K.K. Molgazhdarov[1], B. Ziadauly[2]

[1]Sh.Ualikhanov Kokshetau university, Kokshetau, 020000, Republic of Kazakhstan
[2]Kazakh Ablaikhan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, 050000, Republic of Kazakhstan

THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF OLD TURKIC WORDS

Language has been the primary means of communication since the creation of mankind. Gesture communication of the first people and then language evolved along with civilization, forming languages through divisions such as geographical environment and political class. Language is a living organism being born anew, developing, and then dying, disappearing from the surface of the earth. As an argument, the Latin language can be mentioned, which plays a key historical role. Although it is a dead language, the languages separated from the Latin branch are a reflection of European languages today.

The article examines the specific lexical meaning and etymology of some incorrectly translated words or words with different meaning used in Old Turkic runic written monuments. In addition, when considering the research material of the Old Turkic language, they were compared based on the materials of the Middle Turkic and modern Turkic languages. It is mainly compared with the lexical fund and grammar of the Kazakh language and is considered as the main connecting language.

Key words: Orkhon-Yenisei, Turkic, runes, etymology, Kazakh language, translation, written monuments.

MAIN PROVISIONS

During the years of independence, we have made sure that in society as a whole, regardless of the branch of science, our country is developing at an unusually fast pace, gaining prestige in world history. Domestic scientists, in particular, devote their scientific research to the ancient roots of our native language, the history of its formation, the origin of words and original meanings.

And today's Turkic-speaking peoples, including the history of the Kazakh language, the development of languages from one linguistic family, are one of the relevant problems in the field of comparative linguistics and Turkology.

Three related groups of world languages are known: Indo-European, Sino-Tibetan and Ural-Altaic. The prosody of a word or morphological structure is taken as the classification features of their grouping. If prosodics is taken, one should rely on stress, syllable and vowel harmony. If morphological structure is considered, we should rely on the fusional, isolating agglutinative features.

INTRODUCTION

Here is a more detailed description of the lexical composition of Turkic languages, which are the root of the modern Kazakh language. Information about the lexical and phonetic structure of the Old Turkic languages can be found in ancient Turkic monuments written in the VI-VIII centuries. The oldest written monuments testify that Turkic words were either homogeneously hard or soft, root words were one-syllable, new words were created by attaching various suffixes to these roots. Moreover, there are fused and paired words in these monuments. Assuredly, the lexical stock of Turkic languages of that time cannot be compared with the modern one. For example, the word "ton" at that time meant the general name of clothing. The phrase on the monument "Ichıre ashsyz, tashra tonsyz" [1, 147] means "Without food, without clothes". The fact that the word "Ton" was used until recently in the meaning of clothes is evidenced by such proverbs and stable phrases in the Kazakh

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023
Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023
ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

language as "As – attynıkı, toy — tondynıkı" (A wake for those who have a horse, a feast for those who have rich clothes), "Körgen zherde ton syily, körmegen zherde boi syily" (Meet by clothes, see off by mind), "Tonnyŋ ıshkı bauyndai" (To be in friendly relations). The words "syrtky kiım" (outerwear), ıshkı kiım (underwear), which are now used in Kazakh, were previously used as "syrtky ton", "ıshkı ton".

Therefore, it can be seen here that the Kazakh language belongs to the Altai family, the Turkic language group. However, old Turkic words are found not only in the Kazakh language, but also in other fraternal nationalities, undergoing only phonemic changes and scope of application. For example, in the Kazakh language, the word "Keruen" has the same meaning as the migration of merchants, in Bashkir there was a phonemic change as "Khareuan", also a change from the lexical side can be seen, because the translation of this word is "shopping center". However, despite the fact that it has two different meanings in the two languages, the etymology comes down to the word "trade" [2,65]. In addition, Old Turkic words were reflected in the Kazakh language and came into use without losing their meaning in the Russian language. Thus, in the modern Kazakh language the word "alma" (apple) in translation from Old Turkic means "is it red?". Therefore, the word "al" means "red". The proof of this is the word "alqyzyl", which is found in the Kazakh language. This word has found its reflection in the Russian language. The word "Al" probably means "aliy" (алый), which means "alqyzyl" (scarlet).

Basically, scholars are aware that the Old Turkic runic written monuments inherited from our ancestors constitute an important milestone and documentary material of research. The meaning, scope of application, specificity underlying the formation of words considered in our native language as modern root words, and being the basis for the creation of modern single-rooted words, which are preserved as part of dead roots or turned into the composition of long-formed complex words, stable word combinations, having indefinite personal meaning, not used independently is of great importance. Therefore, we want to draw attention to our research rationale related to the origin and existing lexical meaning of some words originating from the Old Turkic language.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Comparative-historical, retrospective, areal, static, etymological research methods were used in the study. The author quoted and compared previously expressed opinions about the etymology of an ethnonym and only after that offered their assumption. Such voluminous studies of the works of scientists A. Gaidar, K. Sartkozhauly, V. Makhpirov, T. Kairken, L. Gumilev, as well as "Ancient Turkic Dictionary", "Dictionary of Turkic Languages" by M. Kashgari are taken as a basis. For example, in the Small inscription of Kültegin, which begins as follows: "Sabymyn tüketı esıdgıl: ūlayū ını-yıgünım, oğlanym, bırıkı oğūshym bodūnym...", the word "ūlayū" in the sentence in Russian means " having followed me", in Kazakh "all", "bound, connected". [1, 33; 2, 6; 3, 178]. In the Russian translation the meaning of the word ūlayū is conveyed correctly, in the modern Kazakh language this word is not found. But if the peculiarities of historical formation by lexical meaning are to be analyzed, by structure, dividing it into root and suffix, then, in fact, it was formed on the basis of the original lexical meaning of this word in the Kazakh language. In the inscriptions of the Middle Turkic period there is the root *ūla* meaning "to attach, to extend", which served as a lexical basis for the word *ūlayū*. For example: Ol yıp ūlad*y* – He spliced the thread (MQ III 255). Already then it was noticed that it was also used in figurative meanings, e.g., to drag on, to continue. The noun "ūlağ" formed from the root *ūla* (join, adjacency, accession, connection/link) (SUV. 614.12), "ūlağ-sapyğ" has the meaning "row, line" (SUV. 1279). The forms of the verb "Ūla" were "ūlan, ūlash, ūlat". "Ūla" is still used in the sense of "to attach" in a number of modern Turkic languages (e.g., Uyghur). Although in Kazakh the word "Ūla" is not used as such, the verb formed from it "Ūlas" (to go on, let there be feasts all the time) is used. The word "Ūlan-baitaq" in our language is formed from the root "ūla". If the word combination "ūlan-baitaq" means "without borders, vast", then in the Old Turkic language this word meant "limitless" (SUV. 351.15). Consequently, there is reason to believe that the modern words ūlas, ūlan were formed on the basis of reciprocal and reflexive forms of the voice of

