



DOI: 10.26907/2311-2042-2022-19-2-7-23

ASPECTS OF STUDYING ROOT BASES IN THE TURKIC LANGUAGES

Nuriya Usmanovna Khaliullina,

Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmulla,
3 a October Revolution Str., Ufa, 450000, Russian Federation,
nurkha@yandex.ru.

Ilshat Sakhiyatullovich Nasipov,

Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmulla,
3 a October Revolution Str., Ufa, 450000, Russian Federation,
nasipov2021@yandex.ru.

This article provides an overview of various trends in Turkic linguistics related to the study of root bases.

The paper examines the views of well-known Turkologists on the structure of root bases, morphological features and semantic features. Primary roots, as the simplest, smallest and at the same time important units, constitute a very ancient layer, like the linguistic phenomenon itself. Today, their collection and systematization is one of the urgent tasks of studying the history of the language.

The theoretical and practical significance of this research is determined by the possibility of using its main results in comparative-historical and etymological studies, in developing the theory of the root in the Turkic and Altaic languages.

Key words: Turkic languages, comparative-historical linguistics, root, base, reconstruction, etymology, diachrony, syncretism, system

Introduction

The concept of the root was used in linguistics in ancient Indian grammars. In scientific literature, this term is used to name the smallest semantic unit, *the nominal root of the word, root morpheme, root word, primary word, etymological root, main morpheme, root base, formative form of the word, formative stem, primary stem, etc.*

The problem of the “root base” occupies a special place in the Turkic languages, since in Indo-

European linguistics a “historical taboo” was set regarding the relationship between the root and the word, the possibilities of the root and the stem coinciding [1, p. 99]. This stereotype in comparative studies persists today. A. Potebnya especially supports the opinion that “roots existed before words and were formed by means of word formation after the appearance of the inflectional system. Scholars, working in the field of the Turkic languages, do not adopt this scientific standpoint for two reasons:

firstly, synchronously Turkic words can be freely distinguished into an independent root and other morphemes; secondly, monosyllabic roots were clearly recorded in the Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions of the 7th century. "In the Turkic languages, the 'adding' of morphological elements to the root occurred in accordance with the laws of agglutination," notes the Kyrgyz scientist B. M. Yunusaliev. In his opinion, "in the Turkic languages, only a monosyllabic word can act as a root. Even inseparable polysyllabic words are formed either by adding grammatical indicators to the root, or as a result of the semantic mixing of two independent roots, or as a result of phonetic 'deformation'" [2].

Numerous works published on the issue of root bases and the abovementioned views testify to its current significance. Opinions on the structure of the Turkic root in different years were expressed by O. Betlingk (1851), G. Vamberi (1878), V.V. Radlov (1893-1911), V. Bang (1916), N. 1954), D. G. Kiekbayev (1955), A. Zayonchkovsky (1961), V. Kotvich (1962), N. A. Baskakov (1962, 1979, 1988), N. K. Dmitriev (1962), G. Derfer (1964), B. A. Serebrennikov (1965), V. Aslanov (1965, 1971), A. M. Shcherbak (1970), A. N. Kononov (1971, 1980), N. Ganiev (1974), I. V. Kormushin (1971, 1991), E. V. Sevortyan (1973), E. R. Tenishev (1976), V. I. Tsintsius (1979), T. M. Garipov (1979), K. M. Musaev (1984), A. T. Kaidarov (1986), E. Z. Kazhibekov (1986), Zh. Mankeeva (1991), N. I. Egorova (1992), B. O. Oruzbayeva (1994), A. G. Shaikhulova (2000) and others. In particular, scholars debate whether monosyllabic verbal roots are the [C+V] type ending in a vowel. A number of Turkologists (for example, V. Kotvich), using a comparative analysis of the Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungus-Manchu languages, conclude that in the Turkic and, more broadly, Altaic languages, the root can be of different types - from simple V, CV, VC to complex CVC, CVCC. Other scientists (G. Vamberi, V. V. Radlov, N. A. Baskakov, A. M. Shcherbak), on the contrary, believe that the monosyllabic root of the classical type C + V + C is the type of the most ancient root structure. Proponents of this point of view believe that the only primary root in the Turkic languages can be the type CVC (for example, the verbs *Sal* -, *Bar* -, *Kel* -). In their opinion, the presence of an etymological root of the V + C type is impossible. N. A. Baskakov notes that the theory suggesting the primacy of two-vowel roots has not been proven [3, p. 100]. In later works, the author says that the roots in the CV structure are numerically smaller than in the ancient written monu-

