# L.K. Meirambekova[1] , G.R. Dautova[2*]

[1] L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan, Nur-Sultan
[2] Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty
*e-mail: *gulnazdautova001@gmail.com

# THE HISTORICAL ROLE OF KAZAKH LANGUAGE IN THE SYSTEM OF TURKIC LANGUAGES

The article touches upon the historical role of Kazakh language in the system of Turkic languages, as the former passed on its own way to the formation of different subethnical processes which lasted for several centuries. It comes as no surprise that it is necessary to know well the nature of the given ethnos itself to study any ethnic language. The knowledge of only internal language laws is not sufficient to recognize the original nature of any ethnic language and it goes without saying that its ultimate roots is directly related to the culture, history, religion and way of living of the ethnic groups speaking this language for centuries. Therefore, the way of study the national language through the combined research of the ethnic language, culture and cognition, and the history led to the birth of the totally new directions in the field of linguistics as anthropolinguistics, psycholinguistics and cognitive, social linguistics. The language of that time, which formed the basis of the ethnogenesis of Kazakh people who contributed to the formation of the nation were applied by the tribes and people are considered as the historical basis of modern Kazakh language. As a result of combining and merging all related tribal groups included in the territories of the Kazakh Khanate (Uysin, Kanly Kipchak, Argyn, Dulat, Shapirashty, Zhalayr, Sirgeli, Alban, Suan, Konyrat, Nayman, Kerey, Alshyn etc.) formed a monolithic integration of national Kazakh language and acquired a general structure of language. The aim of the research is to define the historical role of Kazakh language in the system of Turkic languages.

**Key words:** Turkic linguistics, ethnic groups, intralinguistics and extralinguistic factors.

## Л.К. Мейрамбекова[1], Г.Р. Даутова[2*]

[1] Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Нұр-Сұлтан қ.
[2] Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.
*e-mail: gulnazdautova001@gmail.com

### Қазақ тілінің түркі тілдері жүйесіндегі тарихи рөлі

Мақалада түркі тілдері жүйесіндегі қазақ тілінің тарихи рөлі туралы айтылады, өйткені оның өзі бірнеше ғасырлар бойы жалғасқан түрлі субэтникалық үдерістердің қалыптасудың жолымен жүрді. Кез келген этникалық тілді зерттеу үшін осы этностың табиғатын жақсы білу қажет екендігі таңқаларлық жайт емес. Кез келген этникалық тілдің бастапқы негізін танып білу үшін тек ішкі лингвистикалық заңдылықтарды білу жеткіліксіз және оның негізгі тамыры ғасырлар бойы осы тілде сөйлеп келген этностардың мәдениетіне, тарихына, дініне және өмір салтына тікелей байланысты екендігі айтпаса да түсінікті. Сонымен, этникалық тілді, мәдениет пен таным мен тарихты бірлестіріп зерттеу арқылы ұлттық тілді зерттеу тәсілі лингвистика саласында антрополингвистика, психолингвистика және когнитивтік, әлеуметтік лингвистика сияқты мүлдем жаңа бағыттардың тууына әкелді. Қазақ халқының этногенезіне негіз болған, ұлттың қалыптасуына ықпал еткен, тайпалар мен халықпен қолданылған сол кездегі тіл қазіргі қазақ тілінің тарихи негізі болып саналады. Қазақ хандығының құрамына енген барлық туыс тайпалық топтардың бірігуі мен кірігуі нәтижесінде (Үйсін, Қаңлы, Қыпшақ, Арғын, Дулат, Шапырашты, Жалайыр, Сіргелі, Албан, Суан, Қоңырат, Найман, Керей, Алшын, т.б.) ұлттық қазақ тілінің монолитті интеграциясын құрып, жалпы тілдік құрылымға ие болды. Зерттеудің мақсаты – қазақ тілінің түркі тілдері жүйесіндегі тарихи рөлін анықтау болды.

