ISSN 1799-2591 (print); ISSN 2053-0692 (online)
Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 16, No. 9, pp. 2956-2965, September 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1609.04

Verbs in the Uyuk-Turan Monument: A Grammatical and Semantic Comparison With Modern Kazakh and Tuvan

Anarkul Salkynbay
Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Bauyrzhan Kaspikhan
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Ibodulla Mirzayev
Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Barno Qodirova
Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University Named after Sh. Rashidov, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Dilfuza Raxmatova
Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University Named after Sh. Rashidov, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Iroda Ernazarova
Sharof Rashidov Samarkand State University, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Dilzoda Mirzaeva
Samarkand State University, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Shapagat Zhalmakhanov*
Kazakh Linguistics of the E.A.Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan;
Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

***Abstract*—The article analyzes verbs attested in the Yenisei group of Old Turkic inscriptions. Among Turkic written monuments, the Yenisei inscriptions are distinguished by their specific graphic features and short epitaphic texts. Despite its small size, the *Uyuk-Turan* monument, discovered near the town of Turan in the present-day Republic of Tuva, provides extensive information on the verbal system of the Turkic period through the verbs used in its text. *The aim of the study* is to identify the grammatical and semantic features of the verbs occurring in the *Uyuk-Turan* monument, to compare their meanings with corresponding forms in modern Kazakh and Tuvan, and to conduct an in-depth analysis of the historical and linguistic relationships between these languages. *The research material* includes four verbal forms—*bökmädim, adïrïltïm, bantïm,* and *qazγaqïm*—extracted from the Uyuk-Turan monument and compared with ancient and modern verb forms in Kazakh and Tuvan. *The relevance of the study* lies in the fact that the form qazγaqïm has been interpreted differently by scholars: some regard it as a nominal form, while others classify it as a verb. *The scholarly significance of the research* is determined by the fact that, although the Old Turkic inscriptions of the Yenisei region are limited in size, semantic analysis of verbal forms contributes to improving the accuracy of text interpretation and translation. *As a result of the study,* different translation variants were compared, leading to the conclusion that the form qazγaqïm should be identified as a verbal form.**

***Index Terms*—verb categories, voice, Yenisei inscriptions, Old Turkic verb semantics, Kazakh language**

I. Introduction

Verbs indicate the closeness of modern Turkic languages and their uniqueness from other language groups. Both the

* Corresponding Author. Email: szhalmakhanov@bk.ru

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

semantic character and the grammatical specificity of verbs are particularly important in determining the kinship of modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages compared to other classes of words. Determining the general regularities and finding a common usage between verbs of Kazakh and Tuvan languages, especially single-syllable verbs, in terms of their development and modern function is scientifically relevant, as it has not been studied in depth before.

The primary aim of the scholarly article is to identify the grammatical and semantic features of the verbs attested in the *Uyuk-Turan* monument (Aydın, 2025; Bakır, 2025), to compare their meanings with those of corresponding forms in modern Kazakh and Tuvan, and to conduct an in-depth examination of the historical and linguistic relationships between these languages. Although verb categories have been extensively studied in Turkic linguistics, they still require further comprehensive investigation. By comparing the manifestations of verb categories in modern Kazakh and Tuvan with data from Old Turkic monuments, the study explores the developmental dynamics of modern verbs and yields new insights into the preservation and transformation of Old Turkic verbal forms in contemporary Turkic languages.

The first works on verbs in Turkic philology include Kashkari's (1997b) dictionary "Diwani lugat-it-Turk". In this medieval encyclopaedia, Kashkari reveals nouns derived from verbs, ways of deriving verbs from nouns, their tenses, ways of forming their negative forms, and the meanings of verbs. Kashkari reveals how participles, forms of adverbial participles, and peculiarities of verbs in the imperative mood are formed in Turkic languages.

The founder of Kazakh linguistics Baitursynuly (2022) defined a verb as 'words indicating complete and incomplete actions of an object' in his work "Til-qural" (Language Guide) in 1915, and distinguished positive and negative forms of verbs, two different kinds of verbs, such as participle and adverbial participle, 10 kinds of voices, and 14 kinds of moods. In Kazakh linguistics, information about the verb is given in the works of K. Zhubanov, S. Amanzholov that were dedicated to grammar and in the book "Modern Kazakh language" (Balakaev at al., 1954), which analyses the way of verb formation, compound verbs, positive and negative forms of verbs, transitive and intransitive verbs, 5 types of voices, 5 types of moods, and categories of participles and adverbial particles.

In linguistics, the knowledge base about each category of part of speech, like the verb, relied on writing separate research papers. In 1950-1960, substantial studies of verb categories in Kazakh linguistics were published, such as Sauranbaev's (1942) works on adverbial particles in the Kazakh language, Kordabaev's (1949) works on the category of tenses, Mamanov's (1949) works on auxiliary verbs, and Kalybaeva's (1951) works on verbs were published. Special focus was given to derivative and non-derivative verbs, auxiliary verbs, the category of verb moods, and state of verbs in these studies. The works on analytical forms of verbs were published, and the stylistic functions of verbs were discussed. Since the 80s, the verb has been widely studied in the semantic aspect (Orazov, 1983).

Scientific research work on the Tuvan language, on the other hand, began in 1861 with the works of W. Radloff and N.F. Katanov. N.F. Katanov's works contain some valuable opinions on the peculiarities of the Tuvan language, on the category of verb tenses in the Tuvan language. Iskhakov and Palmbach (1961) write on derivative and non-derivative verbs, verb formation, verb categories, negative verbs, adverbial participles and participles, mood categories, auxiliary verbs. Tatarintsev (1987) writes on the semantics of the Tuvan language from the synchronic and diachronic lens. His etymological dictionary contains an analysis of the history of the origin of words and verbs of the Tuvan language.

In the history of language development, the study of the nature of verbs in ancient times and the Middle Ages is closely related to the study of the language of monuments. The study of verbs in the Old Turkic era began at a time when the collection and publication of monumental materials was gaining momentum. For example, Radloff (1897) in his work, written in connection with the language of ancient Turkic written monuments, reflects the verbs in monuments, the classification of verbs, tense forms, participle and adverbial participle forms. In the last part of his research, Thomsen (1896) gives an indication of grammatical forms in Orkhon monuments and enumerates verb forms, while in the grammars published in the XX century, verb forms are more widely analyzed.

II. Research Data and Methods

As the sources of the study, materials from epitaphic monuments discovered along the Yenisei River were used to compare ancient and modern verbal forms. In particular, the verbal forms attested in the *Uyuk-Turan* monument were compared with data from contemporary languages. Texts in modern Kazakh and Tuvan, scholarly works on the morphology of the Kazakh and Tuvan languages, as well as lexicographical sources, were used as research materials.

