



Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ БІЛІМ - 2018»
XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы

СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ

XIII Международная научная конференция
студентов и молодых ученых
«НАУКА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ - 2018»

The XIII International Scientific Conference
for Students and Young Scientists
«SCIENCE AND EDUCATION - 2018»



12th April 2018, Astana

**ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ
Л.Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ЕУРАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ**

**Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«Ғылым және білім - 2018»
атты XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ**

**СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
XIII Международной научной конференции
студентов и молодых ученых
«Наука и образование - 2018»**

**PROCEEDINGS
of the XIII International Scientific Conference
for students and young scholars
«Science and education - 2018»**

2018 жыл 12 сәуір

Астана

УДК 378

ББК 74.58

Ғ 96

Ғ 96

«Ғылым және білім – 2018» атты студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың XIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы = XIII Международная научная конференция студентов и молодых ученых «Наука и образование - 2018» = The XIII International Scientific Conference for students and young scholars «Science and education - 2018». – Астана: <http://www.enu.kz/ru/nauka/nauka-i-obrazovanie/>, 2018. – 7513 стр. (қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша).

ISBN 978-9965-31-997-6

Жинаққа студенттердің, магистранттардың, докторанттардың және жас ғалымдардың жаратылыстану-техникалық және гуманитарлық ғылымдардың өзекті мәселелері бойынша баяндамалары енгізілген.

The proceedings are the papers of students, undergraduates, doctoral students and young researchers on topical issues of natural and technical sciences and humanities.

В сборник вошли доклады студентов, магистрантов, докторантов и молодых ученых по актуальным вопросам естественно-технических и гуманитарных наук.

УДК 378

ББК 74.58

ISBN 978-9965-31-997-6

©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия
ұлттық университеті, 2018

ПОДСЕКЦИЯ 5.4
ТЮРКСКИЙ МИР В КОНТЕКСТЕ ДУХОВНОЙ МОДЕРНИЗАЦИИ

УДК 811.111:17.023.0

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TURKIC AND MONGOLIAN LANGUAGES

Baigazh Aizhan

Baigazh_a@enu.kz

L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University

Supervisor – A.Zh.Sharip

Clawson writes in his article: "Lexicostatic evaluation of the Altai theory", writes about the Altai theory, i.e. about the theory according to which the Turkic, Mongolian and Tungus-Manchu languages originated from a common ancestor - the Praaltaic one [1]. The main supporters of this theory are such scientists as Poppe, Menges, Ramsted, Miller, Martin (for the Korean-Japanese linguistic affinity) its opponents are Derfer, Scherbak and Clawson himself.

In the mid-nineties, Cardinal G. Derfer also radically revised his views. Of course, he did not recognize the existence of the Altai family, but if earlier the theory provided for only unidirectional borrowings: Turkic> Mongolian> Tungus-Manchu, nowadays Derfer recognizes the existence in the Altai languages of such borrowings as the layer of early Mongolisms in Turkic languages this refers to suits of horses, titles, terms of camel breeding and horse breeding).

In particular, according to G. Durfer, in the old Mongolisms the Mongolian * h was transmitted as a Turkic q: Turk. qolaŋ 'cinch' <Mong. * holaŋ 'cinch'> modern.mong. olaŋ; qotaz 'yak' <mong. * hotus[2].

A. Vovin during the 90's quite sharply changed his position on the question of the composition of the Altai family. From the recognition of a broad Altai family (the Turks - the Mongols - the Tungus - the Manchus - the Koreans - the Japanese), he proceeded to recognize only a narrow "East Altai" family, to which only the Tungus-Manchu, Korean, and Japanese subgroups belong.

So, Rassadin regards the Altai family as consisting only of continental families: Turkic, Mongolian and Tungus-Manchurian. At the same time, he does not consider the relationship of all three families to be conclusively proven, although quite probable. Moreover, he expresses a rather unexpected idea about the closer relationship of the Turkic and Tungus-Manchurian families with each other, while the Mongolian languages are more remote from them. The basis for this is a whole set of common-tongue-Manchu-Turkic vocabulary related to hunting and other cultural realities, which is absent in Mongolian languages. Perhaps this is due not to a closer relationship, but to separate contacts of the Turkic and Tungus-Manchu languages in a certain period of time.

I must say that, in particular, V.I. Rassadin does not exclude possible Bulgarian borrowings in Mongolian languages of rotational type, for example biragu 'calf' <Turk. buzagu, * bor> * bora 'gray', which occurred in the Hunnic era. Thus, many of the correspondences, which are indicated in the Altai etymological dictionary as primordial, are considered by him as borrowings. Accordingly, the percentage of convergence between Turkic and Mongolian vocabulary decreases[3].

