

Speech Parts And Adverbial Lexemes Interpretation In Turkic Linguistics

Dilfuza Saiidyrakhimova¹, Baktygul Ismailova², Gulbakhor Usarova², Mirgul Kashkarieva², Nuriza Abdimalip kyzy², Samara Ismailova², Gulgena Rakhimbaeva³, Alтын Zhumabaeva³, Roza Zhumashova², Miiasar Mirzakhidova², Raziia Kyrgyzbaeva², Zhympargul Abdullaeva^{4*}

¹Department of English Philology, International Kyrgyz Uzbek University named after B. Sydykov, Osh, Kyrgyzstan

²Department of Kyrgyz Philology, International Kyrgyz Uzbek University named after B. Sydykov, Osh, Kyrgyzstan

³Department of Foreign Languages, International Education Programs College, Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan

⁴Science and Research Department, Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan

*Corresponding author: Abdullaeva Zhympargul, E-mail: jypar.science@oshsu.kg,

ORCID <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5777-4478>

Abstract

This article is investigating speech parts and adverbial lexemes study in Turkic linguistics. Most linguists divide the parts of speech into significant and auxiliary in full accordance with the tradition of Russian linguistics. Official words are defined as having predominantly grammatical functions, characterized by the absence of direct subject correlation, reduced phonetically. Official words classification is also applicable for syntactic criterion. Categorical, grammatical meanings exist based on word lexical meaning, where semantic feature is the leading part. Morphological features present in the English language are not all parts of speech, considering the syntactic function features. Detailed analysis of lexico-semantic properties and morphological peculiarities of adverbs in some separate Turkic languages were described.

Keywords: lexemes, speech parts, study, linguistics, grammatical meaning, categories.

1. Introduction

Official words can also be auxiliary or semi auxiliary verbs, as well as some pronouns or adverbs that function as conjunctions; connection words are used to express relationships between reality phenomena, called as denominative words same as prepositions in different contexts that express relationships between things (Tsoy, 2008). All scientists distinguishing in English language that there are a huge number of detailed classifications of speech parts. It was noted that speech parts are distinguished by several features, emphasize the role of a syntactic feature for modern English (Zhigadlo et al., 1956). Prepositions combined

with nouns in relation to preposition, postpositions are also combine with nouns, being used in postposition and often becoming postfixes; unions enter into bilateral relations between homogeneous words, phrases or sentences (Sultanbayeva, 2012). Speech parts in linguistics were studied, representing one of the most pressing problems of modern general linguistics (Saiidyrakhimova et al., 2021).

Authors believe that there is no insurmountable boundary between speech parts, and not only the transition of one speech part to another is possible, but also the use of one part of speech in a function predominantly characteristic of another speech part. In their

practical classification, the authors very consistently adhere to principles they have espoused and distinguished 13 parts of speech, of which 9 are significant and 4 are official. Significant parts of speech consisting of noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb, conditional category words, adverb, modal words and interjections. Official words in the parts of speech include prepositions, articles, conjunctions and particles. There is also a system set of works from the early 70s, written by prominent English linguists (Quirk et al., 1982).

The authors give their classification in traditional terms to the speech parts, which as they write, have been used in relation to the Indo-European group languages since ancient times (Mallory, 2021; Zulpukarov et al., 2021). The division of speech parts into groups is carried out under the influence of "positional classes" and "formal words" by Ch. Fries (Kazaryan & Grigoryan, 2021). The first group include nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. Demonstrative pronouns are separated into a separate part of speech, as it mentioned, all the rest are pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. Parts of speech in the second group are called as "elements of a closed system", since their number is relatively small and new elements appear rarely. In the same parts of speech as pronoun and article, it is difficult to expect any continuation of series. Parts of speech in the first group are elements of "open classes". These parts of speech are "open" since the series can be continued indefinitely. Separate elements of these classes as elements of a closed system cannot be placed in such a binary opposition: a - the, this - that. These "closed" and "open" systems are reminiscent of Ch. Fries "open" positional classes and his "closed" groups of functional words, but here this distinction is made within the general system framework of traditionally distinguished parts of speech.

In Turkic languages, the distinction between adverb and adjective is characterized on the basis of another explanation; words denoting attributes and properties in Turkish languages

can be attached to both the noun and the verb (Saiidyrahimova et al., 2020).

