



Theoretical principles and criteria of historical and genetic differentiation of lexical parallels between Turkic and Mongolian languages

Senbek Utebekov

International University of Tourism and Hospitality, Republic of Kazakhstan,

Kenan Koç

Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Republic of Türkiye



In this article, we analyze the problems related to the theory of Altaic languages and lexical parallels between them. For this purpose, new findings and information in the work of the Kazakh linguist Janseyit Tuymebayev “Principles and Criteria of Historical and Genetic Differentiation of Lexical Parallels of Turkic and Mongolian Languages” published in 2024 are taken as a basis. In the Introduction section of the article, the historical development of the theory of Altaic languages and information about Tuymebayev’s other works on the Altaic theory are presented. In the main part, the researcher’s studies in the field of Altaistics to date, his opinions put forward, the historical and cultural contacts between the Turkic and Mongolian peoples, the results of their linguistic interactions, the evaluations and determinations on the historical development processes of cultural contacts between the languages in question are considered scientifically. In addition, Tuymebayev’s information about the linguistic features and vocabulary of Tuvan, which is more affected by Mongolian when compared to other Turkic dialects, and the similarities of Mongolian elements in Kazakh in terms of meaning and sound are analyzed.



Keywords: *Altaic languages; Turkic languages; Mongolian languages; Janseyit Tuymebayev; cultural borrowing; cultural relation; lexical parallel*



For citation:

Utebekov S. and Koç K. Theoretical principles and criteria of historical and genetic differentiation of lexical parallels between Turkic and Mongolian languages. *New Research of Tuva*, 2025, no. 1, pp. 198-211. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2025.1.15>

UTEBEKOV, Senbek, Doctor of Philology, Teacher, Language School, International University of Tourism and Hospitality. Postal address: 14A Rabiga Sultan Begim, 161200 Turkistan, Republic of Kazakhstan. E-mail: senbek.utebekov@iuth.edu.kz



KOÇ, Kenan, Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Modern Turkish Dialects and Literatures, Faculty of Letters, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University. Postal address: 48170 Köteklü Campus/Muğla, Republic of Türkiye. E-mail: kkoc@mu.edu.tr

Утебеков Сенбек — доктор филологических наук, преподаватель языковой школы Международного университета туризма и гостеприимства. Адрес: 14А Рабига Султан Бегим, 161200 Туркестан, Республика Казахстан. Эл. адрес: senbek.utebekov@iuth.edu.kz ORCID: 0000-0003-3557-6758



Коч Кенан — доктор филологических наук, доцент кафедры современных тюркских диалектов и литератур филологического факультета Университета Мугла Сытки Кочмана. Адрес: 48170 Köteklü Campus/Muğla, Republic of Türkiye. Эл. адрес: kkoc@mu.edu.tr



Теоретические принципы и критерии историко-генетической дифференциации лексических параллелей между тюркскими и монгольскими языками

Сенбек Утебеков

Международный университет туризма и гостеприимства, Республика Казахстан,

Кенан Коч

Университет Мугла Сытки Кочмана, Республика Турция

В статье анализируются проблемы, связанные с теорией алтайских языков, и лексические параллели между ними. С этой целью за основу взяты новые находки и информация в работе казахского лингвиста Ж. Туймебаева «Принципы и критерии историко-генетической дифференциации лексических параллелей тюркских и монгольских языков», опубликованной в 2024 г.

Во вступительном разделе статьи представлено историческое развитие теории алтайских языков и информация о других работах Туймебаева по теории алтайского языка. В основной части рассматриваются исследования исследователя в области алтаистики на сегодняшний день, высказанные мнения, исторические и культурные контакты между тюркскими и монгольскими народами, результаты их языковых взаимодействий, оценки и определения исторических процессов развития культурных контактов между рассматриваемыми языками с научной точки зрения. Кроме того, анализируются сведения Туймебаева о лингвистических особенностях и словарном запасе тувинского языка, на который в большей степени влияет монгольский язык по сравнению с другими тюркскими диалектами, а также сходство монгольских элементов в казахском языке с точки зрения значения и звучания.

Ключевые слова: алтайские языки; тюркские языки; монгольские языки; Жансеит Туймебаев; культурное заимствование; культурная связь; лексическая параллель



Для цитирования:

Utebekov S., Koç K. Theoretical principles and criteria of historical and genetic differentiation of lexical parallels between Turkic and Mongolian languages // Новые исследования Тувы. 2025. № 1. С. 198-211. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2025.1.15>

Introduction

Research on the theory of Altaic languages, the foundations of which were laid by the Swedish geographer Philip Johan von Strahlenberg (Strahlenberg, 1730) in the early 18th century, did not reach a successful conclusion due to its distance from the methods of comparative linguistics. This theory, which attracted many researchers, began to be analyzed in two separate branches, namely Uralic languages and Altaic languages, at the beginning of the 19th century. Scientists such as W. Schott (Schott, 1836), G. J. Ramstedt (Ramstedt, 1912, 1957), Z. Gombocz (Gombocz, 1912), W. Kotwicz (Kotwicz, 1938) N. N. Poppe (Poppe, 1960, 1965) etc. focused their research on Altaic languages and discovered the commonalities of the languages belonging to this language group (Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungus, Korean and Japanese) and obtained important information by comparing languages and dialects in terms of phonology and morphology. There are also opinions among some researchers such as W. Kotwicz (Kotwicz, 1938), L. Ligeti (Ligeti, 1971), V. I. Rassadin (Rassadin, 1980), N. I. Egorov (Egorov, 2006), A. A. Chechenov (Tuymebayev, Egorov, Chechenov, 2009), G. D. Sanjeyev (Sanjeyev, 1953, 1973), T. A. Bertagaev (Bertagaev, 1968, 1971, 1974) and T. Gülensoy (Gülensoy, 1974), etc. that homologues in Altaic languages may be borrowings arising from exchanges between the peoples living in close geographies. However, it is obvious that the sound similarities between Altaic languages such



as rotasism, lambdacism, zetatism and sigmatism are not identical. Nevertheless, starting from the common features such as regular vowel harmony, the presence of suffixes only, the order of sentence elements as subject+object+predicate, the precedence of genetives over determinatum in determinative groups, and the lack of grammatical gender of words, many scholars (including K. H. Menges, O. Pritsak, N. A. Baskakov, P. Aalto, H. W. Choi, T. Tekin, O. N. Tuna, A. Temir, T. Gülensoy, R. A. Miller, O. F. Sertkaya, S. Barutçu and N. Yüce) have supported the theory of Altaic languages (Akar, 2003: 22, 39).

The studies of these researchers present important information on the history of the formation and development of Turkic dialects and other Altaic languages, their periods and places in the world's linguistic system, similarities and differences between languages and dialects. Nevertheless, although some scientists have expressed their opinions on such questions as "Where is the homeland of the peoples who speak Altaic languages?", "How old are Altaic languages?", "Which of the modern languages is closer to pra-Altaic?" and "Which of the languages thought to be derived from pra-Altaic is older and which is newer?", no definite solution has yet been found. In addition, the question of whether similar words in Altaic languages are common words or intercultural borrowings remains on the agenda to this day.

The topic of the theory of Altaic languages is discussed in the works of many Kazakhstani authors. Particularly, in the studies of researchers such as K. Akhanov (Akhanov, 2003), Ä. Qaydar (Kaydarov, 1970), S. Kenesbayev (Kenesbayev, 1971), S. Sarybayev (Sarybayev, 1960, 1971), M. Orazov (Qaydar, Orazov, 2004), B. Bazilhan (Bazilhan, 1973), G. Qaliyev and A. Bolganbayev (Qaliyev, Bolganbayev, 2006), the Kazakh language as a dialect of Turkish and the languages belonging to the group of Altaic languages were compared in terms of phonetics, morphology, lexis, semantics and syntax and similarities were identified. Recently, J. Tuymebayev's works have brought a new perspective to this issue with his original approach, interpretations and evaluations in the light of new findings and information.

