

THE ROLE OF PHONO-MORPHOLOGICAL FACTORS IN THE LINGUO-ETHNO-GENETIC INVESTIGATIONS

Kuldashev Akram Makhmudovich

Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
akramkuldashev@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present article deals with the analysis of the social aspects of the development of the morphological structure of Germanic languages. The author discusses the role and influence of the phenomenon the Great Migration of Peoples on the morphology Germanic languages. Furthermore, it will compare the writing systems of the ancient Germanic and Turkic peoples as these two language groups used the same writing system at the same time. Contacts of languages cause the rise of new phonemes as a result of the influence of the phonetic structure of the languages in contact. Mediaeval Europe was a "pot" where nations boiled, especially in III-X centuries. Romance and Germanic languages had intensive contacts with newly born Slavic and Turkic languages. And one of the main participants, or to be more exact, causators of these great changes was the language of Ancient Turkic tribes. Finally, the language of the Hunns which became the matter of discussion in modern linguistics will also be analysed by the author.

Keywords: Great Migration of Peoples, morphological structure, socio-historical aspect, linguistic community, dialectal division, intralinguistic factors, extralinguistic factors, geographical distribution, runic inscriptions, runic alphabet, phonomorphological aspects, phonological structure.

INTRODUCTION

In the works on Germanic studies in recent decades, there has been a significant expansion of the range of problems and research material on the history of the Germanic languages. So, the historical and genetic study of literary languages is enriched with social and functional aspects, thanks to which, different forms of linguistic differentiation are directly related to each other. (Keydan, 2006; Trubetskoy, 1999)

This article attempts at considering the role and influence of social factors in the development of the morphological structure of the Germanic languages. The direct object of study in the article is the influence of the Great Migration of Nations on the formation of the Germanic languages. "The Great Migration of Peoples" (hereinafter referred to as GMP), the conventional name for the totality of ethnic movements in the III-VII centuries. A huge amount of literature on history is devoted to this event and we will not go into details and only refer interested persons to the book of Budanova et al. (2005) as the most recent publication and giving a rather detailed description of this process, which is of great importance in the history of the peoples of Europe.

We are directly interested in the linguistic implications of this process and what place GMP occupies among other factors in the development of the grammatical structure of the Germanic languages.

As we know, the morphological structure of the Germanic languages has evolved over a number of centuries as a result of tendencies dating back to the era of Proto-Indo-European linguistic community, as well as to the era of stabilization of the western area of IE languages - on the one hand, and tendencies going back to the era of isolation of a certain continuum of dialects that gave foundation of the Germanic languages. (Makayev, 1977; Kuldashev, 2010)

The connection between the formation of tribal groups and the GMP was written about earlier (see N.S. Chemodanov, 1982). For example, N.S. Chemodanov (1982) writes that "... when in the first half of the 1st millennium AD. there was a great migration of peoples and tribal differences in language were determined; the period after the 4th-5th centuries, characterized by the disintegration of the clan system, the shift of dialects and the formation of nationalities within the framework of the new political boundaries that emerged in the initial period of class society." (Chemodanov, 1982)

The disintegration of the Proto-Germanic language into separate languages occurred in the first centuries of our era. Over such a long time, the language system could have changed dramatically.

MAIN BODY

The attempt we have made faces a lot of difficulties associated with the complexity of studying the socio-historical aspect of both Proto-Germanic and the early stages of the existence and functioning of individual Germanic languages. This is due to the fact that, firstly, even in the most favorable situation, the incompleteness of the available data is inevitable, since there will always be no direct evidence of the oral forms of the language. Secondly, the further into history, the more fragmentary and limited are the data on the basis of which it is possible, at least in general terms, to reconstruct the linguistic situation and determine the nature of the functioning of the language and the main types of its dialectal division. (Zhirmunskiy, 1965; Rastorguyeva, 2005)

But nevertheless, if we ignore the detailed purely linguistic analysis of the facts of the morphological structure of the Proto-Germanic language of the era before the GMP and individual Germanic languages formed after the GMP and name the most important intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors, then the following points should be listed:

