

IZAFET IN LANGUAGE OF ANCIENT TURKIC RUNIC  
INSCRIPTIONS AND MODERN AZERBAIJAN LANGUAGE

ESKİ TÜRK RUNİK YAZITLARI VE MODERN AZERBAIJAN  
DİLİNDE İZAFET

*Shahnaz KAMALOVA<sup>1</sup>*

**Özet**

Makalede eski Türk runik yazıtlarının dilinde ve modern Azerbaycan dilinde tamlama belirtme öbek yapısı olan izafet konusu incelenmiştir. Eski Türk runik anıtlarının dili modern Azerbaycan dilinin genetik öncüsüdür. Sonuç olarak, bu iki dile dayanarak, izafi sahiplik yapılarının gelişimsel çizgisini hem semantik hem de biçimsel morfolojik bakış açısından izlemekte olduğu bir durumla karşı karşıyayız. Yazar, iki dilde benzer şekillerde izafetin farklı işlevlere sahip olduğu gerçeğine dikkat çekmektedir. Çalışma süresinde, bir belirsizlik kategorisinin oluşumu ve eski Türk anıtı ve modern Azerbaycan dilinde farklı şekillerde izafetin kullanım sıklığı hakkında sonuçlar çıkarılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** izafet; eski Türk runik yazıtlarının dili; Azerbaycan dili

**Abstract**

In this article, the subject of relativity which is the phrase structure of the phrase in the language of the old Turkish runic inscriptions and in the modern Azerbaijani language was examined. The language of the ancient Turkish runic monuments is the genetic precursor of the modern Azerbaijani language. As a result, based on these two languages, we are faced with a situation in which the relative ownership structures of the relative ownership structures follow from both the semantic and formal morphological point of view. The author draws attention to the fact that in two languages similar functions have different functions. At the time of the study, the emergence of a category of uncertainty and the frequency of the use of the old Turkish monument and the different ways of seeing in the modern Azerbaijani language were revealed.

**Key words:** izafet, language of Old Turkic runic monuments, the Azerbaijan language

**INTRODUCTION**

The object of this article is a structural and semantic description of one syntactic model the components of which are linked by an attributive model.

---

<sup>1</sup> Russia, Saint-Petersburg, Researcher, shahnazkamal@gmail.com

In the light of the functional-semantic approach to the study of linguistic phenomena, it is fair to say that a language is a communicative mechanism objectively existing in the psyche of the individual. All units of a language, both inventory and structural, are treated as ideal formations, representing abstract images.

In its turn, speech is a material link of communication. Under speech F. Saussure understood a sign or a set of linearly arranged signs that act as representatives of some kind of thought content. [Saussure1977:51-53; Kasevich 1977:10-12].

In this article, an attempt is made to identify the most often used proper Turkic syntactic models in the ancient Turkic runic monuments (hereinafter referred to as ATRM). According to M.I. Cheremisina M. İ. “the most important syntactic entity is an elementary simple sentence represented in the description with the model, i.e. with a scheme or symbolic formula. The formula fixes the signs necessary and sufficient to single out a given unit and to oppose it to all others.”[1993:47]

Melnikov G. P. states that “in one way or another, every sentence should contain the information on what the subject and the predicate are or where the predicate boundary between parts of the sentence is. Additionally, oftentimes in various languages, the external expression of the relation between the name of something and the definition of this name, between the action and the object of the action, the action and the circumstances of the action, is often obtained ”[1969:107]. Thus, according to G.P. Melnikov in syntax speech patterns have only three types of the most common syntactic structures. A.N Baskakov [1974:18], V.G. Guzev [2015: 259] and Sh. N. Kamalova [2018] who also distinguish three varieties of syntactic models share this viewpoint of G.P.Melnikov:

1. copulative model;
2. predicative model;
3. attributive model.

An attributive model is a structure where one component is specified (i.e., determined, supplemented or circumstantially clarified), and the other is specifying (i.e, definition, addition or circumstance) [Guzev 2015:260]. Determinative, circumstantial and objective subordinate syntactic relations are established between the dominant and dependent components of the word combination. In its turn, the attributive model has three particular varieties: determinative, complementary and circumstantial structure. Determinative structure that generalizes the dependent semantic relationships between the characteristic and its carrier, that is, "clarification of one naming with another" [Melnikov 1969: 107] .

Izafet is one of the varieties of attributive determinative relations. In Turkic languages they convey a very wide range of relationships between objects from personal property relations (i.e., "real belonging", i.e. possessive in a narrow sense) up to such relationships that researchers call "belonging in a broad grammatical sense" [Meisel 1957: 43]. Expressions of such possessive relations in Turkic languages are phrases in which both the first (definition) and the second (determined) components refer to the substantive groups of words among which there can be nouns, pronouns, and also substantive forms of the verb: Safs and Masdars and substantivized participles. Such attributive substantive constructions in Turkic linguistics are called izafet or izafet constructions. S.S. Meisel formulates the content of the concept of "izafet" as follows: "Izafet is a combination of two nouns, one of which is a definition in genitive or indefinite (basic) case and at the same time is a complement to the other which it determines and complements simultaneously" [Meisel 1957: 13].