ments and the modern Turkic languages, which is an argument against their primacy. As one of the proofs, he cites the fact that the Turkic languages are characterized by a root type with a closed syllable, consisting of initial (anlaut) and final (auslaut) consonants, their frequency being 75% [3].

N. Baskakov's ideas can serve either as a starting point for researchers in their search, or as their last frontier, which they are to reach on the basis of observations.

Materials and methods of research

Our study is based on the theory of the root in Turkology and Altaistics, research works and dictionaries.

We use the methods of historical and comparative linguistics and the descriptive method.

Discussion

V. Radlov was the first scientist to demonstrate the possibility of restoring (reconstructing) many Turkic roots into a CV prototype. In his work "Vvodnye mysli k opisaniyu morfologii tyurkskikh yazykov" ("Introductory Thoughts on the Description of Morphology of the Turkic Languages") (1906), he proposed a doctrine of the morphological elements' origin in Turkic words. According to the data on modern languages that have passed a long way of development, one can trace Turkic words "expansion" in the history of their development. According to Radlov, "...when studying monosyllabic Turkic stems, we can further observe that some widespread monosyllabic bases cannot be considered proper roots at all; they were formed by a fusion of a lost stem with some other base affixes" [4]. For example, *bak* ~ *pak* are formed from the verb *pa-* ~ *ba-* "to bind" plus the affix - *k*, they were recorded in the Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions, in "Kutadgu bilig"; the verbs *syk* - "to squeeze", *syn* - "to break, destroy", *syt* - "to crush" are formed from the more ancient root **sy* [5]. Later, E. Sevortyan and A. Kononov agreed with these views of Radlov. Moreover, in many cases, the second consonant sound of the VC type also falls into a similar scheme. For example, according to E. Sevortyan, the final consonants *y*, *z* in the Turkish words *iy-* "to agree, approach, correspond, be to the face" and *uz* - "suitable, befitting" are derivational indicators [4].

Proceeding from the disintegration of the roots, Mr. Vambery singles out the concepts of "root" and "base". In his opinion, the use of the term "base" makes it possible to single out "the root and

adjoining appendages" in its composition. He was one of the first in Turkology to identify 47 bases confirming this point of view.

The status of the Turkic root in diachrony as an "inseparable lexeme" is only a hypothesis. Many experts note that in the modern Turkic languages not only two- and three-syllable roots, but also monosyllabic roots constitute once independent morphological elements of the language as a result of the agglutinative development. In accordance with phonetic, morphological and semantic patterns, they have merged into a single whole to such an extent that today it is impossible to separate them [4, p. 19].

According to the terminology of Zh. Mankeev, the theory of the root should be analyzed in dynamics. The root is a unit of the ontological level, so it constantly changes.

The presence of etymological roots like V, CV, VC does not cause controversy in many studies. In his well-known article, A. Zaionchkovsky finds specific examples to illustrate the thesis about the occurrence of verbal stems of the primary C + V type in the Turkic languages [6, p. 29]. The researcher found the material showing that in the Turkic languages, especially in written monuments, there is a large number of examples of monosyllabic verbal roots belonging to the CV type. In support of his point of view, he cites 11 root bases: *ba* – "binding"; *yu* – "wash", *yi*-, *ye* – "eat", *ku* – "protect"; *ka* – "fold", *ko* – "deliver"; *sa* – "count"; *sy* – "destroy"; *su* – "pull"; *ti* / *te* – "to speak"; *tu* – "load" [6]. As K. Musaev notes, A. Zaionchkovsky developed a method for restoring the etymological root using the comparative method [4]. At the same time, the author says that not all root verbs can be attributed to the CV type.

