

Yermukhamet Maralbek

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, Kazakhstan, Almaty
ORCID: 0000-0001-5954-8689 E-mail: elahau@mail.ru

TELZHAN SHONANULY'S SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO THE KAZAKH WRITING

Abstract. This article analyzes the works of Telzhan Shonanuly, a well-known linguist, prominent figure in Kazakh linguistics at the beginning of the 20th century, talented educator, and representative of the Baitursynuly linguistic school, concerning Kazakh orthography and the Kazakh-Latin alphabet. The scientific articles and reports published by Shonanuly between 1924 and 1930 are used as sources, and issues such as writing, orthography, terminology, and the spelling of foreign words are examined. The article is divided into two main parts: the first part analyzes Shonanuly's works on the spelling of native words and Kazakh orthography in general; the second part considers his scientific and publicistic articles on the spelling of foreign words. We compared these works with complex and contradictory issues of modern Kazakh orthography and the works of A. Baitursynuly, Y. Omaruly and tried to reveal the content, essence, novelty and continuity of traditions. As a result of the research, the role and contribution of T. Shonanuly in the formation and development of Kazakh writing and orthography are given due recognition. This article is intended for researchers of Alash linguistics, scholars studying writing theory, and readers interested in the history of Kazakh linguistics.

Keywords: Shonanuly; Baitursynuly; Kazakh writing; Kazakh orthography; spelling rules

Source of financing: The article was prepared within the framework of the fundamental scientific research project of the No.BR20280984 “The Potential of Modernization of the Kazakh Language: Innovations, Tendencies and Processes”.

For citation: Maralbek Y. Telzhan Shonanuly's Scientific Approach to the Kazakh Writing. *Tiltanym*, 2024. №3 (95). 96-107-66.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2024-3-96-107>

Ермұхамет Маралбек

философия докторы (PhD), А. Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл білімі институты,
Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,
ORCID: 0000-0001-5954-8689 E-mail: elahau@mail.ru

ТЕЛЖАН ШОНАНҰЛЫНЫҢ ҚАЗАҚ ЖАЗУЫ ТУРАЛЫ ҒЫЛЫМИ ТАНЫМЫ

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада белгілі лингвист ғалым, XX ғасыр басындағы қазақ тіл білімінің көрнекті тұлғасы, дарынды педагог, Байтұрсынұлы лингвистикалық мектебінің өкілі – Телжан Шонанұлының қазақ емлесі мен қазақ-латын әліпбиі туралы еңбектері талданады. Т.Шонанұлының 1924-1930 жылдар аралығында жарияланған ғылыми мақалалары мен баяндамалары дереккөз ретінде алынып, ондағы жазу, емле, терминдер мен шеттілдік сөздердің жазылу мәселесі қарастырылады. Мақала үлкен екі бөліктен тұрады: бірінші бөлігінде Т.Шонанұлының төл сөздердің жазылуы, жалпы қазақ емлесіне арналған еңбектері талданады; екінші бөлігінде шеттілдік сөздердің жазылуы турасындағы ғылыми-публицистикалық мақалалары қарастырылады. Біз бұл еңбектерді бүгінгі қазақ емлесіндегі күрделі, даулы түйткілдермен және А.Байтұрсынұлы, Е.Омарұлының жазу туралы еңбектерімен салыстыра отырып, мазмұнын, мәнін, жаңалығы мен дәстүр жалғастығын ашуға талпындық. Зерттеу нәтижесінде қазақ жазуын, қазақ емлесін қалыптастыру, дамытудағы Т.Шонанұлының орны мен үлесіне лайықты баға беріледі. Мақала Алаш тіл білімін зерттеушілерге, жазу теориясын қарастыратын ғалымдарға, қазақ тіл білімінің тарихы туралы ақпарат алғысы келетін оқырмандарға арналған.

Түйін сөздер: Шонанұлы; Байтұрсынұлы; қазақ жазуы; қазақ орфографиясы; емле ережелері

Қаржыландыру көзі: Мақала BR20280984 «Қазақ тілінің жаңғыру әлеуеті: жаңартпалар <лат. innovation> үрдістер мен үдерістер» атты іргелі ғылыми зерттеу жоба аясында дайындалды.

Сілтеме жасау үшін: Маралбек Е. Телжан Шонанұлының қазақ жазуы туралы ғылыми танымы. *Tiltanym*, 2024. №3 (95). 96-107-66. (ағыл. тілінде)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2024-3-96-107>

Ермухамет Маралбек

доктор философии (PhD), Институт языкознания имени А.Байтұрсынұлы, Казахстан, г. Алматы,
ORCID: 0000-0001-5954-8689 E-mail: elahau@mail.ru

НАУЧНОЕ ПОЗНАНИЕ ТЕЛЖАНА ШОНАНУЛЫ О КАЗАХСКОЙ ПИСЬМЕННОСТИ

Аннотация. В данной статье анализируются труды известного ученого-лингвиста, выдающегося деятеля казахского языкознания начала XX века, талантливого педагога, представителя Байтурсыновской лингвистической школы – Телжана Шонанулы о казахской орфографии и казахско-латинском алфавите. В качестве источников использованы научные статьи и отчеты Т.Шонанулы, опубликованные в 1924-1930 годах, а также рассмотрены вопросы письменности, орфографии, терминов и иностранных слов. Статья состоит из двух больших частей: в первой части анализируются работы Т.Шонанулы по написанию оригинальных слов и общей казахской орфографии; во второй части рассматриваются научные и публицистические статьи по правописанию иностранных слов. Мы сопоставили эти произведения со сложными и противоречивыми вопросами современной казахской орфографии и трудами А.Байтурсынулы, Е.Омарулы и попытались раскрыть содержание, сущность, новизну и преемственность традиций. В результате исследования будет дана достойная оценка позиции и вклада Т.Шонанулы в формирование и развитие казахской письменности, казахской орфографии. Статья предназначена исследователям Алашского языкознания, ученым, занимающимся теорией письменности, и читателям, желающим получить информацию об истории казахского языкознания.

Ключевые слова: Шонанулы; Байтурсынулы; казахская письменность; казахская орфография; правила правописания

Источник финансирования: Статья подготовлена в рамках фундаментального научно-исследовательского проекта №BR20280984 “Модернизационный потенциал казахского языка: инновации, тенденции и процессы”.