The research employs both diachronic and synchronic linguistic methods. Morphological analysis was used to describe verb forms in the modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages and to compare their verb categories. To highlight the specific features of the verbs, a semantic analysis was conducted, and their usage in context was explained. The historical-comparative method was employed to compare modern verb forms with their ancient counterparts.

The study draws on the works of scholars who have investigated Old Turkic written monuments, including W. Radloff, V. Thomsen, H.N. Orkun, S.E. Malov, I.A. Batmanov, A. Kuryshzhanov, M. Tomanov, I.V. Kormushin, A.S. Amanzholov, N. Bazylkhan, Zh. Tuimebayev, and M. Yeskeyeva. Studies on verbs in the Kazakh language by A. Baitursynuly, K. Zhubanov, S. Amanzholov, N.T. Sauranbaev, T. Kordabaev, I. Mamanov, A. Yskakov, A. Kalybayeva, M. Tomanov, B. Sagyndykuly, and A.B. Salkynbay are also taken into account. In addition, research on Tuvan linguistic materials by W. Radloff, N.F. Katanov, F.G. Iskhakov, A.A. Palmbakh, and B.I. Tatarintsev forms an important part of the research framework. The contributions of these scholars to the issue under consideration are examined separately in the Discussion and Results sections of the article. *The object of analysis* is the verbs attested in the *Uyuk-Turan* monument.

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

III. Discussion and Results

Data on this monument are published in atlases compiled by Aspelin (1889) and Radloff (1893). D.A. Clementz in the description of the monument reports that the text is written on the south and north sides of the deer stone and the image of animals and symbols are depicted on the same stone. The *Uyuk-Turan* monument was read and interpreted in different years by Radloff (1895), Orkun (1940), Malov (1952), Kormushin (1997), Bazylkhan (2005), Amanzholov (2010). Batmanov (1959) analyses the words in the text of the monument, observing the reading and translation of S.E. Malov in the textbook. Kuryshzhanov and Tomanov (1964) give the transcription of the monument according to the work of S.E. Malov, translating each word according to the meaning given in the text and publishing it with notes.

In 1887, the monument was first identified and documented by I.G. Funtikov. The deer stone is composed of red-grey sandstone, and the monument contains six lines of text, as well as images of saiga, deer and symbols. The monument's text is comprised of six lines, with the initial three lines situated on the north face (front side) and the remaining three lines on the south face (back side). The monument features a combined symbol comprising a crescent moon and a saddle. In his study, Kormushin (1997) refers to this symbol as the "duga na kreste" and notes the existence of three monuments that depict this symbol without diacritical marks. In the course of the work, the scientific translations of the text of the monument found in the literature were compared, and the transliteration and translation made by A.S. Amanzholov were taken as a basis (see Table 1).

Table 1
The Text and Transliteration of the Uyuk-Turan Monument

Text	
𐰋𐰇𐰋𐰢:𐰇𐰇𐰃:𐰋𐰏𐰢:𐰋𐰇𐰋𐰢:𐰋𐰋𐰋𐰣:𐰇𐰇𐰃:𐰇𐰋𐰍:𐰇𐰇𐰃:𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰇𐰋𐰍:𐰃𐰇𐰋𐰢	1
𐰇𐰇𐰃:𐰇𐰋𐰍𐰀:𐰋𐰋𐰋𐰣:𐰇𐰢:𐰋𐰇𐰃𐰀𐰋:𐰋𐰇𐰃:𐰇𐰋𐰢:𐰇𐰢𐰇𐰇	2
𐰏𐰢:𐰇𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰇𐰋:𐰋𐰇𐰃:𐰀𐰇𐰀𐰢:𐰇𐰇𐰀:𐰏𐰢:𐰇𐰇𐰀	3
𐰋𐰇𐰋𐰢:𐰇𐰢𐰋𐰇𐰀:𐰇𐰋𐰇𐰃𐰣:𐰋𐰇𐰋𐰢:𐰇𐰋𐰋𐰃:𐰋𐰋𐰇𐰃𐰀:𐰇𐰇	4
𐰋𐰇𐰇𐰃:𐰀𐰇𐰢𐰇𐰇:𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰇𐰢𐰋𐰇𐰃:𐰇𐰋𐰇𐰋	5
𐰋𐰋𐰋𐰢 :𐰋𐰇𐰏𐰢𐰏:𐰋𐰇𐰏:𐰋𐰇𐰏𐰣𐰋𐰢:𐰇𐰇𐰀:𐰇𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰇𐰋𐰋:𐰇𐰋𐰀:𐰋𐰋𐰀:𐰇𐰋𐰇𐰋:𐰇𐰇𐰋𐰇𐰋:𐰇𐰇𐰋𐰇𐰋	6
Transliteration	
1	qujda qunčujïm özdä oγlïm jïta bökmädim adïrïltïm kinim qadašïm jïta adïrïltïm
2	altunlïγ kišig bilimtä bantïm täŋri ilimkä bökmädim äsizimä jïta
3	üčin külüg tirig bän täŋri ilimtä jämlig bän
4	üč jitmiš jašïmqa adïrïltïm ägük qatum järimkä adïrïltïm
5	täŋri ilimkä qazγaqïm oγlïm nä uz oγlïm altï biŋ juntïm
6	qanïm tülbäri qara bodun külüg qadašïm äsizim äl äšïm är ögäl är oγlan är küdägülärim qïz kälinlärim bökmädim.

In the *Uyuk-Turan* monument, four verbs *bökmädim, adïrïltim, bantïm, qazγaqïm* are identified. The objective of this study is to analyse the morphological construction and function of these verbs in sentences.

In the Deer stone, the verb *'bökmädim'* is marked as 𐰋𐰇𐰋𐰢 and is featured in all three lines of the text. A comparison of the translations of the monument reveals that the scientists involved have read the verb differently, yet the translations are similar. To illustrate, the first line of the monument has been translated by the researchers as follows:

Radloff (1895):
kyıda кунчujым сіздä оҕлым jыта сізімä jыта бүмäдім адырылтым кунум кадашым jыта адырылтым
Bei euch, meinen Kuntcschui im Kui, meinen Söhnen, bei euch, den Meinen, konnte ich nicht verweilen, habe ich mich getrennt, von meinen Leuten, meinen Gefährten habe ich mich getrennt.
(With you, my Kuntcschui in Kui, my sons, with you, my own, I could not stay; I have separated myself from my people, from my companions I have separated).

