BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ARCHAIC LEXICAL ELEMENTS IN UZBEK AND FRENCH

Kurbonova Gulsara Sodikovna,
Doctor of Sciences in Philology,
Associate Professor,
National University of Uzbekistan
named after Mirzo Ulugbek,
Department of French Philology,

Abstract: This article examines the linguistic nature, classification principles, and translation characteristics of archaic lexical units in the Uzbek and French languages. The study focuses on obsolete vocabulary as an important component of the lexical system and analyzes the approaches adopted in Uzbek and French linguistic traditions for the identification and classification of archaisms and historicisms. Special attention is paid to the historical development of research on obsolete lexical units, their semantic and functional properties, and their role in preserving cultural and historical information. The research is based on a comparative analysis of linguistic, lexicographic, and translation studies devoted to archaic vocabulary in both languages. The findings demonstrate that, despite the universal nature of lexical obsolescence, Uzbek and French linguistics employ different methodological approaches to the study of obsolete words. While

Uzbek scholars mainly emphasize semantic, historical, and linguocultural aspects, French linguistics relies extensively on diachronic analysis, corpus-based research, and lexicographic classification. The study also reveals that archaisms and historicisms perform important stylistic and cultural functions in literary texts and present significant challenges in translation due to their historical and national-cultural specificity.

The results indicate that the adequate translation of archaic lexical units requires consideration of both linguistic meaning and cultural context. Comparative analysis of Uzbek and French obsolete vocabulary contributes to a deeper understanding of lexical evolution, cultural memory, and intercultural communication, while also providing a theoretical basis for improving translation practices involving historically marked lexical units.

Keywords: archaism, historicism, obsolete vocabulary, lexical obsolescence, Uzbek language, French language, comparative linguistics, historical lexicology, linguocultural studies, literary translation, translation strategies, cultural equivalence.

Introduction

Recent reforms in Uzbekistan have significantly stimulated the translation of Uzbek literary prose into major foreign languages. The growing participation of both domestic and international translators has increased scholarly interest in literary translation and intercultural communication. Particular attention has been paid to strengthening research in linguistics, comparative literature, and translation studies, which are regarded as essential for improving the quality and adequacy of literary translation (Mirziyoyev, 2017).

Despite these positive developments, the translation of archaic lexical units remains one of the least explored areas of translation studies. Archaisms frequently occur in literary texts, especially in historical prose, yet they are often omitted, neutralized, or insufficiently represented in translation.

Such difficulties arise from the complex semantic structure of archaic units and their close connection with historical, cultural, and cognitive aspects of the source language. Consequently, a comprehensive investigation of Uzbek archaisms and their rendering into French is of considerable theoretical and practical significance.

Literature Review and Analysis

The methodological framework of the study is grounded in the works devoted to obsolete vocabulary, archaisms, and historicisms in both Uzbek and foreign linguistics. Important contributions to the classification and description of archaic lexical units in Uzbek have been made by Polivanov (1934), Kononov (1948), Baskakov (1952), Reshetov (1960; 1961), Tursunov et al. (1966), Tursunov, Muxtorov and Rahmatullayev (1992), Abduvaliyeva (2017), and O‘rozboev (2018).

Research on the nature and development of archaisms in historical linguistics has been conducted by Trench (1871), Bynon (1977), Campbell (1999), Coleman (1990), Jackson (2002), Petersen et al. (2012), Ringe (2017), Galperin (1981), Sachkova (2012), and Nikolov (2016). The classification of archaic and obsolete vocabulary has been further explored by Shanskiy (1954), Nesterov (1988), Kasatkin et al. (1989), Rastorgueva (1989), Lipka (1992), Shpotova (2003), Korosteleva (2015), and Norman (2016).

Issues concerning the representation of historical and cultural elements in translation have been examined by Isakova (2004), Ormonova (2008), Yarkinova (2002), Xoshimova (2018), and Sidiqov (2010). The translation of national-cultural elements has been investigated by Javburiyev (1991), Yusupova (2011), Kasimova (2018), Yo‘ldoshev (2017), Fayzullayev (2019), and Tuxtaxo‘jayeva (2017). Translation strategies applicable to archaic and culturally marked lexical units have been discussed by Fiodorov (2002), Vlakhov and Florin (1980), Meshalkina (2008), Eco (2000), Newmark (1988), Ivir (1987), Leppihalme (1997), Nord (1994), and Venuti (1998).

Nevertheless, despite the substantial body of research devoted to archaisms and cultural translation, the problem of translating conceptual archaisms from Uzbek into French has not yet been systematically investigated. This gap determines the relevance and originality of the present study.