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023

Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

the Old Turkic verb "Ūla". Based on the lexical meaning of the phrase "ūlsyz-tüpsız", we can assert that the above verb ūla is a derived root, not a primal root. If the primal root were "ūla", this phrase would be pronounced ūl*a*syz. But the suffix of negation is connected to the root "ūla". Therefore, the primary root must be "ūl". And in the form of "ūla" we see that in the Old Turkic language there are two roots of "ūla" in the meaning of foundation, base, fundament and in the meaning of squashing, thinning. But it is too early to say which of them formed the basis of the root "ūla", meaning "accession". Here we can only conclude that the first root is "ūl", based on the fact that the suffixes attached to the word are different (ūla, ūlsyz). The words ūlğart (increase (imperative)) (TQ. 53), ūlğad (increase) (MQ. II 268), ūlūğ (big, great) (TQ. 5), ūlūsh (country, settlement) (Uig II 37) are formed from the Old Turkic root "ūl". For example: Arqūi qarağūğ ūlğartdym - I enhanced the security of the Arqūi (TQ. 93).

RESULTS

As a result, the initial root of the words "ūlğai, ūlğait, ūly, ūlyq (chief, great), ūlys, ūlan (young man, guard), ūlas in our language is *ūl*, which we can recognize by the derived root *ūla* in the meaning of the verb "to attach" and "ūlsyz" in the meaning of limitless. All of these words were based on the lexical meaning that there is an increase as a result of accession, extension, connection to something else. For example: the word ūlūsh (ūlys) means settlement, winter settlement. This is known to be due to the continuation of the construction of one settlement with another. Thus, as for the original word *ūlayū*, it should be an adverb formed from the verb *ūla*, with the meaning of *ongoing, united*. When in the Old Turkic language it is said "Ūlayū ını-iıgünım, oğlanym-oğūshym, bodūnym", it indicates the meaning of "what goes on, comes from me, is connected with me, refers to me". In the Old Turkic language, there was also a form of *ūlaty* in the sense of "more, and". For instance: *Öglı qaŋly ūlaty kıshı oğūl – mother, father and wife, child.* Here "and" means *ongoing, more.*

In the Large inscription of Kültegin there are such sentences as "Kültegin yadağyn oplaiū tegdı (KTü 32). Azman aqyğ bınıp oplaiū tegdı (KTü 45). Az yağyzyn bınıp oplaiū tegdı" (KTü 45). The phrase *oplaiū tegdı* is translated into both Russian and Kazakh as "rushed into the attack". [1, 42; 2, 23; 3, 175]. It is known that the word "tegdı" in the phrase is the verb *tidı* (touched, affected, concernd) in the modern Kazakh. And "oplaiū" is an adverbial form. In the dictionary of M. Kashgari there is a verb "op", which is the root of this word. For example: Yer su opdy – a man drank water» (MQ I.172). This root is also used in the modern Kazakh language in the meaning of "to eat greedily", etc. For example, the explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language says: Arlan auyzyn arandai ashyp bır ret qar obyp aldy. Körsetshı zhaiyn bolyp opqanyŋdy (Arlan opened his mouth wide and scooped up snow. Greedily, trying to grab more). [4, 370]. "Obyrdai opty" (ate every last crumb, to be insatiable) etc. depending on the vowel or consonant affix attached to the root, the last -p sound changes to -b (ob). Consequently, the root of the Old Turkic word *oplaiū* is *op*, from which the derived root verb *opla* is formed giving the meaning "crushingly, assertively, devastatingly". *Oplaiū tegdı* has the meaning of *having trampled, ruined, destroyed*. In our language we have the word *oba* (plague) formed from the root *op*, which became the name of a particularly dangerous, devouring ailment, there are the words "obyr-obyq" etc., which means voracious, insatiable, *öp* was also formed on the basis of *op*.

