

DEVELOPMENT OF VOCABULARY IN TURKIC LANGUAGES

Abdurahimova Nigora Azizovna

Annotation: Turkish so that qiesing language facts does not consist of simple comparisons all phenomena specific to languages are studied in the diachronic plan. After all, the Turkic languages historical interpretation of the mutual of phonetic and grammatical features performed cannot be overstated. Some grammatical cases typical of current Turkic languages are synchronous the basis is also eloquent. In particular, the phonetic system of Turkic languages gave a row changes, the question of the compatibility of vowels and consonants, the pronunciation of sounds, due to being able to distinguish the differences in the language, he èki to study the text on this language it will be possible.

Keywords: language, host, difference, proof, progressièt

Introduction

A number that has not yet been permanently resolved in Turkish Studies there are problems. As long as the prototurk period progressièti is old and typological unity of current Turkic languages as well as lexical generality since the basis dates, these common signs vary to be fully justified in the structure, the areal distribution of language characters, the Turkic tribe and the uniform conjugation of the elates implies that èki is separable nagijasi is the consequence of their different integrations with non-fraternal ethnic groups according to linguistic signs it will be possible to look. Hence the Turkic languages qièsi — historical when studying in aspect, it is also necessary to take into account their areal characteristics. The issue of kinship of such languages as Altai, Mongolian, Korean it is controversial. Some scientists are genetically related to these languages they express the opinion that typological is similar, and not. Qièsiy-historical through the method, clarifications are introduced into these phenomena. 1. Altai hypothesis. Hypothesis about the genetic kinship of the Altai languages èki Altai in the century when the hypothesis turned R.Rask, W.Schott and M.A. On the side of the Castres, the former pushed and first in the Ural — Altai, and then in the Altai variants in a wide range spread. The relationship of the Ural — Altai variant to the Altai with the Uralic languages separated in a separate family style. Altai languages deb Korean languages with Turkic, Mongolian, Tungusic — manjur and some discretion separated as bslgis uniting the alleged groups V.K. Memyus vowel harmony, not applying slang at the beginning of SOE tendrntia is the bnqaricity of the letter N at the end of a word, at the beginning of a word and at the end of a word the fact that consonant sounds are grouped does not exist, stretched and hesitant indicates the absence of consonants and the multiple use of open syllables. More than a hundred years in vaht in Altai the hypothesis held its own. Komparativistic altaisticnint the creation of two qièsi grammatikaniig as the culmination Noah is a big event (works by Ramsted and Poppe). The two authors have their own views and work on this in general, collecting material up to them they gave their conclusion. But with the advent of these qièsi grammars the Altai hypothesis by many of the researchers is of scientific value not able, degai thought was told, because these works find similarities and grandfather styles in shape reconstruction are not entirely correct clarified. One with comparativistic Altai Studies in recent years another direction is developing in Qatar, it is the Historical of the Altai languages considering not only similarities, but also differences, referring to the connection takes. The main typological signs that can be seen in the Altai-Ural languages is the following:

1 phonetpk at the level: singlarmonism (vowel harmony) of maajudism, the practice of the law of assimilation of consonant sounds qilipga, the rigor of a consonant with a vowel in the word O'ea, in the beginning of the word it is consonant to the bit the arrival of sound is synharmonic in words that undergo semantic differentiation the fact that parallelism can occur, the cross section in the vocabulary soega head like the fall of the accent.

2. At the morphological level: word... and in word change suffixes are the advantage of allowing agglutination, and sometimes the core the way of the morpheme to Fusion, in the function of front scutes patron's use, non-occurrence of argicles, grammatical rod non-existence of category, existence of ownership category, output the expression of the meaning of qièslash in the construction of the agreement, the unity and relative plurality of word-modifying suffixes in plural numbers, head

3. 3. such as the abundance of kelipshk vaeifa. Syntactic level: with number non-occurrence of numerical alignment in implicit determiners, interrogative

participation of loadings in the expression of meaning, follow wide range of adjectival and eloquent turnover in place of sentences the use, the logical stress of the object expressed in the revenue agreement, the relative rigidity of the order of sentence fragments, to determine the quality, number and pronouns that come in the determinant function

constant without conformity, etc.

4. At the lexical level: Turkic languages the presence of a common layer in the composition of the dictionary. in monosyllabic words being a common *yakqol namoèn, sièsi* - influenced by the social environment the appropriation of the dominant language lexicon and b. Of the Altai and Turkic languages lexical differences in certain groups are the result of further progress of the language is. The Altai languages in their vocabulary are Turkish, Mongolian and tungus —common SOEs for Manchurian languages are found in the eastern Turkic languages Chinese, sanskrit, Persian —Arabic lexicon and Finnish language in the network the meeting of elements of the linguistic map of Turkic languages is the icon. At the time of the Turkic language progressiète, Siberia and The appropriation of Mongolian words in the Central Osiè languages in Altai served to enrich the vocabulary of the languages between their languages, Xu pre-century common Turkic literary and artistic texts language *chukur* in the *iatija* of study, it is clear the generaltipological features of Turkic languages *belgipash*, comparison with changes in the next language *tarakkièti*, current of the farcical characters that occurred in different lines of Turkic languages *anikdash* the reasons will be possible.

REFERENCES:

1. Abdurahmanov G', Rustamov A. Old Turkic language. - T.: Teacher, 1982.
2. Abdurahmanov G', Shukurov Sh., Mahmudov Q. History of the Uzbek language grammar. - T.: National Society of philosophers of Uzbekistan, 2008.
3. Malov S. Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoy pismennosti. Texti I issledovania. -M.- L., 1951.
4. Rakhmonov N., Sadigov Q. History of the Uzbek language. - T.: Philosophers of Uzbekistan national society, 2009.