

**SAINT-PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY**

*Manuscript Copyright*

Kamalova Shahnaz Novruz kizi

**SYNTACTIC MODELS OF TURKIC LANGUAGES IN FUNCTIONALLY-  
SEMANTIC ASPECT (ON THE MATERIAL OF THE LANGUAGE OF  
OLD TURKIC MONUMENTS)**

Scientific specialty 5.9.6.

Languages of the peoples of foreign countries

(Turkic languages)

A dissertation submitted for the degree of candidate of philology

*Translation from Russian*

**Academic supervisor:**

Candidate of Philology Sciences,

Associate Professor

Telitsin N. N.

Saint Petersburg

2024

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
CHAPTER 1. CONCEPTUAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL APPARATUS... 16	16
1.1. The Theory of Model Description of the Sentence: A Historical Outline...23	23
CHAPTER 2. THE COPULATIVE MODEL.....	29
CHAPTER 3. THE PREDICATIVE MODEL.....	37
3.1. Subject.....	39
3.2. Predicate.....	45
3.2.1. Verbal Predicate.....	45
3.2.2. Nominal Predicate.....	56
CHAPTER 4. ATTRIBUTIVE MODELS.....	61
4.1. Determinative Models.....	63
4.2. Complementary Models.....	83
4.2.1. Models of the Direct Complement.....	84
4.2.2. Models of the Indirect Complement.....	92
4.3. Adverbial Models.....	105
4.3.1. Models of the Adverbial of Manner.....	107
4.3.2. Models of the Adverbial of Place.....	110
4.3.3. Models of the Adverbial of Time.....	119
4.3.4. Models of the Adverbial of Purpose.....	126
4.3.5. Models of the Adverbial of Cause.....	130
4.3.6. Models of the Adverbial of Measure and Degree.....	133
4.3.7. Models of the Adverbial of Condition.....	136
CONCLUSION.....	140
THE LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	148
THE LIST OF SOURCES.....	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	152

## INTRODUCTION

As a rule, in Russian Turkology, as well as in global Turkology in general, the syntax of Turkic languages is studied within the framework of complex description of Turkic languages' grammatical systems. These studies, in its turn, take place on an ongoing basis, perhaps even as a continuation of numerous studies of the syntax of other, mostly Indo-European languages.

This dissertation continues the traditions of Soviet and Russian Turkology, which has been based on the study of the factual material of each Turkic language separately and the theoretical analysis of the specific phenomena which can be found in the texts written in that language. It seems reasonable to say that this dissertation combines some comparative and historical methods of studying linguistic material with comprehensive analysis of specific linguistic phenomena discovered in the course of the study.

It has been characteristic of recent years to attach great importance to the study of specific languages, primarily extinct or little-explored ones, in order to discover their structural features. In this regard, the language of old Turkic runic monuments is of particular interest, since it is one of the first written Turkic languages and, in diachronical terms, demonstrates the earliest version of the syntactic structure peculiar to the Turkic language type.

The oldest Turkic monuments of runic writing, i.e. the very first examples of Turkic written and literary language, provide an unparalleled evidence of the high level of old Turks' linguistic culture [Kononov 1980: 3].

This dissertation **aims** to investigate the typology and morphological composition, as well as the functional purpose and semantical structure of Turkic syntactic constructions, as they are presented in that supradialectal literary standard version

of the language, which is recorded in the old Turkic runic monuments (hereinafter referred to as OTRM).

A number of factors contribute to the **relevance** of this topic:

1. Syntax is one of the most important subsystems of each language. Turkic syntax is replete with special features, and some of them are fairly peculiar in comparison to European languages. This is manifested in the presence of unique syntactic models, both in the sphere of attributive and in the sphere of predicative constructions.
2. Among the attributive constructions, a special role is played by word combinations with verbal nominal forms (participles, substantive-adjective forms, masdars and converbs). The active use of such word combinations enables to reduce the number of complex subordinate sentences in the syntax of Turkic languages [Guzev, Burykin 2007: 111-112, 114].
3. Despite the fact that scholars of Turkic languages traditionally devote considerable attention to syntax and its various aspects, this field remains under-investigated. Most of the sections focused on the syntax subsystem of various Turkic languages are largely descriptive. When describing syntax, scholars often use terminology based on Indo-European languages, which belong to a different structural type. This reduces the possibility to fully reveal the indigenous essence of this language area and its components. The most promising studies in this regard are those based on the theory of functional syntax. When this theory is applied, it enables, firstly, to consistently differentiate speech utterances with their individual features from abstract language models of syntactic constructions with invariant features, and secondly, to categorize the models found in language by their structural type.

In this thesis, we have set the following **objectives**:

1. To identify and record those syntactic models which can be attributed as the native Turkic ones and distinguish them from those models which were borrowed from

neighboring languages. The material used for the analysis is the language of the oldest of the surviving written monuments;

2. To classify the identified syntactic models using as the main criterion the type of syntactic relation by which the components of the construction are connected; as a more specific criterion, their classifying grammatical meaning will be used.

3. To use the developed classification of syntactic constructions found in the old Turkic runic monuments as a basis for a hypothetical model, explaining the emergence and formation of structural syntactic units of a modern Turkic language, the latter being on a corresponding scale of genetic development, and thus representing a language which evolved later in terms of diachrony (Azerbaijani/Turkish).

In order to achieve these objectives, we have set the following **tasks**:

1. To develop and elaborate the conceptual and terminological apparatus necessary for the research.

2. To interpretate and scrutiny the OTRM texts necessary for the gathering of speech material, which should be the basis for theoretical inductive analysis. In the result it is supposed to reveal an entire set of generalized syntactic models in the language system.

3. To describe the linguistic meaning and speech functions of the identified syntactic models within the frameworks of functional-semantic and system approaches in linguistics.

Thus, the **subject of the study** is the syntactic structure of Turkic languages in the functional-semantic aspect (as exemplified in the OTRM language). The study models the structure and analyzes the semantics of the sentence as a language unit, and identifies common syntactic structures (abbreviated CSS) characteristic of this language, as well as similarities and differences in their textual functioning.

The **object of the study** is the language of the oldest monuments, which in Turkology are called “Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions,” found in Southern Siberia, in Mongolia, and on the territories of modern Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. They were created from the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> to the middle of the 9<sup>th</sup> century A.D. [Tashagyl 2018, 2020; Klyashtorny 2006].

The most recent large texts written in the old Turkic script include the “Book of Divination” (Irk Bitig) (the 9<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> centuries), and the date of its compilation is approximately 933. On the Yenisey and in the Altai runic script was used up to the 11<sup>th</sup> century.

The **sources** we have used for practical research are Orkhon and Yenisey monuments of the old Turkic runic script.

1) Monuments found in Mongolia, among which there are the largest Turkic written monuments, monuments of the Orkhon River valley:

1. The monument in honor of Kul Tegin. It is a bilingual monument, presumably created in 732.

2. The monument in honor of Tonyukuk, created approximately in 712–716. The language of this monument differs from the language of the Kul Tegin monument and is closer to the language of Uyghur monuments [Kondratiev 1973: 26].

3. The monument to Mogilyan Khan (Bilge Kagan) (735 A.D.). Its contents are close to that of the monument to Kul-Tegin [Malov 1951:11].

4. Onginisky monument. The monument was erected in honor of Ilteres Kagan and his wife, i.e. parents of Khan Mogilyan and Kul Tegin [Malov 1959: 7]. The approximate dates are either 690–706 or 700–716. [Kononov 1980: 14].

5. Monument to Kul-chur (721 A.D.).

6. Monument to Moyun-chur (“the Selenginsky stone”) (744–759). An interesting feature of the monument is that it is written in the Uyghur language, however not in

the Uyghur script, but in the runic one, and belongs to the time of the Uyghur Kaganate [Kormushin: 147–150].

7. Hoyto–Tamir monuments (ten monuments).

2) Monuments of the Yenisey basin, which, contrary to a previously held view, are not the oldest ones [Malov 1952: 4-8]. It has been established that the monuments, translated by V.V. Radlov, were created in the 8<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> centuries [Kyzlasov 1960: 93-120].

3) The monuments found in the Mountain Altai, which are much less-explored than monuments found in other regions. There are 16 inscriptions, and their wordage is close to that of Yenisey inscriptions, but unlike the Yenisey inscriptions, they are not epitaphs, but texts about everyday subjects.

4) The runic monuments from East Turkestan that include handwritten texts and drawings on frescoes and stucco of cave temples in the Turpan Oasis.

**The methodological and theoretical foundation** of the study was laid down in the basic conceptions of general linguistics, elaborated in the works of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay [Baudouin de Courtenay 1963], F. de Saussure [F. de Saussure 1977], V.V. Vinogradov [2001], A. M. Peshkovsky [Peshkovsky 2001], N. A. Baskakova [Baskakov 2006], N. Chomsky [Chomsky 2018, 2019]. The groundwork for this dissertation is the theory of functional syntax, based on the functional-semantic approach to language, proposed by V.G. Guzev [2015]. Special attention ought to be paid to the conception of system linguistics, thoroughly developed in the monographs and articles of G. P. Melnikov [Melnikov 2003], as well as to the works of the Novosibirsk school of Turkology, headed by M.I. Cheremisina [Cheremisina 1989, 1991, 1996-1998], [Nevskaya 1997], [Chugunekova 1998, 2019].

We also refer to some theoretical insights on Turkic languages shared by such authors as S.E. Malov [Malov 1951; 1959 et al.], A.N. Kononov [Kononov 1956; 1980], A.M. Scherbak [Scherbak 1977], V.G. Guzev [Guzev 2015 etc.], V.M. Nasilov [Nasilov 1963; 1974], D.M. Nasilov in co-authorship with V.G. Guzev

[Guzev, Nasilov 1975], N.N. Telitsyn [Telitsyn 2010; 2011, etc. ], A.S. Avrutina [2011], M.E. Dubrovina [Dubrovina 2010 etc.], N. B. Koshkareva [Koshkareva 2005], A.N. Chugunekova [Chugunekova 2019], M.M. Musayev [Musayev 2011], K. Abdulla [Abdulla 2016], Q. Ş. Kazımov [Kazımov 2010], M. Erdal [Erdal 2004 etc.], C. Alyılmaz [Alyılmaz 2005], H. N. Orkun [Orkun 2011], M. Ölmez [2015], T. Tekin [Tekin 2003; 2020], Alıřova Demirdađ [Alıřova Demirdađ 2021], as well as articles and monographs on Turkology written by other authors.

In this study, all examples and their translations are quoted from the OTRM texts presented in the books of S.E. Malov [Malov 1951; 1959]. Spelling of Turkic runic words and word forms is provided with Latinized transcriptions conventional in Turkology.

The main **method** of this research is the method of modelling syntactic constructions (word combinations and sentences). The essence of this method is to reveal those models in speech utterances which function in the language system as abstract patterns, and on the basis of which these utterances are constructed in speech.

**The statements to be defended:**

1. Syntax is a language subsystem with a limited set of utilized syntactic models.
2. Individual speech utterances are based on typical syntactic structures, the components of which are connected by one of the three kinds of syntactic connection: namely, copulative, attributive, or predicative one.
3. The so-called diversity of sentences' and word combinations' display refers to the sphere of speech, in which the number of possible individual syntactic constructions is virtually infinite. Meanwhile, in the language subsystem, the number of original syntactic models is limited and amounts to several dozen patterns.
4. The utterances which can be found in speech are concrete manifestations (realizations) of the models available in the syntax subsystem of the language. It is not always reasonable to call these utterances sentences, as they may be based on a



predicative structure but may not have a finite form in their speech composition. For Turkic languages, the presence of a finite form in a speech utterance is a necessary condition to identify it as a sentence. Thus, the type of syntactic connection between the components of a construction plays a pivotal role in the classification of syntactic models. For example, the invariant predicative model in speech can be realized in the form of an utterance with a verbal predicate, an utterance with a nominal predicate, as well as with various predicative utterances without a predicate expressed in a finite form (constructions with adverbial participles).

5. Any utterance in speech may be a combination of realizations based on structurally different linguistic syntactic models. In one utterance, both the attributive model, the copulative model and the predicative model can be distinguished; notably, the number of realizations of these models within one utterance cannot be predetermined.

6. The number and typology of syntactic constructions are unique to each language system and may have no counterparts in other languages.

The main **scientific results** achieved in the course of the study are the following ones:

1) The substantive attributive constructions called “izafet” are revealed in the OTRM language and compared to their analogues found in modern Azerbaijani [Kamalova 2017 (a): 93-96].

2) Analytical forms in predicative constructions are detected in the OTRM language [Kamalova 2017 (б): 41–47].

3) The concept of “syntactic model” is studied in the context of Turkic languages, as exemplified in the Old Turkic runic monuments (co-authorship with M.E. Dubrovina) [Dubrovina, Kamalova 2017: 61-65].

4) The predicative models are detected in the OTRM language [Kamalova 2018 (a): 94-97; 2018 (б): 8-20].

5) Syntactic structures of Turkic languages are researched as exemplified in the OTRM language [Kamalova 2018: 27-30 (in English)].

6) Several ways of conveying the adverbial of place in the OTRM language are discovered [Kamalova 2019: 73-75].

7) The copulative models in the OTRM language and the modern Azerbaijani language are revealed [Kamalova 2020: 122-132].

8) Several models of the indirect complement in the OTRM language are detected [Kamalova 2023 (a): 3809-3815].

9) The verbal predicate in the language of OTRM is examined [Kamalova 2023 (6): 1283–1298].

**The novelty of the study.** This dissertation is the first attempt to scrutiny syntactic models as exemplified in the OTRM language. In the course of the study, a number of models were found and the means of their realizations were analyzed, individual utterances being used as examples.

**The theoretical and practical value** of the dissertation lies in the fact that its results may have not only theoretical but also practical significance, in particular, in the field of teaching any Turkic language, because the syntax of each Turkic language is, firstly, basically similar in form set of utilized units (original syntactic models), and, secondly, it contains approximately the same number of them. The factual material collected and analyzed in this study can be useful for both Turkologists, general linguists, academic researchers in philology, and for students of Turkic languages and culture within institutions of Oriental studies and Turkology.

**Approbation of the work.** The fundamentals of the thesis are set out in the following publications.

**Publications in leading peer-reviewed academic journals and editions:**

1. Kamalova Sh. N. Substantive Attributive Construction “Izafet” in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Inscriptions and in the Modern Azerbaijani Language

// Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice. 2017. 5 (71). Part 3. P. 93-96. (In Russian.)

2. Kamalova Sh. N. The Predicative Model in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // Pyatigorsk State University Bulletin. 2018. № 4. P. 94-97. (In Russian.)

3. Kamalova Sh. N. The Models of Indirect Complement in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // Philological Studies. Theoretical and Practical Issues. 2023. Vol. 16, Iss. 11. Pages 3809-3815. (In Russian.)

4. Kamalova Shahnaz Novruz. On the question of structural units of the Turkic syntax (On the material of the language of the ancient Turkic runic monuments). // TEXTE-Revue de critique et de theorie litteraire. 2018. № 4. P. 27-30. (THE JOURNAL IS INDEXED BY THOMSON AND REUTERS EMERGING CITATION INDEX) (In English.)

Publications in other academic editions:

1. Kamalova Sh. N. Analytical Forms in Predicative Constructions as Exemplified in the Texts of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // International Academic Conference “Ivanov Readings.” Saint Petersburg, 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017. The Conference Materials / Ed. by N.N. Telitsin. Saint Petersburg: The Centre for Promotion of Education, 2017. P. 41–47.

2. Dubrovina M.E., Kamalova Sh. N. On the Concept of “syntactic model” as Applied to the Turkic Languages (on the Language Material of Old Turkic Runic Monuments) // IV International Scientific and Practical Conference. Modern Problems of Humanities. Collection of Academic Works Summarizing the Results of the Conference. Kazan. 2017. P. 61–65. (In Russian.)

3. Kamalova Sh. N. An Analysis of Syntactic Predicative Models in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // Türkologiya. Bakı. 2018. 4. P. 8-20. (In Russian.)

4. Kamalova Sh. Izafet in Language of Ancient Turkic Runic Inscriptions and Modern Azerbaijan Language // Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken. München, Germany, VOL. 11, №1, 2019. P. 75-83. (In English.)

5. Kamalova Sh. N. Ways of Expressing the Location Adverbials in the Language of Ancient Turkic Runic Monuments // Materials of the Russia-wide Academic Symposium with International Participation “Sentence as a Unit of Language and Speech,” dedicated to the 95th Anniversary of M.I. Cheremisina (Novosibirsk, 8-11 October 2019). Novosibirsk. 2019. P. 73-75. (In Russian.)

6. Kamalova Sh. N. The Copulative Model in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments and Modern Azerbaijani // Studies in Turkic Philology. Issue XIII: Proceedings of Dmitriev Readings / Chief editor M.M. Repenkova, E.A. Oganova; ed. by O.N. Kameneva, E.M. Napolnova, A.V. Chivrikova; Lomonosov Moscow State University, The Institute of Asian and African Countries. Moscow: MBA Publishing, 2020. P. 122–132. (In Russian.)

7. Kamalova Ş. N. The Verbal Predicate in the language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // X. Uluslararası Türkoloji Kingresi, Hoca Ahmet Yasevi Uluslararası Türk-Kazak universiteti, Türküstan (Kazakistan), Bildiribi Kitabı. Ankara, 2023. S. 1283–1298. (In Russian.)

The findings of the study have been approbated at several international academic conferences:

1. Kamalova Sh. N. Revisiting the Question of Structural Units of the Turkic Syntax // The XXVIII International Conference on Source Studies and Historiography of Asia and Africa “Asia and Africa in the Changing World.” Saint Petersburg, 22–24 April 2015. (In Russian.)

2. Kamalova Sh. N. A Comparative Analysis of Models of Substantive Attributive Constructions in OTRM Language in Modern Oguz Languages // International Scientific Conference “Languages and Literatures of the Turkic Peoples,” dedicated

to the 180th Anniversary of the Department of Turkic Philology at St. Petersburg State University. Saint Petersburg, 26-28 October 2015. (In Russian.)

3. Shahnaz Kamalova. On Definitive and Completive Constructions in the Language of Runic Artifacts // The 6th International Symposium on Oriental Ancient Documents Studies. Saint Petersburg, October 2-6, 2016. (In Russian.)

4. Kamalova Sh. N. Analytical Forms in Predicative Constructions as Encountered in the Texts of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // International Scientific Conference “Ivanov Readings.” Saint Petersburg, May 9, 2017. (In Russian.)

5. Kamalova Sh. N. Revisiting Predicative Constructions in the Language of OTRM // International Scientific Conference “XXXII Kononov Readings,” Saint Petersburg, 27-28 October 2017. (In Russian.)

6. Kamalova Sh. N. The Circumstantial Structure in the Languages of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // International Scientific Conference “XXXIII Kononov Readings.” Saint Petersburg, October 26-27, 2018. (In Russian.)

7. Kamalova Sh. N. Names of Turkic Origin in the Language of Nasimi, and Their Comparison in Old Turkic Dictionaries // International Scientific and Practical Conference “Spiritual Legacy of Seyid Imadaddin Nasimi in the Historical and Cultural Context of the Medieval East.” November 19-20, 2018. (In Russian.)

8. Kamalova Sh. N. Typical Syntactic Models in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // The XXX International Congress on Source Studies and Historiography of Asian and African Countries: On the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Academician V. V. Bartold (1869–1930). Saint Petersburg, 19-21 June 2019. (In Russian.)

9. Kamalova Sh. N. The Copulative Model in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments and the Modern Azerbaijani Language // The XXVII International Conference “Dmitriev Readings.” October 4, 2019. (In Russian.)

10. Kamalova Sh. N. The Model Conveying the Meaning of the Adverbial of Purpose in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments and Modern Turkic Languages (Azerbaijani and Turkish) // International Scientific Conference “XXXIV Kononov Readings,” Saint Petersburg State University, 25–26 October 2019. (In Russian.)

11. Kamalova S.N. Revisiting the Question about the Nominal Predicates in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // The Fifth Scientific and Practical Conference “The Turko-Mongolian World in the Past and Present” in memory of S.G. Klyashtorny (1928–2014), St. Petersburg, February 20–21, 2023. (In Russian.)

12. Kamalova S.N. About Completive Constructions in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // The XXXII International Congress on Source Studies and Historiography of Asian and African Countries: Russia and East. To the 300th Anniversary of Saint Petersburg State University, 26–28 April 2023. (In Russian.)

13. Kamalova Ş. N. Orhon-Yenisei abidelerinin dilinde yargısal (predikatif) yapılar // X. Uluslararası Türkoloji Kingresi, Hoca Ahmet Yasevi Uluslararası Türk-Kazak universiteti, Türküstan (Kazakistan), Bildiribi Kitabı. 17–20 ekim 2023. (In Turkish.)

**The structure of the dissertation:** The dissertation consists of an introduction, four chapters, a conclusion, a list of acronyms, a list of sources and a bibliography.

A continuous numbering of examples is used to illustrate different grammatical forms and categories.

The introduction demonstrates the relevance of the topic, describes the degree of its development, identifies the subject and object of the study, formulates its goals and objectives, provides the methodological and theoretical basis of the work, and relates the history of the question.

The first chapter discusses the conceptual and terminological framework we have adopted as the foundation for the study. Those concepts which are common for

linguistics in general include such as the following: language and speech, lexeme, moneme, morpheme, word combination, sentence, model.

The second chapter focuses on the copulative models. A number of general copulative models is revealed.

The third chapter addresses the predicative models and its varieties.

The fourth chapter analyzes attributive models (in particular, attributive, complementary and adverbial ones). This chapter defines each variety of attributive syntax models and its components.

Having analyzed the linguistic material of old Turkic runic monuments, we summarize our findings in the Conclusion.

## CHAPTER 1. CONCEPTUAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL APPARATUS

In order to build the foundation for a practical study in general features of the OTRM syntax we should first revisit some theoretical ideas. An important question is the question about interrelation between the concepts of “language” and “speech.” Fundamental for language theory, this question predetermines direction of a linguistic study, as well as solution to a number of other important questions, which are related to differentiation between language and speech phenomena. These include phoneme and sound, moneme and sign, morpheme and morph/allomorph/affix, form and word form, model, syntactic construction and utterance, sentence, etc. As far as most concepts in modern linguistics are rather controversial, it seems necessary to present our viewpoint. The theoretical basis of the study has been formed by G. P. Melnikov’s (1928–2000) ideas [Melnikov 1969: 104-113] and the theory of functional syntax, elaborated in V. G. Guzev’s (1939–2021) works [Guzev 2015] and grounded on Melnikov’s ideas.

“Language” is, certainly, a basic concept of linguistics. Nonetheless, this concept is often confused with the concept of “speech,” and still more often substituted with the latter. Confusions of such kind may be noticed in some studies, where language features, and even language patterns, are deduced from facts, which actually prove to be speech facts, sometimes unique and isolated ones, and not illustrative of language invariant features.

Epistemologically, language and speech may be viewed as phenomena of different levels of abstraction. While language is a general, abstract phenomenon, speech is an individual, specific phenomenon. Language and speech are dialectically necessarily intertwined, yet relatively independent of each other. This independence is evidenced by dissimilarities in their systematic construction, differences between



their functions, difference in stages and some asymmetry of their development, their different connection to social milieu.

Ontologically, language belongs to the realm of ideas and psyche, whereas speech is a physical (physiological), tangible and observable phenomenon.

Language ought to be viewed as an objectively existing phenomenon. Language “is both a social product of the faculty of speech and a collection of necessary conventions that have been adopted by a social body to permit individuals to exercise that faculty.” (Saussure 1959: 9).

Even before F. de Saussure’s *Course*, I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay had also offered some observations, which should be taken into consideration. First of all, it is important to remember his reflections upon “language mechanism,” and upon differences between “the essence of language” and “ability to speak” [Baudouin de Courtenay 1963: 70–71].

Language is “a grammatical system that has a potential existence in each brain, or, more specifically, in the brains of a group of individuals. For language is not complete in any speaker; it exists perfectly only within a collectivity” [Saussure 1959: 13–14]. This is a finished product, passively incorporated by the speaker. Language is a social aspect of speech production, and it is external to the speaker, who can neither create nor alter it by themselves.

Functional-semantic approach to language phenomena enables to perceive language as a communicative mechanism objectively existing in individual mind [Baudouin de Courtenay 1963:70–72, 174, 210], [Melnikov 1978: 218–354]. All language units, both inventory and structural, are interpreted as supersensual objects, epitomizing abstract images.

Speech, in its turn, is a material link of communication. F. de Saussure interpreted speech as a group of linearly located signs, which epitomize thought content [Saussure 1977: 51-53, Kasevich 1977: 10-12].

According to V. A. Avrorin, speech is a process of “using” language, a process of realization of language and thinking by means of one or a multitude of linearly located speech signs. Owing to speech production, human mind is constantly replenished and enriched; thus, speech influences thinking and mind, whereas mind and thinking influence and govern speech. “Speech is an external manifestation of language, its specific realization” [Avrorin 1975: 35]. Linguists distinguish between oral (i.e. spoken and audible) and written speech, the latter being manifested in writing systems. However, from the standpoint of general linguistics, this distinction is hardly significant.

Distinguishing between concepts of “language” and “speech,” one should distinguish between these phenomena’s units as well. Units of language are objects of different subdivisions of linguistics, such as phonetics, lexicology, etc. However, it is more important to recognize the need to distinguish not subdivisions of linguistics, but subsystems intrinsic for the language itself, such as phonology, morphonology, morphology, lexicology, syntax. Each subsystem has its own inventory unit, which in speech corresponds to a specific material realization. In speech, the phonology unit – phoneme – corresponds to sound (allophone), the morphology unit – morpheme – corresponds to affix (morph), the lexicology unit – lexeme – corresponds to word or word form, the syntactic unit – the model of syntactic construction – corresponds to utterance. Thus, in linguistics there is a tradition according to which phonemes, forms, morphemes, categories, lexemes, graphemes and other terms of “emic” level signify units of a language system, whereas such terms as “sign,” “sound,” “morph” (or affix), “word form,” “word,” “utterance,” “sentence” signify speech units.