The Study of Obsolete Lexical Units in Uzbek Linguistics

The investigation of obsolete lexical units has occupied a significant place in the development of Uzbek linguistics. The earliest scholarly descriptions of the Uzbek language, including its grammatical structure, lexical composition, and historical development, were largely produced by Russian Turkologists. During the 1920s and 1930s, researchers such as Polivanov (1934) and Kononov (1948) drew attention to the etymological origins of a number of Uzbek lexical items and noted the presence of archaic features in their semantic structure. Nevertheless, their studies were primarily devoted to grammatical and etymological issues rather than to the systematic analysis of obsolete vocabulary.

A similar tendency can be observed in the works of Borovkov, Baskakov (1952), and Reshetov (1960, 1961), whose research focused mainly on the historical development of Turkic languages, the linguistic features of Chagatai, and the etymology of Uzbek lexical units. Although these studies provided valuable information regarding the origins of Uzbek vocabulary, they offered only limited insights into the classification and functional characteristics of obsolete lexical items. As a result, the historical layer of the Uzbek lexicon remained largely unexplored as an independent object of linguistic investigation.

A more systematic approach to the study of obsolete vocabulary emerged between the 1960s and the 1980s, when a number of works devoted to Uzbek lexicology and lexical stratification were published. One of the most important contributions was made by Kamolov, who proposed a distinction between active and passive vocabulary and identified archaic words as a separate component of the passive lexical stock (Tursunov et al., 1966). This approach laid the foundation for subsequent studies devoted to lexical obsolescence in Uzbek.

Further developments can be observed in lexicological works edited by Khojiyev and Ahmedov, where obsolete lexical units were treated as an independent lexical category. These scholars divided the vocabulary of the Uzbek language into restricted and unrestricted lexical groups and distinguished several categories within the latter. Their classification included common vocabulary, professional terminology, neologisms, scientific terms, stylistically marked obsolete words, ethnonyms, dialectal units, and jargon. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that archaic words were used as representative examples of obsolete lexical units preserved for stylistic purposes.

Despite the significance of these classifications, the studies in question did not provide a detailed description of the linguistic nature of obsolete words. Issues such as the semantic characteristics of archaisms, their functional differentiation, and the distinction between various types of obsolete lexical units remained insufficiently developed. Consequently, although Uzbek linguistics gradually recognized obsolete vocabulary as a separate lexical layer, a comprehensive classification and theoretical interpretation of archaic units had yet to be fully established.

A significant milestone in the study of obsolete vocabulary in Uzbek linguistics was the distinction established between archaisms and historicisms. This differentiation was first systematically presented in *Modern Uzbek Literary Language*, published under the editorship of Tursunov, Muxtorov, and Rahmatullayev (1966). In this work, lexical units were categorized according to their degree of relevance in contemporary language use. The authors distinguished between two principal lexical layers: the contemporary layer and the synchronic layer.

The contemporary layer comprises lexical items that are widely used and considered normative in modern communication. Such units are characterized by the absence of either innovative or archaic connotations. In contrast, the synchronic layer includes lexical elements marked by either novelty or antiquity. According to the authors, this layer is a permanent component of any language because vocabulary continuously evolves, generating both newly emerging and gradually disappearing lexical units (Tursunov et al., 1966). Within this framework, archaisms and historicisms were identified as distinct subcategories of obsolete vocabulary and were analyzed with regard to their linguistic functions and semantic properties.

From the 1990s onward, studies devoted to obsolete lexical units increasingly emphasized frequency of use as a criterion for lexical classification. Consequently, many linguists adopted a division of vocabulary into active and passive components, with obsolete words generally being assigned to the passive lexical stock. In this regard, Irisqulov argued that lexical systems consist of active and passive vocabularies, while historical words and archaisms constitute an important segment of the passive layer (Irisqulov).

Another important aspect of contemporary Uzbek linguistic scholarship concerns the terminology used to describe obsolete lexical units. Different researchers employ a variety of terms, including *old vocabulary*, *new vocabulary*, *neutral vocabulary*, *archaic layer*, *innovative layer*, and *contemporary layer*. Although these labels differ, they generally reflect attempts to classify lexical units according to their chronological and functional status within the language.

The term *old vocabulary* usually refers to lexical items that were actively used in earlier periods but have gradually disappeared from contemporary communication. This category is

commonly subdivided into archaisms and historicisms. Archaisms denote words that have become outdated despite the continued existence of the concepts they represent, whereas historicisms refer to lexical units associated with historical realities, institutions, or professions that no longer exist. Examples include *ol-qizil* ("crimson") as an archaism and *qozi* ("judge") or *mirshab* ("police inspector") as historicisms.

