symbol is used for two sounds: One *ج ð* is obtained for *з*. The letters shown on pages 239-272 have not been written.

The presentation of quatrains and passages in the form of masnavi in Arabic script is exactly copied from the edition of S. Mutallibov up to page 179 of volume I. In some places, the corrections made by the authors to the transcription of the poem led to differences:

²⁸ *Махмуд ал -Кавигари*. Диван лугат ат-турк (Свод тюркских слов) : в 3 т. / Пер. с араб. А.Р. Рустамова под ред. И.В. Кормушина, прим. И.В. Кормушина, Е.А. Поцелуевского, А.Р.Рустамова. – М: Вост. лит., 2010-том 1. – 461 с. (R-K)

²⁹ Древнетюркский словарь. – Л.: Наука, 1969.

كَلْدَى مَنكَا تَات
فَشْفَا بُلْبُ أَثْ

Кэлди меңә тат,
Қушқа бұлбү эт,

يَدِيمُ أَمْدَى يَات
سَنَى تَلَارُ أَسْ بُرَى

Ајдїм эмди јат,
Сени *milär* үс бүйі. (ХБ.І,44)

According to the manuscript, the word *أس* in the poem is in the form of *أس* (МК. 30/10). These two words come before the four in the dictionary. However, in S. Mutallibov “ас”, means *йиртқич хайвонларга теккан парча гўшт; ўлимтик (pieces of meat touched by wild animals; mortal)* (SM.I,72) the meaning of the word of “үс”, means *каркас қуши; бургут (carcass bird; eagle)* (SM.I,72). These words are anonymous in the publication. In the original, the next word and unit in the quatrain - “үс” (МК.30/9,10).

There are also places where the order of the articles is reversed: *öçüm* – ўч, қасос (revenge), *азум* – кафт, бир кафтга сиғарлик (a palm, the size of a palm) (НБ.І,54). The same order was kept in S.Mutallibov (SM.I,84). When we compared the sequence of these words with M. Koshgari's copy, it was found that the word *öçüm* and the definition given to it do not exist on this page. H. Boltaboev indicated in his footnote that this word was omitted in the Moscow edition. However, it was found that this word is not on the indicated 36 pages of the manuscript, but on the next 37 pages after the word *ارت* (harakats not placed) and is also present in the Moscow edition. Also, in some places there is variation in the units given for the main words and their explanation: *ämilgän* – Мәниң ийим эзгүлүгүн *ämilgän* ол. (НБ.І,12), *үкди* – Ол жармақ *өкди* (НБ.І,29).

Qosimjon Sodiqov's approaches to preparing “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” for publication. In 2017, the perfect edition (QS.2)³⁰ of "Devoni Lug'ati-t-Turk" in Uzbek based on Solih Mutallibov's translation was published by Professor Qosimjon Sodiqov, one of the leading scholars of Turkology. R. Alimukhamedov notes: “I am a personal witness of Professor Qosimjon Sodiqov's hard work on the same book for eleven years”³¹.

The publication is printed in one volume, 2000 copies. The main text is in the Cyrillic alphabet, totalling 482 pages. By our count, 7,596 keywords have been annotated. The total volume of artistic samples is 243 (856 verses). Of these, 185 are quad bytes and 58 are binary bytes. According to I. Mirzaaliyev, there are 298 proverbs³². Of these, 42 proverbs were repeated. There are a total of 91 comments on the page.

Between pages 192-195, page 6 of the manuscript with Uighur letters, Mahmud Koshgari's map of the earth, and page 474 are copied from the facsimile edition without any change in quality, and attached with a new sheet. In preparing this edition, the author used facsimile editions of the DLT manuscript published in 1990 and 2008.

Proverbs are presented in the form of *أَقَى oçaq* (ўчак) – ўчок; verb combinations [*كُجُرْدَى köçürdi* (кўчурди)- кўчириб ёзди(*copied and wrote*)] *ol bitig köçürdi* – у

³⁰ Маҳмуд Кошғарий. “Девону луғати-т- турк”. – Т: Фафур Ғулом. Нашрга тайёрловчи Қ. Содиков 2007. – 482 б.

³¹ Алимухамедов Р. Проф. Қ.Содиков томонидан тайёрланган “Девону луғати-т-турк” асарининг янги нашри // “Девону луғоти-т-турк” – туркий халқларнинг ноёб ёзма ёдгорлиги” мавзуйдаги халқаро илмий анжуман материаллари. – Т., 2018. – Б. 122.

³² Мирзаалиев И. Қадимги туркий мақоллар семантикаси ва стилистикаси. (“Девону луғоти-т-турк” материали мисолида): Фил. фан. бўйича фалс. д-ри (PhD) дис. автореф. – Т., 2020. – Б. 14.

китоб ёзди (*he wrote a book*). Transcription symbols based on the Latin script accepted in Turkology were used: Vowels - – *ä, a, e, i, i, o, ö, u, ü*; For consonants - *b, p, d, t, q, k, ğ, g, x, z, s, š, č, y, l, m, n, ŋ, r* and و -v, ف/ف – w, ژ — ž, ذ — δ characters are used. Also, Arabic terms (*manqūş*), persons (*İbrahim, δū-l-qarnayn*), place names (*Čanbaliq*), words with separate meanings, Arabic letters, expressions ((*axtardi* - ... the letter *xā* in this word may have replaced the letter *ğayn* (QS.98).

The author used the variant – *-ka* after voiced, sonorous consonants and vowels because of the presence of the suffix *-qa* (*İtqa uwut etsä (yetsä?)*, *uldaŋ yemäs* (QS.59) in the Turkish text: *Ötrük ütün oğrılayu yüzkä baqar; ...Bulmaduq nänkä sewinmän...* (QS.168). In the Namangan copy of “*Qutadgu Bilig*” and in the Orkhun memos, this approach was taken because it appears in the form – *qa, -ka*³³. Regardless of whether the word is pronounced thick or thin, in the first and second person singular, the forms of person-number suffixes *-men, -sen* are taken.: *Idimni öğär-men...Bulmiş nänig sewär-sen...* (QS.445). In this, the author relied on Kokterk texts. In the interpretation, Mahmud Koshgari's one-sentence comments were changed to two sentences by S. Mutallibov. Q. Sodiqov interpreted it as another sentence like the original.

In the manuscript, 61 infinitives end in the قى ligature with both qāf ق , and kāfk. K. Rifat miscalculated it and took one of the two. B. Atalay added special comments to 27 places and he also chose one of the letters³⁴. In the study of English researchers R. Denkoff and J. Kelly, 36 of the letter combinations were written first ك and then ق. In 21 places, on the contrary, ق is used before and ك after (57 in total). (D-K.64,65). It has been suggested that the two endings of infinitives may be a characteristic of some dialects or dialects. Q. Sodiqov paid enough attention to this issue and published 51 of the masdars ending with a ligature according to the manuscript.