- 1) The verbs of the Germanic languages have lost their reduplication in the expression of different grammatical meanings.
- 2) The dental suffix of the preterite arose and became one of the main markers of the grammatical meaning of time.
- 3) In the sphere of nouns of Germanic languages, the suffixed definite article appeared.
- 4) There was a back-passive form of the verb in –sk, -st, -n.
- 5) There was a reduction in grammatical endings expressing different meanings of number, person, time, voice, etc.
- 6) Ablaut is widespread mainly in verbal word formation and word combination.
- 7) The trend towards analyticism has intensified, which is realized in individual languages with varying degrees of completeness.
- 8) The tendency for the decay of the case category has intensified, and at the end it began to appear as an opposition between the general and genitive (possessive) cases, and so on. (Kuldashev, 2020)

The fact that the process of creating a dental preterite in this class belongs to a rather late time is evidenced by the presence of a significant number of phonomorphological variants of the dental suffix, cf. in gothic: wait 'I know', pret. wissa; kann 'I know', pret. kunpa; gadars 'I dare', pret. gadaursta; man 'I suppose', pret. munda; skal 'I must', pret. skulda; og 'I'm afraid', pret. ohta. The appearance of a dental preterite in this class of verbs meant at the same time the creation of a single paradigmatic series and the constitution of the strong and weak conjugation of verbs, well known from the further history of the Germanic languages. In view of the above, it is preferable to talk not about preterite-present verbs, but about the presence of an archaic class of perfect stems that express the state of the subject. (Zhirmunskiy, 1965)

In the construction of the late Germanic verbal paradigmatics, the absence of symmetry is striking. The double construction of the preterite ("strong" and "dental"), the dual position (or, even more definitely: the ambiguous position) of the preterite-present "verbs, the presence at the basis of the presence of a significant number of specific indicators or temporal relevance, which became redundant - all this with relentlessness dictated the need for further transformations of the verbal paradigmatics.

It is not uncommon in the practice of world languages that a writing system with the same alphabet served languages belonging to two or more different language families at the same time. There are many examples of this in the history of world languages. But such languages often turn out to be peoples living in areas that are close to each other or contiguous. The distance between the areas inhabited by the language groups we are talking about in this article, more precisely, the places where written monuments created by those peoples were found in this alphabet, is 5-6 thousand kilometers. Therefore, while it is a historical fact that these two language groups used the same writing system at the same time in their history, the common features between them and the question of whether they are related by origin are still obscure. (A.Kuldashev, & Sh.Kuldasheva, 2021).

At this point, we set ourselves the goal of solving this and some other similar problems and giving them as clear an explanation as possible. Because these general alphabetic letter expressions are so similar that the idea of their kinship seems beyond doubt to any person. But most linguists, on the other hand, try to deny the commonality between these two alphabets as much as possible.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Let's start with the German runic script. the old Scandinavian and English eighty word 'run', the old Icelandic word 'runar' and the old High German word 'runa' are related to the old common Germanic root 'ru' in Goth and they have a common meaning - 'mystery'. The word "raunen" in modern German, which is similar to the word, means "to whisper". The reason why this inscription is called runic is probably explained by the fact that the ancient Germanic peoples, like all other primitive peoples, gave different characters a "divine", "miraculous" or "mysterious" tone. Because usually these mysterious symbols are engraved on various valuables, jewelry, tombstones, weapons by the most knowledgeable and influential members of the tribe - the Druids or shamans. This thing later began to speak of the fact that many 'miracles' had been performed by this and similar characters in history as a result of the growing perception that these inscriptions were mysterious. For example, the ancient German saga and epics contain episodes that speak of the mysterious power of runes. In particular, the famous story of Sigurd describes how this hero killed a dragon using the mysterious power of runes. In the story of Egil, the son of Scallogrim, who lived in the 10th century, the Icelandic hero, we witness a similar event.

More than 50 runic inscriptions from the 3rd to the 6th century AD have been preserved. In addition, more than 200 inscriptions date back to the 9th-11th centuries. The oldest runic inscription is a jewelry inscription found in Vi-Moseda on the island of Fun in southwestern Denmark, dating to the middle of the 3rd century. Another of the oldest monuments is a knife inscription found in Torsbjerg, Schleswig, dating back to the 300s. Such information is given in A. Diringer's (1958) "Alphabet". Surprisingly, Iceland, where ancient Germanic literature flourished, is very poor in runic inscriptions. The earliest runic inscriptions found their date back to the 1200s.

The farthest point of the geographical distribution of runic inscriptions from the northwest is 72 degrees 55 minutes' north latitude, which is Kiigiistorsdak Island in the Baffin Bay, west of

Greenland. Some runic inscriptions have been found in the following places, in addition to the areas mentioned above.