Language units can be categorized into two groups: inventory and structural ones. The inventory units, as already mentioned, include phoneme (unilateral unit), morpheme, lexeme, word combination, and sentence. The following are structural units of language morphological subsystem: form, category (a subsystem of minimal capacity). Their counterparts in speech are various combinations of signs (word

combinations, word forms, combinations of words and word forms) [Guzev 2015: 252]. Therefore, the grammatical form should be defined as a set of the most general abstract rules, as a model for construction of a word form, as a minimal structural unit of the word-change mechanism of language, i.e. an abstraction providing a basis on which a specific kind of word forms is produced [Guzev 1987: 40].

Following A. Martinet, we accept monema as a minimal bilateral language unit, which represents the unity of two abstract images – signified and signifier – which are connected in the mind of the communicator by a strong association [See, for example, Martinet 1960: 19-21; Melnikov 1978: 255 Guzev 2011a: 29-34]. A type of monema, which is a linguistic counterpart of word in speech, is called lexeme.

A monema which conveys a grammatical meaning, or more precisely, an auxiliary or word-forming meaning, and is a means of transforming the image of a word in speech, is interpreted as a morpheme. The term morpheme was coined by I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay [Baudouin de Courtenay 1963: 183, 349]. Morpheme is defined as a minimal unit of morphology, serving as the carrier of one of the grammatical meanings – i.e. word-forming or auxiliary one, and is one of the primary means of operational and grammatical transformation of a word [Baudouin de Courtenay 1963:183, 349; See. Also: Guzev 2011: 94].

For the purpose of this study, it seems necessary to elaborate on the analysis of the syntax subsystem of language. According to N. Chomsky, “Syntax is a teaching about the principles and methods of sentence construction” [Chomsky 2018]. V.G. Guzev and A.S. Avrutina argue that syntax includes the following components: 1) the intralingual correspondence between words and word forms appearing in speech, constituting syntactic inventory, the building material, from which one can form speech sign chains of such length which is necessary for the communicator, only reproduced during speech production; 2) the rules of linear arrangement of words and word forms in speech, which represent kinds of signs; 3) abstract models, structures of all sorts of utterances, larger than one word, established in the human

psyche; 4) abstract images of functions, in which there are significant (autosemantic) words as components of utterances” [Guzev, Avrutina 2013: 6].

The inventory units of the syntax subsystem of language should be understood as significant lexemes, which either become utterances themselves or serve as the building blocks from which extended utterances are constructed in the form of linear chains of the required length. N. Chomsky in his theory of Cartesian linguistics has shown that “language has an inner and an outer aspect,” and he called the inner aspect “deep structure,” and the outer one – “surface structure” [Chomsky 1966: 32–33].

The scholar believes that the deep structure is “the underlying abstract structure that determines [the sentence’s] semantic interpretation”; in his opinion, such a structure is common for all languages. The surface structure is the “superficial organization of units which determines the phonetic interpretation and which relates to the physical form of the actual utterance, to its perceived or intended form.” [Chomsky 1966: 33]. Chomsky further suggests the idea that “it is the deep structure underlying the actual utterance, a structure that is purely mental, that conveys the semantic content of the sentence” [Chomsky 1966: 35]. Thus, the scholar also assumes that any speech (outer) utterance is not constructed on its own, but is based on some kind of deep structure, a typical model.

In the literature on syntax problems, the term “syntagma” is often used. By the common definition given by A. A. Reformatsky, syntagma is a word combination of components which are related to each other by relationships with unequal directions, where one component is designated and the other is designating. [Reformatsky 1996: 325]. The term is coined from the artificially constructed term *syntagma* (Greek), literally “something which is connected.” According to I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, syntagmas, significant lexemes and grammatical forms are the intralingual counterparts of words, word combinations and word forms in speech [Baudouin de Courtenay 1963].

Up to the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, linguists believed that the central concept of syntax was the concept of “sentence,” on the basis of which syntax was defined as a teaching about sentence. Many linguists considered the sentence to be a language unit. For example, V.Z. Panfilov, who did not make a clear distinction between linguistic and speech units, considered sentence as “a linguistic unit that expresses a relatively complete act of thought, and which is characterized by one or another type of communicative intonation (message, question or order) and has content relevant to reality” [Panfilov 1971: 172].

In this regard, the arguments of those scholars who hold a different view on this issue are also interesting. V.G. Guzev considers the sentence to be a kind of utterance, which is formed at the moment of speech activity, and has a specific meaning and individual characteristics. In other words, the scholar believes that a sentence is not an abstract linguistic unit, but a concrete speech realization of a certain invariant syntactic model, referring, therefore, to speech, and not to the linguistic system, the latter being interpreted as an element of knowledge, composed of abstract images [Guzev 2015: 258]. The utterance, in its turn, was understood by F. de Saussure as a speech unit, which is a sign or chain of signs conveying a complete, from the speaker’s point of view, content [Saussure 1977: 48]. It should be noted that the language system exists in the individual mind even when the person does not participate in communication. In this case, the “linguistic unit” basically cannot express any finished idea, i.e. meaning. Therefore, the sentence and the utterance cannot be considered to be linguistic units.

According to recent research, the inventory unit of syntax, which is conveyed by the term “syntaxeme,” corresponds to an abstract image, extracted from a specific word in an utterance, “normally performing any function (subject, predicate, determinant, complement, etc.)” [Guzev 2015: 253]. Thus, according to V.G. Guzev, “in the syntactic fragment of the language system there are images in which the schemes, models, structures, programs of production or either different kinds of constructions

(extended components of utterances) or entire utterances consisting of more than one word” [Guzev 2015: 254].

V.B. Kasevich argues that the basic unit of syntax is an elementary syntactic construction: “The syntactic and, more generally, grammatical ‘core’ of the language is the system of syntactic constructions” [Kasevich 2006: 98]. Construction is a speech unit consisting of more than one word or word forms [Guzev 2015: 257]. Structural syntactic units relate not to utterances, but to constructions in the first place. Constructions at the speech level, along with words, play the role of building material of extended utterances.

It is quite possible that by filling the syntactic models with words and word forms such constructions are produced in speech which are themselves either finished utterances or components of other constructions. This leads to the production of even more extended constructions. The process is interrupted or ended where, in the opinion of the communicator, the coding of the prepared portion of the meaning, i.e. the information to be transmitted to the listener, is completed, and the whole structure functions as a complex or compound utterance [Guzev 2015: 258, Baskakov 1974: 13].

According to V.M. Pavlov, “The syntactic form, which may be represented, for example, as a formula like ‘noun in the nominative case + transitive verb + noun in the accusative case’ can and should be related to the private (equally generalized, containing abstract features) semantic characteristics of its elements such as ‘agent + process or act of influence on something + object of influence’ (typical lexical and semantic contents are taken into account). This gives the status of the (bilateral) language sign to the appropriately semanticized model of a syntactic construction” [Pavlov 2004: 250].

Thus, in this dissertation it is understood that words and sentences are units of not a language system, but of speech. Whereas linguistic units are abstract images, speech and speech units represent the material links of communication.

### **1.1. The Theory of Model Description of the Sentence: A Historical Outline**

In speech, speakers reproduce countless sentences, but in language sentences are constructed according to certain patterns, i.e. models the number of which in a particular language is limited [Cheremisina, Ozanova, Tazranova 2008: 44].

A model can be produced by analysis of language facts and its theoretical consideration; it enables to reflect and identify structural and semantic attributes of the investigated object. Linguists have approached the question of modelling the structure of a simple sentence in different ways, considering the nature of the simplest sentence. Sentence is modelled depending upon different assumptions about what the model should reflect.

Model is a language abstraction, a way of representing a sentence in a way that disregards particular lexical content and focuses on empty formal positions, which are connected to each other in a certain way. The model approach enables to present the sentence as an emic object along with the phoneme, morpheme, lexeme [Bayzhanova 2004: 9].

The first steps in modelling the Russian simple sentence were made by T. P. Lomtev in the 1960s [Lomtev 1969]. He recognized the bilateral symbolic nature of the sentence, but the way he accepted for the recording and demonstration of models – using no symbols, just “sample phrases” – lessened the possibility to fully represent sentence models. He considered the sentence to be a “positional structure” consisting of “positional links.” In its composition, each link represents a position, which in speech is replaced by a word form in a predetermined grammatical form. T. P. Lomtev argues that “position” means those syntactic location which determines predicate valence for nouns. According to T. P. Lomtev, the elementary syntactic

unit is not a sentence member, not the form of a word, but a positional link in the positional structure of the sentence. In his system of concepts, the term “position” corresponds in meaning to “syntactic location” of a word form as a component of sentence.

T.P. Lomtev believes that the sentence is the unity of the “constant and changeable” components, and its model is a consistent connection of the constant elements of the sentence, “a grammatical object, which makes this sentence similar to a number of other sentences.” The model of the sentence has a level of expression (structural scheme) and a level of content (typical meaning of the sentence). Sentence models are not bare schemes: they are informative and have a general character [Lomtev, 1976: 146].

Studies of N. Y. Shvedova [1970, 1973] and V. A. Beloshapkova [1997] have played an important role in the development of the theory of simple sentence modelling. In the late 1960s N.Y. Shvedova developed “structural schemes” of Russian simple sentences, in which she used a symbolic way of presenting a sentence. This enabled her to find her own solution to the problem of modelling the structure of a simple sentence. But the very object of the modelling was limited in her works: the sentence was reduced to a predicate node, a subject-predicate structure, a two-part or one-part nucleus of a sentence. The structural schemes she presents do not enable to see their content. The structural scheme, according to N. Y. Shvedova, is an “abstract pattern on which a minimal individual and independent message may be constructed” [Grammar of modern Russian literary language 1970: 34].

V.A. Beloshapkova presents a different point of view. In her opinion the structural scheme is an “abstract pattern consisting of the minimum of components necessary to create a sentence” [Beloshapkova 1997: 717]. Predicative and nominative minima of a sentence often can be non-identical in composition, which should be taken into account. The minimal pattern must satisfy the demands of not only grammatical but also informative sufficiency. The structural scheme includes components necessary for the delivering of semantic content.



G.A. Zolotova defines the “model of the sentence” as “a living pattern ready for use, which can be also observed in use; yet it is taken in a substantial (in its predicative minimum) and in a typical, i.e. in a series of its analogues formed by models consisting of syntactic forms of the same type and conveying the same generic meaning” [Zolotova 1973: 125]. Models are structural formulas of typical sentences. According to G.A. Zolotova, the sentence model should have not only grammatical and simply informational sufficiency, but also a generic meaning. “The generic meaning is the common meaning of the set of sentences representing the model, and at the same time it is the common meaning of several synonymous models, which integrates the components of similar meaning but different form” [Zolotova 1982: 25].

The development of theoretical questions of simple sentence modelling, and of its metalanguage was launched in the late 1980s by a team of Novosibirsk linguists. A unified conception was developed in the years-long work of M.I. Cheremisina [1989, 1991, 1996-1998]. In her opinion, the “model is a pattern according to which a correct sentence is constructed” and it “combines invariants of minimal structural schemes, ensuring completeness of the sentence, with generalized propositions related to these schemes” [Cheremisina, Ozonova, Tazranova 2008: 6].

According to M. I. Cheremisina, a phrase is understood as a “speech phenomenon” and a sentence as a “language unit.” Sentence “is such a unit of language, which is itself a ‘system,’ each component of which is absolutely necessary” [Cheremisina, Ozonova, Tazranova 2008: 9]. This is exactly the kind of elementary, simple sentence which she calls a model. According to the scholar, the term “model of sentence” is understood as a “sign of unity between the level of expression established by this structural scheme, and the meaning conveyed by the sentence” [Cheremisina, Ozonova, Tazranova 2008: 17]. The sign shaping of the model is the structural scheme of sentence combined with the semantic aspect.

The syntax school of M. I. Cheremisina studies the modelling of simple sentence using a rich material, including the linguistic facts of Russian and a number of Ural-

Altaic languages. To date, scholars have described both general and specific models of simple and complex sentences encountered in many Siberian languages [Cheremisina 1976; Cheremisina, Brodskaya, Skribnik 1986; Bayzhanova 1999; Dorzhieva 2005; Cheremisina, Ozonova, Tazranova 2008; Koshkareva 2007; Thomas 2011; and many others].

The Turkic languages of Southern Siberia, namely Altai, Tuvinian, Khakass and Shor, have been also researched. Models of elementary simple sentences in the Turkic languages of Siberia are described in a number of academic works. For example, the models of elementary simple sentences (ESS) of the Shor language are analyzed by V. M. Telyakova [Telyakova 1994]; the models of nominal sentences of the Tuvinian language are explored by N. Ch. Sereedar [Sereedar 1995]; the models of ESS with spatial semantics as encountered in the Shor language are summarized by I.A. Nevskaya [Nevskaya 1997]; the models formed by the verbs of motion are described by A.N. Chugunekova [Chugunekova 1998]; the models of ESS with spatial semantics are examined by N.Y. Sagaan [Sagaan 1998]; ESS models in the Altai language are studied by N. R. Bayzhanova [Bayzhanova 2004]. The results of specific studies on the models of location, presence, absence and quantity in the Turkic languages of Siberia were summarized in the joint research of N. Ch. Sereedar, E. K. Scribnik and M. I. Cheremisina [1996].

N. R. Baizhanova in her work [Baizhanova 2004], summing up the analysis of elementary simple sentences in the Altai language, found out how the sentences constructed according to the structural scheme  $N_1 \leftrightarrow V_f$  can function. The  $N_1 \leftrightarrow V_f$  structure is based on subject and monovalent verbs conveying state, action, and motion; it is a formula of the hypermodel of subject characterization which combines three ESS models: 1) the subject's state; 2) the subject's action and 3) the subject's motion [Baizhanova 2004: 38, 57].

The model approach to the description of sentences appeals to syntacticians because it enables to structurally cover an infinite number of sentences, to identify their semantic and structural features [Baizhanova 2004:6]. As G.P. Melnikov argues, "In

one way or another, the sentence should contain information about what is subject, and what is predicate, or, more generally, the sentence should indicate the predicate boundary between the parts of the sentence. Besides, in different languages one can often find an external indication of the relationship between the name of something and the clarification of that name, between the action and the object of action, between the action and circumstances of action” [Melnikov 1969: 107].

Thus, in reliance on the findings presented by G. P. Melnikov’s in his analysis of speech utterances, we can conclude that the most important criterion for categorization of syntactic constructions is the type of syntactic connection, which exists between the elements of this construction, namely: conjunction (also the term “copulative connection” is sometimes used), subordination (attributive connection) and predicative connection. On this basis, syntax as part of the language system consists of only three types of the most common syntactic models, which determine specific utterances’ reproduction in speech:

- 1) the copulative model;
- 2) the attributive model;
- 3) the predicative model.

A.N. Baskakov [Baskakov 1974: 18], V.G. Guzev [Guzev 2015: 259], M.E. Dubrovina [Dubrovina 2011: 36-37] share this opinion.

The relationship between the components of the copulative model are conjunctive; they are the union of two or more notional words. United by the same syntactic function, but independent from each other, words (homogeneous parts of the sentence) enter into a conjunctive relationship in utterances. A set of such words is not called “word combination” in the literal sense, since “word combination” always implies dependence of one word on another. But in terminology, which is based on the type of syntactic connection between the words we encounter, such sets of words can be designated as “copulative” word combinations.

The attributive model consists of two components. One of them is the main component which is qualified (i.e. the determinatum, the complemented, or the adverbial qualified), and the other is the dependent component, the qualifier (i.e. determinant, complement, or adverbial) [Guzev 2015: 260].

The general attributive model of syntactic construction is categorized into three more specific varieties, depending on the kind of relationship that arises either between the determinant and the determinatum, or between the complement and the complemented, or between the adverbial and the adverbial qualified:

1. Determinative model;
2. Complementary model;
3. Adverbial model.

The predicate model is realized in speech as a construction in which one component designates the object of thought – i.e. the subject, and the other designates what is communicated, what is affirmed concerning the object of thought – i.e. the predicate [Guzev 2015: 259].

Therefore, the following conclusions can be derived from contemporary linguistic studies:

- 1) Syntax is a subsystem of the language responsible for the construction of utterances in speech;
- 2) As well as other subsystems of the language, syntax has its own inventory and structural units: the syntagma and the model of syntactic construction;
- 3) In the syntax subsystem of language, we can find three types of the most common syntactic structures, i.e. models of syntactic constructions, within which a certain relationship exists: copulative structure, attributive structure, and predicative structure.

## CHAPTER 2. THE COPULATIVE MODEL

This chapter examines copulative syntactic models. Such constructions are combinations of two or more notional words which perform the same syntactic function in the utterance (e.g., homogeneous subjects, homogeneous determinants, etc.). Homogeneous as they are, the components of this syntactic model are independent of each other and have a coordinating connection. “The relation of subject and predicate in the wide sense indicated above is the relation from which the other syntactic conditions take their rise, with one sole exception, namely, the copulative connexion of several elements into a single member of a sentence.” [Paul 1891: 129]. Unlike a combination of such words, the so-called “word combination,” as a rule, assumes dependence of one word on another.

Copulative models in the language of OTRM are rather limited and have not previously been the theme of particular attention in academic works [Baskakov 1974:27; Guzev 2015: 261; Melnikov 1969: 107]. Copulative models remain under-explored not only in old Turkic languages, but also in the modern Azerbaijani language [Kamalova 2016: 75].

In copulative models there are no attributive relations between components. Lexical items included in this type of word combination belong to the same grammatical type. Words with similar meanings in a single word combination logically complement each other, being representatives of the same thematic type.

In copulative models, every word in a word combination has its own stress. In terms of semantics, conjunctive word combinations are able to expand the scope of the denotatum’s meanings with emotional and evaluative connotations. In any language, the use of copulative word combinations can be very diverse. Such word combinations serve as the building material for construction of utterances; the

semantical and structural unity of combined lexical items is an extended nomination of objects, phenomena, and their relations to the external reality.

The structural version of the copulative model in the OTRM language is characterized by a simple enumeration of homogeneous members of the sentence. In texts, a common copulative model may have specific realizations in the form of utterances which include various homogeneous members.

## 2.1. An utterance in which the subjects are homogeneous:

### 1.

Tabyač, tüpüt, apar, purum, kirkiz, üç kurikan, otuz tatar, kitan, tatabi-  
bunča budun kälipän sıytamıs juylamıs (Ktb 4)

Tabyač	tüpüt	apar	purum	
Tabgach	Tibetans	Avars	Purum	
Kirkiz		üç kurikan	otuz tatar	
Kirghizs		three-Qurycans	thirty-Tatars	
kitan	tatabi	bunča	budun	käl-ipän
Kitan	Tatabi	that-much	people	to come-CV
Sıyta-mıs		juyla-mıs		
to wail-PRF		to cry-PRF		

‘Tabgach, Tibetans, Avars and Purum, Kirghizs, three Qurycans, thirty Tatars, Kitan and Tatabi, so many peoples, having come, wailed and cried’

This utterance includes not only homogenous subjects: *tabyač, tüpüt, apar, purum, kirkiz, üç kurikan, otuz tatar, kitan, tatabi*, but also homogenous predicates: *siytamis, juylamis*.

2.2. An utterance where predicates are homogenous members of the sentence:

2.

*Ečümüz-apamiz Bumın kayan tört buluñıy kısmıs, jiymiş, jajmiş, basmiş (O1)*

<i>Ečümüz-apa-miz</i>	<i>Bumın kayan</i>	<i>tört</i>	<i>buluñ-ıy</i>
Ancestors-1PL.POSS	Bumin Qaghan	four	corner-ACC

<i>Kıs- miş</i>	<i>jiy-miş</i>	<i>jaj-miş</i>	<i>bas-miş</i>
-----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

to overbear-PRF      to overturn-PRF    to conquer-PRF    to crumple up-PRF

‘Our ancestor Bumin Qaghan four corners (of the world) overbore, overturned, conquered, crumpled up’

The homogenous predicates we have identified are components of an utterance, which generally has predicative structure. Both main members of the sentence have attributive structures: the subject, designating the actor, has determinative structure, while the predicate has complementary one, and it also has a copulative construction as part of the predicate, which consists of four elements.

In speech, specific utterances can often have a predicate connected with two subjects, or, vice versa, one subject connected with two predicates. If the connections of two subjects to their shared predicate, or of two predicates to their shared subject is exactly the same, such a three-member sentence may be replaced by a two-

member sentence, one member being a copulative combination of two elements; in this case, there is no significant change of meaning.

### 2.3. An utterance with homogenous determinants:

3.

İçre ašsüz tašra tonsüz yabız yablak bodunta üzä olurtım (Ktb 26)

İçre	aš-süz	tašra	ton-süz	yabız
Inside	food-NEG	outside	clothes -NEG	miserable
yablak	bodun-ta	üzä	olur-tı-m	
lowborn	people-LOCABL	over	to sit-PST-1SG	

‘...I sat (on the throne) over a miserable and lowborn people, who did not have food in them, and clothes on them’

The components of this utterance, based on the copulative model of syntactic construction, are extended and condensed determinants: **içre ašsüz, tašra tonsüz, yabız, yablak**.

All the copulative chain is an extended determinant, where the word **bodun** (‘people’) is the determinatum.

### 2.4. An utterance where complements are homogenous:

4.

Türkimä bodunıma jegin anča qazyanu birtim (M Xa 10)

...türk-im-ä	bodun-ım-a	jegin
--------------	------------	-------



Turks-1SG.POSS-DAT      people-1SG.POSS-DATLOC      wealth

anča      qazyan-u      bir-ti-m

So      to acquire-CV      to give-PST-1SG

‘For my Turks, for my people I have accumulated so much wealth’

2.5. An utterance where adverbials are homogenous:

5.

İlqari kün toysık(k)a birgärü gün ortusiñaru, kurıyarı gün batsikiña, jıryarı tün ortusiñaru, anta içräki budun kop m(aña körür, anč) a budun kop itdim (Ktm 2-3)

İlqärü      kün      toysık-(k)a      birgärü      gün ortusi-ñaru,  
Forward      the Sun      sunrise- DATLOC      on the right      midday-DATDIR

kurıyarı      gün      batsiki-ña      jır-γaru  
backward      the Sun      sunset-DATLOC      on the left-DATDIR

tün ortusi-ñaru      anta içräki      budun  
midnight-DATDIR      there located inside      peoples

kop      m(aña körür, anča      budun      kop      it-di-m  
All      to me are subjected      people      all      to arrange-PST-1SG

‘Forward, to the sunrise, on the right, (in the country) of midday, backward, to the sunset, on the left (in the country) of midnight – (everywhere) there (i.e. within these borders) living (literally ‘located inside’) peoples – all are under my control, so many peoples I have arranged.’

Drawing on the factual material of the runic texts, we can conclude that this language initially could function without any special auxiliary means to convey copulative connection. In the Turkic languages of later epochs, the relationship between members of the copulative model can be indicated by various conjunctions. Some similar conjunctions can also be found in the OTRM language, for example: *jemā* ‘also,’ ‘still,’ *artuqī* ‘still,’ ‘moreover.’ Despite the fact that the texts we have explored contain utterances with such auxiliary words, this method of linking homogeneous components in an utterance does not seem to be typical.

6.

*Kün jāmā, tün jāmā jālū bardīmiz* (T 27)

<i>Kün</i>	<i>jāmā</i>	<i>tün</i>	<i>jāmā</i>	<i>jāl-ü</i>	<i>bar-dī-miz</i>
Day	also	night	also	to gallop-CV	to go-PST-1PL.POSS

‘We galloped (on horseback) day and night’

With negative predicate:

7.

*İl jāmā, budun jāmā joq ärtäçi ärti* (T 55)

<i>İl</i>	<i>jāmā</i>	<i>budun</i>	<i>jāmā</i>	<i>joq</i>	<i>är-täçi</i>	<i>är-ti</i>
Tribe	not	people	not	no	to be-PTCP	to be-PST

‘Neither il (tribe), no people there would be’

*Kirk artuk(i jit)i jolī sülāmis* (KTb 15)

<i>Kirk</i>	<i>artukī</i>	<i>jiti</i>	<i>jolī</i>	<i>sülā-mis</i>
Forty	plus	seven	times	to fight-PRF

‘Forty and seven times they went to fight’.

This assumption is supported by examples from modern Turkic languages, in which homogeneous sentence members are often used without conjunctions. For example, in the Azerbaijani language:

Qalx, oyan, zövq al bu fürsətdən [Cavid 2005: 58]

Qalx	oyan	zövq	al
To get up-IMP	to wake up-IMP	pleasure	to gain -IMP

bu fürsət-dən

this opportunity-ABL

‘Get up, wake up, enjoy this opportunity.’

Or with coordinating conjunctions:

Aygün gözəl və ağıllıdır

Aygün	gözəl	və	ağıllıdır
-------	-------	----	-----------

Aygün	beautiful	and	intelligent-ADJ
-------	-----------	-----	-----------------

‘Aygün is beautiful and intelligent’

Formal means of communication (coordinating conjunctions) may be used, but they also may be absent, in which case there is a simple juxtaposition of the components of a word combination. In G.P. Melnikov’s opinion, which we fully share, “even in such languages that have special morphemes to convey copulative relation, such morphemes are used incomparably less often than instruments of enumerative intonation. Therefore, in languages where the principle of economy of auxiliary elements prevails, the copulative relation is even more so conveyed with the help of intonation” [Melnikov 1969: 107]. The essence of this principle is that in Turkic languages, the use of inflectional affixes (case, number) is conditioned by the presence of communicative need, and not by evolutionally established traditions, a consequence of which is formally-grammatical use of morphological elements.

