

ISSN 1226-4490

*International
Journal of
Central
Asian Studies*

Volume 12 2008

**Editor in Chief
Choi Han-Woo**

**The International Association of Central Asian Studies
Korea University of International Studies**

An Analysis of Alternation as a Means of Word Derivation in Turkish by Focusing on Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk

Mehmet Vefa Nalbant
Pamukkale University, Turkey

Abstract:

One of the measures used by the researchers, who work on the relationship between the languages in the world, in order to distinguish those languages is the method of word derivation formed according to the structure of each language. Method of word derivation indicates similarities between related languages. On the contrary, among the languages which have no relationship, there are differences. However, some word derivation methods might show similarities for the languages that belong to different language families. Alternation, used as a word derivation method, has been a method that is different from derivation by affixes although it is not widely known and a method that has associate Turkish with Indo-European and Semitic language families. With the aim of researching the importance of alternation in Turkish, which means changing the meaning of the word by an alteration in the sound, and as a result which means deriving a new word, the work called Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk has been chosen since it includes various words and grammar rules that belong to various Turkish dialects and with the analysis of this work a historical approach is adopted.

Introduction

Each language has its own way of word derivation. But it does not mean that languages of different families never use the word derivation methods used by the others. Although there are great differences in word

derivation methods between the members of two language families, sometimes a word derivation method which seems to belong to a language family may be used by a language that is the member of another language family. The best known method of word derivation in Turkish is derivation by affixes. Besides this, the method of word derivation by changing the function which was analyzed by us before is seen as one of the less applied word derivation methods.(Nalbant 2006 : 137-148)

Another method related to word derivation to be mentioned here is the method of deriving new words which has different meanings by changing sounds in the structure of the words that have the same root.

Has this word derivation method (gradation, alternation) which is one of the methods especially used by Indo-European and Semitic languages in word derivation been a method used by Turkish? If it has been, what are the ways of usage and limits of this method?

These and these kinds of questions have previously made other researchers who work on Turkish engaged and those researchers have tried to find responses to them. In this study, the issue of similarities between other language families in alternation is not focused on. On the other hand, the similarities found between the Altaic languages are referred by indicating the data in the studies of other researchers on this issue. Before dealing with their opinions, it should be emphasized that our analysis will be limited to the examples from *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk*. The word derivation method easily determines the word-pairs indicating alternation. Moreover, *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* which was arranged as a dictionary of Turkish dialects with an encyclopedic order plays an important role in that it reveals this method has been applied in the area of Historical Turkish Language. Absolutely, it cannot be asserted that this method was first used in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk*. However, it might be possible to easily find out the differences in phonetics, morphology and semantics for cognate words in a dictionary form of this work. Since new word derivation method by means of sound change is partly within the borders of etymology, etymological analysis related with the words will be presented when needed. In these etymological studies, the comparative etymological analysis of the dialects in general Turkish language field is emphasized. Besides, the forms of other Altaic

languages, if necessary, and, generally, of the main Altaic language are applied in this study.

1. Alternation and Related Studies in Turkish

Sound phenomenon known as *gradation* or *alternation* in English, *alternance* in French, and *abstufung* or *lautwechsel* in German and called as *almaşma* in Turkish is shortly defined and explained as “the dependence between two sounds or two sound groups that show regular changes in two synchronically morphological lines, for example: in German *Bruder* “brother”, *Brüder* “brothers”, in English “man” and “men” there is alternation between the morphologies. Generally, alternation is seen among various morphologies and it reflects the opposition of an important function, liaison etc. When sound phenomena form a regular sound opposition between two lines of elements that include an opposition of value, this differentiation is used to transfer meaning and to have conceptual separation. Alternation, in the narrow sense, means the vowel change in etymons specifically and, in a wide terminology, means all kinds of change facts which have morphological value.” (Vardar 2002:16, 17) Instead of the term *ablaut* in German to express the sound change between vowels, the term *vowel alternation* is used in Turkish.

