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TURKOLOGICAL RESEARCH OF CZECH SCIENTIST LUDEK HRJEVICEK

Abstract. In the early Middle Ages, the Western Hun state, the Tatars as part of the Mongols, the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Tatars in the Middle Ages and the New Age, the Turkic-speaking states that became union republics within the USSR in modern history, and the recent history of independent Turkic-speaking states including Azerbaijan. Cultural, socio-economic relations have had a profound impact on the history, culture and daily life of the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and other European countries. Historians and philologists such as Jan Rybka, Josef Blaszkiewicz, Ludek Hrjebicek have trained Turkologists and linguists who are engaged in a number of scientific and creative activities. The works and research works of these scientists have been translated and published in the Republic of Turkey, and have been included in general dissertations and doctoral dissertations. The study of local Turkic languages by these scholars, along with internationally recognized and widespread Turkic language groups, demonstrates the position of Turkology in the history of Czech science. One of the peculiarities of Czech Turkology is the study of the "staroosmanstiny" language, which is also called "Old Ottoman" in the field of Turkology. Traditionally, European oriental studies were based on the study of the Turkish court and the local vernacular used in the Aghgoyunlu, Ottoman, Safavid and Mongol empires, primarily in Arabic and Persian. Another peculiarity of Czech Turkology was the study of the stylistic and syntactic features of Arabic and Persian thanks to the Turkic languages.
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The Czech language has words derived from the languages of many nations. These words include various words and phrases related to the Turkic languages, personal or place names. Our observations show that researchers in Czech science have shown less interest in the topic of all-Turkic than in Turkey. This had a negative
effect on the development of ethnonymic words in the Czech language. If the Czech scholar Ludýek Hrjebíček had not previously mentioned the all-Turkic meaning of turkicky (Turkish), perhaps most Czech readers would not have known about the Turkic peoples living on earth. It is a natural process that from time to time scholars exaggerate this or that linguistic problem and mediate the creation of new lexical units. On the other hand, the process of the emergence of the turkicky adjective of all-Turkic meaning and various other concepts related to this topic became widespread after the Republic of Turkey took its place on the world map. At the beginning of the last century, the Ottoman state and the Turkish intelligentsia of the Russian Empire tried to form the ideological basis of the concept of Turkish unity. Strategic research has been conducted in this direction not only in the Turkic world, but also in many leading countries of the world. After the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the states that had both friendly and hostile relations with the Ottoman Empire became more interested in who the Turks were and what Turkism was. Later, this area of interest was transferred to the scientific level, research was conducted in the relevant departments of various science and education institutions [1, 34/3, 5].

L. Hrjebíček was one of the publishers of a textbook on Turkish in Czechoslovakia. Although the scholar raised the issue of Turkish ethnonyms in 1967, in the foreword to his Turkish textbook published in 1969, he did not refer to the lexical unit he invented, but to the expressions understood by all readers. The so-called turečtina patří do skupiny tzv. tureckých jazyků and "Turkish language belongs to the group of Turkic languages". The Turkish adjective he brought to Czechoslovak science was not used instead of the Turkic one. Presumably, the author of the textbook tried to explain his thoughts in terms that everyone could understand, as he did not know the Turkic ethnonym of all-Turkic meaning, which he invented. It should be noted that although the purpose of the adjectives denoting the Turkish ethnonym is clear, there is still uncertainty about their use. This is understandable, as Turkish and all-Turkish issues are rarely discussed in the daily lives of Czechs. This problem can be compared to factory production. If necessary, this or that product will be actively produced in factories and put into consumption.
The producer of words is society, which produces and develops and consumes. If a word is used en masse by people, this process leads to the formation and development of that word. Society is accustomed to this word and does not allow mistakes in the moments of use. There is some uncertainty in Czech society in the use of the adjectives denoting the above-mentioned ethnonyms, and the Czechs confuse the application of nouns denoting a citizen of the Republic of Turkey, as well as all-Turkic.

L. Hrjebicek mainly studies Czech Turkology in the field of linguistics. He has very valuable research in this area. Among them are "Russian words taken in the Kazakh language", "Ancient Turkic inscriptions were written in the form of poems?", "The first syllable of the word in the Turkish language and its relative analysis", "Turkish language reform and modern lexicon", "Structure of the root morpheme in Uzbek", "Predication and text segmentation in Turkish" and others. Let's look at some of them separately.

