

The Specifics of Terminologization of Parts of Speech in Kazakh and English, Including in the Context of the Language of the City: A Comparative Analysis

Altyn Kegenbekova

e-mail: kegenbekova.altyn@gmail.com

Department of Turkology and Language Theory, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University; Almaty, Kazakhstan Researcher at A. Baitursynov Institute of Linguistics Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Orynay Zhubay

e-mail: alm-orynai@mail.ru

Department of Kazakh Linguistics, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Gulzira Akimbekova*

e-mail: gulziraakimbekova@gmail.com

Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Akbope Akhmet

e-mail: akbope.akhmet@mail.ru

Department of Russian philology and world literature, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Barysgul Kenges

e-mail: barysgul221196@gmail.com

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan. National Academy of Education named after Ybyrai Altynsarin, Astana, Kazakhstan.

Assel Baieli

e-mail: baieliassel@gmail.com

Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Abstract: The main purpose of this study was to make a comparative analysis of the process of terminologization of parts of speech in the Kazakh and English languages (Kazakh – agglutinative, English – inflectional) from historical, morphological, and cognitive perspectives. It aimed to comparatively analyze how grammatical terms related to parts of speech in Kazakh and English are formed, their structural features, and their cognitive characteristics. The study also attempted to examine the influence of Latin, Greek, Turkic, and

English languages on the formation of part-of-speech terminology. The study employed comparative-historical, morphological, etymological, and cognitive methods to analyze 18 grammatical terms (nine parts of speech each in Kazakh and English). These methods revealed their origins, structural features, and cultural influences, proposing models of terminologization and aligning Kazakh grammatical terminology with international standards for translation equivalence. The study revealed that grammatical terms in Kazakh are formed on the basis of national cognitive and cultural models, whereas terms in English are grounded in the Greco-Latin academic tradition. The research also revealed that grammatical terminology in the Kazakh language is rooted in national conceptual frameworks, whereas English terminology has developed as a continuation of historical influences and scientific traditions. This research can contribute to improving translation accuracy, enhancing terminological consistency, and promoting the development of language policy.

Keywords: Parts of Speech, Terminology, Terminologization, Comparative Analysis, Etymology, Morphology, Cognitive Linguistics.

Received: 24-06-2025

Accepted: 12-10-2025

1. Introduction

Parts of speech are units that form the foundation of the morphological and syntactic structure of any language. The classification and terminology of parts of speech in linguistics have been formed in accordance with the specific characteristics of each language. The systems of parts of speech in English and Kazakh have undergone different developmental paths within historical and cultural contexts. Terminology of parts of speech belongs to linguistic universals. All languages have parts of speech in their structure, although their number may vary from one language to another. Studying the parts of speech in languages with different structures and origins not only reveals their linguistic and etymological features but also provides insights into the worldview of the speakers of those languages.

The parts of speech in both Kazakh and English languages are among the core categories of grammar, their processes of terminologization differ significantly in historical, cultural, and cognitive aspects. Understanding parts of speech in any language is a complex process that reflects the scientific, cognitive, and cultural potential of a language. This reflects not only the formation and development history of the parts of speech but also the historical events experienced by the communities that speak these languages. Moreover, parts of speech are the foundation of any grammatical system. In Kazakh, this system is closely linked to the reforms of the linguist, Akhmet Baitursynuly, who sought to create terms that were semantically transparent and culturally familiar to the national consciousness. In contrast, in English, the names of parts of speech are inherited from ancient Latin and Greek, making them historically rooted but semantically opaque to the modern user. These elements may cause misunderstandings in language teaching, translation, and scientific communication. The ways in which the grammatical terms of these two languages have been formed, as well as their semantic distinctions, remain insufficiently studied.

There are many scholarly works that have studied the grammatical terminology of Kazakh and English individually. These works have widely studied the structure of parts of speech in different languages, their terminology at the cross-linguistic level—particularly in comparison between typologically different languages (for example, the agglutinative Kazakh language and the analytical English language)—has been comparatively less researched. This gap widens when it is revealed that the terminology of parts of speech, too, has been neglected at the cross-linguistic level, especially in typologically distinct languages such as Kazakh and English. Such gaps can lead to inconsistencies in translation, teaching materials, and language standardization. Hence, to bridge this research gap, this study aimed to compare

the structure and terminology of parts of speech in both languages and examined the main similarities and differences in their formation, in order to gain a deeper understanding of linguistic terminology. The study also attempted to analyze the terminologization of parts of speech in Kazakh and English from historical, morphological, and cognitive perspectives.

The study of the formation and development of part-of-speech terminology in Kazakh and English is a significant direction that contributes to understanding the linguistic system, enhancing scientific and professional communication, standardizing terminology, improving translation practices, and strengthening national language policy. Since, the study highlighted the terminologization of parts of speech in Kazakh and English and examined their development through a comparative analysis, it is expected to contribute to improving the accuracy of terminological equivalents and to be beneficial in the fields of language teaching and textbook development. This study will also help increase the competitiveness of the Kazakh language in the context of globalization. The novelty of the study lies in the comprehensive comparison—historical, morphological, and cognitive—of the terminologization features of parts of speech in Kazakh and English for the first time, and in the systematization of the patterns of their formation. In addition, the results of the study would provide an opportunity to analyze the formation and development of grammatical terminology in the Kazakh language from a new scientific perspective.

2. Literature Review

The body of scholarly works on parts of speech in the English and Kazakh languages is extensive. Much of the extant literature comprise foundational works that laid the groundwork for the formation of part-of-speech terminology, beginning with the classical writings of Plato Jowett (1888) and Aristotle (1859), and continuing through the tradition maintained by Donatus (1926) and Priscian (Alfieri, 2023). The fact that the topic of parts of speech has been discussed from the early stages of linguistic science to the present day demonstrates its continued relevance in the field of linguistics. Walter W. Skeat's *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* Swan and Walter (2011) discusses the historical development of English parts of speech. Thomas Pyles's *The Origins and Development of the English Language* Algeo (2009) covers the history of the English language and the development of its grammatical terminology. Although Randolph Quirk and Sidney Greenbaum's *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* Quirk et al. (1861) does not specifically address the etymology of grammatical terms, it provides information on the historical usage of several terms. Lynda Mugglestone's *The Oxford History of English* Mugglestone (2008) contains studies on the historical changes in grammar and terminology in the English language.

Further in-depth investigations into the evolution of English grammatical terminology and concepts are found in works (Baugh & Cable, 2002; Hanganu, 2014; Law, 2003; Viti, 2014). In addition, the *Online Etymology Dictionary* Harper (2025) explores the origins, formation, former and current meanings, and usage of English part-of-speech terms. This electronic dictionary draws excerpts from several major etymological sources, including Weekley's *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, Klein's *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, the Oxford English Dictionary (2nd ed.), the Barnhart *Dictionary of Etymology*, Holthausen's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Englischen Sprache*, and Kipfer and Chapman's *Dictionary of American Slang*. All these sources are invaluable tools for learning the etymology of any English word.