The subject of alternation in Turkish has generally been analyzed by researchers as a sound phenomenon and without having a special title, but the reasons for alternation and its rules have not been completely defined.

The first studies on alternation in Turkish belong to Bang, Bazin, Räsänen and Menges.

While Bang defines vowel changes as a kind of alternation (*ablaut*), Räsänen exemplifies the vowel changes. On the other hand, he analyzes these changes without using the term *ablaut*. Bazin’s study focuses on the words with sound reflection which have more than one form and are affected by a sound change. (Menges 1966:1-3)

Menges, who briefly summarizes the studies of the former researchers on alternation in Turkish in his study, discusses whether alternation is seen in Altaic languages and tries to prove that it is seen in Altaic

languages by focusing on phonetic changes in personal pronouns which can be regarded as important alternation examples especially for all Altaic languages.

In Turkey, a few studies have been made on alternation that is related to both the sound and the meaning aspect of Turkish. However, the striking point in most of those studies is the fact that this situation which interests sound-meaning relationship is not named with any term.

One of the reasons for this situation is the perception of alternation not as a method of word derivation but as a sound phenomenon for Turkish. Consequently, most of the studies made on the subject in Turkey are related with sound phenomena and can be evaluated within this frame.

Günay Karaağaç, one of the researchers studying the effect of phonetic changes on comprehension in Turkish, has focused on alternating root allomorphs and tried to solve the problem about the existence of brother roots created by various phonetic alternations between Turkish and other Altaic languages. Karaağaç suggests that when there was need to name new things in recorded periods in which original creations were not common, the main method was to derive new words from brother roots and stems that live in the recorded period languages in the form of branches and to give new functions and meanings to these derived words as well as borrowing from other languages. In the rest of his study, he analyzes the words of Turkish and Mongolian which he believes to have the same root but which are different from each other in meaning because of the changes in their root allomorphs. According to Karaağaç, the branch shape of Turkish has been the first way used in naming the new neighbor information of old periods. Karaağaç points to the fact that new word derivation method via sound change has been a method used since the old periods of Turkish. (Karaağaç 1999:593–599)

E.G.Naskali, who dealt with the changes in meaning as a result of phonetic changes in the word bodies and evaluated this phenomenon within the frame of ablaut, focuses on diminutive meaning which is the outcome of changes in the word stem as well as diminutive forms of Turkish performed by the widely known diminutive suffixes and which can be seen in the examples of Fatma-Fatoş-Fatı etc.; also, on the sound-meaning relationship in this phenomenon, and the purpose of his study is

to define the rules of diminutive forms performed by this sound change. (Naskali 1996:491-494)

Mustafa Sarı, who studied on the influence of sound phenomena on meaning in Turkish, established four sound phenomena influential on meaning: a. To change the sound structure of the word b. Echo c. Vowel length d. Stress The phenomenon studied by Sarı under the title of “To change the sound structure of the word” and defined by him as a sound phenomenon related to meaning is similar to the topic called as alternation by us. Under the mentioned title, Sarı gives the words *yalafar-yalavaç*, *kırgag-kargak* and *çumdı-çümdi* as examples which are widely known in *Dîvānu Luğātî't-Türk*. This study is important since it puts forward the relation of phonetic changes and other sound phenomena with meaning and since it handles sound phenomena as the determiners of meaning. (Sarı 2004:2577-2584)

Hubey, who questions the role of intensifying and the origins of doublets in Turkish, aims to define the formation rules of doublets in Turkish such as *mirin-kırın*, *tavuş-süyüş*, *abuk-sabuk* and to prove that the words in those doublets which seem to have different roots share the same root which actually creates the doublet by a change in the sound. (Hubey : www.aton.ttu.edu: 24.03.2007, 1-18)