In contrast, *new vocabulary* encompasses recently introduced lexical items that reflect contemporary realities and innovations. Such words often emerge as a result of technological, social, or cultural developments and are generally classified as neologisms. Examples include terms such as *web designer*, *blogger*, and *vine*. The category of *neutral vocabulary*, on the other hand, includes lexical units that are commonly used in everyday communication and are not associated with either novelty or obsolescence. Words denoting basic concepts, such as *flower*, *tree*, and *book*, belong to this lexical layer.

Existing studies demonstrate that the inclusion of archaic vocabulary within the passive lexical stock is theoretically justified. Nevertheless, many questions concerning the precise boundaries, classification criteria, and semantic characteristics of obsolete lexical units remain unresolved. This issue is particularly evident in Uzbek lexicographic practice. In major dictionaries, including the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*, obsolete lexical items are typically presented as a single category without a clear distinction between archaisms and historicisms. As a result, further research is required to develop a more comprehensive and systematic classification of obsolete vocabulary in Uzbek linguistics.

Studies of Archaisms and Obsolete Vocabulary in French Linguistics

The phenomenon of lexical obsolescence has occupied an important place in French historical linguistics and lexicology, particularly since the nineteenth century. Research in this field has primarily focused on the historical evolution of vocabulary, etymological development, and the transformation of lexical systems across different periods of the French language. These studies have significantly contributed to understanding the mechanisms through which lexical items emerge, evolve, and eventually disappear from active usage.

One of the most influential scholars in the study of obsolete vocabulary was Jean Dubois. In his lexicographic and historical works, obsolete words are described as lexical units that have largely disappeared from everyday communication but continue to exist in literary, historical, or specialized contexts (Dubois, 1992). Such units are viewed as linguistic remnants that preserve evidence of earlier stages of language development and maintain stylistic as well as cultural significance.

Important contributions to the study of lexical obsolescence were also made by Albert Dauzat, whose research examined the relationship between archaic lexical items and their modern equivalents (Dubois et al., 2002). His analyses demonstrated that many obsolete words continue to fulfill stylistic functions in literary discourse and formal registers, thereby contributing to the expressive richness of the French language.

French linguists have gradually expanded the concept of archaism beyond the lexical level. Dubois (1992) emphasized that archaisms may also be manifested through phonological, morphological, and grammatical features inherited from earlier stages of the language. A similar perspective was advanced by Hagège (1992), who argued that archaic elements should be investigated within a broader diachronic framework encompassing not only vocabulary but also structural components of language.

The development of standardized French between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries had a profound impact on lexical change. Language reforms, together with major political and social

transformations, led to the gradual disappearance of numerous archaic expressions and lexical forms. As a result, many words that were once common became restricted to literary, religious, or historical usage. This process significantly reshaped the French lexicon and contributed to the establishment of modern linguistic norms (Rey, 1998; Rey, 2010).

Contemporary studies continue to emphasize the stylistic and cultural value of obsolete lexical units. According to Boulanger (2001), archaisms function not merely as historical relics but also as stylistic devices capable of creating historical atmosphere, aesthetic effect, and cultural authenticity in literary texts. Such observations explain why archaic vocabulary remains an important object of investigation in both historical linguistics and translation studies.

Furthermore, the availability of large electronic corpora and lexicographic databases has significantly expanded research possibilities in this area. Resources such as the *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* (TLFi) provide extensive evidence regarding the historical usage, semantic development, and stylistic distribution of obsolete lexical items (TLFi, n.d.). These tools enable researchers to examine lexical change more systematically and to identify patterns of obsolescence based on actual language data.

Overall, French linguistic scholarship demonstrates that lexical obsolescence should be understood as a multidimensional phenomenon involving historical, semantic, stylistic, and sociocultural factors. Consequently, the study of archaisms remains essential for understanding both the historical development of French and the preservation of cultural memory within language.

Diachronic Approaches to Archaisms in French Linguistics

French scholars have traditionally approached the study of archaisms from a diachronic perspective, examining their emergence, development, and gradual disappearance throughout different stages of language history. Such an approach makes it possible to investigate not only the historical trajectory of obsolete lexical units but also their stylistic and semantic functions within particular socio-cultural environments. By tracing changes in lexical usage across historical periods, researchers can better understand the mechanisms governing lexical continuity and obsolescence in French (Rey, 1998; Rey, 2010).