In recent years, studies on parts of speech in English include (Gizi, 2023; Hustiana, 2023; Kovbasko, 2020; Lehmann, 2013; Suhrob & Vasila, 2022; Topka, 2012) which have explored English parts of speech from different perspectives. Although there are no specialized studies directly comparing the terminology of parts of speech in English and Kazakh, there is a considerable number of articles comparing the grammatical systems and categories of the two languages (Issakova et al., 2022; Malgaazhdar, 2021; Taubeyeveva, 2024; Zhambylkyzy, 2022) and others. A few Russian-speaking scholars have also conducted dissertation-level studies on the development of English grammatical terminology, the system and structure of parts of speech, and classification issues. Several scholarly articles have also been published on this topic, including Yáñez-Bouza (2015), Kovbasko (2020), Ansaldo, Pfau and Don (2010) and Pskit (2002). These works can serve as useful tools for identifying the structural and semantic features of both languages.

The formation of part-of-speech terminology in the Kazakh language began with Akhmet Baitursynuly's work *Til–Qural* Baitursynuly (2017), published in the early 20th century. Subsequently, the most important works published in recent years that played a significant role in the development of Kazakh linguistic terminology include the works of scholars like (Bekmanova et al., 2022; Kurmanbayuly, 2013, 2014; Vakhitova et al., 2022). There are also linguistic dictionaries of terms published in Kazakh (Abakan 1998). In general, these studies have only focused on the formation of Kazakh linguistics and its metalanguage. Since Akhmet Baitursynuly was the first scholar to establish Kazakh national linguistics and create grammatical terms (including parts of speech), there are leading works published on his contribution (Kurmanbayuly, 2013).

Issues such as the systematic nature of grammatical terminology, its specific features in the teaching process, and the way learners perceive and understand it have become highly relevant in linguo-didactics. Empirical research on these subjects help expand the theoretical and methodological basis of our study. For example, (Cross-regional variation in part-of-speech terminology in EFL textbooks: A corpus-based approach, *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics* (Gizi, 2023) uses a corpus-based method to examine EFL textbooks from various regions, comparing the frequency of part-of-speech terminology. Hustiana (2023) investigates foreign language learners' cognitive perspectives on grammatical terms. Data obtained through interviews highlight challenges learners face in understanding and conceptualizing terms such as verb, noun, and adjective in their native languages, showing a gap between these terms and the learners' cognitive models. This finding directly supports the cognitive basis of our research.

In another study (Terminological consistency in Kazakh grammar education: A diachronic analysis of school curricula (Kurmanbayuly, 2014), examines the historical presentation of grammatical terms in Kazakh school curricula, emphasizing that the terminological system introduced by Akhmet Baitursynuly remains in use today. This underscores the scholarly rationale for using *Til–Qural* as a primary source in our study. Studies (Kovbasko, 2020; Suhrob & Vasila, 2022; Viti, 2014) have analyzed how parts of speech are presented in bilingual dictionaries, demonstrating that direct transfer of grammatical concepts between languages often leads to semantic distortions—a factor that further highlights the importance of comparative research between typologically different languages. These studies reveal mismatches between teachers' and students' understanding of grammatical terminology in Chinese EFL classrooms, demonstrating the crucial role of cognitive features and terminological precision in effectively conveying grammatical concepts.

These studies provide valuable insights into the practical use of grammatical

terminology, its representation in learners' cognition, and the influence of cultural-cognitive factors. However, none of them aims to conduct a comparative historical and cognitive analysis of terms in Kazakh and English. To address this gap, the present study offers a comparative investigation of the terminologization of parts of speech in the two languages.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The research seeks to explore semantic, structural, etymological, and cognitive features in depth. Employing a qualitative approach makes it possible to analyze such aspects as the meaning, structure, origin, and conceptual characteristics of each term. Through a comparative method, 18 core grammatical terms—nine from Kazakh and nine from English—were systematically compared. To provide a comprehensive description of the formation and structure of parts of speech terminology in Kazakh and English, the following methods were applied:

- **Etymological Analysis:** The historical development of Latin, Greek, English, and Kazakh terms is studied based on their origin.
- **Diachronic Analysis:** To identify the time of emergence and trends of change in terminology, it is examined by dividing into historical periods.
- **Morphological Analysis:** The structural features of parts of speech are described.
- **Cognitive Analysis:** The way concepts are formed in the worldview of each nation and the cultural foundation of terms is studied.
- **Comparative Method:** The history and functionality of grammatical categories in English and Kazakh are compared.

3.2. Sampling and Population

The object of this study is the terminology of parts of speech in Kazakh and English. Parts of speech are the core grammatical categories of any language. They are also considered grammatical universals, as they exist in all languages; however, their composition may vary depending on the specific features of each language. Using purposive sampling approach, the names of the nine main parts of speech were selected from both English and Kazakh. These terms, in addition to being fundamental categories of grammar, also reflect the historical development of the language and convey aspects of the worldview of its speakers. Examples included noun, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition, interjection, and conjunction in English, with their Kazakh equivalents viz., зат есім, етістік, сын есім, үстеу, септеулік, одағай, and жалғаулық.

3.3. Instrument and Procedure

The data were collected from classical and contemporary grammatical works, etymological dictionaries, and digital terminological databases. As for Kazakh, the primary source Akhmet Baitursynuly's *Til–Qural* was used, since it is the first comprehensive work to describe Kazakh grammar in full, and it introduced the earliest grammatical terms in the Kazakh language, many of which remain in use today. In addition, the modern reference work *Kazakh Grammar* was consulted. For English, authoritative sources such as *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* Huddleston and Pullum

(2002) and *Oxford English Grammar Course* Swan and Walter (2011) were used, along with online resources such as *Etymology Online* and the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data was analyzed from semantic (content), morphological, etymological, and cognitive-conceptual perspectives. The analysis of each part-of-speech term included the following:

- The internal structure of the term (e.g., 3ат есім – compound model);
- The origin and historical development of the term;
- The conceptual model and cultural connotations;
- A comparison of structural differences between the Kazakh and English terms;
- The presentation of research findings through comparative tables and descriptive summaries.

4. Results

4.1. Evolution of Part-of-Speech Terminology in English

Table 1 summarizes the initial findings about the evolution of part-of-speech terminology in English (Table 1).