On the other hand, Mehmet Kara, who studied the words that show phono-semantic alternation and take place in *The Turkish Dictionary*, has analyzed many examples within the frame of this sound-meaning phenomenon called by us as alternation. As well as Turkish words, Kara has preferred to analyze the words with foreign origin and phono-semantic alternation. According to his view, phono-semantic alternation is a way of word derivation that is applied to enrich vocabulary by contributing to the form of new words in Turkish. The author, who has studied to find out which sound phenomena cause phono-semantic alternation in Turkish words, has defined 11 sound phenomena as reasons for phono-semantic change. (Kara 2004)

Kara who defines phono-semantic alternation as a means of word derivation in his study has not mentioned any comments on the reasons of alternation in the given words.

Certainly, studies on alternation in Turkish are not limited to those. However, in the publications apart from the above mentioned ones, the

subject of alternation is handled either in a general way or as a sound phenomenon and except a few studies, the usage of alternation as a word derivation method is not mentioned.¹

However, as clearly put forward by the present study, alternation is an old and widely known method of word derivation for Turkish and it doesn't work without rules and reasons; on the contrary, it is a word derivation method which came out of some social, religious and verbal reasons and can be used within the borders of the rules of the language.

It is clear that it is possible to find out many examples of alternation in many works that belong to the historical periods of Turkish. However, we have chosen *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* and based our study on it since it is composed of the dialects of its age, it includes words taken from those dialects and it gives clues about the similarities and the differences between synonyms and homonymies.

2. Alternation in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk*

There are almost twenty words in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* that can be analyzed for alternation. The first measure in their classification is the existence of alternation in words of noun or verb origin which means it exists in word level. Alternations in words caused by religious, social and verbal reasons are discussed in subtitles under the main titles and words are analyzed according to this method:

2.1 Alternation in Nouns

The reasons of alternation used in words of noun origin in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* can be explained as followed: To find expressions for the new terms of foreign origin, to define the separation between what is divine and what is not according to the believes of those cultures, to separate gender and species, to create difference in meaning between the names of relatives, to state that one situation is more intensive and

¹ For the works related to this topic, the ones in our bibliography can be used apart from the above mentioned studies..

stronger than the other, to define the whole and a part of it and to separate the title and diminutive meaning of a word.

2.1.1 Alternation Used for Finding New Expressions for the New Terms of Foreign Origin and for the Derivation of Words to Show the Difference of Meaning between the Divine and the Undivine

Throughout the history, Turks have believed in many religious systems and showed great care to obey the rules of the religious systems in which they believe. Each conversion into a new belief system caused a change in culture and brought new words of the new culture together with itself, as well. Turks sometimes used the new words related with the concepts of the new culture without making any change, but most of the time they chose to express those concepts with the words in their own language instead of the words that do not exist in Turkish and stand for the new concepts. Turks who converted to Islam showed more care to perform the rules of this divine religion more than they did for their previous believes and with the fear of committing sin, they separated the usages of some words which express the terms of the Islam to show whether they stand for the divine or not. To make this separation, for the word *yalabaç* equal to *resul* in Arabic which means both the Prophet and an envoy, they created a sound change in the structure of this word with the aim of creating difference in meaning. Apart from this example, sound change was applied to two other words with the same purpose and a change in the meanings was achieved.

2.1.1.1 Yalawaç/Yalavaç/Yalafar

This word, which generally means “envoy, ambassador” and can be firstly seen as *yalabaç* in Bilge Khan Inscription (D39) (Tekin 1988:50), originated in Mani and Islam terminology and means “prophet” according to Clauson. Clauson states that the suffix *-vaç/-waç* of the word means “voice” in Iranian language but that the first part of the word has never been seen in any Iranian language. As stated above, the word *resul* means in Arabic both “the prophet” and “the envoy”. This situation creates an ambiguity. Again in Clauson’s view, due to this

reason, the word *resul* was supposed to be used only with its meaning of prophet in the middle period in Arabic. (Clauson 1972:921)

It seems that the same ambiguity in Arabic was seen for the Turkish word *yalabaç* since Uighur people who believed in Mani religion and their Muslim successors wanted to create a difference in the meaning of the word *yalabaç-yalavaç* and to distinguish the words that mean “the envoy” and “the prophet”. With this aim of creating a difference they made a change between the consonants of the word. Thus, they had two words; one for the envoy and one for the prophet and these words were added to the Turkish vocabulary of the time.