One of L. Hrjebicek's interesting articles is dedicated to "The structure of the root morpheme in the Uzbek language". In this article, the author tries to expand the quantitative characteristics of phonemes and the range of their positions in morphemes. However, he considers it important to take into account the syllable structure in the Uzbek language. The Czech scientist believes that the concept of morpheme structure can be defined as a set of relationships between situations characterized by the distribution of morphemes. To determine the structure of the root morpheme in the Uzbek language, the Czech scientist turned to the Uzbek-Russian dictionary, conducted statistical research on the lexical unit taken from it and analyzed them simultaneously. As a result of this statistical study, the author made the following claims: a) which syllable morpheme is the first, second and so on. b) similar information about the lexical unit, c) phoneme pairs in the root regardless of the position, d) sequence of phoneme pairs in the first and second syllables of roots consisting of more than one syllable [2, 34].

On the other hand, in the article, the author analyzes the sequence of two adjacent phonemes in a morpheme, regardless of the position of the pair. In addition, in the article, the author drew up various tables to substantiate his claims and gave
some comments. Specifically, we can name several: Table I - The full value of syllable numbers in root cases, Table II - The full value of syllable numbers in lexical units, Table III - The ratio of vowels and consonants in the sequence of roots, Table IV: The order of pairs of phonemes: consonants according to pronunciation - vowels and others. It should be noted that L. Hrjebicek published not only this, but also other articles of international importance, not in Czech, but in English. This, in our opinion, indicates that these articles will contribute to world Turkology.

Another important article by L. Hrjebicek is called "Predication and text segmentation in Turkish". This article presents the results of the initial experiment on the Turkish text. The aim of the experiment was to separate the predicate-related parts of the text. The purpose of this article is also to promote the Menzerath-Altmann law, one of the basic laws of language, which is little known and applied by linguists. Hrjebicek's third article is dedicated to the reform of the Turkish language. This reform was an important political move in the first half of the 1930s in connection with another reform aimed at severing ties between Islamic traditions and some forms of public life. However, over the next 10 years, reform activity gradually weakened and as a result completely lost its political character. Like other reforms, this reform was linked to the attempt to include modern Turkey in the cultural sphere of Europe. The author of the article notes that the reform is directed against Arabic and Persian words, which are intended to be replaced by Turkish words that appear as derivatives in both normal and Turkish lexemes. Assessing the essence of the reform, the Czech scholar rightly notes that this reform is especially important in two ways: to replace all derived words and to bridge the large gap between the spoken and literary forms of the Turkish language [3, 35].

The analysis of the Czech scientist in the article aims to find answers to the following questions:

Has language reform eliminated the differences between written and spoken language in terms of lexical units?

What role do words of Turkish origin play in the event of significant changes?

What is the difference between the two styles in the application of Arabic and Persian words?
What is the role of European words?

Do both subgroups of derived words represent arbitrarily formed patterns from lexical unit groups of styles? [4, 41]

Another important article by Hrjebicek is entitled "Russian words in the Kazakh language". The focus here is on the quantitative aspect of the problem, which has been used to prove some of the hypotheses expressed so far on an intuitive level. The first part of the article proves the hypothesis of the relationship between the formation of derived words and the functional style of the text, as well as their quantitative distribution. The second part examines other features of derived words, especially their relationship with their Kazakh equivalents. Hrjebicek's other article is devoted to ancient Turkish inscriptions written in the form of poems. The author chose the Orkhon-Yenisei monument as an object of research. In particular, he studied the structure of texts in the Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions. The author has obtained a number of interesting results here. The lines of the inscriptions represent not one, but several, sometimes simple, sometimes complex, and sometimes related to the main idea. The content of the inscriptions is presented in circles, not sentences. They differ in the number of syllables in the verses and range from 6-7 syllables and 12-13 syllables on average. The article refers to several works that analyze folklore samples (poems) of Gagauz, Tuva, Chuvash and other peoples. The article also discusses the development of poetic meanings as metaphors, antitheses and other stylistic phenomena [5, 45]. The last chapter covers content analysis. In the end, the author of the article concludes that the authors of ancient Turkish inscriptions are genius poets.
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