**Түйін сөздер:** түркі тіл білімі, этностар тобы, интралингвистика және экстралингвистикалық факторлар.

Л.К. Мейрамбекова[1], Г.Р. Даутова[2*]

[1]Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Казахстан, г. Нур-Султан
[2] Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы
*e-mail: gulnazdautova001@gmail.com

## Историческая роль казахского языка в системе тюркских языков

В статье затрагивается историческая роль казахского языка в системе тюркских языков, поскольку он сам прошел свой путь к формированию различных субэтнических процессов, которые длились несколько столетий. Неудивительно, что для изучения любого этнического языка необходимо хорошо знать природу данного этноса. Знания только внутренних языковых законов недостаточно, чтобы признать изначальную природу любого этнического языка, и само собой разумеется, что его основные корни напрямую связаны с культурой, историей, религией и образом жизни этнических групп, говорящих на этом языке веками. Таким образом, способ изучения национального языка через совместное исследование этнического языка, культуры и познания и истории привело к рождению совершенно новых направлений в области лингвистики, таких как антрополингвистика, психолингвистика и когнитивная, социальная лингвистика. Язык того времени, который являлся основой этногенеза казахского народа, способствовавший формированию нации, использовавшийся племенами и народом, рассматривается как историческая основа современного казахского языка. В результате объединения и слияния всех родственных племенных групп, проживавших на территории Казахского ханства (Уйсин, Канлы, Кипчак, Аргын, Дулат, Шапирашты, Жалайр, Сиргели, Албан, Суан, Коныраг, Найман, Керей, Алшын и др.), произошла монолитная интеграция национального казахского языка, приобретя общую языковую структуру. Цель исследования – определить историческую роль казахского языка в системе тюркских языков.

**Ключевые слова:** тюркское языкознание, этносы, интралингвистика и экстралингвистические факторы.

## Introduction

As far as language is considered to be a means of depicting and storing the mind images, the impact of language content on its structure is much highlighted in Turkic linguistics. Well-known turcologist N.Baskakov defined the connection of internal language laws and human thinking as follows: «The structure of the Turkic languages, as well as other languages of different topology is very complex and closely connected first of all with the basic types of human thinking. If to take into account direct connection between language and thought, it is necessary to assume that the language as an expression of cognitive functions is an indivisible unity and its basically structural sections such as grammar, vocabulary and sound composition are serial, concentric in nature and to each other aspects containing a special material and subject matter as well as its own specific and internal laws» (Baskakov, 1969: 86). In order to study any ethnic language it is necessary to know well the nature of the given ethnos itself. The knowledge of only internal language laws is not sufficient to recognize the original nature of any ethnic language and it goes without saying that its ultimate roots is directly related to the culture, history, religion and way of living of the ethnic groups speaking this language for centuries. Therefore, the way of study the national language through the combined research of the ethnic language, culture and cognition, and the history led to the birth of the totally new directions in the field of linguistics as anthropolinguistics, psycholinguistics and cognitive, social linguistics.

## The methods and approaches of the research

Historical-comparative, comparative- characteristic, descriptive, structural and typological methods are used in the given article. The investigation of the research is based on the construction of separate lexicology of the Turkic languages.

## The main part

In this regard, at the current period when the aspect of language study and its development is under deep consideration, the recognition of language is characterized by anthropocentric discretion. Also, binding structural and anthropocentric studies together in modern linguistics as well as combinability of intra linguistic and extra linguistic factors in language studies undoubtedly contribute to this matter.

If consider a wide range of complex and multifaceted nature of the language, especially in terms of the national consciousness as the spiritual realities of the phenomenon, there is a clear genetic stability to be seen. Not only gender and morphological

characteristics, but the anthropological types of the given ethnic community based on anthropometric, serologic, dentistry, dermatoglyphical and paleontropologycal marks give a full description of the ethnic genesis of that society. Language may perform the same function and reveals the information relating to ethnic, historical and cultural ties, ideology, traditions, beliefs, profession, geographic environment and many other similar issues. A.Kaydar, the academician, expressed the role of language in determining the nature of ethnos: «Today's generation may get knowledge about its ethnos through various archaeological and architectural data, stone sculptures and stone monuments, but all of them are only the illusions of the past time. The real and true image of ethnic community is kept in language, and through the language is stored in the memory of generations and only the language is capable to keep so much information about ethnos. Regarding this ability, the language phenomenon «world of language» is to be treated as a source of the ethnos' development and competence. The scope of this concept covers all the properties of language: it gave birth to ethnos itself and became the core of ethnos spiritual and cultural life. Thus, the term «the world of language» means synthesis of thousands or even millions of semantic units relating to the nature of any ethnic groups» (Kaydar, 1998:11).

An outstanding scholar K. Mussayev consumed: «When we say that language is a storehouse of history of a nation, primarily it refers to its vocabulary, which directly responds to changes in the lives of people». Therefore, the indigenous vocabulary of the Kazakh language has been formed not only with the development of the national history, but of the Turkic communities' history in general. Kazakh vocabulary is characterized by congeniality with Kipchak group of languages and Turkic languages in whole or in part. Before it became a nation, Kazakh people had passed the same common ways of development as other Turkic communities. Kazakh vocabulary generally spread from Turkic basis and its basic word vocabulary, phonetic and morphological structures started from the ancient Turkish language.