According to Y.Gedikli who focuses on the words *dılmaç-yalabaç* in Turkish, the words *yalabaç* and *yalavaç* are derived from the word *dılmaç*. Gedikli, who bases his study on the fact that /y/ sound in some Turkish words stands for /ny/ in the Hungarian language, expresses that the words *yalabaç/yalavaç* were derived from the word *dılmaç* meaning “the translator” and that they mean “Messenger, envoy, prophet”. As a result of this etymological approach, Gedikli states that Turks used the words *yalabaç/yalavaç* with the meaning of “the translator of Allah, the person who translates the words of Allah”. The relation of the word with *dıl* and with the root **yol* “language, word”, which can be seen in the word *yalbar-* “to pray, to plead” and in some Mongolian word roots, is obvious. Gedikli claims that the suffix of the word *-baç>-waç* comes and develops from the suffix *-makçı*.

At the end of all his evaluations, Gedikli states that there is only a nuance between *yalavaç* and *yalafar* and he does not define this situation as alternation. (Gedikli 2004:1203-1222) The examples **il/el*: “language” in Turkish, **yol*: “language”, **al*: “language” in Mongolian, *tılmaç*: “translator” in Turkish and *yalavaç*: “envoy, prophet” in Mongolian given by Karaağaç are other examples that prove the relationship claimed by Gedikli. (Karaağaç 1996:592-598)

In our opinion, the difference in meaning between these two words is the result of sound change and this means that it should be regarded as alternation. Whereas *yalawaç* and *yalavaç* mean “prophet” in *kırgağ*, *yalafar* is used in the meaning of “envoy, ambassador”. Although the difference between these words was stated by Kāşğarî as well, somewhere in his work *yalavaç* is used not for “prophet” but for “envoy,

ambassador”. However, in the other examples from the work the difference between the words *yalawaç* and *yalafar* can be clearly seen.

The evaluation of Kāşğarî on these two words in *Dîvānu Luġātî*’t-Türk is as following:

yalawaç: “messenger. *yalāwaç* is a variant.” (Atalay 1992:III-47)

yalafar: “the name given to the messenger of kings. In Uighur dialect. It is used as in the following as well: *yaş ot köymes, yalafar ölmes:* “fresh grass does not burn, so the messenger does not die, is not killed.” (Atalay 1992:III-47)

han yalavaçığ boşudı: (The Khan let the envoy free to turn back to his country). (Atalay 1992:III-266)

Mustafa Canpolat, who evaluates the etymologies of Kāşğarî, states that with the above mentioned *yalawaç-yalafar* change the following words *ķarġaķ* are separated with the aim of distinguishing religious terms from the words of everyday life. Moreover, he expresses that it is essential to question whether the change between *Tanrı-Tenri* in Oguz Turks developed with the analogical influence of *Allah, Hak* or the word *teŖâlâ* together with which it is used as have been told so far or with the thickening effect of the /n/ phonem, or whether it is a conscious change to distinguish old word *Tenri* from its present meaning. He, also, emphasizes that *yalawaç-yalafar* and *ķirġaķ-ķarġaķ* distinction in the work of Kāşğarî is a clue for us on the subject. (Canpolat 1999:19-29)