Для цитирования: Маралбек Е. Научное познание Телжана Шонанулы о казахской письменности. *Tiltanyim*, 2024. №3 (95). 96-107-бб. (на англ. яз.)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2024-3-96-107>

Introduction

At the beginning of the 20th century, Telzhan Shonanuly was one of the prominent figures during the formative period of Kazakh linguistics. As a scholar in scientific and creative continuity and spiritual connection with Ahmet Baitursynuly, he conducted research on critical topics in Kazakh linguistics, one of which was orthography. Among the scholars who made significant contributions to the complex and scientific topics surrounding Kazakh writing in the early 20th century are A.Baitursynuly, Y.Omaruly, T.Shonanuly, K.Basymuly, Zh.Aitmauytuly, Q.Zhubanov, and others. However, the first three scholars played a decisive role in the development and formation of Kazakh writing.

From 1910-1911, A.Baitursynuly reformed the old and new scripts used by Turkic peoples and established a national script, developing the first national orthographic rules for the Kazakh language, along with its scientific metalanguage and a group of orthographic scholars. Among these scholars, Y.Omaruly holds a special place. After mastering Baitursynuly's theoretical works, Omaruly devoted himself to Kazakh orthography from the 1920s onward, playing a significant role in developing the “Baitursynuly orthography” and solving some of the complex issues of Kazakh writing. He played an exceptional role in purging the old and new script elements from Baitursynuly's orthography (1911-1922) and filling in some of the deficiencies prompted by the period.

In 1929, after Ahmet Baitursynuly and a group of leading Alash scholars, including Y.Omaruly and Zh.Aitmauytuly, were arrested and exiled, the talented students of these eminent national figures continued their legacy, becoming leading scholars in critical topics of Kazakh science. After the “Baitursynuly alphabet” was removed from use in 1928-1929, a new Kazakh-Latin alphabet was introduced, and its orthographic rules were developed by T.Shonanuly. As the secretary of the “Central New Alphabet Committee” established in the Kazakh ASSR, Shonanuly, along with O.Zhandosov (the chairman), actively engaged in the transition to the Latin alphabet and became the leading scholar responsible for its scientific foundation. From 1928 until his arrest in 1937, Shonanuly played a role in Kazakh linguistics similar to that of Baitursynuly: writing primers used in schools, preparing grammar textbooks, developing the orthography of the Kazakh language using Latin script, and creating educational programs, among other tasks.

The principles of writing arise not from symbols or letters but from the structure of the language itself; therefore, even though the symbols change, the fundamental principles and basic norms of writing are preserved. As a representative of the Baitursynuly linguistic school, Telzhan Shonanuly focused on solving the complex issues of Kazakh orthography in the Latin alphabet. However, what were those issues? What was the continuity and divergence between his work and Baitursynuly's orthography? How did he influence subsequent Kazakh writing? What complex issues of the Latin-scripted Kazakh writing did he manage to resolve? What was his contribution to the history of Kazakh orthography?

These questions remain insufficiently studied to this day. Therefore, identifying T. Shonanuly's role and place in Kazakh linguistics from 1928 to 1937, particularly in Kazakh orthography, and determining the theoretical content of his scientific conclusions is an urgent and pressing task.

Materials and methods

T. Shonanuly's works on orthography characterize a new historical phase of Kazakh writing, fully encompassing its inception and conclusion. Therefore, a scientific study and comprehensive analysis based on extensive material sources are necessary. To fulfill the objectives of the research, scientific works were collected from libraries and archives both in Kazakhstan and abroad. Specifically, collections were made from the National Library of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Central Scientific Library of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the V.I. Lenin State Library of the Russian Federation, the Alisher Navoi National Library of Uzbekistan, the United State Archive of the Orenburg Region of the Russian Federation, and the N.K. Krupskaya Orenburg Regional Universal Scientific Library. All issues of the "Yenbekshi Kazakh" newspaper were reviewed, and T. Shonanuly's works were compiled, with archival research conducted. As a result, over 30 scientific articles by Shonanuly were gathered, providing a substantial material base for the research.

To achieve the research objectives, these materials are analyzed through multiple approaches and methodologies. Shonanuly's works are categorized into thematic groups and systematically examined. Methods of systematization and classification are employed in this process. The formation and development phases of Kazakh orthography cannot be viewed separately from the works of A. Baitursynuly. Therefore, using *historical-comparative* and *structural* methods, the works of T. Shonanuly, A. Baitursynuly, and Y. Omaruly are studied in comparison.

Since Shonanuly's research on writing and orthography reflects a period of Kazakh writing influenced by numerous extralinguistic factors, a descriptive method is used to fully uncover the nature of the language of that period. Sometimes, even individual characters are dissected to explain their influence on the language and writing and their origins. During this analysis, the synthesis method is applied. Consequently, the development dynamics of orthographic rules and alphabets were determined, concluding evaluations were made, and the place and contribution of Telzhan Shonanuly in the history of Kazakh writing were assessed.

Literature review

In Kazakh linguistics, Alash linguistics represents one of the major branches. The early 20th century, a time when Kazakh linguistics was emerging as an independent field of study, is marked by research on many critical topics brought forth by that era. This period is also distinguished by linguists who were not only clear in their purpose but also versatile, working tirelessly to transform the Kazakh language, which had primarily developed orally and had lagged in scientific styles, into a state and scientific language. One such scholar is Telzhan Shonanuly. Although his works have begun to be studied piecemeal since Kazakhstan's independence, most research has focused on his methodological contributions. Consequently, he is often viewed primarily as a methodologist. However, in reality, Shonanuly was a prominent scholar who wrote extensively on various topics within Kazakh linguistics.

The limited scope of research on the many linguistic areas that Shonanuly explored is due to the fact that his works have not yet been fully integrated into the scientific discourse, partly because they have not been translated from the Arabic script or the Kazakh-Latin script. In 2017, a five-volume collection of his works was published, compiled by Dr. O. Zhubayeva, which was a significant resource for readers eager to explore Shonanuly's legacy. Nevertheless, this collection represents only a portion of his vast output, which includes around 40 textbooks and translations, educational programs, and nearly 100 scientific, theoretical, methodological, and publicistic articles, as well as biographical essays written during his 44 years of life.

