

# 42

Presentation date: February, 2022

Date of acceptance: May, 2022

Publication date: July, 2022

## ANCIENT

PHONETIC-MORPHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS IN THE CASE SYSTEM OF  
TURKIC LANGUAGES

**ELEMENTOS FONÉTICO-MORFOLÓGICOS ANTIGUOS EN EL SISTEMA DE  
CASOS DE LAS LENGUAS TURCAS**

Yegana Gurbat kizi Gahramanova<sup>1</sup>

E-mail: [yegane.qehremanova.1976@mail.ru](mailto:yegane.qehremanova.1976@mail.ru)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8579-1486>

<sup>1</sup>Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University.

### Suggested citation (APA, 7<sup>th</sup> ed.)

Gahramanova Y. G., (2022). Ancient phonetic-morphological elements in the case system of turkic languages. *Revista Universidad y Sociedad*, 14(4), 421-427.

### ABSTRACT

The article shows that the idea of the existence of two case systems is not appropriate, based on the phonetic and morphological features of the case system of the Turkic languages. It is noted that the idea that the category of affiliation in Turkish languages preceded possession is not correct, and it is shown that although some Turkologists divide the solution in Turkish into two parts, simple and belonging, in fact, such a division does not justify itself in these languages. Linguistic facts prove that ownership in these languages preceded the category of belonging, but the morphological indicator of ownership was not the suffix -n4 as it is now, but the suffix -ak / -ik in the ancient Sumerian language.

**Keywords:** case category, Turkish languages, affiliation, ownership.

### RESUMEN

El artículo muestra que la idea de la existencia de dos sistemas de casos no es apropiada, con base en las características fonéticas y morfológicas del sistema de casos de las lenguas túrquicas. Se observa que la idea de que la categoría de afiliación en lenguas turcas precedió a la posesión no es correcta, y se muestra que aunque algunos turkólogos dividen la solución en turco en dos partes, simple y pertenencia, de hecho, tal división no justifica mismo en estos idiomas. Los hechos lingüísticos prueban que la propiedad en estos idiomas precedía a la categoría de pertenencia, pero el indicador morfológico de propiedad no era el sufijo -n4 como lo es ahora, sino el sufijo -ak / -ik en la antigua lengua sumeria.

**Palabras clave:** categoría de caso, lenguas turcas, afiliación, propiedad.

## INTRODUCTION

According to Yilmaz (2015) the notion that we learn a lot of our vocabularies through reading, or more particularly comprehensible written input, is now entrenched in second and foreign language teaching. Learners naturally encounter unfamiliar words while reading a text and use a variety of strategies to understand those unknown words. Stoller and Grabe (1993) pointed out that by becoming familiar with only a few stems, prefixes, and suffixes, students will recognize the meaning of many words; one root or affix can often provide a student with a clue to the meaning of dozens of words. According to this idea, analyzing target word structure is one of the efficient ways to deduce the meaning of an unknown word in a text (Paribakht & Wesche, 1999).

Taking the above into account the study of the morphologies of languages play a vital part in its understanding due to, as highlighted by Lieber (2021), morphology is understood as the study of word formation, including the ways new words are coined in the languages of the world, and the way forms of words are varied depending on how they're used in sentences. From a historical point of view, the term morphology is generally attributed to the German poet, novelist, playwright, and philosopher Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749– 1832), who coined it early in the nineteenth century in a biological context. Its etymology is Greek: morph- means 'shape, form', and logos- means 'the study of'. Then, in linguistics morphology refers to the mental system involved in word formation or to the branch of linguistics that deals with words, their internal structure, and how they are formed (Aronoff & Fudeman, 2011).

For this morphology includes the grammatical processes of inflection and derivation. Inflection marks categories such as person, tense, and case; e.g., "sings" contains a final -s, marker of the 3rd person singular; while derivation is the formation of new words from existing words; e.g., "singer" from "sing" and "acceptable" from "accept" (Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2016). However, despite some similarities morphology is not equally prominent in all (spoken) languages. What one language expresses morphologically may be expressed by a separate word or left implicit in another language. For example, English expresses the plural of nouns by means of morphology (nut/nuts, night/nights, and so on), but Yoruba uses a separate word for expressing the same meaning. Thus, okùnrin means '(the) man', and the word àwon can be used to ex-

press the plural: àwon okùnrin 'the men' (Haspelmath & Sims, 2010). Then, when addressing morphology consider a specific language is an important fact.