In the Kazakh language, there is the word *ūryn*, which is used only in the phrase "ūryn kelu, ūryn baru". In the explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language the meaning of this phrase is interpreted as secretly coming to the village with gifts to the daughters-in-law of the betrothed girl. In the old Turkic language there is a word "ūry" meaning "ūl" (son, boy). For instance: Ūrym üch… yertegı – Ūlym üsheu…edı (I had three sons) (C 6). Yana yandrū kelme ai yersıg ūry – Do not come back, young boy (QBN 277). Täŋrı ūrysy – God's son (Uig II.31). Also there are such combinations as ūry-oğlan (MQ I. 88), ūry-oğūl (Ye 48), etc. The root of the word "ūry" should have been "ūr". Because with this word in the Old Turkic language there are words *ūrağūt – woman, ūrğuğ - seed, embryo*. The common root for all of them is "ūr", as well as the word "ūryp soğu" in Old Turkic language, meaning "to beat", but we cannot say that "ūry" (thief) is formed from the "ūr", because

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023   Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023   Philological Series. № 4, 2023
ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

they do not have semantic proximity. There is no other root with "ū"" in the Old Turkic language based on the word "ūryn". Homogeneous words to the word "ūry", which in the Kazakh language are written as *ürım-būtaq* (in the Kyrgyz language ūrym-pūtaq (progeny)), ūryq-zhūrağat, ru, ru-taipa, come from the root "ūr". Thus, the word "ūryn" in the phrase "ūryn kelu" (to go) must be created by adding the affix "n" to the root "ūry" in the meaning of *guy (boy, man, son), to come (to go)*. For example: Byltyr ūryn baryp kelgen. Takezhan yendı osy zhaqynda üilenbek (Takezhan visited the bride's house last year. He's going to get married soon) (M. Auezov). From the use of the phrase "ūryn baru" in this sentence, it is clear that this is not a secret, but a public visit, a kazakh custom when a young man goes to the village to his future wife. To summarize, the following words are derived from the root "ūr": ūry, ūryq, ūl, ūrpaq, ūlys, ūlyq, ūru (genus), ūryn, etc.

The word "moiyn" (neck) in the Kazakh language is used in other languages of Turkic origin (Turkish, Uzbek, Uighur, Tatar, Karaite, etc.) in the form of "boyūn", which means neck and related organs. In the Middle Turkic inscriptions of "Qutty bilik", in the dictionary of M. Kashgari were also used in the form of "boyūn". E.g.: boyūn ber (QBN 183), boyūn chap (Mq 11), boyūn yeg (bend one's head, to bow) (QBK 327), boyūn sū – to obey. Ol aŋar boyūn sūdy (MQ 111, 248) – He/she obeyed him/her, etc. The word *sū* means *to stretch* in the latter phrase "boyūn sū". For example: Ol maŋa yüŋ sūdy (MQ 111, 248) – He sorted/stretched the wool for me. Thus, the literal meaning of the phrase boyūn sū means "bend one's head, to bow" and the figurative meaning is "to obey, to submit to the will". Despite the fact that the word "boyūn" is formed in our language as a moiyn (moyūn), when adding sū to the word boyūn, from a semantic point of view, the verb "boysūnu" (to obey) in our language, apparently, retained the sound composition of the first word "boyūn". Boy+ūn+sū, boy+sū+ūn, the latter monosyllable word was replaced with the -ūn suffix at the beginning and probably one of the two vowels of "ū" that came together was omitted and became "boysūn". The basis for this should be the correspondence of the lexical meaning and sound composition of the phrase "boyūn sū".

In the Old Turkic runic script, the interjections *oq/ök* are used in the modern Kazakh language in the same meaning and in the same form as -aq. There are virtually no assumptions about the origin of this form. However, in the research work of N.K. Dmitriev there is an opinion about this interjections. The scientist connected it with the word oq/ök, meaning "arrow, bullet". [5, 130]. N. Gadzhieva, B. Serebrennikov confirm the concept of N. Dmitriev "We have already mentioned the amplifying-excretory particles go, ku, oq, ök, which are obviously based on an etymological single particle associated with the element -q/k" [6, 247]. The dictionary of M. Kashgari gives "a suffix that gives a verb a shade of meaning or gives meaning". For example*: «Baiya oq keldım – bayağyda-aq keldım – I came a long time ago; barğyl oq – barğyn-aq»* [7, 66]. And in the ancient Turkic dictionary, five meanings of the *oq* word are given, including the meaning of interjection. [8, 369-382]. Thus, the ancient Turkic words *oq/ök* are an auxiliary words/interjectios that enhances the meaning in the Kazakh language. This one is not an interjection like ta/da in the Kazakh language and has only one variant. Among the monuments, it was used only on Tonyukuk (Tonyuquq). However, it is more common than the others. For example:

Old Turkic language: *Özüm ök qağan qysdym (TQ.6) – Özım-aq khan qyldym – I made him a khan myself. Isıg-küchıg bertım oq (TQ.52) – I did gave all my power (energy). Anta aiğuchu yeme ben ök yertım (TQ.50) – And the only sage there was me.* As can be seen from the examples, the faces "oq/ök" are attached to pronouns and verbs, complementing and enhancing the meanings of these words. The originality of this form lies in the fact that these two variants of "oq/ök" are attached to words despite the hard and soft sounds of the words. Мысалы: In the modern Kazakh language, this form is one of the most actively used ones. For example:

Kazakh language: *Manadan ündemei-aq tūr yedı, qyza kele, shynynda, shydai almady – He/She stood silent, but the situation was heating up and he/she couldn't stand it (G.M). Zhyrlağan torğaidai-aq yeŋ bır näzık ünnıŋ zhüzındei, audarmai ūzaq ūstap tūruğa shamasy kelıp tūr – You were like a singing sparrow... (G.M). Ondağy sebep bıreu-aq – There was only one reason (S.M). Bi aldyna barmai-aq bır at-shapan aiypty aldy, būl zhataq – Without even going to a judge, he could escape a severe punishment (M.A).*