F.F. Fortunatov built the speech parts classification based on consistent implementation of morphological principle, calling the official words classes. He also points out that not all parts of speech can be distinguished on the basis of a morphological criterion, since a large number of words (adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, particles, modal words, interjections and other sentence equivalents) do not have inflectional features; for these parts of speech, the morphological criterion is irrelevant (Fortunatov, 1956).

A.M. Peshkovsky distinguishes following parts of speech: verb, noun, adjective, participle, adverb and infinitive. He defines parts of speech "as the main categories of thinking in their primitive nationwide stage of development" (Peshkovsky, 1956). Pronouns, according to Peshkovsky, are a dependent part of speech. Numerals and service words are considered by him only in terms of syntactic.

A.A. Potebnya divides all words into real and formal. He calls the first as significant parts of speech, to which he refers the noun, the adjective, the numeral, the verb and adverb. The second official parts of speech (unions, prepositions, particles and auxiliary verbs). He attributed the infinitive and participle to intermediate parts of speech. He considered pronouns separately from all parts of speech, considering them as demonstrative category, generalizing words that combine features of lexical and formal words (Potebnya, 1958).

L.V. Shcherba proposed classification of parts speech according to the totality of morphological, syntactic and semantic features. According to L.V. Shcherba, who attached paramount importance to words semantic feature, the basis for classifying parts of speech are the categories common to all languages of the world: quality, action and objectivity. L.V. Shcherba wrote "Although, summing up individual words under one or another category of "part of speech", we get a kind of classification of words, however, the very distinction between "parts of speech" can hardly be considered the result of a "scientific

classification of words” (Shcherba, 1957). L.V. Shcherba calls all parts of speech “lexical categories”, or rather “lexical and grammatical categories of words”, which he subdivides into “the category of significant words and the category of auxiliary words”. As part of significant words, L.V. Shcherba names a verb, a noun, an adjective, an adverb, quantitative words (numerals), a condition category, or predicative adverbs. L.V. Shcherba refers to official words as linkages, prepositions, particles, unions “separating”, or fused unions, relative words (or subordinating unions); interjections and onomatopoeic words were considered separately (Shcherba, 1957).

A multi-stage classification of speech parts in the Russian language was proposed by V.V. Vinogradov, referring to parts of speech not all words, but only those that are constituents of a sentence. The author identifies following structural and semantic categories in the modern Russian language: 1) parts of speech (noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb, adverb, and condition category), 2) speech particles (particles in the proper sense (as bundles, prepositions and unions), 3) modal words, 4) interjections (Vinogradov, 1986).

In the Kyrgyz language normative grammar, the modern, significant (noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb, participle, gerund and adverb) and auxiliary parts of speech (postpositions, conjunctions, particles and modal words) were distinguished. Interjections and imitative words are standing separately in this classification, and there is no place for the so-called official names (Akhmatov et al., 1975).

In the "Kyrgyz language modern grammar" S. Davletov and S. Kudaibergenov distinguish significant and auxiliary parts of speech. Significant parts of speech include noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb, participle, participle, and adverb. As auxiliary words, the authors single out conjunctions, postpositions and particles. Modal words are considered as a separate group (Davletov & Kudaibergenov, 1980).

In the Kyrgyz literary language grammar, speech parts are understood as structural-semantic classes of words that differ from each

other by a set of semantic, morphological, syntactic, and sometimes morphological and phonetic features. The entire vocabulary is divided into two large groups: significant words (noun, adjective, numeral, verb and adverb) and auxiliary words (postpositions, conjunctions, particles and auxiliary words), and modal words, imitative words and interjections are also distinguished as special groups (Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences, 1987).

In addition, V.V. Vinogradov wrote about nouns: “The grammatical core of names is the category of nouns. Under this category are summed words expressing objectivity and representing it in the forms of gender, number and case” (Vinogradov, 1986).

The following definition for a noun was given by I.A. Batmanov: “Under the category of a noun, we will understand not only the stems expressing the object names, but also such stems that, together with the expression of the subject concept themselves can in certain positions in the sentence, express the other objects attribute; for example, "mektep uyu is a school building", where "mektep" acts as a spokesman not so much for the object itself, but as a sign with "uyu" (Batmanov, 1940).

2. Research methods and materials

General scientific methods in philological research are used to determine speech parts and adverbial lexemes in Turkic linguistics followed by analysis and interpretation of scientists' opinions with comparative analysis (Ismailova, 2016; Marazykov et al., 2022). Contrastive cognitive approach is indispensable tool in teaching languages. Its implementation in the learning process contributes to the development of students' skills in using the positive transfer possibilities when learning foreign languages and minimizing negative interference effect. Morphologically, nouns in the studied languages are characterized by the presence of derivational affixes, the presence of various categories. Syntactically, nouns in the languages under consideration are characterized by the ability to act in a sentence primarily as a subject and an object.