In the language of OTRM, the components of the copulative models are combined on the basis of morphological similarity and the following basic semantic properties of their components:

- a) semantic similarity and synonymy, for example: **söz sab** ‘conversation’;
- b) antonymy, for example: **açsık toksik ömüz sän** (Ktm 8). ‘When you are lean and hungry (but nevertheless), you do not understand (the state of) fullness.’
- c) binariness, for example: **eçüm apam** ‘My older ancestors.’

In her work about the Persian language, S. E. Talybova argues: “Copulative relation in compound words performs the function of interfix/capula – و ذ د م یان و vāv-e miyānvand and is an intrinsic part of complex numerals more than 20: 22 و د یست 22 bist-o do, 157 صد و پنجاه و هفت sad-o pancāh-o haft» [Talybova 2002]. Huseyin Dallı also regards complex numerals as copulative models in modern Turkish language: «beş yüz altmış üç» [Dallı 2018: 126]. In our opinion, there is no copulative relationship between the composite numerals in the Turkic languages, including the OTRM language, the modern Turkish and Azerbaijani. The components of the copulative models are independent of each other and any of them can be replaced by a synonym or deleted without compromising the meaning. However, if a numeral is deleted or substituted in a compound word combination, the meaning will certainly change, for example: yüz elli iki ‘one hundred and fifty-two’ and yüz iki ‘one hundred and two’.

Copulative constructions are the combinations of two or more notional words performing the same syntactic function in an utterance. Copulative models in the language of OTRM are rather limited in number, and there is no attributive connection between the components. The copulative model may have specific realizations in the form of utterances with different homogeneous parts, such as homogenous subjects, predicates, determinants, adverbials and complements. In the OTRM language there are five models with copulative construction.

### CHAPTER 3. THE PREDICATIVE MODEL

The aim of this chapter is to give a structural and semantic description of the syntactic model which incorporates components interrelated by predicative connection. Our chief purpose is to reveal nominal and verbal predicates in the language of OTRM.

Predicative structure is a ‘tangible,’ usually lexical realization of a logical assertion, conveying a specific meaning. According to G.P. Melnikov, predication is “an act of deducing some new knowledge out of the present” [Melnikov 2003: 139]. Its model includes a syntactic subject (henceforth SS) and a syntactic predicate (henceforth SP). In the construction, SS is lexically the matter of thought, the subject; meanwhile, SP is a component of the construction, which lexically denominates the predicate of logical assertion [Guzev 2015: 262].

It is important to acknowledge that all the diversity of specific predicative utterances in speech center around an abstract model consisting of two components: subject and predicate. Thus, the scheme of any predicative utterance may be depicted in the form of symbolic signs: S + P [Dubrovina, Kamalova 2017: 62]. The general syntactic model “subject – predicate” in the native speakers’ minds may take form of two general models:

1. Subject – Nominative predicate.
2. Subject – Verbal predicate.

To improve readability, for the first type of predicative model the scheme S + P<sub>n</sub> (predicate noun) will be used, and the second type will be schematized as S + P<sub>v</sub> (predicate verb).

Information about the subject and predicate may be rendered in communication with the help of two main components: the theme (conveys the information about the

subject of an utterance) and the rheme (conveys the information about the predicate of an utterance). The theme and the rheme may be formulated in several words, which means that a word combination can include a word, denominating the subject, and words, qualifying (as attributive members of the sentence) limits and characteristic traits of the subject. The rheme part of an utterance must include a word denominating the predicate as well as words which somehow serve the rheme of the utterance, i.e. convey information about the characteristic traits of the predicate and specify the objects which are related to the predicate.

Within the framework of general linguistics, it has been supposed, that a typical rheme in the language is usually formed by a special group of words – i.e., verbs, whereas the simplest typical theme is formed by nouns [Sepir 1993: 114–116]. According to N.Z. Gadzhieva, in a Turkic-language utterance one can find two “concentric circles of determinants and determinatums: the first one forming around the subject and the second one forming around the predicate” [Gadzhieva 1968: 23].

V.V. Vinogradov supposes that the subject-matter of the category of predicativeness lies in the relevance of the content of the sentence to reality, which, in its turn, is fractionalized and expressed in the syntactic categories of modality, tense and person [Vinogradov 1960: 69, 80].

Linguists see the category of predicativeness and the category of nominal predicateviness as predicateviness in the proper sense of the word and nominal predicativeness as a structural and grammatical phenomenon. “Predicativeness in this (special) sense is defined as the grammatical coordination of predicate with subject. The means of such coordination are morphemes with the meaning of the subject of thought, which are rendered by affixes of person and number. Meanwhile, predicativeness in the first sense may be described as a relation identical to the subject-predicate relation” [Sibagatov 1984: 31].

Predicativity (or predicative construction) is the semantic core of a sentence; predicativity renders the basic grammatical meanings of a sentence – namely, objective modality and syntactic tense.

Let us examine some elementary predicative structures that can be found in the texts of OTRM. The most elementary implementations of the S + P construction are simple unextended utterances. For example:

Kisi qorqmış (İB1-2)

Kisi            qorq-mış

Man      to get frightened – PST

‘The man got frightened’

Next, let us consider which parts of speech can represent the subject and predicate in the OTRM texts.

### 3.1. Subject

A subject can be expressed by nouns, pronouns and nominalized words, nominal word combinations, forms of secondary representation of the noun, verbal nouns, participles, nominal-adjective forms.

#### 3.1.1. Noun as subject:

8.

Jirči boyuzlantı (T26)

Jirči

boyuzlan-ti

Local guide           to stab – PST

‘The local guide was stabbed’

### 3.1.2. Pronoun as subject:

Personal and reflexive pronouns can be used as subjects in this model.

9.

Biz äki biñ ärtimiz (T16)

Biz   äki   biñ           är-ti-miz

We   two   thousand   to be – PST – 1PL

‘[There were] two thousand of us’

In order to intensify the meaning, the pronoun **ben/män** can be combined with the word **öz** in a possessive form:

10.

Bilgä Toñuquq bän özüm tabyač iliñä qilintim (T1)

Bilgä           Toñuquq   bän           özüm                           tabyač

Wise           Toñuquq   I   myself                   tabgach

il-i-ñä   qilın-ti-m

people – 3SG. POSS–DAT                           to appear – PST – 1SG

‘I myself, wise Tonyukuk, was brought up under the influence of the Tabgach people’s culture.’

In this example, **Bilgä Toñuquq bän özüm** is the subject, and **qilintim** is the predicate.

In OTRM texts, coordination between persons when rendering a predicative connection may sometimes be absent:



11.

Biz äki sü bolti (T18)

Biz                      äki                      sü                      bol-ti

We                      two                      army    to be – PST– Ø

‘We were two armies’

*Emphatic pronouns functioning as subjects:*

One can find just two emphatic pronouns in the OTRM texts: **öz** and **käntü**. The pronoun **öz** translates as “interior,” “core,” “essence,” “heart,” “brain” [Kononov 1980: 167]; when combined with a possessive affix, as in **özüm**, it translates “my essence,” “I myself,” **öziñ (özün)** “your essence”, “yourself,” **özi** “his essence,” “himself”:

12.

Özüm qarī boltim (T56)

Özüm                      qarī                      bol-ti-m

I myself                      old    to be – PST–1SG

‘I myself grew old’

The only example of this pronoun in the form of 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular can be found in the OTRM texts:

13.

Türk budun özün ädgü körtäçi sän (M Xb 14)

Türk                      budun                      özün                      ädgü

Turk    people                      you yourself – PRON.2SG                      the good

kör-täçi-sän

to see – PTCP – 2SG

‘Oh Turkic people, you yourself will live happily.’

OTRM texts use the distinctive pronoun **käntü** to substitute the personal pronoun (be it single or plural) – ‘[one]self.’

14.

Käntü jañiltıy (Ktb 23)

Käntü                      jañıl-ti-γ

Yourself                      to make a mistake – PST – 2SG

‘You have made a mistake yourself’

### *3.1.3. Nominalized words functioning as subjects:*

Occasional nominalization in Turkic languages can be implemented by a lexical-syntactic way; this means that words, which do not belong to the category of nouns, in a certain context acquire a substantive meaning without changing their form.

15.

Uluγı šad ärti (T5)

Uluγ – ĩ                      šad                      är-ti

The older – 3SG. POSS                      shad                      to be – PST

‘The older one became a shad’

### *3.1.4. SAF functioning as the subject:*

16.

Kälmisi alp (T38)

Käl-mis-i    alp

To arrive – SAF – 3SG. POSS      bravemen

‘The newcomers are bravemen’

### 3.1.5. Noun phrases as the subject:

17.

Biziñ sü atı turuk azukī jok ärti (Kt 39)

Biziñ      sü      at-ı      turuk

Our      army      horse-3SG.POSS      thin

Azuk-ī      jok      ärti

food-3SG.POSS      not      to be-PST

‘The horses of our army were skinny, there was no food for them’

This example contains two predicative constructions. In the first construction the subject is represented by a possessive word combination of the second type, while predicate is represented by an adjective. In the second construction, the subject is represented by a noun, and the predicate is represented by the predicative word **jok** and the auxiliary verb **är-**.

### 3.1.6. The form of secondary representation as the subject:

18.

Balıkdakı tayikmīs taydakī inmis (Ktb12)

Balık-da-kı      tay-ik-mīs      tay-da-kī

Town – LOC – SREP      mountain –DERAF – PRF      mountain – LOC – SREP

in-mis

to go down – PRF

‘Those who lived in towns went up to the mountains, and those who lived in the mountains went down’

*3.1.7. Verbal nouns as the subject:*

19.

İçikigme içikdi bodun boltı (Bk 37)

İçik-ig-me

içik-di

bodun

bol-tı

to subordinate – DER AF – VN

to obey – PST

people

become –PST

‘Some of them came back and obeyed me and became a people’

Here **-ig** is a word-forming affix with which nouns are developed from a verbal stem [Alyılmaz 1994: 12].

*3.1.8. Participle functioning as the subject:*

20.

Üküš ölteçi anta tirilti (Bk 31)

Üküš

öl-teçi

anta

tiril-ti

Many to die – PTCP

there

come to life – PST

‘Many of those who were supposed to die survived’

## 3.2. Predicate

In the language of OTRM texts the predicate can be represented by tenses, modal forms, complex forms, analytical forms of participles, adverbial participles (if it is a verbal predicate). If the predicate is a noun, then it can be rendered by adjectives, numerals, pronouns, nominal word combinations, modal verbs, postpositional word combinations.

### 3.2.1. Verbal Predicate

Turkic languages utilize finite verb forms as “predicates in syntactic constructions” [Telitsyn 2011: 182]. In other words, “verbum finitium morphologically fixes the main structural category of the Turkic sentence,” namely a predicative connection [Sevortyan 1963: 123]. The finite form of verb is a morphological means of expressing judgement, i.e. a thought with a subject-predicate structure, where the subject is represented by a grammatical person (single or plural) [Guzev 1982: 67–79], and predicate is represented by a form of mood and tense of the verb [Telitsyn 2011: 183].

#### 3.2.1.1. *S+P<sub>VF</sub> model*

21.

Ol sü anda ölti (Ktb 48)

Ol sü anda öl-ti

That army then to die – PST

‘That army died then’

“Some infinitive forms of the verb in Turkic languages can be located near link verb of the noun predicate (secondary predicate), i.e. when used with personal pronouns or forms of the verb **er-ir-/i-** ‘to be’” [Telitsin 2011: 184].

### 3.2.1.2. *Modal forms of the verb functioning as predicate*

The OTRM texts employ three forms of modality to form a verbal predicate – namely **ärmış(s)**, **ärinč**, **ärti**,

**S+ P-ur** ärmış(s)

22.

Türk bodunu jorïjur ärmis (T9-10)

Türk bodun-u	jorï-jur	är-mis
Turkic people – 3SG.POSS	to move – PRS	to be – PRF

‘The Turkic people is moving’

**S+P -mis** ärinč

23.

Täñri ölütmis ärinč (T3)

Täñri	öl-üt-mis	ärinč
The sky	to kill – CAUS – PRF	perhaps – INT PART

‘The sky has killed’

The following interpretation is presented by Tekin in his study: “Täñri öl temis ärinč” [Tekin 2020: 14].

Täñri	öl	ti-mis	äriñč
The sky	to die	to tell – PRF	perhaps –INT PART

**S+P** -ti/-dī äriñč

24.

Täñri, Umaï, İduq Jär sub basa bär-ti äriñč (T38)

Täñri	Umaï	İduq	Jär	Sub	basa	bär-ti
The sky	Umay	sacred	Land	Water	to give – PST	

äriñč

perhaps – INT PART

‘The sky, Umay, the sacred Homeland (land-water) — they are, one must think, those who gave (us) the victory’

**S+P**- duq äriñč

25.

Anta kisrä inisi äčisin täg kilinmaduk äriñč (Ktb5)

Anta	kisrä	ini-si
Then	after	younger brother – 3SG.POSS

äči-si-n	täg	kilin-ma-du-k
----------	-----	---------------

older brother – 3SG.POSS –INST      how to act – NEG – PST –1PL

ärinč

perhaps – INT PART

‘After that, their younger brothers did not do anything like their older brothers did’

The utterance predicate may be one of the complex tense forms generated by combining **-r**, **-miş**, **-di**, **-gay**, **-daçı** with one of the forms of the past tense verb **är** – “to be” (**är**ti, **ärmis**).

**S+P**-r är

Form **-r är**ti signifies a long-term action that refers to the past:

26.

Türk budun Tabyačqa körür är

Türk            budun            Tabyač-qa            kör-ür            är-ti

Turkic            people            Tabgach – DAT    subordinated – PTCP    to be – PST

‘Turkic people were subordinated to the state of Tabgach’

**S+P** -r ärmis

The form **-r ärmis**, which has the same tense meaning, is made more complicated by the modal shade of non-obviousness:

27.

Türk budun üläsikig anta anıy kisi anča boşyurur ärmis (Ktm7)

Türk            budun            üläsikig            anta            anıy    kisi            anča

Turkic            people            part            then            bad    man    thus

Boşyur - ur            är-mis

to teach – PTCP    to be – PRF

‘They say that some of the Turkic people were so taught by bad people.’



**S+P**-miš ärti

The form **-miš ärti** signifies a state caused by an action that precedes the background of the past. The starting point of time reference shifts to the past:

28.

Ol ödkä kul kulliy bolmiš ärti (Ktb21)

Ol	öd-kä	kul	kulliy	bol-miš	är-ti
That	time –DAT	slave	slaveowner	to become –PRF	to be –PST

‘By that time (our) slaves had already become slaveowners’

**S+P**-tači ärti

The form **-tači ärti** communicates the tendency to commit an act in the past, the possibility or necessity of committing an act, and indicates the future action in relation to the background of the past:

29.

Türk bodun öltači ärti joq boltači ärti (M33)

Türk	bodun	öl-tači	är-ti
Turkic	people	to die –PTCP	to be – PST

joq	bol-tači	är-ti
no – NEG	to become – PTCP	to be – PST

‘Turkic people could have died, could have disappeared’

If the form **-sar** is used in the first part of the utterance, the form **-tači ärti** acquires subjunctive semantics:

30.

Udu bän özüm qazyanmasar Il jämä, bodun jämä joq ärtäči ärti (T55)

Udu	bän	özüm	qazyan-ma-sar	
If	I	myself	to acquire –NEG – COND	

Il	jämä	bodun	jämä	joq
the state	also	people	also	not

är-täči	är-ti
to be – PTCP	to be – PST

‘If I myself had not sought to acquire, the state and its people would have vanished’

### 3.2.1.3. *Complex verbal forms functioning as the predicate*

The noun and verb of a special lexical-syntactic purpose form a special word combination called complex verbs [Kononov 1980: 118]. In OTRM, the second component of a complex whole is usually verbal: **bol** – “to grow,” “to become,” **är** – “to be,” “to exist,” **qil** – “to do.” However, only the auxiliary verb **bol** can act as a predicate of an utterance.

**S+P<sub>bol</sub>**

31.

Inim Kül tigin kargäk bolti (Ktb50)

In-im	Kül tigin	kargäk	bol-ti
-------	-----------	--------	--------

younger brother – 1SG.POSS Kūl tigin to die to do – PST

‘Kyul-Tegin, my younger brother, passed away’

In this example, “**kārgāk bolti**” acts as a predicate of an utterance with the meaning of “to die, to pass away.”

#### 3.2.1.4. *Verbs provided with indicators of aspect functioning as the predicate.*

Complex verbal constructions are frequently employed as predicates in the OTRM texts. Arguably, in the language of this period aspectual constructions had not yet developed as a variety of complex verbal structures which can be found in Turkic languages [Dubrovina 2011: 151]. Thus, in the OTRM language, only an analytical construction can be used as a predicate for such a predicative model:

#### **S + P<sub>V</sub> analytical construction**

In the OTRM, the speech realizations of this predicative model can be found in these variants:

#### **S + P<sub>V</sub> -u bār-**

The form **-a / -u bār-** is used to describe an action performed in favor or for the benefit of someone else.

32.

Qayanīm... ötünčümın äsidü bārti (T 15)

Qayan-īm                      ötünč-üm-ın                      äsid-ü                      bār-ti

Kagan –1SG.POSS      plea –1SG.POSS –ACC      to hear – CV to be –PST

‘My Kagan has agreed to listen to my plea.’

#### **S + P<sub>V</sub> -a, -u,-p bār-**

The analytical form **a / -u / -p bar** can be used to indicate either 1) that the action is completely finished, or 2) that the action is a long-term, continuous, and “monotonously unfolding” one [Dubrovina 2011: 153].

33.

Qaŋim qaŋan ... uça bardī (M Xa 10)

Qaŋ-īm	qaŋan	uç-a	bar-dī
Father – 1SG.POSS	kagan	to pass away – CV	to go – PST

‘my father [Elterish] kagan passed away’

34.

Uluŋ irkin azqīña ärin täzip bardī (Ktb 34)

Uluŋ irkin	azqīña	är-in	täz-ip	bar-dī
Great erkin	few warrior –ACC		to run –CV	to go – PST

‘The great erkin fled [from the battlefield] with a few warriors’

This form can be found in Uzbek, Uyghur, Karakalpak, Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Bashkir, Tatar and other Turkic languages. Semantically, the form with the **-p bar-** is similar to the analytical form **-(y)ip git-** in Oghuz languages [Guzev 1990: 137].

**S + P<sub>V</sub> -ü olur-**

The form **-ü olur-** employs the verb **olur-** with the meaning “to sit,” “to take a seat” as a modifying verb.

This form, according to the data available, provided the lexical meaning of the original verb with the shade of a gradual, time-consuming process [Dubrovina 2011: 153].

35.

Türk bilgä qaŋan, Türk sir bodunuŋ Oŋuz bodunuŋ igidü olurur (T62)

Türk	bilgä	qayan	Türk	Sir	bodun-u-γ
Turkic	ruling	kagan	Turkic	Sir	people – 3SG.POSS
					– ACC
Oγuz	bodun -u-γ		igidü	olurur	
Oghuz	people – 3SG.POSS –ACC		to elevate	to sit	

‘The Turkic ruling Hagan always exalts Turk-Sir people and Oghuz people’

**S + P<sub>V-u</sub> qal-(kal-)**

36.

Ölügi jurtda jolta jatu qaltači ärtigiz (Ktb 49)

Ölüg-i	jurtda	jol-ta
The dead – 3SG.POSS	country –LOC	road – LOC
Jat-u	qal-tači	är-ti-giz
to lie – CV	to remain – PTCP	to be –PST+3PL

‘The dead would still be lying on nomad territories and on the roads’

The analytical form employed in the texts has a functional purpose that is consistently fulfilled in the OTRM texts: to report a prolonged action [Dubrovina 2011: 157].

**S + P<sub>V-a</sub> ält-**

M. E. Dubrovina suggests that “the meaning of the independent verb **ält**, ‘to carry, to drag’ may have been associated with the action that was perceived as a finished, completed one” [Dubrovina 2011: 154].

37.

Jaraqılǵı qantan kälip jaña älti (Ktb 23)

Jaraqılǵı            qantan            käl-ip                            jañ-a            ält-di

Approaching            from where    to come – CV            to scatter – CV to carry – PST

‘From whence armed (men) came and scattered you’

**S + P<sub>v</sub>-ü jorī**

The traditional interpretation of this analytical construction is that it indicates a long, lasting or gradually fulfilled action [Kondratiev 1980: 35].

38.

Anta kalmiši jir saju kop turu ölü jorijur ärtiq (Ktm9)

Anta            kal-miš-ī                            jir            saju            kop

Then            the remaining –SAF – 3SG.POSS    country    every all

turu            öl-ü                            jorī-jur            är-ti-q

dead            to die –CV                    to go –PRS            to be –PST – 1PL

‘You, who remained (alive) then, in all countries wandered in a completely miserable position (literally: now living, then dying)’

**S + P<sub>v-(j)A</sub> käl**

The analytical form **-(j)A käl**, utilized as a predicate of an utterance, conveys the action’s completeness with a shade of suddenness:

39.

Üč oγuz süsi basa kälti (M32)

Üč    oγuz            sü-si                            bas-a            käl-ti

Three Oghuz      army – 3SG.POSS to attack – CV      to come – PST

‘The Uch-Oghuz army suddenly attacked [us]’

**S + P<sub>V</sub> -(j)U,-Ü id/i-**

The runic monuments seldom employ the form **-(j)U / -Ü id/i-**. This form is intended to show that the initial action has been completely accomplished:

40.

Türk budun illädük ilin içyïnu idmïs kayanladuk kayanïn jütürü idmïs (Ktb 6-7)

Türk      budun      illä-dük      il-in      içyïnu      id-mïs

Turkic      people      to own –SAF      people – ACC      to lose – PST1SG

Kayan-la-duk      kayan-ïn      jütür-ü      id-mïs

to have kagan - SAF      kagan - ACC      to lose -PST

‘The Turkic people has led the tribal union to chaos and caused the reigning kagan to perish.’

*3.2. 1. 5. The verbal predicate is represented by a converb:*

41.

Sıñar süsi söñüşgäli kälti (BK 32)

Sıñar      sü-si      söñüş-gäli      käl-ti

Half      army – 3SG,POSS      to fight – CV      to come – PST

‘Half of the army has come to battle with us’

The study's results indicate that any analytical form available in the morphological subsystem of the OTRM language can serve as the syntactic predicate of an utterance [Kamalova 2017: 46].

### 3.2.2. Nominal Predicate

#### Модель S+P<sub>N</sub>

Nominal predicates can be represented by nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals, verbal nouns, and participles. Complex nominal predicates are represented by complex words and nominal word combinations.

##### 3.2.2.1. *The nominal predicate represented by a noun:*

42.

Uluγī šad är-ti (T5)

Uluγ-i	šad	är-ti
--------	-----	-------

The older-ACC	šad	to be – PST
---------------	-----	-------------

‘The older one became šad’

##### 3.2.2.2. *The nominal predicate represented by an adjective:*

43.

Kälmisi alp (T38)

Käl – mis – i	alp
---------------	-----



to come- SAF-ACC

brave

‘The newcomers are bravemen’

44.

Bujurukī jāmā bilgä ärmis ärinč alp ärmis ärinč (Ktb3)

Bujuruk-ï jāmā bilgä ärmis ärinč

Servant –ACC also wise to be

Alp ärmis ärinč

brave to be – PRF

‘Their servants were also wise and courageous.’

The form **ärinč** in the system of verb conjugation or functioning as a predicative link located near the noun predicate conveys the action as a transition to the inner, immanent state, when the action becomes self-sufficient (Nasilov 1960: 69).

45.

Bilge tonyukuk anıy ol öz ol (T34)

Bilge tonyukuk anıy ol öz ol

Wise Tonyukuk cunning 3SG intelligent 3SG

‘The wise Tonyukuk is cunning and he himself is intelligent’

In this example “**ol**” is the personal affix of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person.

*3.2.2.3. The nominal predicate is represented by participle:*

46.

il jāmā, budun jāmā joq ärtäçi ärti (T55)

il	jämä	budun	jämä	joq är-täči	är-ti
state	also	people	also	not to be – PTCP	to be- PST

‘Neither the state nor the people were existing’

3.2.2.4. *The nominal predicate is represented by a nominal word combination:*

47.

Tokuz oguz bodun kentü bodunum ärti (Ktb34)

Tokuz	oguz	bodun	kentü	bodun-um
Tokuz	Oghuz	people	[my] own	people –3SG.POSS

är-ti

to be – PST

‘The Tokuz-Oghuz people were my people’

3.2.2.5. *The nominal predicate is represented by nominal word combinations with a postposition:*

48.

JayİMİZ tägirä uçuk täg ärti (T8)

Jayİ-mİZ	tägirä	uçuk	täg	är-ti
enemy –1PL.POSS	around	stove	how –POST	to be – PST

‘Our enemies were all around’

3.2.2.6. *The nominal predicate is represented by numerals:*

49.

Süsi altı biñ ärmis, biz äki biñ ärtimis (T 16)

Sü-si                      altı              biñ              ärmis

Army – 3SG.POSS      six thousand      to be-PRF

biz              äki              biñ              är-ti-miz

we              two              thousand      to be – PST –1PL

‘Their army counted 6,000 men, we had 2,000’

3.2.2.7. *The nominal predicate is represented by predicate words **jok, bar**:*

50.

Tabyač süsi bar ärmis (T30)

Tabyač      sü-si                                      bar              ärmis

Tabgach      army – 3SG.POSS                      there is              to be – PRF

‘There is a Tabgach army’

51.

Azukī jok ärti (Ktb39)

Azuk-ī                                      jok              är-ti

food – 3SG.POSS                      not              to be – PST

‘There was no food for them’

In the course of the study we have found that in the OTRM language the subject can be represented by nouns, pronouns, nominalized words, nominal word combinations, forms of secondary representation of noun, verbal nouns, participles, substantive-adjective forms. In total, they produce 8 models.