Within French linguistic scholarship, the concept of archaism has been interpreted in both broad and narrow senses. In its broadest understanding, any linguistic element that reflects an earlier stage of language development may be regarded as an archaism. This includes not only lexical items but also grammatical, phonological, and morphological features. According to Dubois (1992), an archaism may be defined as a word or linguistic form associated with a previous stage of the language that continues to survive in restricted contexts, particularly in literature, poetry, and formal styles.

Contemporary scholars have further expanded this definition by emphasizing the multidimensional nature of archaic phenomena. Francard argues that archaisms should not be viewed solely as obsolete lexical units because they may also appear in morphological structures and phonetic forms preserved for stylistic or historical purposes (Francard). A comparable position is adopted by Hagège (1992), who maintains that the study of archaisms requires a comprehensive diachronic framework encompassing lexicology, phonology, and morphology. From this perspective, archaic elements represent linguistic traces of successive stages in the historical development of a language and may be manifested in both vocabulary and grammatical structures.

The study of archaisms in French has a long scholarly tradition dating back to the nineteenth century. Early philologists such as Gaston Paris and Ferdinand Brunetière laid the foundations for historical investigations of the French language through their analyses of medieval texts and older

linguistic forms (Paris, 1890; Brunetière, 1890). Their work established an important basis for subsequent research into language change and lexical evolution.

Despite this extensive tradition, studies devoted specifically to lexical obsolescence remain relatively limited. Most historical linguistic investigations have focused on etymology, lexical development, and language change in general, while the processes leading to the disappearance of lexical units have received comparatively less attention. Consequently, the phenomenon of lexical obsolescence has often been examined indirectly within broader studies of language history rather than as an independent object of research.

In recent decades, however, advances in corpus linguistics and digital lexicography have opened new possibilities for the study of archaic vocabulary. Electronic databases and linguistic corpora, including *Frantext* and the *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* (TLFi), provide extensive quantitative data concerning the frequency, distribution, and contextual usage of archaic lexical units in both classical and contemporary French literature (TLFi, n.d.). These resources enable scholars to investigate processes of lexicalization and obsolescence more systematically and to identify patterns of lexical change across different historical periods.

Current research increasingly incorporates sociolinguistic and pragmatic perspectives into the study of archaisms. Rather than treating archaic forms solely as remnants of earlier linguistic stages, contemporary scholars examine their role as stylistic, cultural, and identity markers within specific communicative contexts. In literary discourse, formal registers, and regional varieties of French, archaic elements may serve important expressive functions, contributing to historical authenticity, stylistic coloring, and cultural representation (Boulanger, 2001). Consequently, the analysis of French archaisms requires a multidimensional framework that integrates historical linguistics, stylistics, sociolinguistics, and cultural studies.

Classification of Obsolete Lexical Units in French Lexicography

Although the classification of obsolete vocabulary has not always occupied a central position in linguistic research, French lexicography has developed relatively systematic approaches to the description and categorization of archaic lexical units. Major lexicographic resources, including the *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française* (Dubois, 1992; Rey, 1998, 2010) and the *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* (TLFi, n.d.), classify obsolete words according to their historical status, frequency of use, and functional sphere of application.

According to these lexicographic sources, lexical units that have completely disappeared from contemporary usage are generally classified as obsolete words. However, this designation is not applied uniformly across all dictionaries, since the degree of lexical obsolescence may vary depending on the historical period, stylistic register, and communicative context. Dubois (1992) notes that many words regarded as archaic in modern French continue to be preserved because of their historical significance or stylistic value, particularly in literary and scholarly discourse.

The classification system adopted by the *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* distinguishes several categories of obsolete lexical items. These include rare words, words that have become rare over time, archaisms, historical words, and fully obsolete lexical units (TLFi, n.d.). Such a classification demonstrates that lexical obsolescence in French is not a homogeneous phenomenon but rather a continuum characterized by different degrees of usage and historical relevance.

This approach highlights the complexity of French historical lexicology, where obsolete vocabulary is evaluated not only according to its presence or absence in contemporary language use but also according to stylistic function, historical background, and frequency of occurrence.

Consequently, the boundaries between different categories of obsolete words are often fluid rather than strictly defined.

From a lexicographic perspective, a lexical item is frequently categorized as a rare word when its occurrence in historical corpora and dictionary databases is extremely limited. Such units are represented by forms that have either survived only in isolated textual sources or have remained on the periphery of the lexical system. Examples include *aguillonnement*, an older lexical form associated with the notion of stimulation or excitation; *resjouir*, an archaic variant of the modern verb *réjouir*; and *desloyaleté*, an obsolete orthographic form corresponding to contemporary *déloyauté* (Dubois, 1992; TLFi, n.d.).