3. Results and discussion

If in Russian a noun is characterized by the presence of three grammatical categories: 1) category of case, expressed by the declension paradigm, consisting of six cases; 2) category of number, consisting of two numbers as singular and plural; 3) categories of grammatical gender, representing three genders as masculine, feminine and neuter, having the corresponding morphological expression. Then in English noun is characterized by the presence of two grammatical categories: 1) the category of number, consisting of two numbers as singular and plural; 2) the category of determinability (certainty / uncertainty), expressed by articles in the preposition. In the Kyrgyz language, the noun is characterized by the presence of two grammatical categories: 1) the category of case, expressed by the declension paradigm, consisting of six cases; 2) category of number, consisting of two numbers as singular and plural.

Let us turn to the definitions of the verb in linguistic dictionaries and textbooks. As L.V. Shcherba writes, "in the category of verbs, the main meaning, of course, is the action, and not the condition at all, as it was said in the old grammars" (Shcherba, 1957). As for linking verbs, according to L.V. Shcherba, there is only one link "to be", expressing logical relationship between the subject and the predicate. All other connectives, according to L.V. Shcherba, are more or less significant, i.e. they are a contamination of the verb and connectives, where the verbality can be more or less pronounced (Shcherba, 1957).

The authors of the theoretical grammar of modern English, I.P. Ivanova, V.V. Burlakova, G. G. Pocheptsov believe that grammatical meaning of an action is understood broadly: it is not only an activity in the proper sense of the word, but also a condition and simply an indication that given object exists, that it belongs to a certain class of objects (persons). It is important that verb conveys the sign not statically, not as a property attributed to the object (person), but as a sign that necessarily proceeds in some temporary (even if unlimited) period. This sign, according to the authors, is not

an abstract name for an action; the so-called personal (finite) forms of the verb always convey the action as coming from some agent, therefore the syntactic function of the personal forms of the verb is unambiguous: they are always the predicate of the sentence (Ivanova et al., 1981).

The "Kyrgyz literary language grammar" gives the following definition to a verb: "A verb is a part of speech denoting an action, condition, becoming in its processuality. Processuality as the basis of verbal semantics is already laid down in its basis, in connection with which the verbal stems, with the exception of a small number of homonyms such as to "saturate" and "feast", do not have coincidences in other parts of speech, and there is no transition of the verb to others. Parts of speech or nominal parts of speech are including into a verb without additional means of word formation" (Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences, 1987).

The verb in English is characterized by the presence of the following grammatical categories: 1) the category of a person expressed in the present tense by the morpheme: -(e)s and zero morphemes in other persons; 2) category of number; 3) the category of time, which finds its expression in the forms of three times: present, past and future; 4) the category of the species, represented by forms of two types: a general view and subjective view; 5) the category of mood, represented by six morphologically expressed forms of moods: indicative, imperative, subjunctive 1, subjunctive 2, presumptive and conditional; 6) The category of voice, which has a morphological expression in the form of active and passive voices. The following grammatical categories are presented in the Russian verb system: 1) categories of a person expressed by personal endings; 2) category of number expressed by personal endings; 3) category of grammatical gender in the past tense singular; 4) category of the species expressed by the morphological forms of the perfect and imperfect species; 5) category of time, expressed by five forms of time: three forms of imperfect time and two forms of perfect time; 6) category of mood, represented by forms of three moods: indicative, imperative

and subjunctive or conditional-desirable mood; 7) category of voice, which has a morphological expression in the form of real, reflexive-middle and passive voice. In the Kyrgyz language, the verb is characterized by the presence of the following grammatical categories: 1) category of a person expressed by personal endings, 2) category of number; 3) category of time, which finds its expression in the forms of three times: present, past and future; 4) category of inclination, represented by five morphologically expressed forms of inclinations: indicative, imperative, conditional, desirable mood and intention; 5) category of voice, which has a morphological expression in the form of five forms: main, reflexive, joint, compulsory and passive voices.

As it is known, an adjective is a lexico-semantic class of predicate words denoting a non-procedural attribute (property) of an object, event or other attribute indicated by a name. The adjective denotes either a qualitative attribute of an object, outside of its relation to other objects, events or signs, or a relative attribute, denoting the property of an object through its relation to another object, attribute, and event.