In the department of Senne and Loire, now in the east of France, that is, the territories that once housed the Kingdom of Burgundy.

In Volon (Russia) (monuments of the 3rd century AD).

On the shores of the Black Sea (2nd century).

A lion made of marble with runic inscriptions was found in Pierce, near Athens, Greece, dating back to 1170.

A huge treasure trove of runic inscriptions dating back to the 4th century has been found in Romania. Among them was a large bracelet with the gutaniowihailog inscription in runic writing in Goth. Archaeologists have translated this inscription as Gutan (e) Iowihailog, meaning "dedicated to the Goths' Jupiter." The Jupiter of the Goths was understood to be the god Donar.

A short runic inscription found in Thornheim, Norway, is believed by some scholars to date to the 1st century AD.

In Germany, the runic script was considered the "national script" of the Germans, and at the same time posed a number of problems. It is still unknown who invented this runic inscription and from whom the Germanic peoples got it. so far there have been a number of scientific debates on these issues, different opinions have been expressed but there is still no opinion that satisfies everyone equally. One of these ideas is the "Urrunen Theory" (Urrunen), according to which there was some kind of general letter before the Germanic runes, that the Germanic-runic script, the Phoenician script, and a number of other inscriptions originated from the "ancestral runes."

According to Isaac Taylor, who studied the formal features of the runic alphabet, runes are based on inscriptions used by the Greeks in the 6th century BC. The runic inscription was developed by the Goths in the northern regions of the Black Sea coast.

According to Isaac Taylor, who studied the formal features of the runic alphabet, runes are based on inscriptions used by the Greeks in the 6th century BC. The runic inscription was developed by the Goths in the northern regions of the Black Sea coast.

We see that the above ideas of Isaac Taylor fully support the idea we have advanced in previous articles, namely:

- there were connections between the ancient Germanic and Turkic tribes.
- runic writing was brought to Europe in the 6th-4th centuries B.C.
- During this period, they lived in large areas north of the Black Sea.

According to Isaac Taylor, who studied the formal features of the runic alphabet, runes are based on inscriptions used by the Greeks in the 6th century BC. The runic inscription was developed by the Goths in the northern regions of the Black Sea coast.

If you notice, in addition to Taylor's view that "the Goths invented the runic script" and that "the Goths brought this alphabet to Europe and spread it among all the other Germanic peoples." We have the following grounds for this. The point is that the Runic script is derived from the Greek alphabet B.C. The reason it was not created in the 6th century is that runic inscriptions already existed during this period. Especially now in Yettisuv, Quva and other regions (Amanzholov, 1975), the inscription is widely used.

The Goths did not invent this alphabet themselves, but took it ready and made some minor changes. The Goths derived this inscription from the Scythian-Gunns, the ancestors of the present-day Turkic peoples.

The Turkic tribes used runic inscriptions in vast areas from the Great Wall of China in the east to Central Europe in the west, from the Altai in the north to the borders of Iran and Arabia in

the north, and all peoples in contact with the Turkic peoples used this script in one way or another.

There was no difference between the phonetic meanings of the Turkic runic writing in the 6th-5th centuries BC and the German runic writing. Then, after the last 500-600 years, the German-speaking peoples adapted this alphabet to their phonetics, and a number of changes occurred in the alphabet. More precisely, runes began to be used to denote the sounds expressed in the Turkic alphabet to other sounds. Here the external resemblance of the letters is completely preserved.

Let us turn to some linguistic facts so that the said ideas do not remain dry: A comparison of the alphabets of the German runes and the Orhun-Yenisei inscriptions reveals some very interesting features.

The “ʎ” sign in the German runic script represents the “s” sound. The same symbol represents the sound “r” in Turkish runes. This suggests that in the 6th-3rd centuries BC the ancient Germans (more precisely the Goths) and the Turks (more precisely the Scythians and the Gunns) lived in the vicinity of Eastern Europe and adjacent areas, and the connection between them was very strong. The phenomenon of Rhotacism, i.e. the change of “s” through “z” to “r”, occurs at this time. More precisely, rhotacism did not occur in the Germans, and in the Turks, rhotacism occurred.

In the history of linguistics and writing, there have been many attempts to prove the idea that “other languages, including Slavic, also had runic writing,” but all of them turned out to be ungrounded.