In this article, we specifically focus on one of the research areas within Shonanuly's linguistic studies – the "Kazakh writing" issue. To achieve this goal, we gathered Shonanuly's works on Kazakh writing from 1924 to 1930 from various sources, including periodicals from the early 20th century. The material base of our research consists of nearly ten scientific-publicistic articles and reports published in the "Yenbekshi Kazakh" newspaper, fully cited in the bibliography. The majority of these works were originally published in the Arabic script, with his post-1929 works appearing in the Kazakh-Latin script. We conducted our research by reading and analyzing these works in their original form.

In order to fully understand Shonanuly's scientific conclusions on Kazakh writing, alphabet, and

orthography, and to explain them to readers, we also examined the works of scholars who conducted research on these topics before him, such as A.Baitursynuly (Baitursynuly, 2023) and Y.Omaruly (Omaruly, 2018), as well as the 1923 “New Orthographic Rules for the Kazakh Language” (Maralbek, 2024), the materials from the First Congress of Kazakh Scholars (KBTS, 1925), and the materials from the 1929 “Orthography Conference.” These served as the theoretical foundation for our research. Additionally, to assess the scientific significance and future relevance of Shonanuly's works within the context of contemporary linguistics, we referenced key studies on modern Kazakh writing by scholars such as R.Syzdyq (Syzdykova, 2000), N.Uali (Uali, 1999), B.Momynova (Momynova, 2022), Q.Kuderinova (Kuderinova, 2013), and N.Amirzhanova (Amirzhanova, 2013).

Results and discussions

The scholarly and pedagogical potential of Telzhan Shonanuly was evident as early as the period of struggle for the establishment of the Alash Autonomy. His election as one of the five members of the Alash Orda Government's Educational Commission is a testament to this. Shonanuly first demonstrated his expertise in the field of orthography during the First Congress of Kazakh Scholars, held in Orenburg in 1924. It is likely that Shonanuly attended the Congress as an unofficial representative, as his name is not listed among the 19 officially invited delegates. This, of course, is a separate issue in itself.

At the First Congress of Kazakh Scholars, complex topics related to Kazakh orthography were discussed. The elements of the *qadim* and *zhadit* scripts used previously were purified, and other issues within Baitursynuly's alphabet were addressed, with most of them being resolved. It is well known that Y.Omaruly played a significant role as the main speaker on the topic of orthography at the Congress. Shonanuly also presented himself as a scholar with a firm stance and well-founded conclusions on orthography. During the Congress's discussions on orthography, a significant scientific debate emerged among Omaruly, Baitursynuly, and Shonanuly concerning the representation of the sounds /y/ and /и/. Regarding Omaruly's main presentation on orthography, Shonanuly remarked:

“Aside from the proposals related to 'y' and 'u', I have no objections to the rest. However, it is incorrect to claim that there are no long vowels 'y' and 'u' in the Kazakh language. Akhmet and Eldes argue that suffixes and affixes cannot include 'y' and 'u' as vowels. They assert that 'y' and 'u' are not part of the vowel group. But there are cases where 'y' and 'u' do belong to the vowel group, and there are cases where they do not” (Shonanuly, 1925:31).

The scholar further provided evidence of the characteristics of /y/ and /и/ that align with those of vowel sounds:

1. The suffixes starting with the sound /л/(-лык, -лы) attach to «y» and «и» the way vowels do;
2. The dative clause (-ға, -ге) is attached to /y/ and /и/ the way vowels do;
3. Plural endings (-лар, -лер) are attached to /y/ and /и/ the way vowels do;
4. /Y/ and /и/ can be pronounced in a prolonged way similarly to vowels.

Telzhan Shonanuly argued for the inclusion of the /y/ and /и/ sounds in the category of vowels, primarily due to their predominant vowel-like properties. He supported his argument with additional evidence, noting that in other related Turkic languages, these sounds are considered vowels. From the perspective of universal methodological science, Shonanuly also pointed out that writing these sounds with a single letter would be more efficient and simpler. He stated, “This difficulty arises from writing one /y/ as two sounds with two letters. If we write the long /u/ and long /i/ as one letter, writing becomes easier” (Shonanuly, 1926: 32).

As a methodologist, Shonanuly valued the ease of mastering educational content and the efficiency of practical processes. This emphasis likely influenced his strong advocacy for writing the contentious sounds /y/ and /и/ with a single letter.

In addition to the vowel-like properties of /y/ and /и/ that Shonanuly enumerated, these sounds also exhibit vowel-like behavior in the way they attach to personal suffixes and particles (such as conjunctions and interrogative particles). This feature has been discussed in detail in a previous analysis of A.Baitursynuly's work “On the Classification of Sounds” (Maralbek, 2022: 193-198). The article delves into the combinatorial (valency) characteristics of /y/ and /и/ with both vowel and consonant sounds, which will not be reiterated here.

The method of determining the phonological properties and functional characteristics of sounds through the use of suffixes and affixes was first introduced into Kazakh linguistics by A.Baitursynuly.

Shonanuly's use of this method reflects his intellectual and scientific continuity with Baitursynuly and indicates his adherence to the Baitursynuly linguistic school. A.Baitursynuly's ability to accurately determine the number and properties of Kazakh sounds was not due to "intuition" but rather to this method of deep, functional, and fact-based research into linguistic sounds.

During the First Congress of Kazakh Scholars, where the classification and graphical representation of the /y/ and /ɯ/ sounds were debated, the Kazakh intelligentsia could not reach a consensus. As a result, A.Baitursynuly proposed the formation of a special commission on orthography to address these contentious issues. The proposal was accepted, and a five-member commission was established, consisting of A.Baitursynuly, T.Shonanuly, Y.Omaruly, M.Myrzauly, and H.Dosmukhameduly.

On the evening of June 13, the commission held a meeting to discuss complex issues related to Kazakh orthography. Specifically, the commission considered the number of sounds in the Kazakh language and their symbols; the sounds /к/, /г/, /к/, /Ғ/ and their graphic features; whether the sound /ɯ/ (/i/) should be written in closed syllables; the spelling of the sounds /б/, /п/, /д/, /т/ at the end of words; the removal of the "supporting stick" ("I") from the alphabet; the inclusion or exclusion of the borrowed sounds /x/, /ч/, /ф/, /h/ in the Kazakh alphabet; and the issue of /y/ and /ɯ/.