In some units that appear as the main word in the dictionary, both fatha and kasra or zamma and kasra are placed above the consonant. Also, when it comes in the middle of a word, it is written the same, only the dots that differ according to the position and number of the dots are exactly the same. K. Rifat left only one variant and considered the rest to be a mistake, while A. Rustamov accepted that they are different variants of the same word, such as *сэвук/севик ва бэк/бек* (AR.I,19)³⁵. A. Erjilasun and Z. Akkoyunli believe that they belong to both the scribe and another scribe who edited the text in later centuries.

Q. Sodiqov emphasizes that this feature of the text came from the pen of the scribe, that he cannot have copied the text by mistake, but that Mahmud Koshgari intended the dialectal version of the word and included both versions in the publication. تَقْلِدِي / تَقْلِدِي *tiqildi / taqildi – et šišqa tiqildi / täqildi – go'sht six va boshqa narsalarga taqildi* (the meat was pounded into six and other things) (QS.246).

In the text, the name of the fourteenth Oghuz tribe كَرْدَرُ is added to the next fatha and kasra in brown ink. This ensures that the word is read both *igdar* and *igdir*. (MK.40/14). --*izdäp* in S.Mutallibov (SM.I,90) and in other editions, i.e. – *igdir* Turkish (BA.I,57), English (D-K. I,102), Russian (R-K,96), M.Auzeva Russian

³³ Алиев А., Содиқов Қ. Ўзбек адабий тили тарихидан. – Т., 1994. – Б. 58.

³⁴ Şaban Kurt. Özel Adlar Dizini. – Istanbul, 2008. – S.17.

³⁵ Маҳмуд ал Каушгарӣ. Диван лугат-ат-гурк. (Свод тюркских слов). Перевод с арабского языка А. Рустамов. под редакцией С.Хасанова, Ш.Хасановой, С.Рустамий, М.Рустамова и др. Том III – Т: Мумтоз сўз. 2018.

(MA.I, 92) is obtained. In 2009, the Azerbaijani scientist B. Khelilov in his monograph “Ethnonyms in Mahmud Koshgari's “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”³⁶ he referred to F.Sumar's research “Oguzlar”. It is compared with the classification of Oguz tribes given in the works of historian Rashididdin and Y. Aliya, written almost at the same time as DLT. According to him, the name of the tribe is recorded as *igdir* in DLT, and as – *yigdir/iqdir* in Rashidid. B. Khalidov gave the etymology of this tribe as follows: Most likely, the first variant of this ethnonym was *yiğdir*. Here the variants *iq//yiq///yiqd* are phonetic variants of the word *igid*. This is also confirmed by the fact that the ethnonym *iqdir* means “greatness, pride”. The part “*ir*” in the ethnonym *Iqdir* is a phonetic variant of the word *er*, which means “person, man, husband”³⁷. From this, it can be assumed that Koshgari referred to the name of the tribe as both *igdar* and *igdir*. Q. Sodiqov's edition reads like this: “... ўн тўртинчи қабила *igdār/igdir* – *уздарлардур*”. (QS.37) *er ištīn/ištān qizğutlandi*, تَرْمُتْلَانْدِي *tarmutlandi* (*turmutlandi*?). We can see this in the current live speech : *urish / urush, kulgi / kulgu*. In particular, the word “laughter” has two actions in the text: كُنْج / كُنْج *külünç / külinç* — *кулги*(laughter) (QS.450). Also, in important places, two-variantity came within the framework of additions. The main defect in the publication is that the manuscript pages are not inserted and the form of Turkish sentences and compounds in Arabic script is not given. However, in 2021, this defect was corrected and it was reprinted by Turkish scientists in Istanbul³⁸.

In Chapter III, the differences and peculiarities of the texts of the Uzbek editions of the work “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” are studied. When we compared the publications in Uzbek, we encountered about 3000 textual differences. We sorted and classified 650 of them and compared them with the manuscript. The results were tabulated in a large table and attached at the end of the paper. In the analysis of poetic fragments, Fitrat's complex was also subjected to comparative analysis for the first time and compared with the manuscript.

Textual differences related to the preface in the publications. A comparative analysis revealed about 50 textual differences (see Appendix 1). The first of these differences is related to the name of the dictionary: “*Девону луготит турк*”- “*Девону-луготи-т-турк*”- “*Девону лугати-т-турк*”. In manuscript: ديوان لغات الترك — *Divānu luğāti-t-türki*.

Mahmud Koshgari quoted a hadith about the Turks that he heard from a reliable scholar³⁹ from Bukhara and Nishapur. S. Mutallibov wrote that the narrator who narrated this hadith attributed it to the prophet (SM.I,42; HB.I,22). In the edition of Q. Sodiqov, this sentence is attributed to the prophet and is acquired in the form of “*payg‘ambarga nisbat berib, sanadi bilan aytgan edilar*” (“he said it with sanadi”) (QS.14). In the text: كِلَاهُمَا رَوِيَا بِإِسْنَادٍ لَّهُمَا عَنْ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ *kilāhumā ravayā bi isnādi lahumā ‘an rasūli-l-lahi ṣalla-l-lohu ‘alayhi va sallama*, that is “*har ikkisi ham Rasululloh s.a.v haqida u ikkisining sanadi bilan rivoyat qiladilar*” (that is, it is said that both of them narrate about Rasululloh s.a.w.)(MK.2/16).

³⁶ *Xelilov B.* Mahmud Kaşgarinin “Divani lüğət-it-türk” əsərində etnonimlər.”Garisma” mms. – Baki.2009. – S.110

³⁷ That source. – P. 104-105.

³⁸ *Маҳмуд Кошғарий.* Туркий сўзлар девони. Нашрга тайёрловчи Қосимжон Содиқов. Akademik Kitaplar. – Istanbul. 2021. – S.776

³⁹ In the manuscript, the word "olim" is replaced by "imam".

Mahmud Koshgari said that the Arabic letters are not found in any Turkic tribal language, and to write *ṣā* from these letters, they are written in the form of Turkish *dāl* and a dot is placed on it (تَنْقَطُ عَلَيْهَا) — *tunqatu a'layhā* MK.7/13). In the translation of S.Mutallibov and H.Boltaboyev, it is written that a double dot (ie two dots) is placed over this place (SM.I,49; HB.I,26). Q. Sodiqov corrected this place based on the manuscript (QS.17). Also, textual differences in the content of words such as *табзади, жағмур, жауар, чумчук, бәжәнәк, жазым, қузурғун, жіған, жіғаж, азәір, ол әwgä барғулуқ әрді, ол киші ол бізгә кәләгән* in S.Mutallibov's edition have been identified.