In 2024, with the support of the Turkic Academy, J. Tuymebayev, known as one of the representatives of the neo-Altaicists who combine the ontological processes of ethnolinguistic and cultural nature that take place at different levels in the Altai region with the processes of linguistic borrowing, has published a book entitled *Theoretical Principles and Criteria of Historical and Genetic Differentiation of Turkic-Mongolian Lexical Parallels* ("Teoreticheskie printsipy i kriterii istoriko-geneticheskogo razggranicheniia tiurksko-mongol'skikh leksicheskikh paralelei" / «Теоретические принципы и критерии историко-генетического разграничения тюркско-монгольских лексических параллелей») (Tuymebayev, 2024).

The study works through the historical and genetic dimensions of the linguistic similarities between Turkic and Mongolian languages under four main parts: "Theoretical, Scientific and Methodological Foundations of the Development and Formation of Altaicism", "Ethnohistorical Preconditions of Turkic-Mongolian Language Contacts", "The Problem of Anlaut Lip Consonants in Altaic Languages" and "Kazakh-Mongolian Lexical Parallels". In addition, the historical development of the languages belonging to Altaic languages family and the processes of cultural and linguistic borrowings between these languages are analyzed through historical and ethnological analysis methods. In this respect, the work is of great importance for Altaic and Turkological research. In this article, it is aimed to compare the work of the linguist with the research conducted in the field of Altaicism, to examine the issues identified, intersecting and diverging points with scientific perspective.

The methods of the study

Beyond introducing the work, this study aims to analyze and evaluate the new findings and determinations obtained in the book. In the study, which deals with Altaic languages in terms of phonetics, morphology and lexico-semantics in addition to descriptive methods, comparative, diachronic, synchronic, analytical and critical methods are also used.

Evaluation of studies on the unity of Altaic languages

There are two approaches to the theory of Altaic languages (hereinafter referred to as 'AL'): *genetic* (arguing that it is based on a single mother language) and *typological* (arguing that they are not genetically related but only structurally similar). While some of the proponents of the *typological* approach argue that the similarities between AL are due to the centuries-long relationships between them, their strong influence on each other, and the fact that they are different languages (Kotwicz, 1938), others state that the theory of AL needs to be further clarified, studied and researched (Castrén, 1857).



In fact, serious studies on this language theory have been carried out by researchers from various countries of the world, especially in the West, and remarkable opinions have been put forward (Kotwicz, 1938; Ligeti, 1971; Rassadin, 1980; Egorov, 2006; Tuymbayev, Egorov, Chechenov, 2009; Sanjeyev, 1953; Bertagaev, 1968; Gülensoy, 1974). Considering these ideas and opinions, we can categorize Altaicism into three types: traditional Altaicism, anti-Altaicism and neo-Altaicism.

In Tuymbayev's work, which constitutes the basis of our study, some issues related to Altaistics were discussed to obtain definite results, opinions on these issues were advanced and detailed examinations were made together with comparisons. More than 600 sources, including scientific works, dictionaries and literary works, etc. were used during the analysis. First, J. Tuymbayev, who tries to defend the theory of AL, states that until the 20th century there were no materials on Turkish, Chuvash, Mongolian, Tungus, Manchu, Korean and Japanese languages at the time when anti-Altaicists such as when anti-Altaicists such as V. Grønbech, J. Krueger, L. Ligeti, J. Benzing, D. Sinor, G. Dörfer, A. M. Shcherbak, B. A. Serebrennikov and D. Clauson attempted to refute the theory of AL. In other words, the researcher puts forward that the lack of resources lies as the cause of the defense that the Altaic linguistic unity is only a fiction (Tuymbayev, 2024: 16). In the meantime, the researcher tries to emphasize the importance of comparative and historical linguistics. Drawing attention to this in his work from time to time, the researcher emphasizes that other linguists do not give due importance to the principles of comparative and historical linguistics in analyzing the basic ethnic, linguistic and genetic problems between languages. In fact, the scholar argues that a holistic comparison of linguistic sources in such studies would yield more robust results (Ibid.: 11). In this context, he emphasizes the research of Altaicists such as Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832), Heinrich Julius Klaproth (1783–1835), Matthias Alexander Castrén (1813–1852), Wilhelm Schott (1802?–1889). However, Abel-Rémusat, who also draws attention to the common words specific to Eastern Turkish, Mongolian and Manchu languages and states that those common words are related to the concepts such as trade, culture and religion, etc., defends the opinion that the common words in Altaic languages resulted from various contacts among peoples (wars, political ties, trade relations, religion, etc.). Tuymbayev states that this opinion of Abel-Rémusat refutes the views on the true kinship of Eastern Turkish, Mongolian, Manchu and Tibetan languages. Nevertheless, he also notes that the materials Abel-Rémusat compiled on these languages provide important clues for later Altaistic studies (Ibid.: 17).

In the 20th century, important work on AL was also carried out. During this period, the basic assumptions of traditional Altaistic research were adhered to, but they began to be updated slightly. Many scholars, notably N. A. Baskakov attempted to syncretize the concepts of genetic, typological and developed kinship of languages (Baskakov, 1981). There was also a growing tendency to extend the boundaries of the Altaic community to other languages and language families. It is known that researchers such as V. M. Illich-Svitych (Illich-Svitych, 1963, 1965), A. B. Dolgopolsky (Dolgopolsky, 1964), A. V. Dybo (Dybo, 1996) tried to classify Altaic languages as Nostratic in terms of their macrofamilies (Turkish, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungusic) and microfamilies (Korean and Japanese). However, Tuymbayev states that all these steps were taken in a cursory manner and the basic problems of the theory of AL were not addressed, and researchers only tried to test the validity of the theory using the methods and techniques of glottochronology and lexicology (Tuymbayev, 2024: 55–56).

Since the 19th century, the most important common features of the languages belonging to AL have been revealed in the abundant publication of dictionaries and grammatical studies that deal with various languages both specifically and comparatively. However, he also highlights that the study of world languages, language families and communities within the framework of the historical and comparative perspective has become even more important in the 21st century (Ibid.: 11). In fact, this theory lost its momentum in the 1990s, but following the publication of the two-volume *Etymological Dictionary of Altaic Languages* (including Korean and Japanese) by S. A. Starostin, A. V. Dybo and O. A. Mudrak in 2003¹ and M. Robbeets' book *Is Japanese Related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* in 2005 (Robbeets, 2005), the theory of Altaic languages was brought back to the agenda. It should be noted that the issue was further stimulated by the harsh and critical definitions written regarding the first work, and the responses given to them by the authors of the dictionary (Ünal, 2019: 503). J. Tuymbayev also criticized the work of S. A. Starostin, A. V. Dybo and O. A. Mudrak, stating that they did not reach any conclusions due to the obvious flaws of the initial materials (Tuymbayev, 2024: 56).

Starostin S. A., Dybo A. V., Mudrak O. A. *Etymological dictionary of Altaic languages* : in 3 vols. Leiden : Brill, 2003.



In this part of the study, he also includes the views of some anti-Altaicists. For example, he criticizes the Hungarian scientist G. Décsy, who sharply rejects the kinship of Altaic languages, questioning even the term 'Altaic'; and the Hungarian Mongolist L. Bese, who argues that Altaic languages do not denote their ancestral homeland, even approximately, and that this fantastic hypothesis cannot be verified by anyone (Ibid.: 82).

