

## K. MUSAEV ABOUT THE TURKIC ALPHABET: THE AGE-OLD TRADITION AND PROBLEMS OF UNIONS

<sup>a</sup>SANDYBAY BORANBAEV, <sup>b</sup>NURGALI KASHKINBAEV

<sup>a-b</sup>Regional Social and Innovation University, 160005, 4 Kurmanbekov Str., Shymkent, Kazakhstan  
email: <sup>a</sup>sandybai60@mail.ru, <sup>b</sup>nur1nur2nur3@mail.ru

**Abstract:** According to K. Musaev, the impossibility of a full understanding of Turkic peoples without a common alphabet is reasonably comprehensive scientific analysis of modern Turkology, where the study of languages should be based on ethnological and cultural foundation, as the requirement of today is to make public, ethnic, cultural value of Turkology, to fully comprehend the meaning of the ethnic history, cultural history of the state and inter-state relations, people and international relations in the development of language, understand the fact that it is through linguistic unity merged tribes and the emergence of nation as a nation with its own traditions, its culture, with its national world view. External factors can not completely change the linguistic system, but in the formation process of the ethnic group related languages dialects and played a role, enriching language audio features, which after a long historical development, resulted in a particular language system, with its domestic laws, with only her inherent properties, with its morphology, phonetics and semantics.

**Keywords:** comparative-historical study, common Turkic alphabet, Turks, grammatical features, sound system.

### 1 Introduction

The beginning of the 60s is a time when, apart from the languages of small Turkic peoples, the grammar of the peoples of the individual republics and autonomies of the Soviet Union was written.

Even if it was created, it was only under severe control and with the permission of the center. In addition, the scholars who study the languages and the history of the Turkic peoples were subjected to persecutions of the former capital of Almaty, who were referred to remote areas, where they were forced to work in educational institutions.

At that time (1964), the work of K.M. Musaev "Grammar of the Karaitic language" was published, the materials of which the author painstakingly collected from a small number of representatives of the Karaitic people who lived in Lithuania and Ukraine (1957-1963). This publication analyzes the phonetic system and grammatical features of the Karaitic language, the materials of which, to this day, are one of the important sources for comparative such as historical research in modern Turkic studies. According to Professor D. Iskakuly, (1) "Out of forty Turkic languages, six are the state languages, twelve have the status of an autonomous language which is maintained by virtue of current laws and their capabilities in varying degrees, the rest can be credited to a number of defenseless languages". Some of them have weakened so much that only a few native speakers have left. For example, Karaitic language is spoken in Lithuania by 20 people, in Ukraine by 10 people, in Poland by 10 people. And if this handful of people die, the Karaitic language will die. Consequently, the Karaitic language is on the verge of extinction. This means that not only the Karaitic language will disappear, but also the whole spiritual world created on it.

But also, the people who spoke it, the descendants of the Göktürks rulers, whose possessions stretched from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean.

### 2 Materials and Methods

After independence, some Turkic-speaking republics switched to the Latin script, and even after that, the scientist raised the problem of preserving the Turkic languages remaining in the Russian Federation. A good example published in 2008 in textbook "Kazakh language", written for Russian Kazakhs in Russian.

Assessing the current state of the Turkic languages the scientifically substantiated opinion of K. Musaev on the possibility of further misunderstanding of each other of the Turkic peoples without a single common Turkic alphabet

occupies a special place. It is known that Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, using various modifications, switched to the Latin alphabet. However, there are more unresolved issues, as there is no common Turkic system approach for the graphic representation of sounds.

According to Professor A. Zhunisbek, (2) "Scientific reforms are waiting for Turkic linguistics and they must begin with phonetics. The main leitmotif of the reform is to determine the place of the Kazakh (Turkic) language in the composition of world languages. Consequently, the main goal is to review the genealogical classification of world languages. As a result, the laws of the Kazakh (Turkic) language will be revealed, on the basis of which the scientific research apparatus will be formed. Thanks to getting rid of the theory of languages that prevails over Kazakh (Turkic) linguistics, we will be able to determine the true phonetic composition and system through the prism of our own (native, original) theory."