Comparative-textual differences of the vocabulary part in publications.

The first difference in the comparative analysis of Uzbek publications is related to vocabulary statistics. According to our calculations, 7222 keywords were identified in S.Mutallibov's publication, 6962 in H.Boltaboyev's publication, and 7596 in Q.Sodiqov's publication. This difference is caused by two factors:

1) In the text, according to their approach, the publishers gave ambiguous or homonymous words in one article or, on the contrary, they were taken separately.

2) In the publications, some words of the dictionary are explained as lexical units and the situations related to the omission of their explanation have been identified. The five articles on pages 579 and 580 of the manuscript *يُكَلِّدِي, يَمَلِّدِي, يَمَلِّدِي, يَمَلِّدِي, يَمَلِّدِي* (yiklädi, yamladi, yimlädi, yašnadi, yelnadi) and their combined sentences and Arabic translation are not included in DLT's SM and HB editions. Q. Sodiqov filled in based on the manuscript (QS.428). Also, the text on page 318/3 *كُرْتِي ol anig qulin küratti* (HB.II/203) of the text of H. Boltaboyev was edited (HB.II/66), and the translation of the book on page 418/3 *ال انك برلا ك كرشدي ol anig birlä kerisdi* was edited. (HB.II/203) compounds as well as the article *Ölišdi nän* on page 104/7 are not included in both editions (SM.I,196; HB.I,142).

We have analyzed the wide range of differences in the publications in terms of “word” and “sound”.

Differences in scope of “Word”.

1. **Increase or decrease of words.** *The increase of the pronoun in the text in the publications happened on the basis of two factors:* a) In many places, the pronoun in the text may have been added by the publishers because it comes together with the pronouns *ағар: ол мәңа суwлуқ сарлашди* (SM.II,2494 HB.II,141) — *meña suwluq sarlaşdi* (QS.273) — *منكا سۇقلق سۇرلشدي* (MK.374/5). b) All of the cited examples are preceded by the Arabic word *يُقَالُ* *yuqālu* (it is said, it is said) and the Turkish text begins there. *يُقَالُ yuqālu* is final and its *zamma* movement are spelled very similar to *أل ol* and can be read as *أل ol* at a glance. We compared the 6 compounds in the table with B. Atalay's publication. 4 are the same as S.Mutallibov. So, omitting the pronouns is the action of either B. Atalay or K. Rifat. H. Boltaboyev wrote like S. Mutallibov. Q. Sodiqov restored it based on the manuscript.

In these samples, it can be seen that the pronoun *ol* has been omitted in the publication *:әр ijindī* (SM.I,265)- *әр ijindī* (HB.I,189)- *ol er iyindī* (QS.113). Occurrence in the text: *ال آر ايندي*⁴¹ (MK.138/8).

2. Interchange of words in compounds

⁴⁰ *ال* in the word, there is no suffix on the alif.

⁴¹ *ال* the word has no *zamma* action. Other motions and sukun in the compound are marked in brown ink.

1) The word in the composition has been changed to another word, but the interpretation reflects the situation in the manuscript: ол аниң өпкасин эмүртти — у бекнинг ғазабини тинчлатди (*he calmed the beck's anger*) (SM.III,226; HB.III,282) — ол beg öpkäsin amurtti- *he calmed the beck's anger* (QS.470) — أَلْ بَاكُ أَبْكَاسِنِ أُمُرْتِي (МК.630/1).

2) Both the word in its content and its interpretation have been replaced by another word: Ол мәндә түнәди – у менинг өнимда тунади (*he spends the night with me*) (SM.III,289; HB.III,187) — Ol munda tünädi – у бу ерда тунади (*he will spend the night here*) (QS.417).

3) The word and its interpretation were interchanged in the manuscript itself, which is why they were also interchanged in the publications: اي انه⁴² - أَلْ مَنكَا سُوْتُ أُبْرُدِي - أَحْسَانِي الْمَرْقَةَ وَ غَيْرِهِ (МК.97/15,16) – means, *ay anahu ahsāni-l-maraqata va ġayrahu*- Ol meñä süt öpürdi — u menga sho'ruva va undan boshqasini ichirdi (*he gave me soup and another*). In Uzbek publications: Ол мәңә мүн үнүрди - У менга шўрва ичирди (*He gave me soup*) (SM.I,186; HB.I,134) — Ol meñä süt öpürdi - У менга сут ичирди (*He gave me milk to drink*) (QS.84).

Here, S.Mutallibov changed the Turkish text based on the Arabic interpretation, while Q.Sodiqov changed the Arabic interpretation based on the Turkish text. The reason for this mistake of the scribe is that verbs based on *öp* are always used side by side with the word *sut* (milk) or *mün* (soup).

3. Differences in interpretation. There are very few differences in the interpretation of the Turkish text in Uzbek publications, we identified 20 of them and presented 8 in the appendix with their interpretation in the manuscript.

1) ол әни тамғақладі – the interpretation of the combination was omitted in the publication of S. Mutallibov and H. Boltaboyev (III.362; 231) It was restored by Q. Sodiqov - у унинг томоғидан бўғди (QS.441). In the text اَيُّ اَنَّهُ ضَرَبَهُ عَلَى حَلْفِهِ, *ay annahu ġarabahu 'alā ħalqihī* – u uni bo'uniga (halqumiga) urdi (*he hit him on the neck (throat).*) (МК.598/5).

2) Cases where the interpretation does not correspond to the manuscript: jağiu – ислом динидаги одамларнинг бутларга назр қилиб сўядиган қурбонлари (*sacrifices that people in Islam sacrifice to idols*) (SM.III,18; HB.III,9) — yağış – жоҳилия давридаги кишиларнинг бутларга сигиниб, уларга атаб сўядиган қурбонликлари (*the sacrifices that people in the Jahiliyya period worshiped idols and sacrificed to them*) (QS.327) — اَهْلُ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ *aḥlu-l jahiliyahi* means *johiliya ahli* (МК.448/17). In the next sample, the interpretation of the text is the same in S. Mutallibov and Q. Sodiqov, H. Boltaboev changed it: бауи тутти – яра оғримми (*the wound hurt*) (SM.II,337; QS.229) — бауи тутти – бош оғриди (*he had a headache*) (HB.II,194). In the manuscript بَاشُنْ تُتِّيْ أَيْ أَمَضَّ الْجُرْحَ بِضَرْبَانِ (МК.411/17) – baš tutti — *ay amadda-l-jurħa bi-ḡarabānin*, means *yaraga zarba berib og'ritti* (*He hit the wound and hurt it*). We found that in another chapter of the text (510/14) the meaning of the word “baş” is explained twice in one place.: 1. بَاشُ الرَّاسِ *baš* — *ar-ra'su* (*bosh*); 2. بَاشُ الْجَرَاْحَةِ *baš* — *al-jarāħatu* (*injury*). The homonymy of the word may have confused the authors of the second edition.

