

## PROBLEMS OF NOUN AND VERB ROOT WORDS IN THE KAZAKH LANGUAGE

**Zhuzimkul BAİYMBETOVA<sup>1</sup>**  
**Kenzhegul Utepovna KAZİBAYEVA<sup>2</sup>**

### ABSTRACT

The article deals with the composition of verbs in the Kazakh language, the structure of verbs, and the root of verbs. When we say "composition of a verb", we mean what morphological parts verbs are made of, we say the types and characteristics of main morphemes and auxiliary morphemes, we define the types of lexical and grammatical parts of a verb. When making an etymological analysis of the composition of ancient morphemes in Turkic languages, there are often homomorphic, one-syllable nouns and verb-homonyms. M. Kashkari proved with great foresight in his principles that it is impossible to move on to the problem of the phonetic structure and character of the root when talking about the root morpheme of the Kazakh and Turkic languages. The root morpheme of Turkic and Kazakh words is monosyllabic. So, these cases show that it is not correct to use words, roots, and bases interchangeably in many cases. V.V. Vinogradov said that it is necessary to consider the forms and transformations of words from the point of view of each word class. In conclusion, we can say that the verbs in the modern Kazakh language, like other word classes, from a historical point of view, their roots and additions are developing and forming in terms of meaning, phonetics and morphology.

**Keywords:** Composition of Words, Turkic Studies, Morphological Structure.

### KAZAKCA DİLİNDE İSİM VE FİL KÖK SÖZCÜK SORUNLARI

#### ÖZET

Makalede Kazak dilinde fiillerin yapısı ve fiillerin kökü ele alınmıştır. "Bir fiilin bileşimi" derken, fiillerin hangi morfolojik kısımlardan oluştuğunu kastediyoruz, ana morfemlerin ve yardımcı morfemlerin türlerini ve özelliklerini söylüyoruz, bir fiilin sözlüksel ve dilbilgisel kısımlarının türlerini tanımlıyoruz. Türk dillerinde eski morfemlerin oluşumuna ilişkin etimolojik bir inceleme yapılırken, çoğu kez homomorfik, tek heceli isimler ve fiil-homonimleri vardır. M. Kaşkari, Kazak ve Türk dillerinin kök morfemlerinden bahsederken kökün fonetik yapısı ve karakteri sorununa geçmenin imkansız olduğunu ilkelerinde büyük bir öngörü ile kanıtladı. Türkçe ve Kazakça kelimelerin kök morfemleri tek hecelidir. İşte bu durumlar göstermektedir ki, birçok durumda sözcüklerin, köklerin ve tabanların birbirinin yerine kullanılması doğru değildir. V.V. Vinogradov kelimelerin biçimlerini ve dönüşümlerini her bir kelime sınıfı açısından ele almanın gerekli olduğunu söyledi. Sonuç olarak, çağdaş Kazak dilinde fiillerin, diğer kelime sınıfları gibi, tarihsel bir bakış açısıyla, kök ve eklerinin anlam, fonetik ve morfoloji açısından geliştiğini ve oluştuğunu söyleyebiliriz.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kelime Bileşimi, Türkçe Çalışmaları, Morfolojik Yapı, Orhun Abideleri.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D., Candidate of Science in Philology, South Kazakhstan State Pedagogical University, zhuzimkul.bayymbetova@mail.ru

<sup>2</sup> Candidate of Science in Pedagogy Peoples' Friendship University named after Academician A. Kuatbekov, Shymkent, Kazakhstan, kazybaeva.k77@mail.ru

Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article, Geliş Tarihi/Received: 05/05/2023–Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 12/05/2023

## INTRODUCTION

In the 1950s, special attention was paid to the problems related to the structure of words, and as a result of conferences, discussions, this problem was revised and clarified. In the 1960s, special research was conducted on these issues. Among such works, we can mention S.U.Usmanov's work "Morphological features of words in the modern Uzbek language" (1964), A. Yskakov's work "The structure of words and word classes in the modern Kazakh language" (1964). N.K. Dmitriev this problem about, the structural system of words in the Turkish language is clearly visible. It was said that the morphological composition of words consists of two elements: root persons and affixes [1] N.A. Baskakov, T.M. Garipov, A. Kaidarov, M. Shcherbak (and other scientists) have addressed this issue in their research.xs

Each of the linguistic terms "composition of verbs" and "structure of verbs" has its own limits and theoretical problems. When we say "structure of verbs", we define the place order and order system of the main and auxiliary morphemes in the word composition, we consider the mutual structure system of the lexical-grammatical particles in the word composition of the classified persons.

When we say "composition of a verb", we mean what morphological parts verbs are made of, we say the types and characteristics of main morphemes and auxiliary morphemes, we define the types of lexical and grammatical parts of a verb. A word has its own structure, type, and personality. It is related to the lexical-grammatical characteristics of the word. It is known that vocabulary - grammatical character is different in each word. Therefore, their internal morphological structure and personality structure system are different. The reason for their difference is due to the fact that the external appearance of the words is different. This law is a very old law.

### 1. PROBLEMS OF WORD COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE

The composition and structure of the word is the main research object of morphology. Prof. A. Iskakov on "Morphological composition of words": "Words in our language are not uniform in terms of morphological composition, they are different. Among the words, there are bare root words and derived words made by suffixes..."

And about the "Morphological structure of words" it is said: "To determine the root of words or its morphological structure, it is necessary to take into account whether the morpheme to be determined is subject to other words in the language or not" [2].

If one morpheme is used as a root or suffix in one or more words other than the analyzed word, it should be remembered that the morphological composition and etymological composition of the same word may not be exactly the same. Since semantic and grammatical connections between morphemes are permanently destroyed, the word may completely lose its original meaning.