Table 1 shows the historical development of the main parts of speech in the English language from ancient times to the present day. It identifies the stages of the emergence of parts of speech and the way in which they were introduced into the grammatical system. For instance, in ancient times, word classes were borrowed from Greek and Latin, and in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the influence of French was noticeable. In the 17th–18th centuries, grammar was systematized, and in the 19th century, linguistics was formed as a science. In the 20th century, semantics and syntax were deeply analyzed, and in the 21st century, word classes played an important role in artificial intelligence and data processing. As can be seen from the table, the development of nouns, verbs, and numerals in each era is associated with the expansion of their grammatical and functional role.

Table 1: Evolution of Part-of-Speech Terminology in English.

Part of Speech	Ancient Period (4th c. BCE – 5th c. CE)	Middle Ages (5th–15th c.)	Renaissance (15th–17th c.)	17th–18th c. (Systematization of English Grammar)	19th c. (Establishment of Linguistics as a Science)	20th c. (Formation of Modern Linguistics)	21st c. (Contemporary Linguistics)
Noun	Greek ὄνομα, Latin nomen	Nomen became the primary term in Latin grammar	Influence of French: during the Norman Conquest (1066), the French word <i>nomen</i> entered English	The term <i>noun</i> appeared in English grammar for the first time	<i>Noun</i> was formally established as a grammatical term	Morphology and syntax were studied in depth	Widely used in AI and computational linguistics
Verb	Greek ῥήμα, Latin <i>verbum</i>	<i>Verbum</i> was standardized in Latin grammar	Influence of French: the word <i>verbe</i> entered English; some verb forms were borrowed	The term <i>verb</i> came into use in English grammar	Verb tenses and aspects were studied thoroughly	Prominently featured in Chomsky's Generative Grammar theory	Highly important in machine learning and semantic analysis
Numeral	Greek ἀριθμός, Latin <i>numerales</i>	Treated as a category close to nouns and adjectives in Latin grammar	Influence of French: ordinal numerals such as <i>premier</i> , <i>second</i> were adopted	The term <i>numeral</i> was officially introduced into English grammar	Semantic and morphological features of numerals were studied	The semantic role of numerals was analyzed in cognitive and corpus linguistics	The role of numerals has increased in AI and data processing

Parts of speech represent one of the oldest grammatical concepts. If we look at the first mentions of parts of speech, we can see that in the earliest period of linguistic thought—the classical era (Ancient Greek and Roman philosophy)—philosophers categorized words, and later linguists continued to refine and modify this classification. The works of Plato Jowett (1888) and Aristotle (1859) serve as evidence of this. By that time, each language had already developed its own categories of parts of speech based on its unique characteristics. In particular, Aristotle's ten fundamental categories served as a foundation for the modern system of parts of speech. Émile Benveniste commented on this: "Aristotle's categories are classifications of parts of speech: substance – noun, quality – adjective, quantity – numeral, relation – comparative degree of adjective, action and passion – active and passive voice of the verb, etc." (Benveniste, 1974).

In antiquity, Aristotle identified ten categories as representations of reality:

1. Substance – the essence of a thing;
2. Quantity – the numerical property of a thing;
3. Quality – the non-numerical (qualitative) property of a thing;
4. Relation – the relationship between things;
5. Place – the location of a thing in space;
6. Time – the temporal arrangement of events;
7. State – the condition or arrangement of things;
8. Possession – ownership/adverbial state;
9. Action – an activity;
10. Passion – change or being acted upon.

Aristotle's ten categories represent the clearest early form of categorization. Although he did not offer a strict definition of the concept of "category," his work suggests that he regarded categories as components of propositions or utterances. In his treatise *Categories*, Aristotle wrote that the words used in making statements are associated with certain categories: "Each of the things listed does not in itself imply affirmation or denial; affirmation or denial arises from their combination. Every assertion or denial is either true or false, but taken individually and without any connection, none of them is either true or false—for example, 'man,' 'white,' 'runs,' 'wins'" (Aristotle, 1859). Aristotle's categories are closely interconnected, but the primary and fundamental one is "substance." The others are secondary (accidental) categories. Without substance, there can be no quantity, quality, or action. Hence, substance exists independently of the others.

The notion of categories in antiquity had not yet fully developed into the modern understanding of parts of speech but rather arose as a result of logical and philosophical reflections on being. While Aristotle's categories reflect the structure of thought and reality, parts of speech reflect the structure of language. Their connection lies in the linguistic manifestation of human cognition. Aristotle's categories can thus be considered the philosophical foundation for both grammatical and logical systems. The philosophical ideas of the ancient thinkers were developed and continued in later historical periods. In the 3rd century BCE, due to the Roman Empire's expansion and conquest of neighboring territories, the Latin language became widespread. The authors of Latin grammar relied on the methods developed by ancient Greek philosophers in their analysis of language. One of the main representatives of the Greco-Roman grammatical tradition was Aelius Donatus (4th century CE), whose

work *Ars Grammatica* was used as the primary Latin grammar textbook in European schools until the late 18th century.

Donatus (4th century, *Ars Grammatica*) (Priscian (5th–6th centuries, *Institutiones Grammaticae*) (Alfieri, 2023) complemented each other's works and, following the ancient Greek grammatical tradition, identified eight parts of speech: Nomen (noun); Pronomen (pronoun); Verbum (verb); Adverbium (adverb); Participium (participle); Coniunctio (conjunction); Praepositio (preposition); Interiectio (interjection). Donatus and Priscian laid the foundation for the grammatical systems of modern European languages. Their classification of parts of speech was adopted by most European languages. Until the 18th century, Latin grammar and its terminology were used as the standard for describing both classical and modern languages. The Latin terms for parts of speech introduced by Donatus and Priscian significantly influenced the formation of English grammatical terminology.

4.2. Evolution of Part-of-Speech Terminology in Kazakh

With regard to the Kazakh language, Akhmet Baitursynuly pioneered the establishment of the terminology of sentence parts in Kazakh, laid the foundation of its grammar, and raised it to the national level. No individual scholar can ever develop a terminology based solely on personal intuition; Baitursynuly, first and foremost, relied on global experience in term formation, investigated part-of-speech classification within Turkic languages, and created terms that aligned with the worldview of the Kazakh people. Akhmet Baitursynuly divided the local vernacular (Kazakh) words into two major groups: (1) Naming words (*ataushy sozder*): noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, verb; (2) Particles (*shylau sozder*): adverb, postposition, conjunction, interjection (Baitursynuly, 2017). These words were classified with lexical meaning as naming words, and words without lexical meaning but bearing grammatical function as particles. Table 2 depicts the list of Parts of Speech in the Kazakh grammar, contrasting Baitursynuly's classification with the academic standard Kazakh grammar.

Table 2: Parts of Speech in Kazakh Grammar.

