GENERAL DIALECTOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK "ALTUN YARUK"

Kilichov Nazarbay

Karakalpak State University, Doctoral student of Khorezm Ma'mun Academy

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD), associate professor

Abstract: This article analyzes the semantics of paired nouns in the vocabulary of the ancient Turkic language monuments in the Turkic-Uigur writing. The pairing of words is a unique lexical and morphological feature of the samples of the ancient Turkic language, especially the monuments of the Turkic-Uigur writing. The examples are taken from the works "Altun Yaruk" and "Huastuanift", which are examples of the ancient Turkic language, and theoretical ideas are built on these examples. It can be said with confidence that a number of formations, pairs of words that exist in modern Turkic languages, formed by means of word-building suffixes - in general, the morphological form of a word is a morphologically formed lexical unit in the period of the ancient Turkic language. To prove our point of view, we can give an example of the fact that in all samples of the ancient Turkic language, words in pairs form new derivative words. The semantic volume of paired nouns formed by root or derivational suffixes is described, that is, such features as pairing of words and serving to enhance the meaning, expression of a common meaning, synonymy and antonymy between the components of paired words are highlighted. Along with the description of the semantic aspects of noun pairs, such as meaning transfer, meaning expansion, meaning narrowing, the development of the meanings of some lexical units in them is explained, and their comparison with the vocabulary of modern Turkic languages is carried out.

Keywords: "Altun Yaruk", dialect, ancient Turkic dialects, historical dialectology, lexical dialectisms, Oghuz, Kipchak, Qarluq dialects.

INTRODUCTION.

It is noteworthy that the 9th-10th centuries are a special period in the history of the Turkic peoples. The Old Turkic-runic script was replaced by the Old Uyghur-Turkic script, which arose on the basis of the Sogdian script, and a number of other scripts - Sogdian, Manichean, Kharoshti, Brahmi, etc. Of course, the arrival of these inscriptions was not accidental, but was connected with a change in the cultural environment. Buddhism came from India, Manichaeism from Iran, and along with these religious currents, the aforementioned

scriptures began to be used. Indeed, the cultural environment has fundamentally changed social life. Moreover, the equal influence of religious currents from other regions on a number of Turkic tribes living in East Turkestan led to changes in the lexical layer of the tribal languages. Of course, this, as a positive phenomenon, led to a new linguistic environment. Primarily, the changes that occurred in the lexical layer of "Altun Yaruk" are proof of our opinion.

At the time of the creation of "Altun Yaruk" the place and role of ancient Turkic lexicon in the cultural environment of other peoples were also noticeable. In particular, the centuries-old cultural and historical relations of the Slavic peoples with Turkic tribes in the 10th-11th centuries left their mark on the ethnogenesis, architecture, names of clothing, household items, names of everyday life and certain customs, animal husbandry and eagle hunting, surnames and nicknames, toponyms and hydronyms of the Slavs [1].

If we examine the lexical layer of "Altun Yaruk", we encounter the regularities characteristic of most written monuments of the past. This is a pattern, first of all, words related to various fields that came from other languages as a result of cultural and historical connections. Also, along with foreign words and terms related to various fields, we see a lexical layer belonging to Kipchak, Oghuz, and other tribal languages at the end of the 9th - beginning of the 10th centuries. It should be noted that the lexical layer of any work is an important tool that also provides information about the social, cultural, and ethnic history of its time. One fact: the lexicon of Sumerian monuments provides information about the history of the statehood of the ancient Sumerian people [2]. At the same time, there are many examples of this in the history of Turkic languages [3]. Due to these aspects, "Altun Yaruk" is of great importance as a written source that largely clarifies the socio-cultural relations of the Turkic peoples.