A., one of the scholars who studied the ancient Turkic runic inscriptions in depth. In his doctoral dissertation S.Amanzholov (1975) writes: Two inscriptions in the ancient Greek alphabet were found in the Ili River Valley. One of them could not be understood. The second one dates back to the middle of the first millennium BC and was written in Turkic. This indicates that the Orkhon-Yenisey and runic inscriptions are relatively very stable. The fact that the ancient Greek alphabet could not survive in Central Asia shows that the Turkic writing traditions are very strong. (Amanzholov, 1975)

Paleographic analysis shows that the Turkish runic alphabet is very ancient and that it appeared in the middle of 600 years BC in southern Siberia, the Semirechye and the eastern parts of Central Asia. This alphabet is primarily related to the Asia Minor and Italian variants of the ancient Greek alphabet, while on the other hand it is related to the northern-Semitic-Phoenician and Middle Aramaic and southern Semitic alphabets. This is in line with the Northeast Asian, nomadic and sedentary population of Old Asia, BC This is evidenced by the fact that over the past millennium, their ties have been very strong, and the peoples of Central Asia have played a very important role in establishing and maintaining these ties.

The Turkish runic alphabet is a very rich and independently formed writing-graphic system. Some similarities of the Turkic runes with the ancient Semitic, ancient Greek, Italian, Venetian, Etruscan, Pittsen, Messap, and Asia Minor alphabets - Kari, Liki, Lydia, and Sidet alphabets. served as and finally goes back to some common alphabetical writing.

After analysing the Turkish runic script, the famous scholar S.E.Malov (1947) came to this conclusion and said: "After investigating these inscriptions, I came to the conclusion that Turkic languages historically appeared at least 2,500 years ago." (Malov, 1947)

We fully agree with this opinion of the famous scholar.

The fate of none of the peoples who have lived in the history of the world, created an empire in their time, and then disintegrated, is probably as abstract as the fate of the Hunns and their language. The traces left by the Hunns in world history are somewhat elucidated on the basis of information left by historians and chroniclers of monasteries at that time. about the names of the drinks remained in Greek and Latin and later in German sources in the west, and in the

chronicles of Chinese chroniclers in the East, in documents of various contents and character. These authors, who clashed with the Hunns, tried to convey the words used by the Hunns, whether in Greek, Latin, or Chinese, through their own letters and hieroglyphs, relying on the sounds and phonetic laws of their language. These words are usually used as the national lexicon and names of the Hunns (and the Hunnu and Sunnu in the East) transliterated into Greek, Latin, or Chinese. Given that the Altaic language family is a family of languages different from the Indo-European or Sino-Tibetan language family, and that their phonomorphological aspects are not so close, it is possible to understand how unrecognizable the original Hunn word was in these translations and how difficult it was for European and Chinese linguists. The fact that the word Hunn is called Gunn in the west or syunnu in the east, and that they are also called Greek Scythians around the Black Sea, also indicates how complicated the matter is.

These challenges and N.Ya. Marr note the following words: "The greatest disaster for the Turkic peoples is that their history is learned by non-turkic peoples". These words explain that the language of the Hunns has not yet been clearly analyzed. (Marr, 1936)

We can list the following problems here.

First of all, it is denied that the Hunns, the Huns, the Sunnis are a single ethnic whole, more precisely a people, either unknowingly or deliberately. In our opinion, the latter is probably more accurate. This is because none of the peoples of Europe, neither the Germans, nor the Romans, nor the Slavs, nor the Iranians in the south, nor the Arabs, nor the Chinese in the East, want any of these great peoples to recognize the greatness of the Turkic peoples of the past. Therefore, their dominant ideology aimed to separate the Turkic peoples from their ancestors, great history and living past in all scientific and unscientific, just and unjust ways. To this end, Western and Eastern scholars try to distance themselves from the truth by deliberately giving erroneous options in their linguistic research. For example, I. Bentsig in his work on the study of the language of the Hunns says that "the language of the Huns and Sunnis has nothing in common with Turkic languages and it is more correct that they belong to the Ket and Paleo Asian languages than to the Danube and Volga Bulgarians" and brings ket words that don't come close at all. [4] The fact that the word "Tangri" in the Hunn language corresponds to the Old Turkic word "Tangri" in the Kipchak language ["tangri"] in the Chuvash language ["tura"] in the Mongolian language [tenggeri] does not mean that the Huns still speak Turkic. Maybe it's a word from another language."

They also try to confuse scholars by giving their wrong proposals where their affiliation with the Turkish language is clearly visible. For example, the Hunnic woman's name says that the name "Golden Parcha" should be read as "Golden Burdock" or "Golden Burdock", and she is confused because she does not understand the meaning of the simple name "Golden Piece".

