THE VC STRUCTURAL MODEL OF MONOSYLLABLES IN ANCIENT TURKIC AND KIPCHAK LANGUAGES

Lyazat Meirambekova[*], Gulgaisha Sagidolda[**], Magripa Yeskeyeva[**], Gulbarshin Syzdykova[**], Lyazzat Yespekova[***] and Ardak Beisenbay[***]

Abstract: This article is dedicated to study and analysis of structure of Turkic roots in historical perspective. The direct attention to the study of Turkic roots perhaps could be explained by the fact that all derivatives of the word are usually traced back to monosyllables. It is suggested that these facts indicate the source of the Turkic communities' languages was originated by their root vocabulary. The materials of Turkic manuscripts of the VI-IX centuries which show the extensive use of the VC form consisting of vowels and consonants in the structural system of Turkic roots and their unchanged retention in most of modern Kipchak languages, namely Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai, Tatar, Bashkir, Kumyk languages are taken as the object of the research. The nature and semantics of VC structural model of monosyllables in ancient Turkic and the Kipchak languages are analyzed. Also the important views and conclusions about root study of the turkologists are considered in the given article.

Keywords: Monosyllables, vowel, consonant, structural system of Turkic roots, Kipchak languages.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of root structure has been always in the centre of Turkology researchers' attention. The papers of the turkologists such as V.L. Kotvich (1962), G. Vamberi (1879), G.I. Ramstedt (1957), V.V. Radlov (1882), N.K. Dmitriyev (1949), E.V. Sevortyan (1962), I.A. Batmanov (1971), A.N. Kononov (1982), E.R. Tenishev (1963), B.M.Yunusaliev (1959), N.A. Baskakov (1952), A.M. Scherbak (1994), K.M. Mussayev (1984), A.T. Kaidarov (1986), I.V. Kormushin (1971), J.A., Mankeeva (1985), E.Z. Kajibekov (1986), A.A. Zayonchkovsky (1961), J.I. Haritonov (1954), Ch.K. Dyykanova (1985), B.O. Oruzbayeva (1975) and other researchers are dedicated to the investigation of the structure of Turkic languages roots, the origins of these languages, analyzing their genetic affinity. Their results made it possible to solve a number of theoretical and practical issues in Turkic and Kazakh linguistics.

The topicality of this issue seems to be increasing due to the emergence of new research papers and research methods improvements. Moreover, there is a scientific revolution involving factual precise materials of Turkic languages. The direct attention to the study of Turkic roots perhaps could be explained by the

[*]   PhD Student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

[**]   Professor, Doctor of Philological Sciences, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

[***] Candidate of Philological Sciences, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

fact that all derivatives of the word are usually traced back to monosyllables. It is suggested that these facts indicate the source of the Turkic communities' languages was originated by their root vocabulary. The primary roots can observe the process of a new word derivation and its further semantic development. Thus, there is an opportunity to discover ancient roots of linguistic analysis which will allow more reasoned approach to generalizations Turkic features (Kyzlasov, 1998).

Undoubtedly, materials for analysis and conclusions illustrations were taken from the materials of Turkic manuscripts of the VI-IX centuries which are regarded as the valuable heritages in the storeroom of history Turkic and modern Kipchak languages group. Not surprisingly, there are many unknowns still valuable heritages in the storeroom of history to modern generations of Kazakh people who survived at different times, in different centuries many things associated with the semi-nomadic way of life, with different political and social circumstances. Kipchak, Kazakh written historical monuments as well as samples of oral literature transferred from memory of one generation to another take a special place in determining the path of development of the Kazakh language and its historical place among the Turkic languages.

The indigenous vocabulary of the Kazakh language has been formed not only with the development of the national history, but of the Turkic communities' history in general. Kazakh vocabulary is characterized by congeniality with Kipchak group of languages and Turkic languages in whole or in part. Before it became a nation, Kazakh people had passed the same common ways of development as other Turkic communities. Kazakh vocabulary generally spread from Turkic basis and its basic word vocabulary, phonetic and morphological structures started from the ancient Turkic language. It is a well known fact in history of language, that Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai, Tatar, Bashkir, Kumyk languages are referred to the group of Kipchak languages.

When all is said and done, the researchers who made a great contribution to the development of global Turkic studies, over a period of sovereign development of the state, attach a great importance to the integration problem of the Turkic world, emphasizing the fact that the Turkic language takes a significant place in the history of Kazakh people. The heritage left by our ancestors is bottomless ocean of rich spiritual values.