⁴²This word is the أَنَّ download, and in most places of the text its letter n is written without a punctuation mark (we have shown it in this case in the thesis and the appendix).

3) The interpretation in the manuscript itself is unclear, so there are three interpretations in the publications: *ол көчүт көчүрди* — “у *отни* бир жойдан бошқа жойга күчүрди” (“he moved the horse from one place to another”) (SM.II,79) — у *нарсани* бир жойдан бошқа жойга күчүрди (“he moved the thing from one place to another”) (HB.II,51) — у *ўтни* бир жойдан бошқа бир жойга күчүрди (he moved the grass from one place to another) (QS.229). In the manuscript: أَيُّ أَنَّهُ نَقَلَ الْفَرَسَ مِنْ مَوْضِعٍ إِلَى آخَرَ — means, *ol kočut köčürdi* – *ay annahu naqala-l-farasa min mavdi'in ila axar*— means, *u otni bir joydan boshqa joyga ko'chirdi*(he moved the horse from one place to another). Here, S.Mutallibov interpreted according to the Arabic commentary, and Q.Sodiqov based on the Turkish text. In our opinion, the scribe made a mistake in writing the word farasa (horse, mare) in one letter. If غَرَسَ was written as *ğarasa*, the Turkish text and interpretation would match. Because the word *ğarasa* means “plant, seedling”. Most probably, we assume that *ğarasa* is written in the autograph of Mahmud Koshgari.

Differences in the scope of “Sound”.

1. Falling of vowels. In Turkish examples, vowels are dropped in the reading of the text mainly in verbs.

In the manuscript (MK.483/3,4,5) and editions (SM.III,102; HB.III,62) - (QS.354,355) in the 4 verb *yelpirädi*, the manuscript has ِ fatha, but sukun is silent. In these two editions, both ِ and ُ were left silent, the reading *jəlniprdi* ўқилиши was ensured, and one vowel was omitted. H. Boltaboyev did not make any moves. In our opinion, S. Mutallibov paid attention to another aspect. These verbs belong to the section “Four-Letters” section of words that are pronounced in different actions in the form of *fa'laldī*. And the word *yelpirädi* is not suitable for this scale, it has one vowel. Only suitable if *Yelpirdi*. In this chapter, all the words that come after these four verb conjugations follow the *fa'laldī*. About 20 such verbs have been identified and displayed in the applications. Differences in pronunciation of names were also analyzed.

2. Increase of vowel sounds. In the next verb, the sound is acquired in Q. Sodiqov's edition: كَجُرُشْدِي *kečürüşdi* second *zamma* has been acquired in the word. The compound reads as follows: *olar bir-birniñ yazuqin kečuruşdi*. (QS.275). Writing in manuscript: أَلَا زُ بِيْرِنِك يَزُوْقِن كَجُرُشْدِي (MK.378/1). In the editions of S.Mutallibov and H.Boltaboev, it is taken as in the manuscript: *олар бір-бірің жазуқин кэчрүшдї* – (SM.II,258; HB.II,147). Also, the word *بِيْرِنِك* is read in publications in the style of *бір-бірің* — *bir-birniñ* — each other.

3. Different pronunciation of vowel sounds. In Uzbek publications, vowels are read differently as follows: *ə-ä-a, a-ə-a, y-y-o, y-y-o, y-y-ö, a-a-e, y-ö-ö, o-y-u, a-a-ü, ö-ö-u, i-i-e, ə-ə-i, ə-y-o*. These different cases were grouped as follows:

1) The writing corresponds to the manuscript, the reading (transcription) is different: أَرْك (MK.33/14) — *эрк* (SM.I,78) – *äрк* (HB.I,49) – *erk* (QS.31) - *erk*; kingship and sharpness of command.

2) Neither the writing nor the reading are suitable for handwriting: أَعْرُشُقْ *ağurşuq* (SM.I,165) — *ағуршақ* (HB.I,117) - *أَعْرُشُقْ* *oğurşuq/oğirşuq* (QS.74).

3) The issue of reading unstressed sounds in handwriting. The first letter of the word *اشبَار*, which means food mixed with straw and bran, is inactive (MK.71/12). In

publications: اشبار *iūbar* — (SM.I,140; HB.I,96) — اشبار *ašbar* (QS.60). As far as we can determine, this word is repeated on page 439 of the text and the action is placed: أَلْ أَتَقَا أَشْبَارَ لِبَتِّي *ol atqa ašbar yelpitti* (MK.439/1).

Differences in the pronunciation of consonants

1. To decrease or increase of consonants : боғмақладі (SM.III,362;HB.III,231) — boğmaqlaldı (QS.441) — بُغَمَقَلَدِي (MK.598/4). In this place, the Turkish word is written and read with a consonant sound. армут қатутті (SM.II,328) – армут қатуті (HB.II,187) — armut qatuttı (QS.296)- أَرْمُتٌ قَاتُتِي (MK.408/9). In this combination, the tashdid in the text is not read.

2. Different readings of consonants. This part has been extensively analyzed in our research, divided into the following groups, and the factors that caused the differences were identified:

1) The writing of the consonants corresponds to the handwriting, only the reading differs. Most of the differences in publications are related to this type: *b-p, g-k, j-č, w-f, δ-z.*

b / p — *These sounds are expressed separately with one letter in Turkish texts with Arabic⁴³ and Uyghur script, and with special letters in Orhun-Enasoy sources⁴⁴.* In particular, we analyzed the 12 words from the first edition, Volume I, as corrected in Q. Sodikov's edition. Also, S.Mutallibov and H.Boltaboev added the adverbs in the text *-b, -ib, -yb/ýb*; And Q. Sodiqov studied in the style of *-p,-ip, -up/úp*, and this approach also expanded the scope of certain contrasting positions.

g / k – Such differences were noted in 12 words in pages 155-168 of S.Mutallibov's edition, and the corrected positions in the next two editions were analyzed in the work. The word *ölükka* in the sentence *Ол ölykkä joғладі* (SM.III,324; HB.III,208) is read as *Ol ölügka yoғladi* in the edition of Q. Sodikov (QS.428). In the manuscript *أَلْ أَلْكَا يُغَلَادِي* (MK.579/7). It is worth noting that two *أَلْكَا* letters are written in a row in the word. So, these two letters represent two different sounds, one is voiced [g], the other is voiceless [k]. Otherwise, Mahmud Koshgari or the secretary would have written one palm and put a threat sign on it. Qiyoslang: *أَزَّتِي uzatti* – *uzaytirdi* (MK.113/3). Also, 11 combinations related to the reading of suffixes *-lig/-lik* in five-letter words in the book of *Sālim* names were comparatively and textually analyzed.

j / č sounds are represented by *ج* in the Arabic script. [č] is a purely Turkic sound with a special character in the Blue Turkic and Uyghur scripts. G. Abdurahmonov and A. Rustamov claim that the consonant [j] is absent in the ancient Turkic language⁴⁵. Q. Mahmudov wrote that the sound [j] is found in the old Turkic language sources only in the structure of the assimilated words⁴⁶. From this, it can be understood that more [č] was active in words written with *ج*. Q. Sodikov read many words [č] read by S. Mutallibov [j]. In H. Boltaboev's edition, this approach from the first edition remained almost unchanged. In Volume I, 21 textual differences were identified and presented in the work.