In the language of OTRM the predicate is rendered by tense forms, modal forms, complex forms, analytical forms of participle, converb (if it is a verb predicate). The verbal predicate forms 5 models.

The nominal predicate, in its turn, can be conveyed through nouns, pronouns, adjectives, numerals, verbal nouns, and participles. Complex nominal predicates are represented by complex words and nominal word combinations, which are grouped into 7 models.

## CHAPTER 4. ATTRIBUTIVE MODELS

The syntax subsystem contains three models of syntactic constructions, one of which is a construction having an attributive connection between its components. Revealing the essence of the attributive model has often been a topic of linguistic research and discussion among scholars [Dubrovina 2010: 36-38]. The numerous opinions offered by linguists can be summarized to draw several conclusions.

The attributive model of syntactic construction is a linguistic means used to render a certain type of relationship between its components; it cannot be understood in a narrow sense exclusively as a determinative model. It is not only the connection between the component conveying a trait and the main component of the word combination that can be considered attributive, but also the connection that arises between the determinant component that denominates a feature of an action and its determinatum (as in the combination ‘quickly runs’), as well as the connection in which the determinant member is an object denominating something which is not contained in the determinatum itself but is related to it by objectal relations: drinks tea, watches TV, etc. [Dubrovina 2010: 37]. According to A.A. Reformatskiy, the connection between the feature of an action and the action itself can be described by the term “relative connection” [Reformatskiy 1996: 328], which corresponds, apparently, to the more common term “relative-attributive” connection [Akhmanova 1966: 384]. Meanwhile, the connection between the complement and its complemented, according to the traditional view, may be rendered by the term ‘objective relations’ [Reformatskiy 1996: 328].

Arguments for considering the three types of connection as a unity can be found in the works of N.A. Baskakov, who believes that “in language we can only observe two types of relations: predicative and attributive in a broad sense; on the basis of the latter it is possible in speech to construct statements with determinant and

determinatum (dependent and principal) members” [qtd. in: Dubrovina 2010: 37]. The point, apparently, is that the first type is based on the cognitive act of predication, while the latter is based on attribution. According to N. A. Baskakov, the essence of the cognitive act of attribution is the differentiation and specification of one concept by means of another [Baskakov 1975: 34, 48]. The author of this work tends to share the opinion of those researchers who see the essence of attributive relations differently. In their view, “attributive relations arise between such components of constructions, the abstract images of which in the individual mind are part of a single, general, complex, nonsegmented image” [qtd. by: Dubrovina 2010: 38]. In other words, in language components of the attributive construction are represented by two elements, but in the process of thinking they form just one, nonsegmentable image opposed to two images – the logical subject and the logical predicate [Melnikov 1978: 294–295].

In academic literature, the attributive word combinations are often called subordinate word combinations; authors also indicate that “the syntactic criterion which enables to reveal subordinate word combinations is attribution, which can be implemented through the following ways of subordinate connection: adjoinment, government and concord” [Baskakov 1974: 19].

Attributive models can be categorized into three types:

1. Determinative models;
2. Complementary models;
3. Adverbial models

The next step is to examine every variation of the attributive model by utilizing the factual material of the OTRM texts.

#### 4.1. Determinative Models

According to V. G. Guzev, the determinative syntactic model is a construction, “containing and summarizing the connection of an object or action with a feature which is assigned to it or reported about it.” The determinative model is the unity of its two components – abstract images: determinant (a feature) + determinatum (the feature carrier)” [Guzev 2015: 269].

Due to its constant association with the word possessing the given feature, the determinant is the most clearly expressed secondary member of the word combination rendering a dependent feature of the object.

As virtually in most other Turkic languages, the determinant precedes the determinatum in the language of OTRM. Thus, the determinant can be conveyed by adjectives, demonstrative pronouns, numerals, nouns in the genitive case, as well as various verbal-nominal forms (above all, adjectival and substantive-adjectival forms) [Telitsin 2011: 188]. Meanwhile, the determinatum components of attributive/determinative word combinations in this language are usually nouns.

The determinant, being one of the subordinate members of an utterance (sentence), communicates any feature or characteristic of an object and may qualify any member of the sentence (subject, nominal predicate, complement, adverbial); the subject may be represented by noun, infinitive or nominalized participle. A Turkic utterance typically has dependent components placed in front of the main components, often creating a long chain of successive, interconnected word combinations. Thus, the determinant may refer to a complement and adverbial, the complement – to a determinant (represented by a participle) and an adverbial (represented by a converb), and the adverbial – to a determinant (represented by a participle), to a complement (represented by an infinitive and a verbal noun) as well as to another adverbial [The Grammar of Azerbaijani Language, 1971: 282].

The determinative relations arising between the components of a Turkic utterance have been examined by many scholars, including A. N. Kononov [Kononov 1980], L. G. Habibullina [Habibullina 2016].

A.N. Kononov believes that there are two types of determinative connections:

- 1) the first type determines an object and person;
- 2) the second type determines an action [Kononov 1980: 212].

This provision recommends dividing the determinative structures into two types:

1. Constructions where the determinant is represented by an adjective that describes an object or a person;
2. Constructions that use determinative-adverbial or adjective-adverbialized forms (AAF).

#### 4.1.1. *Determinative models that contain adjectives functioning as determinants*

In Turkic languages, word combinations with adjectives are the most typical way to convey attributive relationships. Determinants that are conveyed by adjectives can render either qualitative features or determinants of the object's relations with other objects.

The adjective was considered as a grammatical category as early as in one of the first books on Turkic grammar, the Turkic-Tatar grammar (Kazembek 1846). Due to the fact that Turkic adjectives in ancient languages did not have special morphological indicators, their very existence in the Turkic ancestral language as an independent lexical-grammatical category was repeatedly questioned by Turkologists. Reflecting upon the absence of adjectives in the Turkic ancestral language, A. M. Shcherbak supposed that the unification of adjectives occurred by virtue of semantic and functional transformation of nouns, as well as addition of



autonomous morphological systems containing distinctive features which were rendered at the level of both basic and derived forms [Scherbak 1977: 109].

E. V. Sevortyan examines the forms of adjectives in Old Turkic monuments of the 5<sup>th</sup>–8<sup>th</sup> centuries and describes the process of adjectives' and nouns' formation which unfolded in that era. As in many other languages, the formation of adjectives in Turkic languages was facilitated by various forms that appeared gradually and at different times. Whereas some of these forms proved unproductive as early as in ancient times, others have retained their productivity until today and even increased it. Some of the forms were applicable to both nouns and adjectives, while others were exclusive to adjectives, but they did not develop further [Sevortyan 1963: 58–68].

Studying the parts of speech in modern Turkic languages, N. A. Baskakov mentions that the noun, adjective and adverb were not independent parts of speech, but were part of a unified part of speech which can be called “noun-adjective-adverb.” It combined all names of objects, static features of an object (as well as characteristics of the features) and represented functional grammatical forms of one unified part of speech: (a) substantive from which the noun developed, (b) determinative attributive, evolved into the adjective, and (c) adverbial attributive, which transformed into an independent lexical-grammatical category, namely adverb [Baskakov 1952: 158].

An abstract model that combines determinant and determinatum can represent the entire range of specific attributive utterances one can find in speech. The factual material of the OTRM language demonstrates that the abstract attributive model can have two specific verbal realizations in which an adjective functions as the determinant:

*The first model:*

ADJ + N

determinant (adjective) + determinatum (noun)

*The second model:*

ADJ + V

determinant (adjective) + determinatum (verb)

4.1.1.1. ADJ + N

52.

Jāti jüz kisig udīzīγma uluγī šad ārti (T 4-5)

Jāti	jüz	kisig	ud-īz-īγma	uluγ-ī
------	-----	-------	------------	--------

Seven	hundred	man	to follow – CAUS – ACTN	the older –ACC
-------	---------	-----	-------------------------	----------------

šad ār-ti

shad to become – PST

‘The oldest of them, who forced to go (to us) seven hundred people, was shad’

According to A.N. Kononov, affixes **-γma**, **-gma** (**-γ**, **-g** – affixes of the secondary verbal stem=causative voice + **-ma** and **-mä** as the verbal noun) form verbal adjective. As part of the sentence, it provides the basis for extended determinants [Kononov 1980: 110].

4.1.1.2. ADJ + V

53.

Jok čīγan budunīγ kop kobartīm, čīγan budunīγ baj kiltīm, az budunīγ ūküš kiltīm  
(Ktm 10)

Jok	čīγan	budun-īγ	kop	kobar-ti-m
-----	-------	----------	-----	------------

Not	poor	people –GEN	whole	to raise – PST – 1SG
-----	------	-------------	-------	----------------------

Čřyan	budun-řn	baj	křl-tř-m
poor	people – GEN	rich	to make – PST – 1SG

Az	budun-řn	řkřř	křl-tř-m
Little	people – GEN	numerous	to make – PST – 1SG

‘I have raised the ruined, poor people, I made the poor people rich, and a small population became large one.’

In this example, the words **jok**, **čřyan**, **az** are determinants for the word **budunřy**. The words **baj**, **řkřř** form a semantic unity with the verb **křltřm** and act as determinants of action. V. M. Nasilov called this form “predicative determinant” [Nasilov 1960: 71].

The AAF emphasizes a qualitative or quantitative side of a feature in the component which is being determined. For example:

54.

Taluřka kičik täqmädim, birgärü Tokuz ärsänkä täqi sülädim, Tüpütka kičig tägmädim (Ktm3)

Taluř-ka	kičik	täq-mä-di-m	birgärü	Tokuz
Sea-DATLOC	a little	to reach – NEG – PST – 1SG	to the right	nine

Ärsän-kä	täqi	sülä-di-m
Ersen – DATLOC	till	to reach – PST – 1SG

Tüpütka	kičig	täg-mä-di-m
Tibet – DATLOC	a little	to reach – NEG – PST – 1SG

‘I did not reach the sea. I went to the right (to the south) to the very “nine ersens” with the army, but I could not get to Tibet.’

Becoming the attributive component of the verb “**täqmädim**,” the word **kiçik** “small,” “junior,” “young” is adverbialized and acquire qualitative and quantitative meaning “a little,” “few.”

According to O.S. Akhmanova and G.B. Mikaelyan, “An adjective, which as part of speech signifies a feature, can easily establish a determinative connection and function as a determinant. On the contrary, nouns denoting an object, as well as circumstantial adverbs, by their very meaning, naturally tend to have a more independent position in the sentence; they enter into a freer, complementary connection with other words: complementary connection being best suited for describing objectal and adverbial relations” [Akhmanova, Mikaelyan 2013: 148].

Adverbials of manner differ sharply from such typical adverbials as that of time or place; on the contrary, the unite with determinants.

In contrast to circumstantial adverbs, such adverbs are able to regularly occupy a position immediately before the verbal determinatum, i.e. the position which is also typical of the noun-neighbouring determinants [Akhmanova, Mikaelyan 2013: 151].

For example, in modern Azerbaijani “**yaxşı yazar, yaxşı yazar**” (a good writer writes well) the first word “**yaxşı**” (good) located before the noun is a determinant, and the second “**yaxşı**” located before the verb is an adjective-adverbial form.

Thus, in utterance adverbials of manner, located in preposition of the verb, play a role which is very similar to that of the adjective which function as a determinant of a noun, and can be included into the category of determinants.

Determinative word combinations can be categorized into simple and complex ones. Simple word combinations are combinations which consist of a determinant-attribute and a determinatum, which can be either substantive or verbal: “**çiyan bodun**” – “poor people,” “**baz kiltim**” – “forced to peace.”

The complex type of determinative word combinations is a type in which the determinant and the determinatum can consist of a group or a chain of adjoining determinants, sometimes quite lengthy one:

55.

Ädgü bilgä kisig, ädgü alp kisig jorïtmaz ärmis (Ktm6)

Ädgü	bilgä	kisig	ädgü	alp	kisig
Good	wise	man	good	hero	man

Jorï-t-maz	ärmis
to walk – CAUS – NEG	to be

‘Tabgach people and their supporters (could) not move good and wise people, valiant heroes (from the true path)’

A complex attributive word combination is formed by the primary meaning of the words ‘**ädgü**’ – ‘good,’ ‘boon’ and ‘**alp**’ – ‘hero.’ Complex word combination requires that there be a certain order in which multiple attributions express the main and secondary characteristics of the determinatum. Determinants conveying the major, basic characteristics of the determinatum are located immediately before the latter, while determinants referring to secondary or minor characteristics of the determinatum are located before the main determinants.

In the language of OTRM, three types of word combinations had already developed enough, and they were combined on the basis of by what external ways the connection between their components was rendered: adjoinment, government or concord. The subsequent historical development of numerous Turkic languages led to the continued differentiation of these connection methods.

Adjoinment is a composition of words in their basic form without any affixal relations attached. In the language of OTRM, adjoinment as a type of subordinate

connection in determinative groups is used more widely than in most monuments of subsequent centuries and in modern Turkic languages [Kononov 1980: 212].

56.

Üzä kök täñri asra jayız jir kilintukda (Ktm1)

Üzä	kök	täñri	asra	jayız	jir	kilın-tukda
Upon	blue	sky	down	dark	earth	to come – CV

‘When the blue sky was created (or appeared) above, and dark (literally: brown) earth (was created) below’

As noted above, in Turkic languages, substantive concepts can transform into adjective ones and vice versa; there is also possibility of transforming the substantive-adjective concepts into adverbial ones, thus the use of adjoinment is extensive. The adjoinment represents attributive or adverbial composition of words.

57.

Tört buluñdaki budunıy kop baz kiltim, jayısız kiltim (Ktb30)

Tört	buluñ-da-kı	budun-ıy	kop	baz	kıl-tı-m
Four	corner – LOC— SREP	people – ACC	entire	peace to do – PST –1SG	
Jayı-sız	kıl-tı-m				
enemy – NEG	to make – NEG-- 1SG				

‘I have made the peoples of the four corners (i.e. the four winds) peaceful and not hostile towards me.’

In this example, the word **baz** “peace” conveys a feature and becomes an adjectival category. Literally meaning “having no enemies,” the word **jayısız** conveys a characteristic and transforms semantically into “being not an enemy.” In the word

combinations “**baz kiltim**,” “**jayisiz kiltim**” the adjectives, acting as attributions, qualify verbs.

Thus, there is currently no consensus among scholars on whether it is right to consider adjective as an independent part of speech in the texts of OTRM. In our view, adjectives found in the texts of OTRM should be considered as undifferentiated nouns with a substantive-qualitative meaning.

#### 4.1.2. *Attributive models with a participle functioning as the determinant*

The determinant can be represented by active and passive participles in the present and past tenses. They characterize an object by its action or condition. The attribution rendered by participle in OTRM can be either prepositive or postpositive.

*Participle of the broad I tense -r, -ur<sup>4</sup>, -ar<sup>2</sup>:*

58.

Körür közüm körmaz teg bilir biligim bilmaz teg bolti (Ktb50 (10))

Kör-ür	köz-üm	kör-maz	teg
Seeing – PTCP	eyes –1SG.POSS	to see – NEG PTCP	how
Bil-ir	biligi-m	bil-maz	
to know – PTCP	knowledge –1SG. POSS	to know – NEG PTCP	
teg	bol-ti		
how	to become-PST		

‘My sighted eyes seem to have stopped seeing, and my prophetic mind seems to become ignorant.’

Broad I tense in negative form **-maz<sup>2</sup>**:

59.

Bilig bilmäz kisi (Ktm7)

Bilig	bilmäz	kisi
Wisdom	to know – NEG PTCP	man

‘Men without (true) wisdom’

Participles of past non-obvious tense **-mīs<sup>4</sup>**:

60.

Elsirämis qayansiramīs bodunīy (Ktb13)

Elsirä-mis	qayansıra-mīs	bodun-īy
El – PTCP	kagan – PTCP	people – ACC

‘People who lost (their) el and lost (their) kagan’

An intransitive verb is accompanied by the **-sirä** affix, which conveys the meaning of losing the element expressed by the original word stem.

Participle **-siq, -sik**:

61.

İl tutsik jir Ötükän jış ärmis (Ktm 4)

İl	tut-sik	jir	Ötükän	jış	ärmis
People	to take over – PTCP	country	Otuken	land	was

‘It was the Land of Otuken where a tribal union could be established.’

Participle **-dači<sup>2</sup> /-tači<sup>2</sup>**:

62.

Öltäči bodun (Ktb 29)

to die – PTCP	people
Öl – täči	bodun



‘A perished people’

Participle **-sar**, **-sär**:

63.

Erdäm bolsar bodunïy (E29, 1)

Erdäm	bol-sar	bodunïy
Bravery	to be – PTCP	people

‘A people who must be valiant’ ‘A victorious people’

#### 4.1.3. *Attributive models with a SAF functioning as the determinant*

SAF with the affix **-duq /- tuq** functioning as an extended determinant:

64.

Közin körmädük qulaqaqïn esidmädik bodunïmïn ... (M Xb 11)

Köz-in	kör-mä-dük	qulaqaq-ïn
Eyes – 2SG.POSS	to see – NEG – SAF	ears – 2SG.POSS
Esid-mä-dik	bodun-ïm-ïn	
to hear – NEG – SAF	people – 1SG.POSS – GEN	

‘My people, who (before) could not see with their eyes, could not hear with their ears’

#### 4.1.4. *Determinative models with numerals functioning as the determinant*

The determinant conveyed by numerals is extensively used in the language of the OTRM. Combined with a noun, such a kind of determinant is used in the sentence to qualify an object or person quantitatively. A numeral functioning as the

determinant refers to abstract, non-substantiated, numerical concepts, a certain number of objects (expressed in integers or fractional numbers), the order of items in count, a sum of calculated items perceived as unity. In the OTRM language, there is no mention of fractional numbers. Non-uniform determinants, conveyed by numerals, are located before other non-uniform determinants, conveyed by adjectives or participles, or nouns in the absolute form. The language of OTRM allows for the use of all types of numerals, including cardinal numerals, ordinal, distributive, approximate, and numerative words, as determinants.

Let us present some examples that utilize cardinal numerals in the determinative function. Determinants conveyed by cardinal numerals refer to the quantity represented by a specific number of items, or an abstract numerical concept unrelated to concrete items. The determinant rendered by an ordinal numeral, characterizes the object by its position in the counting order.

65.

Äčümiz apamiz Bumın kayan tört buluñıy kismis (O1)

Äču-miz	apa-miz	Bumın	kayan
Father – 1PL.POSS	older relative – 1PL.POSS	Bumyn	Kagan
tört	buluñ-ıy	kis-mis	
four	corner –ACC	to oppress – PRF	

‘Our ancestor Bumyn Kagan has oppressed four corners (of the world).’

Ordinal numerals in the attributive role are similar to cardinal ones in that they do not vary in cases; they just prepositionally adjoin the determinatum.

66.

Kañim kayan it jil oninč aj alti otuzka uča bardı (MXa 10)

Kañ-ım	kayan	it	jil	on-inč	aj
Kan –1SG.POSS	kagan	dog	year	ten – ORD	month

Altī	otuz-ka	uč-a	bar-dī
twenty	six – LOC	to die – CV	to go – PST

‘My father kagan passed away in the year of the dog, on the twenty-sixth day of the tenth month.’

In this example **it**, **onīnč**, **altī otuzka** are determinants, and **jīl**, **aj**, **uča bardī** are determinatums.

In the texts of OTRM affix **-ntī** was registered once:

67.

Ikinti sūņūs (Mč 9)

Iki-nti	sūņūs
two – ORD	battle

‘The second battle’

One instance of the affix **-ik** use was recorded in the OTRM texts:

68.

Äņ ilik Toγī balıkda sūņüşdimiz (Kt b44)

Äņ	il - ik	Toγī balık-da	sūņüş-di-miz
the very first – ORD		Togu town – LOC	to fight – PST –1PL

‘The very first (time) we fought near the town of Togu’

Let us examine some examples where the attributive function is performed by approximate numerals.

69.

Äligčä är tutdimiz (T42)

Älig-čä                                      ār                                      tut-dī-mīz  
 Fifty – APP NUM                      warrior                                      to capture – PST – 1PL

‘We captured about fifty warriors’

Approximate calculation can be rendered by repeating the cardinal numerals:  
 70.

Qorȳi äki-üč kisilig[in] tezip bardī (M 37)

Qor-ȳi                      äki-üč                                      kisilig[in]      tez-p                      bar-dī  
 to be afraid – CV      two three – APP NUM      man      to run – CV      to go– 3SG

‘Frightened, he fled with two or three men’

In the OTRM language numerative words **joli**, **qata** functioned as determinants:  
 71.

Kīrk artuk(ī jit)i joli sülāmis (Ktb 44)

Kīrk                      artuk (ī jit)i                      joli                                      sülā-mis  
 Forty                      also      seven                      times                      to fight – PRF

‘They fought forty plus seven times’

Numerals in the language of OTRM can only be used for attribution when they are located prepositionally.

#### 4.1.5. *Attributive models with pronouns functioning as determinants*

In the attributive models, the role of determinant can also be played by pronouns. The texts of OTRM utilize demonstrative, interrogative, emphatic, resumptive pronouns as determinants.

Demonstrative pronouns:

72.

Ol süg anta jok kıştımız (T32)

Ol                    süg                    anta    jok    kış-ti-miz

That                army                there not                to destroy – PST – 1PL

‘We destroyed that army there’

Interrogative pronouns:

73.

Türk bodun ilinjin törünün kim artadı (Ktb22)

Türk bodun                il-in-in                                törü-ñ-in

Turk people                el – 2SG.POSS – ACC    law – 2SG.POSS – ACC

kim                                arta- di

who                                to destroy – PST

‘The Turkic people, who destroyed your el’

Reflexive pronouns:

74.

Kentü bodunım (Mč 14)

Kentü                                bodun-ım

My                                        people – 1SG.POSS

‘My own people’

Resumptive pronouns:

75.

Qamuq baliqqa tegdim(Oa1)

Qamuq	balıq-qa	teg-di-m
Entire	town – DATLOC	to attack – PST – 1SG

‘I attacked the entire town’

Pronouns can play they attributive function only if they stand in preposition:

76.

Bunı äsidiñ (Ktm10)

Bunı	äsidi-ñ
This	to hear – IMP

‘Listen to this’

#### 4.1.6. *Attributive models with nominal word combinations (izafets) functioning as determinants*

The noun can stand in preposition and postposition. A prepositional determinant is a determinant where the noun denotes the name of an ethnic group, the name of the year according to the animal cycle, a proper name, a toponym [Kononov 1980: 213]:

Türk kayan (Ktm3)

‘Turkic kagan’

Depending on the number of members having subordinate connection, determinants can be categorized into simple and complex ones. The complex type consists of two or more notional members. Both a prepositional and a postpositional determinant can be rendered by an attributive group.

Izafet is a variety of attributive determinative relations, which in the Turkic languages convey a very broad range of real relations between objects: be it personal property relations (“real belonging”, i.e. possessive in a narrow sense) or such relations, which are called by researchers “belonging in a general grammatical

sense” [Maizel 1957: 43]. In Turkic languages such possessive relations are conveyed by word combinations in which both the first (determinant) and the second (determinatum) components belong to substantive groups of words, among which there may be nouns, pronouns, as well as substantive verb forms: SAFs, masdars and nominalized participles. In Turkic linguistics, this kind of determinative substantive constructions are called *izafet* or *izafet* construction.

The meaning of the “*izafet*” concept is interpreted by S.S. Maizel as follows: “*Izafet* is a combination of two nouns, of which one, standing in the genitive or indefinite (nominative) case, is a determinant and at the same time a complement to the other – i.e., its determinatum and simultaneously complemented counterpart” [Maizel 1957: 13].

*Izafet* constructions in Turkic languages can be formed in three different ways: 1) the stem of the noun performs the function of the first and second components; 2) the stem of the noun is the first component, while the second one is a word form with a personal possessive affix (3<sup>rd</sup> person singular); 3) the first component employs affixes of the genitive case, and the second employs possessive affixes (3<sup>rd</sup> person singular).

#### *Type I Izafet*

Type I *izafet* is formed by the method of adjoinment. S.S. Maizel called this type of *izafet* an “amorphous type of *izafet*” [Maizel 1957: 43]. The amorphous nature of the type I *izafet* makes it plausible to draw some parallels with corresponding non-prepositional combinations in the analytical languages of Western Europe; however, they are not identical. Historically, the first type of *izafet* seems to be the most ancient [Gadzhieva, Serebrennikov 1986: 54]. Therefore, in the language of OTRM, type I *izafet* was employed more often than the forms of *izafet* types II and III.

Tonra bir oyuş alpaņu on äriq, Toņa tigin joņita, äqirip ölürtimiz (Ktb 47)

Tonra bir oyuş alpaņu on äriq

Tongra some tribe hero ten warrior

Toņa tigin joņi-ta äqir-ip ölürti-miz

Tongra hero funeral – LOC to chase – CV to kill –PST – 1PL

‘At the funeral of Tongra Tegin we killed, chasing, ten people, heroes from the Tongra tribe.’

V.G. Kondratiev writes that “**Toņa bir oyuş**” is the determinant of the word combination “**alpaņu on äriq**” [Kondratiev 1962: 70]. From our point of view, the word “**bir**” in this example is used precisely as an indefinite pronoun: **Toņa bir oyuş** “of a certain Tongra tribe.”

In modern Turkic languages, type I izafet does not allow to put any word between the determinant and the determinatum, except for the indefinite numeral **bir**, which as a numeral means “one” and can be translated into English by the indefinite article “a(n)” or the words “one,” “some.”