In this article, we would like to focus on the roots and root-stems in Kipchak languages which are regarded as one of the largest branches of the Turkic roots study. They are considered in the area of common structural models and stands out for its peculiar phonetic-phonological characteristics. Therefore to study the monosyllables of modern Kipchak languages in comparison with the monosyllables in ancient Turkic languages is the actual problem which enables to understand the nature of Turkic monosyllables.

MATERIAL AND METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

In this study we used various research techniques to portray an objective picture of the materials of Turkic manuscripts of the VI-IX centuries which show the extensive use of the VC form consisting of vowels and consonants in the structural system of Turkic roots and that helped to shape the main reasons for studying the VC structural models of monosyllables in ancient Turkic and Kipchak languages group, namely Kazakh, Bashkir, Kumyk, Nogai languages.

Key findings of the research were obtained through the use of the comparative-historical and comparative contrastive methods and also etymological, word-formative and morphemic analysis. The use of these research methods is conditioned by the study of VC structural models of monosyllables.

In the context of the research we carry out the materials for analysis and conclusions illustrations were taken from the materials of Turkic manuscripts of the VI-IX centuries.

At the same time we used a method of content analysis to examine 6 languages of Kipchak group.

DISCUSSIONS AND RESULTS

Studying the phonetic structure of root morphemes of the Turkic languages from different sides N.A. Baskakov gives his conclusion that the Turkic roots have CVC form on the basis of the Karakalpak language data (Baskakov, 1952:101) and considers that the example of long vowels use cannot reveal the true nature of Turkic root, as an argument against V. Kotvich's theory, who believes that Turkic roots are open syllable consisting of two sounds (Baskakov, 1962:17). Pointing to the fact that all Turkic roots originally used as a closed syllable consisting of three sounds, he says. "The rest of two-sound and monotonous roots in the Turkic languages are rare exceptions, and historical roots date back to three-sound roots with lost initial or final, or both consonants as a result of phonetic development" (Baskakov, 1969:89).

The scientist considers the models of CVCC form of four sounds as the stems, formed by addition of non-productive or dead affixes to CVC model or borrowed words, and the models of V form like ö "oilau", u "uyky", ï "osimdik" reduced from CVC form to VC form, and then to model V ($ï < \gamma i < jig$ "thick, frequent, tight", $ö < ög \sim ök \sim oj \sim oj \sim od < *bög$ "to think"). In his latest works A.N.Baskakov deepens his theory about root structure and attaches importance to significance of CV forms consisting of an open syllable in determining the Turkic roots nature. But he also reiterates that numerically CVC form is dominant and historical root. According to the researcher's statistics, models of CVC forms make up three quarters of all monosyllables in the ancient and modern Turkic languages (Baskakov,1979:145-146). Against N.A. Baskakov's view A.Zayonchkovsky argues that models of CV forms are found in the language of medieval monuments in great numbers and the

historic Turkic form was used in models of V, VC, CV, CVC forms (Zayonchkovsky, 1961:28-29).

If we consider the structure of root words in the language of ancient scripts "we can notice the separation of historical category of monosyllabic roots to some components on the basis of materials of one language", and the derivative forms found among monosyllabic ones can not be excluded. Kyrgyz scholar B.M. Yunusaliev, one of the first who widely considered the problems of roots in the Turkic languages, says that in addition to two-syllable and polysyllabic words in the vocabulary of the dead roots are preserved in monosyllabic lexemes "Deadened roots do not disappear. They have lost only their lexical independence, but their sound matter continues to live in one form or another in the stem of newly formed root words", and even "... derived forms may lose their independence". (Yunusaliev, 1952:185). Based on the root words *sa* "san, sanau", etc. occurring in the language of the Orkhon monuments, the scientist believes that a dead root of the lexems *bay, baw, ban* in the modern Turkic languages is the form **ba*. (Baskakov, 1969:89).