⁴³ Содиқов Қ. Махмуд Кошғарий келтирган уйғур алифбоси: харф ва товуш муносабатлари // Turkologiya. 2021, – №3. – Б.13.

⁴⁴ Махмудов Қ. Ўзбек тилининг тарихий фонетикаси. – Т., 2006. – Б. 56-60.

⁴⁵ Абдурахмонов Ф., Рустамов А. Қадимги туркий тил. – Т., 1982. – Б.8.;

⁴⁶ Махмудов Қ. Ўзбек тилининг тарихий фонетикаси. – Т., 2006. – Б. 63.

w / f sounds are written in the manuscript with ف/ف. Although both are active in the modern Uzbek language, linguistic historians point out that in the ancient Turkic language there is no sliding labial consonant⁴⁷ [f], it is found only in the structure of assimilated words⁴⁸. T. Barovkova said that [f] is explosive in Arabic, and Mahmud Koshgari interpreted it as weak (sliding) in Turkish, so when he wrote ف, he meant [w], not [f]⁴⁹, J. Kelly and R. Denkof said that the sound [f] in Arabic concluded that it is borrowed from Persian and occurs in onomatopoeic words (D-K.55).

We studied Q. Sodiqov's research on the Uyghur alphabet, and S. Mutallibov transcribed ف/ف sounds in all the words he read [f] with lip sounds [w]⁵⁰. We identified 27 such words in publications and included them in the appendix. We also developed the etymology of the word “*qaftan*”.

z / δ sounds are represented by two letters (ز, ذ) in the manuscript. The words written with text are transcribed with a dot [ẓ] in S.Mutallibov's edition, and with dash [δ] in Q.Sodiqov. In H. Boltaboyev's edition, Latin [z] is shown in the reading table. However, most of the words written with ذ in the edition are read [z]. [ẓ] is actually shown as the transcription symbol for ز. So, in the publication, the words written with ز and ذ are not distinguished in many places. This caused some textual and spiritual differences: Three homonyms with the meaning of are “*kiyimlarni oftobda yoyib quritish; tarqalmoq; ichiga narsa qo‘ymoq, tiqmoq*” (“*drying clothes in the sun; to spread to put something in*”) read with ذ and يَزْلِيْدِي *jazliuidi*. يَزْلِيْدِي meaning "to untie the knot" written with ز is also read *jazliuidi*. Then the combination *jʸtgak jazildı* - "it was stuffed, something was put into it" (HB.III) is changed to "the bundle was spread" in the opposite sense.

n / ŋ The places read by S.Mutallibov and Q.Sodiqov [ŋ] in Volume III were sometimes read by H.Boltaboev [n]. However, in the Arabic text, in all three editions, the combination nazal نك is written: قنكلى (MK.609/16)– қаңли (SM.III,389) – қанли (HB.III,251) – qanli (QS.452). So, Q.Sodiqov reads يَكْت قَانْكَا كُرْسِيْ *yigit qanga kürsidi* - the young man became full of blood and gained weight (468) means قَانْكَ as *qanqa*. However, in this place ن is silent and the word *qan* is added (MK.626/13).

2) Both the writing and reading of consonants do not correspond to the handwriting:

كِيْزْكَا كَ قَاغُوْن (MK.411/6)- the combination of melons, which have lost their purity and become like wool, cotton, or rags, is in publications: كِيْزْكَا كَ قَاغُوْن — *kiñizgak qağun*(SM.II,335; HB.II,193)- كِيْزْكَا كَ قَاغُوْن *kedizgäk qağun* (QS.298). Or the city named *Dizrutin* (MK.509/15) was considered *Дизрутин* (SM.III,164; HB.III,101) by the publication of S.Mutallibov. Such cases are shown in Annex 6.

3) The problem of reading consonants in the text where similar dots have dropped or disappeared. The word interpreted as “air” in line 604/16 of the manuscript is written in the form of نكك (transliteration --*nkk*), the first letter is not dotted and movements are not placed that S.Mutallibov and H.Boltaboyev *сөгүк*,(SM.III,377;

⁴⁷ Абдурахмонов Ф., Рустамов А. Қадимги туркий тил. – Т.1982. – Б.8.

⁴⁸ Махмудов Қ. Ўзбек тилининг тарихий фонетикаси. – Т., 2006. – Б. 60.

⁴⁹ Боровкова Т.А. О губных согласных в Дивану лугат-ит-турк Махмуда Кашгари // Тюркологический сборник. – Москва.: 1966. – С.25

⁵⁰ Содиков Қ. Махмуд Кошгарий келтирган уйғур алифбоси: Ҳарф ва товуш муносабатлари // Turkologiya. – № 3., 2021. – Б. 4-15.

HB.III,243). Q.Sodiqov read *yeňäk* (QS.447) with the letter ي. We identified verb combinations that are not repeated in the text, but are close to the meaning of “air”. These are the following: *quš teňdi* (MK.614/6); *oq teňdi* – *er oqin teňütti* (MK.616/14) – *teňüč* (MK.610/17) We concluded that the correct version of the word is *teňük*, and our guess did not agree with the Uzbek publications.

4) Interchange of sounds. It is found in volumes II and III of the editions: the second *zamma* was not added to the word *يُغرت* in line 528/7 of the manuscript, and in two editions it was read *jožypm* (SM.III,207; HB.III,132) This word is repeated in 361/4, where the letter ر is *zamma* — *يُغرتُ*. Therefore, it is appropriate to read the word *yoğrut* in both places. Q. Sodiqov wrote as in the manuscript. We identified 10 such words and showed them in the work with their position in the manuscript.