All verb roots in the modern Kazakh language are lexically, grammatically, phonetically integrated. And from the historical point of view, the root gradually develops and forms in terms of meaning, phonetics, and morphology. Morphemes, which served as roots in the early times, became obsolete in later times, became part of derived words and assimilated. Among the root words, there are many root nouns and root verbs with different pronunciations and different meanings. V.V Radlov, the scientist who first raised this issue in Turkic linguistics, said in his research that they are found in the form of verb-noun words.

In the 20s, Jean Denis offered a different opinion on this issue. According to the scientist, most of the basic words in Turkic languages were nouns. This opinion was expressed by K. E.V. Sevortyan says that these two works cannot give a meaningful answer to the relationship between verbs and nouns in early times, as they emphasize the properties of nouns only in sentences and phrases. Turkologist scientist V. Bang suggests that the first base words had both verb and noun meanings, and they were expressed in the form of verb-noun words (verb names).

A. A. Potebnya's researches have analyzed the verb-noun nature in detail.

P.M. Melioranskyi says about such words that in ancient Turkic languages, verb and noun stems were not clearly distinguished as they are now, even now there are roots with both verb and noun meanings. This opinion was supplemented by I.A. Batmanov, N.A. Baskakov, G. Ramstedt. Also, K. Brockelman, B. M. Yunusaliv mentioned this issue in their research.

### 1.1 Composition of Ancient Morphemes in Turkic Languages

When performing an etymological analysis of the ancient morphemes in Turkic languages, verb-homonyms with a monosyllabic noun and a verb are often found. Such roots were mentioned in the researches of A.I.

According to E.V. Sevortyan, the way of creating two different words from the same base coexisted with the way of creating words using suffixes. In such a way, if a new word is created only from root words, then it should be changed from basic words to derived bases. It is said that this homonymous approach lives on in our modern language as well [3].

According to A.M. Shcherbak, the creation of syncretic words in the field of grammar of verb and noun bases should reflect the birth and formation of word classes.

A.T. Kaidarov, in his research on noun and verb roots in Turkic languages, divides them into the following two groups: 1) first; 2) subsequent.

It is also mentioned in the researches of M. Tomanov, E. Kazhibekov about the meaningful roots of nouns and verbs.

It is clear from these comments that although the first roots are verb-noun, their main meaning is the name of meaningful action, they are bare at first and later turn into affixed bases.

E.V. Sevortyan: the process of creating root homonyms begins to disappear as our time approaches. However, it is said that during the Middle Ages, it retains its effectiveness. Even in the modern Kazakh language, the verb-noun homonymous roots of the early times are preserved in their original form. For example: name, food, head, wedding, thought, street, etc.

Verbs with multiple meanings in our language are often used in the modern Kazakh language. From a historical point of view, it is gradually developing in terms of meaning, composition, structure, and sound.

For example: the verb "Agar" has the following definitions in the 10-volume explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language. 1. Turning white, pale, pale. His hair has become thinner and his hair has turned gray. 2. Pale light in the morning. After eating and drinking tea, we drove the horse at dawn. 3. Exoneration from the charge, getting rid of it. Come on, turn white now! (M. Auezov). 4. He became blind, his eyes turned white. 5. To make a mistake, to be mistaken. Why did your eyes turn white, not recognizing your grandson? 6. Suffering, getting into trouble. You will be a dog and your eyes will be white. 7. Whitening in combination with 8. The bone is not white. 9. His hair turned white. 10. Fatigue, exhaustion. From this we can see that the verb "agar" is used in ten senses.

The following register-verbs in the 10-volume explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language prove that the verb "agar" is morphologically developing and forming. 1. Darkness. Make it dark. From the verb -ak, the noun -ar is formed by means of suffixes that create an imitative word. 2. It was dark. It turned white. It was created using the analytical method of word creation. 3. In the dark. The verb agar is formed by using the suffix -ar after the verb -ak to create a verb from the verb, -an after the suffix of the imitative word, -and from the verb to create a verb. Ag-ar-an is the base word. In the verb Agarandat, the verb Ag-ar-ang-da-t is formed from four affixes. The arrangement of morphemes in a word is called their structural system. As for the opinions on this, V. Kotvich says, "The composition of a word can be only in the form of a root or a root and a suffix.

N.A. Baskakov: "In agglutinative languages, including Turkic languages, a word contains four different elements: 1. Root. 2. The first base consisting of root and word-forming lexical-grammatical affixes. 3. The second base consisting of root and word-generating lexical-grammatical and word-transforming functional-grammatical affixes. 4. It is divided into word modifying affixes.

We said that S. Usmanov, the first researcher of the morphological structure of words in the Uzbek language, divided words into core and base. Both the words recognized as the root and the base are the word forms taken by various additions. For example: "uqitmagansan" in the word "uqi"-root, uqi-t, uqi-t-ma, uqi-t-ma-gan-san in the words -t, -ma, -gan, -san suffixes "bases" are recognized. Basics: 1. lexical base; 2. morphological basis; 3. It is divided into syntactic basis. The lexical base is the part of the word-forming affixes. Morphological base-form-forming affixes are the part to which the affixes are attached, and the modal form is the part used to create the form. A syntactic base is a part of a word that is combined with modifying affixes.

On the morphological structure of words in the Kazakh language, A. T. Kaidarov: "The morphological structure of words changes with the addition of various affixes. In the Kazakh language, the number of such affixes is up to 8 or even more.

In ancient monuments, the verb "agar" was not used in as many meanings as above. For example: 1. Flow. The water of the Volga flows freely and falls on the foot of the rock. (DTS, 48)

When we compare the structure and meanings of the verb "agar" in the modern Kazakh language and the field of use, structure and meanings in the language of ancient monuments, we see that the meanings, structure and scope of the verb "agar" in the modern Kazakh language have expanded.