The language of the ATRM is the genetic precursor of modern Azerbaijan language, and as a result, the author is determined to trace the diachronic line of development of izafetic possessive constructions from both semantic and formal morphological points of view on the basis of these two languages. In this article the analysis of the facts of the language of runic monuments compiled during the period from the VI to IX century is conducted in comparison with modern Azerbaijan language. In the texts of runic monuments, as well as in the modern Azerbaijan language, you can find three types of izafet. However, their use is somewhat different.

Izafetic constructions in Turkic languages are formed in three different ways: in the first case, the first and second components are the basis of the name; in the second case, the first component is the basis of the name, the second is a word form with the personal affix belonging to the 3rd person singular; In the third case, the first component takes affixes of the genitive case, the second one takes affixes belonging to the 3rd person singular.

#### Izafet of the I type

Izafet of the I type is formed by the method of junction. Meisel called izafets of this type "an amorphous type of izafet" [Meisel 1957: 43]. The amorphous character of izafet of the first type brings it very close to the corresponding non-predicative combinations in the analytic languages of Western Europe, but does not identify it with them. Apparently, the first type of izafet historically is the most ancient [Hajiyeva N. Z and oth. 1986: 54]. Therefore, in the language of the ancient Turkic runic monuments the I type of izafet is used more often than the forms of the II and III types of izafet. Even those forms that are used in modern Azerbaijan language as the forms of the II and III type of izafets are considered in the ancient Turkic

languages as the I type of izafet. Those forms of izafet which are used in the ATRM as the I type of izafet are defined in modern Azerbaijan language as the II type of izafet and can be grouped as follows:

1. Definition - the name of the people, the tribe; defined – the word «bodun», «people». For example: Tarduš bodun (Ktb 17) «Tardush people», «Tarduş xalqı» (in Azerb.), Türk kağan (Ktm3) «Turkish khagan», *Türk xaqanı* (in Azerb.);

2. Definition - the name of the people, the tribe; defined – title, rank. For example: Basmıl idikut (BKb25) «Basmilian idikut», Basmıl idikutu (in Azerb.), Tarduš şad (T 41) «Tardushian shad», Tarduş şadı (in Azerb.);

3. Definition – name of the title, defined – a common word. For example: şad at (O6) «Shad name», şad adı (in Azerb.), Kağan at (Ktb20) «title of khagan», xaqan adı (in Azerb.);

4. Definition – a common word; defined – title.

For example: bujuruk bağlār (Ktm 1) «officials», buyruq bəyləri (in Azerb.);

5. Definition – toponym; defined– Toponym type (space).

For example: Jinçü üzüg(Ktm 3) «Yenchu river» (Pearly), İnci çayı (in Azerb.), Kömür tay (MC 8) «the mountain Komur», Kömür dağı (in Azerb.);

6. Definition – name of an animal; defined – the word «yıl», «year». For example: koj jil (Ktb 53) «year of sheep», qoyun ili (in Azerb.).

But, this is not always the case, some parts of the I type izafet have retained their grammatical forms in the development of Turkic languages:

1. Definition – material name; defined – a thing made of it. For

example: Təmir kapıy (Ktm4;T45) «The iron gates», Dəmir qapı (in Azerb.)

2. Definition – proper name; defined – title, rank.

For example: Bars bəg (Ktb 20) «Bars bey», Bars bəy (in Azerb.), Bumın kağan (Ktb 1) «Bumin khagan», Bumın xaqan (in Azerb.);

3. Definition – a common word; defined – proper name. For example:

Bilgä Tonjuquq (T1) «wise Toyukuk», müdrik Tonyukuk (in Azerb.),

Bilgä Taçam (O4) «wise Tacham», müdrik Taçam (in Azerb.);

4. Definition – nationality; defined – proper name. For example: Töliş

Bilgä (Y48) «Tolyash-wise», Töliş Bilgä (in Azerb.) etc.

"The Turkic language of the primitive (before runic) period can be characterized with the statements in which any official information is conveyed implicitly without participation of morphological indicators only through linear matching of words" [Dubrovina 2015:19]. For example: Soqdaq budun itäjın tıjın, Jinčü ügüziq kăčä Tämır kapıyka täqi sülädımız (Ktb 39). "With the aim of arranging the Sogdian people, we, crossing the river Ienču, went with the army right up to Temir-Kapyga."