Comparative textual analysis of Turkish poems and proverbs in publications

In a comparative study, we compared the poems in the text with fragments from the collection of “Samples of the Oldest Turkish Literature”⁵¹ by the scientist Abdurauf Fitrat, who was the first to study the *divan* in Uzbek Turkic studies.

In the following poem on page 199 of Q. Sodiqov's edition, it was noticed that one word was not written in the manuscript. In particular, the word *Näñin* in the verse *Näñin tutar bekläyü, özi yemäs...* is written *نکن* (MK.251/17). In the editions of S.Mutallibov and H.Boltaboev, it is read according to the manuscript: *Нәғин тутар бәкләйү өзи яәмәс* (SM.I,462; HB.I,331). In the translated text, this word is explained in the meaning of “worldly goods”. In fact, the original meaning of this word is “thing, object”. In this case, the scribe probably made a mistake, and the author corrected the ambiguity in the manuscript according to the Arabic interpretation. The content of the verse (he keeps his wealth without eating) is more consistent with the word *Näñin*. Fitrat also came to the same opinion and said that this “*näkin* should be *نأنك näñ* (F.99-100).

Also at work, *Јүкүнүб мәңә имләди, Қочингар тәкә сәвилди, Јај барубан әркүзи, Булмадиқ нәңка сәвинмәң Эндик киши титилсүн, Ајдум аңар сәвүк, Ўтпүк утун әрләју јүзгә бақар, Эрдәм тила өгранин болма күвәз* is done comparative-textual analysis of line poems. The 23 textual differences found in the 21 poems included in Volume I of the publications were shown in the work with their corrected form and manuscript status. Such textual and spiritual differences in volumes II-III were shown in Appendix 7 with the full version of the poems.

All the proverbs and wise words quoted by Mahmud Koshgari in the text are included in Uzbek language publications. The following 7 proverbs with differences in the publications were analyzed comparatively and textually, compared with the manuscript, and the factors that caused the differences were clarified: *Usuqmišqa saqiğ qamuğ suw körünür*(MK.104/16); *Tašiğ isrumasa, öpmiš kerak* (MK.92/1); *Eriñäñä elik qari bözün/bözün üm tikämäs/tukämäs* (MK.71/6); “*Qadaš*” *temiš qaymaduq, “qadın” temiš qaymīs* (MK.203/9); *Sabanda sandiriš bolsa, örütkindä irtäš bolmas* (MK.203/2). *Tüzün birlä urus, utun birlä tiräšmä* (MK.203/2); *Pušmasar, boz quš tutar, ewmäsar, örün quš tutar* (MK.269/15).

⁵¹ *Фитрат*. Энг эски турк адабиёти намуналари. ЎзР ФАШИ, тошбосма, инв.№16507; in the following places Abbreviated with page number written as (F.24).

CONCLUSION

1. The skill of the scribe who copied the manuscript of “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk” was high, and he inadvertently allowed inaccuracies in the text revealed by the researchers. The revision of the text pointed to the second variant of the word and aimed to correct some ambiguities. The comments in the preface of the text were written with a scribe's pen in the language of the person who ordered the book, referring to the copy copied by Mahmud Koshgari with his own hand.

2. Abdurauf Fitrat was one of the first to prepare Turkish poems in the text for publication in Uzbek. Its publication was based on a printed copy, not a manuscript. The high skill of the scientist in mastering the text is that, without seeing the manuscript, he restored the error in the printed copy as in the manuscript.

3. Solih Mutallibov's edition in Uzbek language was prepared for the second full edition worldwide and served as the only research source in the entire former Soviet Union in the last century. S. Mutallibov was forced to use a re-edited printed copy due to the lack of a manuscript, and he followed Basim Atalay's approaches in the Turkish edition, due to the fact that most of Basim Atalay's under-the-line comments are based on the manuscript.

4. Solih Mutallibov's publication did not include manuscript pages, and due to political restrictions of the last century, verses of the Qur'an and hadiths were not translated. About 40 symbols were used in the transcription system, and errors in the interpretation of the words *Tarkan*, *oğlaq*, *čumğuq*, *ilimğa* were repeated in other linguistic studies. In the scientific article of E. Fazilov comparing this edition with foreign editions, words such as *açyq*, *aryy*, *artuqluq*, *arut*, *äp*, *äpmäk*, *ärdam*, *äräntüz* which are not in the edition of S. Mutallibov, are actually present in the edition.

5. The fact that a facsimile copy of the text has been made five times so far has expanded the possibility of preparing new editions based on the manuscript and created the need for new editions of advances in Turkology. In 2016-2017, two new editions were published based on the edition of S. Mutallibov, supplemented and revised.

6. Alibek Rustamov, Hamidulla Boltaboev and Bakhtiyor Isabekov have translated verses of the Qur'an and hadiths and restored the paragraph in the introduction. Some words are compared with two foreign editions and dictionaries and are noted at the bottom of the page. The authors wrote down their comments on the interpretation and reading of the word. More than a dozen pages were unknowingly left out while putting down the pages of the manuscript (57, 59, 60, 61, 83, 104, 622, 633, 635, 637, 638). In some places, when reading the words, the first sounds were changed in the sentences given for the explanation of these words, and the order of appearance in the manuscript was also changed. There are inaccuracies in the use of symbols ö, ə, j, 3 when turning to transcription. Due to the fact that the quatrains and passages in the form of masnavi were copied exactly from the edition of S. Mutallibov up to 179 pages in the first volume, the changes made were not reflected in the Arabic text of these poems.

7. In Qosimjon Sodiqov's first-volume edition, all Turkic places are compared with the manuscript. The preface on the first page of the text was translated and included in the publication; Turkish text, all proper nouns, Arabic letters, and terms are

converted to strict transcription based on international standards in Latin script. Both versions of the words with two different movements in the text, 51 of the infinitives end with the ligature كى, which appears in 61 places in the manuscript, and the corrected version of the infinitive written in two places in the text, corrected according to the rule given by Koshgari himself, are included in the publication. The use of Kopturk inscriptions was taken into account when defining the categories of agreement and person-number of words. Strict adherence to orthographic standards. Overloads, pairs, and repeated words are highlighted. In the publication, poems and proverbs are not shown in Arabic script, and manuscript pages are not included.

8. About 50 differences in the introduction and 600 differences in the vocabulary part in the Uzbek language publications were compared with the manuscript and the factors influencing the emergence of differences were revealed. The number of word articles is three different in three editions (7222, 6962, 7596), which is due to the fact that polysemous and formative ones are given separately or in one article, and 6 full-length articles are omitted in the publications of S. Mutallibov and 8 articles of H. Boltaboyev (*yiklädi, yamladı, yimlädi, yaşnadı, yelnadı, ölišdi näñ, ol anig birlä kerışdi, ol anig qulın kürätti*).