In conclusion, he states that O. P. Sunik defended the view that, despite the difficulties associated with the detailed research into the modern problems of Altaic studies, especially the explanation of the origin of the commonalities in Altaic languages, it is impossible to solve the issues of Turkology, Mongology and the Manchu-Tungus peoples without Altaic studies based on the historical comparative method (Sunik, 1976).

The researcher states that

“O. P. Sunik’s statement about the relevance and usefulness of Altaic studies for the research into the history of Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tunguz and some other languages should be considered quite fair and convincing” (Tuymebayev, 2024: 56).

Are lexical parallels in Mongolian and Turkish indicative of the existence of the Main Altaic or a result of cultural communication?

The discovery of lexical parallels among the languages belonging to AL has led to the emergence of different opinions among scholars. G. J. Ramstedt (Ramstedt, 1912, 1957) and his proponents attribute these parallels to genetic (blood) ties, while W. Kotwicz (Kotwicz, 1929/1930, 1938) and his followers attribute them to cultural relations and believe that these similarities are due to borrowing. Here, it is seen that there are more lexical parallels between Mongolian and Turkic languages than among other AL. Also, Kotwicz states that there are 25% lexical and 50% morphological parallels between Turkic and Mongolian languages as well (Kotwicz, 1962).

According to the data presented by Tuymebayev (Tuymebayev, 2024: 215), more than 17,000 of the 70,000 words in *The Great Academic Mongolian-Russian Dictionary* (2001–2002)¹ are common to Turkish and Mongolian languages. Therefore, we can see that common features in Turkish and Mongolian are generally included in the studies on the theory of AL. In fact, common and similar words in the two languages were first discussed in P. J. von Strahlenberg’s work *Das Nord- und Östliche Theil von Europa und Asia* (Strahlenberg, 1730). This phenomenon was studied by researchers such as J. P. Abel-Rémusat, P. S. Pallas, W. Schott, M. A. Castrén, J. Grunzel, V. Bang-Kaup in different ways until the end of the 19th century, the similarities in question were brought together and presented systematically by G. J. Ramstedt, N. N. Poppe, P. Pelliot and Z. Gombocz in the first quarter of the 20th century. Therefore, it gained the character of a scientific argument. According to this argument, which has many supporters, Mongolian may be the closest language to Turkish when compared to other languages belonging to Altaic languages. Some researchers including Ä. Qaydar and M. Orazov, argue that it is not correct to consider all the thousands of words and other linguistic elements in Turkish and Mongolian languages as borrowings. They indicate that

“Firstly, there are many common features between these languages. Secondly, all common elements have phonetic and grammatical parallelism in accordance with a systematic rule. Thirdly, common features are found at all stages of the language, especially in the structure of the main roots. If we add these to the parallels in dialects, there is no doubt that the rate of these commonalities will increase even more” (Qaydar, Orazov, 2004: 112).

D. Aksan also argues that aside from the word commonalities and changes in meanings between Turkish and Mongolian, the similarities and affinities in concepts such as *kulak* ‘ear’, *saç* ‘hair’, *karın* ‘abdomen’, *topuk* ‘heel’, *ayak* ‘foot’, *yürek* ‘heart’, *azı dişi* ‘molar’, *boyun* ‘neck’, *mesane* ‘bladder’ can easily be underestimated, and that these concepts have survived without significant changes since the earliest written texts in Turkish. He believes that the commonality of words such as *inek* ‘cow’, *öküz* ‘ox’, *buzacağı* ‘calf’, *teke* ‘goat’, *koyun* ‘sheep’, *koç* ‘ram’, *kuzu* ‘lamb’, and the relationship of words such as *eşek* ‘donkey’, *deve* ‘camel’, *ayı* ‘bear’, *porsuk* ‘badger’, *tavuk* ‘chicken’, *balık* ‘fish’ cannot be explained only by the coexistence and cultural relations of these peoples (Aksan, 2015: 115).

As understood from the opinions of D. Aksan, Ä. Qaydar and M. Orazov, the common elements and grammatical features of Turkish and Mongolian languages go beyond borrowings. In doing so, they try to

¹ *The great academic Mongolian-Russian dictionary*: in 4 vols. / ed. by A. Luvsandendev and T. Tsendendamb. Moscow, Academia, 2001-2002. (In Russ. and Mong.).



prove that the words used in parallel in both languages are not borrowings because they are used not only as forms but also as roots in both languages. Although the researchers, who advocate this idea, such as G. J. Ramstedt, E. D. Polivanov, N. N. Poppe, N. A. Baskakov, O. P. Sunik, S. Kenesbayev, Sh. Sarybayev et al., acknowledge that Turkish-Mongolian relations influenced the languages to a certain extent. They argue that such contacts cannot lead to the similarity of the system of languages, cannot take place in all stages of a language as much as in Turkish and Mongolian languages, and even if they do, they cannot be systematic. Many neo-Altaicists (e.g., W. Kotwicz, L. Ligeti, V. I. Rassadin, N. I. Egorov, A. A. Chechenov, G. D. Sanjeyev, T. A. Bertagaev, T. Gülensoy, G. Smagulova, J. Tuymebayev) argue that the similarities between Turkish and Mongolian languages are the result of ontological processes of ethnolinguistic and cultural nature at different levels. Therefore, Tuymebayev comprehensively discusses the effects of historical interactions between the Turkish and Mongolian peoples on their languages. He particularly stated that the geographical regions and historical events that the two peoples shared played an important role in the emergence of similarities in these languages. For instance, the period of the Mongol Empire reveals how Turkish and Mongolian peoples interacted in terms of language use. He asserts that mutual borrowings between Turkish and Mongolian intensified during this period, especially military and administrative terms were interchanged. In the meantime, he focuses on the mechanisms of borrowing and their impact on Turkish and Mongolian languages. However, as a representative of the neo-Altaic movement, he argues that most of the early scholars studying the history of Turkic and Mongolian peoples ignored the complex, multi-stage and multi-faceted adstratum, substratum, superstratum, interstratum relations that actively developed in the Middle Ages among Turkic and Mongolian communities (Tuymebayev, 2024: 210). However, in his study focusing more on the influence of Mongolian on Turkish, the author defends that from Yakutia in the east to Chuvashia and Turkey in the west, there is no Turkic language that has not been influenced by Middle Mongolian to some extent. In the meantime, comprehensively discussing the effects of historical interactions among the Turkic and Mongolian peoples on their languages, he argues that the geographical regions and historical events that the two peoples shared played an important role in the emergence of similarities in these languages (Ibid.: 97). He further states that the influence of the Mongolian language was not only on giving vocabulary. In the meantime, he argues that the influence of the Mongolian language was not only in the vocabulary, but also in the language of some Turkic tribes living in Mongolia and East Turkestan under the pressure of the sociopolitical factors of the Mongols in the 12th–13th centuries, and that this view can be proved by the Turkic elements in the languages of some Mongolian-speaking peoples living in these territories (Ibid.: 94). There are some sources that prove this assertion to be correct. For instance, laboratory studies on the skills of modern Mongolian speakers which are conducted by phonologists of the Institute of Philology of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The results have shown that most of the Mongols living in Inner Mongolia are Turkic by origin. At the same time, the articulatory and acoustic base of modern Halha Mongols resembles that of ancient Turks. It was transformed in the 11th century at the earliest with a tripartite consonant sound contrast according to the degree of muscular tension of the speech apparatus (Seluytina, Urtegeshov, Dobrinina, 2014). This extremely important result gives good reasons for a radical revision of many accepted ideas about the ethnolinguistic history of the peoples of Central Asia in the field of Mongolistics.

