



Published in the Russian Federation
Bulletin of the Kalmyk Institute for Humanities
of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Has been issued since 2008
ISSN: 2075-7794; E-ISSN: 2410-7670
Vol. 23, Is. 1, pp. 156–165, 2016
DOI 10.22162/2075-7794-2016-23-1-156-165
Journal homepage: <http://kigiran.com/pubs/vestnik>

UDC 811.512.1

V Structural Models of Monosyllables in Old Turkic Inscriptions and Modern Kipchak Languages

Magripa K. Yeskeeva¹

¹ Ph. D. of Philology, Professor of Turkology Department at L. N. Gumilyev Eurasian National University (Astana, the Republic of Kazakhstan). E-mail: mag61103@inbox.ru

Abstract

Though studying of the problem of root word is the classical sphere with its established tradition and principles, specific purpose and objectives, the nature of monosyllabic words which forms the basis of the language is not fully disclosed. The actuality of the problem of root is connected with the multistage and contradictory complex nature of the Turkic roots which originates from the appearance of a sound language. As B. M. Yunusaliev says about monosyllabic forms "...monosyllabic root-stem often looks like a repetition of an undulating agglutination", though development of the forms of Turkic words from simple to complex is a basic feature of Turkic languages, the problems like the inverse processes (contraction, reduction, elision etc.) according to phonetic rules and its re-complication make it difficult to determine the nature of the root [Yunusaliev 1959: 185]. According to the principle of economy, phonetic phenomena, haplogy and reduction generate a new compatibility of the sound and new phonological situation. It leads to positional change of sounds, loss of sounds, emergence of one sound instead of two sounds and according to the principle of conservation of communicative isolation, cumulation of changing sounds will support the new formation of the phonetic system. The changes in the phonetic system may affect monosyllabic forms and simple phonetic changes may affect the phonological structure during the semantic development. As the cognition of the nature of words demands cohesive review of a form and meaning, interrelations of semantic development of monosyllabic forms is, as a phenomenon, directly connected with human consciousness and worldview, the basis of the general Turkic vocabulary with psycho physiological processes according to the multilateral principles of semasiological system, complicate the issue. The author of this paper takes an attempt to expand the nature and semantics of V structural models of monosyllables in Orkhon, Yenisei, Talas and the Kipchak languages.

Keywords: Turkic Languages, Old Turkic written monuments, Modern Kipchak Languages, monosyllabic, root, phonomorphology, phonosemantics, phonology, sound compliances.

Introduction

The explanation of the development way of lexical system of any language and the level of relationship with other languages is primarily based on clarifying the structure of the root. Therefore the first research works were also aimed at determining the structure of the root and there were two directions about the sound structure of the root of Turkic or Altaic languages: on the basis of 1. Monosyllabic (V. V. Radlov, G. Vambery, J. Kloson, V. Kotovich etc.); 2. Disyllabic (V. Bang, K. Menges, B. Y. Vladimirtsov, N. K. Dmitriev etc.) Turkic languages there is a theoretical basis to consider the first syllable indissyllabic and monosyllabic forms to be the main form through morphemic, component, semantic, logical methods of analysis. So the monosyllabic direction was supported by many scholars (N. Sauranbaev, B. Yunusaliev, A. M. Scherbak, E. V. Sevortyan, A. N. Kononov, A. T. Kaidar, A. Ibatov, M. Tomanov, B. Sagindikuli etc.), and though the results of the research of Turkic languages accept the structural model which forms the system of root and root-stem — **V, VC, VCC, CV, CVC, CVCC** as a basic form, the theme of the dispute is the problem which one of these models is the first (etymon root, etymological root, arch root, dead root, old root, initial root etc.).

Western scholar G. Vambery's, who expressed the view about the structure of root and root-stems in the late XIX century, recognition CVC form as the first among the Turkic languages and giving examples that CV model was detached from this form (Handwritten preface to the *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Turko-tatarischen Sprachen*. Leipzig, 1878) was analysed by linguists in the XX century. Some scholars pointed the validity of G. Vambery's view and some of them noted recognize V, CV model as the first saying that from the linguistic data we can see reverse processes and the development of Turkic languages doesn't recognize one-sidedness. The third group of researchers suggests considering **V, VC, VCC, CV, CVC, CVCC** models equally as a historical root. N. A. Baskakov, who studied the phonetic structure of root morphemes in Turkic languages from different sides, gives his first view that Turkic roots are in the form of *cvc* on the basis of Karakalpak language [Baskakov 1952: 101–105] and as an argument against the V. Kotovich's theory that Turkic root is open syllable which consists of two sounds, N. A. Baskakov says that giving

the long vowels as an example cannot disclose the nature of Turkic root [Baskakov 1962: 17]. Noting that all the Turkic roots were used in the form of a closed syllable of three sounds, he formulates his thoughts as "All other two sounds or monotonous roots in the Turkic languages are a rare exception and historical ones date back to three sound roots with the lost as a result of the phonetic development of an initial or final or both consonants" [Baskakov 1969: 89].