To prove the genetic affinity of any language, one must rely on the generally accepted method of research, mainly by analyzing common words in languages. There were two methods - glottochronology (studying the rate of changes in the language and using these data for historical conclusions, especially for determining the time depth, the use of data on temporal depths for clarifying models of internal links within the language family) and lexicostatistics (statistical study of the dictionary for historical conclusions) . But the methods of glottochronology can not objectively assess the language relationship. It is impossible to derive the formula for the percentage of the preservation of the language, equally applicable to all languages. It is unlikely that the main dictionary will change at the same speed for a long period of time. The speed with

which the vocabulary of a language changes varies from time to time, depending on many reasons, the most important of which is the extent to which the speakers of this dictionary are in contact with other speakers of other languages. Thus, glottochronology can not accurately determine the time when modern genetically related languages separated from each other and became separate languages. On the contrary, the value of lexicostatistics as an exact science is visible.

When analyzing the main vocabulary of a number of related languages, it can be shown that those languages that have a greater number of common words have split up later than those that have fewer such words. If it is discovered that some languages have one common word for the same concept, and other languages are another common word for the same concept, then it can be shown that these two groups trace back to the original language-basis through two different intermediate languages [4].

On the other hand, if it is revealed in the analysis of the main dictionary of two or more languages (presumably related genetically) that they are completely different or show only a minimum of common words for them, then we can confidently conclude that these languages are not genetically related to each other, and The common words for them are either borrowings or similarities of a random order.

Clawson draws conclusions based on the list of words of the ancient Turkic monument "Diwan Lugati t Turk" by Mahmud Kashgari (about 1000 years ago) and a list of Mongolian words based on "The Secret Legend", "Hua-I J-Yu" and "Muqaddimatu l-Adab "Zamahshari (700 years ago). Some conclusions from the lists of words considered by Clawson: in both Turkic and Mongolian languages, there are special words for "upper arm" and "hip".

In Turkic and Mongolian languages the same word is used to mean "man", "husband." (Turkic, er, erh, erh-hun).

The Mongolian word with the meaning "road" -jam- later borrowing into the Turkic in the form of yam, is obviously borrowing from the Chinese chan (stopping the way, later-road).

In Mongolian there is a special word for "woman", in Turkic - a special word for "female" (in general).

Common for the Turkic and Mongolian languages is borrowing from the Iranian, which in Turkic horrible in the form of kamag. (Meaning-all).

There are phonetic similarities between personal pronouns in languages. Turk.Menin and Mong. Minii

Similar similarities are in many languages and they can not be considered indicative. It is difficult to find collective terms in the Turkic and Mongolian languages of the early period[5]. Initially, the same words were used to refer to individual fur-bearing animals, for example martens or sables or their fur.

Türk. taluy (sea) is certainly a Chinese loan. ta-large and luy-medieval name of the river Sanganhye. Mong.dalay apparently is the same word, but it was not clarified whether it was borrowed from the Turkic or directly from the Chinese.

Tengri was inherited by the Turks from the language of Hsiung-nu, who, perhaps, was the ancestor of the Turkic languages. Denoted the word "heaven" in a mystical, religious sense, and in physical terms it was used only as a combination of "heaven and earth". It was borrowed by Mongolian languages with the same meaning.

Mong. the word lived (the year of the 12-year-old animal cycle) -conditioning. It is known from the dictionary of Mahmud Kashgari that the sound transition y-c (j) was characteristic for some Oguz dialects. By the 11th century most Oguzes had moved west, but in the 8th century they lived in the area of the Selenga and Tola rivers. Probably, so the Mongols borrowed this word from them [6].

Türk. Kari means "old" in general, and a mong. Ebugen was used in the special meaning of "old man". In the Turkic and Mongolian languages there is a conditional mood. And the sentence can begin with the word "if".

As a result, of the 200 Mongolian and Turkic words considered by Clawson with the same meaning of the main dictionary, only 16 words coincided. Some of them are either Turkic in

Mongolian, or borrowed from Mongolian and Turkic languages from other languages and coincide, or similar pronouns that do not prove kinship.

Clawson's conclusions on the evaluation of the Altai theory: 1) During the historical period the Mongolian languages remained exceptionally resistant to changes, and the Turkic ones remained super-stable. It is unlikely that this stability - a recent phenomenon.

2) After excluding words that can certainly be considered borrowed, the common elements in the Turkic and Mongolian basic dictionary will not be more than 2 percent of the main vocabulary, and these common words can easily be explained as borrowing rather than as evidence of genetic ties.

T.O. Clawson proves the illegitimacy of the Altai theory.