According to A. Kononov, the shortest form of the Turkic root is determined by 2 types: V, CV and VC. As for the widespread type of CVC, "in many cases, morphological analysis shows that the third element (the final consonant) is the direction indicator in verbs and the derivational affix in nouns". Indeed, in many Turkic languages, including Tatar and Bashkir, there are many verbs among root words of the CVC type with affixes denoting the etymological root and direction. In such examples as *kil* < **kel*, *kit* < **ket*, we can distinguish the root **ke* and the direction affix [4, p. 20].

In the most ancient dialect of the Turkic language, B. Yunusaliev identifies four types of monosyllabic roots: 1) V: *u* "dream", *o*- "think", 2) CV: *sa*- "count", *ju*- "load", *sy*- "break", *be+n* "I", *bi+z* "we"; 3) VC: *at*- "horse"; *al*- "take", *as*-

"hang", *an*- "beast"; 4) CVC: *kel*- "come", *ke+t* "leave", *sug*- "water", *tag*- "mountain". The author notes the conventionality of the CVC type, since the words, related to modern languages, such as *zhak* -, *zhan* -, *zhal* -, "may further disintegrate as our cognitive boundaries, expand in historical grammar" [2].

The modern Turkic languages have preserved their ancient root structure. The structure of the roots in ancient Turkic written monuments and in modern Turkic languages is basically reduced to the same types. This testifies to the thousand-year conservation of the root structure in the Turkic languages and, consequently, to the preservation of the structure of the Proto-Turkic root in modern languages [4]. Another opinion of K. Musaev about the root is innovative. He emphasizes that historical roots do not have indicators that allow them to be attributed to one or another group of words.

The concept of "root" has not yet found a complete, objective and strict definition in relation to the modern Turkic languages. According to many researchers, its distinctive feature is historical variability and the preservation or loss of individual formants. These features are reflected in the following definition, given by A. Kononov: "the root of a word is a historical concept meaning that the structure of the root changes depending on a number of circumstances, and, first of all, on the preservation or extinction of the individual formants' word-formation ability" [4]. For example, in the modern Turkic languages, the basis for the formation of the verb *bajla*- "to bind" is the noun *baj* "bundle, knot", which, in turn, consists of an affix forming the verb *ba*- "to bind" + *-j/γ* -; *edgäp*- "to teach" < *ög* "mind" < *ö* "to think"; *sa-na*- "count" < *san* "account" < *sa* "count" (*san*- "be considered").

According to A. Kaidarov, "the Turkic root is the oldest and a historically real unit of the language, which has retained its essence, despite the phono-morpho-semantic changes, as a result of the agglutinative development. It structurally coincides with the original word if it does not exceed one syllable. In other cases, the root is an artificial unit of language, in which it expresses statics and the word - dynamics" [7, p. 24].

G. Alparov, for example, considers that: "practically, we have no three-syllable root words, there are few of them. Upon careful consideration, we have come to the conclusion that they are either abbreviated forms of two words, or are coined by some addition" [8, p. 58]. In his work "Grammar

of the Tatar Language” V. Khangildin writes: “the root is the most important part of the word – the part that cannot be divided into more significant parts. The root base is historically more ancient: from the point of view of the phonetic structure, it has relatively smaller dimensions. Most of the root consists of one or two syllables” [9, p. 28].

Consequently, in the Turkic languages, numerous secondary roots are found, formed on the basis of primary (etymological, historical) roots.