Kazakh Grammar (Academic Standard)	<i>Til-Qural</i> (Akhmet Baitursynuly's Classification)
1. Noun (<i>zat esim</i>)	1. Noun (<i>zat esim</i>) – <i>Ataushy so'zder</i> (naming words)
2. Adjective (<i>syn esim</i>)	2. Adjective (<i>syn esim</i>)
3. Numeral (<i>san esim</i>)	3. Numeral (<i>san esim</i>)
4. Pronoun (<i>esimdik</i>)	4. Pronoun (<i>esimdik</i>)
5. Adverb (<i>usteu</i>)	5. Adverb (<i>usteuish</i>)
6. Verb (<i>etistik</i>)	6. Verb (<i>etistik</i>)
7. Particles (<i>shylau so'zder</i>)	7. Postposition (<i>demeuish</i>)
8. Modal words	8. Conjunction (<i>zhalgauysh</i>)
9. Imitative words	---
10. Interjection	9. Interjection (<i>eliktewish, leptewish</i>)

Source: Zhanpeisov (2002); Baitursynuly (2017)

The data in Table 2 reveals no significant difference between the word classes in the modern academic grammar of the Kazakh language and the classification in Akhmet Baitursynuly's work *Til-Qural*. Many of the terms created by Baitursynuly have been preserved in the current grammatical system and are still effectively used. His classification not only systematized the names of word classes, but also took into account the logic of the Kazakh language and the national worldview, basing the terms

on the folk vocabulary. Therefore, Baitursynuly’s terminological work is consistent with today’s academic grammar, and his terms are still considered standard.

Akhmet Baitursynuly (2017) classification of words into nine parts of speech based on their meanings can be further examined in terms of their structural (morphological) and sematic forms (Table 3).

The table, however, lists very limited historical sources as not much is known about the exact origin of each of these terms, their components and their meaning. These illustrations are based only on historical records, and morphological analysis to help determine their structure.

Table 3: Baitursynuly’s Classification of words into parts of speech.

Parts of Speech	Structural	Semantic
1. Noun (zat esim);	Comprises two elements: <i>zat</i> and <i>esim</i> : <i>zat</i> refers to a tangible object or thing; <i>esim</i> means “name” or “designation.”	Nouns are class of words denoting objects or phenomena, or name of a thing or designation of an object.
2. Adjective (syn esim);	Comprises two elements <i>syn</i> – denoting quality or attribute; <i>esim</i> – meaning “name” or “designation.”	Adjectives are class of words that describe the quality, property, size, or type of an object. Translates as “qualitative designation” or “name of a property.”
3. Numeral (san esim); -	-	-
4. Pronoun (esimdik); -	-	-
5. Verb (etistik);	Comprises verb <i>Et</i> (root) (Kazakh), means “to do” or “to make,” added to <i>-is / -tik</i> suffixes (derived from Old Turkic) The <i>-is</i> functions as a reciprocal voice suffix, while <i>-tik</i> is a noun-forming suffix.	The class of words expressing actions or states, or “name of a deed.
6. Adverb (uste/ usteuish);	Comprises <i>uste</i> : a verb of Old Turkic meaning “to add on top of,” “to increase”; <i>-u</i> is a verbal noun suffix.	<i>uste</i> is rarely used in modern Kazakh. Its meaning aligns with words like “augment,” “intensify,” or “reinforce.”
7. Postposition (demeu/ demeuish);	the term <i>demeu</i> corresponds to that of modern ‘conjunctions,’ meaning “to support” or “to assist”)	<i>demeu</i> refers to words that serve to coordinate words and clauses. It emphasizes their role in linking and supporting elements in speech.
8. Conjunction (zhalgauysh);	<i>zhálgáulyq</i> is derived from <i>zhálgau</i> (“suffix”), which refers to affixes that attach to roots and modify words.	The verb <i>zhálgau</i> means “to connect or join two things,” synonymous with <i>qosu</i> (to add), <i>zhamay</i> (to patch), and <i>ústeu</i> (to supplement)
9. Interjection / Imitative (elikteuish/ lepteuish).	<i>elikteu</i> (imitative) consists of the root <i>elikte</i> and the action noun suffix <i>-u</i> : <i>Elikte</i> is a verb meaning “to imitate or mimic a certain sound or action.” <i>-u</i> is a suffix that forms verbal nouns (as in <i>iygiru</i> – running, <i>soileu</i> – speaking, <i>tyridau</i> – listening).	The word <i>elikteu</i> means “to resemble or repeat something.” In modern Kazakh, <i>elikteu sózder</i> (onomatopoeic words) refer to words based on sounds or actions, typically derived from natural phenomena, animal sounds, or human activities.

4.3. Semantic intervention into parts of speech

Although the meanings of the basic parts of speech terms are relatively easy to explain, some terms require deeper investigation to fully uncover their semantic content. One such example is to understand the morphological, lexical and semantic usage of adverbs. Adverbs are represented by the term ‘*uste*’ which is of old Turkic origin to mean “augment,” “intensify,” or “reinforce”; however, in modern linguistics, *uste* refers to “words that denote various attributes of an action or process—such as manner, place, reason, time, or state—and are not inflected by grammatical markers” (Zhanabekova, 2014). Although adverbs were primarily linked with verbs, similar to usage in other languages; however, Baitursynuly defines *uste* as “words that modify or intensify adjectives, numerals, pronouns, and verbs.” He explains with the example: “in the sentence ‘Әрең келдім’ (I barely arrived), the action of arriving is already implied, but the addition of ‘әрең’ (barely) specifies how the action was performed” (Baitursynuly, 2017). This indicates that, for Baitursynuly, adverbs can precede not

only verbs but also nouns and other word classes. He also notes that pure or root adverbs are few, with most being derived from nouns, pronouns, and verbs.

The term *usteu* aligns with his own definition, and in explanatory dictionaries it is interpreted as “an addition, supplement placed on top of something”. The verb *uste* is defined as “to add something on top, to multiply” (Algeo, 2009). Therefore, Baitursynuly emphasized that adverbs function by being placed before core words to modify or intensify their meaning. This is why he classified them under particles (*shylau sözder*). Baitursynuly further lists examples of fundamental adverbs: әбден, тым, тіпті, қас, сірә, есе, тап, нақ, нағыз, әрең, дәл, дөп, дейім, әрі, бері, әбден, енді, мана, әні, міні, ең, ылғи, таман, сайын, әлі, жорты, жорта, дік. These are identified as intensifying adverbs for numerals and nouns (Baitursynuly, 2017).