In the language of ancient monuments, the verb "agar" is used in the form of ak root voiced + voiceless (GS), and agti is found in one suffix, ag-at-tur-ur, in the form of four suffixes with a verb root, while in the modern Kazakh language, it is used in 10 different meanings, ag-ar -a, ag-ar-gan-da, ag-ar-yp, ag-ar-dy etc. we can see that it received various affixes and underwent various lexical-grammatical changes.

"Verb composition" and "Verb structure" mean a word form that includes not only the root person of the verb, the lexical-grammatical system, but also all its grammatical parts in the dictionary.

When we say the meaningful part of the verb structure, we mean the main part of verbs with independent lexical meaning. In this matter, it cannot be said that the structural system of root verbs, bases, as well as the structural system of word-forming lexical-grammatical suffixes is developing, albeit slowly, throughout history. Historical Turkic researches say that verbs in modern languages are the basis of action nouns. In the historical grammar, the name Kimyl was classified and originated from syncretic roots, which performed both the function of a noun and a verb. When studying verb roots in the Kazakh language, it is necessary to study its grammatical categories from the point of view of word formation issues. V.V. Radlov paid special attention to the characteristics of the main grammatical character of words in Turkish linguistics. He said that they come in the form of verbs and nouns. J. Deni said that most of the words in Turkic languages are nouns. Scientist K. Grenbegte supported this opinion.

E.V. Sevortyan said that these works focused only on the properties of nouns in phrases and sentences. Turkologists Professor V. Bang, A. A. Potebnyalar said that the original root words were verbs and nouns. P. M. Melioranskyi, who studied the ancient roots, said that in the past, the roots of the verb and noun have not been revealed, and even now there are double-meaning verb and noun stems. This opinion was supported by I.A. Batmanov, N.A. Baskakov, G. Ramstedt, K. Brockelmann. In our researches and in the monuments of Orkhon, we have come across a lot of noun-verb roots. For example: spring-summer. Noun-verb. etc. root verbs in double word class function are found a lot. When we compare the ancient monuments and materials in the modern Kazakh language, we can see that the creation of the verb by a synthetic method is hundreds of years earlier. we see that it has been used for thousands of years. Linguistic facts show that the affixes of derived root verbs in Turkic languages have a long history. For example, the verb "boda" in the language of ancient monuments means "paints", "paints" in the modern Kazakh language. For example: Kózi jarip bodadi. He dyed his eyes. Here, bodadi.

The verb "bosat" in the modern Kazakh language was used in the form of a derivational root verb, as in the modern Kazakh language, even in the time of M. Kashkari. For example: The verb "Ol vuliniv vosatti", "blazed, shone" was used as a derived verb "kovlady" at the time of M. Kashkari. For example: "Ot kopolandi" - "Ot zalolad" [4]. The verb "boda" in the language of ancient monuments means "paints", "paints" in the modern Kazakh language. For example: Kózi jarip bodadi. He dyed his eyes. Here, bodadi. The verb "bosat" in the modern Kazakh language was used in the form of a derivational root verb, as in the modern Kazakh language, even in the time of M. Kashkari. For example: The verb "Ol vuliniv vosatti", "blazed, shone" was used as a derived verb "kovlady" at the time of M. Kashkari. For example: "Ot kopolandi" - "Ot zalolad" [4]. The verb "boda" in the language of ancient monuments means "paints", "paints" in the modern Kazakh language. For example: Kózi jarip bodadi. He dyed his eyes. Here, bodadi. The verb "bosat" in the modern Kazakh language was used in the form of a derivational root verb, as in the modern Kazakh language, even in the time of M. Kashkari. For example: The verb "Ol vuliniv vosatti", "blazed, shone" was used as a derived verb "kovlady" at the time of M. Kashkari. For example: "Ot kopolandi" - "Ot zalolad" [4]. The verb vuliniv vosatti, "blazed, shone" was used as a derived verb "kovlady" in the time of M. Kashkari. For example: "Ot kopolandi" - "Ot zalolad" [4]. The verb vuliniv vosatti, "blazed, shone" was used as a derived verb "kovlady" in the time of M. Kashkari. For example: "Ot kopolandi" - "Ot zalolad" [4].

"Kokarat-kaynat" has become a derived verb. For example: Bir san vor iki san sup virla kokartis. - To boil one can of wine with two cans of water." [4].

Language facts show that the verbs "boya-voda", "yarkyra-kaula, kovla, kokhrat-kainat" in these sentences are verbs derived from ancient times, and verb suffixes were used in ancient times as well as now. Most of the verbs in the modern Kazakh language are derivational verbs created using the synthetic method of word formation. In all works written in Turkish, derivational verbs are divided into derivational verbs made from nouns and derivational verbs made from verbs.

M.A. Kazembek in his "Grammar" of 1839 said that the main affixes that add verbs from nouns are -la, -le. In "Grammar of the Altai language" apart from the affixes -la,-le, which make verbs from nouns -a,-e,-ay,-ey, -ar, -er,-syn, -syn,-msyra,-msyre, -kyla, - it was said that they are cream affixes.

The semantic feature of the affix -la,-le was mentioned in the work "Grammatics of the Kyrgyz language" published in Orenburg in 1906. N.P. Dyrenkova, N.K. Dmitrieva explained this issue in more detail in their works, gave examples and proved it.

A.G. Gulyamov, L.N. Kharitonov, N.A. conducted studies on the use of verbs with the affix -la, -le in many meanings. The Basakakovs added more and more in their works. Although some affixes are similar in Turkic languages, it can be seen that in pronunciation and use, in the meaning they convey, the affixes forming verbs in each language have their own characteristics and differences.