Considering the phonetic and morphological features of the case system of the Turkic languages, the existence of two case systems is notorious: simple and relative case. In the research of I. A. Batmanov, Y. Mammadov and M. Mammadli it is mentioned that in the Goyturk language the solution with and without the suffix of affiliation manifests itself. A. M. Shcherbak considers the solution of belonging to be older and shows that simple solution is derived from it. This is seen by both Shcherbak (1977, p. 33), as well as in the research of N. F. Katanov and F.Q. Iskhakov in words such as neck, nose, abdomen, forehead, brain, shoulder, which express the parts of the body. Sevortyan (1956, p. 337) in addition to the words denoting body parts addresses the suffix -in used at the end of words such as thick, dense, cool, chibin, which is considered to be a suffix of belonging. The same is address by Abdullayev (1992) where wood, long, close, deep, bare, and many other words add to this list.

It should be noted that although much has been said about the multifunctionality of the suffix -in //, which is a key element of affiliation, historically acts as a morphological indicator of ownership, effectiveness, instrumental cases, Mammadli (2003, p. 13) rightly writes that:

"It is uncertain ... Both types of solution (according to M. Mammadli, simple and belonging solution) are formed in connection with each other, but it is difficult to determine which is older. Because in the most ancient written monuments of the Turkic languages, both paradigms are perfected ... It is possible to assume that both solutions come from the same paradigm in Praturk".

The fact that historically the suffixes of the case have been replaced and doubled in the Turkic languages proves that the historical connection between the different cases was stronger, historically the -in4 morpheme was involved in the formation of cases such as possession, belonging, instrumental-joint, influence, speech. Considering the historical role of ownership in the double solution, the conclusion that many ideas in the Turkic literature so far, as well as in the works of many Azerbaijani linguists, that the suffix -in // is historically considered a suffix is not very convincing. Then, in order to clarify the issue, the objective of this research is to analyze some of the ideas and considerations that the suffix -in // in the possessive and influential cases is derived from the suffix of the ancient affiliation.

## DEVELOPMENT

Speaking about the origin of affiliation suffixes, Serebrennikov and Hajiyeva (2002) writes: *“A.M. Sherbak believes that with the emergence of the form of ownership, the construction of “I am a man” developed from the construction of man + I’I am human”*. It is difficult to agree with this opinion. It is quite clear that the system of affixes of affiliation was formed much earlier than the forms of ownership. As can be seen, B.A. Serebrennikov, like most Turkologists, believes that the suffix of affiliation came into being sooner than possession. On the other hand, according to the Turkologists, “the issue of the initial form of the affix of singular and plural third person” is also of great interest. A.M. Shcherbak and some other Turkologists believe that in the first stage it was in the form of an affix, which in turn was derived from the ancient pronoun.

According to Shcherbak (1961), from this pronoun came the affix of 3<sup>rd</sup> person affiliation. Thus, its preform (first form) must be restored with a consonant affix at the end. The author goes on to say that they explain the summit with the following: Turk, *evi-ne* “home”, grandfather-to “grandfather”; *evi-n-de* “at home”, grandfather-n-da; from house-n to house, from grandfather-n; *evi-n -i* and so on. In our opinion, the element of in these combinations is an ablaut variant of the pronoun -an, which never acts as a sign pronoun (Serebrennikov & Hajiyeva, 2002, p. 127).

Saying that the suffix -n // is an ancient affiliation suffix, F. Jalilov writes, “The suffix -n //, which is a morpheme of affiliation, became the first element of various case suffixes. In other words, the different case functions of the words used in the ancient Turkic language for us (directional case), *menyidin* (speech case) and suffixes -n // later led to the merging of the -n element in the same morpheme into different case suffixes: e.g., from his father. In this paradigm, the morpheme -n, which remains in the form of an infix, is added to the local suffix to form the suffix -dan // -din: -da + -n > dan // -din” (Jalilov, 1988, p. 225).

As can be seen, the researcher-scientist stated that the morpheme -n //, which he considered a suffix of belonging, was involved in the formation of possessive and affective case suffixes. However, as it is clear from the previous information, the morpheme -da // -ta in the national Turkic language acted as a speech suffix before the local case. So, the allomorph of this suffix from is not an event arising from the union of the local case suffix with the suffix of affiliation, as it is said, because if it were as it is said, that suffix would first form the local state. That’s why the logic of considering the suffix -dan, -din as a form of the suffix joining the local suffix does not seem very convincing.