The definition can be provided with the necessary affiliation affix. In Azeri, in similar cases, izafet of the III type is more often used: ögüm ötin alajın qañım sabın tıñlajın tip (İB 90) Saying: "Let me receive advice from my mother, let me hear my father's speech ... ". «...Anamın məsləhətini eşidim, atamın sözlərini dinləyim, - deyib gəlmiş.» [Shukurlu 1993: 294] ...bodunıy eçüm apam törüsinčä jaratmıs boşyurmıs (Ktb13). "In accordance with the laws of my ancestors, he arranged and sent the people [to the right way] ...". «Xalqı əcdadlarımın qanununca (qanununa görə) təşkil etmiş, öyrətmiş» [Rajabli 2006: 290] oylı atı (E 26,2) « his son's name», «oğlunun adı».

In Turkic languages including the language of the ATRM the principle of economical affixation is shown most consistently and therefore "the mutual systematic consistency of the function, structure and substance of all linguistic tiers is manifested brighter" [Melnikov 1971: 124].

In modern Turkic languages, the I type of izafet does not allow any word between the definition and the word to be determined, except for the numeral bir, which as the numerative word meaning "one" and can be translated into English by the words "one", "some". In the I type of izafet the indefinite pronoun is used between the definition and the determined, and before izafet (definition). For example, "taxta bir qaşiq" (some wooden spoon) and "bir taxta qaşiq" (a wooden spoon) differ from each other in a slight tint. In the ATRM "bir" as an indefinite pronoun seldom occurs: bir kisi jañılsar .. (Ktm 6)"If one, some man is/was mistaken ...

"Toñra bir oyuş alpañu on äriq, Toñra tigin joñıta, äqirip ölürtimiz (Ktb 47). "We killed ten people at the funeral of Tonga-Tegin, heroes from the Tongra tribe, ten people.". V.G.Kondratyev wrote that «Toñra bir oyuş is a definition to the phrase alpañu on äriq» [1962: 70]. We think that «bir» here

is exactly in the role of an indefinite pronoun. Toᅇra bir oyuş- Tribe of Tongra or some tribe of Tongra. Similar constructions are used in modern Azerbaijan language.

For example: Oᅇul qızıl bir üzükdür. Son is like a gold ring.

In the analysis of the use of the word bir, it can be concluded that as an indefinite pronoun it is more used in the subsequent stages of development of Oguz languages. And the category of definiteness was finally formed in Turkic languages later.

Izafet of the II type

The II type of izafet in the ATRM is much less common than the I type.

Türk tãırısı (Ktb 10)Turkic people, Tabyaç ili(T1)State of Tabgach.

Izafets of the second type in many cases become an analogue of Russian complex and compound words expressing one general concept. For example: "çaqalar öyi" (in Turkmen.), "Children's home"

The meanings of the proper names, geographical names and also national identity are conveyed in Turkic languages according to the first and second types of izafet. In most Turkic languages, the importance of nationality is conveyed by means of the second type of izafet, in the Kumyk language (as in Tuvan and ancient Turkic languages) this meaning is conveyed by the first type of izafet: For example; Turk dil, but in Azerbaijan language türk dili is "Turkish language".

N.K. Dmitriev notes that in Kumyk language there is generally a very weak semantic distinction between the first and second types of izafet, the second type of izafet willingly leans toward the first type which it perceives in the same sense as in the second type. For example: Seylov organlar and selyov organlari - "organs of speech" [Dimitriev 1940: 181]. In modern Azerbaijan language this distinction is clear - "danışiq orqanları" (the II type of izafet).

Unlike the ATRM in modern Azerbaijan language the proper names, nationality, geographical names are conveyed with the help of the II type of izafet: Qız qalası "Maiden Tower", Azadlıq Prospekti "Prospect of Freedom", etc. In ATRM there are cases of transfer of izafet of the second type into lexicalized word combinations in modern Azerbaijani language: kün ortusı (Ktm2), verbatim "the sun at the zenith", "south"; tün ortusı (Ktm2) verbatim "night at the zenith", "north". In modern Azerbaijan language the first word combination is similar to the first type of izafet - günorta and the second word combination in modern Azerbaijan language is like the third type of izafet - gecənin ortası.

In the II type of izafet there is a tendency to formation of a complex word: *kəklikotu* - "thyme", *kəklik* -a partridge, *ot* - grass, *u* – affiliation affix of the 3rd p. .; *Suiti* - "a seal", *su* - water, *it* -a dog, *i* – affiliation affix of the 3rd p.