It is a well known fact in history of language, that long before a nation's language was formed, the basis of an ethnos started by tribes or tribe communities. In this regard, there are different terms like «Scythian and Kangly, Kunli languages» which featured the ancient languages widely used by Turkic tribes in process of building their governmental structures. It should be kept in mind that ethnonyms indicating the names of the tribes, lived in BC are mostly contractual hypothetical terms. Despite of

lack of linguistic data showing the direct link between these and modern Turkic languages, there are some certain historical information to consider these ancient languages as the starting stages of Turkic linguistics. The fact that the ancient tribes of Kangly, Uysun, Kipchak, etc. accepted as ethnic founders of a whole Kazakh population had its own specific features and developed languages called «Uysun», «Hanga», «Kipchak» and «Argyn languages» was marked by A.Kaydar. He noted «It is very difficult of course to differentiate these languages and determine their characteristics more than a century later, as they are all in the course of the historical development of mutual equality had become a language». That is why today, though, it is said that there were so-called tribal languages, this only applies to the history of the language. However, according to the logic of the Kazakh language existence of tribal languages Hanga, Uysun, Kipchak, Argyn, Nayman and others long before the appearance of the national language, cause no doubt (Kaydar, 2004:113).

Kazakh, Karakalpak languages belonged to Nogay and Kipchak type of languages had the same characteristics and generally represented a single language. In connection with the collapse of the Nogay Horde, various ethnic groups including in its structure began to disintegrate into other Turkic-speaking groups.

The scientists consider ancestors of Nogay linking them with the successor – the Mishar (Tatars) language of ancient Bulgarians. One part of Mishars located in the vicinity of Caucasus is referred to Nogay ethnonym, the other part is on the coast of Volga and the lowland Meshera – the Tatar ethnonym. During the Altyn and Norgay Horde the linguistic and ethnic processes have brought together languages spoken from the very beginning of the Kipchak language – Kazakh, Karakalpak and Nogay (Zakiev & Kuzmi-Yamanadi, 1996: 140). Referring Kazakh, Karakalpak and Nogay languages in one group the scientists took into account ethno-historical way of formation of the mentioned people Kipchak→Altyn Orda→ Nogay Horde.

According to historical and linguistic literature it is known that the Kazakh ethnic group and its language was formed in XIY-XY centuries and its appearance is largely due to the emergence of the Kazakh Khanate. The appearance of this state was the natural result of the socio-economic and ethno political transformations taking place in the vast areas of the Urals and the Caspian Sea to the delta of the Syr Darya River and Tien Shan. Undoubtedly, the union of ethnic groups into the official governmental structure influenced the strengthening

of the Kazakh nation and systematization of its language. Nevertheless, the roots of ethno-genetic processes which form the basis for the emergence of the Kazakh ethnic group and its language in the Turkic world, to be found in ancient times, at the time when the ancient society and its foundations started to crumble. Morphological and genetic uniformity of the sub-ethnic composition (tribes) of the Kazakh ethnic group is the proof of their common ancestor.

The historical similarity of Kazakh, Karakalpak and Norgay people and their affinity in ethnic composition of common tribes, customs and traditions, models of folklore and common culture could serve as the evidence. There is a little distinction in the history of ethnogenesis of the people speaking in subgroups Kipchak-Bulgar and Kipchak-Polovets subgroups. Those languages which refer to the Kipchak group are grouped differently, depending on the difference of language, geographical location, the history of the formation of ethnic groups speaking the same language. Mahmud Kashgary refers the Bezhenek, Kifshak, Bashkirt, Tatar and Kirghyz languages to a number of languages located in the vicinity of Rum. Those, who only speak the Turkic language is Kyrgyz and Kifzhak tribes. The Bashkirt language is close to the named languages. The Bulgarian language belongs to the Turkic language which is spoken by cutting the ends of words (Ramstedt, 1957).