J. Tuymebayev tries to divide them into periods by stating that Turkic-Mongolian language interactions date back to ancient times and that they went through various processes. By stating that the interaction between Turkic and Mongolian should be considered in three periods (the 4th–7th, 8th–12th and 13th–14th centuries), A. M. Shcherbak underlines that the influence of Turkish on Mongolian was stronger before the 13th century, but after the 13th century, on the contrary, the influence of Mongolian on Turkish increased (Shcherbak, 1970: 11; Shcherbak, 1986).

In his previously published work *The History of Turkic-Kazakh-Mongolian Ethnolinguistic Relations* (“Istoriia tiurko-kazakhsko-mongol’skikh etnoiazykovykh vzaimootnoshenii” / «История тюрко-казахско-монгольских этноязыковых взаимоотношений»; Tuymebayev, 2008), Tuymebayev analyzed the linguistic relations of the Turkic and Mongolian peoples considering the history of the Kazakh Turks and categorizing them into four periods:

- the 13th–14th centuries — Kipchak and Mongolian relationship;
- the 15th–17th centuries — Kazakh and Oyrat ethnolinguistic relationship;
- the 17th century — Kazakh and Kalmuk ethnolinguistic relationship that continues until the present day;
- Kazakh and Khalha ethnolinguistic relationship until the 19th century (Tuymebayev, 2008: 150–295).



In his work, which constitutes the basis of our study, he emphasizes that Turkic and Mongolian ethnolinguistic contacts go back a long way, starting with the Onogurs in the early 2000s BC and perhaps a little earlier, but that Mongolian lexical borrowings in the Turkish language generally began to increase after the penetration of Turkic languages during the Mongol Empire of Genghis Khan and the Golden Horde (Tuymebayev, 2024: 90, 92, 112). In the conclusion of the book, he chronologically divides the historical processes of Turkic-Mongolian ethnolinguistic relations into periods. In doing so, the linguist first divides them into three periods according to the time of Turkic-Mongolian contacts before the Kazakh Khanate and briefly describes the characteristics of each period:

1) The period of Ogur-Mongol contacts (the 10th–13th centuries; during this period, the Mongols assimilated the communities belonging to the Ogur tribes and forced them into the traditional nomadic lifestyle;

2) The period of Uyghur-Mongol contacts (the 12th–14th centuries; during this period, the Mongols assimilated the ancient Turkic tribes of Central Asia;

3) The period of Mongol expansion into the arid regions of Central Asia (the 10th–11th centuries; during this period, the Mongols were greatly influenced by the Turkic-speaking peoples living in the lands they conquered (Ibid.: 251).

Here, starting a comparative study of Turkic-Mongolian lexical parallels, Tuymebayev underlines that the Ogur substratum in Mongolian must first be identified (Ibid.: 92). As we will explain in more detail in the section on Tuvan, according to the researcher, all animal names and words related to animal husbandry in Mongolian derived from Turkic during the /r/- and /l/-speaking Ogur-Bulgarian-Chuvash language period (Ibid.: 110–111). In this context, a chronotopological stratigraphy of mutual borrowings at different times in both Turkic and Mongolian languages is required, as well as a periodization of Mongolian in Turkic languages by Turkic (including Kazakh) word-level interventions in Mongolian. It should be noted that it is extremely important to study the centuries-long history of Turkic, Kazakh and Mongolian ethnolinguistic relations. The researcher states that while determining periods of Kazakh-Mongolian ethnolinguistic relations, it is necessary to start from the Kipchak period:

1) the period of the Mongol conquest of Dasht-i Kipchak (the 13th–14th centuries);

2) the period of Kazakh-Oyrat relations (the 14th–16th centuries);

3) the period of Kazakh-Jungar relations (the 17th–18th centuries);

4) the period of Kazakh-Kalmuk relations (the 19th–21st centuries);

5) the period of Kazakh-Khalha relations (the 19th–21st centuries) (Ibid.: 251).

According to this classification, although we know that Turkish played a more active role than Mongolian before the 13th century, Mongolian also influenced Turkish in its own way. In addition, J. Tuymebayev tries to prove that there were no Mongolian tribes in the Central Asian steppes, starting from the Great Khingan Mountains to the west, during the Hiung-nu and Old Turkic Khaganates, and that there are no traces of Mongolian languages in Mahmud's Dictionary and all known ancient Turkic monuments, and that the influence of Mongolian on Turkish was mostly after the 13th century (Ibid.: 110). In fact, according to some scholars, Mongolian words can also be found in Turkish monuments dating back to the 12th century. For example, as T. Gülensoy states, "Many words of Mongolian origin that entered Old Turkish lived within Turkish for a long time, they even entered the most important dictionary of Turkish, *Divan-ü Lûgat-it-Türk*, and later survived in the works of Babür, Ebülgazi Bahadır Khan and Ali Şir Nevaî and came to Ottoman Turkish" (Gülensoy, 1974: 236).

Based on recent comparative studies in the field of Altai studies, J. Tuymebayev's work concludes that the ethnolinguistic relations between the Turkic-Mongolian communities were formed under conditions of intensive mutual contacts over a very long period of time, i.e. they are not related to genetic kinship ties. By stating that the contacts of the two peoples emerged at different times, at different regions and under different circumstances. The researcher, although he does not consider the phonetic and morphological similarities between Mongolian, Turkic and Manchu-Tungus languages as a coincidence, does not believe that there is an organic connection between these languages unlike the traditional classical Altaicists, starting with G. J. Ramstedt and N. N. Poppe (Tuymebayev, 2024: 215). Therefore, it is also clear that Poppe does not support the view that AL was first divided into "Mother Korean" and "Chuvash, Turkic, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus language union", then into "Chuvash and Turkic language union" and "Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus language union" (Poppe, 1960: 8).



However, we can see that the exchange of words between Turkish and Mongolian, linguistic relations of which are extremely complex, takes place in several ways as adstrat, substrat, superstrat, interstratum and superstratum, because the process of interaction of languages does not happen only from one side. The Turkic and Mongolian peoples have been neighbors since ancient times. Therefore, even before Genghis Khan, these languages exchanged words with each other, but the Turkish language played a more active role in this exchange than the Mongolian language. Nevertheless, the influence of Mongolian on Turkic was still quite significant. As a result of Turkish encounters with the religions of Buddhism and Manichaeism, some Sanskrit religious terms and words entered Turkish either directly or through Mongolian (Gülensoy, 1974: 236).

On this basis, J. Tuymebayev puts forward an idea that the lexical parallels between Turkish dialects and Mongolian dialects can be analyzed in the following aspects:

- 1) Turkish borrowings in Mongolian languages;
- 2) Mongolian borrowings in Turkic languages (including Kazakh);
- 3) Kazakh borrowings in languages such as Mongolian (mostly in western dialects) and Kalmyk, etc.;
- 4) Mongolian borrowings in Kazakh (not found in other Turkic dialects);
- 5) Common borrowings through contacts with foreign languages, etc. (Ibid.: 217).