Orkun (1940):
*k*uyda *k*on<u>ç</u>^{u}y^{ı}m y^{a}z^{ı}da ogl^{ı}m ^{a}y^{ı}ta s^{i}z^{i}me ^{a}y^{ı}ta b^{ü}km^{e}d^{i}m ^{a}d^{ı}r^{ı}lt^{ı}m kün^{i}m k^{a}d^{a}şım ^{a}y^{ı}ta ^{a}d^{ı}r^{ı}lt^{ı}m
kuyda prensesim, yaylada oğlum söyleye, sizlerime söyleye doymadım; ayrıldım. Halkım, arkadaşlarım söyleye; ayrıldım.
(My princess in Kuy, my son on the summer pasture, I did not get enough of speaking to you, my loved ones; I separated. Speaking to my people, my friends; I separated).

Malov (1952):
kyıда кунчujым сіздä оҕлым jыта сізімä jыта бөкмäдім адырылтым кунім кадашым jыта адырылтым.
От вас, мои суприги (принцессы, живущие) в терему; мои сыновья, о горе, в отношении вас, скорбя, я не насладился и отделился (т.е. умер). Мои подруги и приятели, о горе, я отделился (т.е. умер от вас)!
(From you, my spouses (princesses, living) in the palace; my sons, oh woe, in relation to you, grieving, I did not enjoy to the full and separated (i.e. died). My female friends and mates, oh woe, I separated (i.e. died from you))!

Batmanov (1959):

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

Куйда кунчуйым сизде оглым йыта сизиме йыта бөкмедим, адырылтым күним кадашым йыта адырылтым

От вас, мои супруги (принцессы, живущие) в тереме; мои сыновья, о горе, в отношении Вас, скорбя, я не насладился и отделился (т.е. умер) (Или: От моей принцессы в тереме, от вас, мой сын, скорбя, от вас, скорбя, я не насладился. – *И.Б.*). Мои подруги (род – *И.Б.*) и приятели, о горе, я отделился (т.е. умер).

(From you, my spouses (princesses, living) in the palace; my sons, oh woe, in relation to you, grieving, I did not enjoy to the full and separated (i.e. died). (Or: From my princess in the tower, from you, my son, grieving, from you, grieving, I did not enjoy to the fullest. – *I.B.*). My female friends (by blood – *I.B.*) and buddies, oh woe, I separated (i.e. died)).

Kuryszhanov, A., Tomanov, M.:

Қуйда қунчуйым, сізде оғлым, йыта, сізіме, йыта, бөкмедім, адырылтым, күңім-қадашым, йыта, адырылтым.

Құйдағы ханым, сізге, ұлым, қасірет тартып, сізге, қасірет тартып, тоймадым (мейірім қанбады), айырылдым (қайтыс болдым), жора-жолдасым, қасірет шегіп, айырылдым (қайтыс болдым).

(My lady at home, I suffered, my son, I suffered, I did not have enough (I wasn't satisfied), I lost (I died), my friend, I suffered and lost (I died).

Kormushin, I.V.:

qujda qunčujïm özdä oγlïm jïta äsizim-ä jïta bökmädim adïrïltïm kinim qadašïm jïta adïrïltïm

Мои супруги в женских покоях, мои родные сыновья, – как грустно, как жаль мне! Грустно, – я не насладился [вами] и разлучился [с вами]! Мои потомки, мои родственники, – грустно, я разлучился [с вами]!

(My spouses in the women's quarters, my own sons, how sad, how sorry I am! Mournfully, I did not enjoy [you] and was separated [from you]! My descendants, my relatives, sadly, I was separated [from you])!

Bazylkhan, N.:

Quyïda: qunčuyïm: özde: oγulïm: jïta: esizime: jïta: bökümedim: adïrïldïm: ekinim: qadašïm: jïta: adïrïldïm:

Құзда: ханшайымым: өзекте: ұлым: жетім: иесізіме: жетім: бөгеле алмадым: айырылдым: нағашым: немере ағайыным: жетім: айырылдым.

(On the cliff: my princess: in the core: my son: orphan: my orphaned: parentless: I was not blocked: I was deprived: my uncle: my grandson: I was deprived).

Amanzholov, A.:

qujda qu<u>nč</u>^{u}j^{ï}m özdä oγl^{ï}m j^{ï}ta ^{ä}s^{i}z^{i}mä j^{ï}ta b^{ö}km^{ä}d^{i}m ^{a}d^{ï}r^{ï}lt^{ï}m kin^{i}m q^{a}d^{a}š^{ï}m j^{ï}ta ^{a}d^{ï}r^{ï}lt^{ï}m

В покоях моя госпожа, в долине мой сын [мои сыновья], увы, как мне жаль, увы, я не насладился и отделился (расстался с земный существованием). Мои родные (единоутробные братья и сестры?), мои родственники (по крови?), увы, я отделился.

(In the chamber is my lady, in the valley is my son [my sons], alas, how sorry I am, alas, I have not enjoyed and have separated (parted from the earthly life). My kinsmen [my siblings], my relatives [by blood?], alas, I have become separated).

The verb '*bökmädim*' has been translated by researchers as either '*I could not get enough*' or '*I could not stay longer*', depending on the content of the text in question. Upon analysing the construction of the verb, it becomes evident that both translations are based on the same foundation. In the text, the root of the verb that takes the form of '*bökmädim*' is *bök*. The forms *-ma* and *-mä* serve to negate the verb. The *-dï* and *-di* forms indicate the past tense of the verb, whereas the *-m* form denotes the first person singular of the personal ending.

The following definitions are provided in Kashkari's (1997b) dictionary:

The term "*БӨКДІ*" is defined as "бөкті." "*Ол ашдын бөкті – Ол асқа бөкті*; that is to say, he ate his fill. *Ол таварқа бөкді – Ол тауарга бөкті; оның көзі мал-мүлікке тойды*; he derived pleasure from observing the property". The same can be said of other cases: "*Бөкер-бөкмек*" is the same as"*бөгер-бөкпек*".

БӨГДІ: *бөгеді*, *жиды*. "*Ол сұвұғ бөгді – Ол суды бөгеді*; he ceased the waterway and collected". The same can be said of the following examples: "*Бег сүсін бөгді – Бек қосынын жиды* – Bek assembled his military forces". The term "*Бөгер-бөгмек – бөгер-бөгемек*".

A review of the definitions provided in the dictionary reveals that both the verb "*бөк*," which conveys the meaning of "*тою*," and the verb "*бөк*," which has the meaning of "*жию,*" "*бөгеу,*" share the same semantic root, "толу," "толысу," and "жиналу" (to be full, to fill up, to gather). As there is a connection between the words *толу* and *тою*, there is also a correlation between *бөгу* and *бөгелу*. In ancient times, monosyllabic roots had a multitude of meanings. A review of the historical development of the Turkic languages reveals a clear genetic connection between the symbols *k~g*. Consequently, both versions of the aforementioned translation are based on the same foundation.