Most scholars, while studying the structure of the roots, belonging to different Turkic languages, establish the monosyllabic nature of the root. A. Kaidarov highlights such aspects of Turkic monosyllabs as their structure and structural types, primary and secondary roots, internal changes / phonomorphological factors, monosyllabicity / polysyllabicity, decay / non-disintegration, independence / freedom, stability / instability, semantic variability / immutability. He claims that “monosyllabic roots in the Turkic languages are not a fiction, but a real fact”, and draws the following conclusions:

1. *root* → *stem* → *word* as a result of the sequential agglutinative development in the phonomorpho-semantic structure of lexical units are adjacent links that are differentiated internally;

2. historical roots are monosyllabic in their structure in most cases: the most ancient and primary types of monosyllabic roots found today are V (vowels), CV (consonants + vowels), and the types VC, CVC, VCC, CVCC are the result of the further agglutinative development ;

3. Turkic monosyllabic roots can break up not only within artificial language units, but also in general into smaller morphemes that once existed in the language;

4. Turkic monosyllabic roots in modern languages can be distinguished from artificial bases as independent and “conservative, etymologically dark, dead” forms;

5. Turkic monosyllabic root bases are characterized by structural variability and variability in accordance with phono-morphological patterns among representatives of the common Turkic and individual languages;

6. Turkic monosyllabic roots are characterized by a constant change in their development, they are semantically dependent on internal and external factors. Separate groups of roots do not have an independent lexical meaning, only their primary, common etymological meaning can be determined, and this meaning has always been subjected to internal differentiation and concretization

suitable for the development of word formation [7, p. 35].

A. Kaidarov notes that the creation of a complete corpus of monosyllabs in individual Turkic languages and its in-depth scientific research has served as the basis for the development of the Turkic roots general theory. The author, relying on the principles of his theory, compiled a dictionary of monosyllabic root bases in the Kazakh language. At the beginning of the dictionary entry are monosyllabic roots, which are given in the Kazakh alphabet; translations into Russian are given in a simplified and generalized way. All derivatives of a homogeneous root are presented in one layer with the signs >, <. Homonyms-roots are combined into one semantic nest [7, p. 35]. Here is an example of an excerpt from the dictionary of monosyllabic root bases in the Kazakh language:

* *kai* [qaj] I (questions: when, where, etc.): *кайда* (*kai-da*) < *кай+да* where, *кайсы* (*kai-sy*) < *кай+сы* which...

**kai-* [qaj-] II (syncretic: turn, turn back, lean back, arch back // reverse, opposite; rear, rear, rear, western): *кайкы* (*kai-ky*) < *кай+кы* concave, reclined; *кайыр-* (*kai-yr*) < *кай+ыр-* turn away, turn; return back; *кайт-* (*kai-t*) < *кай+т-* return, leave, come back; depart. Compare: ancient uygur: go back, return, come back; chuvash: *кай* (*kai*) back, west.

**kai-*[qaj] III (something frozen, hardened, trust): *каймак* (*kai-mak*) < *кай+мак* sour cream.

**kai-* [qaj-] IV: *кайна* (*kai-na*) < *кай+на* boil; figuratively: to rage;

**kai-* [qaj-] V (syncretic: mate, mated female animals: *кайы* (*kai-y*) < *кай+ы* to mate with the male. Mated (camel);

**kai* [qaj] VI (something slippery, sliding, floating on the surface of the water, through the air): *кайык* (*kai-yk*) < *кай+ык* a boat. Compare in kyrgys *кайы* (*kaiy*) glide through the air; on the surface of the water (about a flat object), etc.;

**kai* [qaj] VII: *кайрак* (*kai-rak*) < *кай+рак* whetstone;

**kai* [qaj] VIII (kinship in the female line): *кайын* (*kai-yn*) < *кай+ын* wife's relatives; compare: *кат* (*kat*) < *кат+ын* (*kat-yn*); ancient Turkic *qad* close, blood relative.

**kai* [qaj] IX (something related to cutting, chopping, shredding): *кайшы* (*kai-shy*) < *кай+шы* scissors... Compare: *кый* (*kyi*) > *кыйкала-* (*kyikala*), *кыр-* (*kyr*) > *кыршы* (*kyrshy*)...