Based on the fact that the suffixes -es in the Uralic languages, -es in the Udmurt language, -ez in Hungarian and -t are both effective and belonging to the second and third persons, Mammadli (2003, p. 14) writes: *“In modern times, the affiliation of the case has weakened in words ending in a consonant, but has remained clear in words ending in a vowel: e.g. tree, horse, sister, grandmother, (his) horse, (your) sister, (his) grandmother”*. Let’s analyze some examples: “Cut down the tree”, “Tie the horse”, “Call your sister”. In the previous sentences of the “I saw my grandmother” type, the suffix is used, and no notion of belonging is remembered. In the third sentence, the context does not allow us to determine the exact position of the morpheme n, so it can be assumed that the concept of both belonging and influence exists in that sentence. In the third sentence, it is the suffix -si, not -ni, that creates the concept of belonging. Thus, it is clear the idea that “the suffix of influence expresses the concept of belonging” does not hold true in these sentences. In the third sentence, it is the suffix -si, not -ni, that creates the concept of belonging.

Researcher K. Bashirov writes in his monograph “Oghuz group grammatical morphemes in Turkic languages” that the morphemes -4, -n4 and -im from the possessive case suffixes are similar to the suffixes of the first and second person claiming that the suffix is derived from the suffix of affiliation. In some Turkic languages, for example, in the Yakut language, based on the fact that ownership has not yet been formed, they claim that Praturk has no ownership at all (Bashirov, 2009, p. 52). While reading these sentences, at first glance it seems that the author will object to the idea that in Turkology the state of ownership arises from the suffix of belonging. However, K. Bashirov, as a continuation of his opinion wrote in his book “Comparison of Turkic languages”:

*“.. the fact that words with affiliation can be used without possessive pronouns indicates the initial and superior position of the category of affiliation”* (Bashirov, 2018, p. 78).

According to Jalilov (1988) there are suffixes -i, -ni, -y in the Azerbaijani language, so the -i morpheme is simply an allomorph of the -y morpheme. However, there is no consonant n in the morpheme n, it is a remnant of the suffix denoting affiliation. For example: when one is thrown, it is for two (KDQ)” (Jalilov, 1988, p. 520). Thus, for the word (said), which he brought from our dialects, for (drew), the author points out that the suffix -in is a morpheme of affiliation in expressions. The author says that the case suffix merges with the last consonant of the suffix of that affiliation (Jalilov, 1988, p. 521). According to the researcher, “In the past, expressions such as ‘drank water, destroyed a house’ were expressed by the suffix ‘belonging’ in words

such as 'listen to the word' and 'ride the horse', which is still a relic" (Jalilov, 1988, p. 521).

It seems to us that in none of the above examples is there a solid scientific basis for claiming that the state of ownership came about through the suffix of affiliation. Therefore, it is necessary to carefully study the connections between the facts of language, to consider the opposite arguments in order to come to more accurate conclusions. From this point of view, it is enough to look at the linguistic facts presented by F. Jalilov to show that the position of the researchers who claim that the state of ownership is effective, and even the state of joint instrument derives from the suffix of belonging, is not so convincing.

The author points out that in the Azerbaijani language, the second and third types of adjectives are now given by a combination of words (horseshoe, your house), ie the category of affiliation is given by the combination of two words in ancient times. For example: that is, the category of affiliation was given in ancient times by the simultaneous use of two words, and it is still possible to find traces of it:

In Chuvash: man al (my hand), san al (your hand)

In Turkmen: we are a village (our village)" (Jalilov, 1988, p. 209).