Speaking about the peculiarities of the "Altun Yaruk" language, it should be noted that various dialects are reflected in this work. The presence in this work of a lexical layer belonging to various dialects - Oghuz, Kipchak, Karluk - also determines socio-philosophical and cultural life. Firstly, if the penetration of Buddhism into the Turkic peoples of this region determines cultural life, then terms related to the structure of the world indicate socio-philosophical concepts. Indeed, special and dialectal lexicon, on the one hand, shows the process of formation of the literary language, and on the other hand, serves as evidence of the foundations of the literary language. In a certain period, literary language accompanied dialects, walking hand in hand, while in another period, literary language abandoned dialects and became a completely distant process from literary language. To prove this point, it is sufficient to compare the language of "Altun Yaruk" (late 9th - early 10th centuries) with the language of "Kutadgu

Bilig" (second half of the 11th century). Both works reflect the characteristics of the literary language of their time, although they were created within a period of slightly more than a hundred years [4: 24-31]. While "Altun Yaruk" took a step with the dialects "by hand in hand", "Kutadgu Bilig" distanced itself from Turkic dialects and became known as the "khan's language" as a literary language.

LITERATURE REVIEW.

In general Turkology and Uzbek linguistics, no separate research has been conducted on the lexicon of the work "Altun Yaruk". The work carried out consists mainly of translations and publications in various languages. The work was discovered in 1910 by the Russian scientist S.E. Malov in a Buddhist temple in the village of Vinshgu, Gansu Province, China. The manuscript consists of 355 pages (710 pages) and was copied in 1687. Currently, this copy is kept in the Asian Museum in St. Petersburg. This work was first published by V.V. Radlov and S.E. Malov in the Old Uyghur-Turkish alphabet [5]. The translations of G.Elherz, R.Finch, P.Zime, K.Reborn, and a number of other French scholars greatly contributed to the spread of "Altun Yaruk" in European countries. The first scholar to work on other copies of this monument was the German orientalist and linguist Friedrich Wilhelm Karl Müller [6]. German Turkic scholars V.Bang and A.Gaben transliterated pages 133-141 from Radlov-Malov's edition and translated them into German [7].

Turkish scholars Rashid Rahmatiy Arat [8], Saodat Chigatoy [9], Shinosi Tekin and Cheval Qoya [10] have carried out certain work on this written monument. The Russian scholar S.E. Malov also transliterated the legends "Ku tai" and "The Prince and the Leopard" and translated them into Russian [11]. Also noteworthy is the work done by Shenol Korkmaz, a master's student at Marmara University in Turkey, regarding "Altun Yaruk". It was transliterated and transcribed based on the collected critical text of "Golden Light" published by Cheval Kaya in 1994, as well as fifty documents found in the Turfan collection at the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and belonging to other copies of "Golden Light." Having studied the differences between them in comparison with the Radlov-Malov edition, he aimed to identify the shortcomings of the Radlov-Malov edition and create material for a perfect edition of "Altun Yaruk" [12]. The research of the famous Turkologist E.R. Tenishev on "Altun Yaruk" is of particular importance [13]. The doctoral dissertation of the Kazakh linguist G. Aydarov on the lexicon of the ancient Turkic language, more precisely, the lexicon of the Orkhon-Yenisei written monuments, can be considered the first fundamental research in this

direction [14]. At the same time, it is appropriate to mention the works of A.N. Kononov as an example of research devoted to the phonetics and grammar of these monuments [15].

In Uzbek linguistics, the translation from ancient Turkish into modern Uzbek of the legend "The Prince and the Leopard" from "Altun Yaruk" included in the textbook "Ancient Turkic Language" by G. Abdurakhmanov and A. Rustamov, was the first bold step in this direction [16]. In the textbook "History of the Uzbek Language" by N.Rakhmonov and K.Sodikov, with the excerpt from "Altun Yaruk" given as an appendix, the analysis carried out in the chapter "Lexicon" of the textbook can be assessed as a way to study the lexical layer of the ancient Turkic language [17].