Likewise, there is another term *shylau* (particle), which in Kazakh cognition, is traditionally associated with horse back. According to the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Language*, *shylau* has several meanings. One of its definitions refers to *shauzhai*, a component of the horse’s bridle. *Shauzhai* is described as “a short piece of metal about a hand’s width in length, fixed between the bit and the rein” (Zhanabekova, 2014). Thus, just as the *shylau* in the bridle connects the rein and the bit, the linguistic term *shylau* refers to words that link other words or clauses together. Another meaning of *shylau* is “influence” or “control.” For instance, in the phrase “He fell under the influence of confusion” (Öl bir túsiniksizdikтің shylauynda ketti – Musin), the word implies subjugation. In Kazakh, idiomatic expressions such as *shylauynda bolu* (to be under someone’s sway), *shylauyna oralu* (to be entangled in someone’s control) are used to describe submission or influence. Therefore, as a linguistic term, *shylau* implies words that are subordinate to the influence of other words and serve to connect or depend on them.

However, the term *shylau*, in A. Baitursynuly’s work, corresponds to *demeu* with the same meaning of postpositions. Baitursynuly’s defines *demeu* as words that serve to coordinate words and clauses, and emphasize their role in linking and supporting elements in speech. Examples include *ma, me, ba, be, da, goi, aq, áshe, bāse, ta, tagy, bálkim, úitkeni, úitpese, sútip, súitse de*, etc. In modern grammar, *demeulik* (particles) are defined as “words that attach to other words and impart various grammatical meanings or shades of meaning” (Zhanpeisov, 2002).

Baitursynuly also uses another category of *zhálgáulyq* (conjunctions) which corresponds to what are now known as postpositions. He classified words like *menen* (or *benen, men, ben*), *úshin, sheiin, deiin, taman*, etc., as conjunctions (Zhanabekova, 2014). The term *zhálgáulyq* is formed with *zhálgau* (“suffix”), which refers to affixes that attach to roots and modify words. The verb *zhálgá* means “to connect or join two things,” and it is synonymous with *qosu* (to add), *zhamaý* (to patch), and *ústeu* (to supplement) (Quirk et al., 1861). Because suffixes are added to roots and follow one after another to form word inflections, they are termed *zhálgau* (suffixes). The term *zhálgáulyq* (conjunction) thus originates from this idea—they function like suffixes by connecting elements, although they lack independent lexical meaning and require the word they follow to be in a specific case.

These examples demonstrate that the grammar terms coined by A. Baitursynuly are derived from the Kazakh language and differ from those used in other Turkic languages. The examples provided under different categories show how parts of speech are

designated in some of these languages and what their origins are (Zhanabekova, 2014).

4.4. Structural features in the terminologization processes of parts of speech

When comparing the features of part-of-speech terminology in the two languages, Kazakh and English, despite their distinct historical trajectories, some commonalities can be observed, namely, functional, historical-etymological, and cognitive. The functional similarity in both systems shows that the parts of speech serve core functions in structuring sentences, conveying semantic information, and facilitating communication. The historical-etymological connection is seen in the fact that while English terms largely derive from Latin and Greek traditions, Kazakh terms have developed in accordance with the worldview and linguistic experience of the Kazakh people. The cognitive dimension is seen in the structural categories of both languages. While Greek and Latin reflect the structure of classical philosophical thought in the English language, the Kazakh terminology embodies the cognitive and experiential model of a nomadic society. This highlights that grammatical frameworks should be considered not only formally, but also within their cultural contexts.

At this stage, 18 grammatical terms—combining the parts of speech from both languages—were analyzed, which revealed several distinctive structural features in the terminologization processes of Kazakh and English parts of speech. For instance, most Kazakh parts-of-speech terms (e.g., зат есім, сын есім, етістік) are morphologically complex, consisting of two components or formed by adding a derivational suffix. Typically, they follow the pattern (noun + noun), e.g., зат есім, сын есім, сан есім; or (noun + suffix) e.g., етістік, жалғаулық, демеулік. In contrast, English terms such as noun, verb, adjective are morphologically simple, monolexemic units, and are primarily borrowed from Latin or Greek root words. These patterns can be interpreted by making a comparison between the features of both languages, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Features of Kazakh and English languages.

Features	Kazakh Language	English Language
Morphological structure	Agglutinative; terms are formed via affixation	Inflectional; terms are formed through word phrases
Lexical influence	Borrowings from Russian, Arabic, Persian, and Latin	Borrowings from Latin, Greek, and French
Adaptation of loanwords	Adapted orthographically and phonetically	Frequently retained in original spelling and pronunciation

While Kazakh grammatical terminology is deeply rooted in national conceptual frameworks, the English grammatical system is largely a continuation of Latin and Greek scholarly traditions. Table 5 enlists the terminological equivalents of parts of speech in Kazakh and English.

In Kazakh, the names of parts of speech are directly linked to the concepts they denote. For example, from the terms зат есім (“name of an object”) or сын есім (“name of a quality”), one can easily deduce their grammatical meaning, a kind of semantic motivation with cognitive features. In contrast, the English term noun (from Latin *nomen* – “name”) may be less transparent to the modern user, making its meaning opaquer. With regard to origin and historical development of terms, the English grammatical terms mostly originate from the classical tradition, rooted in ancient academic frameworks. Kazakh grammatical terms, on the other hand, were largely created through the reforms of A. Baitursynuly, designed in line with national conceptual and cultural models.

Table 5: Terminological Equivalents of Parts of Speech in Kazakh and English.

English Term	Kazakh Equivalent
Noun	Зат есім (Zat esim)
Adjective	Сын есім (Syn esim)
Verb	Етістік (Etistik)
Numeral	Сан есім (San esim)
Pronoun	Есімдік (Esimdik)
Adverb	Үстеу (Üsteu)
Preposition	Шылау (Shylau)
Conjunction	Жалғаулық (Zhalǵauyq)
Interjection	Одағай (Odaghai)

4.5. Etymology of Greek and Latin borrowings in English language

A large number of grammatical terms in English are derived from Latin, as Latin had long been the language of science, religion, and education in Europe, including grammar studies. Key grammatical terms borrowed into English from Latin are listed in the following categories (Table 6):

Table 6: Language Categories of Latin Origin.

Category	Latin origins
Parts of Speech	
Noun	– from Latin <i>nomen</i> (name)
Pronoun	– from <i>pro</i> (instead of) + <i>nomen</i> (name)
Adjective	– from <i>adjectivum</i> (added);
Verb	– from <i>verbum</i> (word)
Adverb	– from <i>ad</i> (to) + <i>verbum</i> (word)
Preposition	– from <i>praepositio</i> (placed before)
Conjunction	– from <i>conjunctio</i> (connection)
Interjection	– from <i>interjectio</i> (insertion)
Participle	– from <i>participium</i> (participating).
Grammatical Categories	
Case	– from Latin <i>casus</i> (fall, event)
Tense	– from <i>tempus</i> (time)
Mood	– from <i>modus</i> (manner)
Voice	– from <i>vox</i> (voice)
Clause	– from <i>clausula</i> (ending, conclusion)
Sentence Structure	
Subject	– from <i>subjectum</i> (that which lies beneath)
Predicate	– from <i>praedicatum</i> (declared)
Object	– from <i>objectum</i> (thrown before)
Word Structure and Form	
Infinitive	– from <i>infinitivus</i> (indefinite)
Gerund	– from <i>gerundium</i> (bearing)
Declension	– from <i>declinatio</i> (bending)
Conjugation	– from <i>coniugatio</i> (joining together).