The articulatory-acoustic aspects of the phonetics of Turkic languages are now widely considered. Along with the physical characteristics of the articulatory and frequency characteristics of the sounds of a language, their nature of hearing is also investigated. In recent years, the interest has been increased in studying the characteristics of hearing (sounding), as researchers have the opportunity to determine the importance of the characteristics of language signals and make appropriate sound analyzes that open up an individual (independent, special) method of studying phonetic units of a language. The perception of phonetic signals is an obligatory stage of the language relation and its research plays an important role in the study of the sound properties (features, qualities) of the language. When comparing the lexical composition and grammatical structure of modern Turkic languages, a relationship is observed, the identity is inherent in these languages, but from the phonetic point of view, along with significant similarity, there are fundamental differences. (3-5) By means of certain language features, they differ from each other. The centuries-old history of these languages evolved differently, therefore, individual characteristics are natural, since the place of residence, formation, development, science and education, culture, customs, and traditions all developed separately. So each of them by being an independent nation has an individual language. Naturally, these languages have individual features.

After gaining independence of the country, freed from the shackles of Soviet politics, we were able to openly express once-veiled thoughts, put the historical past on the scales of justice, openly show the real reasons for cultural and spiritual styling, search for and eliminate the deep roots of these mistakes, and restore the spiritual consciousness.

One of the prominent figures such as Academician K.M. Musaev raised actual problems associated with the Kazakh language, of that time. In particular, the problems of lexicography of spelling, orthoepy, the culture of speech and translation.

Existing in other Turkic languages, problem-solving, connected with the improvement of the Turkic alphabet, has always been the object of attention of the scientist.

The principles proposed by K.M. Musaev, on eliminating differences in the graphic representation of the sounds of the Turkic languages, which are not in Russian, have found wide application among researchers and compilers of national alphabets.

Of course, it is impossible to fully display the graphical features of the sound of the Turkic languages. Therefore, the scientist pays special attention to spelling and orthoepic dictionaries, which are the basis for the preservation of the national language. For example, in modern Kazakh language *сыыр-сығыр* (Old Turkic), *жыын-жыйын-йығын* (Old Turkic), *қын-қийын*,

жуын-жууын-йугын (Old Turkic), буын-бууын-богын (Old Turkic), сауын-сагын (Old Turkic), and others. The scholar systematically used such language information as examples in his writings.

The ideas of K. Musaev about a single alphabet of Turkic peoples found support from scholars of Turkic-speaking countries. For example, the doctor defended his doctoral thesis on the history of the Kazakh alphabet and made changes in connection with the current political and social situation, the results of which were published in the media and widely discussed.

In 1926 Turkic peoples that are part of the Russian Empire, switched to Latin. With hope for the future, the remaining 1500 years of historical Arabic writing, Turkey moved to the Latin script. Unfortunately, in 1940 the alphabet of the Turkic peoples that were part of the USSR is forcibly replaced with a Cyrillic alphabet. As a result, the sounds common to the Turkic languages such as *к, з, н, ҫ, ө, Ү, і, ә* are used in the Kazakh language as separate in other languages by combining letters, or, for example, in the Kyrgyz language it has reached orthoepic pronunciation. (6-7)

Such spelling and orthoepic differences in the alphabet negatively affect the learning of the Kyrgyz national language. Since orthoepically after a solid vowel, there should be voiceless hard consonants. In spelling, this law is not respected. For example, in the spelling of Кыргызстан, in the pronunciation of Кыргызыстан. Consequently, we should pay attention to the opinion of scholars who state the fact of violation of pronunciation in the language of the young generation of original Kyrgyz words. (8)

Professor S. Myrzabekov. (9) who made a huge contribution to the development of Kazakh phonetics, says about the combination of sounds, "Combinations of sounds are the possibility of sounds to fight each other in the same row, this is a historically formed place. They are the offspring, the result of the transfer from generation to generation of an improved, systematized art of speech."

In clarifying the history of the life path of modern Turkic languages, it is necessary to open the veil of secrets of symbols in this language, carved in ancient times, on wooden, stone products and other objects.