For example, in the Oïrot and Yakut languages, rabbit hunting and squirrel hunting are pronounced *koyan-daa*, *balik-ta*, *squirrel-nee* by adding the affix *-la*, *-le*, but in Kazakh, they are not pronounced as *koyan-daa*, *balik-ta*. Such evidence in the Turkic languages requires a comparative study of each language in its own right. N.K. Dyrenkova, A.N. Kononov, N.A. Baskakov, N.K. Dmitriev, V.M.

And another group of Turkic language scholars M.A. Kazembek, A. Arkhangelsky, in "Grammar of the Kyrgyz language" published in Orenburg in 1897, A. Kharisov in his work on the species category of the Bashkir language, verb affixes and *-gila*, *-gile* belonging to the species category: *-nkira*, *-nkire*: *-msire*, *-msira* affixes are considered to form derived root verbs. In their later works, N.A. Baskakov and N.P. Dyrenkova expressed a different opinion in their second works that, apart from their opinion that only verb affixes form a derived root verb, affixes that give the meaning of species are also formed by a derived root verb.

During the opinion of N.K. Dyrenkova and L. Kharitonov that the affix *-la*, *-le* can form a verb from any word, Ph.D. A. Khasenova-Kalybaeva: "Leaving aside other word classes, this affix was not attached to all nouns in the same way." [5].

In the history of the study of Turkic languages for more than a hundred years, the development of the verb related to the category of verb and species has been studied in a synthetic way. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that the scientific system of Turkic languages, which does not cause controversy, has been differentiated to this day. N.K. Dmitriev, A.N. Kononov, N.A. Baskakov, N.K. Dyrenkova, V.M. Nasilov, etc. In their works, scientists say that only the affixes of the verb category create root verbs from verbs, while M.A. Kazembek, Arkhangelskiy, A. Kharisov, along with the verb affixes, *-gila*, *-gile*, *-nkira*, *-nkire*, *-msyra*, *-msire*, belonging to the category of *vid*, He said that a derived root makes a verb.

N.A. Baskakov, N.P. Dyrenkova in their second work (Karakalpak language, book 2), "Grammar of the Oïrot language" stated that there are productive affixes and non-productive affixes among the affixes that give the meaning of species.

In Turkic languages, the productive and unproductive nature of affixes that form derived root verbs is different in each of the Turkic languages. There are different opinions about the kind of affixes that form a derivative root verb

In the work of N.A. Baskakov, he said that affixes such as *-mala*, *-mele*, *-uvla*, *-uvle* *-makla*, *-mekle*, *-ka*, *-ke* convey the meaning of species [6]. I. Uyikbayev defended his dissertation on this issue in Kazakh linguistics. V. A. Serebrennikov expressed the opinion that there is no species category in Turkic languages. I.E. Mamanov, A.I. Kharisov said that the species category is characteristic of Turkic languages and divided it into "Perfect *vid*, *nesovershenny vid*", while A.I. Kharisov called it "*Zavershenny vid*, *ne zavershenny vid*".

M. Kashkari expressed his scientific ideas on the formation of verbs already in the 11th century. He said that word formation of verbs is related to each letter and phoneme. He said that verbs have two letters, three letters, four letters, five letters, six letters. He showed that ten letters were added to them later. Affix is a problem that the prominent scientist is telling about letters with foresight. He says that each of these letters serves to add a meaning to verbs.

He points out that the word "kobzady" meaning "pulled by kobyz" was created by adding one letter t to the word "kobyz". He came to the conclusion that this letter forms a conjugated verb. He proved that each letter of the verb affixes that form a derived verb changes the meaning of the verb in his genius grammar of the 11th century. He says that the letter "t" is added to the letter "r" to form a conjugated verb. For example, he says that it turns into a transitive tense like "came-came", "came-came-came" and "came-came". And the letter -s is added to the verb and gives the meaning of a request, a wish, to do something. For example: if he drank water, he wanted to drink water, etc. And if the letter "-sh" is added to a verb, it means that the action is performed by two people. For example: he stood- correctly. etc. And when the letter "k" is added to the verb, it is said that it means defeat and humiliation. For example: A man swallows an open, a snake swallows a horse, etc. It says that the action is performed by two people. For example: stand-stand-stand-stand. etc. And when the letter "k" is added to the verb, it is said that it means defeat and humiliation. For example: A man swallows an open, a snake swallows a horse, etc. It says that the action is performed by two people. For example: stand-stand-stand-stand. etc. And when the letter "k" is added to the verb, it is said that it means defeat and humiliation. For example: A man swallows an open, a snake swallows a horse, etc.

When the letter -n is added to the verb, it is said that the doer has done something himself. For example: He received his allowance. - he took the money himself.

The suffix -la, -le is added to nouns to form verbs. For example: Beg kissed - Bek caught a bird. etc.

-iThe letter -l is added to the verb to show that the action is about to be completed and has not yet been completed. For example: He is about to get up, he is about to get up, etc.

M. Kashkari has foresight said that the past tense of the verb and the imperative mood have the same root.

## **1.2. The root morpheme of Kazakh and Turkic languages**

M. Kashkari proved with great foresight in his principles that it is impossible to move on to the problem of the phonetic structure and character of the root when talking about the root morpheme of the Kazakh and Turkic languages. The root morpheme of Turkic and Kazakh words is monosyllabic.

Thus, the formation of indigenous roots is monosyllabic and polysyllabic roots in Turkic languages is a phenomenon caused by the typological features of the Kazakh language. Throughout history, monosyllabic roots have become polysyllabic as a result of the addition of affixes, and later became a permanent phenomenon.

When we compare the language of the ancient monuments with the materials of the modern Kazakh language, we see that all the word-formation methods of the modern Kazakh language are found in the language of the ancient monuments, the difference is only in the meaning of the affix, or in the basis of another complex affix, or in the meaning of different affixes.