The scholar considers *cucc* models are made by adding dead affixes to **CVC** form or as a loan word, **V** models like *ō* 'to think', *u* 'sleep', *ī* 'plant' which consists of only one vowel contracted from **CVC** to *vc*, and then to *v* model (*ī* < *yi* < *jig* 'thick, frequent, dense', *ō* < *ōg* ~ *ōk* ~ *oj* ~ *od* < **bōg* 'think, reflect'). In his latest works N. A. Baskakov deepened his theory about the root structure, and he paid attention to the importance of the open syllable roots in determining the nature of Turkic roots, but digitally **CVC** outperforms and he acknowledged that this form is the historic root. According to the researcher's statistics three quarters of all monosyllabic forms of modern Turkic languages consists of **CVC** models [Baskakov 1979: 145–146]. A. Zayonchkovski says that **CV** model occur many times in the language of the medieval monuments and the historic Turkic root was used in the form **V, VC, CV, CVC** and that was against N. A. Baskakov's view [Zayonchkovski 1961: 28–29].

If we consider the linguistic data and the structure of root words in the language of ancient written manuscripts very carefully, "historical category shows that division of monosyllabic roots into components can be noticed on the basis of one language materials" [Yuldashev 1958: 24] and possible occurrence of derivatives in monosyllables can not be denied. Kirghiz scholar B. M. Yunusaliev, one of the first researchers who studied the theme about the remained dead roots in the monosyllabic lexemes together with disyllabic or polysyllabic words said "Deadroots do not disappear. They lost only lexical independence, but their sound material survives in one form or another at the base of newly formed root words" and even "derivative forms can lose their independence" [Yunusaliev 1959: 63]. The scholar considers that based on the root words in the language of Orkhon monuments, *sa* 'number, to count' and others are dead roots **ba* form of the lexemes *bay, baw, ban*

in modern Turkic languages [Yunusaliev 1959: 29, 43].

One of the scholars, who paid attention to the problems of simultaneous use of the notions like root, main root, stem or root-word and their different names, A. Khasenova in her monographs based on the lexical-grammatical characteristics of the verb and the established language features like the use of exchange of sound places in a word in the Turkic languages (*üirek, uryan, örän, uryat, örät; qapuy, qapqa, qaqpa* etc.), being more or less not only last sounds but also the first ones (Kaz. I. *nanu* ‘to believe’; Uzb. I. *inon-moq, iñon-moq* etc.; Kaz. I ‘to rely’; Uzb. I. *inon-moq, iñon-moq* etc.), the Kazakh verbs ending in consonant were deformed and changed into *b, u, m* sounds (*žap* ‘close’: *žabadī, žauip, žamil, žapqan* etc.), she casts doubt on the theoretical conclusions proposed by A. Zayonchkovski and B. M. Yunusaliev. According to A. Khasenova “This phenomenon is connected with propensity of some sounds in the word or final sounds to drop” [Khasenova 1971: 72]. The results of the research works of recent years clarify the facts against the scholar’s view. E. A. Makaev suggests to use the method of chronological stratigraphy as a solution of controversial views about the structure of Turkic roots [Makaev 1971], I. V. Kormushin’s assumption is that CV form corresponds to the first period of language development, (CV + C>) CVC corresponds to the second period and in the next period the final consonants of the root may be omitted again [Kormushin 1971: 11–13]. The scholars G. I. Ramstedt, E. V. Sevortyan, A. M. Scherbak, A. N. Kononov, B. M. Yunusaliev, V. Kotvich and others deepened and specified V. V. Radlov’s view, who first said that CV model is the prototype of Turkic root. The researchers in this direction do not doubt the historicity of VC, V models.

M. Tomanov who separates the forms *қар* ‘snow’, *ай* ‘moon’ forms as the morphemes and recognizes the forms *-m, -йа, -i, -m, -ыс, -қайа* as the elements which has no relation to the root structure in Kazakh words *қарт, қария* ‘old man’, *кәрі* ‘old, elder’; *айт* ‘say’, *айтыс* ‘saying’, *айқай* ‘shout’ etc. concludes “...this analysis of a few group of facts (in only one language), shows that some groups of words considered as an indivisible single root divided into “meaningless” roots and “unknown” additions” [Tomanov 2002: 140]. And also he indicates that prosthetic sounds, the matter in controversy in determining the

root structure, “it is known that the formation of secondary diphthongs and long sounds bring the root structure to other phontic features” [Tomanov 2002: 140] and he says that these given phenomena have no relation with the initial structure of the root. One of the Kazakh scholars A. Ibatov, who notes that monosyllabic words can belong to derivatives on the basis of the language of the medieval monuments and **V, VC, CV, VCV, CVC, VCC, VCVC, CVCC** form roots and root-stems are characteristic to the language of monuments of the XIV century [Ibatov 1983: 67].

Analyzing the previous views and conclusions about the root structure, academician A. T. Kaidar who takes the monosyllabic roots and root-stems as the object of study and studies the nature of the root from formal, statistical and semantic point of view, expresses his opinion about the formation of closed monosyllables of three sounds: “Firstly, because the changes and shifts in the structure of the roots are diverse and multi-directional: CVC theoretically and practically in language development can be converted into V Cor CV, in the same way as the latter may, on the contrary, go to the CVC. In each case, they may have their reasons. ...Secondly, any change of root morphemes in the direction of expansion and contraction of their structure are the result of quite a natural phono-morphological factors operating throughout the historical development of the Turkic languages” [Kaidarov 1986: 14]. The scholar studied the nature of the Turkic root thoroughly on the basis of Kazakh language, he has been attaching importance to the undetermined distinction of the terms root and stem and suggests the scientific definition with special features of these notions. Based on specific information and opinions of famous linguists headed by V. V. Radlov he came to conclusion that “decomposability of monosyllabic root-stems of the Turkic languages... a very real fact” [Kaidarov 1986: 14]. Evidence based on the views of the scientists the fund of linguistic intelligence and defined theoretical conclusions which show that in Turkic languages monosyllables together with dissyllables are the result of a long agglutinative process in language development. E. Kajibek who studied homogeneous monosyllables in Turkic languages from voice and nominal homonymy point and found out the theoretical characteristics of the phenomenon of syncretism, saying that “in Turkic languages the traces of syncretism of parts of speech are seen