The commission members reached a consensus on other issues but could not agree on the matter of /y/ and /ɯ/. The discussion on /y/ and /ɯ/ was divided into several subtopics:

1. Whether /y/ and /ɯ/ should be written before vowels;
2. Whether /y/ and /ɯ/ can occur between two vowels;
3. The existence of vowel sounds /y/ and /ɯ/ in the Kazakh language.

The commission members reached a compromise on the first two topics, deciding that /y/ and /ɯ/ should be written before vowels and can occur between two vowels. However, they could not agree on whether these sounds belong to the group of vowels or consonants. T.Shonanuly and M.Myrzauly continued to insist that /y/ and /ɯ/ possess properties common to vowels as well.

As the debate intensified, M.Myrzauly proposed that instead of defining the phonetic group of /y/ and /ɯ/, the commission should regulate their graphic representation. However, this proposal was not accepted, and the Congress decided to put the issue of which phonetic group /y/ and /ɯ/ belong to a vote. As a result of the vote, 6 members considered /y/ and /ɯ/ to be vowels, while 11 members classified them as consonants. Consequently, /y/ and /ɯ/ were recognized as consonants.

The Congress then continued to discuss the graphic characteristics of these sounds. Shonanuly did not vote and was not present at the further meetings, nor did he participate in the subsequent sessions of the Congress. It is likely that, due to the intense scientific controversy surrounding /y/ and /ɯ/, and the lack of support for his proposals, Shonanuly's scholarly integrity led him to withdraw.

In the history of Kazakh phonetics, T.Shonanuly was the scholar who, in an official meeting, highlighted the complex phonological properties of these sounds, especially their vowel-like characteristics. A.Baitursynuly and Y.Omaruly also recognized the complex phonological nature of these sounds. However, taking into account their phonetic properties and functional characteristics, Omaruly classified them as consonants. A.Baitursynuly, in some of his works, sometimes classified these sounds as vowels and sometimes as consonants, but between 1912-1924 and 1927-1929, he consistently identified them as "semi-vowels." In our view, these sounds can only be classified as "semi-vowels," and this should be considered the most accurate conclusion.

T.Shonanuly approached the subject of orthography from the perspective of the alphabet. It appears that in the early years, he did not intend to engage deeply in the study, correction, or improvement of Kazakh orthography. Given that experts like A.Baitursynuly and Y.Omaruly were already deeply involved in this field, Shonanuly might not have considered it his primary area of focus. Instead, it was the issues arising in Kazakh society and the challenges posed by the new Latin-based Kazakh alphabet that compelled him to engage with the topic. This is also evident from his publications on orthography. While Shonanuly wrote nearly 20 articles related to the alphabet, he penned only 4-5 articles directly addressing orthography. The spelling rules for the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet from 1929 are a separate matter. Let us now examine the key issues discussed in his articles on orthography, the problems he addressed, and their impact on the development of Kazakh writing.

In the article “On Changing Orthography,” co-authored with O.Zhandosuly, T.Shonanuly states: “Orthography should be easy to learn and teach. Delving deep into spelling rules, multiplying the rules, and digging into the roots of sounds is not the work of schools, the general public, or students, but rather the work of language specialists” (Shonanuly & Zhandosuly, 1928: 3). This conclusion clearly stems from his practical approach as an educator. However, orthography has both a scientific-theoretical and a practical side. Orthography is governed by the laws of language and reflects its nature. Writing is the visible form of language; while we cannot equate writing with the language itself, it is a graphic representation of it. Orthography cannot be separated from the laws of language even for a moment. Orthography that does not arise from linguistic laws can lead to changes in the language. If simplification of orthography is necessary, it should be done based on practices that do not alter the language, rather than disregarding strict linguistic rules.

In this article, T.Shonanuly continues to express his thoughts on the “Kazakh Orthography” developed by A.Baitursynuly and outlines key principles that future Kazakh orthography should consider for simplification. These principles can be summarized as follows:

1. Orthography should be easy, facilitate quick and correct writing and reading, and should not aim to mark all clearly or ambiguously heard sounds in the language.
2. Writing should be based on how words sound.
3. The sounds /y/ and /ɯ/ should be simplified by using a single letter at the beginning of words and syllables.
4. Avoid the unnecessary proliferation of the /y/ sound.
5. Write “ТЫН” instead of “ТҮН” at the end of words, thus eliminating the /ɣ/ sound from the second syllable onward.
6. Combine hyphenated words or find other ways to streamline them.
7. Regulate the spelling of borrowed words, ensuring they are adapted to the phonetic rules of the Kazakh language and avoiding unnecessary distortions based on strict rules.
8. Regulate the spelling of the sounds /б/, /п/, /т/, /д/.

Despite the passage of a century, these issues remain relevant to modern Kazakh orthography. These challenges continue to be central topics of scientific debate during the current alphabet reform, especially in the process of developing new orthographic rules for the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet. This indicates that these are complex topics in Kazakh orthography, where the tensions between orthography and orthoepy (correct pronunciation) often emerge.

In the article “On the Issue of Changing Russian Orthography and Alphabet,” T.Shonanuly discusses the intensified proposals to change Russian orthography and alphabet following the October Revolution. The article mentions that more than a hundred proposals had been submitted to the People's Commissariat, and that Russian teachers, workers, students, and progressive intellectuals led the movement, advocating for the following four demands:

1. Changing the current Russian orthography;
2. Modifying punctuation marks;
3. Eliminating capital letters;
4. Adopting the Latin alphabet (Shonanuly, 1929: 2).

The scholar then provides a brief overview of the history of Russian orthography, focusing on the reforms made by Academician Yakov Karlovich Grot (1812-1893). Shonanuly critiques Grot's orthography, stating that “Russian orthography does not correspond to the current state of the language or its inherent rules, is difficult to master, and was scientifically weak and poorly constructed from the outset.” He highlights the various principles of Russian writing, such as the traditional principle, the etymological principle, the phonetic principle (writing as it sounds), as well as instances where there is no consistent principle, resulting in irregularities. At the end of the article, T. Shonanuly informs readers that the work on revising Russian orthography was to be conducted by emphasizing either the phonetic principle or the traditional one as the leading approach, and that a commission of 10 members had been assigned to draft the Russian orthography project.