The traditional grammatical characteristic of an adjective as a part of speech includes a description of morphological features as ability to form degrees of comparison, the presence of word-forming affixes, syntactic features and possibility of attributive-predicative functioning of adjectives. As for semantic features, the adjective is defined as a significant part of speech denoting a sign of an object, i.e. its quality or property.

The adjective is the most prominent representative of indicative, predicate units, "qualitative adjectives to the greatest extent have all the features of predicates" (Arutyunova, 1976).

In the Kyrgyz language, the difficulty of separating the adjective into an independent part of speech is aggravated by the fact that it formally coincides with nouns and adverbs. Many Turkologists consider the ability of an adjective to designate the quality of an object and form degrees of comparison as the basis for

singling out an adjective as an independent part of speech (Melioransky, 1894).

Among the speech parts, an adjective in the languages under consideration occupies a special place and is considered as independent part of speech. The presence of semantic, morphological, syntactic features, as well as the criterion of compatibility gives reason to single out adjectives in the studied languages into an independent grammatical category isolated from other parts of speech. Their semantic property in the compared languages is the expression of the feature of the subject.

Morphologically, adjectives in the studied languages are characterized by the presence of word-building affixes, immutability in the definition function, as well as the ability to form adjectives comparison degrees. Syntactically, adjectives in the languages under consideration are characterized by the possibility of attributive-predicative functioning in the speech chain.

The adjective in English does not have agreement with the noun and in this respect approaches the Kyrgyz agglutinative language, in which the lack of agreement with the noun is typological. In Russian, the adjective is characterized by the presence of agreement with the noun in gender, number and case. In the languages under consideration there is a grammatical category of the comparison degree. The adverb as an independent part of speech exists in English, and in Kyrgyz, and in Russian languages. The structural originality of each language led to the establishment of various criteria for defining an adverb as a separate part of speech.

J. Nesfield brings the adverb closer to adjectives, since he believes that both are definitive words, only the adjective determines the noun, and the adverb determines all other parts of speech except the noun. The author draws attention to the fact that the adverb, contrary to the prevailing assertion, determines all parts of speech: not only verbs, adjectives and adverbs, but also prepositions and conjunctions. Highlighting 3 types of adverbs, J. Nesfield classifies them according to the semantic feature (Nesfield, 1944). When

defining an adverb in the works of Russian English, similarly to the definitions of an adverb in the Russian language studies, out of the three above-mentioned signs, any two or one can be considered. This testifies to the well-known similarity of approaches used by grammarians in the selection of parts of speech in Russian and English languages.

So, on the basis of semantic and functional features, the adverbs of English grammar are determined under the editorship of B.A. Ilyish. According to his definition, the adverb in this grammar denotes the circumstances accompanying the condition action, indicates the features of the action or quality (Ilyish, 1948).

In Russian linguistics, there are also different points of view on the criteria for identifying an adverb in the speech parts system. The morphological approach to identifying an adverb as a part of speech was developed (Fortunatov, 1956). The morphological point of view on the dialect in Russian linguistics was opposed by the syntactic point of view, which was held by A.A. Potebnya, A.M. Peshkovsky (Potebnya, 1958; Peshkovsky, 1956).

There are also concepts that combine morphological and syntactic and semantic features. For example, academician Vinogradov defines an adverb as a set of morphological, syntactic and semantic features. As the author writes, "adverbs are a grammatical category under which indeclinable, non-conjugated and inconsistent words are brought, adjacent to the verb, to the category of state, to nouns, adjectives and derivatives from them (for example, to the same adverbs) and acting in the syntactic functions of a qualitative definition or adverbial relationship.

Adverbs are morphologically correlated with nouns, adjectives, verbs, pronouns and numerals" (Vinogradov, 1986).

Despite the fact that a large number of works are devoted to the problem of dialect, this category remains one of the undeveloped ones in Turkology. The first work in which adverbs were singled out as a special class of words in the Kyrgyz language was "Grammar of the Kyrgyz language" compiled by I.A. Batmanov. However, in this work there is still no definition

of adverbs and criteria on the basis of which they are distinguished into an independent part of speech. The author interprets adverbs very broadly and classifies significant and non-significant words among them (Batmanov, 1940).

S. Kudaibergenov in his work "On adverbs" gives the following definition of adverbs: "Words expressing the way the action expressed by the verb, the circumstances accompanying this action - time, place" (Kudaibergenov, 1960). The definition of adverbs based on taking into account only lexico-semantic features led to an unjustified expansion of the composition of this class of words. Adverbs included, in particular, modal words (албетте, арийне), adjectives (жакшы, жаман), pronouns (баары, бүт) (Kudaibergenov, 1960).