in the grammatical level and also in the level of verbal-nominal homonymy of derivatives or derivational affixes” he points out the importance of the latter that is in the verb with suffix, nominal monosyllables there may be random coincidences [Kazhybekov 1986: 244]. The scholar considered the multifunctionality of roots on the basis of the nature of monosyllabic syncretism as a method of word formation which was in use till agglutinative period and said “From semasiological point, syncretic semantics of Turkic root is the piece of semantic system of the most ancient language. Therefore in differentiating the vocabulary of Turkic languages diachronically it is necessary to pay attention to the development of the Turkic word meaning from general to concrete” [Kazhybekov 1986: 244]. In his next work aimed at the definition of semantic nature of Turkic word the researcher analyses the phono-morpho-lexico-semantical structure and points out the importance of studying monosyllabic level first in solving the complex linguistic problems [Kazhybekov 1988: 51]. J. Mankeeva determined a lot of dead roots in the verbs of our language in the course of morphemic-competent analysis and she recognizes the component *t* in the imperative *ait* ‘say’, *art* ‘load’, *ket* ‘go’, as a historical suffix [Mankeeva 1985: 55; 1991: 42]. The researcher distinguished 35 models of word-formation except imitative verbs and came to conclusion that “In our modern language we conditionally consider many words root words. Actually they are historically derived roots which consist of the “dead” root and addition” [Mankeeva 1988: 68].

The Kazakh scholar B. Sagindikuli’s research work aims at the reconstruction of the roots and additions used in ancient times. He followed the traditional comparative-historical methods and mathematical methods namely the theory of equation in reconstructing the ancient forms of modern Turkic words. In using mathematical methods, the researcher makes use of the method of component analysis. The researcher supports the validity of hypothetical idea that not only dead roots but modern additions also were used in lexemic level with their separate meaning and saying that “Turkic languages experienced the period of flexional structure. Traces of internal flexion are left in some monosyllabic roots. After that the period of polysynthetic structure (root language) came. Many well-known turkologists recognize that Turkic languages

experienced this structure. Now everybody knows its agglutinative position” [Sagyndykov 1994: 5] he shows veracity of flexional, synthetic periods in the development of Turkic languages before agglutinative. The researcher figured out that the main feature of flexional structure is that roots are composed of one vowel and one consonant sillabofonemas and came to conclusion “As some sillabofonemas are homonymous, the vowel and the consonant in the sillabofonema sounded different like in Chinese. The vowel’s position before or after the consonant, its omission and other combinational changes play the important role in transferring a notion, concept. Internal flexion regulated how much emphasis to give to the sounds... Single consonants were the names of things, actions, state and qualities. And vowels gave different semantic changes, colours” [Sagyndykov 1994: 157]. In one of his recent papers he offered to name sillabofonemas as an *arch root* and pointed out “How many consonants in a word, so many *arch roots*” [Sagyndykuly 2006: 199–205]. B. Sagindikuli’s opinions in general are in harmony with the principles of phonological theory, with the idea phone ideas of the imperative theory and clarifies the phono-semantic phenomenon in general lexicon.

Bashkir scholar A. Shaikhulov who considers the necessity of adherence of the new theoretical-methodological principles together with traditional methods in researching the problem of root study of Turkic languages, concluded that in analyzing monosyllables in the language of Turkic people, reside in the territory of the Volga and Ural from the phonetic, morphological, phono-semantical point the half of more than 4000 root-stems in the languages of Kipchak group are the units with unclear etymology and lost independence [Shaikhulov 2000: 56; 2004: 95]. The scholar focused on that giving the structural characteristic to Turkic roots will be successful if it is researched in three levels (phonological, morphological, and semantical). From his conclusions we notice that he follows the theoretical-cognitive direction and connects immanent and cognitologic analysis. He gives his thoughts that it is possible to distinguish the traces of worldview in the languages in Altaic group on the basis of Tatar, Chuvash, Mongolian, Tungus-Manchu materials at the root level “...in the language worldview of the Altaic group languages we can distinguish the general structural-semantic core which expresses not only the existence of common

root bases but also motivating signs that allow to combine into groups and semantic slot and further to consider them within the ideographic paradigmatic” [Shaikulov 2004: 95]. The scholar’s opinion tends to the correspondence of semantic features of the translingual lexical parallels (all Altaic) development which consist of separate and reconstructed monosyllables to the ideographic features covering their general substantial, onomasiological properties. We can see the important views and conclusions about root study in Kazakh language in recent years, from A. Salkinbai’s works who investigates historic process of word-formation from semantic point, Sh. Zhalmakhanov’s works about the problems of semantic derivation, M. Sabir’s works who studied the medieval monuments connecting with the vocabulary of Kazakh language and U. Isabekova’s works, who differentiates the way of development of paronyms [Salkynbai 1999; Zhalmakhanov 2003; Sabir 2004].