9. The largest textual differences are related to the reading of the Turkish text, Turkish words, vowels and consonants were divided into groups such as addition, subtraction, and substitution, and the factors that caused the differences were indicated.

10. In publications, it is based on the approach of reading the drop of vowels within the verbs as it is written in the manuscript, or dropping one vowel to match the word in the title, and the scribe's inadvertent mistake in the analysis of the textual differences related to the interpretation caused the conflict between the Turkish text and its Arabic interpretation in the manuscript. Here, S.Mutallibov changed the Turkish text based on the Arabic interpretation, and Q.Sodiqov changed the interpretation based on the Turkish text.

11. In the study of Turkish poems, Fitrat (*nejin, ejar* without seeing the manuscript), Q. Sodiqov (*nejin, başra qaqar*) and H. Boltaboyev (*ejar*) restored the original form of the word based on the skill of mastering the text and contextual content. It is proven that one source was the basis for the publication of Fitrat and S.Mutallibov.

**НАУЧНЫЙ СОВЕТ DSc.03/30.12.2019. Fil/Tar.21.01 ПО ПРИСУЖДЕНИЮ
УЧЕНЫХ СТЕПЕНЕЙ ПРИ ТАШКЕНТСКОМ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОМ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТЕ ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЯ**

**ТАШКЕНТСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЯ**

САТТОРОВА ЗИЛОЛА ИСМОИЛОВНА

**УЗБЕКСКИЕ ИЗДАНИЯ “ДЕВОНУ ЛУГАТИ-Т-ТЮРК” И ИХ
СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-ТЕКСТОЛОГИЧЕСКОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ**

10.00.10 – Текстология и литературное источниковедение

АВТОРЕФЕРАТ

диссертации доктора философии (PhD) по филологическим наукам

Ташкент – 2024

Тема диссертации доктора философии (PhD) зарегистрирована в Высшей аттестационной комиссии за № В2021.2.PhD/Fil1896.

Диссертация выполнена в Ташкентском государственном университете востоковедения.

Автореферат диссертации на трех языках (узбекский, русский, английский (резюме)) размещен на веб-странице Научного совета www.tsuos.uz и Информационно-образовательном портале www.ziyonet.uz.

Научный руководитель: Омонов Кудратулла Шарипович
доктор филологических наук, профессор

Официальные оппоненты: Исломов Зохидажон Махмудович
доктор филологических наук, профессор

Шодмонов Нафас Намозович
доктор филологических наук, профессор

Ведущая организация: Институт узбекского языка, литературы и фольклора
Академии наук Республики Узбекистан

Защита диссертации состоится «24» февраля 2024 г. в 10⁰⁰ часов на заседании Научного совета DSc.03/30.12.2019.Fil/Tar.21.01 по присуждению ученых степеней при Ташкентском государственном университете востоковедения по адресу: 100047, г. Ташкент, ул. Шахрисабзская, 16. Тел.: (99871) 233-45-21, факс: (99871) 233-52-24; e-mail: info@tsuos.uz.

С диссертацией можно ознакомиться в Информационно-ресурсном центре Ташкентского государственного университета востоковедения (зарегистрирована за № 28). Адрес: 100060, г. Ташкент, ул. Амира Темура, 20. Тел.: (99871) 233-45-21).

Автореферат диссертации разослан «2» февраля 2024 года.

(Протокол реестра рассылки № 19 от «2» февраля 2024 года.)



А.М.Маннанов
Председатель Научного совета по присуждению ученых степеней, доктор филол. наук, профессор

Р.А.Алимухамедов
Ученый секретарь Научного совета по присуждению ученых степеней, доктор филол. наук, доцент

М.М.Исхаков
Врио Председатель Научного семинара при Научном совете по присуждению ученых степеней, доктор истор. наук, профессор

ВВЕДЕНИЕ (аннотация диссертации доктора философии (PhD))

Цель исследования состоит из сравнительного и текстологического исследования узбекских изданий с произведением “Диван лугат ат-тюрк”, выявления текстовых различий, классификации, сравнения с первоисточником и выявления особенностей рукописных изданий.

Объектом исследования является опубликованное в 1960-1963, 2016, 2017-х годах издание на узбекском языке “Диван лугат ат-тюрк”, комплекс Абдурауфа Фитрата, изданный в 1927 году, и факсимильная копия рукописи произведения, изданная в 2008 году.

Научная новизна исследования:

в комплексе Абдурауфа Фитрата “Eng eski turk adabiyoti namunalari” (“Образцы древнейшей тюркской литературы”) доказано, что для издания поэтических отрывков из “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” («Собраний тюркских наречий») правильно восстановлена форма поэтических текстов, соответствующая рукописи, несмотря на то, что печатная копия произведения была основой;

в издании С.Муталлибова раскрыто, что шесть слов-статей, а также ряд религиозных понятий, а также ошибки, связанные с чтением и интерпретацией текста, были повторены и в последующих исследованиях;

доказано, что издание “Devonu lug‘ati-t-turk” под руководством Х.Балтабаева основано на подходах С.Муталлибова, восстановленные места текста основаны на русском издании А.Рустамова, а в издании К.Содыкова - на сохранившихся публикациях его предшественников восстановил введение и восемь слов-статей;

около 650 расхождений, выявленных в публикациях на узбекском языке, сопоставлены с рукописью, основная часть различий связана с тюркским текстом, а в трактате тюркских слов, приведенном в рукописи, доказано, что С. Муталлибов основывался на арабском тексте, а К. Садыков - на тюркском.

Внедрение результатов исследования. Сопоставительное и текстологическое исследование изданий на узбекском языке с произведением “Диван лугат ат-тюрк”:

Текстологические особенности рукописи “Диван лугат ат-тюрк” и исследовательский анализ научных публикаций, изданных на узбекском языке, результаты исследования использованы в практическом проекте № IZ-2020102832 по теме “Создание электронной платформы “Yevroturcologica.uz” на базе тюркских рукописей, хранящихся в европейских и узбекистанских фондах” (Справка №02-04/2217 от 15 ноября 2023 года Ташкентского государственного университета Востоковедения). В результате единственный экземпляр “Диван лугат ат-тюрк”, сохранившийся в Турции, послужил подтверждением анализа о том, что в 1266 году Мухаммад ибн Абу Бакр Дамашк скопировал рукопись Махмуда Кашгарий;

В результате сравнительно-текстового исследования, выявлены различия между редакциями и рукописным источником первого издания “Диван лугат

ат-тюрк” периода совесткой власти и его переизданием в годы независимости, а также полученные результаты исследования использованы при разработке плана работы за первое полугодие 2023 года Агентства по делам молодежи при Министерстве молодежной политики и спорта Республики Узбекистан (Справка № 1-13-21-2157 от 4 августа 2023 года Агентства по делам молодежи при Министерстве молодежной политики и спорта Республики Узбекистан). План работы, подготовленный на основе исследований, был обогащен новой информацией. Он выступил теоретико-методологическим источником в формировании идей и концепций в пропагандистской работе изданий на узбекском языке “Диван лугат ат-тюрк”.