Of all parts of speech, ‘noun’ is one of the fundamental parts that denotes objects, phenomena, and concepts. The historical roots of the term noun originate in the traditions of ancient linguistic thought. Etymologically, the evolution of noun can be understood through five main stages: First, the ancient Greek tradition underpins the term noun to the Greek word *ὄνομα* (*onoma*), meaning “name.” In the grammar developed by ancient Greek philosophers and linguists such as Aristotle, *ὄνομα* was used to designate words that referred to objects, persons, or abstract concepts. However, the Greek grammatical tradition influenced Latin, where further development

of terminology took place. In Latin, the term *nomen* meant “name” or “designation” and was used to denote general word categories. It is derived from the verb *noscere* (“to know”). Latin grammarians such as Varro and Priscian defined *nomen* as a part of speech denoting objects, qualities, or actions. However, in the Latin grammatical system, *nomen* referred not only to nouns but also to adjectives.

During the medieval period, Latin grammar became the foundation of the European educational system. The term *nomen* was adapted into the vernaculars of that time and remained in use in grammatical texts. In Old French, the word *nom* (derived from Latin) was used to designate names and titles. It was during this period that the concept of “noun” began to be discussed separately from other parts of speech like adjectives. The term noun evolved into the English language in the Middle English period (approximately 11th–15th centuries) through Old French (*nom*). Over time, noun displaced other variants and became the primary term referring to this part of speech. During the Renaissance (16th–17th centuries), the development of English grammar solidified noun as a fundamental grammatical category.

In the modern times, looking at the rise of linguistics, the English language uses the term noun to refer to this part of speech, yet it retains a deep etymological connection to Latin *nomen* and Greek *ονομα*. This term is now widely used not only in English but also across many modern grammatical systems. Thus, the term noun evolved from the ancient Greek *ονομα*, through the Latin *nomen*, and the Old French *nom*, preserving its core semantic meaning as “name” or “designation” as it became the modern English word.

Likewise, the etymology of the term ‘verb’ also traces from the Latin term *verbum*, which literally means “word.” In Latin grammar, *verbum* denoted actions, states, or processes—that is, what we now understand as verbs. The Latin *verbum* is associated with the Proto-Indo-European root *wer-*, meaning “to speak” or “to express verbally.” This root can be observed in other ancient languages as well. For example, in the Ancient Greek, it is used as *εἶπω* (*eirō*) – “I say”; in Sanskrit, it is used as *vāca* – “speech, word.” In Latin grammatical tradition, *verbum* was established as the designation for verbs in the works of Roman grammarians like Priscian and Donatus. Within the Latin system, the verb (*verba*) was the part of speech used to express action, state, and tense.

The Latin grammatical tradition continued through the medieval period, and the term *verbum* remained in use in education and grammatical textbooks. Through Old French (*verbe*), the Latin term entered other European languages. Consequently, the modern English word verb comes from the Old French *verbe*, which in turn derives from Latin *verbum*. Thus, the term verb, originating from Latin *verbum* (“word”), underscores the central role of the verb in conveying actions and processes. It has roots in both ancient Greek and Latin traditions and, through the influence of medieval education and French language, entered English while maintaining its historical associations with “speech” and “expression.”

Etymologically, the term ‘adjective’ entered the English language through Old French, where the word *adjectif* was used. The French term, in turn, was derived from the Latin word *adjectivum*. During the Middle English period (11th–15th centuries), adjective began to appear in grammatical descriptions, referring to words that describe the characteristics of nouns. The Latin term, *adjectivum*, consists of two parts: *ad* – meaning “near” or “beside;” *-jectivum* – from the verb *jacere*, whose Proto-Indo-European root means “to throw” or “to add.” According to the English etymology, the Proto-Indo-European root of *ad* is associated with nearness or proximity. The Proto-Indo-European root meaning

'to, near, at.' It forms all or part of: abate, ado, ad-, ad hoc, ad lib, adage, adagio, add, adjective, adore, adorn, adult, adverb, advertise, agree, aid, alloy, ally, amount, assure, at, atone, exaggerate, paramount, rapport, twi. Thus, it is assumed that the root originated in Sanskrit and was later used in Latin and Old English to convey meanings of closeness or adjacency. "It is the hypothetical source of/evidence for its existence is provided by: Sanskrit *adhi* 'near'; Latin *ad* 'to, toward'; Old English *æt*." (Harper, 2025). Literally, *adjectivum* in Latin, therefore, means "something added to a noun." This Latin term was used to designate words that describe or clarify the properties of nouns.

The etymology of the term 'numeral' traces since the ancient period (4th century BCE – 5th century CE) when, under the Greek grammar, the ancient Greeks used the term *ἀριθμός* (*arithmos*), meaning "number." The term *numerale* was used in Latin grammar to classify words that expressed numerical value. In the Middle Ages (5th–15th centuries), as Latin remained the dominant language of grammar and education, the term *numerale* appeared frequently in Latin grammatical treatises. Numerals were often considered closely related to adjectives, as they described the quantitative characteristics of nouns. During the Renaissance Period (15th–17th centuries), since grammar began to be written in vernacular European languages, the Latin term *numerale* was translated into English, French, and German, where it developed into the term numeral. In English, the term numeral began to appear in grammatical research for the first time during the 17th–18th centuries. Numerals were formally divided into cardinal and ordinal types. The term numeral became officially established in English grammatical literature.

The etymology of the term 'adverb' originates from the Latin term *adverbium*, which is composed of two parts: *ad-* (Latin) – meaning "next to" or "in addition"; *verbum* (Latin) – meaning "word" or "verb." Thus, *adverbium* can be interpreted as "a word added to the verb." This term was first used in Latin grammar and later adopted by the grammatical traditions of other European languages. The term entered the English language via French. The French *adverbe* was derived from Latin *adverbium*. In English, the word adverb has been in use since around the 14th century.

The etymology of the term 'pronoun' originates from the Latin *pronomen*, which is composed of: *pro-* (Latin) – meaning "in place of" or "substitute"; *nomen* (Latin) – meaning "name." Therefore, *pronomen* means "a word used in place of a noun." This term was first used in Latin grammar and then entered the grammatical systems of other European languages.