The definitions presented in the ancient Turkic dictionary for the term "*bök*" also serve to substantiate our assertion.

"BÖK- I. 1. to fill up, to be satiated; 2. to be satisfied, to be pleased, to enjoy; 3. to be surfeited.

BÖK- II. 1. to dam, block up; 2. *fig.* to gather (about troops)" (Nadelyaev et al., 1969).

The meanings of this verb have also been preserved in both the modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages. First, it is crucial

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

to examine the meanings of the word *бөк* as it is used in the modern Kazakh language.

БӨК 1. The swelling of food or grass in the stomach. 2. To saturate with water, to drown. 3. *Fig,* to eat too much food (feed); suffer from indigestion (Zhanuzakov, 2008).

From the provided definition, it can be observed that the meaning *тою* of the verb is maintained in the target language. It is also observed that there are semantic fields *ұлғаю, көбею, жиналу* (increase, multiply, gather) that originate from two distinct versions: the first pertains to the swelling of food or grass, while the second is associated with the act of eating too much food (feeding).

In the Tuvan language, there are several words that have preserved the meaning of the verb "gather", including *бөкпек, бөкперлеш,* and *бөкпегер*. In regard to the etymology of the term *"бөкпек,"* which denotes a bouquet, group, or crowd, Tatarintsev (1987) offers the following hypothesis:

"No direct correspondences have been found. Apparently, *bökpek* < **bök-mek*, where *-mek* is a common in the Turkic languages affix from verb formation (in Tuvan – dead formant), and *bök-* is a verbal stem recorded in Old Turkic monuments in the meaning 'to gather', which is interpreted as a figurative meaning of the verb *bök-* 'to dam, block (water)'. The term *bo'kpeger*, which denotes a 'thick tree' or 'thick bush' in the Tuvan language, also encompasses the meanings of "*gathering*," "*multiplication,*" and "*increase*".

In the Kazakh language, the meaning of the word *бөк* "to get one's fill" is related to the meaning of "to be full, to gather". From the literature "*Шаққа жеттім шалғайда шаңға бөккен шатпама, Шалқалай түсіп сұладым, жаныма дерт батса да* (I have hardly reached the farthest place in the dust, I have dropped from the tiredness on my back, even the disease has given pain)" (A. Kekilbay), "*Күндер, күндер... Бастан қанша өттіңдер, Қанша рет шаттығыма бөктіңдер* (Days, days... How many times have you been through, How many times have you made me happy) (G. Seitzhan), we see that the language use *шаңға бөккен* is used in the meaning of *being in dust* or *шаттығыма бөктіңдер* as *made me happy*.

A review of the available data suggests that the verb '*bökmädim*' was employed in the Uyuk-Turan monument with the connotation of *'I was not full, wasn't satisfied'* (Kuryshzhanov & Tomanov, 1964) and *I wasn't satiated* (Amanzholov, 2012).

The first and fourth lines of the monument employ the verb '*adïrïltim'*. The verb is translated by researchers as "lost" or "died". The aforementioned verb is frequently observed in this context in monuments discovered along the Yenisei River, inscribed in an epitaph style.

If we take the root *adïr* of the verb *adïrïltïm*, labelled as 𐰀𐰋𐰼𐰇𐰾, it must be stated that the word itself is derived from the word **ad (aj)*. The form of the verb '*-ïl*' is that of an intransitive verb, the form '*-tï*' is indicative of the past tense, and the form '*-m*' is that of the first person.

The ancient Turkic dictionary enumerates the following meanings of the word *adïrïl*:

"ADÏRÏL- *passive form of* adïr- 1. to be separated; 2. to separate, to part, to disunite; 3. *fig*. to separate from, to be divided from (in the sense of to die)".

The monument used the third figurative meaning given in the dictionary – *be separated, be disunited, pass away*. In ancient Turkic written monuments, the meaning of passing away is given by different linguistic units. From the monuments found along Orkhon, Yenisei, it can be seen that words such as *kärgäk bolti, uča barmïš, ölti, adïrïlti* are used to express the meanings of *death, passing away*. The listed language units have a characteristic place of use and meaning. For example, the phrase *kärgäk bolti* means *passed away, went back*, and is usually used in the third person: *özinčä kärgäk bolmïš* – They (later) passed away (KT I. 3), *išig kučig birür bunča törüg qazγanïp inim kültigin özinčä kärgäk boltï*. – Having spent all his energy and possessed so much land, my brother Ky'ltegi'n passed away himself. (KT I. 30) (Amanzholov, 2012). The phrase *uča barmïš*, as evidenced on the monuments, was used to refer to the Kagans and other notable figures. One such example is *qaŋïm qaγan ïnča ilig törüg qazγanïp uča barmïš*, which translates to "My father Kagan thus established his country, power and passed away" (KT I. 15-16). The verbs *öl* and *ölti* are employed in the monuments in relation to the people or creatures, horses, and are frequently used in the second and third person. The phrase "*süčig sabïŋa jïmšaq aγïsïŋa arturïp üküš türk bodun öltig*" is "Being taken in with the sweet word, with the pleasant gift, many Turkic people, die!" (KT II. 6); *äŋ ilki tadïqïn čurïŋ boz (atïγ binip tägdi, ol anta) ölti* – "First Tadyqyn-Chur mounted his White Horse and attacked... (That horse perished at the scene)" (KT I. 32-33) [27]. The verb '*adïrïltïm*', which is attested in the *Uyuk-Turan* monument, is frequently employed in the first person in the Yenisei monuments. One example is '*qujdaγï qunčujïmγa adïrïldïm apama*', which translates as "I lost my lady, my sister" (E 7.4); *qadašïm adïrïldïm ïju qujda qunčujïm adïrïldïm säkiz urïm adïrïldïm ïju* – "I lost a relative, oh God, lost my lady at home, lost eight sons, what a pity" (E 13.1) [27].

The verb "*adïr*" is reflected in the modern Kazakh language in the form "*айыр*," whereas in the Tuvan language, in the form "*адыр*." In the field of Turkic linguistics, the question of the correspondence of *y~j* represents one of the most significant and widely researched areas of enquiry. Sagyndykuly (2005) posited that in ancient times, sounds originated from complex affricates. He demonstrated that the sounds *j* and *zh, dzh* emerged from a complex affricate *T(s/sh).