On this occasion, A.M. Shcherbak, (10) relying on long-term studies of Turkic languages, notes that "in order to determine the writing history of the Turkic languages and cultural and spiritual history, it is necessary to consider the pre-Turkic periods." The author here apparently refers to inscriptions carved before Christ, the Orkhon-Yenisei script, and the written heritage of the X-XIV centuries, which are often mentioned by scientists of the older generation.

K.M. Musaev as a great theoretician of Turkic languages is one of the creators of the collective 6-volume work "Comparative Grammar of Turkic Languages", published in Moscow, where the scientist actively participated in writing some sections and general editing. The new concepts proposed by K. Musaev in this authoritative work reversed the opinion of Russian scientists and forced them to renounce the old ingrained theory.

In his second work, the scientist removes special attention to the problems of studying the history of the lexicology of the Turkic languages and laid the methodological foundations of their solution.

Separately considered lexico-thematic groups, the author with examples proved the territorial distribution of modern Kipchak languages, their similarities, and differences in the semantic space, depending on the area. Since the historical dictionaries of the Kipchak languages have not yet been created, the scholar had to not only collect archaisms from the works of folklore and monuments of literature but also scientifically proved using the comparative historical method while preserving all its principles,

which speaks of his extraordinary diligence and responsibility to science. (11)

A new milestone in Turkic studies is the monographic study "The Lexicology of Turkic Languages" which has made a great contribution to the development of this science, in which one of the main and important theoretical problems of historical lexicology - the connection with world languages, is considered. The author, by exploring the internal integration and differentiation of Turkic languages in the lexical-semantic space, identified the main directions of research and ways to solve them. Borrowing words from each other, the presence or absence of one lexical unit, in a given language, is not a fact of the absence of a word in general since they can occur with some phonetic changes due to historical and extralinguistic events. In this regard, the use of historical-semasiological, historical-comparative methods in a certain sequence suggests that beyond their limits the constituent lexico-semantic groups of words, now not related languages, may be preserved in the vocabulary of other nations, as well as the possibility of a different meaning in another language. For example, in the modern Kazakh, the meaning of archaism *жарғақ* is known, which has its derivative phrases (*жарғақ, шалбар, жарған, құлағы жастыққа тимей,* and others). In Karaite language, it means "paper made of leather; parchment". Consequently, the lexical space has been expanded, the word from Kipchak language has acquired a different meaning. According to the scientist, it is first necessary to conduct comparative studies within the Turkic languages, then there will be opportunities for determining the linguistic features of the Oguz, Kipchak, Karluk groups. (12-13)

All this should be carried out taking into account the geographic location of the professional educational peculiarity of the Turkic peoples. Prior to this, in linguistics, phonetic and morphological features were taken as the basis for identifying language features. The work of K. Musayev showed that at the lexical level of the language historical and cultural information is long preserved, which tells us about relations with other countries.

One of the urgent problems affected by K.M. Musaev (14) is the kinship of the Altai languages, the problems of the common roots of the Turkic and Mongolian languages. Questions of Altai language kinship did not leave the agenda. In this case, the opinion of scientists differ. Some consider the features common to these languages, associating them with a single foundation, while the latter argue that this is the result of a historical phenomenon of the adoption of words by peoples who lived in the neighborhood for many centuries and had similar traits in everyday life. Supporters of both opinions prove the assumptions, citing linguistic facts.

Another problem investigated by the scholar in the book "Syntax of the Carim language" is the etymology of the ethnonym Karaim. The author, unlike the established opinion in Turkology, the meaning of the ethnonym Karaim Kara ("read, learn"), considers the connection with the ethnonym Kerey, a clan community that was part of the Kazakh Khanate. For example, it is known from history that the descendants of Botbai, one of the sons of Dulat, formed and ruled the small Bolghar i.e., modern Bulgaria, thus it is necessary to prove the scientific importance of the historical ethnogenetic connection of the Crimean Karaites and the Keraites. (15)