A.Remyuza devided Kipchak language into two groups: Nogay Group, and Kyrgyz group, as far as V.V.Radlov is concerned, he devided them into West- Northern, the Volga Tatars, Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Bashkir languages referred to the western group of Turkic languages (the main features – the hard sounds *q, k, t, p* coming at the beginning of word; the using at the beginning the voiced sound *b;* the using at the beginning the voiced sound *d*; the undergoing a transformation of hard consonants before vowels into soft sounds; corresponding the sounds: s ≈ s, c ≈ s, c ≈ ts; using the sounds *z, s, s* in all positions; the sound *l* has two variants: hard and soft), dialects of Crimea Tatars to the southern group (using the sounds o, ö only by in the first syllable; the numerous using sounds: *d, g* at the beginning the word; corresponding at the end of the word č ≈ dz, t ~ d; inter distinction sounds: i, i; the undergoing a transformation of vowels into labial sounds in the last syllable; fully non-compliance with vowel harmony, etc.) (Kaydar & Orazov, 2004: 193).

F. Korsh divided Kyrgyz, Karachay, Kazakh, Nogay, Tatar, Bashkir languages into the northern group of Turkic languages (the main feature – non using the sounds γ, g in the middle and at the end of a word; transformation of sound – *y* at the end of a word after an open vowel sound in *w*,); Kipchak (polovec) language into the eastern group (the main feature – saving sounds γ, g at the end and in the middle of a word) (Korsch, 1910:76).

A.N.Samoylovich referred the Kipchak language to a group of Tagli (the main feature is the pronunciation of *Tay* as *Tag*); The Tau Group or Kipchak north western group (the main feature – the pronunciation of the lexeme *tag* with *y* or long sounds) Kyrgyz, Kumyk, Karachay, Balkar, Karayim, Tatar and Bashkir languages (before the Mongol invasion), Kazakh, Nogay (languages after the Mongol invasion) (Samoylovich, 2005:85).

V.A. Bogoroditsky classified Kipchak languages by geographic location –Kazakh, Karakalpak and Kyrgyz languages are referred to a group of Turkic languages of Central Asia (feature – the alternation of sounds – š ≈ s); The Volga Tatar and the Bashkir language along the Ural group of Turkic languages of Volga, Ural (matching sounds e ≈ ij, o ≈ u) Tatar language Chulim, Barabin, Tyumen, Tobol to a group of Western Siberia, the Kumik language to the South Western group (Bogoroditsky,1953:34).

If M.R. Ryasyanen referred Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogay, Kirghyz, Kumyk, Karachay-Balkar, Karayam, Tatar, Bashkir, ancient Kuman languages to the group of Turkic languages of the North-West (Räsänen, 1935:20). I.Bentsing refers the Karayim, Karachay-Balkar and Kumyk languages to Kipchak languages of the Black Sea coast and Caspian Sea; to the Kipchak languages of Ural – the Tatar, Bashkir, Crimea Tatar languages, to the groups of Aral and Caspian – Kazakh, Karakalpak and Nogay languages. K.G.Menges included the ancient Kuman into the ancient north-western group of Turkic languages; Karayim, Karachay-Balkar, Crimea Tatar, and Kumyk languages into a group of languages of the Black Sea; the Tatar, Western Siberian, Barabin Tatar, Bashkir languages – into a group of the Volga-Kama languages; in a group of Aral and Kaspi – the Kazakh, Karakalpak, Kipchak dialects of Uzbek language, the Norgay language. The main features of classification of the Turkic language, the ethnic composition of the population speaking the same language, fully defined the relation with other ethnic groups; the majority of experts supported N.A.Baskakov's classification where the Tatar and Bashkir languages were included in the subgroup of Kipchak – Bulgarian language of Kipchak group: Karayim, Karachay-Balkar and Crimean Tatar, Kyrymchak languages to the group of Kipchak-Polovets languages: the Norgay, Kazakh and Kara-

kalpak languages to the Kipchak- Norgay language group (Baskakov, 1969: 230).

T. Tekin, guided by phonetic principles in the genealogical classification of Turkic languages Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai, Kumuk, Karachay-Balkar, Karaim, Crimean Tatar (literary languages), Barabin Tatar dialect, Uzbek Khorezm-Kipchak dialects included to the languages of the Kipchak group [Tekin, 1990:10].