Another category consists of lexical units that once enjoyed relatively widespread usage but gradually became marginal in modern French, particularly after the first half of the twentieth century. Such words often preserve historical or literary significance despite their disappearance from everyday communication. Examples include *destrer*, formerly used to designate a medieval war horse; *meschant*, an earlier spelling and semantic variant of the modern adjective *méchant*; and *oisiveté*, which historically carried connotations associated with noble leisure rather than the predominantly negative meaning of idleness found in present-day French (TLFi, n.d.; Rey, 2010).

The existence of these categories demonstrates that lexical obsolescence should be viewed as a gradual and multifaceted process rather than a simple transition from active usage to complete disappearance. Lexical items may pass through several stages of decline, ranging from reduced frequency and stylistic restriction to complete exclusion from everyday communication. Therefore, French lexicographic practice provides an important framework for understanding the dynamics of lexical change and the preservation of historical vocabulary within the language.

Categories of Obsolete Vocabulary and Methods for Identifying Archaisms in French

Within French lexicology, a distinction is commonly made between archaisms, historical words, and obsolete lexical units. Although these categories are closely related, they differ in terms of their semantic characteristics, degree of usage, and relationship to contemporary language.

Archaisms generally refer to lexical items that remain understandable to modern speakers but evoke a strong sense of antiquity when used in contemporary discourse. Their occurrence is usually associated with literary, historical, or stylistically marked contexts. Examples include the use of *point* instead of *pas* in negative constructions, as well as verbs such as *ouïr* (“to hear”) and *quérir* (“to seek”), whose usage immediately signals an older stage of the French language (Dubois, 1992; TLFi, n.d.). Such forms continue to survive primarily because of their stylistic, aesthetic, or historical value.

Historical words, by contrast, denote objects, institutions, professions, and social realities that have disappeared from contemporary society. Unlike archaisms, which often possess modern lexical equivalents, historicisms refer to concepts that no longer exist in present-day life. Consequently, they are mainly encountered in historical narratives, scholarly works, and literary texts describing past epochs. Examples include *rouelle*, a distinctive badge imposed on Jewish communities during the Ancien Régime; *chausse-trape*, a medieval military trap; and *corvée* in its feudal sense of compulsory labor imposed by a lord upon peasants (TLFi, n.d.).

A third category consists of fully obsolete words. These lexical units have disappeared from both spoken and written language and are no longer part of the active linguistic memory of contemporary speakers. Their survival is generally limited to historical documents, specialized dictionaries, or fixed expressions. Examples include *néantiser*, meaning “to annihilate completely,” and *mignoter*, referring to excessive indulgence or pampering (Dubois, 1992; Rey, 2010). Such

words represent the final stage of lexical obsolescence and illustrate the gradual disappearance of vocabulary from everyday communication.

The identification of obsolete vocabulary remains one of the most challenging issues in French lexicology. Owing to the vast size of the French lexicon and the continuous process of lexical change, scholars have not yet established universally accepted criteria for distinguishing archaisms, historicisms, neologisms, and neutral lexical units. Nevertheless, numerous researchers have proposed approaches that classify lexical items according to their historical status and frequency of use.

Among the earliest scholars to emphasize the historical dimension of lexical classification was Brunetière (1890), who argued that the interpretation of lexical units should take into account the historical circumstances in which they were used. Similarly, the philological studies of Paris (1890) significantly contributed to the understanding of archaic forms in medieval French literature and demonstrated the importance of historical context for linguistic analysis. Earlier reflections on lexical evolution can also be traced to the works of Claude Favre de Vaugelas, whose observations concerning language change and linguistic norms laid important foundations for subsequent studies of lexical obsolescence.

More recent contributions have been made by Rey (1998, 2010), whose historical dictionaries provide extensive information regarding the evolution of French vocabulary and the classification of obsolete lexical items. These works have become essential references for scholars investigating the historical development of French lexicon.

Methods used to identify archaisms may generally be divided into two broad categories: traditional approaches and automated approaches. Traditional methods rely on the detailed examination of literary texts, historical documents, explanatory dictionaries, etymological dictionaries, and encyclopedic sources. Through close reading and contextual analysis, researchers identify lexical units that exhibit archaic or historical characteristics. Although this approach provides highly reliable results, it requires extensive time, effort, and expertise, particularly when large corpora are involved.

In contrast, modern approaches increasingly employ computational and corpus-based techniques. These methods make use of digital corpora, lexical databases, and statistical analyses of word frequency to identify patterns of lexical change. By examining fluctuations in usage over extended periods, researchers can determine whether a lexical item is becoming obsolete, remaining stable, or gaining renewed popularity.