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023
ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023

This ancient element is widely used in the written heritage of the Middle Ages and is found in different sound variations in most modern Turkic languages. For instance: *Old Turkic – oq/ök, kazakh, karakalpak – aq, kyrgyz – aq, uzbek, nogai – oq, tatar – uk/ük; tuva – kha; turkmen – aq/yek, akh; shor – oq; khakas – okhök; oirat – ok; chuvash – akh/yekh, aq, etc.*

The forms *ğu/gü/kük* in Old Turkic runic inscriptions bear the function of interjections *qoi/ğoi* (isn't it/doesn't it, auxiliary verbs for concretization, as, you know, etc.), which in Kazakh language bear the meaning of concretization. Although the word order is similar to Kazakh, in that era there were no word combinations with modal words *(bar – to have, zhoq – do not have, yemes - not, etc.).* In general, the given form served to clarify the point expressed in the sentence. For example:

Old Turkic language: *Bödke körügme begler gü yaŋyltachysyz (KTk.11) – Taqqa qūmar bekter ğoi zhaŋylysatyndar – It is high-ranking officials who make mistakes because of a strong desire to get the throne. Yolda yeme ölti kük (TQ.16) – And on the roads/way there were deaths. Bıznı ölürtechı kük tımıs (TQ.30) – Bızdı öltırmekshı (talqandamaqshy) ğoi deptı – They say/said we are going to be killed/crushed.*

Kazakh language: *O da bäsekenıŋ ortasynda ğoi – Right in the midst of rivalry. Bız älı söz berılgen zhoq qoi dep yedık… - We said indeed there was no promise… (G.M). Sailaushy törenı arqağa taŋyp ıstep otyr ğoi – But the voter is tormenting the leader (B.M). Sız baisyz ğoi – But you are rich. Qasen kuä bolady ğoi - But Qasen will be a witness (B.M). Zaman solai ğoi, amal ne? – deidı – But it's life, you know. We do not have a choice (A.T).* Examples show that in the Kazakh language the grammatical meanings of words combined with this form are diverse. These forms of *ğu/gü/kük* are found only on the monuments of Kultegin and Tonyukuk. They appear in runic writings in combination with nouns and verbs, as well as adverbs, tones of approval and conclusion.

In modern Turkic languages, *ğu/gü/kük* forms undergo various phonetic changes and are used as in the meanings of ancient Turkic runic scripts. For instance*: old Turkic – ğu/gü/kük; kazakh, karakalpak – qoi/ğoi; kyrguz – ğö; uzbek – ku/ğu; tatar – kyi; turkish – ki; uigur – ku; chuvash - ki/kha; gagauz – ko,* etc.

The word *azu*, used only in the Small inscription of Kultegin, is a connective word *älde* in the Kazakh language with the meaning *or, either, whether*. For example: *Azu bu sabymda ıgıd bar ğu (KTk.10) – Älde būl sözımde zhalğandyq bar ma? – Or you think I am lying?.* The adjunctive conjunction *azu* came at the beginning of the sentence and served in the sense of doubt, prejudice or proceedings against the ambiguity of the action associated with the thought. In the grammar of the Kazakh language there is an assumption that the word *älde* (or) meaning *azu* comes from the Arabic language. It is noted that this form was originally among the prepositions in the interrogative sense, and then, after careful study, was included in the conjunction. [9, 236]. When comparing with other languages, it was found that in Tuva and Tofalar languages this form is used in the same form and in the same sense as in Old Turkic languages of written monuments. For example:

Tofalar: *Azy chü lään? Azy at paan, azy inäk poon - What is it? Either a horse or a cow. Azy alyr men baan, azy albas men baan? – Should I take or should not I?* [10, 265].

Tuva: *Daarta men Qyzylche azy Abacanche choruur – Tomorrow I will go either to Qyzyl or Abakan. Khovuda baraan köstür, mal be azy kharagan be, ylgavaindar men – There is something in the field: cattle or bush branches* [11, 452].

DISCUSSION

Such researchers as A. Gaben, A. Kononov, M. Scherbak take the root of this word "az – to go astray, to get lost" W. Thomsen (turcica 45-46); according to O. Pritzak azu<a-sein (Das Altturkische §48) in the sense of "or, only, whether" [12, 206]. M. Resenen is also based on this [13, 33]. In the Old Turkic dictionary the word azw has two meanings [8, 73]. M. Kashgari's dictionary gives the meaning of the form azw/azu as "ia, yaki is an auxiliary word denoting arbitrariness, volition in choosing one of two things". For example: *Ūzym yegıl azu qağūn yegıl – grapes yes melon explains by example* [7, 118]. In the field of Turkology there is no controversial opinion about the etymology of the word *azu*. We join the fact that this person is formed by both a homonymic verb and an

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023

Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023
ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

adjectival preposition (u). Thus, it was established that the word originated in the Orkhon-Yensei language of written monuments.