The article was written to argue that Kazakhstan's transition to the Latin alphabet was necessary and the right course of action, aiming to persuade readers of its merits. The article implies that if even

the Russians, with their well-established writing traditions and publishing industry, were considering adopting the Latin alphabet, Kazakhstan's decision to do so was undoubtedly justified. This article also reveals Shonanuly's deep understanding of the Russian language and orthography, as well as his extensive knowledge of writing theory and his experience in developing orthography. Furthermore, in the context of the current alphabet reform, this article provides important information, showing that the movement towards adopting the Latin alphabet in early 20th-century Russia had not only a political dimension but also a scientific and linguistic basis.

Another significant area of Shonanuly's work on Kazakh orthography was the spelling of foreign words. His article "On the Orthography of Foreign Words" (Shonanuly, 1929: 2-3) was published as a proposal following the "Orthography Conference" held in Kyzylorda on June 2-4, 1929. In this article, Shonanuly discusses the methods of spelling foreign words and proposes models for doing so. He asserts that "foreign words should be adapted to the rules of our language to make them easier for Kazakhs to pronounce, more pleasing to the ear, easier to understand, and more accessible for literacy." He then presents 31 principles and models for spelling foreign words, which can be summarized as follows:

1. Adapting foreign words to the rules of the Kazakh language;
2. Ensuring the correct spelling of the roots and suffixes of foreign words according to Kazakh language rules;
3. Writing foreign words according to phonetic and morphological principles, carefully considering whether adjectives should take suffixes (e.g., "социалистический" (socialistic) – should it be "социалистик" or "социал"?);
4. Using the phonetic changes that Arabic-Persian words underwent when assimilated into the Kazakh language as a model for assimilating and spelling foreign words.
Models of replacing the sounds of the foreign words with the sounds of the Kazakh language:
5. /Ф/ – /р/ (in the beginning of a word). E.g.: *фарыз – парыз, фахыр – рақыр* etc.;
6. /Г/ – /ҕ/ (in the beginning of a word). E.g.: *генерал – ҕанарал; география – ҕаоҕара* etc.;
7. /Ch/ (Europe) – /x/ (Russian) – writing /q/ and /k/ (Kazakh). E.g.: *chimik – qijmik, хайр – qajr, technik – teknik* т.б.;
8. /Ц/ – /s/. E.g.: *офицер – аресер, станция – stansa* etc.;
9. /Я/ – /җа/, /җә/ (in the beginning of a word). E.g.: *ява – җав, ярмарка – җәрмеңке* etc.;
10. /Ч/ – /с/ (ш). E.g.: *чай – саж, чахар – сәр* etc.;
11. The initial sound /h/ in the European words – without changes. E.g.: *hidro, henriq* etc.;
12. /V/ (as in European) – /v/ (in Kazakh /y/, in Russian /в/). E.g.: *Москва – maskev (Маскеу), Варшава – varcav (Уаршау)* etc.;
13. /U/, /i/ – /u/ (y), /i/ (и). E.g.: *litr, kilo* etc.;
14. /O/ – /o/ (If «о» occurs in the first syllable of the European words, and it is read as «а» in Russian, «о» must be written). E.g.: *komines, social* etc.;
15. /Ө/, /ь/ (ы), /y/ (ү), /ә/ - these sounds must not be written in European words, and /щ/ must be written as /с/ (ш). E.g.: *прикащик – byrkәncik (бүркәншик)* etc. (Shonanuly, 1929: 2);
16. The «а» letter at the end of the Russian words must be eliminated. E.g.: *физика – физик* etc.;
17. The «сса» at the end of Russian words must turn into *сы*, «нна» into *ны*. E.g.: *касса – каса; ванна – вана* etc.;
18. The sound «а» at the end of European toponyms must be written as «ы» or «і». E.g.: *Америка – Америкі, Ауропа – Ауropy* etc.;
19. The «иат» syllable at the end of Russian words (*пролетариат*) must be preserved. E.g.: *proľtarijat, kotesserijet* etc.;
20. The «ция» (*станция*) syllable at the end of Russian words must be turned into «-sa» (ca) «-se» (се). E.g.: *stansa, milijsе* etc.;
21. The «ет» (*бюджет*) syllable at the end of Russian words must be preserved. E.g.: *byvpet, budcet* etc.;
22. The «тор» (*трактор*) syllable at the end of Russian words must be written as «түр» (түр). E.g.: *doqtur, traktur* etc.;

23. The Latin «izm» (*марксизм*), «ist» (*эгоист*) at the end of European words must be turned into «-шыл», «-шылдық» («-шіл», «-шілдік»). E.g.: *lenincil, sosialcyl* etc.;
24. The suffixes «графия» (*фотография*), «лог» (*метеоролог*) must be turned into «-шы», «-ші». E.g.: *tilci, teknikci* etc.;
25. Adjective endings of the Russian words must be eliminated. E.g.: *социальный* – *social turtyb, электрический* – *elektir quatъ* etc.;
26. The final root sounds of the European words, except for /g/, /q/, /d/, /f/, /v/, /x/, must be preserved. E.g.: *volt, teleskop* etc.;
27. The «ия» (*буржуазия*) syllable must be turned into «а» or «ә». E.g.: *burçuvaza, aksә* (*акция*) etc.;
28. The «ий» (*пролетарий*) at the end of the Russian words must be eliminated. E.g.: *prolet, antiikva* etc.;
29. The «тр» (*театр*) at the end of the Russian words must be preserved. M.: *tiatr, metr* etc.;
30. The «иум» (*натриум*) syllable at the end of scientific terms must be preserved. E.g.: *kolsium, natrium* etc.;
31. The Arabic borrowed syllable «лима» (*мұғалима*) must be eliminated. E.g.: *muqalim* etc. (Shonanuly, 1929: 3).