The ancient etymon root *ad (aj)*, from which the verb *adïrïltim* is derived, has a broad and complex semantic range. Salkynbay (1999) elucidates the semantic system of the person *at/ad* as follows:

"The semantic system, which charts the evolution of the word 'at' as a form denoting a general concept rather than merely an action, can be illustrated as follows:

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

1) The seme of action – *аттау, аттану, адақ (айақ), адасу, адым*, etc.
2) The seme of the object emersion – *таң атты, тас атты, атып шығу, атып тұру;*
3) The seme of the object disappearing, termination – *ат, ад (тамұқ), ада болу;*
4) The object seme – *ат;*
5) The subject seme – *ата, аталық, адам,* etc.”.

In the verb *adïrïltïm*, it can be seen that the seme of the object disappearing, termination of the root ‘*ad*’ is preserved. The loss of loved ones, the end of their life on earth, everything is preserved in this verb.

The second line of the monument contains the verb *bantïm*. The root of the verb marked in the text as 𐰉𐰆𐰇𐰋 is *ba*, *-n* is the voice form, *-tï* – the past tense form and *-m* is the personal ending form of the 1st person.

In the Ancient Turkic dictionary, the following meanings of the verb root are given:

“BA- 1. to fasten; 2. to tie; 3. to bind, tie up”.

In the monument, the verb was used in the sense of “*binding*” as defined in the dictionary: *altunlïγ kišig bilimtä bantïm* – “*I fastened my gold-plated beaver to my waist*”.

The following definition of the verb is provided in the M. Kashkari dictionary:

“*БАНДЫ*: tied up, bound. “*Қой банды – Қой байланды* – The sheep is tied up”. The word is applicable to any object that is fastened and tied up with a cord”.

The verb *bailau* (to tie) in the modern Kazakh language has retained the full range of meanings associated with the verb in the ancient Turkic era.

“*БАЙЛА* 1.fasten something with a thread. 2.wrap the wound or something else, bandage it. 3. set fruits. 4.stop, block water coming to the fields. 5.fattening, battening animals. 6. giving as a gift the trophy obtained from the hunting” (Zhanuzakov, 2008).

The word derived from the verb ‘*ба*’, which denotes the means and result of the aforementioned action, is represented in the Kazakh language as ‘*бау*’ and in the Tuvan language as ‘*баг*’.

In the text of the *Uyuk-Turan* monument, the verb ‘*qaz*’ occurs in the unit ‘*qazγaqïm*’. Researchers have proposed several interpretations of the reading and translation of the fifth line of the monument, in which the verb is found.

Radloff, W.:
täŋri bälimkä kazǯakым oǫlым öz oǫlым altы biŋ jontым
Bei euch, meinem Himmels-Bäl, meinen angenommenen (?) Söhnen, meinen eigenen (?) Söhnen, bei meinen sechstausend Pferden.
(With you, my heavenly Bäl, my adopted (?) sons, my own (?) sons, with my six thousand horses).

Orkun, H.N.:
t^{e}*n*ri el^{i}mke *k*^{ı}zg^{a}*k*^{ı}m ogl^{ı}m öuz ogl^{ı}m ^{a}ltı bi*n* yont^{ı}m
Semavı elimde evlatlık kızım, üveği (?) oğlum altı bin atım.
(My heavenly daughter in my hands, my adopted (?) son, my six thousand horses).

Malov, S.E.:
Täŋri älimkä kызǯakым oǫlым öуz (?) oǫlым altы biŋ jontым
В отношении моего божественного государства, моих дочерей, собственных (?) сыновей и шести тысяч моих лошадей (отделился).
(Concerning my divine state, my daughters, my own (?) sons and my six thousand horses (separated)).

Batmanov, I.A.:
Теңри элимке кызгакым оглым өуз (?) оглым алты биң йонтым
В отношении моего божественного государства, моих дочерей, собственных (?) сыновей и шести тысяч моих лошадей (отделился).
(Concerning my divine state, my daughters, my own (?) sons, and my six thousand horses (separated)).

Kuryshzhanov, A., Tomanov, M.:
Тәңрі елімке, қызғақым, оғлым, өуз оғлым, алты бің йонтым.
Тәңірдегі елімнен, қызымнан, уыздай ұлымнан, алты мың жылқымнан (айырылдым).
(My country in the Heaven, my daughter, my son, my six thousand horses (I lost)).

Kormushin, I.V.:
täŋri elimkä qazγaqïm oγlïm nä uz (?) oγlïm altï biŋ jontïm
То, что я добыл для моего (хранимого) богом государства, – мои сыновья, сколько у меня мастеровых-сыновей (?), шесть тысяч моих коней.
(What I have obtained for my (god-guarded) state – my sons, how many master-sons (?) I have, my six thousand of horses).

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

Bazylkhan, N.:
Teŋiri: Elimke: Qazγaqïm: oγulïm: En Oz: oγulïm: altï biŋ: yuntum:
Тәңірі: Еліме: Қазғақым: ұлым: Ен Оз: ұлым: алты мың: жылқым:
(God: to my country: Kazgakym: my son: En Oz: my son: six thousand: my horse:)

Amanzholov, A.S.:
täŋri ilimkä qazγaqïm oγlïm na uz oγlïm altï biŋ juntïm
От моего божественного государства, мой сын-добытчик [мои сыновья-добытчики], что за искусный мой сын, шесть тысяч моих лошадей (увы, я отделился).
(From my divine state, my breadwinner son [my breadwinner sons], what a skilful son of mine, six thousand of my horses (alas, I have separated)).

A comparison of the provided translations reveals a discrepancy in the interpretation of the word 𐰸𐰍𐰼𐰇𐰍. One group of scientists has read it as *qïzγaqïm*, translating it as "*from my daughter*," while another group has read it as *qazγaqïm* and recognized it as a verb.

Additionally, W. Radloff identified the aforementioned word as a verb and interpreted the following phrase as 'meinen angenommenen (?) Söhnen' i.e. '*my adopted sons*' and read the standing next phrase as '*öz oҕлым*' – '*my own sons*' finding the translation correct. The scientist posits that if the next phrase is read as *уры oҕлым*, rather than the proposed *öz oҕлым*, then the given word would be identified as *кызҕak oҕлым* and translated as '*my daughters*'.

Amanzholov (2010) observes that the term '*qazγaq*' is etymologically linked to the verb '*qazγan*', denoting the role of a breadwinner or provider. This is evidenced by the meaning of the verb '*qazγan*,' which can be translated as "procure, obtain".