2.1.1.2 Ķarġaķ /Ķirġaķ

Other two words, which can show that the difference between the words *yalawaç/yalawaç-yalafar* is not only a nuance but they are the words of the same root derived by alternation to have two different meanings, are *ķarġaķ* with the meaning of “cursing, swearing, imprecation” and *ķirġaķ* with the meaning of “punishment, swearing and rebuke of the Khan towards the people around” derived with the suffix of the deverbal noun from the verb *ķarġa-*. Here the difference of meaning which shows the punishment comes either from Allah or by the Khan is given by the “a>ı” difference between the vowels in the word bodies and by the difference in meaning created by this change. In other words, the difference to emphasize the divine and the undivine is created by the

words *karğak* that stands for the both meanings- punishment both by the Khan and Allah-, and *kirğak* derived from the stem of this noun with the sound change; by this way, two words were created from the same root to express the divine or the undivine.

Their difference of sound and meaning is shown by Kāşgari in the sentences of *Dīvānu Luġātī't-Türk* as in the following:

karğak: “curse, malediction.” (Atalay 1992:II-288)

kirğak: “*beg anı kirğadı*: “the emir sent him away, treated him roughly, and rebuked him...Note that they distinguished between the cursing of God (may He be exalted) and te? driving away by servant of God of another like him, by putting fatha on the one and kasra on the other .” (Atalay 1992:II-288)

Since the words *yalafar* and *kirğak* are registered as Uighur and in Uighur language and neither of these words express the divine, it can be considered that the Muslim Karahan Turks used the words of the non-Muslim Uighur Turks that are from the same root but have a nuance to express the divine and the undivine; thus, the difference of belief might have been reflected on the words.

On the other hand, it is clearly seen in the words *yalafar-yalavaç* and *karğak-kirğak* that the phonetic changes in the same word between the dialects were used as a means of distinguishing the meaning when it was needed to derive a new word for a new religious term.

2.1.1.3 Bitig/Biti

It is a word that is derived by the -g suffix of deverbal noun from the verb *biti-* that is derived by the +i- suffix of deverbal verb from the noun *bit* which means *pir < pjet or *biet* “the brush used for letter writing”, borrowed from Chinese with the meaning of “inscription, book, writing etc” (Nadelyaev 1969:103) and it can be seen in almost all works of Turkish language starting from the oldest written works in Turkish. According to Şinasi Tekin, since the word *bitigçin* derived from the Chinese noun *bit* is seen in Tabğaç language, the old Turks must have observed the activities of the Chinese related to writing long before 400 BC. In order to derive two words following each other from the stem of

the verb, this verb must have existed long before. First *biti-g* was made and then *biti-g-çi-n* was derived from it. (Ş.Tekin 2001:59-70)

It's observed in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* that the word *bitig* is again used with a little sound change because of religious anxieties and that as a result of this sound phenomenon two words of the same root have two distinct meanings.

This word is found as *biti* in one of the Karakhanid Turkic period works, *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk*, and in some later works of Harezm and Kıpçak period. (Clauson 1972:303)

It is not very clear whether this word is a word with two roots (the root which can be used both as the noun and the verb) used in the same way with the verb *biti-* or it has developed into *biti* from *bitig*. Although a *biti* form which is made with the elision of the *g* sound from the form *bitig* exists, it can only be seen in the texts of the Old Oġuz Turkic which became written only in the 13th century. For this reason, it is hard to think that *biti* is the result of the elision of the *g* sound from *bitig* in a work that represents the Karakhanid Turkic period. However, it shouldn't be ignored that it is possible *biti* form represents the dialect of Oġuz in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* and it is a word that shows the /*g*/ sound elision in the early period. We would prefer to evaluate the *biti* form as a *biti-/biti* double-rooted (noun and verb) word.

Whereas the word is a noun that comes from a double-root as we think or it is formed by the elision of the /*g*/ sound from the word *bitig*, here it is clear that the people who had this language changed the meaning according to their own needs by making use of the phonetic changes in the word structure and that they gained a new word by this way. It was aimed to put forward the separation between the work and the object produced by the humanity and the divine work and the object as well.