The term came into English via Medieval French *pronom*, which itself derived from Latin *pronomen*. In English, 'pronoun' has been in use since the 14th century. Since pronouns function as substitutes for nouns, the term pronoun accurately reflects their grammatical role.

The etymology of the term 'preposition' is traced from the Latin term *praepositio*, which is composed of two parts: *prae-* (Latin) – meaning "before," "in front of"; *positio* (Latin) – meaning "placement," "positioning." Thus, *praepositio* can be understood as "something placed before." This term was used in Latin grammar and later adopted by the grammatical systems of other European languages. The term entered English via the French *préposition*, which derived from Latin *praepositio*. In English, preposition has been used since the 14th century. From a semantic perspective, prepositions function as relational words that establish links between other words in a sentence, typically appearing before the noun or pronoun they govern. Therefore, the etymology of preposition closely corresponds to its grammatical function.

The etymology of the term conjunction can be traced in the Latin *coniunctio*, consisting of two parts: *con-* (Latin) – meaning “together,” “joined”; *iunctio* (Latin) – meaning “joining,” “connection,” derived from the verb *iungere* – “to join,” “to bind.” Thus, *coniunctio* can be interpreted as “connection,” “union,” or “joining.” Initially used in Latin grammar, the term later entered the grammatical systems of other European languages. The term reached English through the French *conjonction*, derived from Latin *coniunctio*. In English, the word conjunction has been used since the 14th century. Functionally, conjunctions connect words and clauses within a sentence. Hence, their etymology fully aligns with their grammatical role.

The etymology of the term ‘Interjection’ is traced in the Latin term *interiectio*, which is made up of: *inter-* (Latin) – meaning “between,” “among”; *iectio* (Latin) – meaning “throwing,” “casting,” from the verb *iacere* – “to throw.” Thus, *interiectio* can be interpreted as “something thrown in between.” Originally used in Latin grammar, this term was later adopted into other European grammatical traditions. The term entered English via the French interjection, derived from Latin *interiectio*. In English, the term interjection has been used since approximately the 15th century. In terms of meaning, interjections are words or phrases that do not directly participate in sentence structure but instead express emotion or reaction. Their etymology therefore matches their linguistic function.

5. Discussion

The historical development from the classical period to the modern era is considered a prerequisite for the evolution of all world languages. This includes the grammatical development of the Kazakh language. However, the Turkic languages, including Kazakh, have their own independent histories of development. The history of the Kazakh language originates from the Old Turkic period (6th–13th centuries). Nevertheless, the first scientific grammar of the Kazakh language was written only in the early 20th century. Prior to that, in the 18th–19th centuries, the Kazakh language was studied and described grammatically by Russian missionaries. However, the systematic formation of grammatical terminology and scientific grammar began only in the 20th century. Since parts of speech are considered universal across languages, all languages possess basic categories of parts of speech that are similar in terms of semantics and functionality. Thus, despite the structural differences between English and Kazakh, certain similarities can be identified.

The first scientific grammar of the Kazakh language was authored by Akhmet Baitursynuly. In 1914, he published his work *Til-Qural* (The Tool of Language), which remains in use to this day in Kazakh grammar. The word *Qural* (tool/instrument) in English is equivalent to instrument or implement. The title chosen by Baitursynuly clearly reflects not only the communicative function of language but also its cognitive dimension: that language is a tool for understanding and mastering the world.

One of A. Baitursynuly’s most effective approaches in coining linguistic terms was his use of the native lexicon of the Kazakh language. The fact that about 90% of the linguistic terms he introduced are still in use today reflects his consideration of the Kazakh people’s worldview and cognitive experience in term formation. In Baitursynuly’s terminological practice, it becomes evident that commonly used words in the Kazakh language were endowed with terminological meaning. However, over time, the meanings of morphological terms have become obscured and undergone

changes. To clarify their original meanings, we will analyze the parts of speech terminology found in A. Baitursynuly's works. Through such analysis, we can reveal the features of usage, similarities, and differences in the modern Kazakh language's parts of speech terminology. Moreover, we observe how the Kazakh worldview has been categorized and conceptualized through these linguistic terms, a foundation clearly laid in Baitursynuly's scholarly legacy.

Since antiquity, the formation of grammatical terms has been influenced by cultural and philosophical perspectives. In the Greco-Roman tradition, scholars such as Aristotle, Donatus, and Priscian laid the foundations for the classification of parts of speech.

While most part-of-speech terms in English originate from Latin and Greek, the terms in Kazakh are largely based on Turkic roots. Akhmet Baitursynuly developed the first scientific grammar of the Kazakh language and established a national linguistic system.

The findings of this study thus confirm that the formation of linguistic categories and part-of-speech terminology reflects cognitive models underlying human perception and understanding. Each language's grammatical structure offers valuable insights into how its speakers conceptualize and interpret the world. In this regard, the comparative analysis of Kazakh and English contributes significantly to the fields of multilingual studies and intercultural communication.

6. Conclusion

In this study, the terminologization features of parts of speech in Kazakh and English were examined using a qualitative comparative method. The analysis of 18 grammatical terms revealed significant differences in their structural, semantic, historical, and cognitive characteristics. Kazakh terms are based on national conceptual models, are semantically transparent, and morphologically complex; whereas English terms are rooted in a Latin-based academic tradition, but their meanings are often opaque to the modern user. The formation and development of part-of-speech terminology is not merely the process of designating grammatical categories—it is a complex phenomenon that reflects a people's worldview, culture, and cognitive models. While the English grammatical terms have been shaped under the influence of the Latin-Greek tradition, the Kazakh terms have been systematized based on national cultural foundations and the scholarly contributions of Akhmet Baitursynuly.

This study, by comparing the grammatical systems of the two languages, contributes to the development of linguistic theory and enhances our understanding of the structure of communication and cognition. In future research, it is recommended to expand this topic to include detailed examination of the cognitive and social aspects of linguistic categories. The results of the study have demonstrated that the process of terminologization of parts of speech varies depending on linguistic structure and cultural context. Future comparative studies with English and other global languages will be particularly relevant for enhancing the terminological system of the Kazakh language.

To conclude, the present study may be further developed through the following research directions: Cognitive and psychological studies for investigating the cognitive and psychological foundations of part-of-speech classification in different languages; for making intercultural comparison showing how grammatical categories are formed across various cultures; for applying digital models and corpus-based research in computational linguistics, to conduct comparative analysis between languages; and

designing language policy and education, exploring the role of grammatical terminology in the development of national linguistic systems.