One of the main tasks facing modern Turkology is the study of the history of Turkic dialects, the identification of the phonetic-lexical-grammatical features of ancient Turkic dialects, the characterization of their stages of general and specific development from ancient times to the present day, in a word - the study of historical dialectology. The study of ancient Turkic dialects allows not only to clarify the formation and differentiation of Turkic languages, but also to determine the ethnogenesis, culture, way of life, and thinking of peoples. True, ancient Turkic dialects have been studied, classified, and characterized by a number of Turkologists. In particular, views on the dialects and classification of the ancient Turkic language can be seen in the scientific works of foreign and Russian Turkic scholars such as V.V.Radlov, S.E.Malov, N.A.Baskakov, V.M.Nasilov, I.A.Batmanov, T.Tekin, S.G.Klyashtorny, A.Gaben, O.Pritsak, E.R.Tenishev. Scholars, while studying the phonetic-lexical-grammatical features of the ancient Turkic language, also describe its dialectal features. While the scholarly works of some of these scholars specifically address ancient Turkic dialects, the scholarly works of some researchers, against the backdrop of their general grammatical views, contain scholarly views on dialects. In particular, in this regard, we consider it expedient to conduct a comparative study of their lexical units with the lexical layer of modern Turkic languages based on the lexicon of individual works characteristic of the ancient, old Turkic language periods.

METHODOLOGY.

It is important to study the lexicon of "Altun Yaruk" in comparison with the lexicon of modern Turkic languages, the lexical composition of their dialects, and on this basis, to substantiate the development of the lexicon of Turkic languages. Our observations on ancient Turkic dialects and their phonetic-grammatical features, lexical composition showed that the

common Turkic lexical layer can be studied by dividing it into the following groups according to dialectal composition:

1. Dialectal neutral lexical layer. Lexicon common to all Turkic languages, undifferentiated by the dialectal features of the common Turkic layer in both ancient and modern Turkic languages (for example, nouns such as *ög, qang, qiz*; verbs such as *qil, et*, etc.). According to the composition of this lexical layer, it consists of verbs, nouns, adjectives, and other parts of speech, which are words used from the language of ancient written sources to the present day.

2. Phonetic dialectisms. Dialectal layer arising on the basis of phonetic differences (for example, the presence of ŋ/n/y sounds with slight differences between them; the use of the sound **b** instead of **ğ** in auslaut: sub or water instead of sug'; the presence of **b//m** sounds in anlut: *ben //men*, etc.).

3. Morphological dialectisms. Dialectal layer arising on the basis of morphological difference (for example, the use of the forms -ïp/-ïb, -pan; the past participle of the second person -tïğ, -tïğïz; the past participle of the third person -sun/-čun; the conditional suffix -sïğ; the modal particle erinč [18], etc.).

4. Lexical dialectisms. Dialectal layer formed on the basis of lexical difference. Inter-Turkic dialectal lexical difference from the period of the ancient Turkic language to the present day constitutes a unique layer of Turkic dialects (Kipchak, Karluk, Oghuz) and is a differential feature that distinguishes these tribes even in their later periods of formation as separate languages. The formation of such a distinctive, specific lexical layer, on the one hand, is connected with the living conditions, lifestyle, thinking, that is, linguocultural, pragmalinguistic, cognitive aspects of those Turkic tribes, and on the other hand, their territorial proximity to other peoples, socio-economic and cultural ties, is the result of the interaction of languages on this basis, that is, a sociolinguistic factor.

In this way, a special lexical layer characteristic of Turkic tribes and clans was formed, and at the same time, this lexical difference, along with ethnocultural peculiarities, served the formation of separate Turkic tribes, clans, languages, and nations, and the formation of a separate ethnos separated from the ancient Turkic language, mainly on the basis of differences in dialects and languages, more than other factors, continued from the 9th century to the 17th-19th centuries and was formed as independent literary languages [19]. In this regard, the information about Turkic tribes (Argu, Chigil, Kipchak, Karluk, Oghuz, Turkmen, Kyrgyz, etc.) in Mahmud Kashgari's work "Devonu lugat-t-turk" and the presentation of a number of words

based on dialectal signs are proof of our opinion. In particular, the work contains about 500 lexical units, distinguished on the basis of dialectal features [20: 644].