The views and thoughts about root study in Kazakh language, the results of studying some aspects of the roots and root-stems and comprehensive study shows that the formation and development of root level in the language are based on the close relationship of phonetic-phonological, morphologic, semantic, onomasiological phenomena and studying the external form and internal content in conjunction in order to understand the nature of the root. So the monosyllables, which compose the basis of lexical richness, are a linguistic and ontological structure, which defines the importance of the language in human life and provides the different spiritual-functional quality. The variable and flexible nature of constantly evolving language system is characterized by the direction of the structural models of monosyllables, the possibility of harmonies of phono-correlates, distribution area, phono-morphologic, phono-semantic, idiophone, idiosegmental sides.

The definition of the sound structure of root words in all-Turkic continuum which has been the object of study and the basis of dispute based on modern and medieval Turkic language together with the language of the VI–VIII centuries. The roots and root-stems in Kipchak languages which is one of the largest branches of the study of Turkic roots is considered in the area of common structural and stands out for its peculiar phonetic-phonological characteristics. Therefore to study the monosyllables of modern Kipchak

languages in comparison with the paronymous monosyllables in ancient Turkic languages is the actual problem which enables to understand the nature of Turkic monosyllables.

The monosyllables which compose the vocabulary of the ancient scripts language are not so many. It is about 10 times less than the monosyllables in modern Turkic languages. If there are about 3000 (2704) monosyllabic words in Kazakh language [Kaidarov 1986: 183]. A. G. Shaikulov pointed out that about 4000 monosyllables can be distinguished in Kipchak languages of Ural-Volga [Shaikulov 2004: 56], and 1160 lexemes are registered as the root words in the work edited by I. A. Batmanov “Ancient Turkic dialects and their reflection in the modern languages”. The authors of the dictionary covered grammatical forms of a word (*adīr, adīrt, adīrīl, adīrīlmaj, adīrīn* etc.) and also paronymous derived words (*bat, batīm, batsīk* etc.) [Batmanov 1971: 108–112].

In G. G. Levin’s work aimed at the language of Orkhon monuments and the lexico-semantic structure there are 498 root-stems, the registration of the paronymous words like *bar, barīm, barī, barċa* etc. [Levin 2001: 168] is connected with the author’s aim to show separate monosyllables and polysyllables which cannot be conjugated from synchronic point. If we consider it from monosyllabic point only about 350 monosyllabic roots and root-stems were used in Orkhon, Yenisei, Talas written manuscripts.

Discussions and Results

It is clear that a small number of monosyllabic models cannot reveal the root system, which was the basis of the lexical foundation of our ancestors’ language. The volume of the monosyllables in the language of ancient monuments are smaller than the monosyllables of modern Turkic languages because firstly, they haven’t been read completely; secondly, it is connected with the individual authors’ and printer’s (on the rock) use of words, richness of the language and individual style; thirdly, the influence of 1300 years natural law of language development. Though the monosyllables in the language of ancient manuscripts are small in number, they enable to determine the main features of the ancient language and outline collection of roots and root-stems, and its informational value is important in differentiating the nature of root in modern Turkic languages. Though all the models of “the classical six”, which constitute the system

of root and root-stems of Turkic languages, is characteristic to ancient Turkic language, its frequency of use, significant autonomy, appropriateness of forms with modern Kipchak language are different.

V form monosyllables. It is known from many studies that one component model V, consists of vowels, and covers only five-six words in the ancient Turkic manuscripts [Kononov 1980: 76; Sherbak 1970: 196–198]. These words, which are considered the phenomenon of the first period of Turkic languages development, were used as the words with individual meaning in the VII–IX centuries, and in modern Turkic languages, among them in Kipchak language, they survived only in the root-stems. In Kazakh language 8 of *a* form, 11 interjection meaning of *ä* form, 6 interjection meaning and 1 verb meaning of *e*, are registered [Kaidarov 1986: 40–41].

e ‘to be’ Tal. III [Batmanov 1971: 86] the verb *e* from Talas monuments means the auxiliary verb in past tense in modern Kipchak languages. In spoken language tense form can be omitted and also be combined with possessive endings directly. For example, in Kazakh language: *e* → *edim* → *em*, *e* → *edin* → *en*; *e* → *edi* → *et* and *e* → *ken*. Usually the form *e* in Kazakh language extends from general Turkic monosyllable *er*/**är*/**ip*. In Orkhon monuments the form *er* is widely used: *tabyač budun sabli süčik, ayisi jumčaq ermis* ‘the words of the Tabgach people are sweet, and their treasure is precious’ KTk. 5 [Aidarov 1995: 169]. As the forms *e*, *er* were used in one period to determine their archaeological form is still needs deep investigation.

ö ‘to think, to consider’ [Ancient Turkic Dictionary 1969: 375]: *ačsığ tosığ ömezsen bir todsar ačsığ ömezsen* ‘You do not understand hunger when fed, if you are fed, you do not think about hunger’ KTk. 8 [Aidarov 1995: 169]. In the language of monuments there are some root-stems from the root *ö*: *ö* → *ög* → *ögüt* ‘advice, instruction, [Ancient Turkic Dictionary 1969: 382], *ö* → *ög* → *ögle* ‘to discuss’ [Aidarov 2000: 102]; *ö* → *ök* → *ökün* ‘to repent, to regret’ [Ancient Turkic Dictionary 1969: 382]. The way of development, changes in form and meaning of general Turkic *o* ≈ *ö* ≈ *u* ≈ *ü* root are widely discussed problem [Sevortian 1974: 428–432; Baskakov 1988: 40–41; Kazhybekov 1986: 179]. In Modern Kipchak language all the forms of the given roots preserved: Bashk. *ögöt* ‘instruction’, *uj*