In terms of morphological structure, verbs are divided into bare verbs and derived verbs. Root verbs cannot be divided into stems and suffixes. As the root of the verb develops historically, their number is gradually filled, and among the root verbs there are verbs that are used as derived verbs and gradually become inseparable from the root and suffix. In the same way, the collected materials prove that the verbs that were previously used separately from the modern conjugated word were verbs that were used together in ancient times.

The composition of verbs in Orkhon monuments is divided into root and additional morphemes, as in the modern Kazakh language. Additional morphemes do not have independence in terms of personality and meaning, they are used only when they are added to root morphemes to have a grammatical meaning.

Root morphemes appear as the basic units of word meaning that cannot be broken down further. The verbs in the monuments of Orkhon were used as root morphemes and additional morphemes, but not all verbs in the monuments remained in the same form. Sometimes the root is personified (root morpheme), sometimes it is a root and additional morpheme. For example: ah, ay-ayt, eg-mayystyr, et, ba-baila, in-down, il, ich, kach-kash, seo-sui, kor, ti-ayt, sik, sur-ku, etc. If we take verbs, they are verbs used in the root person without any suffixes. These are the main morphemes, the main persons. Agyt, atlat-attandir, esitgil, esinin-sistindin, igil-gorylat, ichigir-bagindir, yabrit-alsiret, yagyrt-japkyz, iaramat-jaramady, kaldiur-kalar, eklur-keltir, sobolesh-soyles, sule-sogis found in the monuments of Orkhon. , dive-battle, tapla-tapta, etc. words are not bare roots, ak, at, es, yap-jap, yara-jara, kal, kel, word, su-sok, tap, etc. root persons and root morphemes and -yt, -lat, -itgil, il, -ihir, -ryt, -yt, matty, -yur, -lesh, -le, -la etc. These verbs are composed of root morphemes and grammatical auxiliary morphemes. We see two different types of Orkhon monuments in these examples. In one of them, root verbs without any suffixes are used, in the other as derived verbs with an additional morpheme. The verbs in the Orkhon monuments are not limited to being used as bare verbs. Combined, double, compound verbs are often encountered in monuments. The composition of those verbs does not consist only of root morpheme and auxiliary morpheme. Those verbs are composed of at least two independent verbs and do not need to be divided into root morpheme and auxiliary morpheme.

For example: birur-give, yugchi-sygchitchi (crying-squeezing, olu-yitu, (dying-reviving), trying to push, know to see, know to see, know to see, know to see, know to see, know to see, write to write while sitting, immortal lips to die ate, ilutugi tirmen-kiraar, yokki svet-we will destroy, tutmis tag-we will stay, kabysalym-let's unite, iyelu ker timis-kem ker, basitma timis-bastyрма, etc. verbs are not in the form of single words, but complex, combined, are considered as individual morphemes in the compound words.

But the morphemes here are not divided into root and additional morphemes, as in derived root verbs. Since they are words with independent meaning, they are not roots and additional morphemes in the word structure, but independent morphemes of equal rank. rushed). Here, the individuals composing complex verbs are roots with separate lexical meanings.

For example: ol-u-yit-u, yug-chi, squeeze-chi. Here, both parts of compound words in compound words are composed of meaningful verbs. Compound words are often encountered in monuments. One of the features of compound words in monuments is that some compound verbs have become separate verbs in the modern Kazakh language, some have become suffixes. For example: khynshurtikin-dulavlaskan, yonshurtikin-juvalskan, etc. In the monuments, combining two roots to form one verb was a productive way of word formation methods. The way of forming a new word through the method of fusion is a method characteristic of nouns, especially a phenomenon characteristic of nouns.

Since verbs represent an abstract concept, they are compactly united by the phonetic factor. It is not known whether they are composed of two words. Some of the combined verbs in the mnemonics have been turned into phrases in the modern Kazakh language throughout the history of the language's development. For example: the word ichuk in the language of monuments is used in the phrase "go inside" in the history of the development of the language. Therefore, the composition of verb double words in ancient monuments is not only composed of root morphemes, but also of root and additional morphemes. In monuments, additional morphemes are also found in the individual parts of double words. For example: ol+u-yit+u (death-jit), yug+chy-sygit+chy (cry-sigh) etc. One of the grammatical features of double words in monuments is the frequent repetition of auxiliary morphemes in the parts of double words. For example: he+u-yit+u, yug+chy-sygit+chy etc. Here, one additional morpheme is added to two parts of a double word and is repeated. Due to the nature of the constituent parts of double words, double words formed by repeating two roots and one addition of morphemes are often encountered in monuments.

So, if we summarize our opinion about the composition of verbs in the monuments, depending on the purpose of the verbs in the language of the monuments, bare verbs are sometimes used as root verbs, and sometimes as derived verbs consisting of a root and an auxiliary morpheme. And complex verbs are made from two root morphemes, repetition of one addition to verbs with two lexical meanings. System of the root morpheme and additional morphemes in the word, order of place, etc. In some words, the units are used differently from the current Kazakh word usage.

*-yip, -yip* instead of prepositional suffixes, almost all suffixes *-ü* are used. The verbs in the sentences "Ulu-yitu ekarantym. It is known that there are the following principles in Kazakh linguistics regarding the repeated use of verbs. We would like to say that the opinion that "in Kazakh linguistics, all double words from verbs are classified as adverbs" (2,36) is a hasty conclusion.

## **2. VERBS IN THE LANGUAGE OF ORKHON MONUMENTS**

Verbs in the language of Orkhon Monuments are divided into suffixes and conjunctions. Suffix morphemes are used as word generators, functional-grammatical, word modifiers, and conjunction morphemes are added as adverbial, plural, participle, dependent conjunctions.