The genealogical and historical classification of Turkic languages is regarded as a huge result of comparative linguistics of that time. The scientific, theoretical and methodological basis of the named classification had been studied deeply in modern Turkic linguistics, its achievements and defective sites are analyzed comprehensively. There were some contradictions and inconsistencies met in the classifications made by the seventies years of the twentieth century which were to be the result of historical and comparative grammar of Turkic languages and lack of research in historical dialectology as well as in the phonetic – phonological changes and historical morphological patterns of the Turkic languages. Nowadays the material funds give us the opportunity to clarify the boundaries of distribution and use of phonetic, morphonological phenomenon of the Turkic languages. Moreover, alternational phenomenon either for separated languages or common Turkic languages have been investigated much deeper, the systematic changes and relating to them information has been analyzed, language fund data showing dialectical features have been refilled. Concerning the possibilities of modern Turkic language Professor A.V. Dybo has stated the following idea: «More or less careful comparative-historical analysis of a full material by present time allows to establish quite regular correspondence between the Turkic languages where before seeming inconsistency led to talk of «interdialectal borrowing» and by a consensus can not be established phonetic regularities (for example, reflexation of initial deaf and sonorous, or intervocalic complexes). In any case, the observed failure of correspondences explained basic interdialect borrowing much less than development or complex positional morphonological alignments (Dybo, 2007:10)». On the basis of the reconstruction of the phonological system of Proto-Turkic scientist a new genetic classification of Turkic languages had been proposed, divided into two groups according to the macro initial stage of disintegration of Turkic century:

1) great Bulgar group;

2) common Turkic group.

The Bulgar group is allocated to the Bulgarians of Volga and Danube, from the language of Volga

Bulgars is spread Chuvash language. A common Turkic language is divided into three macro groups:

1) the Yakut-Dolgan languages;

2) Sayan languages;

3) Oguz languages, «Kyrgyz», the northern Altai, central east, the Karluk and Kipchak languages are separated from Oguz branches (Dybo, 2007: 65).

Considering Turkic language from the basis of glottochronology Professor O.A. Mudrak divided the Kipchak language group into five ones: South Bashkir and East Bashkir languages; Volga Tatar and Siberian Tatar languages; Kazakh and Kalpak languages; Karachay-Balkar, Kumyk languages; Karayim and Crimea Tatar languages (Mudrak, 2009: 175).

Comparative study of all the classifications concerning the Turkic language makes it possible to find similarity of phonetic system and morphological structure of the languages relating to the modern Kipchak language. The given fact can be explained by genetic and historical proximity of the ethnoses speaking those languages and no principal contradiction in their distinctions is featured by scholars. The research of the well-known scientist K.M. Musayev, who studied the general lexicon by comparing West Kipchak language on the level of common Turkic languages proved the historical and genetic proximity of modern Kipchak languages from lexical and semantic point of view (Musayev, 1984: 20).

The ability of language to from one basis and not to keep the features of the main language at the same level depends on the internal and external factors and is called lingua evolutional regularity. The lexical composition and grammatical structure and sound system of modern Turkic languages are formed on the basis of the ancient Turkic. Turkic languages inherited undertaking common vocabulary from Proto-Turkic, while preserving the layer forming a common Turkic gentility meaning, had undergone to sound and morphological changes. This process was explained by scientist E.R.Tenishev as follows «In YII-YIII centuries Oguz and Kipchaks acquired j- language, the Uygurs – d language , but the Kirghiz z – one» (Tenishev, 1976:165).

The fact that the ancient Bulgarian language had a link to Kipchak languages and possessed the characteristics of Oguz language, included in the same group, is explained by interaction with other languages, for example, (Karachay Balkar, karzykam, Crimean Tatar languages with Azerbaijan language). In addition, a favorable geographic location contributed to languages relations. Interaction of languages descended from the ancient Kipchak (elements of Oguz language found in ancient Kipchak) such as

Karakalpak, Kazakh, Kipchak dialect of Uzbek to Karluk languages (Uzbek and Uighur), Oguz languages of Norgay language family (Turkish, Turkmen, Azeri) and as well with the Bulgarian languages (Chuvash) led to a change of the Kipchak lexical layer in these languages (Róna-Tas, 1982:15).

Such differences are determined on the basis of similarities in sound form of words. Separation of specific vocabulary peculiar to the ancient Kipchak from Turkic is one of the challenges in the history of Turkic languages. Zh.Mankeeva relying on certain scientific research results in modern Turkology, managed to indicate the principle of determining the Turkic layer. The scientist taking cultural lexicon in Kipchak language as an object of research, determined condition in the Kipchak group layer classification (Mankeeva, 1997: 37).

Preserving the elements of ancient Kipchak language, not only in the group of Kipchak languages, but also in other groups of Turkic languages is explained by the fact that, the area of distribution of ancient Kipchak language was quite broad.

The lexics of general Kipchak layer are repeated in the Azerbaijan language on the shores of the Black Sea, the Caucasus, Turkic, Turkmen language and in the language of Turkic people of Central Asia located on the coast of the Volga.