S. Davletov takes into account morphological, semantic and syntactic criteria when defining an adverb. The author believes that in a semantic sense, the adverb denotes a sign (action, quality, state). In morphological terms, the adverb is characterized by immutability, with the exception of the category of comparison of some adverbs and the presence of special derivational affixes. In syntactical terms, adverbs are used in adverbial and attributive functions and are subordinated to verbs, adjectives and other adverbs by adjoining (Davletov, 1960).

In modern English, the main criterion for determining an adverb is syntactic, in which the adverb acts as a different kind of circumstance; in Russian, the main criteria are syntactic and semantic; however, the syntactic criterion cannot be the main one for the Kyrgyz language, since there is no differential feature of the syntactic functions of parts of speech in a sentence. Consequently, the selection of an adverb as an independent part of speech in a comparative sense cannot be based on a syntactic feature.

As for the morphological criterion, it is known that it is irrelevant for adverbs, since they do not have inflectional features. Thus, neither morphological nor syntactic criteria can be relevant for the compared languages in defining an adverb as a part of speech. The most striking identification feature of an adverb in the

languages under consideration is the lexical meaning of words. The languages under consideration have a grammatical category of degree of comparison.

Pronouns constitute a special part of speech due to their semantics, syntactic forms and the grammatical categories expressed by them. The established traditions and repeated discussion of the theory of parts of speech have made a significant contribution to their development. But despite the unflagging interest and truly comprehensive approach to English pronouns, many of the problems associated with them have not yet received an unambiguous solution. Domestic and foreign researchers again and again turn to the problem of choosing the demonstrative pronouns *this*, *that* and the personal pronoun *it*, putting forward various hypotheses regarding the scope of their use.

Pronouns are one of the most obvious language universals. There are pronouns in all languages, and they are distributed in approximately same categories. Due to its great semantic and morphological diversity, class of English pronouns has attracted the attention of researchers in all periods of the development of linguistics. For a long time, the status of pronouns as an independent part of speech was controversial.

This is explained by the morphological and functional heterogeneity of this class, the absence of its own grammatical meaning, which is different from the grammatical meaning of the noun and adjective, and the absence of special syntactic functions peculiar only to the pronoun. That is why they are sometimes referred to as nouns, adjectives, adverbs, highlighting, respectively, within these categories pronominal nouns, pronominal adjectives, pronominal adverbs.

The classics of Russian linguistics (Potebnya A.A., Fortunatov F.F., Peshkovsky A.M.) denied that numerals have grammatical features of a special part of speech, pointing out that numerals and pronouns in their syntactic features are close to such grammatical categories, as nouns, adjectives and adverbs

(Vinogradov, 1986). The numerals in the English language have neither the category of number, nor the category of case, nor other morphological categories (Ilyish, 1948).

Conclusion

In the languages under consideration, pronouns have an extremely generalized meaning: they point to any objects, creatures, abstract concepts, without naming. Pronouns, acting as pointer and substitute words, have a large semantic capacity, a wide range of meanings, which also determines their unusual wide use. Pronouns in the Russian and Kyrgyz languages have some morphological features, which include the declension of pronouns in the Kyrgyz language, in addition, their use with some postpositions.

Syntactically, pronouns function in the same way as nouns and adjectives. Pronouns fall into a number of subclasses, different in lexical content, morphological forms, syntactic functions and compatibility with other parts of speech: personal, demonstrative, interrogative, negative, attributive and indefinite.

Numerals, having a specific lexical meaning, denote the number of an object or the order of an object when counting. They also have morphological features inherent only to them, in a sentence they can perform the function of the main and secondary members of the sentence and they are often substantiated. All these features emphasize the specifics of the numeral as a special part of speech.