This research is valuable for improving translation accuracy, standardizing the terminology used in curricula and textbooks, and enhancing language policy from a cultural-cognitive perspective. Considering national conceptual models and cognitive frameworks in term formation is a key to effective linguistic communication and high-quality education. However, a major limitation of the study was that it covered only 18 terms, which does not allow for a comprehensive description of the entire grammatical system. Moreover, it was limited to two languages and did not include an empirical investigation of the actual use of these terms among learners, teachers, or translators.

Future research could expand the number of grammatical terms studied, including syntactic and word-formation categories. It is also recommended to conduct surveys among language learners and teachers to explore the perception and understanding of these terms. Large-scale comparative studies involving Turkic, Slavic, and Romance languages would also be relevant.

7. Funding

This research was funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No AP26105127).

References

- Alfieri, L. (2023). Priscian, the Divisio Graeca and the History of Word-formation in Graeco-Roman Grammar. In A. C. Cassio & S. Kaczko (Eds.), *Alloglossoi: Multilingualism and Minority Languages in Ancient Europe* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-28). Walter de Gruyter & Co. GmbH & Co. KG. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110779684-001>
- Algeo, J. (2009). *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Cengage Learning.
- Ansaldo, U., Pfau, R., & Don, J. (2010). *Parts of Speech: Empirical and Theoretical Advances*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.25>
- Aristotle. (1859). *The Categories* (E. M. Edghill, Trans.). Saint Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences. <https://procbfd9f30-pic9.ysjianzhan.cn/upload/p5v0.pdf>
- Baitursynuly, A. (2017). *The Linguistic Legacy of Akhmet Baitursynuly*. Astana: Alashorda. <https://kazneb.kz/index.php/kk/catalogue/view/1559523>
- Baugh, A., & Cable, T. (2002). *A History of the English Language* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203994634>
- Bekmanova, G., Nazyrova, A., Amangeldy, N., Sharipbay, A., & Kudubayeva, S. (2022). A New Approach to Developing a Terminological Dictionary of School Subjects in the Kazakh Language. In *2022 7th International Conference on Computer Science and Engineering (UBMK)* (pp. 527-532). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/UBMK55850.2022.9919581>
- Benveniste, E. (1974). Categories of Thought and Categories of Language. *General linguistics*. <https://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/benvenist-74g.htm>

- Donatus, A. (1926). *The Ars Minor of Donatus: For One Thousand Years the Leading Textbook of Grammar*. University of Wisconsin.
- Gizi, S. K. E. (2023). The Peculiarities of the Functional Interaction of Parts of Speech in Modern English. *Colloquium-Journal*, 7(166), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.24412/2520-6990-2023-7166-57-60>
- Hanganu, E. C. (2014). *The English Grammar: A Historical Perspective*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3603.6009>
- Harper, D. R. (2025, April 7). *Online Etymology Dictionary*. <https://www.etymonline.com>
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530>
- Hustiana. (2023). Students' Viewpoints Toward Part of Speech as the Fulcrum of Grammar. *Journal of English and Education*, 9(2), 61-73. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.v9i2.31087>
- Issakova, S., Issakova, A., Ordabekova, K., Kussainova, Z., & Rakhimbekova, G. (2022). The System of Grammatical Categories of the Verb in Kazakh, Russian, and English. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(2), 120-126. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n2p120>
- Jowett, B. (1888). *The Republic of Plato*. Clarendon Press. <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/jowett-the-republic-1888-ed>
- Kovbasko, Y. (2020). On the Problem of Parts of Speech Identification in the English Language: A Historical Overview. *Kalby Studijos*, (36), 30-45. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.36.24312>
- Kurmanbayuly, S. (2013, February 21). *Akhmet Baitursynuly and Kazakh Terminology*. Kazgazeta.kz. <https://anatili.kazgazeta.kz/news/12246>
- Kurmanbayuly, S. (2014). *Kazakh Terminology*. Almaty: "Sardar". <https://termincom.kz/books/?id=30>
- Law, V. (2003). *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316036464>
- Lehmann, C. (2013). The Nature of Parts of Speech. *STUF-Language Typology and Universals*, 66(2), 141-177. <https://doi.org/10.1524/stuf.2013.0008>
- Malgaazhdar, M. (2021). The Kazakh Future Tense Forms and Translation Techniques of Rendering Them From Kazakh Into English. *Eurasian Journal of Philology: Science & Education*, 182(2), 180-188. <https://doi.org/10.26577/EJPh.2021.v182.i2.ph19>
- Mugglestone, L. (2008). *The Oxford History of English*. Oxford University Press.
- Pskit, W. (2002). The Classification of English Word Classes: Jespersen and Descriptive Academic Grammar. *Linguistica Silesiana*, 23, 95-102. <https://bibliotekanauki.pl/articles/59603016>

- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1961). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415437>
- Suhrob, E., & Vasila, K. (2022). Parts of Speech and Sentence Structure in English Grammar. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(7), 156-160. <https://internationaljournals.co.in/index.php/giirj/article/view/2390>
- Swan, M., & Walter, C. (2011). *Oxford English Grammar Course*. Oxford University Press. https://elt.oup.com/catalogue/items/global/grammar_vocabulary/oxford-english-grammar-course
- Taubeyeva, A. (2024). Comparison of Voice Categories in Kazakh and English. *Iasau Universitetinin Habarshysy*, 133(3), 168-179. <https://doi.org/10.47526/2024-3/2664-0686.83>
- Topka, L. (2012). The Problem of Parts of Speech in Modern English. In L. V. Ball (Ed.), *Issues in English Philology* (3rd ed., pp. 223-229). Irkutsk. <https://www.academia.edu/36931785>
- Vakhitova, T., Kuzembayeva, G., Yergazina, A., Zhumakhanova, A., & Khayrullina, R. (2022). Kazakh and Russian Kinship Terminology: A Comparative Linguistic and Cultural Analysis of Lacunae. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 28-43. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911517>
- Viti, C. (2014). Latin Parts of Speech in Historical and Typological Context. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 13(2), 279-301. <https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2014-0012>
- Yáñez-Bouza, N. (2015). Senses of “Grammar” in the Eighteenth-Century English Tradition. *English Studies*, 96(8), 913-943. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013838X.2015.1078584>
- Zhambylkyzy, M. (2022). Structural-Semantic and Functional Features of Phrasal Verbs: Based on the Materials of English and Kazakh Languages. *Tiltanym*, (2), 84-92. https://www.tiltanym.kz/jour/article/view/340/0?locale=en_US
- Zhanabekova, M. (2014). The Common Climate of Classroom Communication. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 114, 579-583. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.750>
- Zhanpeisov, E. (2002). *Kazakh Grammar. Phonetics, Sozhasam, Morphology, Syntax*. Astana. <https://f.eruditor.link/file/3263119>