Similar cases can be observed in the works of other scholars L.Bazen (1986), R.G.Akhmetyanov (1978), and many other linguists who devoted themselves to the study of the Hunn language.

For example, R.G. Akhmetyanov (1978) considers the Hunn language to be close to the Evenk language and compares several words belonging to these two languages. Interestingly, the words he is comparing are so far from each other that such an "infamous" position of the author to prove the thesis, which was initially incorrect, only serves to further reduce the overall value to the scientist. For example, in this play, the word angiskir in the Hunn language (tribal name) is found to be close to the alenkagir in the Evenk language.

He suspects the word hungur (onogur) in close proximity to the word hungu.

Utrigur considers the words uturgur to be close to the word udygir.

If, as the author himself puts it, the analysis is more reliable and scientific, and the names "utrigur, uturgur, onogur" are ancient pure Turkic words without any Evenk language, they are a rotational variants of the word Oghuz, and understood that "onogur" means "community

uniting ten Oghuz tribes" and "utrigur" means "union uniting thirty Oghuz tribes" and would not even need looking for this word in dictionary of the Evenk language.

The fact that the Hunn language is not derived from the Evenk language, or vice versa, can be explained by the fact that the Evenk language is not derived from the Hunn language, which is now numbered by 50,000 people. Although the Evenk language also belongs to the Altaic language family, they have never been so numerous in history as forming a vast empire.

Summarizing the information presented here, it can be said that the Hunn language is very close to the Turkic language with its typological features, i.e. palatal and labial synharmonism of vowels, assimilation of consonants, specific form of word structure, and phonological structures consisting of similar elements. allows you to add to a group of languages. Further studies of the similarities and differences in the design of grammatical categories that exist between the languages of peoples historically related in their past can serve as valuable material for studying the history of the development of specific languages and language families. Summarizing the above, the following conclusions can be drawn.

1. Sociolinguistics of the present time is characterized by an increased interest in the study of the historical aspect of the existence of language. As a result, the prehistory of peoples speaking Germanic languages, their ancestral home, etc. are established. Systematization of the facts of the history of language and the history of society and states helps to restore the socio-economic conditions of life of these peoples.

2. The Great Migration of Peoples, a historical event that took place in the life of Eurasia, had a huge impact on the ethnogeographic map of Europe. This is due to the fact that this process in the III-VII centuries covered all both old and young peoples and nationalities, civilized and less civilized, with or without writing, with and without state education.

3. The linguistic map of Europe before the GMP is very different from the linguistic map of Europe after the GMP, since many languages have died out during this period, many new languages have appeared, many languages have greatly expanded the sphere of use, and vice versa, many languages have greatly lost their former functional activity.

4. Many of the now unexplainable or controversial phenomena observed in the grammar of Germanic languages can be explained only by resorting to the material of the languages of the peoples who took part in the GMP. So many facts of the Germanic languages, which do not have their parallels in other Indo-European languages, can be explained by a systemic comparison of facts from other language families like the Altaic, Uralic, since the Indo-Europeans of Europe at the beginning of the 1st millennium had contacts only with peoples belonging to these language families. But if we are talking about some third language family that existed in Europe before the GMP, then nothing about it has survived, not even toponymic data. Therefore, it is hardly correct to look for some kind of object where it does not exist at all.

5. The shift of the morphological structure of a word from four-membered to three-membered occurred under the influence of the same extralinguistic factors, i.e. language contacts. The historical characteristics of linguistic contacts and their influence on the grammatical structure that makes up the specificity of a particular system, taking into account all the differences determined by the originality of the languages included in its composition, can be the subject of special research, subordinated to the main task - the study of the history of languages.

6. Called the "true Germanic script" by the Germanic peoples, the runic alphabet is not actually a Germanic runic alphabet, but a variant of the Turkish runic alphabet.

As the Germanic peoples, who emerged in the field of history, settled down and became more civilized, the most developed of them, the East Germans, began to use the ancient Turkic alphabet and made the necessary changes to the alphabet based on their phonetic structure.

7. The discovery of a large treasury of Germanic runic inscriptions in Romania indicates that relations between the Germanic and Turkic peoples reached their apogee during the so-called "Great Migration of Peoples".

Since this article is the first attempt on this topic, it is natural that it has not been able to provide a complete solution to this wide-ranging issue. We hope that further research will reveal the similarities and differences of these two alphabets completely.