The author considers the meaning of belonging given by such a combination of words as the first means of expression in the language of the category of belonging, the first stage. For example Jalilov (1988, p. 209): my head, your head. Based on M. Shiraliyev, the author, who sees that a similar situation is used in the Azerbaijani language (our house, your house) and in the Zagatala and Gakh dialects with the morpheme of, as well as with the morpheme of, presents the following examples Jalilov (1988, p. 209):

Me // my eye

You // your eye

Honu // honun göz (gözü)"

As can be seen, F. Jalilov himself shows that in terms of the expression of the concept of belonging in the ancient Turkic language, the possessive variant of -ıŋ, ın, -ı is older. An interesting question arises: If the affiliation suffix originated after the possessive case suffix (this is indeed the case), then how can the morpheme of affiliation suffix -ıŋ participate in the formation of suffixes of cases such as possession, influence, joint-instrument? The author supports A. M. Shcherbak's opinion that the word in //, which is a sign-person pronoun in the ancient Turkish language, is based on the suffix denoting the third person, and

writes: "*was the first morphological indication of the category of belonging, and its archetype needs to be restored in the form ıŋ. Because after that pronoun was formed, it became an allomorph of -uŋ // - ıŋ, // - un //*" (Jalilov, 1988, p. 210). F. Jalilov points out that with the improvement of the word combination belonging to the category of affiliation, the third stage of its development appeared. For example (Jalilov, 1988, p. 510):

My head is my head

You are your head, your head is your head

Be the head of the head (ıŋ)

We are our heads; our heads are ours

You are your head (ıŋ)

They can be the head (ıŋ)

Here, the stages of formation of the possessive suffix in terms of morphological indicators are clearly considered, but it seems that the development of the possessive suffix -im in the pronouns I and us is the next linguistic fact. Interestingly, while the researcher correctly identifies the stages of the emergence of the concept of belonging in the Turkish language, it does not show that the morpheme -ıŋ is a possessive suffix in *meni baş, seniŋ baş* type compounds, and the possessive suffix as a formal sign is formed before the affiliation suffix. Therefore, a false subjective conclusion emerges that the "-ıŋ morpheme, which is at the source of the suffix of affiliation, later took part in the formation of joint-instrumental, influential and possessive cases.

The position of B.A. Serebrennikov and N. Hajiyeva on the idea that the word *ın*, which is a sign-person pronoun in the ancient Turkish language, is based on the suffix denoting the third person, is that "... no pronoun in the great Turkic language ends in *n*, so , -*n*- was a special guide. Forms such as "your horse" and "your cow" have never existed. In indirect cases, the origin of the suffix "extra" can be explained in another way. It is possible that as a result of the attraction of content and form, it has entered the paradigm of naming affixes. Forms with affixes of belonging, such as *horse, father*, are associated (perceived) with the pronoun of the person he is.

A characteristic feature of this pronoun is that the forms of indirect cases contain the -*n*- element, and in the nominative case it does not: *Turk, he is only then, from him*. If the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular affix form of association has an associative relationship with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular pronoun, then the solution of nouns with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular

affix will be similar to the solution of the pronoun in indirect cases. By analogy with him and from him, type forms were formed at the beginning” (Serebrennikov & Hajiyeva, 2002, pp. 127–128)

Researchers continue to write that in the whole of Central Asia there is an undeveloped isogloss in the solution of nouns with affixes of affiliation. This type of spelling is typical of Uzbek and Uighur languages; this solution has a strong place in their literary language norm. This type of solution, which does not have an “additional” -n- consonant, is spoken in the Kyrgyz language in southern Kyrgyzstan, as well as in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. Uzbek-Uighur-type settlement is found in the language of Western Siberian Tatars outside Central Asia. Taking into account the zonal limitations of the Uzbek-Uighur type of solution, the authors assume that the suffix without the “additional” -n-consonant is a derivative event. In fact, there has been a linguistic improvement of affixes of affiliation. The language was freed from the leadership of the “extra” summit.

In the presence of possessive pronouns, the system of affixes of affiliation is to some extent redundant (pleonasm). Not surprisingly, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person affixes are not used regularly in Chuvash. In some dialects of Chuvash, the system of affixes of affiliation has been severely disrupted, and in the Morgaush dialect it has completely disappeared. In the Salar language, there is no difference between singular and plural suffixes. The system of affixes of affiliation in the San Uyghur language has almost disappeared. Even in Turkic languages, where the system of affixes of affiliation is generally preserved, these suffixes are often omitted, especially in the first-person plural. tat. our awbl. çuv. pirin yal “our village”. For example: our home, your home.