At the end of his proposal, T. Shonanuly states: “There may be mistakes in our proposal. However, we believe most of it is correct. If anyone disputes the correctness of any point, we will provide more detailed explanations” (Shonanuly, 1929: 3). Of course, when compared with current practices, and as evidenced by a century of experience, some of these proposals do contain flaws. However, a thorough and comprehensive analysis of all these points in a separate article is necessary. What must be emphasized here is that for its time, this proposal was a significant achievement. In 1924, the First Congress of Kazakh Scholars had only one rule regarding foreign words: “Foreign words should be spelled according to the rules of the Kazakh language.” Four or five years later, the creation of such detailed and specific models represents significant progress in the assimilation and spelling of foreign words.

T. Shonanuly's most significant and substantial work on Kazakh orthography was the development of the concept and orthographic rules for the new Latin-script Kazakh alphabet in 1929. The conference was convened on June 2-4, 1929, by the Kazakh SSR People's Commissariat of Education and the Central Committee for the New Kazakh Alphabet. The council was chaired by Yudakhin, Baidildauly, and Kabylauly, with Zhubanuly (Zhubanov), Toktabaiuly, and council appointed as secretaries. T. Shonanuly was the main speaker on the topic of orthography. He began his speech by stating: “We have practically transitioned to the new alphabet. Having transitioned to the new alphabet, we also needed to change our orthography, which was previously based on the Arabic script and took into account some of the characteristics of the Kazakh language” (Shonanuly, 1930: 5). He then divided his presentation into three parts: the first part discussed the current main laws of the Kazakh language and its future laws; the second part covered what kind of orthography the Kazakh language needed based on these laws; and the third part dealt with the orthography of foreign words based on the living laws of the Kazakh language. Shonanuly's orthographic project was presented on behalf of the Education Commission.

Listing the main laws of the Kazakh language, Shonanuly argued that Kazakh orthography should be based on the phonetic principle. He emphasized that Kazakh orthography should be grounded in the spoken Kazakh language, retain the roots of Kazakh words without change, acknowledge that Kazakh is an agglutinative language, and recognize that there are no dialects in Kazakh. He also noted the importance of vowel sounds, particularly the strength of root vowels, and that each sound in the alphabet should have its distinct character. All these factors, he said, necessitate that Kazakh orthography be phonetic. Shonanuly clarified: “When we talk about a phonetic system, we do not mean writing sounds according to their subtle nuances in a scientific manner. We simply mean writing clearly audible sounds in a way that does not alter the meaning of the word” (Shonanuly, 1930: 7). However, he also noted that, when necessary, the morphological principle could be applied within certain limits and conditions. This idea reflects the concept of “phoneme,” indicating that Kazakh orthography should be

based on the phonetic principle, specifically the phonemic principle. This approach aligns with the principles used to develop the new Latin-script Kazakh orthographic rules.

Shonanuly argued that if the new Latin-script Kazakh orthography were to be based on the phonetic principle, the first step would be to identify the main laws governing Kazakh sounds. He listed the following laws:

1. Progressive and regressive assimilation (*итіншек және тартыншақ еліктеу*)¹;
2. The phenomena of dissipation of our rapid and semi-rapid sounds²;
3. Vowel harmony law (Shonanuly, 1930: 8).

He then discussed the classification of sounds, noting that for the purpose of creating orthographic rules, Kazakh vowels should be classified based on their *labialization*, *openness/closedness*, and *thickness/thinness* (or back/front) articulatory features, while consonants should be categorized by their *strength*, *sonority*, *rapidity/fricativity*, and *voicing/devoicing* properties (Shonanuly, 1930: 8). This viewpoint also stems from the phonemic principle, indicating that there is neither a need nor a benefit in fully exposing and converting the detailed properties of Kazakh sounds into orthographic rules.

The scholar also mentioned that the “harmony law” only applies to vowels, dividing it into palatal harmony and labial harmony. He noted that while palatal harmony is still strong, labial harmony is fading. Discussing the stages of labial harmony's decline, he concluded that “labial harmony should not be included in our orthography” (Shonanuly, 1930: 11).

Shonanuly pointed out that the influence of vowels on each other is evident not only within a word but also between words. For example, the phrase *қара ат* (black horse) would be pronounced as *қарат*. However, despite the phonetic nature of the orthography, he considered it appropriate to ignore such influences in compound forms, arguing that preserving the roots of words in writing is necessary to convey meaning accurately, in which case the morphological principle takes precedence over the phonetic principle.

The scholar also touched on the properties of the narrow vowels /ы/ and /и/, noting that these vowels often become obscured or disappear, and in such cases, they should not be written, even if they are preserved in the root. For example, *қарын* becomes *қар-ным* (not *қа-ры-ным*) (Shonanuly, 1930: 11). Similar principles are reflected in the current draft orthography for the new Latin-script Kazakh alphabet, which also advocates reducing the syllables formed by /ы/ and /и/ through contraction, thus shortening the word by one syllable.

In the report, it is mentioned that when creating new spelling rules, it is necessary to consider the following characteristics of consonants:

1. The sounds /б/, /ғ/, /г/, and /д/ do not appear at the end of native Kazakh words.
2. When the sound /н/ occurs at the junction of compound words and is combined with /б/ or /п/, it changes to /м/ (e.g., *қарынбай* becomes *қарымбай*). When combined with /к/, /ғ/, /к/, or /г/, it changes to /ң/ (e.g., *қазанқап* becomes *қазанқап*).
3. The sounds /б/ and /п/ transform into the sound /у/ when they occur at the junction of syllables and are combined with vowels (e.g., *шабын* becomes *шауын*).
4. The vowel /а/ between the sounds /ж/, /ш/, and /ы/ becomes thinner (i.e., changes in quality) due to these existing phonological laws (Shonanuly, 1930: 12-13).

These characteristics of Kazakh consonants had already been addressed in the works of Baitursynuly, where corresponding spelling rules were developed. However, Shonanuly also recognized these laws, proposed some of his own terms, and suggested that these laws should be taken into account in the new spelling.

The scholar also addressed the issue of writing compound words together or separately, identifying it as one of the difficulties in Turkic spelling. He noted that although the Kazakh language is

¹ The law of *regressive assimilation* involves the consonants at the junction of the root and suffix, aligning according to their type: voiceless with voiceless, voiced with voiced, and sonorant with sonorant. Additionally, when consonants such as /п/, /к/, and /ғ/ appear at the end of a root and are followed by a vowel, they transform into /б/, /г/, and /ғ/, respectively.