‘thought, reflection’, *uqiw* ‘reading, study’; Kaz. *oj*, *ujyar*, *uyim*, *uq*, *ügit*, *üjrenetc.* In the language of old Kipchak monument “Kitabu Medgmu-u Terdjuman Turki ya ’Adjami ya Mogoli ya Farsi’ *ök* ‘mind, soul, spirit’, *öküš* ‘upbringing’, *örenle* ‘to think, believe’, *ojna* ‘to play, joke’ [Kuryszhanov 1970: 175, 179] lexemes from the root *ö* were used.

u ‘sleep’ [Ancient Turkic Dictionary 1969: 603]: *Ertis ügüzig keče joridimiz, turgis buduniy uda bastimiz* ‘We crossed the river Irtysh and caught Turgis people while they were sleeping’ KTg. 37 [Aidarov 1995: 179]. In Kipchak languages **uj* ≈ **oj* remained in the root-stems: old Kipch. **uj*: *ujjüil* ‘to sleep, to go to bed’, *ujitqil* ‘to lull’, *ujuqla* ‘to fall asleep’ [Kuryszhanov 1970: 208]; Tat., Bask. *jokla*; Nog. *ujkla*; Kkalp. *ujqila*; Kaz. *ujqi*, *ujiqta*. Ancient Turkic root *u* in Tat., Bask. languages was changed metathetically with the monosyllable *jo*.

u ‘to be able, to bear’ [Ancient Turkic Dictionary 1969: 603]: *jayı bolip, itinü jaratunu umadiq, jani içikmis* ‘As the enemy they could not do anything and gave up’ KTg. 10 [Aidarov 1995: 173]. One of the ancient roots, difficult to distinguish its outline from the basic vocabulary of Modern Turkic languages is *u*. B. Sagindikuli showed the meaning of the monosyllable *uy* as ‘the owner of powerful force and motion’ in the word *uyan* ‘almighty, god’, A. N. Baskakov relying on the fact that the meaning of the word *u* is closer to ‘to know, to understand’ said ‘the verb *u* ‘to be able, to tolerate’ is genetically related to the verb *uq* ‘to understand’ (with derivatives *uq* — *uš* ‘intelligence, conception’), which in other languages has, moreover, the meanings in Karakalpak *uq* ‘to delve into the essence, to digest’ and so on” [Baskakov 1988: 41–42]. The opinions which connect the lexeme *u* with infinitive producing grammatical form suffix *-uare* substantiated. *uz* ‘master, handyman’ which you can see in Yenisei monuments Y. 31 [Batmanov 1971: 75], monosyllable *uz* ‘skillful, experienced, skilled’ which were used in V. Kashgari’s works [Kashgari 1960: 46], and it is noticeable that Kazakh word *usta* ‘blacksmith’ is of the same origin with ancient Turkic root *u*.

u ‘to increase’ El. 1 [Batmanov 1971: 74]. In the language of ancient manuscripts the use of the root *u* with the meaning ‘to increase’ as an individual lexeme can occur in the monuments found near locality Elegest in Tuva region. In other scripts like Orkhon, Yenisei,

Talas root-stem **ul* which is from this root is used: *ulga* ‘to grow, to become more’ Y. 29; Y. 7 [Batmanov 1971: 76]; *ulgat* ‘to grow’ HB [Batmanov 1971: 76]; *uluγ/ulug* ‘big, important, senior’ Y. 47, Ton. 5, KCh. 3, KTg. 28, 34 [Batmanov 1971: 76]. In old Kipchak *ulaldur* ‘to increase, to multiply’, *ulu* ‘large’ [Kuryzhanov 1970: 209]; Bashk. *olo*; Tar. *oli/olii*; Kkalp. *ullī*; Kaz. *ulī/ulīq* ‘great, large’. In Turkic language the word *ülken* ‘large’ is also of the same root with *u* form: *ü* → *ül* → *ülken*. According to the data of the Kipchak languages *u, ü, o* variants of the ancient Turkic root *u* are allocated.

ī ‘plant’ [Ancient Turkic Dictionary 1969: 603]: *ī bar bas asdimiz* ‘crossed the top with bushes’ Ton. 26 [Aidarov 2000: 52]. N. A. Baskakov said about *ī* monosyllable “... the root *y*, which can be found mainly in paired words like *y — yyač* ‘any vegetation’, *y — taryγ* ‘sowing of cereals’, *y — taš* ‘bushes and rocks (stones)’ and therefore seems either borrowed from other languages, or graphically defective issued, or phonetically reduced” [Baskakov 1988: 39] and doubts the individual lexemic ability and Turkic nature of *ī* form. The separate use of *ī* form in Tonikuk monument: *Atiγ iqa bajur ertimiz* ‘We tied his horse to a branch’ Ton. 27 [Aidarov 2000: 109] shows that the given monosyllable was used as a word with an individual meaning in ancient Turkic languages, and also as the graphic sign of the sound *ī* was drawn so clearly (in both sentences) we cannot say that it is a drawback in graphical decoration. The researchers headed by I. A. Batmanov point the meaning ‘wood’ of the word *ī* [Batmanov 1971: 83]. So we can notice that on the basis of the general Turkic lexemes *īyaš/īyač/ayaš/agač/jīyaš* there is the root *ī*. The word *īyač: īyač tutumu ayturtum* ‘We go out (go up) with sticks’ used in Tonikuk monument Ton. 25 [Aidarov 2000: 109] was formed with *a* form in Kipchak languages: old Kipch. *jīyač/ayas/ayač* ‘wood, timber, forest’ [Kuryzhanov 1970: 77]; Kum., Tar., Kar. *ayač*; Nog., Kkalp., Kaz. *ayaš*; Bashk. *ayas*. in Makhmud Kashgari’s works the word *īyač* is formed as *jīyač* ‘dense tree’ [Kashgari 1961: 25], i. e. in the meaning ‘jungle, wildwood’. The lexeme *jīš* ‘mountain, wood, forest’ [Aidarov 1995: 163] is also used in the language of monuments: *Ötuken jīšqa jig idi joq ermīs* ‘There was not a good owner in Otuken jungle’ KTk. 4. It is clear that the form **jī* is genetically related to the monosyllables *ī, iγ*. Simultaneous use of the homogeneous monosyllables in the ancient period of the development of Turkic