Academician A.T. Kaydar who took monosyllabic roots and root stems in Turkic linguistics as an object of study and comprehensively investigated the nature of root on the basis of large-scale linguistic material from structural, semantic and statistical points. Analysing all the views and conclusions, he expresses his opinion about the formation of monosyllables of closed syllable, consisting of three sounds as follows: "Firstly, because the changes and shifts in the structure of roots are diverse and mixed: in the language development theoretically and practically CVC may turn into VC or CV, in the same way as the latter may, on the contrary, go to the CVC. In each case, they may have their reasons. ... Secondly, any change of the root morpheme in the direction of expansion and contraction of their structure are the result of legitimate phono-morphologic factors, acting throughout the historical development of the Turkic languages" (Kaidarov, 1986:323). The scientist who considers the nature of the Turkic roots from different sides in the framework of the Kazakh language for a long time, studies the terms of root and stem in the Turkic languages and offers a scientific definition of these concepts, classified by the characteristic features. He draws the conclusion that "separability of monosyllabic roots-stems in the Turkic languages ... is a real fact" based on specific linguistic data of the well-known scientists linguists-turkologists headed by V.V. Radlov (Kaidarov, 1986:323). Language data that shows some monosyllables and dissylables are the result of agglutinative process for a long time, which may be evidence of the validity of the scholars' opinions, and important theoretical conclusions have been refined.

Studying homogeneous monosyllables in the Turkic languages from the point of homonymy of voice and name and defining the theoretical characteristics of syncretism on the basis of scale language data, E. Kajibekov says that "the traces of syncretism of parts of speech in the Turkic languages are found both in grammatical

level and on the basis of verb-noun homonymy of derivatives or word-forming affixes". He notes that it is necessary to pay attention to the latter phenomenon, that is coincidence may occur in the part of monosyllables with verb and noun meaning, formed by means of affixes (Kajibekov, 1986: 270). The scientist who viewed multifunctionality of roots based on the nature of monosyllabic syncretism as a way of word formation used before the agglutinative period, notes that "From semasiological point syncretic semantics of Turkic root is the remnant of the semantic system of the ancient proto-language. Therefore, analyzing the Turkic languages diachronically, it is necessary to pay special attention to the direction of development the Turkic word meaning from general to specific". (Kajibekov,1986: 270). In his following work devoted to the definition of semantic character of Turkic word the scientist makes comprehensive analysis of phono-morpho-lexical-semantic structure of mono-root words and notes that in solving complex linguistic issues it is important to learn monosyllabic level (Kajibekov, 1998).

Scientist J. Mankeeva who has determined the rich fund of dead roots in the verbs, used in the language in course of morphemic-competent analysis of the verbal stems in the Kazakh language, says that the component *t* in the imperatives *ajt, art, ket* in the Kazakh language is a word forming suffix (Mankeeva, 1985:55, 1991:27). The scientist also distinguishes another 35 word forming models of the imperative verbs and concludes that "we consider many words in the modern language root words. In fact, they are historical derivative roots from the "dead" root and ending" (Mankeeva, 1988:68).

Bashkir scientist A. Shaikhulov who raises the problem of necessity to adhere to the new theoretical-methodological principles along with traditional methods in the study the Turkic roots, comes to the conclusion that in the course of monosyllable differentiation in the language of Turkic peoples living in the Volga-Ural from phonetic, morphological and phono-semantic point, almost half of more than 4,000 root-stems of Kipchak group languages of this region are with uncertain etymology and lost independence (Shaikhulov, 2000; 2004: 56). From the scientist's conclusion that to do structural characteristic of the Turkic roots can be successful only in the framework of a three-level (phonological, morphological, semantic) study we observe that in the study of root nature he adheres to the theoretical-cognitive direction and prefers to connect the immanent and cognitological analysis. He expresses the opinion that it is possible to reveal the traces of universe picture at the level of root in the languages of Altai family based on data of the Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash, Mongolian and Tungus-Manchu languages, thus "... in the language pictures of the world, Altaic languages we can identify common structural-semantic core, which expresses not only the common root stems but also motivating features, allowing to unite the lexemes in the thematic groups and semantic nest to consider them in the framework of ideographic paradigmatic" (Shaikhulov, 2004:56). The scientist's consideration points that semantic features of development of general Altaic inter-language lexical parallels consisting of independent and reconstructed

monosyllables corresponds to ideographic feature, covering their general content and onomasiological qualities.

The important views and conclusions about root study in Kazakh linguistic are shown in recent years, namely, from A.Salkinbai's works who investigates historic process of word-formation from semantic point (Salkynbai, 1999: 340), from Sh. Zhalmakhanov's works devoted to the problems of semantic derivation (Zhalmakhanov, 2003: 552), from M. Sabir's works who studied the medieval monuments connecting with the vocabulary of Kazakh language (Sabir, 2004) and U. Isabekova's works, who differentiates the way of development of paronyms (Isabekova, 2003).