**kait-* [qajt-] return, return back. Compare: **кай* (*kai*) II > *кай+ыр* (*kai-yr*) > *кай+тар-* (*kai-tar*) [6, pp. 235-236].

The dictionary is the basis for systematizing the lexical richness of all Turkic languages and etymological research.

In the article “The Lexico-Semantic Development of the Root **qa* in the Altaic Languages”, I. Kormushin provides additional materials on the root **qa* in a comparative aspect study based on the Turkic languages and the Mongolian, Tungus-Manchu languages. This work substantiates the author’s reasoning that the root bases in Turkic words, which do not fall apart according to the current point of view, have historically developed as a result of their formal and semantic development.

Mahmud Kashgari recorded the verb **qa* in the dialect of the Yagma tribe, the form *qala* is used in the same meaning in the local dialect of the Chigians [10, p. 13]. The oldest meaning of this verb has been preserved in the Yakut and Nogai languages: Yakut *xala* (*kala*) “put”, Nogai *кала* (*kala*) 1) “lay, put”, 2) “restore, build”. The *-la* element can be considered as an affix in the *qala* verb; in Indo-European language studies, the term “determinative” is used in relation to such elements.

If we compare the root *qa* with the verb *qat*, widely used in ancient monuments and the modern Turkic languages, we will find that the element *-t* has acquired the meaning of an expansion form. The semantics of the verb *qat* has developed further; it has acquired not only the meaning “to connect, bring two things together”, but also, as in Turkish, the meaning “to add (take something as a basis, add to it)”, “mix” (mix different things, usually about a solution). In the Bashkir, Yakut and Kazakh languages, the verb *kamy* (*katu*) has its own meaning: “twist, weave (thread)”, that is, connect the threads together, etc. The concretization of semantics in the Bashkir and Nogai languages has led to the following meaning: “seasonal food”: *Ашка корот камыу* (*ashka short katyu*). Also, in Turkish, *katik* means “spice for bread”, in Tatar – “food spice”.

The *qar* verb should be included in the group of the words in question. Mahmud Kashgari defines synonymy – the semantic identity of the verbs *qar* and *qat*. In different Turkic languages, the abovementioned differences in the meanings of the verbs *qat*, *qar* can only be explained by the specialization of their original, primary meaning. This feature manifests itself in the new shades of meaning added to the lexical content of the verb: some additional indications of the features of the action functions and the action objects [10, p. 16].

I. Kormushin notes that the verbs *Qa-*, *qala-*, *qat-* and *qar* have one root, and the elements *-la*, *-t* and *-r*, can be considered formatives merged with the root as a result of semantic differentiation.

Despite the fact that Turkic words, united by the bases *Qal*, *qat*, *qar*, *qap*, have a clearly expressed external expressive features and independent categorical lexical content, their semantics is common. The fact that these units indicate plurality and totality is associated with the common presence of the root element *qa* in these words. Consequently, minor consonants are fundamentally affixes or formatives. As for the root **qa*, the uniqueness of its modifications is obvious. It is revealed in the repetition of the certain “semantic ingredient” – the meaning of addition-mixing, the direction towards something, the connection in motion, the unification and definition of a single set of these objects [10, p. 29].

E. Kazhibekov, developing the theory of monosyllabic roots, showed that the main source of homogeneity of roots in the Turkic languages was the syncretic, causative nature of their meanings, the complexity of ancient words’ semantics. After the centuries-old evolution of the language, ancient words concretized their lexical and grammatical meanings and took shape as morphologically independent groups of words. But “at first, their boundaries were not very clearly defined” [11, p. 44].

The morphological development of the word in the Turkic languages reinforces the meanings of the lexemes present in the language. Solving the problem of word groups’ syncretism allows us to trace the evolution of their forms and meanings.