#### Izafet of the III type

Izafet of the III type is organized by the method of coordination and they "express actual, real belonging" [Meisel 1957: 31]. Constructions with the definition in the genitive case and the determined with the affiliation affix of the third person (izafet of the III type) are used in the language of the ATRM comparatively rarely. Usually this meaning is conveyed by means of the II type of izafet. Izafet of the III type expresses belonging of the object to the object, possession, possessive attitude. For example: *Oylī atī* (E26,2) «his son's name», *adugyη karny* «belly of a bear», *toηuzuη azygy* «canines of a wild boar».

*Bilgä qayaniη bodunī* (Oa3) «people of Bilga-kagan»,

*qayaniηin sabin almatin...*(KTm9) «not heeding your kagan's words...»,

*ol qanim elimiη beηgüsi* (E24,2) «This is the monument of my khan and my land».

The III type of izafet is used to convey the relation of a part to a whole:

*adiyη qarnī jarilmış toηuzuη aziyī sinmiş* (İB10-11) “ The belly of the bear was torn, the canines of the wild boar were broken”

For transferring possessive relations in a sentence, the same substantive-determinative construction is used both in the third and second type of izafet: *türk budunīy atī küsi jok bolmazun tijin, kaηim kayaniy, ögim katunīy kötürmiş täηri* , *il birigmä täηri, türk budun atiküsi jok bol*(mazun tijin, özimin ol täηri) (KTb25) “(Then) The sky, in order the name and glory of the Turkic people will not be lost, raised my father-khagan and my mother-khatun. The sky that gives (to the khans) the state made me a khagan so that the name and glory of the Turkic people would not be lost.”

In the sample the first phrase *budunīy atī* , a definition with affix-*iy*, affix of genitive case and defined with an affix – *i* theaffiliation affix of the III person, formed the third type of izafet.

In general, there is a fluctuation in the use of the II and III type of izafet, the possibility of using the II type of izafet instead of the III type of izafet. In ATRM izafet of the II type expresses both the relations conveyed in modern Azerbaijan language with the help of izafet of the II type, and the connections and relations conveyed in these languages with the help of izafet

of the III type. For example, "Kür qırağı" and "Kürün qırağı" "the bank of the Kur" is used both as the II type and III type of izafet.

In modern Turkic languages, including modern Azerbaijani language the third type of izafet is most commonly used. In the course of the study of the attributive substantive constructions in the language of the ATRM and modern Azerbaijan language, it was possible to single out the following:

1. In the texts of ATRM the first type of izafet is often used and sometimes it replaces the second and third type of izafet. In modern Turkic languages, izafet of the III type is used most commonly.

2. There were the traces of the category of indefiniteness in the ancient runic inscriptions, but they were formed at the next stages of the development of the Turkic languages. In modern Turkic languages this category is used quite often.

3. The fluctuations in the sphere of use of the II and III type of izafets are evident, using the II type of izafet instead of the III and sometimes in the same sentence the same word combinations were expressed by both types of izafets. This shows the instability of all three types of izafets in the ATRM.

#### REFERENCES

- Baskakov A.N. (1974) Phrases in modern Turkish language. "Science", Moscow
- Cheremisina M.I. (1993) About work on a new grammar of the Altai language // Language and culture of the Altaians. Col. Scientific. Articles / edi.: A.A. Tibikova (exe.edi.) and dr. Gorno-Altai.
- Dmitriyev N.K. (1940) Grammar of Kumik language. Moscow-Leningrad, USSR.
- Dubrovina M.E.(2015) "On the stages of the formation of definitive substantive constructions (izafet) in the language of ancient Turkic runic inscriptions (in comparison with the modern Turkish language)" // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Oriental Studies and African Studies. Series 13. 12-21
- Guzev V.G. (2015) Theoretical grammar of the Turkish language. St. Petersburg: pub.h. of St. Petersburg State University
- Kamalova Sh. N. (2018) "On the question of structural units of the Turkic syntax" // TEXTE- Revue de critique et de theorie litteraire. Le volume 13, 2018, Issue 4, pp. 27-30
- Kasevich V.B. (1977) Elements of General Linguistics.. Moscow
- Hajiyeva N.Z. Serebrennikov B.A. (1986) Comparative-historical grammar of Turkic languages. Syntax. Moscow, «Science»
- Meisel S.S. (1957) Izafet in Turkish language. Moscow- Leningrad.: Publishing house of Academy of Sciences of USSR,



- Melnikov G.P. (1969) "The syntactic system of Turkic languages from the position of system linguistics". "Nations of Asia and Africa", № 6, p.104-113
- Melnikov G.P. (1971) "Principles of system linguistics in application of problems of Turkic studies // Structure and history of Turkic languages". Moscow: Publishing house of "Science", 121-137.
- Rajabli Abulfaz (2006) Language of ancient Turkic monuments. Part II. Baku, Nurlan,
- Saussure F., de. (1977) Works on linguistics. Moscow.
- Shukurlu Alisa. (1993) Language of ancient Turkic monuments. Baku, Maarif,