We align with the view of the scientists who recognise this word as a verb. There are a number of compelling justifications for this position. Firstly, if the aforementioned word is read as '*qïzγaqïm*,' then one word would be written in two different ways within the text of the monument. The word *qïz* in the marking 𐰸𐰃𐰚𐰇𐰚𐰇:𐰇𐰃𐰍: of the words read as '*qïz kälinlärim*' by almost all researchers on the sixth line of the monument is correctly spelled as 𐰇𐰃𐰍, taking into account that narrow vowels are written at the beginning of the word. If we were to read the word labelled 𐰸𐰍𐰼𐰇𐰍 as '*qïzγaqïm*,' this would result in the same word being labelled in two different ways within the same text, which would not comply with the established rule regarding the occurrence of narrow vowels at the beginning of a word on the monument. Furthermore, upon analysing the word *qïzγaqïm* based on its composition, we would encounter an issue. For example, Batmanov (1959) in the monument notes highlights "КЗГМ = кызгакым: кызгак-ым – моя дочь, дочь, дочь (или: подруженька, подруга) (My daughter, daughter, daughter (or: friend))". If the root of the word were *qïz*, *-ïm*, would be the personal ending form of the 1st person, and the unit - *γaq* would require a separate interpretation. Thirdly, when reading the aforementioned word as '*qazγaqïm*,' even if the open vowels are not written at the beginning of the word for the sake of economy, they must be taken into account in reading, and the content of the text will also be more understandable.

In the Ancient Turkic dictionary (Nadelyaev et al., 1969), the word '*qazγaq*' is translated as "*Qazγan* – to gain, to obtain", while the word '*qazγanč*' is translated as "*Qazγanč* – acquisition; profit, gain; income" [25:466]. In the modern Kazakh language, the verbs *alğan* (gained), *qazğan* (dug), *olzhalağan* (procured), created by the form *-γan* bear a close resemblance in meaning to the verb found in the monument. The forms of participle in the modern Kazakh and Tuvan are as follows: in the Kazakh language *-ған, -ген, -қан, -кен, -ар, -ер, -р, -атын, -етін, -йтын, -йтін, -мақ, -мек, -бақ, -бек, -пақ, -пек*, and in Tuvan *-кан, -кен, -ган, -ген, -ар, -ер (-эр), -ыр, -ир, -ур, -үр, -калак, -келек, -галак, -гелек, -аалак, -ээлек, -ыган, -иген, -уган, -үген, -ачы, -ечі, -кчы, -ыкчы, -икчи, -укчу, -үкчү*. For example, in Kazakh the words *жасалған* (made), *баратын* (going), *келер* (come, coming), *қайтар* (returning; refunding), *бастамақ* (starting), in Tuvan language will be *келген* (arrived), *көрген* (seen), *келир* (come, coming), *тарыыр* (seeding (harvest)), *аар* (taking), *кескелек* (cutting), *бижээчи* (writing; constantly writing), etc.

The study revealed that the verb forms in the *Uyuk-Turan* monument, which belong to the Yenisei monuments, are identical to those in the Orkhon monument and are representative of typical forms from the ancient Turkic era. Tomanov (1992) provides the following definition of a verb: "A verb is a part of speech that denotes action, state, or position of an object, and through a special system of morphological forms, it expresses the categories of voice, mood, tense, person, number (singular and plural), and negation". The text contains forms *-tï* and *-di*, which denote the past tense of the verb. In ancient Turkic written monuments, the verb forms *-tï, -ti, -dï, -di* function as a suffix denoting the definite past tense, as well as the transitive present tense (Tuimebayev & Yeskeyeva, 2016). In the text, the suffixes *-ma* and *-mä* are used to form a negative verb: *bökmädim*. The function of the positive verb is to indicate that the action has occurred, whereas the negative verb serves to indicate that the action has not occurred and will not occur. In ancient Turkic written monuments, the variants *-ma* and *-mä* were employed. In the Kazakh language, negative verbs are formed by conjugating suffixes *-ма, -ме, -ба, -бе, -па, -пе*, in the modern Tuvan language negative verbs are formed through the forms *-ма, -ме, -ба, -бе, -па, -пе, -ва, -ве*. For example, in Kazakh *кес* (cut) – *кеспе* (don't cut), *ал* (take) – *алма* (don't take), *ойла* (think) – *ойлама* (don't think), and in the modern Tuvan language *кес* (cut) – *кеспе* (don't cut), *ал* (take) – *алба* (don't take), *бода* (think) – *бодава* (don't think).

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

Additionally, the text of the monument exhibits the use of verb suffixes. To illustrate, in the verb '*bantïm*,' the form '-*n*' of the reflexive voice is attached to the root '*ba*-'. The reflexive voice is typically derived from a transitive verb, signifying that the action is addressed directly to the subject of the action (Tuimebayev & Yeskeyeva, 2016). In the sentence "*altunlïγ kišig bilimtä bantïm*", which is translated as "*I fastened my gold-plated beaver to my waist*", the verb suffix indicates that it was the subject who tied the beaver belt, rather than the other individual. In the verb *adïrïltïm* given in the text the passive voice in the form -*ïl* is presented. Kononov (1980) posits that the verb in the form *adïrïl* has a passive-reflexive meaning. In this instance, the verb-forming form -*ïr* was also employed. With regard to this suffix of the verb, researchers have noted that "-*ïr/-ir, -ar/-er, -ur/-ür/-r* are rarely used unproductive suffixes, and are primarily found in the composition of historical stems in which morphemes are not divided" (Tuimebayev & Yeskeyeva, 2016).

From the very definitions given to the category of voice in Turkic linguistics, it can be seen that the problem of verbs is still relevant. The category of voice has its own peculiarities compared to other verb categories. For example, some scholars consider transitive and intransitive verbs together with voices (active or passive), while others express the opinion that they should be considered separately from voices. There is also no clear consensus on determining the number of voices in Turkic languages.

If we review the scientific opinions on the type and number of verbs in the Kazakh language, Baitursynuly (2022) names the following 10 types of voice – *сабақты етіс* (active voice), *салт етіс* (intransitive voice), *ортақ етіс* (common voice), *өздік етіс* (reflexive voice), *өзгелік етіс* (causative voice), *беделді етіс* (influential voice), *ырықсыз етіс* (passive voice), *шығыс етіс* (initial voice), *дүркінді етіс* (recurring voice), *өсіңкі етіс* (ascending voice). Kalybaeva (1951), who specialised in the study of voices in Kazakh, divides voices into four parts: possessive, passive, common and causative voices. In the work 'Modern Kazakh Language', Balakaev at al. (1954) distinguish such types of voices as *өздік* (emphatic reflexive), *өзгелік* (causative), *өзіндік* (reflexive), *ортақ* (common) and *ырықсыз* (passive). The authors recognize forms such as *киіміңді киін* (put on your clothes) and *белбеуіңді буын* (tighten your belt) as a reflexive voice, which shows that the action is performed by the subject over himself, that is, the action is directed at himself. Yskakov (1991) distinguishes five types of voice, they are *негізгі* (active), *ортақ* (common), *өзгелік* (causative), *ырықсыз* (passive,) and *өздік* (reflexive). And in the latest grammars (Kazakh Grammar, 2002), reflexive, passive, causative and common types of the voices are appeared.