The first to express an opinion on the origin of the word *"üshın"* was the scientist O. Betling. For the scientist, the origin of the word is connected with the word "*ısh"* (gut) [14, 774]. This view was later supported by M. Resenen [13, 169-509]. Then the opinion was formed that the first assumption of the word *"üshın"* came from the word "*ısh"* (stomach, inner part), i.e. a noun. In the work of B. Todaeva the opinion of M. Castren is given against it. It is said that the origin of the interjection comes from the word "ūshy" (end), i.e. a word meaning the end of something. [15, 249]. H. Hadjeminoglu in his research said that V. Bang, M. Ergin, t. Bangunoglu also joined this viewpoint[16,84]. Also Z. Korkmaz points to the Old Turkic word "Üch" (cause, reason) and joins the opinion that the word "üshın" came from the word in the concept of "cause" [16,98]. E. Sevortyan's Etymological Dictionary shows that Karl Zaleman adheres to this opinion and connects it with the assumptions of Mr. Vambery, A. Elove and gives the identity composition for Üch: üchi Üch-i, üchi :ni-Üch-i: n-y, Üchur-Üch-(ü) [17, 643]. The researcher also believes that uchi, used in Turkmen, is derived from a verb. But for one, when it is said that its base comes from a noun and not from a verb, it is now assumed that one comes from a verb. N. Gabin and K. Brockelman also point to this base and the apposition of "-ın" as the third person ending of the possessive form". A. Shcherbak says in this context: "To summarize what has been said, it should be emphasized that a praform containing back vowels seems to be the most probable, and that it was most likely the form of the orudative case from üch "end", "goal" [18, 91]. The researcher further notes that the other declensions coincide with additive compounding and have a harder variant in Altaic, Kumyk and a softer variant in Karakalpak, noting that they tend to be compounded rather than suffixed. For the fourth point of view, the opinion of the researcher A. U. Elov that the word comes not from the verb, but from the noun "ösh" (repayment, retribution), is reflected in the study of A. Shukyurov. G. I. Ramstedt connects it with the verb "ıt" (ıch) (to watch, to look at) in Altai and Korean languages. And M. Kashgari's dictionary gives only the auxiliary word denoting the cause [7, 106]. The dictionary of the Old Turkic language indicates only that it is the subjunctive mood [8, 622]. A. M. Shcherbak makes it clear that "uchun" is used in the modern Altai language, as well as in Uzbek [18, 91]. The expert researcher of the Karakalpak language N.A. Baskakov gives the origin of words meaning "inside, from inside" as "gut, middle", and indicates the origin of words meaning "end, tip of something or peak". On the basis of such different considerations some say that addition is a union, others distinguish it as a suffix. That is, the suffix -ın in the word "üshın" is used by one as a suffix of the participle of help, and by another as a suffix of a preposition. Let us try to identify the first root of the word in modern Turkic languages. For example: Bashkir: Ösön, Turkish: ichin, chin, Karakalpak: ushyn, yuchin, Uzbek: uchun, Karaim: ichin, Karashay Balkan: yuchun, Crimea Tatar: ichun, chyun, üshın, Tatar: öchen, Tuvinian: uzhun, Turkmen: uchin [17, 642]. So, let's break down the composition of interjections into root and apposition from a historical perspective: üch-ün, ush-yn, üsh-ın, ch-in, ich-yun, öch-ön, yuch-un, roots: -üsh, üch, ush, ich, yuch, ch, and appositions: ün, yn, in, ın, ön, yun.

Summarizing the views on the origin of interjections in general, it can be concluded that:

the word for is derived from the nouns "ösh" and "ısh". The view is that it is the suffix of an auxiliary verb attached to it.

Connecting the word "üshın" with the word "ushy" (the edge of something), one of them says that it is formed from a verb through the prepositional form, and the other says that it is formed from a noun through the auxiliary participle.

The assumption is that the word "üshın" is formed by a preposition linking it to the verb "it".

The word *üshin* (for) comes from the word *sebep* (cause). It is the 3rd person form of the 3rd person auxiliary subjunctive mood associated with it.

We have a slightly different idea of the suffix attached to it, confirming the idea that the word "üshin" comes from nominals.

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023   Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023   Philological Series. № 4, 2023
ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

It is clear that the root of this word is the *ūsh (uch, üsh)* form . The opinion of scientists such as M. Castren, A. Shcherbak and the views of scientists that the concept of reason is formed from the word are semantically combined.

As for the suffix, the problem is not in the vowel (y-ı) sound, but in the phoneme *-n*.

This form was present in written monuments in various grammatical meanings.

In relation to the phonemes *-yn,- ın,-n*, which are found in the sources of Turkic languages, N. K. Dmitriev (1948), G. I. Ramstedt (1957), A. N. Kononov (1956), A. Aigabylov (1995) studies talk about the manifestation of word-generating properties in the creation of other word classes to varying degrees.

In fact, in the Orkhon-Yenisei language of written monuments, the form *-yn,- ın,-n* served different meanings in terms of grammatical indicators.

In general, the phoneme *-n* appears as the most unstable affix. For example, in the words yebın – üyin (your house), sabyn – sozın (your word), süsın – äskerın (your army) is the accusative case of the participle of success.

Yadağyn – zhayauymen, yalaŋyn – zhalaŋashymen, qağanyn – qağanymen. It is also possible to find out what is happening in the country.

The participle of the auxiliary in these words is also homonymous in first person with the suffixes of the preposition *-yn , -ın, -n* and the participle of the mood of Desirable: Ölürejın – öltirejın, uryğsyraytyn – ūryqsyratayin. According to N.K. Dmitriev, the form *-n* was originally the third-person suffix of the subjunctive, as well as it not only changed the personal nature of the participles "genetive case ,dative case,locative case,ablative case" but also sometimes appeared in the language and sometimes disappeared [5, 24]. Therefore, it is difficult to say that the "n" form is a third-person suffix of the dependent conjunction (since it acts in functions other than its meaning and sometimes disappears). However, based on the opinion that dependent conjunctions appeared earlier than adverbial conjunctions, then it is not surprising that the fused form in the composition of the adverbial conjunction is an ancient element of the dependent conjunction.