In the modern Azerbaijani language, the type I izafet implies that an indefinite numeral can be used between the determinant and the determinatum, as well as before the izafet (determinant). For example, the meanings of such combinations as “**taxta bir qaşiq**” (‘some kind of wooden spoon’) and “**bir taxta qaşiq**” slightly differ from each other. In the OTRM texts, **bir** as an indefinite numeral is quite infrequent:

Bir kisi jaņilsar (Ktm 6)

Bir kisi jaņil-sar

One man to error-COND

‘If one, some person was wrong / is wrong’



In the course of the analysis of how the word **bir** is used, it can be concluded that it was rather at the subsequent stages of the Oghuz languages development that it comes into use as an indefinite numeral. And it was later that the category of definiteness completely developed in Turkic languages.

### *Type II Izafet*

Type II izafet is much less common in the OTRM than the type I.

78.

Tabyač ilinā qīlīntīm (T1)

Tabyač      il-i-nā

qīlīn-tī-m

Tabgach      state – 3SG.POSS –DAT

to appear – PST – 1SG

‘I was brought up in the State of Tabgach’

In many cases, the type II izafet is a counterpart of Russian complex and compound words, expressing one common concept. For example: “**uşaq evi**” (Azerbaijani) – “children’s home, orphanage.”

The meanings of proper names, toponyms, as well as ethnicity are conveyed in the Turkic languages according to the I and II types of izafet. In most Turkic languages, ethnicity (of a person or phenomenon) is signified by type II izafet, but in the Kumyk language, in Tuvan and Old Turkic languages it is signified by type I izafet: for example, **Türk dil**, in the Azerbaijani language **türk dili** ‘Turkish.’

### *Type III Izafet*

Type III Isafet is organized by the method of concord and “expresses the actual, real affiliation” [Maizel 1957: 31]. Constructions with the determinant in the genitive case and the determinatum with the possessive affix of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person (type III izafet)

are rather infrequently used in the language of OTRM. Usually its meaning is conveyed by type II izafet. Type III izafet communicates the idea of one object's belonging to another object, possession, possessive relations. For example:

79.

Bilgä qayanıñ bodunı (Oa3)

Bilgä            qayan-ıñ                            bodun-ı

Bilge            kagan – GEN                    people – 3SG.POSS

‘The people of Bilge-kagan’

Type III izafet is utilized to express the relationship of a part to the whole:

80.

Adıyıñ qarnı jarılmıš toñuz-uñ azıyı sinmiš (İB10-11)

Adıy-ıñ                            qarn-ı    jarılmıš

Bear – GEN                            belly – 3SG.POSS                            torn

toñuz-uñ                            azı-yı    sinmiš

boar – GEN                            fang – 3SG.POSS                            broken

‘The bear’ belly was torn open, the boar’s fangs were broken’

In one sentence, possessive relations can be conveyed by utilizing the same substantive-attributive construction both in the III type of izafet and in the II type of izafet:

81.

Türk budunıy atı küsi jok bolmazun tijin...türk budun atı küsi jok bolmazun tijin (KTb25)

Türk            budun-ıy                            at-ı    küs-i

Turkic            people – GEN                    name – 3SG.POSS                    fame – 3SG.POSS

jok	bolmazun	tijin	Türk	budun	at-ï
not	to be	in order to	Turkic	people name	-3SG.POSS
küs-i		jok	bolmazun	tijin	
fame – 3SG.POSS		not	to be	in order to	

‘(Then) Heaven, which, so that the name and glory of the Turkic people would not be lost... so that the name and glory of the Turkic people would not be lost’

In this example, the type III izafet is formed by the first word combination **budunïy atï**, determinants with the affix **-ïy**, the affix of the genitive case, and the determinatums with the affix **-ï** and the possessive affix of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person.

It should be mentioned that there is a fluctuation in the use of type II and type III izafet, and it is also possible to use type II izafet instead of type III izafet.

In the OTRM, type III izafet expresses both connections and relationships.

In the course of the study, we revealed that in the OTRM language, the function of determinant can be performed by models with adjectives, with SAF, with numerals, with pronouns and with nominal word combinations.

## 4.2. Complementary Models

Complementary models consist of two components – the complement and the complemented, and serve as a means of expressing the connection of an action, feature, or object with some object [Guzev 2015: 282]. Depending on the nature of an object’s participation in the action, the complements referring to this object can be categorized into two main types: direct and indirect ones.

A direct complement refers to a direct object, i.e. the object affected by the action. An indirect object has only an indirect relation to the action.

#### **4.2.1. Models of the Direct Complement**

A direct object shows a real or grammatical object over which an action is performed in real and grammatical senses. It is usually combined with a transitive verb. A direct object can have an affix of the accusative case or have no case marker. Depending on the use of accusative affixes, the direct complement can be categorized into two types: definite and indefinite one. Whereas a definite direct object in the texts of OTRM can be expressed by a noun in the accusative case, an indefinite direct object utilizes a noun in the indefinite accusative case, i.e. without affixes.

##### *4.2.1.1. Constructions with a complement marked by the accusative affix*

A definite direct object in the texts of OTRM can be expressed by any word or a word form carrying a substantive semantics: a noun in the accusative case, a pronoun, a locative adjective, a nominalized part of speech, as well as an izafetic word combination.

The noun in the accusative case can be found either immediately before the verb, or at a certain distance.

82.

Qizimin qaliqsiz bertim (E 47)

Qiz-īm-īn    qalīñ-sīz                      ber-ti-m  
 daughter – 1SG.POSS – ACCDEF    bridewealth-NEG                      to give – PST –1SG

‘I married my daughters off without bridewealth’

The noun marked by the accusative affix, denotes a definite object and marks a direct complement in the following cases:

1. *When the object is logically defined, i.e. somehow individualized, isolated from the total mass of homogeneous objects.*

83.

Säkiz jäqirmi jašīma altī čub soɣdak tapa sülādīm, budunīy anta buzdīm (M 24-25)

Säkiz              jäqirmi              jaš-īm-a    altī              čub  
 eighteen                                      years – 1SG.POSS – DAT              six              area

soɣdak                      tap-a    sülā-di-m

Sogdians                      upon – POST    to go – PST –1SG

budun-īy    anta                      buz-dī-m

people – ACCDEF    there                      to defeat –PST – 1SG

‘When I was eighteen years old, I went with my army to the Sogdians of six regions. I defeated (their) people there’

2. *In order to preserve the meaning of the sentence.*

84.

Tilīy kälürti, sabī antay (T36)

Til-īy    käl-ür-ti    sab-ī    antay

Scout – ACCDEF    to come – CAUS-PST    word – 3SG.POSS like that

‘A scout has been brought in, here is his word’

In this utterance, if the word **tıl** ‘scout, enemy rogue’ had not been marked with an affix, a misunderstanding could have arisen due to a change in the original meaning, and instead of ‘a scout has been brought in,’ the interpretation ‘a scout brought’ would have been justifiable.

3. *When the direct complement contains a toponym:*

85.

Ärtis ügüzüg kăča kältimiz (T37-38)

Ärtis            ügüz-üg            kăč-a            käl-ti-miz

Irtys̄h            river – ACCDEF    to cross – CV            to come – PST – 3PL

‘We came by crossing the Irtys̄h River’

4. *When the direct complement is an ethnonym:*

In these cases, the name of a people is perceived as a proper name, which always requires a morphological mark of the accusative affix:

86.

Qırqızıy uda basdımız (T27)

Qırqız-ıy            u-da            bas-dı-mız

Kyrkyz – ACCDEF    sleep – LOC            to defeat – PST – 1PL

‘We defeated the Kyrkyz when in sleep’

5. *When the direct complement is a word form of a noun with a possessive affix of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person:*

87.

Qayanın tutdımız (T41)

Qayan-ï-n	tut-dï-mïz
Kagan – 3SG.POSS – ACCDEF	to capture – PST – 1PL

‘We captured their kagan’

6. *When the direct complement is defined by a demonstrative pronoun:*

88.

Bu süg elt (T 32)

Bu	sü-g	elt
This – PRON	army – ACCDEF	to lead – 2 SG IMP

‘Lead this army’

7. *When a direct object is expressed by a nominalized part of speech:*

89.

Illigig ilsirätmis, kayanlıyïy kayansiratmïs, jayïy baz kilmïs (Ktb 15)

Il-lig-ig	ilsirä-t-mis
People – ADJ – ACCDEF	to lose – IMP – PRF

Kayan-lïy-ïy	kayansira-t-mïs,
kagan – ADJ – ACCDEF	kagan – IMP – PRF

Jayï-γ	baz	kil-mïs
enemy – ACCDEF	foreigner	to appear – PRF

‘He deprived those who had a tribal union of the tribal union, he deprived those who had a kagan of the kagan, he forced his enemies to peace’

**Illigig, kayanlïyï, jayïy** represent the forms of nominalized adjectives and, as direct complements to the predicates **ilsirätmïs, kayansïratmïs, baz kïlmïs**, they obtain an affixal mark.

8. *When the direct complement is expressed by an izafetic word combination conveying a possessive relation:*

90.

Tabyač kayanïñ içräki bädizčig itï (Ktm12)

Tabyač	kayan-ïñ	içräki	bädizči-g	it-ï
Tabgach	kagan – GEN	inside	master – ACCDEF	to send – PST

‘Tabgach sent me the “inner” masters of their emperor’

#### 4.2.1.2. *Constructions with a direct complement, having no accusative affix*

In the texts of OTRM, as well as in texts written in other Turkic languages, one can find utterances in which the direct complement can be used without the accusative affix. Analysis of the factual material of various Turkic languages shows, that the object – the direct object of an action most often does not have an explicit morphological indicator (i.e. is not marked by the accusative case affix) in such cases when it is conveyed in an utterance by an adjacent complement, i.e. it stands immediately before the verb with which it is associated [Dubrovina 2011: 123].

But it is important to remember that the adjacent complement is not devoid of a morphological indicator in all cases. Examining the material of various Turkic languages, Turkologists explained some reasons for the absence of the accusative affix in such kind of complements. For example, according to A. N. Kononov, the “adjacent” complement can refer to an indefinite object, which in combination with the verbal predicate forms a complex lexical-syntactic combination. At the same



time, despite the fact that the complement acts as a separate member of the sentence, it forms a close semantic and syntactic connection with the complemented; this connection seems to unite them into one whole and is not interfered by addition of a morphological indicator [Kononov 1956: 397].

Analysis of the factual material of the OTRM also shows that the noun playing the role of an adjacent complement without an accusative affix often represents an indefinite object:

91.

Bitiq bitdim (K-Ç 28)

Bitiq bit-di-m

Inscription – ACC İND to write – PST – 1SG

‘I wrote an inscription’

In the texts of OTRM, the adjacent direct complement is often used in the indefinite accusative case. This happens when the object to which the transitive verb refers is not isolated from homogeneous objects and represents a cumulative set of objects, i.e. the noun is used in its collective meaning:

92.

Käjik jījü, tabısyān jījü, olurur ärtimiz (T8)

Käjik jı-jü tabısyān jı-jü

Deer – ACC İND to eat – CV hare – ACC İND to eat – CV

Olurur är-ti-miz

to live to be – PST – 3PL

‘We lived (there), eating deer, eating hares’

The authors of the *Grammar of the Tuvan language* F.G. Iskhakov and A.A. Palmbakh discovered the formal pattern on which appearing of the accusative affix

depends: “A noun in the accusative case does not have a case affix only when it stands next to the governing verb, but if there is just one word inserted between them, the noun will necessarily have an accusative affix...” [Iskhakov, Palmbakh 1961: 132]. A characteristic of the OTRM language is that a direct complement can stand in the nominative case, even if it is separated from the predicate by another member of the sentence (most often by an adverbial of manner, less often by an adverbial of place or by another member of the sentence). As for modern Turkic languages, in such instance, the direct complement is marked by the accusative case.

93.

Sab anča ĩdmīs (T9)

Sab	anča	ĩd-mīs
Word – ACC ĪND	so	to be – PST

‘The word was like this’

Obviously, this is connected with the semantics of a direct object: when an object signifies a set of homogeneous items, the case affix may not be used even if the direct complement is separated from the governing verb:

94.

Tabyač qayanta Isji Likāñ kelti, bir tüman ayĩ, altun, kümüš kergäksiz kelürti  
(KT52)

Tabyač	qayan-ta	Isji	Likāñ	kel-ti
Tabgach kagan – LOC ABL		Isji	Liken	to come – PST – 3SG

Bir	tüman	ayĩ	altun
one	ten thousand	gift – ACCĪND	gold – ACCĪND

kümüš	kergäk-siz	kelür-ti
silver – ACCIND	count – NEG	to bring – PST

‘Isji Likän came from the Tabgach kagan, he brought many gifts and countless amounts of gold and silver’

In objectal word combinations, when a noun located next to a transitive verb optionally stands in the form of the nominative (indefinite, non-marked) case, “adjoinment should be recognized, and ‘case adjoinment’ should be attributed entirely to government” [Amanzholov 1969: 18].

95.

Bängü taš tokïtdim (Ktm12-13)

Bängü	taš	tök-ït-dï-m
Eternal	stone – ACCIND	to cast – CAUS – PST – 1SG

‘I put up a monument’

Specialists on Turkic languages have repeatedly noted that a direct object can, in addition to the accusative affix, also be marked by the affix of the ablative case. Thus, according to N. Ch. Sereedar, in the Tuvan language, “a direct object is signified by the marked and non-marked accusative cases and by the ablative case. Each case has its own patterns of use. For example, the noun in the accusative case occupies a free position in the sentence: it can stand directly in front of the verb, but it can also stand far from the verb governing it. A noun in the non-marked accusative case usually stands in front of the verb, and other words between it and the verb appear infrequently. A noun in the ablative case expressing a direct object takes a position only in front of the verb” [Sereedar 2009: 190]. The Tuvan researcher notes that “the noun in the ablative case, playing the role of a direct object, stands immediately before the verb, and expresses either an indefinite object or part of the whole” [Sereedar 2009: 190]. In different Turkic languages, a different case of the direct complement may depend on multiple factors. As for the Tuvan language, “the

choice of this case is dictated by the mood and tense of the verb. It is used if the verb is in the imperative, conditional, consiliatory subjunctive moods or in the future tense of the indicative mood. In all these cases, there is a point of contact with the idea of future” [Sereedar 2009: 199]. Let us look at some examples from the Tuvan language:

Оон мен хап киргеш, машина=дан эккел-гей мен (CC) – Then I will go and I can bring the car; imperative mood.

Соок шиме=ден чооглаңар (КК, УХ, к, 66) – Drink cool araki (a dairy product).

However, no examples of direct complement in the ablative case have been found in the OTRM texts. Nevertheless, perhaps this is due solely to the patterns of the written literary language of that era.

#### **4.2.2. Models of the Indirect Complement**

An indirect complement is often defined as “a complement in which the relationship between items and processes has a more distant, less immediate character” [Akhmanova 1966: 141]. In this case, the object is only partially related to the major action, the action does not involve this object completely, but only affects some part of it. In the OTRM language, an indirect object can be expressed using various means:

1. case forms of the substantive parts of speech and verbal-nominal forms (dative, locative-ablative, directive, ablative, accusative);
2. by means of postpositions as part of word combinations;
3. by a pronoun with a substantive meaning;
4. by a nominal word combination (izafet);
5. by a substantive-adjectival form (SAF).

4.2.2.1. *The construction of an indirect complement rendered by various case forms.*

*Indirect complement in the dative case*

The dative case refers to the object of indirect influence. In the texts of OTRM, this case bears several different meanings, representing the object:

1) to which the action is directed:

96.

Er abqa barmīs (İB 17)

Er            ab-qa                            bar-mīs

Man            hunting – DAT                            to go – PST

‘Man went hunting’

2) which is immediately reached by the action:

97.

Tüpüt-kä kičig tägmädım (Ktm 3)

Tüpüt-kä            kičig                            täg-mä-di-m

Tibet – DAT            a little to reach – NEG-PST – 1SG

‘I almost reached Tibet.’

3) for whose benefit the action is being performed:

98.

Kemkä ilig qazyanur men tir ermis (Ktb 9)

Kem-kä            il-ig                            qazyanur    men    tir                            er-mis

Who – DAT            el – ACCDEF            to acquire I            to say to be – PRF

“Who am I acquiring el for?” he said.

4) from which another object is separated:

99.

Üč jetmis jašimqa adiriltim egük qatun jerimkä adiriltim (E 4)

Üč	jetmis	jaš-ım-qa	adiril-ti-m
Sixty three	years – 1SG.POSS – DAT		to part – PST – 1SG

egük qatun	jer-ım-kä	adiril-ti-m
Egyuk-katun	earth – 1SG.POSS – DAT	to separate – PST – 1SG

‘When I was sixty-three years old, I parted [with this world], I parted with my land  
Egyuk-katun’

5) towards which the action is performed:

100.

Eki oylıma jabyu šad at birtim (Mč 19)

Eki	oıl-ım-a	jabyu	šad	at
Two	son – 1SG.POSS – DAT	yabgu	shad	name – ACCIND

bir-ti-m

to give – PST – 1SG

‘I gave my two sons the titles of yabgu and shad’

6) as a time adverbial:

101.

Bäš jägirmi jašimda tabgač kanga bardim (E 9)

Bäš	jägirmi	jaš-ım-da	tabgač
-----	---------	-----------	--------



Tabyačda adirilti (T2)

Tabyač-da                                 adiril-ti

Tabgach – LOCABL                         to separate – PST

‘He separated from the Tabgach people’

3. The object is something that is being compared to, juxtaposed with:

104.

Bizintä äki uçı sıñarča artuq ärti (T40)

Bizin-tä   äki   uç-ı   sıñar-ča

we – 1.PL.POSS.LOCABL   two   wing – 3SG.POSS                         half – ADV

artuq   är-ti

more   to be – PST

‘Compared to us, their two wings were one and a half times more numerous’

*Indirect complement in the directive case*

105.

Kıtangaru Tuņra Sämig idmiš (T9)

Kıtan-garu                         Tuņra                         Sämig   id-miš

Khidan – DIR                         Tungra                         Samig   to send – PRF

‘Tungra Samig was sent to the Khidans’

*Indirect complement in the ablative case*

106.

Oyuzdantan körüg kelti (T 8)



Oyuz-dantan	körüg	kel-ti
Oghuz – ABL	scout	to come – PST

‘A scout came from the Oghuz people’

*Indirect complement in the accusative case*

The case in question expresses several customary, conventional meanings in the OTRM texts [Dubrovina 2011: 169–170]:

1. The object acts as an instrument, a means of performing an action:

107.

...süñigin açdımız (T 28)

süñig-in	aç-di-miz
spear – ACC	to open – PST – 1 PL

‘We paved [the road] with spears’

2. The object is something or someone accompanying in the performing of the action:

108.

Qayanımın sülätdimiz (T 53)

Qayan-ım-ın	sülä-t-di-miz
kagan – 1SG.POSS – ACC	to fight – CAUS – PST – 1PL

‘My kagan and I led the army together’

“Relations between objects in Turkic languages are formally similar to spatial relations” [Khabibullina 2016: 100]. To distinguish them, attention should be paid to the predicate in the sentence. For example, if the predicate is rendered by an intransitive static verb, the noun in the directive case is an indirect object, and it performs the role of an indirect complement in the sentence; meanwhile, if the

predicate is rendered by an intransitive dynamic verb, this word is a place adverbial, and a spatial relationship develops.

a)

109.

Taṅrikä elimkä bašda bagimkä bökmädim (E 3)

Taṅri-kä	el-im-kä	baš-da
Tengri – DIR	people – 1SG.POSS – DIR	head – LOC

bag-im-kä	bök-mä-di-m
bek – 1SG.POSS – DIR	to enjoy – NEG – PST – 1SG

‘I did not enjoy enough my reign as a bek, [put] at the head [of] my divine state’  
(translated by M.E. Dubrovina) [Dubrovina 2011: 155].

b)

110.

Basmil jagidip äbimrü bardī (Mç 28)

Basmil	jagid-ip	äb-im-rü	bar-dī
Basmyl	enemy – CV	house – 1SG.POSS – DIR	to go – PST

‘The Basmyls, having turned enemies, went [with war] to my house’

A simple word combination in the Old Turkic language is a combination of two notional words that retain their nominative meanings.

In a modern Turkic language, one of the members of a simple word combination may contain an indefinite particle **bir** ‘some,’ for example: **böyük bir ev** (Azerbaijani) ‘big (a / some) house.’ Here, **bir** performs an auxiliary function of an indefiniteness indicator and in these combinations does not perform a nominative function.

When analyzing attributive word combinations, special attention should be paid to postpositions. Postpositions, being an auxiliary part of speech, do not have notional meaning. Due to the fact that postpositions render syntactic relations, in their functions they are similar to the semantics of case forms.

Examining the nature of the connection between action and object, A. N. Kononov identified 3 types of complements: direct, indirect and relational (postpositional) ones [Kononov 1980: 224]. When there is a case government, the case depends on the semantics of the verb; meanwhile, postpositive government means that the verb determines the postposition, and the postposition determines the case.

4.2.2.2. *Complementary models can also be represented by constructions with the postpositive words **birlä**, **tapa**, **suju**, **ötrü**.*

The postposition **birlä** ‘jointly,’ ‘together,’ combined with a noun in the nominative case, conveys a comitative meaning, i.e. the meaning of accompanying, compatibility, joint participation:

111.

Äčim kayan birlä ilqärü Jašil ügüz Šantun jazıka täqi sülädimiz (Ktb 17)

Äč-im                                      kayan                      birlä                      ilqärü

Uncle – 1SG.POSS                      kagan                      together              ahead

Jašil üzüq                      Šantun                      jazıka                      täqi              sülä-di-miz

Yashil river Shantung              valleytill              to go – PST – 1PL.POSS

‘With my uncle, the kagan, we went to war forward up to the Yashil River, to the Shantung Plain.’

The general comitative meaning, depending on the real meaning of the noun governed by the postposition, acquires additional semantic shades – the participation of the thing designated by this noun as the subject and object of action [Kononov 1980: 202]:

112.

Čača seŋün sekiz tümen birlä sünüsdim (M 26)

Čača seŋün            sekiz tümen            birlä            sünüs-di-m

Chacha sengun    eight thousand    with    to fight – PST–1SG.POSS

‘I fought with eight-thousand [army] of Chacha-sengun’

The complement **Čača seŋün sekiz tümen** is rendered by a word combination.

The meaning of the postposition **tapa** as used in the OTRM texts is “against”:

113.

Äki otuz jašima tabyač tapa sülädim (M25-26)

Äki    otuz            jaš-ım-a            tabyač            tapa

Two    thirty years – 1SG.POSS-DAT tabgach            against

sülä-di-m

to attack – PST – 1SG

‘In my twenty-second year, I attacked the Tabgachs’

The postposition **saju** denotes an action that affects the entire object, and it governs the nominative and accusative cases:

114.

Jir saju bardıy (Ktm 9)

Jir                            saju                            bar-dī-γ

land                      all                      to walk – PST – 1PL

‘We walked all over the earth / all over the lands’

The postposition **ötrü** is combined with a word in the locative-ablative case and serves to indicate the following of one event, fact, action after another (“then, subsequently, after”) [Kononov 1980: 205].

115.

Anta ötrü qayanıma ötüntüm (T 12)

Anta	ötrü	qayan-ım-a		ötün-tü-m
there	due to	kagan – 1SG.POSS –DAT		to address – PST – 1SG

‘After that, I made a request to my kagan’

4.2.2.3. *The indirect complement can also be represented by a pronoun with a substantive meaning.*

1. *Personal pronouns functioning as the indirect complement*

116.

Kop maña körür (Ktm2)

Kop	maña	kör-ür
All	I – DAT	to obey – PRS

‘Everyone is subjected to me’

2. *An interrogative pronoun functioning as the indirect complement*

117.

Kemkä ilig qazyanur men tir ermis (Ktb 11)

Kem-kä	il-ig	qazyanur	men
--------	-------	----------	-----

Who – DAT      el – ACC      to acquire      PERSAFF.1SG

ti-r                      ermis

to say – PST      to be – PRF

‘ “For whom did I buy el?” – he said’

4.2.2.4. *The indirect complement can be represented by a nominal word combination (izafet).*

118.

Türk bodunın ilin törüsün tuta birmis (Ktb1)

Türk      bodun-ın      il-in      törü-sin

Turk      people – GEN      tribe – 3SG.POSS      law – 3SG.POSS

tuta                      bir-mis

to support – CV

‘They supported the tribal union and the Turkic people’s conventions’

4.2.2.5. *The indirect complement can be represented by a substantive-adjectival form (SAF).*

Within the framework of his conception developed on the material of the Turkic languages, V. G. Guzev reveals one more type of the form within the category of nominalization of action (along with participles, converbs and nominal verbs). This form is able to occasionally represent an action both as a feature and as an object [Guzev 1976: 61].

*SAF -duq functioning as an extended direct complement*

119.

Tapladīqimīn tutar men, sebdükimin jijür men (İB 4-5)

Tapla-diğ-īm-İN	tutar	men
to approve – SAF – 1SG.POSS – ACCDEF	to catch	PERSAFF.1SG

Seb-dük-im-in	jijür	men
to love – SAF – 1SG.POSS – ACCDEF	to eat	PERSAFF.1SG

‘I catch what I like, I eat what I love’

In this example, the actor (the subject of action) is indicated by using possessive affixes.

Examining the OTRM texts, we have found out that in the old Turkic language complements may be classified into two main types: direct and indirect ones. There are nine constructions for the direct complement which is marked by the accusative case, and four constructions for the complement marked by another case. Meanwhile, the indirect object can be rendered by using case forms and by means of postpositions within word combinations.

Depending on the use of the accusative affix, the direct complement can be categorized into two types: the definite and the indefinite ones. The definite direct object in the texts of OTRM can be represented by a noun in the accusative case, and the indefinite direct object – by a noun in the indefinite accusative case, i.e. without affixes.

The definite direct object in the texts of OTRM may be conveyed by any word or a word form bearing substantive semantics: by a noun in the accusative case, by a pronoun, by a locative adjective, by a nominalized part of speech, as well as by an izafetic word combination.