When clarifying areal differences and common features, the historical development of modern Turkic languages, namely from the point of view of historical phonetics, is the process of sound change of individual phonemes and the historical systematization of phonetic patterns; from a grammatical point of view is the historical development and the formation of grammatical categories and forms in the Turkic languages; in the definition of the word-formation system is the historical and semantic structure of the root; historical development of the word stock and vocabulary and all of the listed language system is based on medieval written monuments that become the object of research in modern Turkology. Nevertheless, there are specific difficulties related to the meager amount of the written heritage, fully covering the periods of the historical development

of the Turkic languages or, for some reason, not introduced scientific circulation when creating historical grammar and phonetics, historical word formation and lexicology, creating historical dictionaries. Summing up, we see that in recent times, researchers in various degrees are turning to the scientific and methodological conclusions of academician K.M. Musaev. The specific language materials presented by the researchers from the above-mentioned written Kipchak Monuments (12th-17th centuries) state (clarify) the uniform glottogenesis of Kipchak languages and this is a scientific problem - a prerogative of ethnolinguistics. (16-17)

The peculiarities of social development and the fundamental shift in the state of the language situation among the Turkic-speaking peoples formed new tasks in Turkic studies and identified new approaches to solving theoretical and practical issues. During this period, the most prominent figures of the scientific paradigm that were formed in the Turkic linguistics were E.D. Polivanov, Acad. A.N. Samoilovich and their younger colleague N.K. Dmitriev. The scientific and scientific-organizational activity of Acad. A.N. Samoylovich is proved to be a strong link that connected the main trends of the Turkological scientific paradigm of the Radlovian period with the Soviet era, thanks to which this line was not interrupted and remains in science until recently; it provided the basis for the development of the new paradigm of the 30s-50s construction (writing, alphabets, spelling, the formation of new literary languages, dictionaries, textbooks, generalized descriptions of languages, etc.). (18-19)

A noticeable shift in Turkic linguistics occurred in the 50-60s, the impetus for which was the rejection of Marrah dogmas. It was then that the scientific and organizational N.K. Dmitriev's talent, who revived comparative historical research in domestic Turkology and generally raised its development to the level of world linguistic science. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the formation of a new scientific paradigm in Turkology, the paradigm that largely determines the face of this branch of Russian science today, is associated with its name.

The structure of the Turkic scientific paradigm of the Soviet period was clearly presented by Acad. A.N. Kononov, who singled out in her 10 directions:

- phonetics and grammar of modern Turkic languages;
- lexicography and lexicology;
- dialectography and dialectology;
- the history of the formation of the Turkic national languages;
- the study and publication of monuments of Turkic writing;
- historical phonetics and grammar of individual Turkic languages and comparative historical phonetics, and grammar of groups of Turkic languages;
- "Altai theory" and Turkic linguistics;
- description of the Turkic manuscripts;
- history of Russian Turkic philology;
- bibliography of domestic Turkology.

These directions were represented in almost all scientific Turkic centers of the country both in the central and in the peripheral, republican. In those years, in the USSR, there seemed to be a common Turkological scientific space, the unity of which was organizationally created and coordinated thanks to the activities of the Soviet Committee of Turkologists at OLYA Academy of Sciences and was supported by the All-Union scientific journal "Soviet Turkology".

In the framework of the Turkological paradigm of the 70s-90s, these areas of research have developed successfully. It was during these years that the comparative-historical studies of the Turkic languages advanced greatly, the historical phonetics and morphology of which were represented by three holistic concepts of A.M. Shcherbak, B.A. Serebrennikova, and N.Z. Gadzhieva, a group of Moscow Turkologists under the leadership of E.R. Tenisheva, as well as many fundamental works on the study of individual categories (G.F. Blagova, I.V. Kormushin, E.V. Sevortyan). Experiments have been written to

describe the history of individual Turkic languages or their grammatical categories such as Uzbek (E. Fazylov, Sh. Shukurov, U. Tursunov, S. N. Ivanov, Kh.G. Nigmatov), Azerbaijani (M. Shiraliyev, M. Ragimov, A. Akhundov, H. Mirzazade, E. Demirchizade), Turkmen (Z. Mukhamedova, S. Akhally, M. Hydyrov), Turkish (E.A. Grunin, V.G. Guzev, P.I. Kuznetsov), Chuvash (L.S. Levitskaya, V.G. Egorov), Karachay-Balkar (M.A. Khabichev, A.A. Chechenov), Kazakh (A.T. Kaydarov, N.O. Oralbaeva, G. Aidarov, A.K. Kuryshzhanov, E.Z. Kazhibekov, K.M. Musaev), and others.