Recent studies suggest that frequency-based approaches offer particularly promising results for the classification of lexical units according to their degree of historicity. Gabriel and Rebedeya (2017), for example, proposed a model based on data obtained from Google Books N-gram Viewer, distinguishing between archaisms, neologisms, and general vocabulary according to long-term frequency trends. Their findings demonstrated that changes in frequency provide valuable indicators of lexical obsolescence and can be used to identify words that have gradually disappeared from active usage.

The application of such corpus-driven methodologies to French offers considerable research potential. Digital resources and frequency-based analyses make it possible to investigate lexical evolution more objectively and systematically than traditional approaches alone. As a result, contemporary research increasingly combines qualitative linguistic interpretation with quantitative corpus evidence.

The analysis of existing scholarship demonstrates that obsolete vocabulary constitutes a universal linguistic phenomenon, although the principles used for its classification vary across

languages. In French linguistics, the study of archaisms is primarily based on two major criteria: patterns of usage and historical chronology. Consequently, obsolete lexical units are generally classified according to their functional distribution and their relationship to specific historical periods.

The predominance of historical approaches in French lexicology reflects the profound linguistic transformations experienced by French over the centuries. Successive stages of language development have led to the gradual replacement, marginalization, or disappearance of numerous lexical units. As a result, vocabulary associated with particular historical epochs has become obsolete, a process that parallels developments observed in many other languages.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of obsolete lexical units in Uzbek and French demonstrates that lexical obsolescence is a universal linguistic phenomenon resulting from historical, social, cultural, and linguistic changes. In both languages, obsolete vocabulary represents an important component of the lexical system, preserving information about earlier stages of linguistic and cultural development. Nevertheless, the approaches adopted for the classification, interpretation, and analysis of such units differ considerably between the two linguistic traditions.

The review of Uzbek linguistic studies reveals that research on obsolete vocabulary initially developed within the broader framework of grammatical and historical investigations. Although Uzbek scholars have gradually distinguished archaisms from historicisms and have proposed classifications based on active and passive vocabulary, many issues related to the semantic boundaries and functional characteristics of obsolete lexical units remain insufficiently explored. In particular, Uzbek lexicography still tends to treat obsolete vocabulary as a relatively homogeneous category, often without a clear distinction between archaisms and historicisms.

French linguistic scholarship, by contrast, has developed a more systematic and diversified approach to the study of obsolete lexical units. French researchers have traditionally employed diachronic methods, examining lexical change through historical, stylistic, and sociocultural perspectives. Modern French lexicography, supported by extensive corpora and electronic databases such as the *Trésor de la langue française informatisé* (TLFi), provides detailed classifications that distinguish between rare words, archaic words, historical words, and fully obsolete lexical units (Dubois, 1992; Rey, 2010; TLFi, n.d.).

The comparison of the two languages also demonstrates important similarities. In both Uzbek and French, obsolete lexical units can be divided into archaisms, which denote concepts that still exist but are expressed by outdated forms, and historicisms, which refer to social, cultural, or material realities that have disappeared from contemporary life. Furthermore, in both linguistic traditions, such units continue to perform significant stylistic functions, particularly in literary discourse, where they contribute to the recreation of historical atmosphere, cultural authenticity, and national identity.

At the same time, notable differences can be observed. French linguistics places greater emphasis on frequency-based classification, corpus analysis, and lexicographic categorization, whereas Uzbek studies have traditionally focused on semantic, historical, and linguocultural aspects. As a result, the French tradition offers a more elaborate framework for identifying and classifying obsolete vocabulary, while Uzbek linguistics provides valuable insights into the relationship between archaic lexical units and national-cultural heritage.

The findings of the present study indicate that the translation of archaic vocabulary requires not only linguistic competence but also a deep understanding of the historical and cultural contexts in which such units function. Since archaisms and historicisms often carry culturally specific meanings, their adequate translation demands the preservation of both semantic content and cultural connotations. Therefore, comparative investigations of obsolete vocabulary in Uzbek and French contribute not only to historical lexicology but also to the development of linguocultural and translation studies.

Overall, the research confirms that obsolete lexical units constitute an essential element of linguistic and cultural memory. Their systematic study enhances our understanding of lexical evolution, intercultural communication, and the mechanisms through which languages preserve and transmit historical experience across generations.

