

Common Features of the Turkic Languages and Problems of Their Study

Kakharova Nilufar Nuridinovna

Teacher of the Department of Russian Language and Literature
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan, Kokand

Kudinova Gulnara Frangilevna

Doctor of Philology, Professor, Bashkir State Pedagogical University
Russian Federation

Article Information

Received: February 06, 2023

Accepted: March 07, 2023

Published: April 10, 2023

Keywords: Turkology, areal classification, Altai hypothesis, phonetic level, morphological level, lexical level, syntactic level.

ABSTRACT

In this article, the authors consider the common features of the Turkic family of languages and the problems of their study. The features of the kinship of languages and the uniqueness of the Turkic languages from the point of view of sections of linguistics are described. As a result of in-depth study of the language of common Turkic literary and artistic texts, the general typological features of the Turkic languages are clearly defined and the causes of the various signs that have arisen in different lines of modern Turkic languages are revealed.

There are still several problems in Turkology that have not been solved definitively. Since the progress of the Proto-Turkic period is evidence of the typological unity of ancient and modern Turkic languages and the basis of lexical generality, these common features should be fully justified. In a different structure, the areal distribution of linguistic signs, which is the result of the same non-conjugation or separation of Turkic tribes and nationalities, can be considered as a consequence of their different integration with related or unrelated ethnic groups in accordance with language symbols [1]. Therefore, when studying the Turkic languages in a comparative historical aspect, it is also necessary to take into account their areal features.

The question of the relationship of such languages as Altaic, Mongolian, and Korean is controversial. Some scientists suggest that these languages are typologically similar rather than genetically related. However, with the help of the comparative historical method, clarifications are made to these phenomena.

The Altai hypothesis consists in the genetic relationship of the Altai languages, or the Altai hypothesis, was put forward in the last century by Rask, W.Schott and M.A.It was

propagandized and widely distributed, first in the Ural-Altai, and then in the Altai variants. Due to the modification of the Ural-Altai variant into Altaic, the Uralic languages were separated into a separate family group. The Altaic languages were divided into Turkic, Mongolian, Tungusic and, with some considerations, Korean.

As unifying features of these groups, V.K. Memus calls vowel harmony, the tendency not to use voiced consonants at the beginning of a word, indicates the instability of the letter h at the end of a word, the lack of grouping of consonant sounds at the beginning and end of a word, the absence of elongated and oscillating consonants, and the intensive use of open syllables.

E.D. Polivanov argues that morphology belongs to the suffix type, that stress is a constant (in the previous syllable), that approximate similarity in the typical quantitative composition of lexical morphemes (words with one and two syllables), synharmonism, provide the basis for similarity in phonetics.

In the introduction to the book "Languages of the world" (new edition), the author J. Denis, describing the Turkic, Mongolian and Tungusic-Mandzhur languages, points out the following common features of these three groups:

- in the field of phonetics, the harmony of vowels, the non-use of sonorants at the beginning of a word (especially in Turkish), the inappropriateness of semivowels, the instability of the h sound at the end of a word, the lack of grouping of consonant sounds at the beginning and end of a word;
- in morphology, however, the absence of a grammatical category of gender, the presence of only two grammatical categories of number, the possibility of independent use of the root morpheme, indicates that morphology has an agglutinative-suffix character (absence of prefixes), the absence of prepositions (instead of which special morphemes are used), etc. [3].
- in syntax, the order of words in a sentence (preposition of minor sentence members), almost complete absence of conjunctions and relative pronouns. Subordinate clauses in Indo-European languages correspond to "quasi-sentences", that is, a group of words that end in verb forms (with the name of the action, participle, adverbial). It is also possible to note the similarity in personal pronouns.

For more than a hundred years, the Altai hypothesis has maintained its strength. A great event is the creation of two comparative grammars, which became the culmination of the comparative Altaic language (the works of Ramsted and Poppe). Two authors collected their opinions and materials on them, giving a summary of the work done on this issue as a whole.

But with the advent of these comparative grammars, many researchers expressed the opinion that the Altai hypothesis has no scientific value, since these works explained that the methods of finding similarities and reconstructing grammatical forms were not correct at all.

In recent years, in addition to comparative studies of the Altai language, another direction has been developing, which takes into account not only similarities, but also differences, referring to the historical connection of the Altai languages.

The main typological features that can be seen in the Altai-Uralic languages are the following:

1. At the phonetic level: the presence of synharmonism (vowel harmony), the law of assimilation of consonant sounds, the strong position of a voiced consonant at the root of a word, the presence of one consonant sound at the beginning of a word, the possibility of synharmonic parallelism in words with semantic differentiation, the fall of the main stress on the predicate in the phrase.
2. At the morphological level: the predominance of suffixes that allow agglutination in a word, and sometimes there is a merger of the root morpheme, the use of auxiliary means as

prepositions, the absence of an article, the absence of a grammatical category of gender, the presence of a possessive category, the expression of comparative meaning in a case construction, a relative multitude of inflectional suffixes in the singular and plural, a multitude of nominative tasks cases , etc .

3. At the syntactic level: the absence of numerical inconsistency in definitions expressed by numerals, the participation of particles in the expression of the interrogative meaning, the widespread use of participial and adverbial turns instead of subordinate clauses, the relative constant order of sentence members, the adjective as a definition, the immutability of numerals and pronouns in accordance with the definition, etc.

4. At the lexical level: the presence of a common layer in the structure of the dictionary of Turkic languages, the obvious manifestation of commonality in monolingual words, the appropriation of the dominant language vocabulary under the influence of the political and social environment [2]. Lexical differences in certain groups of Altaic and Turkic languages are the result of further progress of this language. In the linguistic richness of the Altai languages, there are common words for Turkish, Mongolian and Tungusic-Mandzhur languages. The combination of elements of Chinese, Sanskrit, Persian-Arabic vocabulary and Finnish in the eastern branch of the Turkic languages is a sign of the expansion of the linguistic map of the Turkic languages. The borrowing of Mongolian words from Siberian and Central Asian languages in the moderate period of the development of the Turkic language contributed to the enrichment of the vocabulary of some languages from the Altai family.

As a result of in-depth study of the language of common Turkic literary and artistic texts up to the XV century, it will be possible to clearly define the general typological features of the Turkic languages, compare them with changes in the later language structure, find out the reasons for the various features that have arisen in different lines of modern Turkic languages. It is necessary to study modern Turkic languages in a comparative aspect, determine the degree of their compatibility with different language levels, enrich theoretical data based on modern approaches and methods of study, create comparative dictionaries of related languages in various fields, all this serves to clarify the issues facing Turkology.

Sources used:

1. Баскаков Н.А. Введение в изучение тюркских язмокв. М.Вмсшая школа. 1969
2. Ботиров, А. А. Словообразование в тюркских языках / А. А. Ботиров // НАУКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ИННОВАЦИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ и современные АСПЕКТЫ : сборник статей XVI Международной научно-практической конференции, Пенза, 20 февраля 2023 года. – Пенза: Наука и Просвещение (ИП Гуляев Г.Ю.), 2023. – С. 86-87. – EDN ВУУКТН.
3. Kakharova, N. N. (2022). Verb Prefixes in Russian Language. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Review*, 5(8), 170-174.
4. Kakharova Nilufar Nuridinovna. (2022). FEATURES OF FORMATIVE SUFFIXES OF THE MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. *Open Access Repository*, 8(12), 320–322.