Word-forming suffixes add a new lexical meaning to the word they are connected to. For

example: *ag-yt, es-il, iab-ryt, (al-siret), yay-la, (jay-la), iar-yl-ka (jar-yl-ka), yog-la (no-ta), yug-ir, (jug-ir), kab-ysh (kab-ys), kat-yl (one-eg), build-la (enemy), fire-un (go-in), sob-in (kiss-in), word-le-sh (conversation), suy-is (war-ys), syg-yt (sik-ta-u), trz-e-l-ti-m (I am corrected)* etc. Suffixes transform the root persons to which they are connected into words with new lexical meaning.

The relation of additions to creating lexical-grammatical meaning is closely related to word creation and word transformation. The guiding principles for distinguishing between word creation and word-transforming additions are: 1) changing or not changing the lexical meaning of a false word. 2) ability to create grammatical abstraction. 3) change of the word-generating suffix with the connected word of the same word class. 4) function of linking words in the sentence. 5) inclusion in dictionaries.

### 2.1. Applications in Turkish linguistics

In this regard, the fact that there are differences in the classification of supplements in Turkish linguistics requires special attention. Supplements in Turkish linguistics are divided into two. 1) word-forming affixes 2) word-transforming affixes. Supporter of this classification is N.A. Baskakov. According to his classification, suffixes are attributed to the word-modifying affix, and all other additions are attributed to word-forming affixes. Word generators are internally classified into lexical-grammatical and functional-grammatical groups. In this model, the classification of affixes into only two E.V. Sevortyan, K.M. Musaev, L.N. Pokrovskaya et al. found in the works of scientists. The following scientists classify affixes into three groups: 1) word-forming affixes, 2) form-forming affixes, 3) word-changing affixes. Scientists supporting this model: V.N. Hangeldin, A.A. Palmbach, B.A. Oruzbaeva, A. Yskakov, A. Kalybaeva,

The third model of classification of affixes again groups affixes into two groups. They are: 1) word-forming affixes 2) form-forming affixes. The difference of this classification from the previous classifications is that the former word-forming affixes remain the same, and form-forming and word-changing affixes are combined to form a group of form-forming ones. The creator of this model is the well-known Turkologist scientist A.N. Kononov. Scientists supporting this were: S. Usmanov, D. G. Tumasheva, scientists in Kazakh linguistics such as Y. Mamanov, S. Isaev.

in Kazakh linguistics. In the classification model of S. Isaev, one branch of word-formative additions is called "functional additions".

V. M. Nasilov classified affixes as 1) word-creating, 2) (word-modifying, 3) inserting affixes as early as 1958.

Kuman language researcher M.A. Khabichev groups affixes as word-creating affixes, word-changing affixes, form-creating affixes, and syncretic affixes. These additions show that both words create and form create additions. And -dai, -dey, -dagi, -dagi, -sha, -she are classified as form-generating additions.

Among the additions in the monuments of Orkhon, there are additions that are functional-grammatical, word modifiers, give a new grammatical person to the word it is connected to, and add various functional superimpositions to that person. Kyrgyz, sebin-sui-in, birmis-bergen, birmis-bergen, etc. Verb, preposition, and pronoun affixes are attached to root verbs. Adding these morphemes does not create a new word, the adverbial meaning of these suffixes is closely related to the use of the word in the sentence, depending on which, different grammatical meanings are added.

Another complex area of additional morphemes is conjunctions. Conjunctions connect words and words by adding purely grammatical meanings such as plural, adverbial, accusative, dependent to the word they are connected to.

In the monuments, there are roots with the ending -myn instead of the suffix -dy,-di,-ty,-ti in the modern Kazakh language. For example:

This soap smells good.

*Hear this word well.*

I did not care about the land.

*Birgeru-Tokuz Ersenke family name.*

*I barely reached the sea,*

*In the afternoon, I fought until Togyz Ersen.*

The suffixes -ka,-m,-rü,-ke,-m in these sentences do not affect the lexical meanings of the words Taluy, tegmedim, Ersenge, and sule. In the case of taluyka, it adds the grammatical meaning of the direction of the movement, in the case of tegmedim, it adds a one-sided meaning, and in the case of Bergeru-Tustikte, it adds the meaning of place. Additions are divided into three types: word generators, word modifiers, and word-to-word connectors.

In the monuments, it is found that the function of the participle of the leopard in the modern Kazakh language is performed by the addition -r, sometimes -u. For example.

*An ignorant person learns a lesson.*

*Iagru is an innocent man*

*Ignorant people believe that word*

*A lot of people died when he went there.*

*Don't knock your knees*

*Ilgeru Kadyrkan yishka tag*

*He bent his knees*

Advance to Kadyrkan gorge.

In ancient monuments, the suffix -ig performed the function of multi-functional adverbs. -Ig appendix sometimes served as a source of income, sometimes as a source of help, and sometimes as a source of marrow. For example:

*Baz kaganyg balbal timins...*

*Baz Kagan's ballet was performed.*

Here, the suffix -yg acts as an adverbial adverb. And in this sentence, it acts as an adverbial adverb.

*Khitanka dived yeti*  
*Five dives to Oguz...*  
*He fought with the Katyns seven times*  
 He fought five times with the Oghuz.

*-mish, -mish*connector in Orkhon monuments, M. In the Kashkari dictionary, it is also used as a suffix of the noun.

Regarding the affixes *-mysh, -mish*, R. Kordabayev says that "*-mysh, -mish* suffix of unproductive pronouns is often used instead of the pronoun form in the language of historical monuments of the Kazakh language (3,75). About this application, N.A. Baskakov Karakalpak, Uzbek etc. it is said that these affixes are repeated twice in languages and have a separate lexical meaning (4,409).