8. In conclusion, it can be said that the archaic features of the Hunn language, i.e. the presence of specific generalizing consonants, or incorrectly articulated vowels, explain its belonging to the Altaic language family. In the morphological structure of the Hunn language, agglutination is characterized by being one of the main ways of expressing grammatical meaning, in which the agglutination serves as affixes, word formation and word modification. Hunn did not have a grammatical category, as is the case as in all other Turkic languages, and the affiliation or genitive convention had a distinctly common means of expression. There were no prepositions in Hunn, but there was post-position. The more complex verb tenses, aspect, voice and mood forms in Hunn, or the impersonal forms of the verb, and the types of compound sentences in Hunn syntax, cannot be said of the various connectives or others involved in making them because the body of texts of sufficient complexity has not been preserved.

REFERENCES

1. Akhmet'yanov, R.G. (1978). *Sravnitel'noye issledovaniye tatarskogo i chuvashskogo yazykov (fonetika i leksika)*. Moskva: Nauka.
2. Amanzholov, A.S. (1975). *Materialy i issledovaniya po istorii drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti - Doctoral dissertation*, Alma-ata.
3. Bazen, L. (1986). *Chelovek i ponyatiye istorii u tyurkov Tsentral'noy Azii*. In *Zarubezhnaya tyurkologiya* (361-379). Moskva: Nauka.
4. Bentsig, A. (1986). *Yazyki gunnov, dunayskikh i volzhskikh bulgar*. In *Zarubezhnaya tyurkologiya* (11-28). Moskva: Nauka.
5. Benvenist, E. (1973). *Obshchaya lingvistika*. Moskva: Progress.
6. Budanova, V.M., Gorskiy AA., & Yermolova, I.Ye. (2005). *Velikoye pereseleniye narodov: etnopoliticheskiye i sotsial'nyye aspekty*. Moskva.
7. Chemodanov, N.S. (1982). *Germanskiye yazyki*. In *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskoye izucheniye yazykov raznykh semey: Zadachi i perspektivy*. (91-116). Moskva: Nauka.
8. Diringer, D. (1958). *Alfavit*. Moskva: Literatura na inostrannih yazykah. Moskva.
9. *Drevnetyurkskiy slovar'*. (1969). Moskva-Leningrad: Nauka.
10. Keydan, A. (2006). «Kal'kirovanny arkhaizm» gotskogo yazyka. *Indoyevropeyskoye yazykoznanie i klassicheskaya filologiya. Materialy chteniya posvyashchennogo pamyati prof. I.M. Tronskogo*. – SPb, s.149-155.
11. Kuldashev, A.M. (2010). *An Introduction to Germanic Philology*. Tashkent: Sharq press.
12. Kuldashev, A.M. (2020). *Tilshunoslikda tarixiylik tamoyili*. Toshkent: Yangi Davr.
13. Kuldashev, A.M., & Kuldasheva, Sh.A. (2021). *On the nature of Changes in Germanic languages under the influence of the Great Migration of Peoples*. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (96), 325-331.
14. Kuldashev, A.M., & Satimov, G. (1990) *Tipologiya sistemno-obuslovlennykh izmeneniy kak faktov razvitiya struktury yazyka. Aktual'nyye problemy sravnitel'noy tipologii i metodiki obucheniya inostrannym yazykam v svete razvitiya sovremennykh protsessov natsional'nogo i internatsional'nogo*. Osh, Kyrgyzstan.
15. Makayev, E.A. (1977). *Obshchaya teoriya sravnitel'nogo yazykoznaneya*. Moskva.
16. Malov, S.Ye. (1947). *Pamyatniki drevne tyurkskoy pis'mennosti*, Moskva: Nauka.
17. Marr, N.YA. (1936). *Izbrannyye raboty, tom II*. Moskva.

18. Osokin, N.A. (2003). Istoriya srednikh vekov. Minsk: Kharvest.
19. Rastorguyeva, T.A. (2005). Istoriya angliyskogo yazyka. Moskva.
20. Trubetskoy, N.S. (1999). Vavilonskaya bashnya i smesheniye yazykov – naslediye Chingiskhana – M., 1999, 240 s.
21. Zhirmunskiy, V.M. (1965). Istoria nemetskogo yazyka. In V.M.Zhirmunskiy. –Ed.5-e, peresm. i. ispr. – Moskva: Vysshaya shkola.