The author gives examples in this way because he mostly takes the words from the vocabulary of Kazakh Turkish. In fact, the content of the fourth aspect can be changed according to the vocabulary of the dialect taken as a basis. However, it can be criticized that J. Tuymebayev does not give any information about the reason why he evaluates their linguistic parallels as cultural borrowings, although he identifies some sound correspondences in Turkic and Mongolian languages other than features such as the presence of suffixes common to general Altaic languages, the absence of gender distinction, the plainness of words following numerical adjectives, and vowel harmony. Indeed, those who consider the lexical parallels between Mongolian and Turkish as borrowings made in ancient times generally argue that some of the elements that make up the basic vocabulary¹ and number systems² of these languages are different, and this situation is an indication that there is no genetic kinship between these languages. In particular, the Orientalist Sir G. Clauson, who reacted sceptically to the theory of AL, argues that even in Turkish and Mongolian, which are considered to be the closest to other languages belonging to AL, the ratio of common words related to basic concepts is not more than 2% and that these are not sufficient to prove genetic kinship, and that they can only be borrowings (Clauson, 1969).

However, some researchers emphasize that these lexical parallels are not ordinary borrowings, but substratum interactions which have a deeper character, dating back too far to be explained by a precise period, and therefore they can be found at all stages of the borrowing language, while recent borrowings can be used only in some areas of the language. Therefore, he emphasizes that substratum relations can go as deep as ethnogenetic ties, and it is difficult to discover the source of some of these borrowings. However, the viewpoints of those who argue that the parallels between Altaic languages are borrowings differ from those of the anti-Altaicists in that they argue that although these languages are not related in terms of their genetic resources, they have ethnic similarities in typological terms and due to their long interaction with each other.

Comparison of Mongolian elements in Kazakh Turkish at the semantic and phonetic levels

In the Kazakh academic world, Sh. Valikhanov was the first who expressed ideas about the common elements between Kazakh and Mongolian and wrote articles on this issue (Valikhanov, 1961: 657–658). In fact, almost all the researchers, notably G. J. Ramstedt and N. N. Poppe, working on the theory of AL used the vocabulary of the Kazakh language. Later, in the last quarter of the 20th century, this issue was discussed by K. Akhanov (Akhanov, 2003), Ä. Qaydar (Qaydarov, 1970), S. K. Kenesbayev (Kenesbayev, 1971), Sh. Sh. Sarybayev (Sarybayev, 1960, 1971), M. Orazov (Qaydar, Orazov, 2004), B. Bazilhan (Bazilhan, 1973), G. Qaliyev and A. Bolganbayev (Qaliyev, Bolganbayev, 2006) and many other Kazakh scholars.

¹ Generally, personal and demonstrative pronouns, some adjectives indicating size and color, vocabulary of society, family and kinship, general names of nature, animals and plants, organ names, basic verbs, etc. are considered as basic word types (Eker, 2006: 72).

² Indeed, it is seen that the number names in Altaic languages are not similar except for four in Mongolian (Ibid.: 70).



Recently, linguists such as J. Tuymebayev, G. Sagidolda, etc. continue their research on Mongolian elements in Kazakh Turkish. Linguists dealing with the historical formation and development of Kazakh Turkish generally attribute the lexical parallels, similar affixes and sound equivalences in the two languages to Kazakh-Mongolian sociopolitical and cultural relations. Suggesting that Kazakh-Mongolian ethnolinguistic relations can be a criterion for other Turkic dialects (Tuymebayev, 2024: 90), J. Tuymebayev devotes a significant part of his work to comparing linguistic elements in the written languages and dialects of Mongolian and Kazakh Turkish. In this section, the researcher evaluates Kazakh as one of the languages that are highly influenced by Mongolian, such as Tuvan, Khakas, Altai, Kyrgyz dialects in the modern period (Ibid.: 97). We can see the lexical parallels between Mongolian and Kazakh in the names of places, water, people and clans, in daily life and in the vocabulary related to administration, military, law, custom, etc. However, as noted by G. Qaliyev, A. Bolganbayev, apart from the words borrowed between Turkic and Mongolian dialects in various periods, there are many common elements whose origin is unknown. For example, according to the information provided by scientists who have studied this issue, there are hundreds of words in the vocabulary of Kazakh Turkish and Mongolian that are very similar in terms of root, structure and meaning (Qaliyev, Bolganbayev, 2006: 143).

Analyzing the words in Kazakh and Mongolian languages in terms of structure, root and meaning, B. Bazilhan has found that 60% of the 40,000 words in the Mongolian-Kazakh Dictionary are common to both languages (Bazilhan, 1973: 4–7).

In his study, J. Tuymebayev, while analyzing the Mongolian and Kazakh linguistic contacts, examines the historical events that took place between the Kipchaks and the Mongols in the 13th–14th centuries, between the Kazakhs and the Oyrats in the 14th–16th centuries, between the Kazakhs and the Jungars in the 17th–18th centuries, between the Kazakhs and the Jungars in the 19th–21st centuries, and between the Kazakhs and the Khalkhas in the same period.

Moreover, he deals with the linguistic elements of the Kazakh written language and dialects of the Turkic-Kazakh tribes, which some scholars believe to be of Mongolian origin, their distribution and language. After that, he evaluates the linguistic similarities underlying the theory of AL in historical, morphological and semantic terms. The similarities between Kazakh and Mongolian languages that this theory reveals are supported by various examples.

As an indicator of Kazakh-Kalmuk ethnolinguistic relations, J. Tuymebayev notes the parallel use of the words *nagashi* ‘maternal relative; uncle’ (< Mong.) and *jiyen* ‘nephew’ (< Trk.) in both languages. He considers this as an indication that despite the sharp political conflicts between the Kazakhs and the Kalmyks, they lived as friends, brothers and relatives in daily relations (Ibid.: 202). In the western dialects of Kazakh, *tas* ‘lime-free brick’, *moşka-* ‘to question’ (< Klm. *moşǵa* ‘to try’), *äydik* ‘big, huge’ (< Klm. *degĕd ik* ‘big, huge’), *žolım üj* ‘small felt tent’ (< Klm. *žolām* ‘house made of poles and felt’), *zorman* ‘squirrel’ (< Klm. *žurmān*, Khalha *zuram*, Buryat *zumbarān* ‘squirrel’), *terme üj* ‘felt tent’ (< Klm. *terēm* ‘the wall of a felt tent like a fence’), etc. are examples of Kazakh-Kalmuk ethnolinguistic relations (Ibid.: 205).

Table 1. Some examples of parallels of /ch/ ~ /sh/ sounds in the Bayan-Ölgii (Mongolia) dialect of the Kazakh language
Таблица 1. Некоторые примеры параллелей звуков /ч/ ~ /ш/ в баян-олгийском (монгольском) диалекте казахского языка

In the Bayan-Ölgii dialect of the Kazakh language	The Kazakh written language
<i>chapan</i> ‘caftan’	<i>Shapan</i>
<i>chataq</i> ‘fight’	<i>Sharaq</i>
<i>chini</i> ‘china, glass’	<i>Shini</i>
<i>cheke</i> ‘forehead’	<i>sheke</i>
<i>aqça</i> ‘money’	<i>aqsha</i>
<i>okche</i> ‘heel’	<i>okshe</i>
<i>emchi</i> ‘physician’	<i>emshi</i>
<i>kichi</i> ‘small’	<i>kishi</i>
<i>tilmach</i> ‘interpreter’	<i>tilmash</i>
<i>kuch</i> ‘power’	<i>kush</i>



While examining the phonetic parallels, he expresses his thoughts about the sounds that are different from the written Kazakh language and the ones in the language of Kazakhs living in Bayan-Ölgii region of Mongolia and the source of these differences. For example, he writes that consonants /ʃ-/ and /ʒ-/ in the front and inner voice in the Kazakh written language are /ç-/ and /ʒ-/ in Bayan-Ölgii. An important result that draws our attention here is that Tuymebayev states that although these features in the dialect of Bayan-Ölgii Kazakhs overlap with the language of the Khalha Mongols, this is not the influence of Mongolian, but a trace of the language of the Kereys who once lived here (Ibid.: 211–212). In other words, modern Kazakh Turkish converts /ç/ to /ʃ/ in all Turkish and loan words, in all positions of words in modern Kazakh Turkish (Koch, Dogan, 2013: 82). In the Eastern dialects of Bayan-Ölgii Kazakhs, however, /ch/ is preserved (Table 1).