² Consonants are not repeated consecutively at the junction of the root and suffix. For example, instead of *mallar*, the correct form is *maldar*.

rich in suffixes and endings, it is challenging to distinguish the boundaries of complex and derivative words. He attributed this difficulty to “the nature of the Arabic script, where the script dominates the language rather than the language governing the script” (Shonanuly, 1930: 14). This observation is logical. The characters in the Arabic script change their form in four different ways depending on their position in the word, and when two words are combined, the shape of the letters changes, giving rise to an entirely new graphical form that can be unrecognizable. People who have learned to read and write in this script often revert to traditional principles.

Shonanuly was well aware that when words merge, their meaning becomes unified, their sounds harmonize, and they are pronounced with a single stress. This issue had previously been addressed by Baitursynuly and Omaruly.

After explaining these foundations and the relevant rules of Kazakh spelling, Shonanuly proposed seven draft rules for the writing of root words, suffixes, and compound words:

1. Words are written according to how they sound individually, without considering their influence on each other when combined. For example: *қара қой* (Black sheep).
2. Words that express a single concept are written together. For example: *оқшантай* (cartridge belt), *Ержан* (a name).
3. General compound words are written with a hyphen. For example: *төсек-орын* (bedclothes).
4. In compound words where the suffix *-ма* is inserted, it is added to the first syllable and written with a hyphen. For example: *қолма-қол* (immediately).
5. Reduplicated intensive words are written with a hyphen. For example: *қым-қызыл* (bright red).
6. Suffixes and endings are attached to the root word (Shonanuly, 1930: 16-17).

At the end of his report, Shonanuly addressed the issue of writing foreign words. Although he did not provide specific models or rules, he discussed conceptual matters and core principles, stating: “Our aim is singular: one spelling system will be developed for both Kazakh words and borrowed words; foreign words will also be adapted to the rules of Kazakh phonetics and affixation” (Shonanuly, 1930: 18). This principle is crucial in dealing with foreign words as it directly relates to the fate of the language. Early 20th-century Kazakh intellectuals, regardless of their specific efforts or ideas, unanimously supported the adaptation of foreign words to the rules of the Kazakh language and actively contributed to this endeavor. This was a genuine expression of respect and care for their native language. The intellectuals of the Alash movement understood well that assigning two different spelling systems to one language would be a violation of linguistic rules or an act of desperation. On this matter, Shonanuly remarked, “If we do not wish to alter foreign words at all, we will inevitably end up with two separate spelling systems” (Shonanuly, 1930: 19). This challenge remains relevant today.

At the spelling conference, 16 primary laws of Kazakh phonetics, four fundamental principles of orthography, and a set of 30 spelling rules were adopted. These rules were officially approved by the Central Executive Committee of Kazakhstan on July 25 of the same year. These spelling rules mark a significant turning point and a new beginning in the history of Kazakh writing. Therefore, their scientific foundations still require comprehensive and in-depth study.

Conclusion

In conclusion, between 1929 and 1937 Telzhan Shonanuly effectively assumed Baitursynuly's role in advancing Kazakh linguistics in Kazakhstan. He was a talented scholar, masterful educator, and influential figure who made significant contributions to the development of Kazakh science and statehood. As well as an outstanding linguist who dealt with complex and pressing issues at the stages of the formation and development of Kazakh linguistics. One such issue was the orthographic rules of the Kazakh-Latin alphabet in the early 20th century. Shonanuly played a crucial role in developing these orthographic rules and in establishing the culture of Latin-based Kazakh script. Shonanuly was among the first scholars to propose concrete models for the adoption and writing of foreign-language terms in Kazakh. His approaches and rationales could be applied to contemporary alphabet reforms. He was able to accomplish these significant tasks by thoroughly mastering and building upon the scholarly legacy of Ahmet Baitursynuly's work in Kazakh linguistics. Shonanuly's writings on script and orthography reveal the influence, foundation, and future potential of Baitursynuly's pioneering ideas in Kazakh linguistics, firmly establishing Shonanuly as a representative of the Baitursynuly linguistic school.