As evidence, there is an opinion in the work of B.A. Serebrennikov, N.Z. Hadzhyeva: "It is absolutely obvious that the system of possessive affixes appeared significantly earlier than the form of the genitive case" [6, 99]. A similar opinion can be found in the research of A.M. Shcherbak. The scientist gives his opinion, referring to what V. A. Bogoroditsky first drew attention to such a phenomenon: "The special position of the accusative paradigm contributed to the "penetration" of "n" into the case forms of the common (possessive) declension: by analogy, the initial "n" began to be used in the affixes of the genitive and accusative cases, first after the stem to the vowel (tashynyŋ – of his stone, balanyŋ – child's) and later, after all bases in all Turkic languages, except Oguz and Chuvash" [18, 33]. The author did not consider it on the basis of the opinion of scientists, which was only expressed in the volume of the affix. At the same time, he analyzes the study of R. Shaw (na vesh – on "thing"), which says that it came from a fully meaningful word, and proves that it is abstract. A scientist studying the etymology of the Kazakh language B. Sagyndykuly paid special attention to the problem of "n" ("н" letter of the Kazakh alphabet), weighed many grounds, in addition to the opinion of the named scientists, and made conclusions based on reasonable scientific data. We give the following example that there was a third person of the possessive endings: Teŋrı yarylqadyqyn üchün öz üm kutum bar üchün qağan olurtym – I became the kagan God blessed me and I had a happiness.

The interjection phrase "zharylqadyqyn üchün" in this sentence is on the third person of the dependent clause. Because first person yarylqaduqym üchün, second person - yarylqaduqyŋ üchün, third person – yarylqaduqyn üchün. He also gave examples of the appearance in the declension paradigm, showing that it translates into Kazakh as "zharylqağandyğy üshın" (for blessing). The third person of the singular form of the dependent participle explains in detail the presence of the full form *-yŋ, - ıŋ, -syn, -sın*. M. Shukyurov considers the emergence of such interjections from an isaphetic point of view. From this point of view, the word *üchün* was used Twenty (20) times in one Kultegin inscription monument. In particular, it is attached to twelve (12) words with the form *-yn, -ın, -n*. In the meantime, the above opinion does not decrease if it does not increase in importance. In other

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023
ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023

words, it is known that the phenomenon of isafety is related to the dependent clause. In conclusion, there was an effect on the combination of the forms *–-yn, -ın, -n* at the end of the combined words with the interjection for *üchün*. However, it still requires special study, paying attention to the appearance of the participle (instrumental, genitive, accusative) endings and participle (I-person), possessive (III-person) forms of this form and the preposition of the verb. So, the turkologist, etymologist B. M. Yunusaliyev: "Dead roots do not disappear without a trace. On the basis of the statement they are destroyed by lexical self-sufficiency, but their sound matter continues to live in wedding or in foreign form in the basis of newly formed words", we presented our morphological and etymological analysis regarding the etymology of some words in the language of ancient Turkic runic written monuments.

CONCLUSION

First President N.A. Nazarbayev said: "The people of our country should be proud of our great ancestors, and the names of the first Kagans, such as Bumyn, Estemi, Bilge Kagan, Kultegin can stand on a par with the names of other great military leaders and statesmen of antiquity". He emphasized and highly appreciated the heroic deeds of people seeking to preserve our land and become a state.

It is a great pride for us that another significance of the ancient monument for the Kazakh people is that our written culture, as an offshoot of Ata Turk, originates in the VI-VIII centuries.

In general, comparing the vocabulary system of our modern language with the ancient Turkic language of the V-VIII centuries, there is a tendency to reduce the number of syllables in words of antiquity. We clearly see this by the fact that modern two syllabic or polysyllabic words in the ancient Turkic language look monosyllabic. At the same time, we can say that it is a developed language with a rich vocabulary and a mature grammatical structure. This is distinguished by linguistic flexibility in the depiction of images, sharp analogies in ancient Turkic written monuments, the use of words in many meanings, rational linguistic uses that convey a lot of meaning , it is not difficult

The ancient Turkic language took its place in the system of world languages and entered into linguistic relations with other neighboring language groups. Especially today's direct expression of the ancient Turkic language occupies a huge place in the Kazakh language.

REFERENCES

1 Malov S.E. (1951), Коне тургі zhazba ескерткіshteri[Ancient Turkish written monuments]. – Moscow (In Kazakh)

2Ezhelgi dayir adebieti[Literature of ancient times](1991), Екinshi kitap. – Almaty (In Kazakh)

3Qarzhaubai S. (2003), Orhon muralary[Heritage of Orkhon], Birinshi kitap. – Astana(In Kazakh)

4 Qazaq tilinin qysqasha etimologiyalyq sozdigi(1966) [Brief etymological dictionary of the Kazakh language] . – Almaty (In Kazakh)

5 Dmitriev N.K. (1948), Grammatika bashkirskogo yazika[Grammar of the Bashkir language]. – Moscow-Leningrad(In Russian)

6 Serebrennikov B.A., Gadzhievaa N.Z. (1986), Sravnitelno-istoricheskaya grammatika turkskih yazikov[Comparative historical grammar of Turkic languages]. – Moscow(In Russian)

7 Egeubai A.Q. (1997), M.Qashqari Diuani lygat at-turk[M. Kashkari Diwani Lugat-it Turk]. – Almaty (In Kazakh)

8 Drevneturkskii slovar (1969)[Ancient Turkic dictionary] . – Leningrad(In Russian)

9 Qazaq tilinin grammatikasy (1967)[Grammar of the Kazakh language], Morfologiya.– Almaty (In Kazakh)

10 Rassadin V.I. (1978), Morfologiya tofolorskogo yazika v sravnitelnom osveshenii [Morphology of the Tofolor language in comparative light]. – Moscow(In Russian)

11 Ishaкov F.G., Palmbah A.A. (1961), Grammatika tuvinskogo yazika. Fonetika I morfologiya[Grammar of the Tuvan language. Phonetics and morphology]. – Moscow(In Russian)

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023

Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023

12 Kononov A.N. (1980), Grammatika yazika turkskoh runicheskih pamyatnikov VII-IX vv [Grammar of the language of Turkic runic monuments VII-IX centuries]. – Leningrad(In Russian).