In the subsection “Etymological Analysis of Kazakh-Mongolian Word Correspondences”, the researcher defends his own opinion against the viewpoints of G. J. Ramstedt, N. N. Poppe and their followers that /j-/ at the beginning of some words in general Turkish should be considered as /ʒ-/ in Kazakh Turkish and /d-/ , /ʒ-/ , /n-/ , /j-/ and /s-/ in Mongolian. According to Tuymebayev, all the words with these sound parallels are not common words belonging to both languages, as traditional Altaicists say, but borrowings of Turkic origin in Mongolian languages. That is, the Turkish forms of these examples are primary and more archaic. Therefore, the linguist argues that “Such investigations should start from Turkic forms, not from Mongolian and Manchu-Tungusic forms” (Tuymebayev, 2024: 225). This point of view is remarkable and could be a milestone for Altaic studies.

Determinations on the place of Tuvan in Turkish dialects and its relationship with Mongolian

In the work of J. Tuymebayev, the linguistic characteristics and factors of Tuvan, like other Turkic dialects, are frequently mentioned. This information can be evaluated under two headings: “Evaluations Evaluation upon Lexical Similarities” and “Evaluations Evaluation upon Lexical Phonetic Parallels”.

Evaluation upon lexical parallels

Tuvan¹ is a contemporary Turkic language that most closely resembles the phonetic, morphological and lexical features of Old Turkic. The fact that Tuvan Turks have never been geographically separated from the oldest lands of Turks, and that they have lived around the area where the inscriptions were found since the early period has enabled them to preserve the features of Old Turkic. Although their interaction with Mongolian is high, their archaic features were not affected by this situation. Tuvan, which is thought to have close ties with the tribes mentioned in the Orkhon-Yenisey monuments, draws attention because of a good preservation of Old Turkish, Old Oghuz, Old Uyghur features, its long and guttural vowels, its closeness to Tofa, Sakha (Yakut) dialects, and the high number of loan words because its speakers lived in contact with various ethnic groups such as the Mongols and the Manchu-Tunguz peoples (Qaydar, Orazov, 2004: 322; Arikoğlu, 2007: 1151; Bizaqov, 2013: 252).

J. Tuymebayev, while talking about the distribution and frequency of Mongolian words in Turkic dialects, touches upon some important issues related to the vocabulary of Tuvan. Taking into account some studies, he emphasizes that the numerical proportion of Mongolian words in Turkic dialects gradually decreases from language to language, from east to west, so the total number of Mongolian words in Siberian and Sayan-Altaic languages is extremely high, especially the number of Mongolian words in Yakutian and Tuvan is higher than in other dialects and even ranks first (Tuymebayev, 2024: 97). The information the scholar gives while listing the effects of Mongolian on Turkic dialects is also noteworthy. According to him, the presence of many Mongolian elements in Tuvan can be explained by the constant contacts between the Tuvans and the Mongols, the fact that their lands are in the same region and well-known historical and political conditions. Khakas, Gorno-Altai, Kyrgyz, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages come next, followed by Uyghur and Uzbek languages. There are fewer Mongolian words in the Kuman-Kipchak group, which can be distinguished by the abundance of Mongolian lexical elements in Karachay-Balkars. Finally, Oghuz and Chuvash languages have fewer Mongolian elements than other dialects. Of these, Mongolian words in Chuvash were transmitted mainly through Middle Kipchak and mostly through Tatar (Ibid.: 97).

V. I. Rassadin identified more than 2200 borrowings from Mongolian in Tuvan. They are mostly evenly distributed in the three main Tuvan dialects (Rassadin, 1980: 58).

¹ In the colloquial language it is referred to as *Tuva*, *Kici*, and in written texts also as *Uryankay*, *Soyot*, *Soyon*, *Tanu-Tuva* (Qaydar, Orazov, 2004: 322).



According to the sources, Tuvan is highly influenced by Mongolian not only in terms of lexis and semantics but also in terms of phonology, morphology and syntax¹.

Evaluations upon phonetic parallels

Tuvan is one of the Turkic languages whose characteristic phonetic features are taken as an example to explain the phonology of Altaic languages. In fact, Tuvan is important because it is the only dialect that preserves the /d/ sound in the inner voice as it was in Old Turkic. While it has turned into /z/ in Khakas and Yellow Uyghur dialects, it has been replaced by /y/ in others. Generally, these edge effects are taken as a criterion for comparing Altaic languages. Taking this criterion into account, O. N. Tuna argues that /d/ after the root vowel is /d/ in Halach and Tuvan, /t/ in Yakut, /z/ in Khakas, /r/ in Chuvash, /d/ in Mongolian (/c/ before *i*), /d/ in Tungus (/c/ in Manchu and Goldi before *i*), /l/ in Korean, /r/ in Japanese (*y/ after *i* > Ø), and /y/ in others. From this he concludes that the status of this sound in Main Altaic may be */d/ (Tuna, 1992: 20).

When the rotacism and zetatism among the languages belonging to the Altaic family are mentioned, the scholar usually gives examples that the /z/ sound in general Turkish corresponds to /r/ in Chuvash, Mongolian and Tungusic, and to /l/, /t/ and sometimes /y/ in Korean. This view can be proved by the examples given by O. N. Tuna (Ibid.: 22) (Table 2).

Table 2. Some examples of sound parallels among Altaic languages
Таблица 2. Некоторые примеры звуковых параллелей между алтайскими языками

Turkish		Mongolian	Tunguz	Manchu	Korean	Main Altaic
General Turkish	Chuvash					
üz- 'to cut, abrade, tear off'		urü 'to rub, drive; file, rasp'	–	furu 'to crumble, to break into small pieces', furuku 'scraper, file'	phulda- 'to gouge, drive; to grind, file'	*pür(ü)-

Tuymebayev, referring to the opinion of A. Róna-Tas that all animal names and words related to animal husbandry in the Mongolian language are borrowed from the Oghuric-Bulgar-Chuvash dialects with /r/ and /l/, provides information about the usage of the General Turkish word *öküz* in other Altaic languages and some dialects of Turkish. Old Turkic *öküz*, Ogur **ökür* 'ox', Old Mongolian **üker*, Middle period Mongolian *xuker*, *xuger*, *ükär*, *üker* 'large horned animal; ox; cow', Khalkha Mongolian *üxër* 'large horned animal; bull, cow, ox', Buryat *üxër* 'large horned animal; ox; cow', Kalmyk *ükër* 'large horned animal; ox; cow', Oirat *ükër*, *ükür* 'cow', Ordos *ükër*, Dagurian *χukur*, *hukure*, Dunsian *fugie(r)*, Mongolian *fugor*, *χukur* 'large horned animal; ox; cow', etc. In addition, he notes that in Tuvan, the word *üger* has the meanings of 'cattle' and 'bull star', and that the stereotyped language unit *üger bō* means 'rifle used to shoot cattle or bulls'. The linguist also adds examples from the dialects of Manchu-Tungus such as Evenki (*hukur*, *ukur*, *huk ul*, *uk un*, *ekun*, *uku* 'large horned animal; cattle'), Even (*höken*, *hökön* 'cow') and Solonese (*uχur*, *ukur(u)* 'horned animal') dialects of Manchu-Tungus. There is one more point to be noted here. According to Tuymebayev, the Tuvan word *üger* was borrowed from Mongolian at the end of the 18th century. However, Mongolian, in turn, borrowed this word from the Bulgarian-Chuvash (Ogur) dialect of Turkic in the 1st–2nd centuries AD (Tuymebayev, 2024:: 110–111).