The noun, marked by the accusative affix, signifies a definite object and marks a direct complement in the following cases:

- 1) The object is logically defined, i.e. it is somehow individualized, isolated from the total mass of homogeneous objects.
- 2) If necessary, to preserve the meaning of the sentence.
- 3) The direct complement contains a toponym.
- 4) The direct complement is an ethnonym.
- 5) The direct complement is a word form of a noun with a possessive affix of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person.
- 6) The direct complement is represented by a demonstrative pronoun.
- 7) The direct complement is represented by a nominalized part of speech.
- 8) The direct complement is represented by an izafet word combination conveying a possessive relationship.

The analysis of the factual material of the OTRM has also shown that the noun playing the role of an adjacent complement without the accusative affix often represents an indefinite object. In the texts of OTRM, the adjacent direct complement is often used in the indefinite accusative case. This occurs when the object to which the transitive verb refers is not isolated from homogeneous objects and represents a cumulative set of objects, i.e. the noun is used in its collective meaning.



In the OTRM language, the indirect object may be rendered by various case forms, by postpositions within word combinations, by a pronoun with a substantive meaning, by a nominal word combination (izafet), by a substantive-adjectival form.

### **4.3. Adverbial Models**

The adverbial syntactic form is a kind of the attributive form, which consists of the adverbial qualified and the adverbial itself. V.G. Guzev writes that “the meaning of this form suggests that a certain phenomenon (most often an action) is connected with another phenomenon that accompanies it and thus characterizes and qualifies it in some way” [Guzev 2015: 288].

The adverbial modifier can also be seen as a qualification of the nature of the action or process discussed [Melnikov 1969: 107].

Like other syntactic categories, adverbials unify a grammatical form and a grammatical meaning.

The main features which determine the category of an adverbial are the following:

- 1) grammatical meanings of words in a sentence,
- 2) morphological means of rendering sentence members,
- 3) the nature of the syntactic connection between words and
- 4) lexical meanings of explanatory and explained sentence members [Apresyan 1974].

In the language of OTRM, the proportion of syntactic models, containing the components which are connected by adverbial relationships, is significantly higher

than that of the models employing other types of syntactic connections. This is due, firstly, to the greater variability of adverbial meanings (adverbials of time, cause, purpose, etc.), and secondly, to some patterns of functioning.

Meaning is the key factor helping to distinguish adverbials from complements as syntactic components of a speech utterance.

Adverbial relationships are complex and multifaceted. In linguistics, the following logical-semantic meanings have been established, which are traditionally regarded as adverbial ones: the semantics of place, time, purpose, cause, image (character), measure, direction, degree of action performance, condition. In substantive adverbial constructions, qualifying components are usually represented by adverbs. However, in addition to adverbs, adjectives and numerals can also become the morphological basis for constructing an adverbial. Besides, nouns denoting a certain period of time can also function as an adverbial of time without changing their form. Some nouns in the dative, locative and ablative cases are also used to convey a feature of action.

The following types of adverbial syntactic constructions can be distinguished:

1. Models of the adverbial of manner;
2. Models of the adverbial of place;
3. Models of the adverbial of time;
4. Models of the adverbial of purpose;
5. Models of the adverbial of cause;
6. Models of the adverbial of measure and degree;
7. Models of the adverbial of condition.

### 4.3.1. Models of the Adverbial of Manner

The adverbial of manner expresses the qualitative characteristic of an action, the method of performing an action, the features of an action accompanying the action itself, the object to which an action is compared. The adverbial of manner shows how, under what conditions, and in what way the action is performed. In the texts of OTRM, it can be rendered in different ways.

#### 1. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by an adverb:*

120.

Ädgüti äsid katıydı tıñla (KTm2)

Ädgüti	äsid	katıydı	tıñla
Well	to listen	well	to pay attention

‘Listen well, and pay close attention to (him)!’

#### 2. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by an adjective:*

121.

Jalñusın jorıjur (İB 59)

Jalñusın	jorı-jur
Lonely	to wander -PRS

‘He wanders alone’

#### 3. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by converbs*

##### 3.1. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by a converb with the affix -(y)A:*

122.

At üzä bintürä, qarïy sökdim (T25)

At            üzä    bin-tür-ä                            qarïy sök-di-m

horse            upon to sit – IMP – CV                            snow to pave – PST – 1SG

‘Having put (the warriors) on horses, I paved (the road) through the snow’

### 3.2. *The adverbial of manner expressed by a converb with the affix -(y)İ̇:*

The converb **-(y)İ̇** describes the manner of performing an action which is being performed, in general, simultaneously with the action rendered by the verbal predicate.

123.

Käjik jïjü, tabïsyn jïjü, olurur ärtimiz (T8)

Käjik            jï-jü    tabïsyn            jï-jü

Deer to ear – CV            hare            to eat – CV

olur-ur    är-ti-miz

to live – PTCP                                    to be – PST – 1PL

‘We lived [there], eating deer, eating hares’

### 3.3. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by the converb -(y)İ̇p:*

124.

Tirilip jätmis är bolmïs (Ktb12)

Tiril - ip    jätmis    är    bol-mïs

To gather – CV                                    seventy    warrior    to become – PRF

‘Having gathered, they made up (a squadron numbering) seventy men’

4. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by the noun in the ectative case -čü:*

125.

Örtčä qızıp kälti (T40)

Ört-čä	qız-ıp	käl-ti
Fire – EKV	to burn – CV	to come – PST

‘They came flaming like fire’

If several adverbial members of the sentence are presented in a utterance, then their use in relation to the predicate-qualified depends on their semantic significance. Immediately before the predicate or as close as possible to it, those adverbial components are utilized which specify the main action in more detail; meanwhile, the adverbials of generic nature are separated from the predicate and tend closer to the beginning of the utterance.

5. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by accusative cases:*

126.

Jalñusın jorıjur (İB 59)

Jalñus-ın	jorı-jur
Lonely – ACC	to walk – PRS

‘He wanders alone’

6. *The adverbial of manner conveyed by postpositive constructions **täq, birlä:***

127.

Kañım kayan süsi böri täq ärmis, jayısı koñ täq ärmis (Ktb12)

Kañ-ım	kayan sü-si	böri	täq	ärmis
--------	-------------	------	-----	-------

kagan – 1SG.POSS	kagan army –3SG.POSS	wolf	like	to be
jayï-sï	koñ		täq	ärmis
enemy – 1SG.POSS	sheep		like	to be

‘My father’s army was like a wolf, and his enemies were like sheep’

128.

Oğuz bodun tokuz-tatar birlä tirilip kälti (BK 34)

Oğuz	bodun	tokuz	tatar	birlä
Oghuz	people	nine	Tatar	together –POST
tiril-ip		käl-ti		
to revive – CV		to come – PST		

‘The Oghuz people, united with the Tokuz Tatars, came up’

#### 4.3.2. Models of the Adverbial of Place

Apparently, any phenomenon, event or process has spatial characteristics, since humans cannot exist outside of space. The adverbial relations of spatial semantics can be found in the semantic structure of many utterances, indicating the course, realization of events within a certain space; unlike other types of adverbial relations, they are more concrete.

Interpreting spatial relations from a philosophical point of view, L. G. Valieva writes: “Philosophically, space is a form in which matter exists. In the language structure the concept of space, as a rule, is reflected in the form of designation of the place within which an action is performed” [Valieva 2014: 61].

Scholars consider the category of space to be a functional-semantic field covering the multi-level means of a given language which are involved in the expression of spatial relations [Nevskaya 2005: 10].

Spatial elements of a language constitute one of the most important functional-semantic systems, which includes a variety of lexical, morphological, and syntactic means.

This dissertation examines multi-level means of expressing spatial relations in the OTRM language. For this purpose, we identify the types of spatial relations conveyed by grammaticalized means of the Turkic languages, and offer the description of the semantic field of “spatiality,” the semantics and structure of postposition+case combinations, cases with locative semantics, as well as other morphological elements capable of conveying spatial semantics. Besides, linguistic subsystems aimed at expressing certain types of spatial relations have been analyzed. In the course of the study, we offer structural-semantic descriptions of spatial syntactic constructions which express the relations of spatial localization of objects and events, and examine their internal structure and semantics.

Within the framework of Turkology, the studies of I. A. Nevskaya [2005], A. N. Chugunekova [2019] and others focus on the category of space; the scholars mostly consider the expression plane of this category.

The adverbial of place indicates the place where an action is performed or a feature is manifested. Comparing the world languages, one can find a wide range of formal means used to express spatial relations, from purely grammatical to lexical ones. All of them are jointly involved in the expression of spatial relations.

In the OTRM texts, spatial relations are rendered by lexical, morphological and syntactic means.

Spatial semantics in the Turkic languages can be carried by word forms in locative-ablative, directive and ablative cases, constructions with postpositional words that indicate the location or points of objects' and phenomena' movement, and also

adverbs. In the texts of OTRM, the adverbial of place can be expressed by utilizing the following models.

4.3.2.1. *The adverbial of place is represented by a noun.*

1.1. *The adverbial of place represented by a noun in the locative-ablative case:*

129.

Ötükän jışda jig idi jok ärmis (KTm 4)

Ötükän                    jış-da                    jig                    idi                    jok                    är-mis

The Land of Otuken – LOCABL                    ruler was                    not                    to be – PRF

‘There was no good (i.e. real) ruler in the Land of Otuken’

*The adverbial of place represented by a noun in the directive case:*

130.

Tämir kapıya täqi sülädim (KTm 4)

Tämir                    kapı-ya                    täqi                    sülä-di-m

Темир                    капы – DIR                    till                    to lead army – PST-1SG

‘I marched with the army all the way to Temir kapyg’

In this example, **Tämir kapıya täqi** is an adverbial of place, which is represented by the first izafet in the directive case with the postposition **täqi**.

*The adverbial of place represented by a noun in the ablative case:*

131.

Öñdän qayanıaru sü jorilim (T29)

Öñ-dän                    qayan-ıaru                    sü                    jori-lim



East – ABLkagan – DIR                      army to send – 1PL. IMP

‘We will send the army to the kagan from the east’

The ablative case is used here in the adverbial-determinative function: "the eastern kagan," "kagan from the east."

Thus, in the Old Turkic language, three cases are involved in the expression of spatial relations. The locative-ablative case is used to express location in a physical or social space. The directive case is used to indicate a direction (without reaching a point of reference) somewhere in space. The semantics of indicating a place that is being left or from which something is being withdrawn is conveyed by the ablative case.

#### *4.3.2.2. The adverbial of place is expressed by utilizing postpositional constructions.*

Constructions with postpositional words in the Old Turkic language contain spatial semantics. Postpositions can indicate the location, direction, or point of objects' movement.

As I.A. Nevskaya notes, "As a classification criterion of such postpositions, the type of case government of the spatial name is traditionally established" [Nevskaya 2005: 121]. According to this feature, the postpositions of the Old Turkic language can be divided into postpositions which govern the nominative, accusative, dative, directive and ablative cases.

Spatial postpositions include: **tägi**, **örä**, **ičrä**, **ičintä**, **ara**, **qodï**, **saju**, **tapa**.

The postposition **tägi**, which governs the dative case, shows the direction of action, and indicates the limit in time and space [Kononov 1980: 205].

132.

İlgärü Šantun jazıka tägi sülädim (Ktm3)

İlgärü            Šantun                            jazı-ka                            tägi

Ahead      Shantung                      valley – DAT      till  
 sülä-di-m

to lead army – PST – 1SG

‘Forward (i.e. eastward) I marched with the army all the way to the Shantung Valley.’

In this example, the adverbial qualification, in addition to the meaning of "direction," also bears the meaning of "time" (**İlgärü**, **birgärü**) and "place" (**Šantun jazika**).

The postposition **önrä** translates "in front, before, previously" (DTS 387) and serves to signify temporal, spatial relations:

133.

Özimin önrä biŋa bašit i(d)tī (Mč6)

Özimin      önrä                      biŋ-a                      bašit              i(d)-tī

Me    ahead – POST              thousand –DATLOC              chief to send – PST

‘He sent me ahead as the chief of a thousand (warriors)’

The postposition **ičrä** is quite infrequent in the OTRM and denotes spatial relationships. **İč** translates as "inside, interior" + **-rä** is the affix of the dative-directive case.

134.

Sayır içrä älik kijik kirmiš (İB 97)

Sayır      içrä              älik              kijik              kir-miš

Pen      into              female              chamois              to come – PRF

‘Female chamois entered the pen’

In the OTRM, "**ičintä**" is extremely rare, and this postposition denotes spatial relations:

135.

Ben öltim türgiš el ičintä (E 37, 3)

Ben öl-ti-m türgiš el ičintä

I to die – PST – 1SG turgesh tribal union in

‘I died in the Turgesh tribal union’

The postposition **ara** governing the nominative and accusative cases:

136.

Oğuz ara jäti ärän jayı bolmıs (O 5)

Oğuz ara jäti ärän jayı bol-mıs

Oghuz among – POST seven man enemy to be – PRF

‘Among the Oghuz beks, seven men (leaders) were enemies’

The postposition **ara** governing a numeral:

137.

Äkin ara kisi oylı kılınmıs (Ktb1)

Äki-n ara kisi oyl-ı kılın-mıs

Two – ACC between – POST man son – POSS 3SG to appear – PST

‘Between (them) both, the sons of men (i.e. humans) were created (or: came into existence)’

The postposition **qodı** serves to denote spatial relations. This lexical unit also has an independent meaning of ‘the path travelled’ [Kononov 1980: 202]. In the OTRM, it is little used.

138.

Ol sub qodī bardīmiz (T27)

Ol	sub	qodī	bar-dī-miz
This	river	stream	to walk – PST – 1PL

‘We were walking down this river stream.’

In this example, the postposition **qodī** governs the nominative case. In the following example, the same postposition governs the ablative case:

139.

Toyan quš tānridin qodī tabišyan tipän qapmiš (İB 66)

Toyan	quš	tānri-din	qodī	tabišyan
Falcon	bird	sky – ABL	down	hare
tipän	qap-miš			
alive	to catch – PRF			

‘The falcon (swooping) down from the sky, grabbed the hare.’

The postposition **saju** denotes an action that extends to the entire subject; it is governed by the nominative and accusative cases [Kononov 1980: 202]. It is little used in the OTRM texts.

140.

Jir saju bardiy (Ktm9)

Jir	saju	bar-dī-γ
Country	all	to wander – PST – 2SG

‘Wandered all over the world’

141.

Otuz yaşıma baş balık tapa sülädim (BK 28)

Otuz yaš-īm-a    baş                        balık                        tapa

Thirty years – 1SG.POSS.DİR                        Besh                        balik towards – POST

sülā-di-m

to lead army – PST – 1SG

‘When I was thirty I went to confront Besh-balik’

4.3.2.3. *The adverbial of place is expressed by an adverb.*

Adverbs occupy a significant part of the vocabulary with spatial semantics in modern Turkic languages. But in the language of OTRM, the adverb was in the state of formation, and had not yet developed as a separate lexical category. V.M. Nasilov notes that “most adverbs are case forms of nouns which are losing or have already lost their affixal productivity, as well as converbial verb forms” [Nasilov 1960: 39-40].

As a rule, adverbs of place express the linguistic space in its basic dimensions. Employing case affixes, adverbs can act as adverbials of place.

An adverb in the directive case:

142.

Jeti ašnuqı iším taşru etilti (E 41, 2)

Jeti ašnuqı                        iš-im    taş-ru    et-il-ti

Sevenprevious                        deed –1SG.POSS                        beyond –DİR to do – COUS – PST

‘My first seven deeds were done outside [my yurt]’

According to A. N. Kononov, here the adverb **taş** “external, outer side” is used in the directive case [Kononov 1980: 137].

An adverb in the ablative case:

143.

Öñdän qayanyaru sü jorilim temis (T29)

Öñ-dän                      qayan-γaru                      sü                      jori-lim                      te-mis

Ahead – ABL                      kagan – DIR                      army                      to go – IMP to say – PST

'He said, "Let's go with the army to the (hostile) kagan from forth (from the east)."

*4.3.2.4. The adverbial of place is conveyed by a nominal word combination:*

144.

Türk sir budun jārintā idi jorimazun (T11)

Türk sir      budun                      jār-i-ntā

Turk sir      people                      place – 3SG.POSS – LOCABL

idi                      jorī-mazun

the owner      to go-NEG

'May he not command in the land of the Turk-Sirs'

*4.3.2.5. The adverbial of place is represented by interrogative pronouns:*

In modern Turkic languages, adverbials of place combined with an interrogative pronoun is quite a frequently observed phenomenon. However, in the language of OTRM, this phenomenon is infrequent, but it can also be found in it.

145.

Kaganlīy budun ārtim, kayanīm kanī (Ktb9)

Kagan-līy                      budun ār-ti-m                      kayan-īm                      kanī

Kagan-DEF/ACC      people to be – PST – 1SG                      kagan – 1SG.POSS                      where

'I was a people who used to have a kagan, where is my kagan'

### 4.3.3 Models of the Adverbial of Time

Along with space, time is considered a universal form of material existence, which expresses the duration of this existence, the sequence of state transformations in the change and development of all material systems and processes in the world [Valieva 2014: 63].

Temporal relations play an important role in the construction of an utterance, participating in the formation of the eventfulness of a syntactic whole. The adverbial relations of temporal semantics are contained in the semantic structure of many sentences, indicating the course, the realization of events within a certain period.

The adverbial of time is a secondary component of an utterance (a member of a sentence), which indicates when the action rendered by the predicate is performed and how long it lasts [Shiraliev, Sevortyan, 1971: 298], in other words, the adverbial of time qualifies the qualified action depending on the time of its performing.

146.

Tün udīsīqīm kālmādi (T12)

Tün                      udīsīq-īm                      kāl-mā-di

night      sleep –1SG.POSS                      to come – NEG – PST

‘My sleep did not come at night’

4.3.3.1. *The adverbials of time are expressed by nouns in various cases.*

*Adverbial qualifications are expressed by nouns in the dative case (or nominal word combinations in the dative case):*

147.

Ančip bars jilka čik tapa joriđim (MČ19)

Ančip bars jil-ka čik tapa jori-di-m

So tiger year – DAT Chik towards – POST to go – PST– 1SG

‘After that, in the year of the tiger, I went on a campaign against the Chicks.’

148.

Bir jilka biš jol süñüşdimiz (KTb44)

Bir jil-ka biš jol süñüş-di-miz

One year – DAT five times to fight – PST –1 PL

‘There was a year when we fought five times’

*A certain moment when the action is being performed is expressed by a form of the instrumental case.*

149.

Ančip ol jil küzün ilgärü joriđim (Mč 20)

Ančip ol jil küz-ün il-gärü jori-di-m

So that year autumn – INST East – CV to go – PST –1SG

‘After that, in the autumn of the same year, I moved eastward.’

4.3.3.2. *The adverbials of time are expressed by nominal word combinations:*

150.

Toŋra tigin joyınta, äqirip ölürtimiz (Ktb47)

Toŋra tigin joy-i-nta

Tonga tegin funeral –3SG.POSS – LOCABL



äqir-ip

ölür-ti-miz

to chase – CV

to kill – PST – 1PL

‘We killed while chasing, at the funeral of Tonga-tegin’

4.3.3.3. *The adverbials of time are expressed by a form of the numeral, ordinal numeral and a numeral combined with a postposition:*

151.

On uɣɣur tokuz oɣuz üzä jüz jil olurup (Mč3)

On uɣɣur tokuz oɣuz üzä jüz jil olur-up

On-Uyghur Tokuz-Oghuz over hundred years to rule – CV

‘Ruling over on-Uighurs and Tokuz-Oghuzes for a hundred years’

152.

Törtinč Äzqänti Kadazda söñüştim (BK 31)

Törtinč Äzqänti Kadaz-da söñüş-ti-m

Thr fourth Ezgenti Kadaz – LOCABL to fight – PST – 1SG

‘The fourth time I fought at Ezgenti Kadaz’

153.

Äbi on kün öñrä ürküp barmış (MČ 31)

Äb-i on kün öñrä ürk-üp bar-mış

house –3SG.POSS ten day before to get scared – CV to flee – PRF

‘His family had fled in fright ten days before’

In this example, “**on kün örä**” (“ten days ago”) is an adverbial of time, and “**ürküp**” (“getting scared”) is an adverbial of manner.

4.3.3.4. *The adverbial of time is expressed by a pronoun.*

154.

Kayan at bunta biz birtimiz (Krb20)

Kayan	at	bunta	biz	bir-ti-miz
Kagan	name – Ø	that time – PRON	we	to give – PST
	– 1PL			

‘We gave (to him) the title of kagan at that time’

4.3.3.5. *The adverbial of time is conveyed by a converb.*

The start of an action is expressed by a converb. In the texts of OTRM, the form -**yalı** denotes an adverbial of time with the semantics of the starting point, the beginning of an action (“since...”):

155.

Türk bodun oluryalı türk qayan oluryalı santun baliq(q)a taluj üzügkä tegmis joq ermis(T18)

Türk	bodun	olur-yalı	türk qayan	olur-yalı
Turkic	people	to sit – CV	Turk kagan	to sit – CV

santun	baliq(q)-a	taluj	üzüg-kä	teg-mis
Shantung	town – DAT	sea river –DAT		to reach – PRF

Joq er-mis

not to be – PRF

‘The Turkic people and the Turkic kagan for (further) inhabiting (conquering) did not reach the city(s) of Shantung and the sea river’

The actions preceding the main action are expressed by the adverbial participle –**ip**:

156.

Tipilip jätmis är bolmīs (Ktb12)

Tipil-ip	jätmis	är	bol-mīs
to gather – CV	seventy	man	to count – PRF

‘Having gathered, they made up seventy men’

If the actions are simultaneous, they occur within the same time interval.

4.3.3.6. *The construction -da käsrä denotes the following of one action after another; the construction indicates that the moment when the action referred to by the adverbial ends is the beginning of the main action:*

157.

Ol ka jok boltukda käsrä äl jitmis (O1)

Ol	ka	jok	box-tukda	käsrä	äl	jet-mic
This khan	not	to become – PTCP	then – POST	the people	to die – PRF	

‘Then, when this khan was gone, (our) people perished’

4.3.3.7. *The adverbial of time is expressed in words that convey a temporal meaning. For example, kičä, küntüz, tün, amfi, etc.*

158.

Jarın kičä altun örgin üzä olurpan mäniläjür män (İB)

Jarın	kičä	altun	örgin	üzä
-------	------	-------	-------	-----

Morning evening golden throne over

Olur-pan                      mənjlä-jür                      män

To sit – CV to rejoice – PRS                      PERSAFF.1SG

‘Morning and evening, sitting on the golden throne, I rejoice’

159.

Tün udimatı küntüz olurmatı (T 51-52)

Tan              hd-mat                      küntüz              olur-at

Night to sleep – NEG – PST day to sit – NEG – PST

‘I didn't sleep at night, having no rest during the day’

160.

Ol amtı anıñ jok (KTm3)

Ol      amtı              anıñ              jok

He      now corruption not

‘They do not have the current corruption’

4.3.3.8. *The adverbial of time is expressed by the adverbs **bängü** ‘eternal’, **taqı** ‘still’:*

161.

Ötükän jış olursar bängü il tuta olurtaçı san (Ktm8)

Ötükän      jış                      olur-sar                      bängü

Otuken      Land                      to stay – COND                      eternal

il      tut-a                      olur-teci san

tribe      to keep – CV                      to sit – PTCP 2SG

‘When you stay in the Land of Otuken, you can live, building your eternal tribal union’

162.

Tanīm tüsi taqī tükämäzkän, taluıda jatıpan, tapladuqımın tutar män (İB 4)

Tan-ım                      tü-si                      taqī    tükä-mäz-kän

My body 1SG.POSS    fruits – 3SG.POSS still    to run out – NEG – CON

Taluı-da                      jat-ıpan    tapla-duq-ım-ın

Sea – DATABL    to locate – CV                      to love – PTCP –1SG.POSS – GEN

Tu-tar                      män

to catch – PTCP            1SG

‘The prey for my body will not run out at all. Being at sea, I catch what I like’

In Turkic languages, temporal relations express the synchronicity and asynchrony of actions and processes. When the relationship is asynchronous, one action precedes another. The preceding action is terminated before the next one begins. In this case, the process either ends naturally, or is stopped under the influence of some other event.

With continuous precedence, one process follows another after its natural completion. In this case, one situation can follow immediately after another without a time interval, or some time after.

#### 4.3.4. Models of the Adverbial of Purpose

According to the definition given by A.G. Pazelskaya and A.B. Shluinsky, the general meaning of the adverbial sentences of purpose is that “the situation described by the dependent predication is carried out in order to cause the beginning of the situation described by the main predication” [Pazelskaya, Shluinsky 2007: 74]. In comparison with modern Turkic languages, in the language of OTRM the adverbials of purpose are relatively seldom used and differ in their way of expression [Rəcəbli 2006: 160].

The adverbial of purpose in the OTRM language can be rendered by various means: by converbs with affixes **-GAIĪ**; **-A**; **-O**; **-U**, by nominal parts of speech in combination with the postposition **üčün** ‘for.’

4.3.4.1. *The converb with the affix -yalī, -gāli represents an action in the form of an adverbial of purpose [Kondratiev 1970: 43].*

Scholars note that this converb was widely used as early as in Old Uyghur monuments (Kononov 1980: 28; Nasilov V.M. 1963: 51).

163.