languages shows that their historical formation had taken their origin from ancient languages times. The root *ī* together with the meaning ‘wood’ has the meaning ‘generally plant’ and it is important in defining the etimological basis of the names of plants *arša, iyyaj, arpa* etc. in Kazakh language.

ī ‘to sent, to erect’ [Batmanov 1971: 83]: *Ötuken jir olurup, arqiš tirkiš isar, neñ buñuy joq* ‘There is no sorrow if you sent a caravan being in Otuken’ KTk. 8 [Aidarov 1995: 161]. In the language of monuments individual lexemes formed of this root *id* ‘to send, to direct, to throw’ On. I, 2, KTg. 6, MCh. II, 22, *it* ‘to send’ KTk. 12, Ton. 42 [Batmanov 1971: 83, 85] are in use. In modern Kipchak language the form *ī* is not used as an individual lexeme. From the structure of the Kazakh words ‘to move, to stir’ which kept its seme *it* ‘to quit, to send’, *isir* ‘to move, to remove’, *ibir* (ыбыр-жыбыр/кыбыр-жыбыр — fidget/hustle) ‘to move, unnecessary movement’ we can notice ancient Turkic word *ī* and *at* ‘to shoot a gun, run away heartbeat, to gush out (water) etc.’ old Kipch. *at* ‘to throw, to cast’ [Kuryzhanov 1970: 88]; Nog., Bashk., Kum., Tar., Kkalp., Kirg. *at* ‘to shoot, to throw’; *atta* ‘overstep’, *adim* ‘step, stride’ and other lexemes we can distinguish correspondence *a ≈ i* and the same content widely used in Turkic languages. With the help of these examples we defined the archesemes of general Turkic **i/a* former root meant ‘general movement’. If so, the number of homogeneous monosyllables *at~ad ≈ aš~ač~až~az~aj~aq~ay...* which retained the meaning ‘to separate, to part’ also can be grouped with the complex of words come from archeroot *ī/a*. B. Sagindikuli studied the monosyllable *at* with the meaning ‘horse’, ‘name’ coordinating with the verbs *it/at*, his pointing the semes of the verb *at* connected with movement; compulsion of movement; quick movement; separation as a result of the movement; repetition of movement is based on the general meaning of the verbs *at/i/t* [Sagyndykov 1994: 40–41]. A. Salkinbai deepened the scholar’s view about the verb *at* and she expands homogeneous monosyllables on the basis of the data in the system of other languages together with Kazakh language [Salkynbai 1999].

In connection with rare appearance of **V** formed monosyllables in ancient Turkic languages and their nonuse as an individual lexeme in modern Turkic languages N. A. Baskakov considers them as a form shortened from two-three compound roots,

unable to be an initial root, with a long way of development from the phonetic and semantic point: "It is clear that the stem (C) V (C) in Turkic language is the latest structure genetically formed from rather complete root morphemes (C) VC < CVC" [Baskakov 1988: 43]. To consider V structural monosyllables given in the language of monuments as a derivative form cannot be approved by the language data. Pointing out that V formed roots (mostly interjection) with the vowels *a*, *ä*, *e*, *o* give about 30 semantic meaning and also that V formed roots are used A. Kaidar says "Comparing with the modern Turkic languages widespread occurrence of this type of monosyllabic root-stems in the language of ancient monuments proves that they formed in ancient times. Model V which represents the ancient period of Turkic language development formed the new types of monosyllabic root-stems like VC, VCC and disyllabic stems and accepted the elements of agglutinative structure" [Kaidarov 1986: 41].

Use of separate vowels (with their allophones), which originate from the period of the development of human language, with a definite idea eventually will change in form through accepting the consonants and the combination of sounds with peculiar idiosyncratic meaning, polysemantic feature is concretized in accordance with the form and the initial content is likely to have certain properties of conditionality. It is clear that the more abstract-conditional properties have language elements, the more complication they

have in learning its inwardness and defining the historical way of development. In general if the importance of spiritual value increases it is more difficult to learn and estimate it. Language is also as the most important human value becoming more complicated, in the developed sound language only remainders and some slight traces of its initial position stay.

Model V monosyllables in Turkic languages also should be accepted as relict signs and outline of ancient lexical fund. In Kazakh language the common content and the similarity of forms of the monosyllables *ös*, *ön*, *ör* 'to advance, multiply, products, intensify, flourish' cannot be a random phenomenon, it is clear that the vowel *ö* keeps the common content.