Not all variants of root bases arose simultaneously, they represent the patterns of the general Turkic central vocabulary development, harmoniously fitting into the phonological structure and the historically established articulation base of each Turkic language. Their, at first glance, confusing device is actually an alternation of sounds, vibrations and reflex reflections [7, p. 69].

Variants of the root, formed by the alternation of the consonant [й] ([j]), are common in the Turkic languages. Such lexical units, having a common origin since ancient times, but not having a similar phonetic structure, may have different semantic content. This opinion is confirmed in the works of R. Akhmetyanov, the author of the etymological dictionary of the Tatar language, and the Bashkir scientist E. Ishberdin. The genetically common roots of the verbs *yat-* ~ *yad-* ~ *yaz-* ~ *yaz-* ~ *yar-* ~ *yas-* ~ *yal-* ~ *yai* in the modern Tur-

tic languages have a wide semantic field: “to lie” – “to spread” – “to expand” – “straighten” – “spread” – “spread out” – “expand” – “set” – “build” – “create” – “dissect” – “split”. The antiquity of the root sounds is reflected even in ancient Turkic written monuments: *yat-* “to lie down, lay down, spread out” – *yad-* “to spread, distribute, lay out, spill” – *yaz-* “to spread, lay out, spread out”, *yaz-* “to untie, dissolve, unravel, spread” – *yar-* “to dissect, split” – *yas-* “to dissolve, scatter, establish, lower” – *yal-* “to flare up, ignite” – *yai-* “to disperse, shake, shake, rinse”. In the Tatar language, this phonetic alternation is expressed in a peculiar way: *yat-* “lie down” – *yaz-* “straighten, straighten” – *yar-* “split, split” – *yai-* (жәй-) “spread, spread, spread”. The root *yal-* is found on artificial bases: *yal-kyn* “flame”, *yal-pak* “flat, flattened”, *yal-kau* “lazy” < *yat-kak* “loving to lie down”; *yas-a* “to construct, make, arrange” [12]. Consequently, the change in the phonetic structure of a word is closely related to its semantic content, so the study of the most important historical processes in the phonetics of the Tatar language is directly related to the subject of historical lexicology.

The meanings of a homogeneous word define different aspects of the same phenomenon (name of the work, place, result, tool and other attributes of the work / process). Let’s look at some examples that support this point of view.

In the Tatar language, the word *añ* (*an* – consciousness) has several meanings: 1. The ability to think, to perceive reality as something inherent in a person. 2. The process of reflecting reality, all human mental activities in the human brain. 3. Sober look, mind; knowledge, awareness. *Añ* (*an*) expresses the following semantics in the presence of a verbal root: 1. Understanding something, revealing its content, meaning. 2. Evaluation, recognition. 3. Thinking, imagination [13].

**añ* – “to think”; “to ponder”; “remember”, “remember”, “understand” ↔ **añ* – “mind”, “consciousness”, “susceptibility”, “understanding”, “thought”, etc. a homogeneous root is found in the ancient Turkic and modern languages [5, p. 46].

Khakass **oñna-*, North Altaic **oñno-*, as well as **onga-* “know”, “understand” along with the Turkic **añla-* make it possible to reveal a direct connection between “*a:ñ* (*a:ñ*) ~ *añ* (*añ*) ~ *añ* (*an*) and *oñ* (*oi*) “thought”, “mind”. This idea can be substantiated by the form parallel between *oñan-* (*oñan-*) and *oñdan-* (*oñdon*) “wake up”, “wake up”, “wake up”, “come to your senses.” This connection is also found in other languages: Kyrgyz **ojyor-* “assume, conclude”, Khakass **oñar-* “un-

derstand, reason”, Kazakh, Karakalpak **añyar-* “understand, guess.” As in the case of the homogeneous roots **es*, **uq*, the derivative meanings “understand” and “listen” can be singled out among the meanings of **añla* [11, p. 48].