13 Räsänen M. (1969), Versuch eines etymologischen Worterbuchs der Turksprachen. Heisinki(In Germany)

14 Böthlingk O. (1851), Ueber die sprahe der jakuten (In Germany)

15 Todaeva V.H. (1951), Grammatika sovremennogo mongolskogo yazika[Grammar of the modern Mongolian language]. – Moscow(In Russian)

16 Necmettin Hасıeminoğlu.(1992) Türk dilinde edatlar. Istanbul. -366s. (In Turkish)

17 Sevortyan E.V.(1974) Etymological dictionary of Turkic languages. M.: Publishing house Nauka -767 p. (In Russian)

18 Shcherbak A.M.(1987) Essays on the comparative morphology of the Turkic languages (Adverb, functional parts of speech, figurative words). L.: Nauka,. -152 p. (In Russian)

Көне түркі сөздерінің шығу тегі мен мағыналары жайлы

Қ.К. Молғаждаров[1], Б.Зиядаұлы[2]
[1]Ш.Уәлиханов атындағы Көкшетау университеті, Көкшетау, 020000, Қазақстан Республикасы
[2]Абылайхан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті, Алматы, 050000, Қазақстан Республикасы

Тіл адамзат жаратылғаннан бері негізгі қарым-қатынас құралы болды. Алғашқы адамдардың қарым-қатынасы ым-ишара болса, содан кейін тіл өркениетпен бірге дамып, географиялық орта, саяси тап сияқты жіктелу негізінде тілдер қалыптасты. Тіл – тірі организмнің жаңадан туып, дамып, кейін өліп, жер бетінен жойылып кетуі мүмкін. Дәлел ретінде тарихтан белгілі латын тілінің тағдырын айтуға болады.

Мақалада көне түркі руникалық жазба ескерткіштерінде қолданылған кейбір қате аударылған немесе басқа мағынада берілген сөздердің нақты лексикалық мағынасы мен этимологиясы қарастырылады. Сонымен қатар көне түркі тілінің зерттеу материалын қарастырғанда, оларды орта түркі және қазіргі түркі тілдері материалдары негізінде салыстырылып берілді. Негізінен қазақ тілінің лексикалық қоры және грамматикасы арқылы салыстырылып, басты байланыстырушы тіл ретінде негізге алынады.

Кілт сөздер: Орхон-Енисей, түрк, руника, этимология, қазақ тілі, аударма, жазба ескерткіштер.

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

1 Малов С.Е. Көне түркі жазба ескерткіштері. – Москва, 1951. – 246 б.

2 Ежелгі дәуір әдебиеті. Екінші кітап. – Алматы: «Ана тілі», 1991. – 221 б.

3 Қаржаубай С. Орхон мұралары. Бірінші кітап. – Астана, 2003. – 392б.

4 Қазақ тілінің қысқаша этимологиялық сөздігі. – Алматы – 196 б.

5 Дмитриев Н.К. Грамматика башкирского языка. – Москва-Лениград, 1948. – 272 с.

6 Серебренников Б.А., Гаджиева Н.З. Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. – М.: ІІ-издание Наука, 1986. – 302 с.

7 Егеубай А.Қ. М.Қашқари Диуани лұғат-ит түрк. -Алматы: Хант, 1997-1998. I-III том.

8 Древнетюркский словарь. – Ленинград: Наука. АН СССР, иност. языкознания. 1969. – 676 с.

9 Қазақ тілінің грамматикасы. Морфология. – Алматы: «Ғылым», 1967. – 264 б.

10 Рассадин В.И. Морфология тофаларского языка в сравнительном освещении. – Москва: Изд-во «Наука», 1978. – 288 с.

11 Исхаков Ф.Г., Пальмбах А.А. Грамматика тувинского языка. Фонетика и морфология. Москва: Изд-во вост. лит., 1961. – 472 с.

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023
Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023

12 Кононов А.Н. Грамматика языка тюркских рунических памятников VII-IX вв. Ленинград: Наука, 1980. – 256 с.

13 Räsänen M. Versuch eines etymologischen Worterbuchs der Turksprachen. – Heisinki, 1969. – 533 s.

14 Böthlingk O. Ueber die sprahe der jakuten,1851. – 774 s.

15 Тодаева Б.Х. Грамматика современного монгольского языка. – Москва: Изд-во АН ССР, 1951. – 158 с.

16 Necmettin Насıeminoğlu. Türk dilinde edatlar. – Istanbul,1992. – 366 s.

17 Севортян Э.В. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. – Москва: Изд-во «Наука», 1974. – 767 с.

18 Щербак А.М. Очерки по сравнительной морфологии тюркских языков (Наречие, служеб. части речи, изобразит. слов). – Ленинград: «Наука», 1987. – 152 с.