We know that the idea 'to develop, to breed, to appear' was preserved in the monosyllable **ur* (urpaq 'descendant', ru 'genus', ur *iq* 'seed', ur *yaši* 'female').

B. Sagindikuli considers the forms *ör*, **ur* as homogeneous monosyllables [Sagyndykov 1994: 111]. The conservation of the general content of the form **ur* in monosyllables **ür* (*ürim-butaq* 'descendant', *ürpi* 'nipple'), **oy/uy* ← *oyul*, *um* (Umai), **ül* (ul *i* 'great', ul *γ* *aju* 'to increase', *ulasu* 'to continue'), **ül* (*ül* ken 'large') etc. shows the ideological ability of the vowels *u*, *ü*. So we have the chance to distinguish V formed monosyllables **u*, **ü*, **o*, **ö* as the hypothetical previous root of homogeneous words that begin with *u*, *ü*, *o*, *ö* which kept the idea 'to appear, to develop, to continue, to multiply' in Turkic languages.

Abbreviations

Inscriptions

BK	—	Bilgekagan
Y	—	Yenissei Inscriptions
IA	—	Ihe-Ashat Inscription
KTg	—	Kultegin great text
KTs	—	Kultegin small text
KH	—	Kanmiildig Hovu monument
KCh	—	Kulli Chor monument
MCh	—	Moiun Chur monument
On	—	Ongin monumant
Orh	—	Orhon inscriptions
S	—	Sudgi inscription
Tal	—	Talas inscriptions
Ton	—	Tonikuk monument
HB	—	Herbis Baar inscription
HT	—	Hoito Tamir inscription
Sh	—	Shu inscriptions
El	—	Eleges inscriptions

Languages

Kaz.	—	Kazakh language
KKalp.	—	Karakalpak language
Nog.	—	Nogai language
Kum.	—	Kumuk language
Tat.	—	Tatar language
Tur.	—	Turkish language
Kirg.	—	Kirgiz
Bashk.	—	Bashkir language
CTat.	—	The language of Crimean Tatars
Uig.	—	Uighur language
Hak.	—	Hakass language
Chuv.	—	Chuvash language
Yak.	—	Yakut language

References

- Aidarov G.* Kultegin monumant. Almaty: Ana tili, 1995, 232 p.
- Aidarov G.* The language of Tonikuk monumant (VIII C.). Almaty: Kazakhstan, 2000, 120 p.
- Ancient Turkic dialects and their reflection in the modern languages. Edited by I. A. Batmanov. Frunze: Ilim, 1971, 194 p. (in Russian).
- Ancient Turkic dictionary. Edited by V. M. Nadelyaev, D. M. Nasilov, E. R. Tenishev, A. V. Scherbak. L.: Nauka, 1969. 676 p. (in Russian).
- Baskakov N. A. Historical and typological morphology of Turkic Languages (structure of words and the mechanism of agglutination). Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1979, pp. 145–146 (In Russ.).
- Baskakov N. A. Historical typological phonology of languages. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1988, 207 p. (In Russ.).
- Baskakov N. A. Introduction to the Study of Turkic Languages. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1969, p. 89 (In Russ.).
- Baskakov N. A. Karakalpak language. Part. 1. Moscow, Publ. house of AS USSR, 1952, pp. 101–105 (In Russ.).
- Baskakov N. A. Preface by V. Kotvich. Studies of Altaic languages. Moscow, Publ. House of East Literature, 1962, p. 17 (In Russ.).
- Ibatov A. Morphological structure of words. Almaty, Gylym Publ., 1983, p. 67 (In Russ.).
- Kaidarov A. T. The structure of monosyllabic roots and stems in the Kazakh language. Alma-Ata, Nauka Publ., 1986, 323 p. (In Russ.).
- Kazhybekov E. Z. The meaning of the Turkic word. Interlevel conjugacy problem. ADD. Alma-Ata, Til. Bilimi, 1988. 63 p. (In Russ.).
- Kazhybekov E. Z. Verb-Noun correlation of homogeneous roots in the Turkic languages. Alma-Ata, Nauka Publ. 1986. 270 p. (In Russ.).
- Khasenova A. Lexico-grammatical characteristics of the verb. Almaty, Gylym Publ., 1971, 306 p. (In Russ.).
- Kononov A. N. Grammar of Turkic Runic inscriptions of the 7–9 centuries. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1980, 256 p. (In Russ.).
- Kormushin I. V. Lexical-semantic development of gair Altaic languages. Turkic lexicology and lexicography. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1971, pp. 10–18 (In Russ.).
- Kuryshzhanov A. K. Research on lexis of Old Kipchak inscription of 12 c. Turkic-Arabian dictionary. Alma-Ata: Nauka Publ., 1970, 232 p. (in Russ.).
- Levin G. G. Lexical-semantic parallels Orhon-Turkic and Yakut languages: in comparance with Altai, Hakass, Tuva languages. Novosibirsk: Nauka Publ., 2001, 190 p. (in Russian).
- Makaev E. A. Problems of construction of comparative grammar and Turkic languages. Soviet Turkology, 1971, no. 2, pp. 20–28 (In Russ.).
- Makhmud Kashgari. Devonu Lugot it turk. S. M. Mutalibov. Tashkent: Publ. House of AS UzSSR, 1961, vol. II, 427 p.
- Mankeyeva Zh. A. Methods for the isolation of dead roots in the disyllabic verbs-imperatives. Problems of Turkic linguistics. Alma-Ata, Nauka Publ., 1985, p. 50–62 (In Russ.).
- Mankeyeva Zh. A. Morphological analysis of disyllabic verbs-imperatives in Kazakh. Problems of historical lexicology of Kazakh language. Almaty, Gylym Publ., 1988, pp. 61–75 (In Russ.).
- Mankeyeva Zh. A. Reconstruction of the primary root verb stems of Kazakh language. Alma-Ata, Gylym Publ., 1991, 255 p. (In Russ.).
- Sabir M. The interconnection of Middle Turkic and Kazakh language vocabulary (on the basis of 14 century written manuscripts). Almaty, Kazakh Univ., 2004 (In Kazakh).
- Sagindikov B. Etymological basis of the development of Kazakh lexicology. Almaty, Sanat Publ., 1994, 166 p. (In Russ.).
- Sagindikuli B. Arch root-language unit. Modern Turkology: theory, practice and objectives. The second International conference of Turkology, part I. Turkestan, Turan Publ., 2006, pp. 199–205 (In Kazakh).
- Salkinbai A. Historic word-formation (semantic aspect). Almaty, Kazakh Univer., 1999, 340 p. (In Kazakh).
- Sevortyan E. V. Etymological dictionary of Turkic languages. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1974, vol. I, 768 p. (in Russian).
- Shaikhulov A. Altaic civilization and world view reflected in the Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungus languages (based on them on the monosyllabic root bases). Turkology, 2004, no. 5, pp. 92–100 (In Russ.).
- Shaikhulov A. The problem of root words in Turkic languages. Turkology, 2004, no. 2, pp. 50–61 (In Russ.).
- Shaikhulov A. The structure and ideographic paradigm of monosyllabic root bases in Kypchak languages of Ural-Volga region in the continuum of areal, Interturkic and all Turkic vocabulary: Synopsys and taxonomy of cognitive sphere “Nature (non-living and living)”. Ufa, BashGU, 2000, 392 p. (In Russ.).
- Sherbak A. M. Comparative phonetics of Turkic languages. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1970, 201 p. (in Russian).
- Tomanov M. Studying the history of language. Almaty, Gylym Publ., 2002, 614 p. (In Kazakh).