In the Azerbaijani language, after the development of the pronouns we and you in the possessive case, the second party can be formed without the suffix of belonging. For example: our home, your home. In our opinion these points are more logical to accept the morpheme -n as a suffix of ownership, rather than belonging. In our opinion, in modern Azerbaijani, Uzbek, Uyghur, some Tatar and Kyrgyz languages, and in some Turkic dialects, the -n morpheme is used as a conjunctive consonant between the third-person suffix and that suffix. N.A. Baskakov and M. Kipchak support the idea that the morpheme is “a reduced form of the full variant of the possessive suffix” (Ramstedt, 1957, p. 228).

On the other hand, it seems to us that the consonants k, q, which are used in the ancient Turkic language, as well as in many modern Turkic languages, as a part of the suffix

-ka, -ke, -ga, -qa, -ge, as well as in the Azerbaijani literary language, the y-summit, which is considered to be an adjunct in our dialects and a number of modern Turkic languages, is more likely to be a remnant of the original suffix -ak, -ik, -k, which played a special role in the double solution. In order to prove our opinion that the y-summit, which is considered a connecting consonant, is an ancient relic of the directional state, we would like to draw attention to the examples presented by Z.Korkmaz. The author says that the Turkish language has a variant of the possessive suffix -y4 in the mouths of Bart and gives the following examples: “The seabed is deep. In the royal way: soldier” (Korkmaz, 1964, pp. 140–147). Then, the -k suffix is more likely to be a residue.

In our opinion, considering the function of ky substitution for our literary language, it seems more plausible to think that the possessive case of the -y conjunction in the case of direction and influence in our dialects is a remnant of the ancient Sumerian -ak, -ik. A. Huseynov, who considered the element of self-determination in the past as a manifestation of the inflammatory order of our language, wrote that the late professor A. Demirchizadeh’s idea to call this event “the law of voting” (Huseynov, 2000, pp. 23–24). However, the above requires a different approach to the issue.

N.K. Dmitriyev said that the n sound was increased to create harmony. indicates that it is an ingredient. M. Rasa’s “y” and “n” consonants are the element of the original root (Recepli, 2009, p. 70). V.A. Bogoroditsky (1953, p. 153) connects the element “n” with the “n” at the root of personal pronouns. According to the researcher, place and speech were preserved before the case suffixes, and in the form of analogies, the third person pronoun was used in the solution of suffixes. A.N. Kononov, V. Nasilov, Q.I. Ramstedt, A. M. Shcherbak, V. Q. Kondratev also consider the element “n” to be a sign of belonging.

E. R. Tenishev (1976, p. 103) stated that the “n” element appeared in the cases ending in a vowel as a case of necessity in the possessive, directional, influential cases, and in the local and exit cases there were no conditions for the vowel. M. Mammadli (2003, p. 17) writes that: *“In other modern Turkic languages, except for the Oghuz group, which attracts the most attention, in simple and belonging cases the possession and influence is only the development of the full form of the suffix (-n, -ni). In those moments, regardless of whether the word ends in a vowel or a consonant, the position of the -n consonant casts doubt on its status as a connecting consonant”*.

An interesting point in these views is that if this ancient feature of Turkish pronunciation is really related to the

addition of suffixes to words ending in a vowel, then why is the same element repeated in the increase of local and verb suffixes beginning with a consonant? What should be the connection between the elements “n” and “y” involved in the solution of words that do not accept the suffix of belonging?

On the other hand, if this situation is related to the suffix of affiliation, as shown, if the suffix of affiliation is not accepted, which ancient relic is a trace or remnant of the “n” element that these pronouns adopted before the local and verb suffixes? In the historical materials of the Turkic languages, what are the numerous examples of the use of the “n” element in words ending in a consonant? As can be seen, when the element “n” is approached as an element of the suffix of belonging, it is impossible to find and substantiate the answers to the questions. Therefore, it seems more logical to accept the “n” as well as the “y” element, which manifests itself in different cases of the noun, not as a vowel and a conjunctive consonant, but as a sign of a double solution of ownership in the most ancient stage of the Turkic languages.

In modern Turkic languages and dialects, the derivation of the element “y” from the ancient possessive suffix is effective instead of “n”. It also proves the consonant “y”, which manifests itself in the solution of the words water and what. A. M. Shcherbak’s idea that in the history of Turkic languages there is both a pure and nasal pronunciation y summit can be a derivative of sound combinations such as ny, nğ (nq), yn or n summit. The author also tries to prove his point with examples: muq.et: yakut: turuya - turkmena: crane; also says that appropriate cases are being monitored (A. M. Shcherbak, 1961, p. 59). M. Yusifov (1994, p. 33) also considers the idea that the sound y is derived from n. Even in modern Turkic languages, they have not been able to differentiate as independent and special phonemes”.