It is clear that a small number of monosyllabic models cannot reveal the root system, which was the basis of the lexical foundation of our ancestors' language. There are many reasons why the volume of the monosyllables in the language of ancient monuments are smaller than the monosyllables of modern Turkic languages: firstly, they have not been read completely; secondly, it is connected with the individual authors' and printer's use of words and with the richness of the language and individual style; thirdly, impact on the language development of 1300 years' natural law. Despite the fact that three monosyllables: V, VC and CV in the language of ancient manuscripts are small in number, they enable to determine the main features of the ancient Turkic language.

Although the two-part root morpheme consisting of vowels, consonants were used in the ancient and modern Turkic languages as a lexeme with an independent meaning, there is no consistent opinion on the way of formation of this form. Most of the researchers (A. Zayonchkovski (1961), E.V. Sevortyan (1962), A.N. Kononov (1982), A.M. Scherbak (1994), B.M.Yunusaliev (1959), A.T. Kaidar (1986) and others) recognize monosyllables of open syllable as a unit of language used from the very beginning, they believe the concept about the primacy of **VS** models unfounded and offer to consider it within **CVC** models based on A.N.Baskakov and V.V.Radlov's views about prosthetic nature of anlaut consonants, G.I. Ramstedt's opinion about the impact of sandhi laws on anlaut sounds, as well as the works of scientists like G.Derfer and V.A.Serebrennikov etc. (Baskakov, 1988: 207). Though two part monosyllables consisting of the vowel and consonant were widely used in both ancient Turkic and modern Kipchak languages as the lexeme with an individual meaning, but there is not any consistent view about it. Some monosyllables of **VC** model are used as an individual lexeme in the language of monuments and some can be distinguished from disyllables and polysyllables (Yeskeyeva, 2016).

The oldest written records are found upon stone monuments in Central Asia, in the Orhon, Yenisey and Talas regions within the boundaries of present-day Mongolia. These were erected to Bilge Kaghan (735), Kültigin (732), and the vizier Tonyukuk (724-726). The given examples are taken from the written records of these monuments. Pay attention to the following examples:

VC	Meaning	Languages						
		Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
ab	hunting animals and birds, entertainment	aw	aw	av	aw	aw	aw	av
aγ → aγï	jewelry, treasures, gifts.	aqša, aqï, aqïq	aqša, aqï	aqša, aqï	akča, akï	akča, akï	akča, akï	aqča, γaq

Altun, kümüš, isigti, qutaj buŋsiz anča birir tabγač budun savï süčig, ayïsï jumčaq ermis "Tabgach people who give limitless gold, silver and silk were so generous and their treasure was so precious" KTk. 5 (Aidarov, 1995: 169). The ancient Turkic monosyllable *aγ* stored in the Kazakh lexemes (Mankeeva, 1997: 27) which is considered the borrowings: *aqša* "banknote" *aqï* "payment for something", *aqïq* "precious stone".

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
ad → adaγ/adaq	foot	ajaq	ajaq	ajaq	ajaq	ajaq	ajaq	ajaq

Türk budun adaq qamaštdi "The Turkish people's legs are tired"

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
ad → adïnčïγ	other, another, special	aγrïqša/ erekše	ajrïq	ajrïq	ajrïq	ajrïq	ajrïq	ajrïq

Aŋar adïnčïγ barq jaraturdïm "I build special house for them" KTk. 12 (Aidarov, 1995: 170)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
ad → adiril	to break away	ajïril	ajïril	ajïril	ajïril	ajeril	ajïril	ajïril

Qara Čur esiz ... öztige ujalarïna adïrilmiš "Poor Kara Chur, lost the nests and the relatives" Tal. 2 (Amanjolov, 2003: 44)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
ad → adγïr	stallion	ajγïr	ajγïr	ajγïr	ajγïr	ajγïr	ajγïr	ajγïr

Kültegin Bajïrqunïŋ aq adγïrïγ binip oplaju tegdi "Kultegin took the white stallion of old times and came into the attack" KTg. 35 (Aidarov, 1995: 179)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
az	little	az	az	az	az	az	az	az

az budunïγ üküš qïltïm "Made more people from a small nation" KTk. 10 (Aidarov, 1995: 170). The monosyllable *az* is related to the forms *ar → aršï* "to clean", *ar → arïq* "to become emaciated", *az → azuw* "to thin".