- Yuldashev A. A. The system of word-formation in the conjugations of the verb in Bashkir language. Moscow, Publ. House of AS USSR, 1958, 195 p. (In Russ.).
- Yunusaliev B. M. Kyrgyz lexicology: Development of root words. Part. I. Frunze, Publ. House of Kyrgyz State Educational and Pedagogical, 1959, 248 p. (In Russ.).
- Zayonchkovski A. On the structure of roots in Turkic languages: verb stems monosyllabic (one syllable) type C + V (consonant + vowel). Problems of Linguistics. 1961, no. 2, pp. 21–29 (In Russ.).
- Zhalmakhanov Sh. Semantic derivation of Kazakh lexics. Karagandy, KarMU, 2003, 552 p. (In Kazakh).

УДК 811.512.1

СТРУКТУРНЫЕ МОДЕЛИ МОНОСИЛЛАБОВ Г В ДРЕВНЕТЮРКСКИХ НАДПИСЯХ И СОВРЕМЕННЫХ КЫПЧАКСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ

Магрипа Кайнарбаевна Ескеева¹

¹ доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры тюркологии Евразийского национального университета им. Л. Н. Гумилева (Астана, Республика Казахстан). E-mail: mag61103@inbox.ru

Аннотация. Хотя изучение проблемы корня слова является классической сферой с устоявшимися традициями и принципами, конкретными целями и задачами, природа односложных слов, которая формирует основу языка, не полностью раскрыта. Актуальность проблемы корня слова связана многоступенчатостью и противоречивостью характера тюркских корней, который возникает с момента появления звука в языке. Б. М. Юнусалиев говорит об односложных формах: «...односложная корневая основа часто выглядит как волнообразное повторение процессов агглютинации», хотя развитие форм тюркских слов от простого к сложному является основной особенностью тюркских языков, некоторые преграды, такие как инверсия (сокращение, редукция, элизия и т. д.), из-за фонетических правил и их усложненности не позволяют определить природу корня [Юнусалиев 1959: 185]. В соответствии с принципом экономии фонетические явления — гаплоглия и редукция — порождают новую совместимость звука и новую фонологическую ситуацию. Это приводит к позиционному изменению звуков, их потере, появлению одного звука вместо двух, и в соответствии с принципом сохранения коммуникативной изоляции аккумуляция изменяющихся звуков будет поддерживать новое формирование фонетической системы. Изменения в фонетической системе могут влиять на односложные формы, а простые фонетические изменения — на фонологическую структуру в ходе семантического развития. Так как познание природы слов требует полного пересмотра формы и смысла, то в основе общей тюркской лексики с психофизиологическими процессами в соответствии с многосторонними принципами семасиологической системы лежит взаимосвязь семантического развития односложных форм как явления, напрямую связанного с человеческим сознанием и мировоззрением, что усложняет вопрос. Автор статьи предпринял попытку расширить характер и семантику структурных моделей Г моносиллабов в орхон-енисейском, таласском и кыпчакском языках.

Ключевые слова: тюркские языки, древнетюркские письменные памятники, современные кыпчакские языки, односложный, корень, фонеморфология, фоносемантика, фонология, звуковое согласие.