According to some scholars, there is a *p- consonant in the front vowel of some words in Main Altaic. According to Poppe, this default *p- sound has different statuses in modern Altaic languages (Poppe, 1965: 197) (Table 3).

¹ Baran B. *Grammaticalization in Tuvan Turkish* : Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara, Ankara University, 2023 (In Turk.); Findik A. Ş. *Tuvaca according to Radloff* : Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara, Yıldız Technical University, 2023. (In Turk.).



Table 3. Statures of word-initial *p- consonant in Altaic languages
Таблица 3. Статус начальной согласной *p- в алтайских языках

Tunguz-Manchurian	Mongolian	Chuvash	Turkish	Main Altaic
P	F	∅	∅	*p

In addition to this information, Osman Nedim Tuna further states that “in Halachic, the word-initial h is ∅ in all the remaining dialects and dialects of the Turkic language: h, x, f, sh, s, ∅ in Mongolian: Tungus p, h, x, f, ∅: p in Korean, ph in Japanese, p, φ in Japanese, and argues that the sounds in these correspondences originate from the Main Altaic sound *p” (Tuna, 1992: 19). According to this information, the *p- sound developed in several stages, including */p/ > /f/ > /h-/ > /∅-/. Here, the sounds /h-/ and /∅-/ attract our attention. In fact, although Tuna states that the /h-/ sound is only found in Halachic and /∅-/ in other dialects, G. Doerfer argues that the /h-/ sound is also found in Old Turkic and that this sound is also shown in writing. J. Tuymebayev states that examples of these phonological features are found in Azerbaijani (Az.), Gagauz (Gag.), Turkish (Trk.), Turkmen (Trkm.), Salar (Sal.), Sari Uyghur (S. Uyg.), Uzbek (Uz.), Uyghur (Uyg.), Kumyk (Kmk.), Karakalpak (Kkp.), Karayim (Krm.) dialects as well as Tuvan Turkish and lists the following examples:

- *harı* ‘bee’ (Trk. *āri*, Trkm. *āri*, Kzk. *ara*, Uyg. *härä*, Kkp. *härre*, Alt. *arū*, Yak. *ıřıria*);
- *hügü* ‘owl’ (Trk. *ügi*, *ükki*, Trkm. *hüvi*, Kzk. *üki*, Kkp. *ükü*, Mong. (*h*)*uyuli*);
- *hörüm* ‘drill’ (Trk. *ör-* ‘to knit’, Az., Uzb. *hör-*, Gag. *jör-*, Trkm. *ö:rüm*, Kzk. *örim* ‘weaving, knitting’), etc. (Tuymebayev, 2024: 168).

When the /h/ sound is mentioned, an important phonetic change in Tuvan comes to our mind. In modern Tuvan, there are glottal vowels. There are eight of these vowels that occur only in the first syllable. But when they are affixed (when the first syllable becomes toneless), this glottalization usually disappears. In 1937, O. K. Sagan-ool wrote these vowels with the letter /h/ to show the characteristics of other vowels: *pahş* ‘head’, *pahşь* ‘his/her head’, *aht* ‘horse’, *ahdь* ‘his/her horse’, *oht* ‘his/her fire’, etc. (Iskhakov, Palmbakh, 1961: 24).

In today’s Cyrillic-based alphabet, this is indicated by the /ъ/ sign: *аѡт* ‘horse’, *эѡт* ‘meat’, *оѡт* ‘fire’, *каѡт* ‘floor’, *чаѡс* ‘rain’, *чуѡк* ‘load’, *чоѡн* ‘throat’, *дуѡш* ‘noon’, *аѡш* ‘food’, etc. (Qaydar, Orazov, 2004: 324). The origin of these vowels has not been analyzed. However, E. Arıkođlu argues that the origin of this sound is related to the /g/ sound in Mongolian: “It can be assumed that they derive their glottal characteristic from /g/, which was previously found in publications, but later disappeared. For example, there is an etymological connection between Tuvan Turkish *аѡт* and Mongolian *agt* ‘castrated horse’”¹ (Arıkođlu, 2007: 1154). This information is an essential material for Altaic studies.

Conclusion

In this study, the problems related to the theory of Altaic languages, which was put forward in the early 18th century but has remained a controversial issue until today, are evaluated in the light of new findings and information. In particular, the views and findings of neo-Altaicists, who argue that the parallels between Altaic languages are cultural borrowings, have been dealt with. We agree with J. Tuymebayev’s assumption that there have been close contacts between Altaic languages for centuries, even if there is no genetic link between them, and his claim that without Altaic studies, the history and developmental processes of Turkish, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungus, Korean and Japanese languages belonging to AL cannot be structured well.

In this case, as stated by neo-Altaicists, the adstratum, substratum, superstratum and interstratum categories should be taken as the basis for analyzing the interactions between Turkic and Mongolian languages. In other words, we believe that the interactions between these languages do not belong to only one side, they are reciprocal and these situations were developing differently during various periods. In Turkology and Mongolistics, it has been studied that many words passed from Mongolian to Turkish and the background of these words have been researched at a certain level, but the view that the history of relations between these languages dates back to ancient times (before the On-Ogurs) comes to the fore. It seems necessary to

¹ Cf. Alt., Kaz., Krg., Kkp., *akta*, Uzb. and Uyg. *ahta*, Tkm., *agta* ‘castration’, etc.



open new horizons in Altaic studies by analyzing the Ogur substrate in Mongolian languages in addition to knowledge and further works in this field.