References

- Ahmet Baitursynulyning alipbi, zhazu, emle turaly engbekteri. (2023) Qurast.: E.Maralbek. Almaty: JK Asyl, 584 b. [Akhmet Baitursynuly's works on the alphabet, writing, spelling: textbook. (2023) Scientific commentary written and compiled by Y. Maralbek. Almaty: JK Asyl, 584 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Amirzhanova, N. (2012) Qazaqstandagy latyn zhazuynyng tarihi tagylymy. Almaty: Memlekettik tildi damytu instituty, 300 b. [Amirzhanova, N. (2012) Historical study of Latin script in Kazakhstan. Almaty: State Language Development Institute, 300 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Kuderinova, Q.B. (2013) Qazaq zhazuynyng tarihy men teorijasy. Oqu quraly. Almaty: Eltany baspasy, 242 b. [Kuderinova, Q.B. (2013) History and theory of Kazakh writing. Educational tool. Almaty: Eltany Publishing House, 242 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Maralbek, E. (2022) Ahmet Baitursynulyning qazaq tili dybystaryn zhikteu adisining gylimi negizdemesi. Ahmet Baitursynuly zhane qazaq tiltanyynyng bolashaq bagdary. Almaty: Printexpress baspasy, 400 b. [Maralbek, Y. (2022) Scientific justification of Akhmet Baitursynovich's method of classification of sounds of the Kazakh language. Akhmet Baitursynovich and the future direction of Kazakh linguistics. Almaty: Print Express publishing house, 400 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Momynova, B. (2022) Qazaq gazetі (1913-1918): alipbi, emle erekshelikteri zhane leksika-semantikasy. Almaty: Qazaq tili baspasy, 256 b. [Momynova, B. (2022) Kazakh newspaper (1913-1918): alphabet, spelling features and vocabulary and grammar. Almaty: Qazaq tili, 256 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Omaruly, E. (2018) Shygarmalary. 1-2 t. Tusinikemesin zhazyp qurastyrushy: E. Maralbek. Almaty: Lugat baspasy. [Omaruly, Y. (2018) Works of Yeldes Omaruly. 1-2 t. Compiler of the commentary: Y. Maralbek. Almaty: Lugat public fund.] (in Kazakh)
- Qazaq bilimpazdarynyng tungysh s`ezi (1925). Qazaq emlesi turaly Telzhannyng pikirleri. Orynbor: Qazaq memleket baspasy. 118 b. [The First Congress of Kazakh Educators (1925). Telzhan's Comments on Kazakh Spelling. Orynbor: Kazakh State Printing House, 118 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Qazaq bilimpazdarynyng tungysh s`ezi (QBTS) (1925). Orynbor: Kazmembas, 121 b. [First Congress of Kazakh Educationists (KBTS) (1925). Orynbor: Kazmembas, 121 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Shonanuly, T. (1929). Shet sozder emlesi zhaynda (Emle s`ezine usynys retinde). Engbekshi qazaq gazet. N 66 (1395), 2 b. [Shonanuly, T. (1929) About the spelling of foreign words (as a proposal to the Spelling Congress). Enbekshi kazakh newspaper. N 66 (1395), 2 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Shonanuly, T. (1929) Shet sozder emlesi zhaynda (Emle s`ezine usynys retinde). Engbekshi qazaq gazetі. N 67 (1396), 3 b. [Shonanuly, T. (1929) About the spelling of foreign words (as a proposal to the Spelling Congress). Enbekshi kazakh newspaper, N 67 (1396), 3 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Shonanuly, T. (1929) Ors emlesi men alipbiin ozgertu maselesi. Engbekshi qazaq gazetі. N 265 (1594), 2 b. [Shonanuly, T. (1929) The problem of changing the Russian spelling and alphabet. Enbekshi kazakh newspaper, N 265 (1594), 2 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Shonanuly, T. (1930) Emle turaly bajandamasy. Emle konferencijasy (stenografijalyq esebi). Qyzylorda: QAZIZDAT, 110 b. [Shonanuly, T. (1930) Report on Spelling. Spelling Conference (shorthand report)]. Qyzylorda: KAZIZDAT, 110 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Syzdyq, R. (2000) Qazaq tilining anyqtagyshy (emle, tynys belgileri, soz sazy). Astana: Elorda baspasy, 527 b. [Syzdyq, R. (2000) Kazakh language guide (spelling, punctuation marks, vocabulary). Astana: Elorda, 527 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Uali, N. (1999) Ahmet Baitursynuly zhane qazaq zhazuynyng ontogenezdik damuy. Ulttyq ruhtyng uly tini. Gylimi maqalalar zhinagy. Almaty: Bilim, 568 b. [Uali, N. (1999) Ahmet Baitursynuly and the ontogeny development of the Kazakh script. The great tissue of the national spirit. Collection of scientific articles. Almaty: Science, 568 p.] (in Kazakh)
- Zhandosuly, O., Shonanuly, T. (1928) Emle ozgertu zhaynda. Engbekshi qazaq gazetі. N 138 (1165), 3 b. [Zhandosuly, O., Shonanuly, T. (1928) About changing the spelling. Enbekshi kazakh newspaper. N 138 (1165), 3 p.] (in Kazakh)

Әдебиеттер

- Ахмет Байтұрсынұлының әліпби, жазу, емле туралы еңбектері: оқу құралы / Ғылыми түсініктемесін жазып, құрастырған Е. Маралбек. – Алматы: ЖК Асыл, 2023. – 584 б.
- Әміржанова Н. Қазақстандағы латын жазуының тарихи тағылымы. – Алматы: Мемлекеттік тілді дамыту институты, 2012. – 300 б.
- Елдес Омарұлы шығармалары. 1-2 т. / Түсініктемесін жазып құрастырушы Е. Маралбек. – Алматы: Лұғат, 2018.
- Жандосұлы О., Шонанұлы Т. Емле өзгерту жайында // «Еңбекші қазақ» газеті. – 1928 ж. – №138 (1165). – 3 б.
- Күдерінова Қ.Б. Қазақ жазуының тарихы мен теориясы. Оқу құралы. – Алматы: Елтаным, 2013. – 242 б.
- Қазақ білімпаздарының тұңғыш съезі (ҚБТС). – Орынбор: Қазмембас, 1924. – 121 б.
- Қазақ білімпаздарының тұңғыш съезі / Қазақ емлесі туралы Телжанның пікірлері / – Орынбор: Қазақ мемлекеттік баспаханасы, 1925. – 118 б.
- Маралбек Е. Ахмет Байтұрсынұлының қазақ тілі дыбыстарын жіктеу әдісінің ғылыми негіздемесі // Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы және қазақ тілтанымның болашақ бағдары. – Алматы: Printexpress, 2022. – 400 б.
- Момынова Б. «Қазақ» газеті (1913-1918): әліпби, емле ерекшеліктері және лексика-грамматикасы. – Алматы:

Қазақ тілі, 2022. – 256 б.

Сыздық Р. Қазақ тілінің анықтағышы (емле, тыныс белгілері, сөз сазы). – Астана: Елорда, 2000. – 527 б.

Уәли Н. Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы және қазақ жазуының онтогенездік дамуы // Ұлттық рухтың ұлы тіні / Ғылыми мақалалар жинағы. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1999. – 568 б.

Шонанұлы Т. Емле туралы баяндамасы // Емле конференциясы (стенографиялық есебі). – Қызылорда: ҚАЗИЗДАТ, 1930. – 110 б.

Шонанұлы Т. Орыс емлесі мен әліпбиін өзгерту мәселесі // «Еңбекші қазақ» газеті. – 1929 ж. – №265 (1594). – 2 б.

Шонанұлы Т. Шет сөздер емлесі жайында (Емле съезіне ұсыныс ретінде) // «Еңбекші қазақ» газеті. – 1929 ж. – №66 (1395). – 2 б.

Шонанұлы Т. Шет сөздер емлесі жайында (Емле съезіне ұсыныс ретінде) // «Еңбекші қазақ» газеті. – 1929 ж. №67 (1396). – 3 б.

Information about the article / Мақала туралы ақпарат / Информация о статье.

Entered the editorial office / Редакцияға түсті / Поступила в редакцию: 12.08.2024.

Accepted for publication / Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации: 03.09.2024.

© Maralbek, Ye., 2024

© А. Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл білімі институты, 2024