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
aj	moon, month	aj	aj	aj	aj	aj	aj	aj

Toquzïnč aj jiti otuzqa joq ertürtimiz "We buried on the twenty seventh of the nineth month"

VC	Meaning	Languages						
		Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
aq	white, grey	aq	aq	aq	aq	aq	aq	aq
	Alp šalčï aq atïn binip oplaju tegdi "The giant Shalshi went to attack on a white horse" KTg. 42 (Aidarov, 1995)							
ar → arïq	thin, to be tired, to fatigue, to be exhausted	*arïq,* *arïp – ašuw*	arïq	arïq	arik	arïnya	arïnya	arïq
	The meaning "thin, to lose weight" in the language of the monuments also is used in the meaning "to tire". *Arïq oqsen* "You are a tired genus" KTk. 8.							
al	to take, to get, to receive	al	al	al	al	al	al	al
	Bilig bilmez kisi ol sabïy alur … "a man who knows nothing takes the floor …" KTk. 7 (Aidarov, 1995: 169)							
el → elig	hand	el	el	el	el	el	el	el
	The word *elig* was remained in Kazakh word of measurement *eli*: *Eki eli auyzga tort eli kakpak koyu* "To keep the mouth shut" (saying).							
el	1 "tribal alliance"; 2 "people"	el	el	el	əl	ijl	ijl	el
	The sound marks *i, e* in Orkhon-Yenisei alphabet is common, therefore the word *el* is also read as *il* in the texts of the monument. *Qayanin anta ölürtimiz, ilin anta altïmïz* "We killed the khan and then conquered the country" KTg. 38 (Aidarov, 1995: 179).							
ol	he, this, that	ol	ol	ol	ol	ul	ul	ol
	Ol jirgerü barsar, türk budun öltečisisen "If you go to that place, Turks, you are wretched" KTk. 8 (Aidarov, 2000: 169).							
ot	fire	ot	ot	ot	ot	ut	ut	ot
	Türgis qayan süsi Bolčuda otča, borča kelti "The army of Turgis khagan came as the fire and as the storm in Bolshu" KTg. 37 (Aidarov, 1995: 179).							
ök → ökin	to regret, to sorrow	ökin	ökin	ökin	ökin	ükin	ükin	ökin
	Antay ödke öküniin "regretted at that time" KTy. 40 (Aidarov, 1995: 179)							

VC	Meaning	Languages						
		Kaz.	KKalp.,	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
oq	an arrow	oq	oq	oq	oq	uq	uq	oq

On oq qayani jayï mïz erti "The khagan of On ok (ten arrows) was our enemy" Ton. 19 (Aidarov, 2000: 42)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
uč	to fly (to die)	uš	wuš	wuš	wuš	oč	os	wuš

učuq "bird", *jayïmïz tegire učuq teg erti* "The enemies around us are alike birds of prey" Ton. 8 (Aidarov 2000: 105); *uča bapmïs* "flied" KTg. 16 (Aidarov, 1995: 174)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
üz	to break, to interrupt	üz	üz	üz	üz	öz	öz	üz

jinčge eriklig üzgeli učuz "It is easy to break thickness" (Aidarov, 2000:106).

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
üč	three	üš	üš	üš	üš	öč	ös	üš

Qamuγï bïš otuz süledimiz, üč jegïrmi sünüšdimiz "Altogether twenty five times were at war, and fought thirteen times" KTg. 18 (Aidarov, 1995: 175)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
ün	voice	ün	ün	ün	ün	ön	ön	ün
ül → ülug	part, portion, part, duty, fate	üles	üles		üleš			

Eki ülügi atlïγ erti "Two parts were Cavalry (on horseback)" (Aidarov, 2000: 104); *Anta kisre teŋri jarïlqazu qutïm bar üčün, ülügim bar üčün, ölteči buduniγ tiriγrü irittim* "After that God blessed us, due to my luck and my share, I raised the miserable people" (Aidarov, 1995: 177)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
id → idi	owner	je	je	je	ïje	ïjä	egä	ee

Ötuken jïšda jïg idi joq ermis "There was no a good owner in the hollows of Otuken" KTk. 4 (Aidarov, 1995: 168)