Öd täñri jasar kisi oylī kor ölgāli törümis (Ktb50)

öd täñri jas-ar kisi oyl-o

time to distribute the sky – FUT man son – POSS.3SG

to op öl-gāli törü-miss

a lot to die – CV to give birth – PRF

‘Time (i.e. destinies, terms) is distributed by heaven (i.e. God), (but, one way or another) the sons of men are born to die’

In the OTRM language, the verbal-nominal form with the affix **-GAIİ**, as is often the case with similar forms, is a multifunctional form and can be used in two functions – substantive and adverbial ones. As an adverbial form – a form of converb – it is intended to indicate the purpose of an action; in a substantive function, as an action noun, the form **-Gäli** also conveys the purpose of the action which is expressed by the predicate of the sentence. It was precisely this mode of functioning that became the basis for identifying this form with the Latin supine [Kononov 1980: 28], [Erdal 2004: 489]. However, according to the definition of O. S. Akhmanova, supine is a kind of verbal noun performing a function close to that of the infinitive with the meaning of purpose [Akhmanova 1966: 462]. A. Ch. Kozarzhevsky’s view is quite similar: “Supininium is a verbal noun expressing purpose of verbs related to the concept of movement: Veni tibi gratulatum. I have come to congratulate you” [Kozarzhevsky 1981: 60]. Nevertheless, it is hardly reasonable to regard the Old Turkic form **-Galİ** as a supine, given its broader functioning than that of the verbal noun, as well as its ability to act as an adverbial in an utterance.

The converbs **-(y)A**, **-(y)İ**, **-(y)U** should be considered as phonetic variants of one morphological form. This form represents as an adverbial both a preceding action and a simultaneous one [Kondratiev 1970: 42]. It is able to carry the semantics of the adverbial of time, purpose, cause and manner [Kononov 1980: 131].

164.

Üč oyuz süsi basa kälti (BK32)

Üč oyuz sü-si bas-a käl-ti

Uch-Oghuz army – 3SG.POSS to suppress – CV to come – PST

‘The Uch-Oghuz army has come to defeat us’

165.

Bars kijik äñläjü mänläjü barmış (İB 74)

Bars kijik äñlä-jü mänlä-jü

Leopard deer to hunt – CV to looking for prey – CV

Barmīs

to go – PRF

‘The leopard beast went hunting for prey ’

In the OTRM language, the same linguistic means have the ability to convey different adverbial meanings: both the semantics of the adverbial of purpose and that of the adverbial of cause. Nevertheless, speech distribution makes it possible to distinguish between these meanings. So, if the converb renders an action performed before the time of performing the main action, then the adverbial of cause is expressed. Conversely, if the form of the converb represents an action that will be performed after the main action, then the adverbial of purpose is employed. For example, in the language of OTRM, the form with the affix **-Īn** can also be used both to express the adverbial of purpose and the adverbial of cause.

From the semantical point of view, the opposition of purpose and cause is quite reasonable, as the time plane to which the situation relates can be a factor of distinction.

166.

Türk budunīy atī küsi jok bolmazun tijin, Kañim kayanīy, oqim katunīy kötürmiš täñri (Ktb 25)

Türk budun- ĩy at-ĩ kü-si

Turk people – GEN name – 3SG.POSS glory – 3SG.POSS

Jock bol-maz-un you-in

Not to disappear – NEG in order to – CV



kaŋ-īm kayan-īy öq-im

father – POSS 1SG kagan – ACC DEF mother – 3SG.POSS

Katun-oy kötür-miš täŋri

Katun – ACCDEF to exalt – PRF Heaven

‘The heaven that exalted my father, kagan, and my mother, katun, so that the name and glory of the Turkic people would not be lost’

The example given above illustrates the fact of using of a converb, which indicates an action performed before the time indicated by the predicate to express the adverbial of cause. In the following example, the action conveyed by the converb is performed after the main action, and accordingly, it communicates the semantics of purpose.

167.

This is iqitäjin tijin, jiryaru oyuz budun täpä ... sunušdim (Ktb 28)

Budun-īy iqit-äjin tij-in

People - ACC DEF to raise - FIN in order to - CV

jir-yaru oyuz budun täpä sünüš-di-m

To the left-DAT Oghuz people towards to fight-PST-1SG

‘In order to raise (my) people, (I moved) to the left (i.e., northward) against the Oghuz people ... (I) fought’

4.3.4.2. In the OTRM texts, the most common way of expressing the adverbial of purpose is the model based on the following pattern:

*The nominal part of speech + the postposition **üçün** ‘for.’*

168.

İltäris Guyan bilig äsin üçün, alpın üçün Tabyaçqa jäti jägirmi sünüşdi (T48-49)

Iltäris Guyan bilig äs-in üçün

Elterish kagan knowledge comrade – 2SG.POSS for – POST

alp-ïn

üçün

Tabyaç-qa

hero – 2SG.POSS for – POST Tabgach – DAT

Jäti Jägirmi sünüs-di

seventeen to fight – PST

‘Elterish Kagan, for the sake of his community with knowledge and heroism, went to fight on Tabgach people seventeen times’

#### 4.3.5. Models of the Adverbial of Cause

The general meaning of the adverbial of cause is that “the situation described by the dependent predication is the reason for unfolding of the situation described by the main predication” [Pazelskaya, Shluinsky 2007: 71].

*4.3.5.1. In the OTRM language, there are the following basic means of expressing the cause: converbs and converbial phrases:*

169.

Üc karluk jablok sakïnïp täzä bardï (Mc 11)

Üc            karluk        jablak        sakîn-îp        tâz-â bardî  
 Three        karluk        bad            to think – CV   to go – CV   to go –PST

‘Three Karluks, with evil intentions, fled’

170.

Bin özüm bilgä TONUQUQ ÖTÜKÄN JÄRİG QONMİS, TÄJİN, ÄSIDİP BÄRİJÄKİ BUDUN ... KÄLTİ  
 (T17)

Bän özüm        bilgä TONUQUQ    ÖTÜKÄN        JÄR-İG        qon-mİS        TÄJİN  
 I        myself        wise Tonyukuk    Otuken        Land –ACC to come-CV

ÄSID-İP            BÄRİJÄKİ        budun        KÄL-Tİ  
 to hear – CV        southern        peoples    to come – PST

‘I myself, the wise Tonyukuk, chose the Land of Otuken as my place of residence, the southern peoples came (to us)’

171.

Biz az biz tijin korkmais (About 7)

Biz    az    biz                            tijin            kork-mİŞ  
 We small    1PL.PERSAFF    so            to be afraid – PST

‘We are small, therefore, we were afraid’

4.3.5.2. *The adverbial of cause is expressed by participles and participial phrases with the postposition **üçün**:*

172.

Täñri jarlıkaduk üçün män kazyantık üçün türk budun kazyanmış arinč (M33)

Täñri jarlıkaduk üçün män kazyantık üçün

Heaven to bestow – PTCP for I to acquire – PTCP for

Türk budun kazyan-mış ärinč

Turkic people to acquire – PST to be

‘Since Heaven was (kind to me) and I (gained so much), the Turkic people also became an acquirer’

In this example, the participle, without taking any affixes, joined the postposition **üçün**. In the following example, the participle **-tuk**, taking possessive affixes, can be attached to the postposition **üçün**.

173.

Täñri jarlıkadukïn üçün ... kayan olirım (Ktm 9)

Täñri jarlıka-duk-ïn üçün kayan ol-ir-ım

Heaven to deign – PTCP – POSS 1SG for Kagan to become –PST-1SG

‘By the grace of heaven ... I was enthroned as a kagan’

4.3.5.3. *The adverbial of cause is expressed by a participle and a participial phrase without a postposition:*

174.

Jayı bolıp itinü jaratunu umaduk jana içikmis (Ktb 10)

jayı bol-ıp itinü jaratunu umaduk

The enemy to become – CV to remove to do for oneself to hope

jana içik-mis

again to go inside– PRF

‘Became an enemy and not being able to (do anything) for oneself’

In the OTRM language, the pronoun, adjective and sometimes noun with the postpositions **üçün** and **ötrü** serve to express causal relations:

175.

Bir äki atlıy jablakın üçün kara budunim öltiη (Mč17)

Bir äki atlıy jablak-un üçün kara

One two famous baseness – ACC because of simple

budun-ım öl-ti-η

people 1SG.POSS to perish – PST-2SG

‘Because of the ignobility of one or two famous (high-ranking) you, my common people, received a severe blow and died’

176.

Anta ötrü qayanıma ötuntüm (T12)

Anta ötrü qayan-ım-a ötün-tü-m

There then kagan – 1SG.POSS – DIR to address – PST – 1SG

‘After that, I made a request to the kagan’

#### 4.3.6. Models of the Adverbial of Measure and Degree

*The adverbial of measure and degree denotes the measure and degree of an action and can be expressed as follows:*

4.3.6.1. *The adverbial of measure and degree is expressed by a numeral:*

177.

Iltäris qayan ...Tabyačqa jäti jägirmi sünüsdi (T48-49)

Iltäris qayan      Tabyač-qa      jäti jägirmi      sünüs-di

Elterish kagan      Tabgach – DAT      seventeen      to fight – PST

‘Elterish Kagan ... went to fight on the Tabgach seventeen times’

*The adverbial of measure and degree is expressed by combining a cardinal numeral with a noun conveying the semantics of measure and quantity and the numerative words **joli** “one time” and **qata** “one time”:*

178.

Kanım kayan bunča...kirk artuk(ï jit)i joli sülāmis (Ktb 14-15)

Kan-ım                      kayan              bunča              kirk      artuk (ï jit)i

Father 1SG.POSS              kagan              so much      forty-seven

Joli              sülā-mis

time              to go to war – PST

‘My father, the kagan, went with the army as often as forty-seven times’

*The adverbial of measure and degree is expressed by a cardinal numeral and the word “**jil**” (year):*

179.

Älig jil isiq küčig birmis (Ktb 8)

Älig              jil              isiq              küčig      birmis

Fifty              year              hard work      strength      to give – PST

‘For fifty years they gave (him) their labors and strength’

*The cardinal numeral and the word “aj” (month), “jaš” (a year – about age), the collective numeral “Kop” also serve as the adverbial of measure and degree:*

180.

Eki aj kütdim (MÇ 17)

Eki            aj            kütdim

Two        month        to wait – PST – 1SG

‘I have been waiting for two months’

181.

Kül tigin ö(lıp) kırk artukī jiti jašīŋ boltī (Ktb 53 13)

Kül tigin            ö(lıp)                            kırk artukī            jiti    jašīŋ            boltī

Kul Tegin            to die-CV                            forty seven            year            to be

‘Kul Tegin was dying when he was forty-seven years old’

182.

Sü sülä-pän tört buluŋdakī budunīy kop almīs (Ktb2)

Sü            sülä-pän                            tört            buluŋ-da-kī

Army        to go – CV                            four            corner – DATABL – SREP

Budun-īy            kop            al-mīs

people – ACC        all            to conquer – PST

‘Marching with their army, they conquered all the peoples who lived in the four corners’

4.3.6.2. *The adverbial of measure and degree is expressed by adverbs:*

183.

Az budunīy üküš kiltim (Ktm 10)

Az	budun-ïγ	üküş	kīl-tī-m
Poor	people – ACC	rich	to make – PST – 1SG

‘(I) transformed a poor people into a rich one’

#### 4.3.7. Models of the Adverbial of Condition

Models of conditional adverbials, generally, mean that “the situation described by the dependent predication is a condition for the situation described by the main predication to unfold” (Pazelskaya, Shluinsky 2007: 27).

Models of conditional adverbials signify the condition under which an action is performed, and are expressed by the form **–sar, –sär**.

In the Orkhon monuments, the conditional converb **–sar, –sär** appears only in the adverbial function as a predicate of a dependent clause. Meanwhile, in the Yenisei inscriptions, the affixes **–sar, –sär** are also used in the attributive function [Kononov 1980: 132].

Conditional sentences are usually categorized into three semantic types.

4.3.7.1. Conditional constructions with a hypothetical condition, characterized by the fact that the speaker does not know whether the situation described by the dependent predication has been fulfilled or will be fulfilled in reality. The predicate in this case is expressed by the present-future, future definite tenses, forms of the optative mood:

184.

Bir todsar ačsīk ömäzsän (Ktm 8)

Bir	tod-sar	ač-sīk	ö-maz-siän
-----	---------	--------	------------



One to be full – COND hungry – PTCP to think – NEG – 2SG

‘Once you are full, you will not experience (the state of) hunger’

4.3.7.2. Conditional constructions with a real condition, characterized by the fact that the situation described by the dependent predication has been fulfilled or is being fulfilled in reality. The predicate is expressed by the forms of the broad tense, future definite, imperative forms, nominal predicate:

185.

Ol jirqärü barsar türk bodun öltäčisän (Ktm 8)

Ol jir-qärü bar-sar türk budun

That country – DIR to go – COND Turkic people

öl-täči-sän

to die – PTCP – 2SG

“Turkic people, when you go to that country, you approach the verge of death.”

4.3.7.3. Conditional constructions with an unreal condition, characterized by the fact that the situation described by the dependent predication has not been fulfilled or is not being fulfilled in reality. The predicate is represented by the following forms: past definite tense, reported past (Turkish non-defined past) and future-past:

186.

är ärdäm älim bolsar bodun isrik jörümädi (E29,2)

är ärdäm älim bol-sar

Hero valour el -1 SG.POSS to possess – COND

Bodun isrik jörü-mädi

People to walk – NEG – PST

‘If my el had had heroic valour, the people would not have been unruly.’

The unreal condition can also be expressed by a combination of the past definite tense + modality with **ersär**:

187.

Kälir ärsär, kü är ükülür, käl-müz ärsär tiliy sabiy ali olur (T32)

Kas-ir      ärsär                      kü              är      ükül-ür

to come – PRS    to be – COND    famous    man    to increase –PRS

Käl-müz                      är-sär                      til-iy                      sab-iy

to come – NEG    to be – COND    language – ACC    word – ACC

Al-i                              ol-ur

to take – CV                      to be – IMP

‘If (anyone) had desired to come, (the number of) noble warriors would have increased, if (no one) had desired to come, take the “tongues,” (collect) information (about the enemies)’

The adverbial of manner can be rendered by an adverb, an adjective, a converb, a noun in the ectative case –**čä**, by the accusative cases, postpositional constructions **täq**, **birlä**. Taken all together, six models have been discovered.

Spatial semantics in the Turkic languages can be conveyed by word forms in the locative-ablative, directive and ablative cases, constructions with postpositional words (which indicate the location or points of movement of objects and phenomena), as well as adverbs. Five models have been revealed.

The adverbials of time can be represented by nouns in various cases; by nominal word combinations; by various forms of the numeral, by ordinal numerals and numerals in combination with postpositions; by pronouns; by converbs; by the

construction **-da käsrä**; by words that render a temporary semantics; by adverbs. In sum, eight models have been found.

The adverbial of purpose in the OTRM language can be rendered by various means: by converbs with the affixes **-GAIİ**; **-A**; **-İ**; **-U**, by nominal parts of speech in combination with the postposition **üçün** ‘for.’ Two models have been identified.

The basic means of expressing the cause are the following: converbs and converbial phrases, participles and participial phrases with the postposition **üçün**, participles and participial phrases with no postposition, nouns with postpositions **üçün** and **ötrü**. Six models have been revealed.

The adverbial of measure and degree may be expressed by numerals and adverbs; it forms two models.

The adverbial of condition denotes the conditions under which the action is performed, and is expressed in the form **-sar**, **-sär**; it is represented by one construction.

## CONCLUSION

In the course of the study, syntactic models in the language of Old Turkic runic monuments have been analyzed. The dissertation has been founded on the idea that syntax is a language subsystem containing a limited set of inventory syntactic models. Specific speech utterances are based on typical syntactic structures, the components of which may be connected by one of three kinds of syntactic connection: namely, a copulative, attributive, or predicative connection. The three types of connection have been identified in the language of OTRM.

The dissertation consists of four chapters. The first chapter focuses on the conceptual and terminological apparatus of the research and on the examination of such fundamental concepts for this topic as language, speech and, respectively, phoneme and sound, moneme and sign, morpheme and morph/allomorph/affix, form and word form, model, syntactic construction and utterance, sentence.

The second chapter addresses **copulative syntactic models**. Due to their limited manifestation in the language of OTRM, copulative models previously remained underexplored and did not become the object of separate studies. We have revealed and analyzed five copulative models.

In the OTRM language, the components of copulative models are combined on the basis of morphological similarity and the following basic semantic features of their components: a) semantic similarity and synonymy; b) antonymy; c) binarity.

The analysis has made it possible to confirm that such constructions are a combination of two or more notional words that have the same syntactic function in an utterance. Here are the schemes of copulative models identified in the course of the study:

1. N + N + N + P

2. N + POSS + PER + PER + PER

3. ADJ + NEG + ADJ + NEG + ADJ + ADJ + PST

4. POSS + DATLOC + POSS + DAT + CV + PST

5. COND + NOUN + DAT + COND + NOUN + DIR + COND + COND + DIR

According to the results of the research conducted in the Third Chapter, it can be stated that almost all forms available within the morphological subsystem of the OTRM language can act as a syntactic predicate in an utterance. **The predicative model S + P**, the purpose of which consists in the transmission of thought in the form of a judgment, is an important linguistic tool from a communicative point of view, since it is with the help of this model that sentences and predicative utterances conveying a complete meaning are constructed in speech. Meanwhile, the variety of speech realizations of this model, recorded in the OTRM texts, fully corresponds to the idea that an unlimited number of speech utterances can be constructed on the basis of a limited number of linguistic units.

According to the results of the study, the general syntactic model “Subject – Predicate” is represented by at least two main models:

- 1) The Subject – The Nominal Predicate;
- 2) The Subject – The Verbal Predicate.

The methods of rendering the subject, nominal and predicative predicates have been clarified. It has been discovered that in the language of OTRM, the subject can be represented by a noun, a pronoun, nominalized words, nominal word combinations, forms of secondary representation of the noun, verbal nouns, participles, substantive-adjectival forms (SAF). All in all, there are **eight models**:

1. N + P

2. PRON + NUM + P

3. N + 3SG.POSS + P

4. SAF + P

5. IZAF + P

6. N + LOC + SREP + P

7. VN + P

8. PTCP + P

In the language of the OTRM texts, the predicate (if it is a verbal predicate) can be expressed by tense forms, modal forms, complex forms, analytical forms, and converbs. The verbal predicate is represented by **five models**:

1. S + P<sub>VF</sub>

2. S + P<sub>MV</sub>

3. S + P<sub>COMP V</sub>

4. S + P<sub>ASP</sub>

5. S + P<sub>CV</sub>

In its turn, the nominal predicate can be rendered by a noun, pronoun, adjective, numeral, verbal nouns, participles; they amount to **seven models**.

1. S + N + PST

2. S + ADJ

3. S + PTCP

4. S + IZAF

5. S + IZAF + POST + PST

6. S + NUM + PRF

7. S + PRE + PRF

The fourth chapter focuses on the **attributive models** in the OTRM language, which are represented by three varieties: 1) Attributive models; 2) Complementary models; 3) Adverbial models.

Attributive models are understood as such constructions in which the connection of an object or action with a feature attributed to it or stated in it is reflected and generalized. In the course of the study, we have discovered that in the OTRM language, determinants can be rendered by models with an adjective, participle, SAF, numerals, pronouns, nominal word combinations. Thus, **six models** performing the attributive function have been identified in the OTRM language:

1. ADJ + N + GEN + P
2. PTCP + N + POSS + V + NEG PTCP + P
3. N + POSS + V + NEG + SAF + N
4. N + POSS + N + NUM + P
5. PRON + N + P
6. N + N + 3SG.POSS + P

**Complements** can be divided into two main types: direct and indirect ones. A direct complement can be marked with an accusative affix or remain without a case affix. Depending on the use of the accusative affixes, the direct complement can be classified into two types: definite and indefinite ones. Whereas the definite direct object in the texts of OTRM can be represented by a noun in the accusative case, the indefinite direct object can be conveyed by a noun in the indefinite accusative case, i.e. without affixes.

It can be represented by any word or word form bearing substantive semantics: a noun in the accusative case, a pronoun, a locative adjective, a nominalized part of speech, as well as an izafetic word combination.

The noun, marked by the accusative case, signifies a definite object and marks a direct complement.

1. POSS + ACCDEF + NEG + PST

The analysis of the factual material of the OTRM texts has also shown that the noun in the role of an adjacent complement without the accusative affix often represents an indefinite object. In the texts of OTRM, the adjacent direct complement is often used in the indefinite accusative case. This occurs when the object to which the transitive verb refers is not isolated from homogeneous objects and represents a cumulative set of objects, i.e. the noun is used in its collective meaning.

2. AC IND + CV + AC IND + CV+ PST

In the OTRM language, an indirect object is rendered using various case forms, by means of postpositions included in word combinations, by a pronoun with a substantive meaning, a nominal phrase (izafet), a substantive-adjectival form (SAF).

1. N+ DAT + PST

2. N + POSSE + N + POST +POST

3. PRON + DAT + PRS

4. IZAF + GEN + 3SG.POSS + CV + PRF

5. SAF + POSS + ACC DEF

In the course of the study, we have identified **seven models** in the language of OTRM.

There are the following types of adverbial syntactic constructions in the OTRM:

- 1) Models of the adverbial of manner;
- 2) Models of the adverbial of place;
- 3) Models of the adverbial of time;
- 4) Models of the adverbial of purpose;



- 5) Models of the adverbial of cause;
- 6) Models of the adverbial of measure and degree;
- 7) Models of the adverbial of condition.

The adverbial of manner can be expressed by an adverb, an adjective, a converb, a noun in the ectative case –**čä**, accusative cases, postpositional constructions **täq**, **birlä**. All in all, **six models** have been identified:

1. ADV + IMP + ADV + IMP
2. ADJ + PST
3. N + CV + N + CV + PTCP + PST
4. N + EKV + CV + PST
5. N + ACC + PRS
6. N + POSS + POST + PST

Spatial semantics in the Turkic languages may be conveyed by word forms in the locative-ablative, directive and ablative cases, constructions with postpositional words that indicate the location or points of movement of objects and phenomena, as well as adverbs. **Five models** have been discovered:

1. N + ABL + DIR + N + PST
2. N + DAT + POST + PST
3. DAT TER + N + PRF
4. N + 3SG.POSS + DAT + PST
5. N + PST + N + PRON

The adverbials of time can be rendered by nouns in various cases; by nominal word combinations; by forms of the numeral, of ordinal numerals and numerals in combination with postpositions; by the pronoun; by the converb; by the construction

**-da käsrä**; by words that express temporal semantics; by the adverb. In total, **eight models** have been found.

1. N + DAT + N + POST + PST
2. N + 3SG.POSS + LOCABL + CV + PST
3. N + NUM + CV
4. N + PRON + PST + 1PL
5. N + CV + N + CV + DAT + N + DAT + PRF
6. N + PTCP + POST + N + PRF
7. ADV + IZAF + CV + PRS
8. N + COND +ADV + N + CV + PTCP + 2SG

The adverbial of purpose in the OTRM language can be expressed by various means: by converbs with affixes **-GAIİ**; **-A**; **-İ**; **-U**, by nominal parts of speech in combination with the postposition **üčün** 'for.' **Two models** have been identified:

1. N + FUT + N + POSS.3SG + CV + PRF
2. N+ 2SG.POSS + POST + 2SG.POSS + POST + DAT + PST

In the OTRM language, there are the following basic means of rendering the cause: converbs and converbial phrases, participles and participial phrases with the postposition **üčün**, participles and participial phrases with no postposition, nouns with postpositions **üčün** and **ötrü**. All in all, **six models** have been detected:

1. N+ CV + CV + PST
2. N + ACC + CV + CV + N + PST
3. PTCP + POST + PRON + PTCP + N +PST
4. PTCP + POSS + POST + N +PST
5. N + AFTER + N + 1SG.POSS + PST

## 6. AFTER + 1SG.POSS + DIR +PST

The adverbial of measure and degree can be rendered by numerals and adverbs, and forms **two models**:

1. N + DAT + NUM + PST

2. N + ACC + ADV + PST

The conditional adverbial model designates the conditions under which an action is performed, and may be expressed by the forms **–sar, –sär**; it is represented by **one construction**:

PRON + DIR + COND + N + PTCP

The total number of models revealed in the course of the study is 68; these models are illustrated with 187 examples.

In the future research, guided by the developed classification of syntactic constructions in the language of OTRM, we shall be able to propose a hypothetical model of the emergence and formation of structural units in modern Turkic languages, which currently pass through the corresponding stage of the genetic development and thus represent later-evolved languages in diachronic terms (Azerbaijani, Turkish).