As a consequence, while the word *bitig* means "book, writing, amulet" in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk*, the word *biti* is used for "each of the four holy books":

biti : "each of the books that were sent from the heavens" (Atalay 1992:III-217)

bitig: "writing, book, amulet" (Atalay 1992:I-384)

2.1.2 Using Alternation in Order to Create Difference between Gender and Species

To express various genus and species with the same words that have little phonetic changes should be certainly connected with the conditions of life for a society and with some necessities created by these conditions. As a result of the shared life of the human beings and animals in especially nomadic societies on horseback and in half settled societies, it is widely seen that the names for the babies of both the human beings and animals are used for each other usually by the way of transfer and similes. Besides, it is a situation known by people who study Turkish language and its dialects that a word used for a species is used for another in another dialect. In Dīvānu Luġāti't-Türk, as well as expressing different species with the same word by the way of similes and transfer, it is preferred to gain new meanings by creating some phonetic changes in the structure of the word and to separate gender and species from each other with the words that share the same root by doing so. There are two root words in Dīvānu Luġāti't-Türk that exemplify this situation. The first one is *oġul and the other is *in. While new words are derived from the word oġul with some sounds to separate human beings from animals which belong to two different species, in the word *in sound change was created to separate two animal species.

2.1.2.1 Oġla/Oġul/ Oġlak

One of the few words which means “young, child” among the names for human beings and animals and which expresses the young individual of the both species with the same word is oġul.

“The word oġul, oġlan which is seen in the Orhun Inscriptions not only had a wider meaning in Uighur Turkic as “son, young man, adolescent” but also caused words such as oġlaġu which means “in a childlike manner, like a young man, compassionate, elegant”. The Uighur language period in which oġlaġ was used together with oġlan shows that those two words are derived from the same root and it is given to the animals just because of the change of grammatical form. As a result, in Old Turkic language works, word groups such as oġla, oġul, oġlaġ, oġlüt

which have three or four grammatical forms with the same meaning can be seen...

The word oğul and oğlağ, which is derived from it, entered into the social life of the Turks with the meaning of the unity in the family, and they created new words from them such as oğlan kız, kız oğul, oğul kız without thinking any separation of gender for the words oğul and oğlağ with the meaning of “daughter, children, sons/daughters”.

However, no matter what its root and derivation phases are, the word oğul has similar semantic meaning phases with the word kişi. As widely known, kişi and oğul meant “human, generation, descendants, creature” in the first Orhun state law, and it still has no gender discrimination. The gender discrimination of man and woman occurred in later ages.” (Caferoğlu 1968:1-15)

Although Caferoğlu, from whose study we have a long quotation above, showed different words that developed out of the same root and focused on the difference of meaning among those words, he did not mention the influence of the phonetic changes in these words upon meaning and the oğla form that can be seen in Dîvānu Lüğātî't-Türk in his study.

On the other hand, Hasan Eren (1999:305) who evaluated the previous etymologies related with the word oğul in his work called *The Etymological Dictionary of Turkish Language*, states that the word oğul is a very old word. The idea that /l/ at the end of the word oğul is a suffix which is stated by Eren in this study based on the studies of Bang and Nemeth is striking since this word is thought to have developed from a hypothetical **iuga* form in The Main Altaic language.

Besides the words oğlan “sons, children” and oğlağ “oğlak” which are derived from the word oğul “child, son” and one of which has the diminutive suffix and the other a plural suffix, the word oğla meaning “young man, strong-hearted” shows an older form that is related to this root in Dîvānu Lüğātî't-Türk. This word comes also from a hypothetical root meaning **iuga* “child, son” in The Main Altaic language (Starostin vd.2003:612).

The **ögele-*ogala* (Starostin vd.2003:612) forms of the word in Proto Mongolian show that oğla developed out of this forms. The *ögelen* form seen in The Western Mongolian must be similar to our word oğlan.