If we consider examples, related to the type CVC, we can see the syncretism of the roots **küj* ↔ **kün*. In the ancient Turkic languages, the verb forms **köj-* ~ **kön-* ~ **küj-* “to burn” are found [p. 5, 312, 314, 325, 646]. Old Türkic **kön-* e.g. Turk. **kön-ük-* are formed from the verb “get tanned” [6, p. 60]. The similarity of **kuj-* “burn”, “bake” with **kün-* “burn” can be explained with the help of secondary stems containing the same identifications: for example, Nogai **qujas* ~ **qijās* “sun”, “a place lit by the sun”; compare: **qujas*; Bashk., Tat. *кояш* (*koyash*), Uzbek. *күёш* (*kuesh*), Uyg. *күяш* (*kuyash*) and **künāš* “sun” [5, p. 327]; Turkish **qüneş* “sun”, Chuv. **хәвел* “sun”, Turkic **kunal* “sun”, etc. In Tatar dialects, along with **kujās* “sun”, **kön* “sun” is also found. It is used as a part of compound words: *konchygysh* (East), *konbatysh* (West).

The Ufa School occupies a special place in the development of the Turkic languages root theory. Related languages are studied on a broader plane, based on the Ural-Altaic language family.

D. Kiebaev, on the basis of the certainty-uncertainty principle, proved that word forms developed from unknown to known as a result of the successive attachment of indicators to the root. At each of the language levels– in phonetics, morphology, vocabulary and syntax – there are special means of expressing certainty and uncertainty. From the point of view of the root theory, of interest is the researcher’s reasoning about the presence of certain grammatical and semantic possibilities of sounds at the phonetic level. In other words, words have gone along the path of development corresponding to the principles of agglutination from simple to complex, from unknown to known. For example, the plural suffix *лар-* (*lar-*) has gone through several stages of its historical development: *-л* > *-ла-* > *-лар* (*-л* > *-ла-* > *-лар*). At each stage, the meaning of plurality is expressed more clearly, due to the possibilities of sounds (phonetic units). Here, for example, the possibility of expressing plurality, width, and uncertainty of the exponent *-a* is explained by the fact that it is acoustically the widest vowel. The same principle allows us to distinguish consonants as grammatical formants that are parts of the roots, especially in the roots like VC, CVC.

The works of T. Garipov provide a synchronic and diachronic description of the Kypchak languages of the Volga and Ural Regions.

Working on compiling a synopsis and taxonomy of language units, the Ufa School relies on the principles of systematicity in the study of root bases.

The well-known Turkologist Prof. A. Shaikhulov explores the material of the languages of the Volga-Kama-Ural ethno-linguistic region in ideographic paradigmatics. In his works, he refers to the general Turkic and areal vocabulary, and to the lexical units of the Altaic languages. More than a million appellative units of current dialects and modern languages, collected by a scientist in the "Research (Educational) Interuniversity Laboratory of the Spiritual Culture of the Turkic, Mongolian, Finno-Ugric and Indo-European (Slavic) Peoples of the Volga-Kama-Ural Ethnolinguistic Region", have become the basis for theoretical observations. From a systemic point of view, A. Shaikhulov explores monosyllabic roots in the Kypchak languages within the framework of the cognitive spheres "nature (inanimate, animate)", "man" (man as a physical and biological being), "man as an emotional, mental, emotional, conscious being", "society", "cognition". On the one hand, according to the author, "the presentation of the root bases of related languages in the form of a synopsis allows us to reveal their specific features concerning a person's knowledge of the world around him and its reflection in the word" [4, p. 179]. In other words, the systematization of root bases should form the basis of etymology. On the other hand, A. Shaikhulov, continuing the ideas of well-known Turkologists on monosyllabic roots, managed to describe the phonological combinatorics, the semantics of monosyllabic roots of the Tatar and Bashkir languages within the framework of the systematic approach.

In his works, I. Nasipov systematizes borrowings from the Fin-Ugor languages found in the Tatar language [14].