**THE LIST OF ACRONYMS**

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ACCDEF	accusative definite
ACCIND	accusative indefinite
ACTN	action name
ADJ	adjective
APP NUM	approximate numeral
AUX	auxiliary
CAUS	causative
COND	conditional mood
CV	converb
DAT	dative
DERAFF	derivational affix
DIR	directive
EXCONS	exhibition consonant
FUT	future

GEN	genitive
IMP	imperative
INST	instrumental
LOC	locative
NOUN	noun
NEG	non- (negative)
OPT	optative
ORD	ordinal
P	predicate
PASS	passive
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
POST	postposition
PRON	pronoun
REF PRON	reflexive pronoun
PRF	perfect
PRS	present
PTCP	participle
PST	past
PTN	potential
S	subject
SAF	substantive-adjektive form

SG	singular
SREP	secondary representation
V	verb
VN	verbnoun

## THE LIST OF SOURCES

- OTRM                    Old Turkic runic monuments
- E                        Yenisei Inscriptions
- Kč     “Kul-Chur Inscription”: Malov S.E. Old Turkic Runic Monuments of Mongolia and Kirghizia. – Moscow, Leningrad, 1959. P. 25-30.
- Ktm, Ktb                The Monument for Kul Tigin (The Minor and Major Inscriptions):  
Malov S.E. Old Turkic Runic Monuments. Moscow, Leningrad, 1951. P. 19-27.
- M, Mxa, MXb                        “The Bilge Qaghan Monument”: Old Turkic Runic Monuments of Mongolia and Kirghizia. – Moscow, Leningrad, 1959. P. 11-25.
- Mč                        “The Mo-yun Chur Monument”: Old Turkic Runic Monuments of Mongolia and Kirghizia. – Moscow, Leningrad, 1959. P. 30-44.
- T.                        “The Tonyukuk Monument”: Malov S.E. Old Turkic Runic Monuments. Moscow, Leningrad, 1951. P. 56-70.
- İ B                        “The Book of Divination” (Yrq bitig): Malov S.E. Old Turkic Runic Monuments. Moscow, Leningrad, 1951. P. 80-92.
- O                        «Онгиниский памятник»: Old Turkic Runic Monuments of Mongolia and Kirghizia. Moscow, Leningrad, 1959. P. 7-11.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### STUDIES WRITTEN IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES:

1. Abdulla Kamal 2016 – Kamal, A. Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri. Bakı: MTM-İnovation, 2016. 360 s.
2. Alyılmaz Cengiz 2005 – Alyılmaz, C. Orhun Yazıtlarının Bugünkü Durumu. Ankara: Kurmay yayınları, 2005. VIII+276 s.
3. Alışova Demirdağ 2021 – Alışova Demirdağ, E. Azərbaycan Türkçesi Söz Dizimi. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınlar, 2021. 478 s.
4. Dallı 2018 – Dallı, H. Türkçede söz diziminin yapı birimleri. İstanbul: Papatya yay, Eğitim, 2018. 260 s.
5. Erdal 2004 – Erdal, M. A Grammar of Old Turkic. Boston, 2004. 575 p.
6. Kamalova 2018 – Kamalova, Sh. N. On the question of structural units of the Turkic syntax // *TEXTE – Revue de critique et de théorie littéraire*. 2018. Vol. 13. Issue 4. P. 27–30.
7. Kamalova 2019 – Kamalova, Sh. N. Izafet in Language of Ancient Turkic Runic Inscriptions and Modern Azerbaijan Language // *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken*. München, Germany. VOL. 11, №1, 2019. P. 75–83.
8. Kazımov 2010 – Kazımov, Q. Ş. Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Sintaksis. Bakı: Elm və təhsil, 2010. 500 s.
9. Martinet 1960 – Martinet A. *Eléments de linguistique générale*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1960. 224 p.
10. Musayev 2011 – Musayev, M. Türk ədəbi dillərində mürəkkəb cümlə sintaksisi. Bakı: Kitab aləmi, 2010. 404 s.



11. Orkun 2011 – Orkun, H. N. Eski Türk Yazıtları. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2011. 962 s.
12. Ölmez 2015 – Ölmez, M. Orhon-Uygur Hanlığı Dönemi Moğolustandaki Eski Türk Yazıtları: Mein-Çeviri-Sözlük. Ankara: BilgeSu yayıncılık, 2015. 400 s.
13. Rəcəbli 2006 – Rəcəbli, Ə. Qədim türk yazılı abidələrinin dili. 2 hissədə. I hissə. Bakı: Nurlan, 2006. 648 s. (II hissə 480 s.)
14. Tekin 2003 – Tekin, T. Orhon Türkçesi Grameri. İstanbul: TDAD, 2003. 272 s.
15. Tekin 2020 – Tekin, T. Tonyukuk yazıtı. Ankara: Bilgesu Yayıncılık, 2020. 112 s.
16. Tekin, Ölmez 2014 – Tekin T., Ölmez M. Türk dilleri (-Giriş-). Ankara: Bilgesu Yayıncılık, 2014. 224 s.
17. Şükürlü 1993 – Şükürlü, Ə. C. Qədim türk yazılı abidələrinin dili. Bakı: Maarif, 1993. 336 s.

#### STUDIES WRITTEN IN RUSSIAN AND TRANSLATED INTO RUSSIAN:

1. Akhmanova 1966 – Akhmanova O.S. A Dictionary of Linguistic Terms. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966. 607 p.
2. Akhmanova, Mikaelyan 2013 – Akhmanova O. S., Mikaelyan G. B. Modern Theories of Syntax. Moscow: “LIBROKOM” Book House, 2013. 168 p.
3. Amanzholov – Amanzholov A.S. Verb Government in the System of Words’ Syntactic Connections (Based on the Material of the Old Turkic Language). Moscow: Science, 1969. 103 p.

4. Apresyan 1974 – Apresyan Yu. D. Lexical Semantics: Synonymous Means of Language. Moscow: Science, 1974. 368 p.
5. Avrorin 1975 – Avrorin V. A. Problems of Researching the Functional Side of Language (Revisiting the Purpose of Sociolinguistics). Leningrad: Science, 1975. 276 p.
6. Avrutina 2011 – Avrutina A. S. Old Turkic Runiform Script: Writing System and Phonological Reconstruction. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2011. 136 p.
7. Baizhanova 1999 – Baizhanova N.R. Basic Structural Scheme  $N_1-V_f$  of the Elementary Simple Sentence in the Altai Language: A diss. subm. for the degree of Candidate in Philology. Novosibirsk, 1999. 158 p.
8. Baizhanova 2004 – Baizhanova N.R. The Models of Elementary Simple Sentences in the Altai Language: The Structural Scheme  $N_1-V_f$ . Novosibirsk: Science, 2004. 176 p.
9. Baskakov 2006 – Baskakov N. A. A Historical and Typological Description of Turkic Languages' Structure: Word Combination and Sentence. Moscow: KomKniga, 2006. 288 p.
10. Baskakov 1984 – Baskakov A.N. Sentences in Modern Turkish. Moscow: Science, 1984. 200 p.
11. Baskakov 1952 – Baskakov N. A. The Karakalpak Language. Phonetics and Morphology (Parts of Speech and Word Formation). Part 1. / N. A. Baskakov. Moscow: The Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1952. 543 p.
12. Baskakov 1974 – Baskakov A. N. Word Combination in Modern Turkish. Moscow: Science, 1974. 186 p.
13. Baudouin de Courtenay 1963 – Baudouin de Courtenay I.A. Selected Words on General Linguistics. Vol. II. Moscow: The USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing, 1963. 391 p.

14. Beloshapkova 1997 – Beloshapkova V. A. Syntax // The Modern Russian Language. Moscow: Azbukovnik, 1997. P. 532–772.
15. Cheremisina 2002 – Cheremisina M. I. Analytical Constructions of the Infinitive Type in the Turkic Languages of the Southern Siberia // Languages of Siberian Indigenous Peoples. Iss. 8. Novosibirsk, 2002.
16. Cheremisina 1995 – Cheremisina M. I. On Consistency in the Area of Sentence Models: (As Exemplified in Siberian Languages) // Languages of Siberian Indigenous Peoples. Iss. I. Novosibirsk, 1995. P. 56–61.
17. Cheremisina 1989 – Cheremisina M. I. On Some Theoretical Questions Concerning Model Description of Sentences // Sentence in Siberian Languages. Novosibirsk, 1989. P. 3–18.
18. Cheremisina, Ozonova, Tazranova 2008 – Cheremisina M. I., Ozonova A. A., Tazranova A. R. Elementary Simple Sentences with Verbal Predicate in the Turkic Languages of the Southern Siberia / Editor-in-chief E.K. Skribnik. Novosibirsk: “Lyubava,” 2008. 205 p.
19. Cheremisina, Skribnik 1996 – Cheremisina M. I., Skribnik E. K. On the System of Models of Elementary Simple Sentences in Siberian Languages // Humanities in Siberia. 1996. №4. P. 46–57.
20. Chomsky 1972 – Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Moscow: Moscow University Publishing, 1972. 129 p.
21. Chomsky 2018 – Chomsky N. Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought. Moscow: URSS, 2018. 232 p.
22. Chugunekova 2019 – Chugunekova A. N. The Category of Spatiality in the Khakass Language. Abakan, 2019. 160 p.
23. Chugunekova 1998 – Chugunekova A.N. Verbs of Motion and the Models of Simple Sentence Formed by Verbs of Motion (as Exemplified in the Khakass

Language): A Diss. subm. for the Degree of Candidate in Philology. Novosibirsk, 1998.

24. Dubrovina 2015 – Dubrovina M. E. About the Stages of Development of the Attributive Substantive Constructions (Izafets) in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments (Compared to Modern Turkish) // Bulletin of Saint Petersburg State University. Asian and African Studies. Iss. 1. 2015. P. 12–21.

25. Dubrovina 2010 – Dubrovina M.E. Morphology of the Language of Old Turkic Runic Inscriptions. Substantive Inflection. An Analysis of Tendencies Common for Turkic Languages. Lambert Academic Publishing, 2010. 239 p.

26. Dubrovina 2011 – Dubrovina M.E. The Category of Aspect in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // Essays on Theoretical Grammar of Eastern Languages / Ed. by V.G. Guzev. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University Publishing, 2011. P. 141–158.

27. Dubrovina, Kamalova 2017 – Dubrovina M.E., Kamalova Sh. N. On the Concept of “Syntactic Model” as Applied to Turkic Languages (on the Material of Old Turkic Runic Monuments) // Modern Problems of Humanities in the World. Iss. IV. Collection of Scientific Papers Following the International Applied Science Conference (11<sup>th</sup> June 2017), Kazan. P. 61–65.

28. Gadzhieva 1968 – Gadzhieva N.Z. On the Methods for Comparative Historical Analysis of Syntax // Topics in the Study of Language. Moscow: Science, 1968. № 3. P. 19–30.

29. Gadzhieva, Serebrennikov 1986 – Gadzhieva N.Z., Serebrennikov B.A. A Comparative Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages. Syntax / Chief edito E.R. Tenishev. Moscow: Science, 1986. 284 p.

30. The Grammar of Azerbaijani (Phonetics, Morphology and Syntax) / Ed. by M. Sh. Shiraliev and E. V. Sevortyan. Baku: Elm, 1971. 416 p.

31. The Grammar of Modern Literary Russian / Ed. by N. Yu. Shvedova. Moscow: Science, 1970. 767 p.
32. Guzev 1976 – Guzev V.G. The System of Turkic Verb's Nominal Forms as a Morphological Category (As Exemplified in Old Anatolian Turkish and Modern Turkish) // *Turcologica*. In Honour of 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Professor A.N. Kononov's Birth. Leningrad: Science, Leningrad Department. 1976. P. 61-65.
33. Guzev 1987 – Guzev V. G. Essays on the Theory of Turkic Inflection: The Noun (as Exemplified in Old Anatolian Turkish). Leningrad: Leningrad State University Publishing, 1987. 146 p.
34. Guzev 1990 – Guzev V. G. Essays on the Theory of Turkic Inflection: The Verb (as Exemplified in Old Anatolian Turkish). Leningrad: Leningrad State University Publishing, 1990. 168 p.
35. Guzev 2011 – Guzev V. G. On Distinguishing the Terms “Morpheme” and “Moneme” // *Linguistics from the Orient to the Occident*. In Honour of the 70<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of V.B. Kasevich. Saint Petersburg: Department of Philology of Saint Petersburg State University, 2011. P. 29–34.
36. Guzev 2015 – Guzev V. G. Theoretical Grammar of Turkish. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University Publishing, 2015. 320 p.
37. Guzev, Burykin 2007 – Guzev V. G., Burykin A. A. General Constructional Characteristics of Agglutinative Languages // *Acta linguistica Petropolitana*. Writings of The Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Vol. 3. Part 1. Saint Petersburg: Nestor-History, 2007. P. 109–118.
38. Guzev, Nasilov 1975 – Guzev V. G., Nasilov D. M. On Interpreting the Category of Noun Quantity in Turkic Languages // *Topics in the Study of Language*. № 3. 1975. P. 98–111.

39. Guzev, Avrutina 2013 – Guzev V. G., Avrutina A.S. Functional Syntax of Modern Turkish. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University Publishing, 2013. 72 p.
40. Humboldt 2000 – Humboldt W. Selected Studies on Linguistics. Moscow: Progress, 2000. 397 p.
41. Iskhakov and Palmbakh 1961 – Iskhakov F.G., Palmbakh A.A. A Grammar of Tuvinian Language: Phonetics and Morphology. Moscow: Eastern Literature Publishing, 1961. 470 p.
42. Kamalova 2017 (a) – Kamalova Sh.N. Substantive attributive construction (izafet) (In the language of ancient Turkic runic inscriptions and in modern Azerbaijani language) // Philological Disciplines. Theoretical and Practical Issues. №5 (71). 2017. Part 3. “Letters.” P. 93–96.
43. Kamalova 2017 (б) – Kamalova Sh.N. Analytical Forms in Predicative Constructions as Exemplified in the Texts of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // International Academic Conference “Ivanov Readings.” Saint Petersburg, 9<sup>th</sup> May 2017.P. 41-47.
44. Kamalova 2019 (a) – Kamalova Sh. N. The Predicative Model in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // Pyatigorsk State University Bulletin. 2018. № 4. P. 94-97.
45. Kamalova 2018 – Kamalova Sh.N. An Analysis of Syntactic Predicative Models in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // Türkologiya. Bakı. 2018. № 4. C. 8–20.
46. Kamalova 2019 (б) – Kamalova Sh.N. Means of Conveying the Adverbial of Place in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // Proceedings of Russia-wide Scientific Symposium with International Participation “Sentence as a Unit of Language and Speech,” dedicated to 95<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of M.I. Cheremisina’s Birth (Novosibirsk, 8<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> October 2019). Novosibirsk. 2019. P. 73–75.

47. Kamalova 2020 – Kamalova Sh. N. The Copulative Model in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments and Modern Azerbaijani // *Studies in Turkic Philology. Issue XIII: Proceedings of Dmitriev Readings / Chief editor M.M. Repenkova, E.A. Oganova; ed. by O.N. Kameneva, E.M. Napolnova, A.V. Chivrikova; Lomonosov Moscow State University, The Institute of Asian and African Countries. – Moscow: MBA Publishing, 2020. P. 122–132.*
48. Kamalova 2023 (a) – Kamalova Sh. N. Models of Indirect Complement in the Language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // *Philological Disciplines. Theoretical and Practical Issues. 2023. Vol. 16, Iss. 11. P. 3809-3815.*
49. Kamalova 2023 (б) – Kamalova Sh. N. The Verbal Predicate in the language of Old Turkic Runic Monuments // *X. Uluslararası Türkoloji Kongresi, Hoca Ahmet Yasevi Uluslararası Türk-Kazak universiteti, Türküstan (Kazakistan), Bildiribi Kitabı. Ankara, 2023. S. 1283–1298.*
50. Kasevich 1988 – Kasevich V.B. *Semantics. Morphology. Syntax. Moscow: Science; The Chief Editorial Office of Eastern Literature, 1988. 309 p.*
51. Kasevich 2006 – Kasevich V.B. *Studies on Linguistics. Saint Petersburg: Department of Philology of Saint Petersburg State University, 2006. 663 p.*
52. Kazembek 1846 – Kazembek A.K. *General Grammar of Turkic-Tatar Language. Kazan: Univesity Printing House, 1846. 459 p.*
53. Khabibullina 2016 – Khabibullina L.G. Circumstantial Constructions with Syncretical Semantics in Turkic Languages // *Proceedings of Voronezh State University. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication. 2016. № 3. P. 99–101.*
54. Klyashtorny 2006 – Klyashtorny S.G. *Old Turkic Written Monuments and Ethnocultural History of Central Asia. Saint Petersburg: Science, 2006. 591 p.*
55. Kondratyev 1973 – Kondratyev V.G. On the Relation of Orkhon-Yenisey Written Language to the Language of Old Uighur Monuments // *Soviet Turkology. 1973. №3.*

56. Kondratyev 1970 – Kondratyev V. G. A Study on Old Turkic Grammar. Leningrad: Leningrad University Publishing, 1970. 64 p.
57. Kondratyev 1980 – Kondratyev V.G. Periphrastic and Analytical Verb Forms in Old Turkic Language // Asian and African Studies 7. Philological Research. Leningrad, 1980. P. 32–40.
58. Kondratyev 1981 – Kondratyev V. G. Grammatical Construction of Old Turkic Written Monuments of the 8<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> Centuries. Leningrad: Leningrad University Publishing, 1981. 191 p.
59. Kondratyev 1962 – Kondratyev V. G. The Izafet Construction and the Direct Complement in the Language of Old Turkic Written Monuments // Scientific Papers of Leningrad State University. Asian and African Studies. 1962. Iss. 16. № 3, P. 68–79.
60. Kononov 1956 – Kononov A. N. Grammar of Modern Literary Turkish. Moscow – Leningrad: The USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing, 1956. 570 p.
61. Kononov 1980 – Kononov A. N. Grammar of the Language of Turkic Runic Monuments. Leningrad: Science, 1980. 258 p.
62. Kormushin 2004 – Kormushin I. V. Old Turkic Languages. Abakan: The Publishing House of Khakassian State University named after N.F. Katanov, 2004. 336 p.
63. Koshkareva 2005 – Koshkareva N. B. Studies on Syntax of Forest Nenets: Part One. Syntactic Connections / Chief editor A. A. Maltseva. Novosibirsk: Любава, 2005. 334 p.
64. Kozarzhevskiy 1981– Kozarzhevskiy A.Ch. A Latin Textbook. Moscow: Moscow University Publishing, 1981. 312 p.
65. Kyzlasov 1960 – Kyzlasov L. R. A New Dating of Yenisei Written Monuments // Soviet Archaeology. № 3. Moscow, 1960. P. 152–161.



66. Levin 2001 – Levin G. G. Lexican and Semantic Parallels Between Orkhon-Turkic and Yakut Languages (in Comparison with Altaic, Khakassian, Tuvinian Languages). Novosibirsk: Science, 2001. 190 p.
67. Lomtev 1976 – Lomtev T. P. General and Russian Linguistics. Moscow: Science, 1976. 381 p.
68. Lomtev 1969 – Lomtev T. P. The Principles of Constructing the Formula of Sentence // Philological Disciplines. 1969. № 5. P. 3–17.
69. Maizel 1957 – Maizel S. S. Izafet in Turkish. Moscow – Leningrad: The USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing, 1957. 187 p.
70. Malov 1952 – Malov S. E. Old and Modern Turkic Languages // Bulletin of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The Department of Literature and Language. Vol. 11. Iss. 2. 1952. P. 135–143.
71. Malov 1951 – Malov S. E. Old Turkic Written Monuments. Texts and Studies. Moscow – Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing, 1951. 452 p.
72. Malov 1959 – Malov S. E. The Monuments of Old Turkic Writings in Mongolia and Kirghizia. Moscow – Leningrad: The USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing, 1959. 113 p.
73. Maslov 1998 – Maslov Y. S. An Introduction to Linguistics. Moscow, 1998. 272 p.
74. Melnikov 1978a – Baudouin de Courtenay's Interpretation of Language as a System // Language Practice and Theory of Language. Iss. 2. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing, 1978. P. 32–51.
75. Melnikov 2003a – Melnikov G. P. Syntactic Construction of Turkic Languages as Viewed from the Position of System Linguistics // Peoples of Asia and Africa. № 6. Moscow, 2003. P. 104–113.

76. Melnikov 2003b – Melnikov G. P. Systematic Typology of Languages: Principles, Methods, Models. Moscow: Science, 2003. 395 p.
77. Melnikov 1978 – Melnikov G. P. Systemology and Language Aspects of Cybernetics / Ed. by Y.G. Kosarev. Moscow: Soviet Radio, 1978. 368 p.
78. Melnikov 1971 – Melnikov G. P. The Principles of Systematic Linguistics as Applied to the Problems of Turkology // Structure and History of Turkic Languages. Moscow, 1971. P. 121–137.
79. Nasilov 1960 – Nasilov V. M. The Language of Orkhon-Yenisey Monuments. Moscow: Eastern Literature Publishing, 1960. 86 p.
80. Nasilov 1963 – Nasilov V.M. The Old Uyghur Language. Moscow: Eastern Literature Publishing, 1963. 122 p.
81. Nasilov 1974 – Nasilov V. M. The Language of Turkic Monuments Written in Uyghur Language in the 11<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> Centuries. Moscow: Science; The Chief Editorial Office of Eastern Literature, 1974. 102 p.
82. Nevskaya 1997 – Nevskaya I. A. The Typology of Locative Constructions in Turkic Languages of Southern Siberia (on the Material of the Shor Language): A Diss. subm. for the degree of Doctor in Philology. Novosibirsk, 1997. 198 p.
83. OTD – Old Turkic Dictionary / Ed. by V.M. Nadelyaev, D.M. Nasilov, E.R. Tenishev, A.M. Shcherbak. Leningrad: Science, 1969. 676 p.
84. Pavlov 2004 – Pavlov V.M. Revisiting the Subject of Syntax // Theoretical Issues of Linguistics. Papers Collected for the 140<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Department of General Linguistics of Philological Faculty (SPbSU). Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University Press, 2004. P. 248–260.
85. Panfilov 1971 – Panfilov V.Z. The Interrelation of Language and Thought. Moscow: Science, 1971. 232 p.

86. Paul 2014 – Paul H. Principles of the History of Language / Transl. from German and Foreword by S.D. Katznelson. Moscow: “Librokom” Book House, 2014. 504 p.
87. Pazelskaya, Shluinskiy 2007 – Pazelskaya A. G., Shluinskiy A.B. Adverbial Clauses // Lyutikova E. A. et al. (ed.). Mishar Dialect of the Tatar Language. Essays on Syntax and Semantics. Kazan: Magarif, 2007. P. 38–82.
88. Peshkovskiy 1956 – Peshkovskiy A. M. Russian Syntax in Academic Light (Foreword by Professor A.B. Shapiro). Moscow: Pedagogical Publishing, 1956. 511 p.
89. Reformatskiy 1996 – Reformatskiy A.A. An Introduction to Linguistics / Ed. by V.A. Vinogradov. Moscow: Aspect Press, 1996. 536 p.
90. Sagaan 1998 – Sagaan N.Y. The System of Means of Conveying Spatial Relations in the Tuvinian Language: Author’s Summary of a Diss. subm. for the Degree of Candidate in Philology. – Novosibirsk, 1998. 21 p.
91. Saussure 1998 – Saussure F. de. Cours de linguistique générale / Transl. from French by A.M. Sukhotin. – Moscow: Logos, 1998. 235 p.
92. Saussure 1977 – Saussure F. de. Écrits de linguistique générale / Transl. from French ed. by. A.A. Kholodovich; Ed. M.A. Oborina; Foreword by Prof. N.S. Chemodanov. Moscow: Progress, 1977. 695 p.
93. Sepir 1993 – Sepir E. Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech // Sepir E. Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies. Moscow: Progress, 1993. 654 p.
94. Serebrennikov, Gadzhieva 1986 – Serebrennikov B.A., Gadzhieva N.Z. Comparative-Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages. Moscow: Science, 1986. 301 p.
95. Sereedar – Sereedar N. Ch. Structural-Semantic Types of Models of Existential Sentences in Turkic Languages of the Southern Siberia // The World of Science, Culture, Education. № 1 (44). 2014. P. 220–222.

96. Sevortyan 1963 – Sevortyan E.V. On Some Problems of Complex Sentence in Turkic Languages // *Studies in Comparative Grammar of Turkic Languages*. Vol. 3: Syntax. Moscow, 1963. P. 122–135.
97. Talybova – Talybova S.E. Word Combinations in the Modern Persian. <https://www.ayk.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/TALİBOVA-S.-E.-ТАЛЫБОВА-С.-Э-Словосочетания-в-современном-персидском-языке.pdf> (Accessed 28.09.2019).
98. Telitsin 1990 – Telitsin N. N. Non-Finite Verb Forms in Old Uyghur Language (As Exemplified in Old Uyghur Monuments from Xinjiang): A Diss. subm. for the Degree of Candidate in Philology. Л., 1990. P. 104–105.
99. Telitsin 2011 – Telitsin N. N. Non-Finite Verb Forms in Old Uyghur Language // *Essays on Theoretical Grammar of Eastern Languages: the Noun and the Verb*. Saint Petersburg, 2011. P. 179–230.
100. Telitsin 2015 – Telitsin N. N. To the Interpretation of the -sar Form in the Old Uyghur language // *Alkiš bitig. Scripta in honorem D.M. Nasilov. Collection of articles for the 80th anniversary of D.M. Nasilov*. M., 2015. P. 234-238 / Editor-in-chief E.A. Oganova. Moscow, 2015. P. 234–238.
101. Theory of Functional Grammar. Introduction. Aspectuality. Temporal Localization. Taxis / Ed. by A.V. Bondarko. Leningrad: Science, 1987. 358 p.
102. Telyakova 1994 – Telyakova V.M. Simple Sentence in the Shor Language (Compared to Russian): Author's Summary of a Diss. subm. for the Degree of Candidate in Philology. – Novosibirsk, 1994. 24 p.
103. Shvedova 1973 – Shvedova N.Y. Considerations on Describing Structural Schemes of Simple Sentence // *Topics in the Study of Language*. 1973. № 4.
104. Shcherbak 1977 – Shcherbak A. M. Essays on the Comparative Morphology of Turkic Languages (the Noun). Leningrad, 1977. 192 p.

105. Ubryatova 1976 – Ubryatova E.I. Studies in the Syntax of the Yakut Language. II. Complex Sentence. Books I, II. Novosibirsk: Science, 1976. 214 p.
106. Valieva 2014 – Valieva L.G. Adverbial Relations of Situational Plane in Turkic Languages // Bulletin of North Eastern Federal University. 2014. Vol. 11, № 5. P. 60-66.
107. Vinogradov 2001 – Vinogradov V. V. The Russian Language (A Grammatical Theory of Word) / Ed. by G. A. Zolotova. Moscow: The Russian Language, 2001. 720 p.
108. Yuldashev 1965 – Yuldashev A.A. Analytical Verb Forms in Turkic Languages. Moscow: Science, 1965. 275 p.
109. Zolotova 1973 – Zolotova G.A. A Study on Functional Syntax of Russian. Moscow: Science, 1973. 351 p.
110. Zolotova 1982 – Zolotova G.A. Communicative Aspects of Russian Syntax. Moscow: Science, 1982. 368 p.