According to the study kipshakizms in the Turkic languages of Central Asia and the coast of the Volga are «Pure Kipchak» and words of Kipchak languages spread on the territory of the Black Sea, the Caucasus due to the favorable geographic conditions are found to be kipchakizms formed as a result of the second wave of relations(Hadjiyeva, 1986: 70).

The language of ancient Turkic written monuments related to the Middle century is regarded as the evidence of the preservation of the traces of Kipchak – Oguz language association. Possession of individual characteristics of both languages, Ogyz and Kipchak is not a matter of splitting of one language into two, but the ability of these languages to keep their own peculiar features to be alive. As a result, it was revealed that, in modern Kipchak languages group the Kipchak property prevails in Kazakh, Nogay, Karakalpak languages and in the Tatar dialect.

The Kipchak elements are divided into four types according to the differences in forms as well as other properties in Oghuz languages: 1) pure Kipchak words (remaining from the Oguz-Kipchak linguistic associations); 2) kipchakizms formed in the result of favorable geographic relations; 3) kipchakizms based on poetry and mutual literary language interrelations; 4) false Kipchakizms formed as a result of random coincidence and convergence process development (Hadjiyeva, 1986:73).

The systematization of Kipchak elements is based on a rigorous methodology, based on complex linguistic analysis in modern Turkic languages. All registered parallel phenomena in Turkic languages may not show the same genetic unit (not on common Turkic basis). Therefore, when determining the Kipchak signs in the Oghuz, Karluk, Bulgarian languages it is necessary to remember that there were statistic universals to be found in Turkic languages like in other ones, i.e. latitude of potential opportunities of sound changes.

The delabialization, spirantalization and other processes of sound system which are met in both languages, Kipchak and Oguz give representations of convergent isogloss phenomena. For example, the brevity of vowels in the Tatar language is connected with a reduction, there isn't any phonetic influences of brevity vowels in Azerbaijan language, and transition of a sound $\kappa$ in Chuvash language to a sound $x$ is connected with promotion of language a little forward and carried out on the basis of reduction of a sound for example, in tatar language kĭš ~in chuvash language $xel$ «winter». Regional isoglosses shown in each language can be either of synchronous and systematical conditional types, for example: transitions č≈š, š≈s met in micro areas of Kazakh, Karakalpak, Norgay languages (Eker, 1998:15).

Convergence of genetic groups in Turkic languages is defined only on the basis of language data. In structure of isogloss phenomena there can be not only generated on the basis of influence against each other language of adjacent people elements, but also the signs of ancient relics inherent in the basic language, and the ancient forms which have remained after historical migrations.

Taking into consideration the convergence of genetic groups in the Turkic languages V.M Zhirmunsky noticed that: «... isoglosses of common Turkic dialect atlas beyond the scope of today's national republics and national language, pointed to the more ancient genetic relationships between tribes and peoples, their dialects and languages» (Zhirmunsky, 1966: 56).

So it is necessary to involve not only literary language but also its micro areal groups into the study to recover purely clean Kipchak layers in modern Kipchak languages. The use of dialectological research results of modern languages in connection with studies of ancient Turkic language manuscripts is a particularly important matter (Tryarsky, 1976: 326).

A deep understanding of nature of dialects along with data on the literary language will significantly expand the area of comparative linguistics and development, direction and intermediates of sound changes in related languages, and in some cases, the original version of these languages may be determined by the phenomena inherent in the existing languages. The micro-areal groups may show signs and historical stratifications, including various chronological stages of the evolution of language. Also, the description of areal linguistic units with cognitive-structural point of view, consideration of language layers at different evolutionary-phase level makes it possible, firstly, to learn the phenomenon of language as a unity invariants, set of alloemic elements, and secondly, open the way to the definition of internal, external linguistic factors of historical change, and to determine the influence of interlingual contacts.

Numerous preservation of Kipchak language traits in monuments of VI-IX centuries, constant repetition of these features in Turkic languages of modern Kipchak group, then in literary language, then in dialectal features, the using of Turkic Kipchak ethnonyms in the language of monument Moiyn Čhursk as the title of one ethnic group indicates the proximity to truth proposed at one time known scientists assumptions about possible using in synonymous meaning of names «Turk» and «Kipchak». Hereditary consequence in lingua evolution i.e. a linguistic phenomenon, existing in parallel with a genetic sequence in organs, human blood. So from common Turkic Orkhon, Yenisey, Talas monuments is much that is taken from languages entering in modern group of Kipchak languages (Tekin, 2000: 26).