### 3 Results and Discussion

With regard to the terminology of the Turkic languages, there is an opinion that there is an established terminological system in individual languages, as well as its absence. For example, if scientist K.M. Musaev (20) considers that terminological spheres are not fully settled in the Turkic languages, according to Kh.F. Iskhakova (21), "The modern stage of development of the Turkic languages is characterized by a high degree of elaboration of terminology associated primarily with the humanities, and only on them in the native language are the scientific works currently printed and teaching in higher education."

As an argument, K.M. Musaev (14) gives the following, "the terminological system is largely determined by the existence of national-Russian bilingualism and Russian monolingualism in a number of areas. In addition, the development of terminology in different Turkic languages, along with common points, is different in each of the republics, since literary languages and, accordingly, national terminological systems have different historical fates."

Supporting the idea of an isolated development of the terminology of the Turkic language from each other, the existing difference in historical destinies, the peculiarities of the process of forming a national culture, the quantitative composition of the media, the ethnic environment of the people, the researcher L.Kh. Makhiyeva (22) argues that "despite the commonness of the original vocabulary of the languages of the Turkic system, in modern Turkic languages there is a big discrepancy in the term of creation. It affects the specificity of each literary language."

From all this, it follows that the kinship of the Turkic languages under the influence of extralinguistic factors is lost and weakened at the present stage. Of course, as a result of this process, the language is clearly divided into the vocabulary of a language, it becomes less understandable to speakers of different Turkic countries. New laws appear in the language, displacing the old through another dominant language. For example, the weakening of the law of harmoniousness in the Tatar language, etc. However, the typology of the language and the motivation of word creation in the Turkic languages today are quite similar. They still have a metalanguage. The scientist N.Z. Gadzhieva (23) spoke about this, "The main lexico-semantic groups of words such as the terms of kinship, the names of wild and domestic animals, the names of objects (nouns), the names of qualities (adjectives), the names of actions (verbs), etc. constitute the common Turkic vocabulary, presented in all areal groups of Turkic languages. Unlike other typological languages, the Turkic roots, and the derivatives of the foundations were phonetically relatively little transformed. With the observance of phonetic laws, it is not difficult to carry out phonetic and morphological reconstruction, cf. *qara* 'black', Turkic - *kara*, Kумык, Ногай, Казах, Кыргыз - *qara*, Azerbaijani - *qara*, Tatar - *qara*, Chuvash - *xpa* etc."

In this regard, it is necessary to note the process of chaotic borrowing, which is destructive for the original grammatical categories and laws of the language. According to the researcher N.Z. Gadzhieva (23), "All borrowings in the Turkic languages in terms of word formation and inflection, as a rule, obey the internal laws of the Turkic languages. However, there are a number of linguistic features of the Turkic languages that are the result of lengthy processes due to the influence of a foreign language environment, cf. the processes of destruction of vowel

harmony, reduction of long vowels, increased delabialization, an inconsistent reflection of early Turkic, etc.". In our opinion, this is the result of chaotic borrowing. In this connection, the problem of preservation and the problem of the own development of the internal laws of the Turkic languages arise. Studies in terms of comparative phonetics and grammar allow using the material to enrich the Turkic languages through another Turkic language. For example, only the passive voice in all Turkic languages has as its indicator *-л, -ыл/-ил*; reflexive *-н, -ын/-ин*; reciprocal *-ш, -ыш/-иш*; causative has a variety of affixes, the most common of which are *-тыр/-тир, -т, -ыт/-ит, -ыз/-из*. Comparative work in terms of vocabulary and grammar allows us to talk about the kinship of a particular language and the possibilities of addressing these languages as an object of enrichment of the lexical fund, the development of forms of formation of terms. Formation of terms in language requires the term of creation. Under which the principles of terminology are observed, and the methods of terminology such as morphological, syntactic, lexicon-semantic, loan translation are used. Among which the morphological method gives a visual similarity of the grammatical structure of the Turkic languages. The scientist N.Z. Gadzhieva (23) spoke about the presence of uniform grammatical forms, "There are quite a few universal tendencies in the historical development of the vocabulary of the Turkic languages cf. development of significant words in service and some service elements in affixes, development of particle-based conjunctions, etc."