This raises the problem of determining borrowing in the languages in question. Since there are a lot of common elements in the grammar and vocabulary of the Turkic and Mongolian languages, most of them are either Turkic in Mongolian or Mongolian in Turkic. For example, in the "Secret Legend" of 1240 there are such Turkisms as: alashas-horses, al-red, alginchy-forward detachment,alachuk-tent, trench-robbers. In the dictionary Mukaddimat-al-Adab of the 14th century such Turkisms as: sai-ravine, rumi - Roman, rahim - mercy. There are also Turkicisms inherent in certain areas of the Mongolian languages, such as Oirat (in the west), Khalkha, Buryat (in the east), Kalmyk[7].

Examples of Mongolism in the Turkic language can serve: tat. Megels (mittens), cf. Mong. - begelei, mong. - BA. (before the 13th century).

Comparative altaism has proved the existence of very old correspondences between the Turkic, Mongolian and Tungus system of initial consonants, and they appeared probably before the 13th century. These are the correspondences of the Turkic-j / y-moong.-d / j / n, türsk.-t-moong.-t / d.

Serebrennikov cites data on the basis of which it is possible to draw some conclusions regarding the relationship or non-relatedness of the Turkic and Mongolian languages, such as: a) 1) a greater degree of preservation of similarly sounding Mongolian and Turkic words. If the languages that make up the group of related languages really go back to one source, i.e. proto-language, the material-related words of these languages can not be at the same level of preservation. And all the Turko-Mongolian parallels are almost at a single level of security. They are so close that the bearer of the Turkic language without much difficulty and, without resorting to special etymological research, can say that this word really looks like a Turkic word corresponding in meaning.

-mong. ail (group of yurts), tat.avil (village), kaz. ayil (aul);

-mong.altan (gold), tat.altiyn, kaz.altin;

-mong. balt (ax), tat.ballā, Bashka Balta, Kaz.balta;

-mong. zhimes(fruit), tat.zhimesh (fruit, vegetable), kaz.zhemizs (fruit, fruit).

-mong.harzgai (hawk), kalm.-hartzkh, tat.karchchig, kaz.karshyga.

-mong.-tanikh (learn) kalm.tan, kaz.tan, tat.tan.

-mong.-alag (motley), kalm.alg, tat.al, kaz.ala, kum.ala.

-mong.har-black, tat.kara, bashkara, kaz-kar.

-mong.mal-cattle, kalm.mal, tat-mal, kaz-mal, kum-mal.

Serebrennikov considers these examples of borrowings of Turkic words by Mongolian languages, and in a relatively recent era (no more than 2000 years ago) [9].

2) the impossibility of establishing on the Mongolian material the archetypes of words that would coincide with the Turkic archetypes. A simple comparison of a number of close materially close words or forms in itself still does not give anything, because There is not a sample for comparison or the most ancient form. Only a comparison of the ancient form with modern ones makes it possible to reveal the directions of the development of a particular word, one form or another. It is difficult to establish an archetype based on Mongolian material. If it is possible to determine the Mongolian archetype, then it does not appear to be analogous to an archetype established using only Turkic languages.

Thus, Serebrennikov reaffirms his opinion that there are borrowings, and not words leading to their origin from the common ancient praaltaic archetype for them.

3) the suffixes attested in the Turko-Mongolian parallels do not reflect the system of suffixes of the Mongolian languages. Morphological analysis of the Turko-Mongolian parallels showed that they, unified in phonetic and semantic relations, from the morphological viewpoint are still indivisible on primordially Mongolian soil and find a satisfactory explanation only when using the data of the Turkic languages.

4) underdevelopment of lexico-semantic nests as a sign of a borrowed word. Some of the Turk-Mongolian lexical parallels in Mongolian languages reveal signs of borrowed words. The meaning of the word, according to the law of semantic changes when borrowed by other languages, as a rule, sharply narrows and specializes[10].

In the Mong. the suffix -, which denotes the profession, the type of activity, is widespread. (Malchin is a cattle-breeder, a uyach-tailor, an orchulag-translator).

In Turkic languages, words with the affix -hy, chi denote persons according to their activities (Taty Eshche - worker from ash-work, Uzbek Chorvachi - cattle-breeder from cattle-cattle, Kirghiz Balygchi - fisherman from balyk-fish, etc.) .)

The origin of the suffix -h can not be established on the basis of Mongolian language data. For this purpose it is necessary to involve the data of Turkic languages. Apparently, the importance of the profession was not original. Most likely the Turkic affix - chi, chi was the affix of adjectives, meaning habit, inclination to anything. Then, from the sphere of adjectives, the suffix was moved to the sphere of nouns. And since Mongolian languages do not have such data, Serebrennikov concludes that the -xi affix is of Turkic origin in Mongolian languages.

5) Rotazism (transformation of z into r) and lambdaism (conformity of l and š) (observed in the Chuvash language) did not take place in the Mongolian languages. It manifests itself only in the Turko-Mongolian parallels[11].