It is also known that there is an assumption about this suffix *-mish, -mysh* that the word "emis" was formed by adding the suffix "mysh" to the auxiliary verb, and it means "deed" in our language.

The frequency of use of the suffix *-mysh, -mysh* in monuments is noteworthy. It is sometimes used as a past participle, and sometimes in the passive form. According to Professor A.N. Kononov, this affix used to mean the duration of the action, the duration of the process [7].

Therefore, the additions to the ancient monuments had a multi-functional function. We can see from this that additional morphemes, word-forming suffixes, word-modifying suffixes, word-to-word conjunctions are not always used in their natural character. In some cases, depending on the purpose of use, we can see that they are used interchangeably, and they alternate in terms of function. Therefore, the composition of verbs in the language of Orkhon monuments consists of root and additional morphemes, and they are not equal in terms of meaning and personality. In the language of monuments, root morphemes have lexical meaning, and additional morphemes have a dominant grammatical meaning.

The functions of the appendages in the monuments are also different. Due to the lexical-grammatical meaning of the morphemes attached to the root, although each of the appendages has its own function, it is a common phenomenon that one of them performs the function of the other.

Distinguishing between a word and a root is the key to distinguishing between suffixes and conjunctions, lexical and grammatical categories from purely grammatical categories. It is of great theoretical and practical importance for linguistics to define the limits of the concepts of word, base of word, root of word, as well as to establish their similarity, overlapping properties, and peculiarities. The use and purpose is based on the common root, not the words of each person, without taking any word into different dictionaries. The root of a word is the main semantic part that gives its lexical value. Therefore, word roots have a special place in lexicographic work. Although many works have been written and debated on the question of what a word is, it cannot be said that the full beginning of this problem has not yet been revealed. Scientists have worked hard to define what "word" is.

In the work "Morphological structure of words in different languages" (M-L. 1963), there are 36 opinions of 6 scholars about the word. Different definitions of the word may depend on which language the scholar studies. There are also differences in the definitions given by scientists who study the Turkic language. V.V. Zhirmunskyi says "The word is the shortest linguistic unit in terms of its meaning and form", N.A. Baskakov says "A word is a manifestation of the unity and system of the morpheme, it shows the lexical and grammatical properties of the morpheme, i.e. the lexical property of the lexicon, the sentence and shows the grammatical properties of phrases. V.V. Sevortyan considers that "Word is a small unit of language with lexical-grammatical and semantic independence."

In Kazakh linguistics, NT Sauranbayev concludes that we call the sound expression of a known concept, which is a part of a thought in a sentence. A. Yskakaov gives two different definitions of the word. In the first one, it is said, "We call it a sound complex word used as a certain concept (certain or symbol)."

In the second, words are the image of objects perceived by human senses, their various qualities, thoughts, and actions, it is defined as not just an image, but a digested, accumulated received image. There are a lot of definitions and opinions given to the word. The opinions and definitions of the scientists who gave the word are different.

A. Ibatov, when giving a definition of a word, it is necessary to take into account not the single form of the word, but also the complex form, because it is a property of complex words that make it difficult to distinguish the boundaries of the word. - concludes that it creates a concept that is completely different from the concept.

V.V. Vinogradov says that the main property of a word is the unity of its meaning and transformation. Based on this opinion of V. V. Vinogradov, T. Ya. Skorin recognizes the word as "Words represent a tselnoznachimuyu tselnoofornlennuyu unitary language." A. Ibatov adds the syntactic integrity of the word in addition to these definitions given to the word. That is, when giving a definition to a word, not only its meaning and transformation properties, but also its function should be one of its decisive properties, it recognizes the word as a lexical-grammatical unit spoken in lexical, morphological and syntactic integrity.

When a word is recognized as a root, it can be used grammatically without a suffix along with its lexical meaning, and can be given a new meaning by accepting conjunctions. The sound side and the meaning side of the word are united. If the sound makes up the material side of the word, the meaning makes up the idea side of the word. Sound and meaning are the conditions for the existence of words. A concept is a mental image of the signs of a thing. A concept is expressed through words, and words define reality. A word combines sounds to express something. A word is associated with a concept through its meaning. the meaning and concept of the word are not equal. it is necessary to determine the relationship between the object named by it and its meaning and sound side. The lexical meaning of a word is considered to be the connection of a sound complex with one of the phenomena in real life established by a group of speakers of a certain language. There is no natural connection between a sound phrase and an object.

When a thing is marked with a sound combination, the name is based on a sign of that thing. The original sign, which was the basis for the name of the object, fades over time and is forgotten. As a result, the etymology of the root word is obscured, its origin is determined as a result of special research. Some of the derivational signs are obvious, while others are obscure and require in-depth research. The concept has no emotional color, and the word has a different emotional tone. The lexical meaning of a word is considered to be the connection of a sound complex with one of the phenomena in real life established by a group of speakers of a certain language. There is no natural connection between a sound phrase and an object. When a thing is marked with a sound combination, the name is based on a sign of that thing. The original sign, which was the basis for the name of the object, fades over time and is forgotten. As a result, the etymology of the root word is obscured, its origin is determined as a result of special research. Some of the derivational signs are obvious, while others are obscure and require in-depth research. The concept has no emotional color, and the word has a different emotional tone. The lexical meaning of a word is considered to be the connection of a sound complex with one of the phenomena in real life established by a group of speakers of a certain language. There is no natural connection between a sound phrase and an object. When a thing is marked with a sound combination, the name is based on a sign of that thing. The original sign, which was the basis for the name of the object, fades over time and is forgotten. As a result, the etymology of the root word is obscured, its origin is determined as a result of special research. Some of the derivational signs are obvious, while others are obscure and require in-depth research. The concept has no emotional color, and the word has a different emotional tone. The original sign, which was the basis for the name of the object, fades over time and is forgotten. As a result, the etymology of the root word is obscured, its origin is determined as a result of special research. Some of the derivational signs are obvious, while others are obscure and require in-depth research. The concept has no emotional color, and the word has a different emotional tone. The original sign, which was the basis for the name of the object, fades over time and is forgotten. As a result, the etymology of the root word is obscured, its origin is determined as a result of special research. Some of the derivational signs are obvious, while others are obscure and require in-depth research. The concept has no emotional color, and the word has a different emotional tone.