In Tuvan language there are voices such as active, causative, reflexive, passive and common. The active voice is considered the base form and is divided into transitive and intransitive verbs. The verb forms in modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages were compared (Table 2):

TABLE 2
VERB FORMS IN MODERN KAZAKH AND TUVAN LANGUAGES

№	In Kazakh			In Tuvan		
1	-	-	-	Active voice	*base form*	*чор, бар, шимче*
2	Reflexive voice	*-ын, -ін, -н*	*киін, таран, мақтан*	Reflexive voice	*-н, -ын, -ин, -ун, -үн; -тын, -тин, -тун, -түн, - дын, -дин, -дун, -дүн*	*долган, белеткен, эжин, кастын*
3	Causative voice	*-т; -ғыз, -гіз, -қыз, - кіз; -дыр, -дір, -тыр, - тір; -ыр, -ір*	*Оқыт, кіргіз, жуындыр*	Causative voice	*-т; -тыр, -тир, -тур, -түр, - дыр, -дир, - дур, -дүр; -ыр, -ир, -ур, -үр; -гыс, -гис, - гус, - гүс, - ыс, -ис, -ус, - үс;*	*кылдыр, өлүр, көргіс, айыт, соңгүт, чылыт*
4	Common voice	*-ыс, -іс, -с*	*санас, істес, біліс, көріс*	Common voice	*-ш, -ыш, - иш, - уш, - үш*	*санаш, ажылдаш, билиш, көрүш*
5	Passive voice	*-ыл, -іл, -л; -ын, -ін, -н*	*бұзыл, шешіл, бастал, жазыл, тазалан*	Passive voice	*-л, -ыл, -ил, -ул, - үл*	*хостал, дыңнал, чарыл, чежил, бузул*

Comparing the forms of voices in the modern Kazakh and the Tuvan, it is evident that there are many sound coincidences in the two languages, and there are many sound variants of singular forms of voices in the Tuvan language.

The *Uyuk-Turan* monument contains a number of verbs which have manifested in various forms in the modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages. The results suggest several semantic and grammatical similarities between modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages. Since the history of origin of Turkic languages is the same, there are common features and basic verb categories – and the presence of similarities in these languages is natural.

One of the main differences is the large number of phonetic variants of verb forms in the Tuvan language. The correspondence of sounds in the modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages, some differences in the sound of verb forms can be understood as the influence of a long process in the classification of Turkic languages. The systematization of the same Turkic languages in Turkic linguistics begins in the Middle Ages with the works of M. Kashkari and continues in the

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

works of such Turkic scientists as I.N. Berezin, W. Radloff, A.N. Samoilovich, V.A. Bogoroditsky, N.A. Baskakov. For example, according to A.N. Samoilovich's classification, the Tuvan language belongs to group '*D*' – Uigur or North-Eastern languages, the Kazakh language belongs to the '*Tau*' or Kipchak (North-Western) group. According to the geographical location, the Tuvan language is included in the north-western group, and the Kazakh language is included in the Central Asian languages. If we pay attention to N.A. Baskakov's classification taking into account the regularities of the epoch of language history established in Turkic linguistics, we will see that the Kazakh language belongs to the Kipchak group of the Western Hunnic branch, including the Kipchak-Nogai languages, and the Tuvan language belongs to the Uyghur-Oguz languages of the Eastern Hunnic branch, including the Uyghur-Tukyu group (Kaidar & Orazov, 2004). This classification fully explains the phonetic differences of verb forms in modern Kazakh and Tuvan from the perspective of the history of language development (Zhalmakhanov et al., 2023).

It can be stated that in the derivative words formed from these roots in the modern Kazakh language, the semes of the verbs in the monument have been preserved. The verb *bökmädim* is found in three instances within the text, while *adïrïltïm* is present in four. The repetition of verbs in the text is more common in texts of limited volume, as the repeated verbs are used to convey the same meaning.

Taken together, the analysis of the four verbal forms attested in the Uyuk-Turan monument demonstrates that the verbal system of the Yenisei inscriptions preserves a coherent set of morphological and semantic features characteristic of Old Turkic (Kalybayeva, 1951). The forms *bökmädim, adïrïltïm, bantïm*, and *qazγaqïm* show that even a short epitaphic text can provide substantial evidence for tense, negation, person marking, and voice, as well as for the semantic continuity of verbal roots across historical stages of Turkic. The comparison with modern Kazakh and Tuvan confirms that these forms are not isolated archaisms but elements of a broader diachronic system whose semantic components have been preserved in contemporary Turkic languages. In particular, the analysis supports the interpretation of qazγaqïm as a verbal form and shows that all four verbs contribute to a more accurate grammatical and semantic reading of the monument as a whole.

IV. Conclusions and Findings

The article compares the ways of formation of derivative verbs in modern Kazakh and Tuvan languages, the formation of positive and negative forms of verbs, the classification of verbs, the categories of participles and adverbial particles, the expression of the voice category in Kazakh and Tuvan languages were discussed.

In the course of our analysis, we examined the meanings of verbs in the forms of *bökmädim, adïrïltim, bantïm* and *qazγaqïm* in the *Uyuk-Turan* monument among the ancient Turkic inscriptions. We also ensured that the meanings of these verbs are preserved in derivative words in the Kazakh and Tuvan languages, which are modern Turkic languages. It can be stated that the utilisation and recurrence of specific verbs in written monuments discovered along the Yenisei River is a distinctive feature of this particular group of monuments. The digitisation of written monuments and the creation of electronic corpora provide a valuable opportunity for a more comprehensive study of verbs in these texts.