Thus, the dialectal layer formed on the basis of lexical differences in the work "Altun Yaruk" can be traditionally studied as Qarluq-Chigil-Uyghur, Kipchak, and Oghuz units. Since "Altun Yaruk" is a translated work, the translators effectively used the possibilities of lexical units characteristic of all dialects of the ancient Turkic language, which were in use in their time, in order to ensure equivalence in translation. This created a unique panorama of the unification of ancient Turkic dialects. The Karluk-Chigil-Uyghur, Kipchak, and Oghuz units of the Turkic dialects can be studied separately.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.

The famous Turkologist V.V. Radlov was the first to propose which dialects formed the basis of the ancient Turkic language and classified the ancient Turkic dialects. To this day, his views are of great importance in Turkology. According to him, the ancient Turkic language consisted of three dialects: the first is the ancient northern dialect. This dialect was spoken by the Turkic tribes of Central Asia and is also known as the Turkic-Syr dialect; the idea that the *Syr* were *Kipchaks* entered and settled in Turkic studies (it is unnecessary here to try to prove that a large part of the Uzbek people consisted of Kipchaks); the second is the ancient southern dialect, this dialect includes the Uyghur language; the third is also called a mixed dialect or mixed language, and is considered to consist of a mixture of the above two dialects; the Turkic written monuments in Manichaean script, "Altun Yoruğ," were created under the influence of this dialect.

In the periodization of Turkic dialects, V.V. Radlov substantiated his views on the basis of sources specific to the ancient Turkic language, dividing them into types. In particular, the ancient northern dialect (Turkic-Syr language) encompasses the language of the following written monuments:

1) the Kultigin and Bilge Khagan monuments;

2) Tonyukuk inscription;

3) Ungin (Ongin) inscription, Khoito-Tamir inscriptions, etc.;

4) inscriptions found in the Khemchik, Yenisei, and Abakan basins;

5) inscriptions found in the ruins of the city of Karabalasagun;

6) inscriptions found in Turkestan;

7) Separate parts of inscriptions on Turfan paper [15].

Regarding the ancient southern dialect (Uyghur language), V.V. Radlov writes: "I call the Uyghur language a southern dialect, because, despite the fact that during the reign of the Turkic-Syr state, some of the Uyghurs lived in the north, between Baikal and Koso-gol, and even further west, this dialect was formed in the south and is known to us from manuscripts in the southern regions".

The mixed dialect encompasses the features of the northern and southern dialects. V.V. Radlov indicates the following as sources related to this dialect:

1) all Turkic monuments in the Manichean script;

2) all Turkic-Manichaean monuments written in the Uyghur script;

3) Cairo copy of the work "Kutadgu Bilig" in Arabic;

4) many Buddhist manuscripts ("Altun Yaruk" sutra, "Tishastvustik" sutra, "Kuan-shi-im-Pusar", etc.) [15: 27].

We can say that the classification of ancient Turkic dialects by V.V. Radlov, who first classified them from a scientific point of view, became the basis for subsequent classifications. Because in the subsequent period, the classification carried out by Turkic scholars was based on the principles of classification.

The role of N.A. Baskakov in the creation of the classification of Turkic languages is significant. As a result of his many years of research, the history of the development of Turkic languages and their genealogical classification were comprehensively covered. The scholar periodizes Turkic languages as follows [18:147-163]:

I. Altai period (up to the 3rd century BC).

II. The Hunnic period (from the 3rd century BC to the 5th century AD).

III. Ancient Turkic Period (5th-10th centuries). This period, in turn, is divided into three periods:

– Tukyuy (V-VIII centuries),

– ancient Uyghur (VIII-IX centuries),

– ancient Kyrgyz (IX-X centuries).