Reference:

1. Akhmatov, T.K., Davletov, S.A., & Zhaparov, S.Z. (1975). Kyrgyz language. Textbook for Russian groups of universities Kirg. SSR. Frunze: Mektep, 301.
2. Arutyunova, N.D. (1976). The sentence and its meaning: Logico-semantic problems. AN USSR. Institute of Linguistics. Moscow: Nauka, 383.
3. Batmanov, I.A. (1940). The phonetic system of the modern Kyrgyz language. Frunze, 164.
4. Bazin, L. (1979). "Türk Dillerinin Müşterek Tarafları ve Temayülleri" 56 Mehmet Akalin, Tarihi Türk Şiveleri, Atatürk Ü. Yay., Ankara, 17.
5. Davletov, S. (1960). Adverbs in the modern Kyrgyz language. Frunze.
6. Davletov, S., & Kudaibergenov, S. (1980). Modern Kyrgyz language. Frunze: Mektep.
7. Grenbech, K. (1936). Der Türkischen Sprachbau. Vol. I. Copenhagen. 161 Pedersen H. Türkische Lautgesetze. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen, 466.
8. Fortunatov, F.F. (1956). Selected works. Vol. 1, 450.
9. Jean, D. (1950). Structure de la Langue Turqie. Conferences de l'Institute de Linguistique de l'Universite de Paris. IX; Paris, 35.
10. Jespersen, O. (1958). Philosophy of grammar. Foreign literature publisher, 404.
11. Ilyish, B.A. (1948). Modern English. Theoretical course. 2nd Edition, corrected and enlarged. Moscow: Publishing house of literature in foreign languages, 347.
12. Ismailova, B.T. (2016). A new hero in the updated "drama". Education and science in modern conditions, (2-2), 112-116.
13. Ivanova, I.P., Burlakova, V.V., Pocheptsov, G.G. (1981). Theoretical Grammar of Modern English. Moscow: High school, 215.
14. Kazaryan, S.Y., & Grigoryan, A.E. (2021). CONTRASTIVE-COGNITIVE APPROACH TO LANGUAGE TEACHING. Law and Practice, (1), 205-209. <https://doi.org/10.24412/2411-2275-2021-1-205-209>
15. Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences. (1987). Kirghiz Literary Language Grammar, Frunze, 183.
16. Kudaibergenov, S. (1960). Pronouns in the Kyrgyz language. Frunze.
17. Mallory, F. (2021). The case against linguistic palaeontology. Topoi 40, 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-020-09691-5>
18. Marazykov, T., Mapaeva, N., Raimberdieva, Z., Kochorova, G., Omorova, T., Tilekova, N., Masalieva, N., Abdieva, Ch., Abdysheva, Z., Abdimalip kyzy, N., Abdullaeva, Z. (2022). Some Features in the Kyrgyz Ethnoculture. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6, 4, 10044 – 10051. <https://www.journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/6305>
19. Melioransky, P.M. (1894). A Brief Grammar of the Kazakh-Kyrgyz Language. St. Petersburg, 2 Vol., 23.
20. Nesfield, J.C. (1944). Modern English grammar. Macmillan, London.
21. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartrik, J. (1982). A University Grammar of English. English Language Book Society and Longman Group, 484.
22. Radloff, W.W. (1906). Eileitende Gedanken zur Darstellung der

- Morphologie der Türksprachen. VII, 107.
23. Rahmatullaev, S. (2006). *Hozirgi adabiy o'zbek tili*. Textbook. Toshkent: Universitet, 406.
24. Saiidyrakhimova, D., Jusupova, D., Narmatova, G., & Sayidrahimova, N. (2020). *METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF A PART OF THE SPEECH OF THE*
27. Sultanbayeva, H.V. (2012). On the problem of service parts of speech in linguistics. *Bulletin of the Bashkir University*, 17(1(I)), 554-555.
28. Tsoy, A.S. (2008). Service words as surface sub-signs of deep structures. *Bulletin of the Buryat State University. Philosophy*, (10), 81-84.
29. Vinogradov, V.V. (1986). *Russian language. Grammatical study of words*. Moscow.
30. Zhigadlo, V.N., Ivanova, I.P., & Iofik, L.L. (1956). *Modern English language. Theoretical course*. Moscow, 349.
- TURKIC LANGUAGES. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences* Vol. 8 No. 12, 2020 Part II, 97-101.
25. Saiidyrakhimova, D., Kulubekova, A., Kadyrova, M., Sayidrahimova, N., & Abdyrakmanova, G. (2021). *Psychology and education*, 58(2), 319-323.
26. Scherba, L.V. (1957). *Selected works on the Russian language*. Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 187.
31. Zulpukarov, K., Amiraliev, S., Aipova, G., Zulpukarova, A., Toichuev, T., Joldosheva, A., Apaeva, S., Ryskulova, B., Saparbaeva, A., Abdykulov, M., & Abdullaeva, Z. (2021). About Transformation Formulas of the Most Ancient Roots in Eurasian Languages. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 11, 907-918.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2021.116070>