For example, the word formative suffixes of the Azerbaijani – **әк/-ек** (*чәүмәк (шүмек), лүләк (кран)*) are similar to the Kazakh suffixes **-ак/-ек** (*бармақ, қармақ, шүмек, ілмек*).

Along with this, in all Turkic languages, such suffixes as **-ым/-ім** as are also actively used by the formation of terms. For example, in the Kazakh language terms *желім, қысым, өсім*. In the Chuvash language, the phonetic variant **-ем** in words *чикем*, in Tatar language *чыгым* etc. The identity and prescription of this affix is confirmed by the presence of similar forms in the dictionary of ancient Turkic languages by M. Kashkari: *алым* (алым, алашак), *өлүм* (өлім). In their scope of use, the suffixes *ым/ім* are used to express a process. This can be in combination with affixes **-ыл/іл**, for example, in Kazakh language *жаз+ыл+ым, айт+ыл+ым*; in Azerbaijani language *уду+л+ма*; in Tatar language *куш+ыл+ма* etc.

The presence of similar word forms allows you to pay attention to this term, its term-forming element and its terminological potential as a whole (terminological family, aesthetics, laconicism). Today, the terminology of the technical sphere is poorly developed in the Turkic languages. The reason for this phenomenon, scientist K.M. Musaev (24) explains in this way, "There is little publication of original scientific and technical literature in Turkic languages, therefore their scope of application is limited mainly to the humanities". This is also one of the main reasons for creating a single terminological fund. Today, learning Turkic languages occurs differentially (E. Akhunzyanov - Tatar language, R. Bekjanova - Kyrgyz language, T.A. Bertagaev - Mongolian and Buryat languages, R. Budagov - Azerbaijani language, L.X. Makhieva - Karachay-Balkar language). In this regard, there is a great opportunity to direct the term of the creation of Turkic languages in one direction. In our opinion, the question of creating a single terminological fund is also relevant, where the general principles of terminology can be applied. For these purposes and for further intensive integration, targeted research work on Turkic languages and a comparative analysis of each language with other Turkic languages are necessary. Thus, we can strengthen the term of the creation of each Turkic language. However, this should not be attributed to bulk copying. The term of the creation of each language should be developed directly according to the model of a single terminological fund of Turkic languages while preserving the national peculiarities of languages. According to the researcher Kh.F. Iskhakova. (21) due to the specificity of the tasks facing the experts in the field of terminology of developing national languages, it is impossible to follow the path of simply copying the developments of other

languages. Here we are in solidarity with the inadmissibility of simple copying. But we must take into account the achievements of other languages, if the practices of related languages are successful and correspond to the norms of our own language, then, in this case, we can apply them in our language.

#### 4 Conclusion

The Turkic peoples, leaving the Arabic script, switched to the Latin alphabet, then to the Cyrillic after that, each one selecting the appropriate characters. Using one alphabet in their own way, nations spiritually moved away from each other.

As a result, they concluded that they no longer read (understand) each other correctly. It is known that the language basis such as writing is a superstructure. This is a philosophical concept. Each graphic (writing) due to its characteristics should show the sound capabilities of the language. In the history of the Turkic peoples of this function, the Old Turkic, Old Uyghur, and Arabic alphabets fully corresponded. In the works devoted to this topic, K.M. Musaev paid great attention to the formation of a common Turkic alphabet.