REFERENCES

1. Abduvaliyeva, D. A. (2017). *Alisher Navoiy tarixiy asarlari leksikasi* (Doctoral dissertation abstract). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
2. Aziz, Z. A., Yusuf, S. B., Mustaf, F., & Munawarah, S. (2020). Acehnese archaic words in Hikayat: An early influential literary work. *Lingua Cultura, 14*(2), 161–169.
3. Baskakov, N. A. (1952). *Tyurkskie yazyki*. Moscow, Russia: Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
4. Boqiyeva, G., Mengliyev, B., Qurbonova, M., Sayfullayeva, R., Yunusova, Z., & Abuzalova, M. (2009). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan va Texnologiya.
5. Boulanger, M. (2001). *Archaïsmes et stylistique en français*. Lyon, France: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
6. Brunetière, F. (1890). *L'évolution des genres dans l'histoire de la littérature*. Paris, France: Hachette.
7. Bynon, T. (1977). *Historical linguistics*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
8. Campbell, L. (1999). *Historical linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press.
9. Coleman, R. (1990). The assessment of lexical mortality and replacement between Old and Modern English. In *Papers from the Fifth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics* (pp. 69–86). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
10. Desrivawati, N. (2021). An analysis of Acehnese archaic words among North Acehnese speakers. *English Education Journal, 12*(1), 86–96.
11. Dubois, J. (1992). *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. Paris, France: Le Robert.
12. Dubois, J., Lagane, R., Michéa, R., & Dauzat, A. (2002). *Dictionnaire de la langue française*. Paris, France: Larousse.
13. Durgut, H. (2018). Litvanya Tatarları el yazmalarındaki Türkçe Miraçname'de bazı arkaik kelimeler üzerine. *Motif Akademi Halkbilimi Dergisi, 11*(21), 105–114.
14. Eco, U. (2000). *Experiences in translation*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
15. Eratalay, S. Ö., & Keklik, M. (2019). Yapı ve anlam bakımından klasik Türk şiirinde arkaizm örnekleri. *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi, 59*(1), 131–157.
16. Fayzullayev, O. M. (2019). *O'zbek folkloridagi lingvokulturemalarni inglizcha tarjimada berilishi* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
17. Fedorov, A. V. (2002). *Osnovy obshchey teorii perevoda: Lingvisticheskie problemy*. Moscow, Russia: Filologiya Tri.

18. Gabriel, C. K., & Rebedeya, T. Y. (2017). Lexical evolution and frequency-based categorization of English words using Google Books N-gram Viewer. *Linguistic Research Journal, 34*(2), 127–145.
19. Galperin, I. R. (1981). *Stylistics of the English language*. Moscow, Russia: Vysshaya Shkola.
20. Hagège, C. (1992). *L'archaïsme en linguistique*. Paris, France: Presses Universitaires de France.
21. Hammond, K. J. (1996). Beyond archaism: Wang Shizhen and the legacy of the Northern Song. *Ming Studies*, 6–28.
22. Heinzelmann, T. (2004). The hedgehog as historian: Linguistic archaism as a means of satire in the early work of Refik Halid Karay. In *The Middle Eastern Press as a Forum for Literature* (pp. 196–210). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
23. Irisqulov, M. (1992). *Tilshunoslikka kirish*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'qituvchi.
24. Isakova, S. (2004). *Badiiy tarjimada milliylik va tarixiylikning aks ettirilishi* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
25. Ivir, V. (1987). Procedures and strategies for the translation of culture. In *Translation Across Cultures* (pp. 35–46). New Delhi, India: Bahri.
26. Jackson, H. (2002). *Lexicography: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
27. Javburiyev, M. (1991). *Vossozdanie natsionalnogo kharaktera i istoricheskogo kolorita v khudozhestvennom perevode* (Doctoral dissertation abstract). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
28. Kasimova, R. R. (2018). *O'zbek to'y va motam marosim folklori matnlarining inglizcha tarjimalarida etnografizmlarning berilishi* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
29. Kharmandar, M. A. (2014). Exploring archaism in translation theory and modern Persian poetics: Towards a Persian translation paradigm. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies, 12*(46), 40–56.
30. Khojiyev, A., & Ahmedov, A. (1981). *O'zbek tili leksikologiyasi*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan.
31. Kononov, A. N. (1948). *Grammatika uzbekskogo yazyka*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: State Publishing House of the Uzbek SSR.
32. Korosteleva, T. V. (2015). *Arkhaizmy kak tropeicheskoe sredstvo v sovremennom russkom literaturnom yazyke* (Doctoral dissertation). Moscow, Russia.
33. Leppihalme, R. (1997). *Culture bumps*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
34. Lipka, L. (1992). *An outline of English lexicology*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.
35. Meshalkina, E. N. (2008). *Strategii istoricheskoy stilizatsii v khudozhestvennom perevode* (Doctoral dissertation). Moscow, Russia.
36. Mirziyoyev, S. M. (2017). *Kitob mahsulotlarini chop etish va tarqatish tizimini rivojlantirish.... Xalq So'zi*, 9, 6703.
37. Nesterov, M. N. (1988). *Russkaya ustarevshaya i ustarevayushchaya leksika*. Smolensk, Russia: Bryansk State Pedagogical Institute.
38. Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
39. Nikolov, A. (2016). Stylistic classification of the English vocabulary. *Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 6*(11), 115–122.
40. Nord, C. (1994). Translation as a process of linguistic and cultural adaptation. In *Teaching Translation and Interpreting* (pp. 59–67). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
41. Norman, B. Y. (2016). Ukhodyashchee slovo: Istorizm, arkhaizm ili notiolizm? *Kommunikativnye Issledovaniya, 4*(10), 21–38.
42. Ormonova, N. (2008). *Tarjimada tarixiy-arxaik leksikani aks ettirish prinsiplari va tarjima aniqligi* (Doctoral dissertation abstract). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