The usage of this form in Mongolian as a different word in the meaning of “young man, brave-hearted” instead of the word *oġul* in Dīvānu Luġāti’t-Türk is important since it shows us that Kāşġarī added into his dictionary not only the words with the same root except a few little phonetic changes which have different meanings from one dialect to the other (as in *yalawaç/yalafar*: *yalafar* is the Uighur language form of the word) but also the words with the same root among the various members of the same language family.

Although Kāşġarī did not make it consciously, it proves that the sound and morphological changes in the words of the same root borrowed from the Mongolian were used instead of the needed words by giving different meanings among the users of Karakhanid Turkic and other Turkish dialects. Certainly, the users of Turkish of those periods did not care whether this word is from Mongolian or another. Kāşġarī collected the word *oġla* which is closely related to the word *oġul* in meaning and which shares the same root from Arġu Turkish and added it to his dictionary. This word added into Dīvānu Luġāti’t-Türk in its Mongolian form by Kāşġarī entered into the vocabulary of the Arġu dialect in this form and belonged to this dialect then. Probably Kāşġarī did not collect this word from Mongols. As well as clues about Arġu people and Arġu language given by Kāşġarī in his work such as *they know two languages and their languages are complicated*, it is striking that he shows Arġu dialect as a dialect of *n*. (Atalay:1992:I-29-34) These informaton show that Arġu language is older but is influenced more by the foreign languages.

Nevertheless, by using the phonetic and morphological differences between *oġla* and *oġul*, one of which represents Turkish and the other of which represents the Mongolian, the situation of giving a different meaning to the Mongolian one, but closer to the real one, is not the only example in Dīvānu Luġāti’t-Türk. We can see how the formal and morphological differences between the words *köşik-köşige* and *kölik-kölige* which will be analyzed below effect the meaning and how nuances occur between their meanings.

Such evaluations of Kāşġarī on three words that come from the same root and that show both the different species and the difference between the members of the same species are given as:

oğla: “young man, brave-hearted” (Atalay 1992:I-129)

oğul: “son. any child can be called as “son”. *bu oğul ne tər* “what does this son say?” This word is made plural without obeying the rule, it should have been made plural as *oğullar*. It is like “eren” for men. The words *Oğlan* and *eren* are also used as singular.” (Atalay 1992:I-74)

oğlak: “kid. It is used in this saying as well: *oğlak yiliksiz oğlan biligsiz.*” (Atalay 1992:I-119)

2.1.2.2 İngek-İngen

Two words used in naming the animal species and used in naming the different animal species although they are derived from the same root are *ingek* and *ingen*. In *Dîvānu Luğātî't-Türk* the former of those words means “cow” and the latter one means “female camel”. The last syllables at the end of the words are constructive suffixes. It is emphasized in *Dîvānu Luğātî't-Türk* that the female turtle is called as *ingek* as well.

Eren states that the origin of this word is unknown, but the similarity between the noun *ingen* used for the female camel and *ingek* is striking. (1999:191)

Clauson believes that the words *ingek* and *ingen* come from the same root and shows their nominal root as **in*. The “*teve ingeki*: Female camel” determinative construction which is taken from the Turkish Kur'an Commentary (Halil İbrahim Usta 2002:138) by Clauson is striking. (1972:184) Here the word *inek* is used to determine gender after the first word about the species and it expresses femininity.