#### Literature:

1. Iskakuly D. Proceedings from the International Congress of Turcology: Ғаламдасу дәуіріндегі түркі тілдері [Turkic languages in the era of globalization]. Turkestan; 2013: 354-8.
2. Zhunisbek A. Қазақ фонетикасы [Kazakh phonetics]. Almaty: Arys; 2009.
3. Gökalp Z. Түрікшілдіктің тарихы [History of Turkism]. In: Turkic anthology. Astana; 2012: 481-6.
4. Malbakov M. Proceedings from V International Congress of Turkic Dialogue. Cultural Integration and Unity of Civilizations: Қазақ әліпбиін латын графикасына көшірудің өзекті мәселелері [Actual problems of translation of Kazakh alphabet to Latin graphics]. Turkestan; 2013: 104-10.
5. Oflazer K. Turkish and its challenges for language processing. Language Resources and Evaluation. 2014; 48(4), 639-653.
6. Gallagher R. On modern terminology in the Turkic languages of the U.S.S.R. Central Asiatic Journal. 1981; 25(3/4):213-29.
7. Erdal M. A grammar of Old Turkic. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill; 2004.
8. Trubetskoy NS. Osnovy fonologii [Basics of Phonology]. Moscow: Aspekt Press; 2000.
9. Myrzabekov S. Қазақ фонетикасы [Kazakh phonetics]. Almaty: Kazakh University; 2004.
10. Shcherbak AM. Sravnitel'naya fonetika tyurkskikh yazykov [Comparative phonetics of Turkic languages]. Leningrad; 1970.
11. Kara D. The formation of modern Turkic 'Ethnic' groups in Central and Inner Asia. The Hungarian Historical Review. 2018; 7(1):98-110.
12. Oztopçu K, Abou Z, Kambarov N, Azemoun Y. A dictionary of the Turkic languages: English, Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar, Turkish, Turkmen, Uighur, Uzbek. New York: Routledge; 1996.
13. Tantuğ AC, Adalı E. (Machine translation between Turkic languages. In: Turkish Natural Language Processing. Theory and Applications of Natural Language Processing. Springer, Cham; 2018: 237-54.
14. Musaev KM. Sovremennyye problemy terminologii na tyurkskikh yazykakh SSSR [Modern problems of terminology in the Turkic languages of the USSR]. Sovetskaya tyurkologiya. 1989; 4:18-30.
15. Johanson L, Csato EA. The Turkic Languages. New York: Routledge; 1998.
16. Winner T. Problems of alphabetic reform among the Turkic peoples of Soviet Central Asia, 1920-41. The Slavonic and East European Review. 1952; 31(76):133-47.
17. Zeynalov FR. O neobkhodimosti sozdaniya sravnitel'nogo slovarya lingvisticheskikh terminov tyurkskikh yazykov [On the need to create a comparative dictionary of linguistic terms of Turkic languages]. Sovetskaya tyurkologiya. 1973; 4:68-71.
18. Frankle E. Some problems of word formation in the Turkic languages. Journal of the American Oriental Society. 1948; 68(2):114-20.

19. Schönig C. The internal division of modern Turkic and its historical implications. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*. 1999; 52(1):63-95.
20. Musaev KM. *Lexicology of Turkic languages*. Moscow: Science; 1984.
21. Iskhakova KhF. *Struktury terminologicheskikh sistem. Tyurkskiye yazyki* [Structures of terminological systems. Turkic languages]. Moscow: Nauka; 1987.
22. Makhiyeva LKh. *Formirovaniye i razvitiye lingvisticheskoy terminologii karachayevo-balkarskogo yazyka* [Formation and development of the linguistic terminology of the Karachay-Balkar language] [dissertation]. 2003.
23. Gadzhieva NZ. *Yazyki mira. Tyurkskiye yazyki* [Languages of the world. Turkic languages]. Moscow; 1997.
24. Musaev KM. *Struktura i semantika kornya. Leksikologiya tyurkskikh yazykov* [The structure and semantics of the root. Lexicology of Turkic languages]. Moscow: Nauka; 1984.

**Primary Paper Section: A**

**Secondary Paper Section: AB, AI**