In such a comparison as kam. cholun - stone, mong - chuluu, turksk. tash, chuvash, Chuvash form should, most likely, be considered as borrowing from Mongolian languages, for the Turkic and Chuvash forms are not derived from one source.

6) many of the Turko-Mongolian parallels are vagabond cultural terms. It is not always possible to determine definitely where the borrowing came from.

7) Many words of the Turko-Mongolian parallels belong to the Turkic proto-language.

Arguments in favor of the genetic relationship of the Turkic and Mongolian languages:

1) the belonging of the words entering the Turko-Mongolian parallels to the basic dictionary fund. This is confirmed by the breadth of spheres covered by the Turko-Mongolian parallels, the coincidence of some categories of the basic vocabulary fund, the absence of sharp violations of sound correspondences.

2) the absence of any significant distortions in the Turkic-Mongolian parallels of the phonetic laws of the Turkic and Mongolian languages.

T.O. Serebrennikov concludes that it is impossible to recognize the Turkic and Mongolian languages as genetically related, and that methods for studying the problem of the genetic relationship of the Turkic and Mongolian languages on the basis of borrowed words and their sounding are not perfect. And to still prove this kinship, you need to use other methods and arguments[6].

You can talk a lot about the similarities and differences between the Turkic and Mongolian languages, but the proposed method for studying the Altai languages of Rhone-Tash, according to Rassadin, is considered the most acceptable at the present time. He believes that the Altai language has disintegrated quite early and the separate life of the Altai languages is a long historical process.

Rona-Tash showed that the general Turkic-Mongolian lexical fund in many respects consists of early Turkicisms in the Mongolian languages related to the Old Bulgarian period. The terminology of highly developed animal husbandry in the Mongolian languages is Bulgarian-Turkic in origin, which is indicated not only by the correspondence z-r, and š-l, but also by a number of other signs (kimir-kumys, the lexeme is of Turkic origin). The basic terms of metal working, such

as darqan-blacksmith, etc. are also Turkic in origin.

Linguistic evidence confirms what is known from history: some Altaic languages were already developed in the Late Bronze Age, and historical contacts existed between them, which was reflected in Bulgarian-Turkic borrowings in the Mongolian language. In Mongolian, of course, there are words of the Bulgarian type, borrowed through trade relations.

Clawson and Rhone-Tash came to the conclusion that the Turkisms penetrated into the Mongolian languages from the early Turkic languages in different historical periods. Therefore, a strict definition of phonetic patterns in correspondences is impossible[12].

Despite all these arguments of the adherents of the Altai theory and its rejection it is impossible to deny the long-standing interaction and mutual influence of the Mongolian and Turkic languages. As the Turkic language introduces its elements into the Mongolian language, so the Mongolian leaves traces in the Turkic language. An example of such influence can serve as the process of interaction of the Turkic and Mongolian in Bayan-Ulgiy aimak in the west of Mongolia. For decades, the influence of the Mongolian on the Kazakh on this territory continues. Also here they feel the influence of the Kazakh and Mongolian Tuvinians. Not to mention the influence of the Mongolian to the Turkic languages of the Tsaatan - Uighurs and Uyghur - Uryankhays (west of Lake Khvsgul). All Turks in Mongolia are currently bilingual. There is also an interaction of the Mongolian language and Tuvan in the Terekhol district, in the Erzin and Ovr regions. An example of the penetration of Tuvan vocabulary and grammar into the Mongolian language: bi us Umaar baina-I want to drink; bi gertee harimaar baina-i want to go home; chi ermeer bainuu? –Do you want to come?

Thus, along with the discussions of linguists about the genetic relationship or its lack of Turkic and Mongolian languages, the languages continue to interact and interpenetrate. It began in ancient times, continued into the Middle Ages and continues to this day. What gives ground for studying this long process of language connections. And more accurate attempts to prove the related or unrelated links of the languages in question.

Literature:

1. Clawson J. Lexicostatic evaluation of the Altai theory.
2. Rassadine V.I. To the description of the Turkic-Mongolian relations.
3. Rassadine V.I. Contacts and the Turkic-Mongolian language community.1988.
4. Rassadine V.I. On the semantic method.
5. Ron-Tash A. Heritage or borrowing.
6. Serebrennikov B.A. Methods of studying the relationship of the Turkic and Mongolian languages. Kharkov., 1983.
7. Scherbak A.M. Lexical interrelations of Turkic, Mongolian and Tung-Manch. Languages.
8. Scherbak A.M. On the methodology of exploring language parallels in connection with the Altai hypothesis.
9. Scherbak A.M. About the Altai hypothesis in linguistics. 1959.
10. Scherbak A.M. Turkic-Mongolian language relations.
11. Ground I.A. Altaism and antialtaism at the turn of the century.
12. Ground I.A. Common heritage and borrowing.