43. O‘rozboev, A. D. (2018). *Ogahiyning tarixiy asarlari leksikasi* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
44. Paris, G. (1890). *La littérature française au Moyen Âge*. Paris, France: Hachette.
45. Petersen, A. M., Joel, T., Havlin, S., & Stanley, H. E. (2012). Statistical laws governing fluctuations in word use from word birth to word death. *Scientific Reports, 2*, Article 313.
46. Polivanov, E. D. (1934). *Russkaya grammatika v sopostavlenii s uzbekskim yazykom*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
47. Rahmatullayev, Sh., Tursunov, U., & Muxtorov, A. (1992). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O‘zbekiston.
48. Reshetov, V. V. (1960). Uzbekskiy natsionalnyy yazyk. In *Voprosy formirovaniya i razvitiya natsionalnykh yazykov*. Moscow, Russia.
49. Reshetov, V. V. (1961). *Osnovy fonetiki i grammatiki uzbekskogo yazyka*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
50. Rey, A. (1998). *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. Paris, France: Le Robert.
51. Rey, A. (2010). *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. Paris, France: Le Robert.
52. Ringe, D. (2017). *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
53. Rusady, D., & Munawarah, S. (2017). Searching of Sundanese archaic words in Inner and Outer Badui. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Conference on Applied Linguistics* (pp. 592–596).
54. Sachkova, E. (2012). *Lectures on English stylistics*. Moscow, Russia: MIIT.
55. Shanskiy, N. M. (1954). Ustarevshie slova v leksike sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka. *Russkiy Yazyk v Shkole*, 3.
56. Sidiqov, Q. A. (2010). *Qutadg‘u bilig to‘rtliklarining inglizcha badiiy tarjima xususiyatlari* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
57. Sokol, N. I. (2016). Meditsinskie arkhaizmy v spetsialnoy i nespetsialnoy rechi kak problema perevodovedeniya. In *Lomonosov 2016 Conference Proceedings*. Moscow, Russia: Moscow State University.
58. Szerszunowicz, J. (2014). Phraseological units containing archaic elements in bilingual lexicography. In *Endangered Words, Signs of Revival* (pp. 1–17). Australex.
59. TLFi. (n.d.). *Trésor de la langue française informatisé*. https://www.cnrtl.fr/definition
60. Trench, R. C. (1871). *English past and present*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner & Company.
61. Turaxujayeva, A. (2006). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili (leksikologiya, frazeologiya, lug‘atshunoslik)*. Qo‘qon, Uzbekistan: QDPI.
62. Tuxtaxo‘jayeva, N. A. (2017). *Badiiy tarjimada lingvokulturemalarning ifodalanishi* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
63. Venuti, L. (1998). Strategies of translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 240–244). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
64. Vlakhov, S., & Florin, S. (1980). *Neperevodimoe v perevode*. Moscow, Russia.
65. Xolmanova, Z. (2007). *Tilshunoslikka kirish*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
66. Xoshimova, D. M. (2018). *Boburnoma matnidagi tasviriy vositalarning ingliz tiliga tarjimalari talqini* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
67. Yarkinova, B. B. (2002). *Turkiy tillardan tarjimada tarixiy koloritning aks ettirilishi* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
68. Yo‘ldoshev, U. R. (2017). *Hajviy matnlar tarjimasining lingvostilistik va lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari* (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

69. Yusupova, H. O‘. (2011). *O‘zbek xalq og‘zaki nasri namunalarining inglizcha tarjimalarida milliy koloritning ifodalanishi* (Doctoral dissertation abstract). Tashkent, Uzbekistan.