N.A. Baskakov divides the language of ancient Turkic language monuments into two groups:

I. The Old Oghuz and Old Kyrgyz languages, as well as the Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions, which have many common features:

a) the presence of the sounds ʌ/ʌ/y, which have some differences between them;

b) the use of the sound b in the auslaut instead of g': sub instead of sog' or water;

c) the presence of the sounds b//m in the anlute: ben //men;

d) the use of the form -pan instead of -ip/-ib;

e) the past participle in the 2nd person -tig', -tig'iz;

f) the past participle in the 3rd person -cun/-chun;

g) the conditional suffix -sig'; h) the modal particle erinch, etc.

II. The Old Uyghur language consists of two dialects:

1) n-dialect, found in Manichean texts;

2) y-dialect, found in later Manichaean and Buddhist monuments, as well as in texts of Brahmi and Christian content.

Thus, identifying the dialects of the ancient Turkic language, classifying them according to phonetic, lexical, and grammatical features is of great importance in the study of the history of Turkic languages.

Mahmud Kashgari, in his work "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk", focuses on the distribution of Turkic tribes and provides a map of their location, primarily showing the differences in these languages. Kashgari gives examples because, despite the differences in the languages of the tribes, all Turkic tribes used a single Turkic language. The examples cited in the work do not belong to a specific tribe, but to all the twenty Turkic tribes that Kashgari describes. "...as an example, I have cited poems used in the Turkic language, wise sayings and proverbs used in days of joy and mourning, so that those who use them can convey it to the narrators (listeners), and the narrators, in turn, can convey it to the speakers of that language" [21: 66-69]. Moreover, he aimed not to contrast the minor differences in each tribe with the common language - the common Turkic language of his time - as Kashgari pointed out, but to strive for clarity in the language and to show the characteristics of the literary language in each tribe's language.

In Mahmud Kashgari's work "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk", about 250 words with "Oghuz" characters are given, most of which are also actively used in the lexicon of the Turkic languages of the modern Oghuz group. The following comparative table clearly demonstrates the proof of this idea when comparing the words given with the "Oghuz" explanation with the languages of the Oghuz group:

№	"Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk"	Conversion	Oghuz group in Turkic languages

1	us (I, 44)	to distinguish between good and bad - ol us boldï - he distinguished between good and bad.	-
2	urra (I, 46)	man's hernia	gorra (turkm.)
3	aŋ (I, 47)	means "no" or "not"	-
4	urq (I, 49)	abbreviated form of the word "seed"	-
5	uč (I, 50)	completion of something	uç (turkm.)
6	ikit (I, 55)	falsehood	-
7	oγur (I, 56)	Compensation, compensation; reciprocal	-
8	oγur (I, 56)	good and successful; beneficial; this word is used only for a journey or traveler	ugur (turkm.II, 397)
9	ögür: jaγ ögüri (I, 57)	sesame	-
10	emir (I, 57)	fog; cloud	ümür (turkm.)
11	ašaq (I, 63)	foothill	aşak (turkm.), aşağı (turk.), aşağı (oz.)
12	aluq (I, 64)	*aluq er* – ignorant person	-
13	alïq (I, 64)	bird's beak	-
14	saγ elig (I, 66)	right hand	sag el (turkm.)
15	jilik (I, 67)	bone marrow	ýilik (turkm.)
16	aγïl (I, 67)	1) sheepfold: sheepfold; 2) sheep dung	agyl (turkm.), ağıl (az.),
17	örän (I, 69)	The worst thing is that it's broken, ruined.	örän (turkm.)
18	ekin (I, 70)	cropland	ekin (turkm.)
19	aq (I, 72)	white. The white of everything. Turkic tribes call a spotted horse *aq at*	ak (turkm.)
20	aq (I. 72)	*aq saqal er* – gray-bearded person	aksakal, aksakgal (turkm.), ağsaqqal (az.)
21	üjäz (I, 74)	small mosquito	-