All ethnic groups speaking the language of Kipchak group to some extent are related to the ancient Kipchak language, and if some of the language from the very beginning were formed on the basis of Kipchak language, the another group Kipchak features had become dominant later. Preservation of elements of the Oguz, Karluk, Bulgarian languages in the language of all the ethnic groups who speak Kipchak language, shows not only the passing of complicated and contradictory ways of lingua-ethnical, linguistic evolutionary development of forma-tion of languages of Turkic people, but also reveals the depth of historical roots, originating from Turkic language.

**Conclusion**

Not surprisingly, there are many unknowns still valuable heritages in the storeroom of history to modern generations of Kazakh people who survived at different times, in different centuries many things associated with the semi-nomadic way of life, with different political and social circumstances. Ancient Kipchak, Kazakh written historical monuments as well as samples of oral literature transferred from memory of one generation to another take a special place in determining the path of development of the Kazakh language and its historical place among the Turkic languages. R. Syzdykova indicates: «In XY-XYII centuries in the cultural life of Kazakh people existed newly formed people's spoken language and literary language, which was developed through ongoing verbal anciently language poetry of patrimonial-tribes who formed Kazakh people» (Syzdykova, 1981:60). Language used in that time by tribes and people who made their contribution to the formation of a separate nation on the basis of ethno genesis of Kazakh people, is regarded as the historical root of modern Kazakh language. If the languages related to Turkic tribes, such as Saks (3rd-1st century BC), Uysin (1st millennium BC), Kangly (1st millennium BC), Guns (3rd millennium BC-1st millennium BC), etc., were considered to be the source of modern Kazakh language, so the languages and dialects of old Turkic tribes of Bulgars, Kipchaks, Oghuz, Karluks, lived between Y and XY centuries AD were regarded as its branches. The main phonetic laws between old Turkic and Kazakh-coincidences d≈z≈j, n≈ŋ≈j, γ/g≈w, γ/g≈j, strengthening elision sounds γ, g-fit to this period (Y-XY centuries).

As a result of combining and merging all related tribal groups included in the territories of the Kazakh Khanate (Uysin, Kanly Kipchak, Argyn, Dulat, Shapirashty, Zhalayr, Sirgeli, Alban, Suan, Konyrat, Nayman, Kerey, Alshyn etc.) formed a monolithic integration national Kazakh language and acquired a general structure of language.

**References**

Baskakov N. A. (1969) Introduction to the study of the Turkic languages. – Moscow: High school. -384 p.
Bogoroditsky V. A. (1953) Introduction to Tatar linguistics in connection with other Turkic languages. – Kazan: Tatizd – 220 p.
Dybo A.V. (2007) Linguistic contacts of the early Turks: lexical fund: the Pratyurk period. – Moscow: Oriental literature. – 221 p.

Eker S. (1998) Comparative phonology of Kipchak Group Turkic languages. – 500p.

Khadzhieva N. Z. (1986) On some complex issues of methodology for studying the history of the Turkic languages». – Leningrad: Nauka, – 70-73.

Kaidar A. T. (1998) historical lexicology of the Kazakh language: problems and tasks // actual problems of the Kazakh language. – Almaty. – 211p.

Kaidar AT (2004) Kangli. – Almaty: Dyke-Press, 2004. – 610 p.

Korsh F. E. (1910) Classification of the Turkic languages// Ethnographic collection. – St. Petersburg, 1910. – 76 p.

Kuzmin-Yumanadi Ya. F., Zakiev M. Z., (1996) Volga Bulgars and their descendants. – Kazan: INSAN, 140.

Mankeeva Zh. (1997) National character of cultural vocabulary. – Almaty: Science, 1997.– 272 p.

Mudrak O.A. (2009) Classification of Turkic languages and dialects. – Moscow: Institute of Oriental Cultures and Antiquity. – 191 s

Musaev K.M. (1984) Lexicology of Turkic languages. – Moscow: Science. – 232 p.

Räsänen, M. (1935). Türkische Lehnwörter in den permischen Sprachen und im tscheremissischen. FUF. XXIII.

Ramstedt, G. J. (1957), Vvedeniye v Altayskoye Yazıkoznaniye, Morfoloji, Moskova.

Róna-Tas, A. (1982). The Periodization and Sources of Chuvash Linguistic History. Chuwash Studie. Budapest.

Samoilovich A.N. (2005) Turkic linguistics. Philology. Runic. – Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura RAN, 2005 – 1053 p.