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
in	to go down (from the mountain)	in	ïjn	ïjn	ïjn	öŋ	öŋ	ïjn

jobalï intimiz "came down with difficulty" Ton. 26 (Aidarov, 2000: 108). In the ancient Turkic language the meaning "to come down" of the monosyllable *in* was remained in the word *in* with the meaning "the habitat of small animals and insects under the ground, hole"

VC	Meaning	Kaz.	KKalp.	Nog.	Kirg.	Tam.	Bashk.	Kum.
is	business, occupation	is	ïjs	ïjs	ïjs	əš	əš	ïjš

isig-küčig birür, bunča törüg qazγanïp, inim Kültegin özinče kergek boldï "Having transferred his business and force to others and gathering all the people, my brother Kultegin heroically died in the fatal hour" KTg. 30 (Aidarov 2000: 177)

CONCLUSION

Not surprisingly, the problem of root structure has always been in the centre of Turkology researchers' attention. There a lots of papers dedicated to the investigation of the structure of Turkic languages roots, the origins of these languages, analyzing their genetic affinity. Their results made it possible to solve a number of theoretical and practical issues not only in Turkic but also in Kazakh linguistics as the Turkic language takes a significant place in the history of Kazakh people. The heritage left by our ancestors is bottomless ocean of rich spiritual values.

The study's results on roots and root-stems in Turkic language show that the formation and development of root level in language are based on phonetic, phonological, morphologic, semantic, onomastiological phenomena and on the external form and the internal content of structural models of monosyllables as to understand the nature of the root. The fact that it is a historical tradition that in Turkic languages only monosyllabic words are really root and disyllabic and monosyllabic words are the result of complication of monosyllabic ones. On the basis of the VC model which similar in meaning and form it can be seen that it developed from the V model consisting of a vowel or a half long vowel.

Moreover, language data that shows some monosyllables and dissylables are the result of agglutinative process for a long time, which may be evidence of the validity of the scholars' opinions and important theoretical conclusions have been refined.

Abbrevations

Kaz.	Kazakh language
KKalp	Karakalpak language
Nog.	Nogai language
Kum.	Kumuk language
Tat.	Tatar language
Tur.	Turkish language
Kirg.	Kirgiz
Bashk.	Bashkir language

Reference

Aidarov, G., (1995). Kultegin monument . Almaty: Mother tongue Press.

Aidarov, G., (2000). The language of Tonikuk monumant (YIII C.). Almaty: Mektep Press.

Amanjolov, A., (1996). The history of Turkic Philology and Writing. Almaty: Sanat Press.

Amanjolov, A., (2003). History and Theory of Old Turkic Writing. Almaty: Mektep Press.

Aragachi, Z.B., Batmanov, I.A. and G.F., Babushkin, (1962). The modern and ancient Eniseyka. Frunze: Publishing house of Academy KirgSSR.

Baskakov, N.A., (1952). Karakalpak language. Moscow: Publishing house of ASUSSR.

Baskakov, N.A., (1962). Studies of Altaic languages. Moscow: Nauka Press.

Baskakov, N.A., (1969). Introduction to the Study of Turkic Languages. Moscow: Nauka Press.

Baskakov, N.A., (1979). Historical and typological morphology of Turkic Languages (structure of words and the mechanism of agglutination). Moscow: Nauka Press.

Baskakov, N.A., (1988). Historical and typological phonology of Turkic languages. Moscow: Science Press.

Batmanov, I.A., (1971). The ancient Turkic dialects and their reflection in modern languages. Frunze: Ilim Press.

Derfer, G., (1976). 'Vorosmanishe (die Entwickung der oghusischen Sprahen von den Orchonschriften bis zu Sultan Veled)', Türk Dili Araştırma Yıllığı, Ankara.

Dmitriyev, N.K., (1949). Materials of Kymik language. Languages of Northern Kaukaz and Dagestan.

Dyykanova, Ch.K., (1985). On the origin of monosyllabic roots of structural types and VVC and VVCC in Kyrgyz language. Issues of Turkic linguistics. Alma-Ata: Nauka Press.

Haritonov, J.I., (1954). Types of verb stem in the Yakut language. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences Press.

Isabekova, U., (2003). Paronymous words in Kazakh language. Almaty: Nauka Press.

Kaidarov, A.T., (1986). Structure of Monosyllable Roots and Stems. Alma-Ata: Nauka Press.

Kashgari, M., (1960), (1961). Diwanu Luġat al-Turk (Arabic: Compendium of the languages of the Turks).