## CONCLUSIONS

The history of the state of ownership in Turkic language is ancient and multifunctional. Apparently, at some stage in history, the suffix -a (k) in the Sumerian disappeared, and then gradually the suffix -in, -n, -un, -un appeared. In response to Kazimov (2003, p. 102), we would like to emphasize that in our opinion, the initial -ak suffix of the possessive case is first formed in the -ik form, then -iŋ, -iŋ and finally -in4. As a result of the closure often observed in the Turkic languages became a morpheme, and ownership became a modern expression. The fact of this language can be schematically thought out as follows: -A (k)> -iŋ> -in4.

Approaching this logic, it is clear that there is no need to artificially divide the pronouns into two types in Turkic languages, as well as in Goy-Turkic written monuments. The notion of a simple and belonging solution does not justify itself. In our opinion, there is no actual language basis for such a division. The reason why the possessive suffix -in, which is used in most modern Turkic languages, does not appear in the early stages of Praturkic language is the existence of the older suffix -ak, -ik, on the basis of which the morpheme -i later appeared. Possession existed at all stages of the Turkic languages, and at the same time took part in the formation of historically influential, cohesive and instrumental cases, as well as suffixes of belonging.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullayev, A. (1992). *Issues of the Azerbaijani language*. BSU Publishing House.
- Aronoff, M., & Fudeman, K. (2011). *What is Morphology?* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bashirov, K. (2009). *Oghuz group grammatical morphemes in Turkic languages*. Science and education.
- Bashirov, K. (2018). *Comparison of Turkic languages: Morphological categories in Oghuz group Turkic languages*. Elm Publishing House.
- Bogoroditsky, V. A. (1953). *Introduction to Tatar linguistics in connection with other Turkic languages* (2nd ed.). Tatar-gosizdat.
- Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2016). Morphology. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/morphology-linguistics>
- Haspelmath, M., & Sims, A. D. (2010). *Understanding Morphology* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Huseynov, A. (2000). Problems of Azerbaijani linguistics. *Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University*, 6(4), 23–24.
- Jalilov, F. (1988). *Morphology of the Azerbaijani language*. Maarif Publishing House.
- Kazimov, G. (2003). *History of the Azerbaijani language*. Education.
- Korkmaz, Z. (1964). Bartin and his mouths. *Journal of Turkology*, 3(2), 140–147.
- Lieber, R. (2021). *Introducing Morphology* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Mammadli, M. (2003). *Grammatical categories of nouns in Azerbaijani dialects*. Elm Publishing House.

- Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1999). Reading and “Incidental” L2 vocabulary acquisition: An Introspective Study of Lexical Inferencing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(2), 195–224. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226319900203X>
- Ramstedt, G. I. (1957). *Introduction to the Altai language: Morphology*. Foreign Languages.
- Recepli, A. (2009). *Monuments of ancient Turkish writing* (Vol. 2). Nurlan Publishing House.
- Serebrennikov, B. A., & Hajiyeva, N. (2002). *Comparative historical grammar of Turkish languages*. Folklore Scientific and Cultural Center of ANAS. SADA Publishing House.
- Sevortyan, . V. (1956). *Category of cases*. IPSGTYA Publishing House.
- Shcherbak, . M. (1977). *Comparative reviews of morphology of Turkic languages*. Leningrad Publishing House.
- Shcherbak, A. M. (1961). *Grammatical review of the Turkic texts of the X-XIII centuries from eastern Turkestan*. Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Stoller, F., & Grabe, W. (1993). Implications for L2 vocabulary acquisition and instruction from L1 vocabulary research. *Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning*, 24–45.
- Tenishev, E. R. (1976). *The Story of the Salar Language*. Nauka.
- Yilmaz, F. (2015). Turkish as a foreign language learners awareness and use of morphology in guessing the meanings of unknown words from context: A case study. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(5), 675–683. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2014.2066>
- Yusifov, M. (1994). *Phonomorphology of root words in Turkish languages: Vol. Part I (Voice links)*. Ganja Publishing House.