References

[1] Aydın, M. (2025). Ailenin Temel Direği: Güney Sibirya Yazıtlarında Kadın-Leksik Bir İnceleme. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *26*(Özel Sayı), 2585-2602.
[2] Amanzholov, A. S. (2010). *History and theory of ancient Turkic writing.* Almaty: Mektep.
[3] Amanzholov, A. S. (2012). *Fundamentals of Turkic philology*. Almaty: Mektep.
[4] Aspelin, I. (1889). *Inscriptions of the Yenisei*. Helsinki: Finnish Archaeological Society.
[5] Baitursynuly, A. (2022). *Works. Essays. Twelve volumes. Language guide* (Vol. 4). Astana: Alashorda Public Foundation.
[6] Bakır, M. M. (2025). Old Turkic women and khatuns in runic inscriptions. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1-28.
[7] Balakaev, M., Sauranbaev, N., Kenesbaev, I., Musaev, G., & Yskakov, A. (1954). *Modern Kazakh language*. Almaty: Gylym.
[8] Batmanov, I. A. (1959). *Language of the Yenisei monuments of Old Turkic writing.* Frunze: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz SSR.
[9] Bazylkhan, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Turkic data on the history of Kazakhstan*. Almaty: Dyke-Press.
[10] Iskhakov, F. G., & Palmbach, A. A. (1961). *Grammar of the Tuvinian language: Phonetics and morphology*. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
[11] Kaidar, A., & Orazov, M. (2004). *Introduction to Turkic studies.* Almaty: Arys.
[12] Kalybayeva, A. (1951). *Verb category in the modern Kazakh language* [Candidate's dissertation]. Almaty: Gylym.
[13] Kashkari, M. (1997a). *Dictionary of the Turkish language* (Diwani lugat-it-Turk) (Vol. 1; A. Egeubay, Trans.). Almaty: Hunt.
[14] Kashkari, M. (1997b). *Dictionary of the Turkish language* (Diwani lugat-it-Turk) (Vol. 2; A. Egeubay, Trans.). Almaty: Hunt.
[15] *Kazakh grammar: Phonetics, word formation, morphology, syntax*. (2002). Astana.
[16] Kononov, A. N. (1980). *Grammar of the language of Turkic runic inscriptions of the 7th–9th centuries*. Leningrad: Nauka.
[17] Kordabaev, T. (1949). *Tense category of the verb in the modern Kazakh language* [Candidate's dissertation]. Almaty.
[18] Kormushin, I. V. (1997). *Turkic Yenisei epitaphs: Texts and studies*. Moscow: Nauka.
[19] Kuryshzhanov, A., & Tomanov, M. (1964). *Study history and grammatical essays of the Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions.* Almaty.
[20] Malov, S. E. (1952). *The Yenisei inscriptions of the Turks: Texts and translations.* Moscow–Leningrad: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
[21] Mamanov, I. E. (1949). *Auxiliary verbs in the Kazakh language.* Almaty: Nauka.
[22] Nadelyaev, V., Nasilov, D., Tenishev, E., & Shcherbak, A. (1969). *Ancient Turkic dictionary*. Leningrad.
[23] Orkun, H. N. (1940). *Eski Türk Yazıtları* [Ancient Turkish Inscriptions] (Vol. 3). Istanbul: Alaeddin Kıral Basımevi.

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION

[24] Orazov, M. (1983). *Semantics of the Kazakh verb (Experience of semantic classification)* [Doctoral dissertation]. Almaty.
[25] Radloff, W. (1893). *Atlas of Mongolian antiquities: Proceedings of the Orkhon expedition* (Vol. 2). St. Petersburg.
[26] Radloff, W. (1895). *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei* [The Old Turkic inscriptions of Mongolia] (3rd delivery). St. Petersburg.
[27] Radloff, W. (1897). *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei* [The Old Turkic inscriptions of Mongolia] (Neue Folge). St. Petersburg.
[28] Sagyndykuly, B. (2005). *The etymological basis of the Kazakh language vocabulary development*. Almaty: Kazakh University.
[29] Salkynbay, A. B. (1999). *Historical word formation (semantic aspect)*. Almaty: Kazakh University.
[30] Sauranbaev, N. T. (1942). *Semantics and functions of verbs in the Kazakh language*. Almaty: Gylym.
[31] Tatarintsev, B. I. (1987). *Semantic connections and relationships of words in the Tuvan language*. Moscow: Nauka.
[32] Tatarintsev, B. I. (2000). *Etymological dictionary of the Tuvan language* (Vol. 1). Novosibirsk: Nauka.
[33] Thomsen, V. (1896). *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées. Helsingfors: Société de Littérature Finnoise*. Helsingfors, Impr. de la Société de littérature finnoise.
[34] Tomanov, M. (1992). *A comparative grammar of the Turkic languages*. Almaty: Kazakh University.
[35] Tuimebayev, Zh., & Yeskeyeva, M. (2016). *Morphological system of the ancient Turkic inscriptions language (VI–IX centuries)*. Almaty.
[36] Yskakov, A. (1991). *Modern Kazakh language*. Almaty: Ana tili.
[37] Zhalmakhanov, Sh., Zharkynbekova, Sh., & Kodirova, B. (2023). Features of the general vocabulary of the Kazakh and Tuvan languages in a comparative aspect. *International Journal of Language, Education, Translation*, *1*, 7-20.
[38] Zhanuzakov, T. (Ed.). (2008). *Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language*. Almaty: Dyke-Press.

Salkynbay Anarkul is a Doctor of Philological Sciences and Professor at the Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov. Her research interests include Turkic linguistics, historical grammar, and comparative studies of Turkic languages. Email: asalkbek@gmail.com ORCID iD: 0000-0003-2334-7499

Kaspikhan Bauyrzhan is a PhD student at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University. His research focuses on Old Turkic inscriptions, historical linguistics, and morphology. Email: b.kaspikhan@gmail.com ORCID iD: 0000-0002-4676-5354

Mirzayev Ibodulla Kamolovich is a researcher at the Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov. His academic interests include Turkic philology and historical linguistics. Email: ibodullamirzayev1946@gmail.com ORCID iD: 0000-0001-5331-7122

Qodirova Barno Ibragimovna is a lecturer at Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov. Her research focuses on modern linguistics and comparative Turkic studies. Email: kodirova.b86@gmail.com ORCID iD: 0000-0001-6281-0111

Raxmatova Dilfuza Axmedovna is a researcher at Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov. Her research interests include linguistics and language pedagogy. Email: raxmatovadilfuza99@gmail.com ORCID iD: 0009-0005-8316-360X

Ernazarova Iroda Shavkat kizi is a PhD and Associate Professor at Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov. Her research areas include Turkic linguistics and syntax. Email: ernazarovairoda@gmail.com ORCID iD: 0009-0005-4956-2551

Mirzaeva Dilzoda Fayzullayevna is a Doctor of Science (DSc) candidate at Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov. Her research interests include comparative and historical linguistics. Email: dilzodakhon94@mail.ru; dilzodaxonmirzaeva51@gmail.com ORCID iD: 0009-0000-8625-5909

Zhalmakhanov Shapagat Sharapatovich is a Doctor of Philological Sciences and Professor at the Department of Kazakh Linguistics, Karaganda Buketov University, and also affiliated with Samarkand State University named after Sh. Rashidov. His research focuses on Turkic linguistics, phonology, and comparative studies. Email: szhalmakhanov@bk.ru ORCID iD: 0000-0002-0227-4617

© 2026 ACADEMY PUBLICATION