Анализ сопоставительного текстологического исследования изданий “Диван лугат ат-тюрк” на узбекском языке до сегодняшнего дня был использован при подготовке сценария программы «Taқdimot» телеканала «O‘zbekiston tarixi» национального телерадиокомпания Узбекистана. (Справка № 06-28-1778 от 28 ноября 2023 года национальной телерадиокомпания Узбекистана «O‘zbekiston tarixi»). В программе на научной основе объяснялось, что изучение узбекской поэзии началось непосредственно с Абдурауфа Фитрата, что первое узбекское издание произведения было основано не на рукописи, а на основе отредактированного печатного экземпляра и что за последние годы работа дважды переделывалась, эти публикации сравнивались и текстуально сопоставлялись друг с другом и с рукописью, а также выявлялись текстовые различия.

Структура и объем диссертации. Исследование состоит из введения, трех глав, заключения и списка использованной литературы. Общий объем диссертации состоит из 150 страниц.

E'LON QILINGAN ISHLAR RO'YXATI
LIST OF PUBLISHED WORKS
СПИСОК ОПУБЛИКОВАННЫХ РАБОТ

I bo'lim (I part; I часть)

1. *Sattorova Z.* “Devoni lug‘ati-t –turk”da qo‘shiq janri // Journal of Word Art – Сўз санъати халқаро журнали – Международный журнал искусства слова. – 2020. – №.3. – Б. 4-14 (10.00.00; №31).
2. *Сатторова З.* “Девону луғат-т-турк” асари ва янги нашрлари // ЎЗМУ хабарлари. – 2021. – № 1–3. – Б. 175–179 (10.00.00; №15).
3. *Сатторова З.* “Девону луғати-т-турк”: ўзбек тилидаги нашрларда муқаддима қисмининг қиёсий-матний тадқиқи хусусида // Sharq mash‘ali. – 2023. – № 1. – Б.144-150 (10.00.00; №7).
4. *Сатторова З.* Қосимжон Содиковнинг “Девону луғати-т-турк” асарини нашрга тайёрлашдаги ёндашувлари // Sharqshunoslik. Востоковедение. Oriental studies. – 2023. – № 1. – Б.75-83 (10.00.00; №8).
5. *Sattorova Z.* Ideological interpretation of seasonal and ceremonial songs in “Diwanlughat al-Turk”-“Compendium of the languages of the Turks” // Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR). – Culcutta, India, 2020.– №. 6. – P.165-171 (ОАК № 23, SJIF 2020 IF= 6.882).
6. *Sattorova Z.* Source Studies and Textual Studies of Fitrat’s “Diwan Lughat al-Turk” // International Journal of Literature and Languages (IJLL) – Manhattan, USA, 2022.– №. 6. – P.25-32. (ОАК № 23, SJIF 2022 IF= 5.705).
7. *Sattorova Z.* About Uzbek Edition Of “Diwan Lughat Al Turk” // The American Journal of Social Science And Education Innovations (TAJSS). – Mesa, USA, 2021.– №. 1. – P. 92-99. (ОАК № 16, Cite Factor 2021 IF= 1.12).
8. *Sattorova Z.* Translation of “Diwan Lugat al-Turk” // Current Research Journal Of Philological Science (CRJPS). – Indiana, USA, 2021.– №. 6. – P.21-28. (ОАК № 23, SJIF 2021 IF= 5.823).
9. *Сатторова З.* “Девону луғати-т-турк”даги икки хил ҳаракатланган сўзларнинг Қосимжон Содиков нашрида берилиши // Замонавий тилшунослик ва таржимашуносилиқнинг долзарб муаммолари номли Республика илмий-амалий конф. мат-лари. – Т.: SupportScience, 2019. – Б. 297-301.
10. *Зилола Сатторова.* (2023). “Девону луғати-т-турк” асарининг ўзбек тилидаги нашрларида туркий матнлар статистик таҳлили // Yangi O‘zbekistonda tabiiy va ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlar Respublika ilmiy amaliy konf. mat-lari. – Т.: universalpublishings, 2023. – Б. 54–57
11. *Sattorova Z.* Analysis of Mahmud al-Kashgari Songs in “Diwan Lughat al-Turk” // World Science: Problems and Innovations: Сб.статей XLVI Междунар. научно-практ. конф. – Пенза: МЦНС «Наука и Просвещение». – 2020. – С.105-109.
12. *Sattorova Z.* On the poetics of lyrical songs in Diwan Lughat al-Turk // Science Innovations: Сб. статей III Междунар. научно – практ. конф. – Петрозаводск: МЦНП «Новая наука», – 2020. – С. 22-27.

II bo‘lim (II part; II часть)

13. *Сатторова З.* Туркологияда Махмуд Кошғарий фаолиятининг ўрганилиши // *Oriental Journal of Social Sciences.* – 2022. – Т. 2. – № 05. – Б. 130-137.

14. *Сатторова З.* “Девону луғати-т-турк”: таржима ва янги нашрлари хусусида // *Turkologiya.* – 2021. – № 03. – С. 100-108.

15. *Sattorova Z.* Description of the first Uzbek edition of “*Diwan Lughat al-Turk*” // *Oriental Journal of Philology.* – 2022. – № 02. – P. 25-32.

16. *Sattorova Z., Omonov Q.* Textual Features of the Work “*Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*” // *International Scientific and Current Research.* – Chicago, 2022. – P. 212-216.

17. *Omonov Q., Sattorova Z.* Textual characteristics of the “*Devonu Luğati-t-Turk*” manuscript // *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE).* – 2023. — № 08. – P. 163-171.

Avtoreferat «Sharqshunoslik, Востоковедение, Oriental Studies»
jurnali tahririyatida tahrirdan o‘tkazilib, o‘zbek, ingliz va rus tillaridagi
matnlar o‘zaro muvofiqlashtirildi.

Bosishga ruxsat etildi: 31.01.2024 yil.
Bichimi 60x45 ¹/₈. «Times New Roman»
garnitura raqamli bosma usulida bosildi.
Shartli bosma tabog‘i 3,5. Adad 100 nusxa. Buyurtma _____.

O‘zbekiston Respublikasi IIV Akademiyasi,
100197, Toshkent shahri, Intizor ko‘chasi, 68.

«AKADEMIYA NOSHIRLIK MARKAZI» DUK