REFERENCES

- Akar, A. (2003) *History of the Turkish language*. Istanbul, Otuken Publications. 339 p. (In Turk.).
- Akhanov, K. (2003) *Fundamentals of linguistics*. Almaty, Sanat Publishing House. 496 p. (In Kaz.).
- Aksan, D. (2015) *Language in all its aspects: Linguistics with main lines*. Ankara, Turkish Language Institution. 244 p. (In Turk.).
- Arikoğlu, E. (2007) *Tuvan Turkish. Grammar of Turkish dialects*. Ankara, Akçağ Publications. (In Turk.).
- Baskakov, N. A. (1981) *The Altaic family of languages and its study*. Moscow, Nauka. 135 p. (In Russ.).
- Bazilhan, B. (1973) *The grammatical grammaticalization of the Moñgol-Qazaq language*. Ölgii. (In Kaz.).
- Bertagaev, T. A. (1968) The Buryat language. In: *Languages of the peoples of the USSR : in 5 vols*. Leningrad, Nauka. Vol. 5. ed. by P. Ya. Skorik et al. 524 p. Pp. 13–33. (In Russ.).
- Bertagaev, T. A. (1971) Internal reconstruction and etymology of words in Altaic languages. In: *The problem of the commonality of Altaic languages* / ed. by O. P. Sunik. Leningrad, Nauka. 404 p. Pp. 90–109. (In Russ.).
- Bertagaev, T. A. (1974) *Vocabulary of modern Mongolian literary languages (based on the Mongolian and Buryat languages)*. Moscow, Nauka. 382 p. (In Russ.).
- Bizaqov, S. (2013) *All Turks*. Almaty, Republican School in Geography. 288 p. (In Kaz.).
- Castrén, M. A. (1857) *Ethnologische Vorlesungen über die altaischen Völker nebst samojedischen Märchen und tatarischen Heldensagen*. St. Petersburg, Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. xviii, 257 p. (In Germ.).
- Clauson, G. (1969) A lexicostatistical appraisal of the Altaic theory. *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–23.
- Dolgopolsky, A. B. (1964) *A long-range comparison of some languages of Northern Eurasia (Problems of phonetic correspondences)*. Moscow, Nauka. 26 p.
- Dybo, A. V. (1996) *Semantic reconstruction in Altaic etymology : Somatic terms (shoulder girdle)*. Moscow, School "Languages of Russian Literature". 390 p. (In Russ.).
- Egorov, N. I. (2006) Problems of chronotopological stratification of the Chuvash-Mongol lexical parallels and their historical interpretation. *Chuvashskiy Gumanitarniy Vestnik*, no. 1, pp. 144–163. (In Russ.).
- Eker, S. (2006) *Contemporary Turkish language*. Ankara, Grafiker Publications. 681 p. (In Turk.).
- Gombocz, Z. (1912) Zur Lautgeschichte der altaischen Sprachen. *Keleti Szemle*, vol. XIII, no. 1–2, pp. 1–37. (In Germ.).
- Gülensoy, T. (1974) Notes on Mongolian words in Old and Middle Turkic and common Mongolian-Turkish words. *Turkology Journal*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 235–260. (In Turk.).
- Illich-Svitych, V. M. (1963) Altai dental: *t, d, δ*. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, no. 6, pp. 37–56. (In Russ.).
- Illich-Svitych, V. M. (1965) Altai guttural: *k', *k, *g. In: *Etymology. Principles of reconstruction and research methodology* / ed. by L. A. Gindin et al. Moscow, Nauka. 397 p. Pp. 338–343. (In Russ.).
- Iskhakov, F. G., Palmbakh, A. A. (1961) *Grammar of the Tuvan language. Phonetics and morphology*. Moscow, Publishing House of Oriental Literature. 472 p. (In Russ.).
- Kaydarov, A. T. (1970) Uyghur-Mongolian linguistic relations in the field of phonetics. In: *Research on the Uyghur language : in 2 parts* / ed. by N. A. Baskakov. Almaty, Nauka of the Kazakh SSR. Part 2. 172 p. Pp. 57–67. (In Russ.).
- Kenesbayev, S. K. (1971) On the issue of the Turkic-Mongolian linguistic commonality (based on the material of some grammatical phenomena of the Kazakh language). In: *The problem of the commonality of Altaic languages* / ed. by O. P. Sunik. Leningrad, Nauka. 404 p. Pp. 322–330. (In Russ.).
- Koch, K. and Dogan, O. (2013) *Kazakh Turkish grammar*. Istanbul, IQ Culture and Arts Publishing. 788 p. (In Turk.).
- Kotwicz, W. (1929/1930) Contributions aux études altaïques. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, vol. 7, pp. 130–234. (In Fr.).
- Kotwicz, W. (1938) Kilka uwag o turecko-mongolskich analogiach językowych. In: *VII Zjazd orientalistów polskich*. Krakow. (In Pol.).
- Kotwicz, W. (1962) *A research on Altaic languages*. Moscow, Publishing House of Foreign Literature. 371 p. (In Russ.).
- Ligeti, L. (1971) The Altaic theory and lexicostatistics. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, no. 3, pp. 21–33. (In Russ.).
- Poppe, N. (1960) *Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen. Teil I: Vergleichende Lautlehre*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz. xii, 188 p. (In Germ.).
- Poppe, N. (1965) *Introduction to Altaic linguistics*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz. xiii, 212 p.
- Qaliyev, G. A. and Bolganbayev, A. (2006) *The lexicology and phraseology of the Kazakh language*. Almaty, Sozdik-Slovar. 258 p. (In Kaz.).



- Qaydar, Ä. and Orazov, M. (2004) *Turkitanuga kirispe*. Almaty, Aris baspa. 360 p. (In Kaz.).
- Ramstedt, G. J. (1912) Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen. Helsingfors, Druckerei der Finnischen Litteraturgesellschaft. 86 p. (Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seuran aikakauskirja, XXVIII, 3). (In Germ.).
- Ramstedt, G. J. (1957) Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft. I: Lautlehre. Helsinki, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 192 p. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, no. 104: 1). (In Germ.).
- Rassadin, V. I. (1980) *Mongol-Buryat borrowings in Siberian Turkic languages*. Moscow, Nauka. 115 p. (In Russ.).
- Robbeets, M. I. (2005) Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic? Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag. 975 p. (Turcologica, Bd. 64).
- Sanjeyev, G. D. (1953) *A comparative grammar of Mongolian languages*. Moscow, Publishing House of Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Vol. I. 240 p. (In Russ.).
- Sanjeyev, G. D. (1973) On Turkic-Mongolian linguistic parallels. *Sovetskaya Tyurkologiya*, no. 6, pp. 73–78. (In Russ.).
- Sarybayev, Sh. Sh. (1960) On the issue of Mongolian-Kazakh linguistic relations. In: *Issues of the history and dialectology of the Kazakh language* : in 2 parts / ed. by T. N. Sauranbaev et al. Alma-Ata, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. Part 2. 175 p. Pp. 34–71. (In Russ.).
- Sarybayev, Sh. Sh. (1971) Mongolian-Kazakh lexical parallels. In: *The problem of the commonality of Altaic languages* / ed. by O. P. Sunik. Leningrad, Nauka. 404 p. Pp. 256–262. (In Russ.).
- Schott, W. (1836) *Versuch über die Tatarischen Sprachen*. Berlin, Verlag von Veit & Comp. 82 p. (In Germ.).
- Seluytina, I. Ya., Urtegeshov, N. S. and Dobrinina, A. A. (2014) Typological specifics of the Evenk consonantism (according to the data of digital roentgenography and magnetic-resonance tomography). *Siberian Journal of Philology*, no. 1, pp. 186–191. (In Russ.).
- Shcherbak, A. M. (1970) *Comparative phonetics of Turkic languages*. Leningrad, Nauka. 204 p. (In Russ.).
- Shcherbak, A. M. (1986) Turkic-Mongolian linguistic links. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, no. 4, pp. 47–59. (In Russ.).
- Strahlenberg, Ph. J. von (1730) *Das nord- und östliche Theil von Europa und Asia*. Stockholm, In Verlegung des Autoris. [26], 438, [16], [XII] p. (In Germ.).
- Sunik, O. P. (1976) Current problems of Altaic studies. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, no. 1, pp. 16–30. (In Russ.).
- Tuna, O. N. (1992) Theory of Altaic languages. *Turkish World Handbook*, vol. 2, pp. 7–58. (In Turk.).
- Tuymebayev, J. K. (2024) *Theoretical principles and criteria of historical and genetic differentiation of Turkic-Mongolian lexical parallels*. Astana, Turkic Academy. 296 p. (In Russ.).
- Tuymebayev, J. K., Egorov, N. I. and Chechenov, A. A. (2009) *Contemporary issues of the study of the languages of Central Asia. Turanian language union*. Kokshetau, Kokshetau State University. 108 p. (In Russ.).
- Tuymebayev, J. K. (2008) *The history of Turkic-Kazakh-Mongolian ethnolinguistic relations*. Astana, Astana Poligrafya. 366 p. (In Russ.).
- Ünal, O. (2019) Words of Turkic origin in the vocabulary of written and middle Mongol I (A–D). *Journal of Old Turkic Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 502–615. (In Turk.).
- Valikhanov, Sh. Sh. (1961) *Collected works* : in 5 vols. Alma-Ata, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. Vol. 1. 777 p. (In Russ.).

Submission date: 12.10.2024.

Acceptance date: 03.12.2024.