The lexical meaning of the word lives together with the grammatical meaning. These are the features that distinguish a concept from a word. Since it consists of a known sound structure, it corresponds to the phonetic law. According to the phonetic law of the Kazakh language, two consonants do not appear at the beginning of a word. These principles should be guided by the study of language history. A word differs from a phoneme in terms of meaning. Phoneme has the function of distinguishing meaning only within the word. The word is personified only according to the grammatical laws of a certain language and appears in its own forms. A word does not include another word in its composition. It changes slowly only in long periods.

A word, its base, and root are very important in recognizing the category that connects words in a sentence, determining their location. Not all words used in different persons are bases or roots. The distinction between the word and the base is connected with the ancient history of our language. It is very important for linguistic knowledge to distinguish between the word and the root, the category related to the suffix and conjunction, lexicon and grammar, from the purely grammatical category. In the same way, the concepts of the root of a verb are not the same. The root of a word can be understood differently from the point of view of each word class, and V.V. Vinogradov emphasized the need to consider the forms of words or the modification of words separately from the point of view of each word class.

The affinity between word-modifying affixes and word-formative suffixes shows that these two categories are directly related to word classes. A. Khasenova says that from the point of view of linguistics, the one-sided understanding of the root and the word as equivalent to each other leads to constant equalization between the root and the word. The linguistic name "root" needs to be understood differently from the point of view of each word class. It can be seen from the opinions and definitions given by linguists to the base, root, and word that the word and root are considered equal in most cases. Kazakh language grammars have different scientific opinions on the issues of root and base.

The definition of the word "root" in the work "Modern Kazakh language" in 1954 is that "the main particle that expresses the lexical meaning common to several words is called the root or root of the word." A. Iskakov points out that "The root morpheme is the most fundamental basis of a word that cannot be further divided." In the modern Kazakh language of 1954, "The root and the base have the following difference: the root means the common (general) lexical meaning of several words, and the base means the individual lexical meaning specific to individual words, the meaning of the base is more precise and clearer than the meaning of the root. if there is no other meaningful particle in the base, the root and the base do not have any difference, they are connected in the same way.

A. Salkynbay about the basis "The basis is a noun with a lexical meaning that marks a known concept." For example: ay, inta, aishyk, etc. The difference between the base and the addition is that it has a lexical meaning, each name marks a certain concept. Based on its composition, it is divided into two parts: the root and the derived word.

According to A. Yskakov on the division of the root word and the derived word, depending on the composition of the words in our language, first of all, they are divided into two groups: simple words and complex words. It says that simple words are divided into root words and derived words.

Regarding the root and base, K. Akhanov says that in Turkic languages, the root and base of the word correspond to each other in terms of word meaning and form. The second-person form of the imperative verb is understood as both the base and root of the verb and is recognized as an independent word. The use as a personal word indicates that it is a characteristic of the root or base in Turkic languages.



K. Akhanov about the root morpheme and the base of the word, the root morpheme functions as a common morpheme for different lexical-grammatical groups of words. For example: the head morpheme is boss, head, boss, etc. It is said that there is a root for the noun, the adjective "head", "headless", and the verb "head". The basis differs from the root in that it is common to the forms of a certain lexical-grammatical group, not for different lexical-grammatical groups of words, for example, if the form "boss" is common to all of the above-mentioned nouns, adjectives, and verbs, bosses, to the boss, to the boss, etc. The common base for the nouns is "boss", and from, began, etc. The common base of all verbs and forms is "basta". And "manage, manage, manage" etc. The basis of verb forms is to control. The conclusion from this is that the root morpheme is an element that is the stimulus for all words, regardless of which lexical-grammatical group (word class) the words belong to, and the base is the same stimulus for all the different forms of the same word related to a certain lexical-grammatical group (word class). If the root morpheme is the root part of the words that cannot be divided further, the base is formed from the combination of the root and the suffix. The base may consist of only one morphological element - a pure root. In this case, units such as root and base, word and root or word and base correspond to each other. For example, fire, bile, etc. in the words - he says.

So, these cases show that it is not correct to use words, roots, and bases interchangeably in many cases. V.V. Vinogradov said that it is necessary to consider the forms and transformations of words from the point of view of each word class.

In conclusion, we can say that the verbs in the modern Kazakh language, like other word classes, from a historical point of view, their roots and additions are developing and forming in terms of meaning, phonetics and morphology.

#### REFERENCES

- 1 Dmitriev N.K. Grammar of the Bashkir language. -M. -L. , 1948, - 276 p.
- 2 Iskakov A. Modern Kazakh language. Morphology. - Almaty: "Mother tongue", 1991. - 381 p.
- 3 Sevortyan E.V. Etymological dictionary of Turkic languages. - M.: Nauka, 1974, - 768 p
- 4 Drevneturksii slovar, - L., 1969. - 677 p.
- 5 Dyrenkova N.P. Grammar of the Oirot language. - M.: Izd-vo AN USSR, 1940. - 303 s
- 6 Baskakov N.A. Karakalpak language. Part of speech and word formation. -M., 1950, -548 p.
- 7 Kononov A.N. Turkish verbal form of "-mysh".-Uchenye zapiski, №20. Series philol. Nauk, vyp. LSU, 1939.