Syzdykova R. (1981) XV-XVII centuries. Kazakh language, literature, history and development paths. – Almaty, 60-86.

Tekin T.A. (1990) A new classification of the Turkic languages. Türk dilleri araştırmaları. – Ankarauhm. – S. 5-18.

Tekin T. (2000) Orhun Türkçesi Grameri, Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi. − Ankara: Sanat Kitabevi. – 290 s.

E.R. Tenishev (1976) On the supra-dialectal nature of the language of the Turkic runic monuments / Turcologica. – Leningrad: Science. – p. 165.

Tryarsky E. (1976) Once again about the method of publishing runic inscriptions. Moscow: Science. – 326 p.

Zhirmunsky V.M. (1966.) About some questions of the linguistic geography of the Turkic dialects. Moscow. – 56 p.

**References**

Baskakov N.A. (1969) Vvedeniye v izucheniye tyurkskih yazykov. – Moskva: Vysshaya shkola. –384 s. (in Russian)

Bogorodiskiy V.A. (1953) Vvedeniye v tatarskoe yazykoznaniye v svyazi s drugimi tyurkskimi yazykami. – Kazan: Tatizd. – 220 s. (in Russian)

Dybo A.V. (2007) Lingvisticheskiye kontakty rannih tyurkov: leksicheskiy fond: pratyurkskiy period. – M.: Vostochnaya literatura. – 221 s. (in Russian)

Eker S. (1998) Kipchak grubu Türk dillerinin karshilashtirmali ses bilgisi. – 500s. (in Turkish)

Khadzhiyeva N.Z. (1986) O nekotoryh slozhnyh voprosah metodologii izucheniya istorii tyurkskih yazykov». – Leningrad: Nauka, –70-73. (in Russian)

Kaidar A.T. (1998) Kazak tilinin tarihi leksiologiyasy: problemalary men mindetteri// Kazak tilinin ozekti maseleleri. – Almaty. – 211b. (in Kazakh)

Kaidar A.T. (2004) Kanly – Almaty: Daik-Press, 2004. – 610 b. (in Kazakh)

Korsh F.E. (1910) Klassifikasiya tyurkskih yazykov// Etnograficheskiy sbornik. – SBb., 1910. – 76 s. (in Russian)

Kuzmin-Yumanadi Ya. F., Zakiyev M. Z., (1996) Volzheskiye bulgary I ih potomki. – Kazan: Insan, 140s. (in Tatar)

Mankeeva Zh. (1997) Madeni leksikanin ulttyk sipaty. – Almaty: Gylym, 1997.– 272 b. (in Kazakh)

Mudrak O.A. (2009) Klassifikasiya tyurkskih yazykov I dialektov. – Moskva: Institut vostochnyh kultur I antichnosti. – 191 s. (in Russian)

Musayev K.M. (1984) Leksikologiya tyurkskih yazykov. – Moskva: Nauka. – 232 s. (in Russian)

Räsänen, M. (1935) Türkische Lehnwörter in den permischen Sprachen und im tscheremissischen. FUF. XXIII. (in German)

Ramstedt, G. J. (1957), Vvedeniye v Altayskoye Yazıkoznaniye, Morfoloji, Moskova. (in German)

Róna-Tas, A. (1982). The Periodization and Sources of Chuvash Linguistic History. Chuwash Studie. Budapest. (in English)

Samoilovich A.N. (2005) Tyurkskoe yazykoznaniye. Filologiya. Runika. – Moskva: Vostochnaya literatura RAN, 2005. – 1053 s. (in Russian)

Syzdykova R. (1981) XV-XVII v. Kazakskiy yazyk, literatura, istoriya I puti razvitiya. – Almaty, 60-86s. (in Kazakh)

Tekin T.A. (1990) A new classification of the Turkic languages. Türk dilleri araştırmaları. – Ankarauhm. – S. 5-18. (in Turkish)

Tekin T. (2000) Orhun Türkçesi Grameri, Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi. −Ankara: Sanat Kitabevi. – 290 s. (in Turkish)

Tenishev E.R. (1976) O naddialektnom kharaktere yazyka tyurkskih runicheskih pamyatnikov/ Turcologica. – Leningrad: Nauka. – 165s. (in Russian)

Tryarskiy E. (1976) Yeshe raz o sposobe publikasiyii runicheskih nadpisei. Moskva: Nauka. – 326 s. (in Russian)

Zhirmunskiy V.M. (1966.) O nekotoryh voprosah lingvisticheskoi geografii tyurkskih dialektov. Moskva. – 56 s. (in Russian)