Kajibekov, E.Z., (1986). Verbal Noun Correlation of Homogenious Stem words in Turkic Languages. Alma-Ata: Nauka Press.

Kononov, A.N., (1982). History of learning Turkic languages in Russia. Moscow: Science Press.

Kormushin, I.V., (1971). The lexical-semantic development * qa in Altai languages // Turkic Lexicology and lexicography. Moscow: Science Press.

Kotvich, V.L., (1962). Research on the Altai languages. Moscow.

Kuryszhanov, A.K., (1970). Research on lexis of Old Kipchak Inscription of XII C. Turkic-Arabian Dictionary. Alma-Ata: Nauka Press.

Kyzlasov, A.S., (1998). Monosyllabbic roots and basic in the Khakas language.

Levin, G.G., (2001). Lexical-Semantic Parallels Orhon-Turkic and Yakut Languages: (In comparance with Altai, Hakass, Tuva languages). Novosibirsk: Nauka Press.

Mankeeva, J., (1985). Methods for the isolation of dead roots in the disyllabic verbs-imperatives // Problems of Turkic linguistics. Alma-Ata: Nauka Press.

Mankeeva, J., (1988). Morphological analysis of disyllabic verbs-imperatives in Kazakh // Problems of historical lexicology of Kazakh language. Almaty: Gylym Press.

Mankeeva, J., (1997). The character of the cultural and lexical nation. Almaty: Gylym Press.

Mussayev, K.M., (1984). Lexicology of Turkic languages. Moscow: Science Press.

Nadelyaeva, V.M., Nasilova, D.M., Tenisheva, E.R. and A.M., Scherbak, (1969). The old Turkic dictionary. Leningrad: Nauka Press.

Oruzbayeva, B.O., (1975). On the structural and morphological features of the root morpheme VC type in the Kyrgyz language.

Radlov, V.V., (1882). Phonetik der nördlichen Türksprachen. Leipzig.

Ramstedt, G.I., (1957). Introduction to Altaic linguistics: Morphology. Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign literature.

Sabir, M., (2004). The interconnection of Middle Turkic and Kazakh language vocabulary (on the basis of XIY century written manuscripts). Almaty: Kazakh University Press.

Salkinbai, A., (1999). Historic word-formation (semantic aspect). Almaty: Kazakh University Press.

Sayahova, L., and M., Usmanova, (2000). Bashkir-Russian, Russian- Bashkir Dictionary. St.Peterburg: BHV- Petersburg Press.

Scherbak, A.M., (1994). Introduction to Comparative Learning of Turkic Languages. St. Petersburg.

Serebrennikov, V.A., (1979). Comparative and Historical Grammar of the Turkic languages. Baku.

Sevortyan, E.V., (1962). The verb formation affixes in Azeri language. Moscow: Publishing of Eastern literature Press.

Sevortyan, E.V., (1974), (1980), (1989). Etymology dictionary of Turkic languages. Moscow. Volumes I – III. (Volume IV - coauthor – Levitskaya, L.S.).

Shaikhulov, A., (2000). The structure and ideographic paradigm of monosyllabic root bases in Kipchak languages of Ural-Volga region in the continuum of areal, Inter turkic and all Turkic vocabulary: Synopsys and taxonomy of cognitive sphere "Nature (non-living and living)". Ufa: Bashkir State University Press.

Shaikhulov, A., (2004). The problem of root basis and root words in Turkic languages // Turkology. No. 2, pp:56.

Tenishev, E.R., (1963). System of Yugur Language. Baku.1st Edn.

Vamberi, H., (1879). Die primitive Culture des turko-tatarischen Volkes. Leipzig.

Yunusaliev, B.M., (1959). Kyrgyz lexicology: Development of root words: Frunze: Ilim Press.

Yeskeyeva, M.K., (2016). 'V Structural Models of Monosyllables in Old Turkic Inscriptions and Modern Kipchak Languages', The Russian Federation Bulletin of the Kalmyk Institute for Humanities of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 23(1):156-165.

Zayonchkovski, A., (1961). On the structure of roots in Turkic languages: verb stems monosyllabic (one syllable) type C+V(consonant + vowel)// Problems of Linguistics: No. 2, pp:28-29.

Zhalmakhanov, Sh., (2003). Semantic derivation of Kazakh lexics. Karagandy: Kar SU, 552 p.