Consequently, language, as an objective reflection of the reality around us, exists in the form of certain combinatorial patterns, schemes, models, matrices and paradigms. Today, as many scholars point out, the "synergetic definition of the world" prevails in linguistics. In new trends, research is also being carried out on the lexical-semantic system of the language. Synergetics is based on the idea of the unity and coherence of the world, the interconnection of everything: "each small unit of the Universe is a special world, defined (animated) by it-

self and universal being, the universe as the unity of all its parts" [15, p. 146].

Such integrity and unity of the world is described in the language through a number of etymological nests, genetic paradigms determined by the primary root base. Our works investigate some etymological nests of common roots found in the Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus-Manchzhur languages of the Altaic language family. For example, the etymological root **toγ-*, recorded in the Old Turkic dictionary, consists of the following semantic "meanings": *toγ-* I. 1. be born, reborn, appear. 2. "ascension (about the luminaries)" (compare: in the Turkic, Mongolian, Tungus-Manchzhur groups: *tuγ-* "something fluttering; rising"); *toγ-* II. "to rise, heave (about dust)"; *tuγ-* II. "a barrier, obstruction, dam; damper, latch" → *tuγ+la-* "to close, push" [5, p. 584]. The etymological root *toγ-* < *to* (its phonetic variants *tī ~ tu ~ tū ~ tō ~ tā*) in some languages has the following reflexes: 1) Tatar, Bashkir: *my-* (tu-), *мы-* (tyu-) "be born, appear", Chuvash: *myx-* (tukh-) "appear, show, elevate"; Mongol *məpə-x* (toro-kh) "give birth" < *my-pux* (tu-rikh) "throw out, throw away", compare *my-пс* (tu-rs – "caviar"), Tatar, Bashkir: *myz-an* (tug-an) "relative; native", *мок-ым* (to-kym) "generation; breed"; Kalmyk: *мохм* (tokhm) "genus, origin", *myz-улах* (tug-ulakh) "to give birth (about animals)", Evenk: *myγ* (tuu) "calve; breed chicks", *my-уэн* (tu-uen) "cousin", Sol.: *my-ну* (tu-ni) "cousins", Neg: *myв-эн* (tuv-en) "children of women from the mother's clan; of the same kind", *my-рул* (tu-rul) "relatives", Sol.: "rebirth"; Mongol: *tu-run* (tu-run) "grandson", *морон* (to-ron) "relationship; relatives"; Tatar dialects: *my-мача* (tu-macha), *мо-мачей* (tu-machey) "relatives"; 2) mongol *моос* (*toos*), bur. *моо-хон* (Too-khon) "dust (dusty fog, raised dust)", compare: *моо-ро-г* (*too-ro-g*) "dust" < *мог-оруху* (*tog-orikhu*) "encircle, encircle from all sides"; manchzhur: *дүвэ* (*duve*) "end", *дүб-э* (*dub-e*) "end, peak, point, top"; 3) Turkic: *мок-та* (*tok-ta*) ~ *мыкма* (*tuk-ta*) "stop"; *тыгыл* (*tygyl*) "blocked; covered; opposite, contradiction; pristine, perfection, absolute; closed", *myz-әрәк* (*tu-gerek*) "isolation, circle"; tatar, bashkir *myz-ар-* (*tug-ar-*) "discord"; Bashkir: *мок-ан* (*tok-an*), Chuvash: *мав-а* (*tav-a*) "knot, loop"; Mongol: *мох-ох-* (*toh-oh-*) "saddles, throws on", *my-кү-* (*tu-ku-*) "saddles", manchzhur: *мох(о)-* (*toh(o)-*) "harness; sheathe with seine"; Old Turkic: *myz-ун* (*tug-un*) "knot", Mongol: *myнэ* (*tung*) "sew-on loop on a dress, breakdown, staple", *my-на* (*tu-na*) "string"; udmurt: *myh-u-* (*tuh-i-*) "satisfy" [16]. Lexical units within the etymo-