22	čanak (I, 74, 256)	dish; bowl; cup	çanak (turkm.)
23	ujuq (I, 75)	imagination (shadow; shadow; black); icon stone	-
24	üjük (I, 75)	*üjük jer* – a sandy area where water and other things are so abundant that it gets stuck when stepped on and is difficult to pull out	-
25	aba (I, 76)	mother. The Karluk Turkmens call you آپَا apa with a hard پ	-
26	oba (I, 76)	tribe	oba (turkm.)
27	ezä (I, 78)	sister	ejeke (turkm.)
28	ïmïr (I, 81)	mixing of light and darkness	-
29	azruq (I, 84)	different, separate	
30	eträk (I, 86)	yellow man	-
31	ütrük (I, 86)	cunning, deceiver	ótrik (qqalp.)
32	endäk (I, 89)	surface, surface of something	entek (turkm.)
33	saxt (I, 90)	Gold-silver ornament for the belt, buckle, and saddle head	-
34	örgän (I, 90)	belt	-
35	andan (I, 91)	after	-
36	sečä (III, 152)	sparrow	serçe (turkm.) sečä (oʻzb.t.oʻ.sh.)
37	keča (III, 152)	felt	keçe (turkm.)
38	keči (III, 152)	goat	geçi (turkm.)
39	dädä (III, 153)	father	däde (turkman tilining ota dialekti)
40	siŋäk (III, 163)	fly	siňek (turkm.)
41	qarïnča (III, 249)	ant	garynja (turkm.)
42	jorïnča (III, 249)	alfalfa	ýorunja (turkm.)

There are also words in the "Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" with the explanation "among the Oghuz and Kipchaks":

№	"Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk"	Conversion	In modern Turkic languages
1	alïγ (I, 62)	repayment of everything, debt	algy (turkm.)
2	arïq (I, 63)	Thin, weak	arryk (turkm.)
3	em (I, 46)	women's awrah	-
4	žinžü (I, 280)	pearl	-
5	qurman (I, 296)	Bullet container. *kiš qurman* Bow-and-arrow vessel Originally derived from the word *"kurman"* - to tie a belt around the waist	-

CONCLUSIONS.

Such evidence shows that the words collected and selected by Kashgari in this dictionary and their use as a means of communication in all Turkic tribes, as well as the differences in the languages of the tribes, can be said to be based on koine. In countries that have turned towards civilization, among many dialects, one language replaces dialects and serves as a means of communication. Where the koine is firmly established, there is, of course, a group of people speaking different dialects, in which case individuals consciously strive to speak according to the criteria of written speech.

Over time, dialectal differences may disappear (the process of integration of tribal languages during the transition of ancient Turkic language to old Uzbek is an example of this). But even then, the process of development of languages common to all creates new individual features in the language. "Altun Yaruk" is a literal example of this.

It is natural that the ancient Turkic literary language underwent changes under the influence of local dialects in the process of functioning in various regions of Central Asia. That is why some Turkologists (for example, Amir Najib) used the term "literary dialect" in relation to the Turkic languages of different regions. In relation to written monuments of one or another group, the concept of "literary dialect" replaces the concept of "literary language" [22: 3]. This

view can be applied not only to medieval Turkic written monuments, but also to monuments of the ancient Turkic period. We believe that when Mahmud Kashgari spoke of "Turkic languages" in relation to the language of the Turkic tribes of the 11th century, he was referring specifically to "several literary languages". Or the differences between the language of the Orkhon monuments and the language of the Yenisei monuments (in particular, in sound structure), between the language of the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments and the language of the Turkic-Uyghur written monuments (sound system, morphological structure, lexical layer) lead to this opinion. When analyzing these differences, it is advisable to consider the types and characteristics of writing. Undoubtedly, this is a pressing issue in Turkic studies, in particular, it serves to prove that "ancient Turkic languages" existed and spread from the east to the west of Central Asia.

