

THE PROBLEM OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE HUNNS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Kuldashev Akram Makhmudovich

Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc),

Associate Professor of UzSWLU

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Annotation: The present day linguistics is marked by the presence of visible white spots, in the history of several prominent tribes or ethnic groups which once served as the hero and the main actor, of inter-ethnic and inter-tribal wars, invasions or occupations. Hunns were the heroes of the earliest mediaeval wars. Alone or in combination with other Turkic-speaking, Germanic-speaking, romance-speaking or else, they fought and formed an Empire in Europe and Asia taken together. Present day linguists made attempt at “privatizing” the memory, the name, the deeds of the Hunns, their History and leaders in order to make their history glorious. Such attempts made by the linguists of other non-Turkic-speaking countries are doomed to fail because of their incorrect explaining the history, related to Hunns.

Keywords: Ethnogenetic investigation, Hunns, tribal union, chronicles, guns, scyths, Syunnu, phonetic Changes, ethnic names, tribes, etymology.

The fate of any of the peoples who lived in the history of the world, created an empire in their time and then disintegrated, is probably not as abstract as the fate of the Huns and their language. The traces left by the Hunns in the world history are covered in detail on the basis of the information left by the historians of the time and the chroniclers of the monasteries, the military art of the state system, military and administrative titles, customs, weapons, clothing, food, lifestyle, about the names of drinks in the West in Greek and Latin and later Germanic sources, and in the East in the annals of Chinese chroniclers, documents of various content and nature. These authors who came into contact with the Huns, whether in Greek, Latin or Chinese, tried to convey the words used by the Huns, relying on the sounds and phonetic laws of their own language, through their own letters and hieroglyphs. These words are usually the national specific lexicon and names of the Gunn (and Hunnu and Xunnu in the East) transliterated into Greek, Latin, or Chinese, and are transliterated without translation, having no natural variant in Greek, Latin, or Chinese, and immediately explained in the language being translated. given. Considering that the Altaic language family is a family of languages different from the Indo-European or Sino-Tibetan language family and their phonomorphological aspects are not so close, it is possible to understand how unrecognizable the original word Gunn was in these translations and how difficult it was for European and Chinese linguists. The fact that the word Hunn is called Gunn in the West or Syunnu in the East, and another name for them around the Black Sea, Greek Scythian, also shows how complicated the issue is.

Note these difficulties and the following words of N.Ya.Marr: "The greatest misfortune of the Turkic peoples is that their history is investigated by scholars, who do not belong to these peoples." These words explain the fact that the language of the Huns has not been clearly analyzed until now.

We can list the following problems here.

First of all, it is either unknowingly or deliberately denied that the Gunn, Hunn, and Sunnu are a single ethnic group, or rather, a people. In our opinion, the second one is probably more correct in

this case. The reason for this is that none of the European peoples, neither the Germans, nor the Romani, nor the Slavs, and the Iranians in the south, the Arabs, and the Chinese in the East, none of these great peoples want the Turkic-speaking peoples to recognize the greatness of the past. Therefore, their ruling ideology aims to separate the Turkic people from their ancestors, great history and living past by all scientific and non-scientific, fair and unfair means.

For this, Western and Eastern scholars try to distance the truth by deliberately giving wrong options in their linguistic research. For example, I. Bentzig in his work devoted to the study of the language of the Huns says that "the languages of the Huns and the Sunnu have nothing in common, and it is more correct that they belong to the Ket language and Paleo-Asian languages than to the Danube and Volga Bulgars" quotes ket words that do not come close to it at all. "The fact that the word ["tangri"] in the Gunn language corresponds to the word in the old Turkic ["tangri"] in the Kipchak language ["tangri"] in the Chuvash language ["tura"] in the Mongolian language [tenggeri] does not indicate that the Hunns spoke the Turkic language. "Maybe this word is a word taken from another language."

In addition, he tries to mislead scholars by giving wrong options where the Turkish language is clearly visible. For example, the Hunnic woman says that the name "Altin Rerce" should be read as "altin burti" or "Iltin bürti" and he is confused because he cannot understand the meaning of the simple name "Altin Parcha".

We can observe such situations in the works written by other scholars L.Bazen, R.G.Akhmetyanov and many other linguists who have set themselves the task of studying the Gunn language.

For example, R.G. Akhmetyanov considers the language of the Huns to be close to the Evenk language and compares a number of words belonging to these two languages. It is interesting to note that the words he compares are so far from each other that the author's "inability" to prove a thesis that was wrong at the beginning only serves to further lower the general assessment of the scholar. For example, in this work, the word *angiskir* (tribe name) in the Hunn language is found to be close to *alenkagir* in the Evenk language.

He suspects the word *khungur* (onogur) to be related to the word *khungu*.

He considers the words *Utrigur* and *Uturgur* to be close to the word *Udygir*.

If the author does not fall for this strange similarity and makes the analysis more reliable and scientific, and the names "*utrigur*, *uturgur*, *onogur*" are ancient pure Turkic words, not derived from the Evenk language, they are the rotatized variant of the word *Oguz*, *Ogur*, he understood that he was *Ugur* and that "*onogur*" means "an alliance uniting ten Oguz tribes" and "*utrigur*" means "an alliance uniting thirty Oguz tribes" and he did not rummage through the vocabulary of the Evenk language.

The fact that the Gunn language did not originate from the Evenk language, or vice versa, that the Evenk language did not originate from the Gun language, can be explained by the fact that the Evenks currently number 50,000 people. Even though the language of the Evenks also belongs to the Altaic language family, they were not historically numerous enough to form a huge empire.

Summarizing the information presented here, it can be said that the Gunn language with its typological properties, i.e., palatal and labial synharmony of vowels, assimilation of consonants, the unique form of the word structure, and the fact that the phonological structure consists of

similar elements, is very close to the common Turkic state and Turkic. allows inclusion in the group of languages.

In summary, it can be said that the archaic features of the Gunn language, i.e., the presence of specific generalizing consonants or improperly articulating vowels, explain its belonging to the Altaic language family. In the morphological structure of the Gunn language, the agglutination rod is one of the main ways of expressing grammatical meaning, in which the agglutinating rod serves in affixes, word formation and word change. The Gunn language did not have a grammatical category like all other Turkic languages, and had a common means of expression, apart from the genitive case. Gunn had no prepositions, but postpositions. It is not possible to talk about the more complex verb tenses, aspect, ratio and mood forms or impersonal forms of the verb and the types of conjunctions in the Gunn language syntax, the various connectives or others involved in their formation, because a corpus of texts of sufficient complexity has not been preserved for this.

Reference

1. Мapp Н.Я. Избранные работы, том II, М. 1936, с. 275.
2. А. Бенциг. Языки гуннов, дунайских и волжских булгар. – Зарубежная тюркология, М. Наука, 1986 – сс. 11-28.
3. Базен Л. Человек и понятие истории у тюрков Центральной Азии. – Зарубежная тюркология, М. Наука, 1986. сс. 361-379.
4. Яхметянов Р.Г. Сравнительное исследование татарского и чувашского языков (фонетика и лексика). М. Наука, 1978, 248 с.
5. Kuldashev A.M. A History of the English language. Textbook. Darslik. –T.: “Ma’rifat”, 2024. 336 bet.
6. Kuldashev A.M., Kuldasheva Sh.A. On the nature of the language situation in Europe after the Great Migration of Peoples (II-IX centuries CE). ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. Vol 10, Issue 11, pp. 1096-1105. India, Nov. 2020.