Происхождение и значение древнетурецких слов

К.К. Молгаждаров, Б. Зиадаұлы
[1]Кокшетауский университет имени Ш.Уалиханова, г. Кокшетау, 020000, Республика Казахстан
[2]Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылайхана Алматы, 050000, Республика Казахстан

Язык был основным средством общения с момента создания человечества. Жестовое общение первых людей, а затем и язык развивались вместе с цивилизацией. Язык подобен живому организму, рождающемуся заново, развивающемуся, а затем умирающему, исчезающему с поверхности земли. В качестве аргумента можно упомянуть латинский язык, играющий ключевую историческую роль.

В статье рассматривается конкретное лексическое значение и этимология некоторых неправильно переведенных или данных в ином значении слов, употребляемых в древнетюркских рунических письменных памятниках. Кроме того, при рассмотрении материала исследования древнетюркского языка они сравнивались на основе материалов среднетюркских и современных тюркских языков. Его главным образом сравнивают с лексическим фондом и грамматикой казахского языка и принимают за основной связующий язык.

Ключевые слова: Орхоно-Енисейский, тюркский, рунический, этимология, казахский язык, перевод, письменные памятники.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1   Малов С. Е. Памятники древнетюркской письменности. – Москва, 1951. – 246 с.

2   Литература древности. Вторая книга. – Алматы: «Родной язык», 1991. – 221 с.

3   Каржаубай С. Орхонское наследие. Первая книга. – Астана, 2003. – 392 с.

4   Краткий этимологический словарь казахского языка. – Алматы. – 196 б.

5   Дмитриев Н.К. Грамматика башкирского языка. – Москва-Лениград, 1948. – 272 с.

6   Серебренников Б.А., Гаджиева Н.З. Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. – М.: II-издание Наука, 1986. – 302 с.

7   Егеубай А.Қ. Қашқари М.Дивани лугат-ит Турк. -Алматы: Хант, 1997-1998. I-III том.

8   Древнетюркский словарь. – Ленинград: Наука. АН СССР, иност. языкознания. 1969. – 676 с.

9   Грамматика казахского языка. Морфология. – Алматы: «Наука», 1967. – 264 с.

10   Рассадин В.И. Морфология тофолорского языка в сравнительном освещении. – Москва: Изд-во «Наука», 1978. – 288 с.

Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы КУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. № 4 2023
Вестник КУ имени Ш.Уалиханова. Серия филологическая. № 4, 2023
Bulletin of S.Ualikhanov KU.
Philological Series. № 4, 2023
ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

11 Исхаков Ф.Г., Пальмбах А.А. Грамматика тувинского языка. Фонетика и морфология. Москва: Изд-во вост. лит., 1961. – 472 с.

12 Кононов А.Н. Грамматика языка тюркских рунических памятников VII-IX вв. Ленинград: Наука, 1980. – 256 с.

13 Räsänen M. Versuch eines etymologischen Worterbuchs der Turksprachen. – Heisinki, 1969. – 533 s.

14 Böthlingk O. Ueber die sprahe der jakuten,1851. – 774 s..

15 Тодаева Б.Х. Грамматика современного монгольского языка. – Москва: Изд-во АН ССР, 1951. – 158 с.

16 Necmettin Hacıeminoğlu. Türk dilinde edatlar. – Istanbul,1992. – 366 s.

17 Севортян Э.В. Этимологический словарь тюркских языков. – Москва: Изд-во «Наука», 1974. -767 с.

18 Щербак А.М. Очерки по сравнительной морфологий тюркских языков (Наречие, служеб. части речи, изобразит. слов). – Ленинград: «Наука», 1987. – 152 с.

М.В. Пименова
АНО ВО «Международный гуманитарный университет им. П.П. Семенова – Тян-Шанского», Санкт-Петербург, 199406, Россия

КОНЦЕПТЫ *УМ* И *MIND* В ЗЕРКАЛЕ ПЕРВОПРИЗНАКОВ

Цель статьи – выявление мотивирующих признаков концептов ум и mind. Методы исследования – концептуальный и этимологический прием в рамках сравнительно-исторического метода. Для определения мотивирующих признаков концептов ум и mind было привлечено по 13 словарей: этимологических, исторических и толковых, в которых приводится история происхождения слов – репрезентантов концептов. В результате исследования было обнаружено, что количество мотивирующих признаков в структуре концепта ум меньше, чем у концепта mind (64 & 79 соответственно). Среди мотивирующих у английского концепта отсутствуют такие группы признаков, как «Явь», «Знание», «Привычка/ умение», «Свет». У русского концепта среди мотивирующих отсутствуют такие группы признаков, как «Память», «Безумие», «Человек со способностями», «Характер», «Стремление».

Ключевые слова: концепт, мотивирующие признаки, культурные первосмыслы; структура концепта; лингвокультурология; концептология; языковая картина мира.

ОСНОВНЫЕ ПОЛОЖЕНИЯ

Общего мнения среди языковедов по поводу истории слова *ум* в русском языке не существует. История имени *ум* словарями представлена по-разному. П.Я. Черных и А.В. Семёнов считают, что слово *умъ* появилось в XI в. [1, с. 289; 2]. А.В. Семёнов указывает на общеславянскую природу этого слова [2].

А.К. Шапошников и Г.П. Цыганенко пишут, что русское *ум* происходит из праславянского **умъ* (**итъ*) [3, с. 456; 4, с. 449]. При этом *ум* – это производное «с суффиксом -мъ от корня **у-* (из **ау-*), соотносительного с праславянским глаголом **(й)авити (сę)*» [10, с. 456]. Г.П. Цыганенко полагает, что праславянское **итъ* произведено «от индоевропейского