REFERENCES:

1. Менгес К.Г. Восточные элементы в «Слово о полку Игорове». –Л.: «Наука» ЛО, 1979. С.3.

2. Драчук В. Ёзувлар – ўтмиш сирлари шоҳиди. Т.: "Ўзбекистон", 1980. Б. 97.

3. Бу ҳақда қаранг: Раҳмонов Н. "Минг йиллик туман кунлик ёзувим"// "Ўзбекистон адабиёти ва санъати" газетаси, № 44. 2019 йил 22 октябрь.

4. Тенешев Э.Р. "Кутадгу билиг" и "Алтун ярук". Боку: Советская тюркология.1970.- №4.- С.24-31.

5. Радлов В.В., Малов С.Е.. Суварнапрабхаса (Сутра Золотого блеска). Текст уйгурской редакции. –Санкт-Петербург, 1913-1917, XV + 723 с.

6. Müller. F.W. K. Uigurica. APAW (Abhandlungen der preubischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).1908, 3-60; F.W.K.Müller. Uigurica. APAW. 1910. 1-110.

7. Bang-A.V., Gaben W. Uygurische Studien. Ungarische Jahrbücher. 10\3, 1930, 193-210.

8. Рашид Раҳматий Аратнинг "Олтун ёруғ" транслитерациясига оид ишлари унинг қуйидаги илмий нашрларида бор: R.R. Arat: F.W.K.MULLER-W.LENTZ: Soghdiische Texte II, Berlin, 1934, 65-70; R.R. Arat. Türk dili üzerinde arastirmalar. Uygur devrine ait dil örnekleri: "Altun Yaruk". –Istanbul. 1936; R.R. Arat. Uygurlarda istilahlara dair. TM, 7-8\1, 1942, 56-81; R.R. Arat. Eski Türk siiri. –Ankara, 1965.

9. Çagatay S.S. Altun Yarukdan iki parça. –Ankara, 1945.

10. Бу ҳақда қаранг: Ceval Kaya. Uygurca Altun Yaruk. –Ankara, 1994.s. 53.

11. Малов С.Е. Памятники древнетюркской письменности. М.– Л.: изд.АН ССР, 1951.С. 145-179.

12. Senol Korkmaz. Uygyurca ALTUN YARUK'a ait belgeler (501-550) yuksek lisans tezi. -Istanbul, 2005. s 3.

13. Тенишев Э.Р.Грамматический очерк древнеуйгурского языка по сочинению "Золотой блеск". АКД, -Л.: 1953. С.16.

14. Айдаров Г.Лексика языка Енисейско-Орхонских и таласских памятников древнетюркской письменности [Текст]: Автореферат дис. на соискание ученой степени доктора филологических наук, 1974.

15. Кононов А.Н. Грамматика языка тюркских рунических памятников VII-IX вв. -Л.: «Наука», 1980.

16. Абдураҳмонов Ғ., Рустамов А. Қадимги туркий тил. –Тошкент: "Ўқитувчи", 1982.

17. Rahmonov N., Sodiqov Q. O'zbek tili tarixi. –Toshkent: O'zbekiston faylasuflari milliy jamiyati nashriyoti, 2009. 234-b.

18. Баскаков Н.А. Введение в изучение тюркских языков. М., 1969. 147-163 ББ.

19. Dadaboyev H., Xolmanova Z. Turkiy tillarning qiyosiy tarixiy grammatikasi. – Т., Mumtoz so'z, 2015. –В.14-15.

20. Древнетюркский словарь, -Л.:1969. с. 644-648.

21. Кошғарий Маҳмуд. Девону луғатит-турк., уч жилдлик, 1 жилд, Тошкент, 1960, "Фан" нашриёти, Б.66-69.

22. Нажип А. Исследования по истории тюркских языков XI-XIV вв., М.: Главная редакция Восточной литературы, 1989, 3-бет.