Although some researchers do not accept the closeness between the Turkish forms of *ingek/ingen* and the Mongolian form *ünigen*, Ramsted, Pope united the forms *ingek* and *ünigen*. (Eren 1999:192)

It is thought that both *ünigen* seen in the Mongolian and *ingek-ijen* forms in Turkish come from a nominal form of **iunu* “cow” in The Main Altaic language. (Starostin vd. 2003:I-619) This form is close to the nominal **in* form thought by Clauson. The *ingek* and *ingen* forms of Turkish are thought to be *in-gek* and *in-ken* in proto-Turkic and it is claimed that this form means “cow, female camel”. (Starostin vd. 2003:I-619)

In our view, two words, one in the Mongolian and the other in Turkish, are derived from **in* nominal root. From the root **in*, while the form *ingek* occurs in Turkish with the help of the derivational suffix – GAK, in the Mongolian the word *ünigen* which has the same meaning was derived. The change seen in the meaning of the word *ingek* may be the result of the usage of this word in different dialects through time to express different species. A similar change occurred in the word *kölik*. As widely known, *kölik* means “calf”, it is used in different Turkish dialects in the meaning of the “young camel” or for the young individuals of other cattle. That the word *ingek* was used in the meaning of “female turtle” in Dīvānu Luġāti’t-Türk as well is another example of using the same word for different animal species in Turkish.

Ingen form seen in proto-Turkic and supposed to be **in-ken*, used in Old and Middle Turkic with the meaning of the “female camel” must be related with the *ünigen* form in the Mongolian. From this form, with the elision in the middle syllable, firstly *üngen* and then with the vowel change at the beginning of the word the form *ingen* must have appeared.

Therefore, it can be supposed that one of the forms of *ingek* and *ingen* which develop from the same root of the Main Altaic Language represents the Mongolian and the other represents Turkish. We have found out a relation similar to the one between these words above between the Mongolian word *oġala* and the Turkish word *oġul* and tried to prove that the form *oġul* is Turkish while the form *oġala* is in the Mongolian.

By using a similar method, it can be accepted that the word *Ingen* that comes from the Mongolian form of *ünigen* was given a meaning of the “female camel” by the people who spoke Turkish because of the phonetic changes in the structure of the word after it was added to the vocabulary of Turkish since the word *ingek* was used in Turkish with the same meaning and a new word was created to express a different animal species by that way.

The sound and morphological differences between two words which are the members of the two different languages, caused the change of the meanings of those one-rooted words in the Main Altaic Language, and also caused the word which means “cow” in this language period to gain the meaning of “female camel” in Turkish as well.

The evaluations of Kāşğarî on these two words in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk are as followed:

ingek: “cow. Oġuz people call the female turtle *ingek* as well.” (Atalay 1992:I-111)

ingen: “female camel. Comes in this saying as well: *ingen ıyrsa botu bozlar*... This saying tells the closeness of the relatives towards each other.” (Atalay 1992:I-120)

2.1.3 Using Alternation to Derive New Names for the Relatives

In Turkish there are various names for the relatives. It is known that sometimes more than one word are used for one relative name. Some part of those names which are related to the social life and used to determine the level of relationship are derived from the same root by means of sound change in words. The words *baldız-baldır*, *eke-ekek* ve *eçe-eçi-eze* from Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk will be analyzed in this part.

2.1.3.1 Baldır-Baldız

This word seen in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk in two forms *baldır* and *baldız* means “sister, sister of the wife”. When the development of the words *baldır* and *baldız* in the field of historical and contemporary Turkish language is examined, it is seen that in the basic meanings of those words there are other words that show relationship and there is a generalization in meaning which causes the usage of them for different relationships in different dialects.

Clauson shows the *baldır* form in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk as hap.leg. Hasan Eren, after giving the meanings of the word *baldız* in his etymological dictionary, states that this word lives in the Çuvaş language as *pultar* and shows this as an example of the rule that the Turkish –z is turned into –r in Chuvash language. (Eren 1999:36)

The *baltır* “baldız” form given by Gabain in his study dedicated to analyze the grammar of Old Turkic is important. (Gabain 1988:266) Räsänen states that the form *baltır* given by Gabain may be the result of a printer's error and evaluates this form more cautiously. (Räsänen

1969:60) However, the form *baldır* in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk shows that the form *baltır* given by Gabain is not the error of a printer.

This word is known to have meanings of “the wife’s sister, the wife’s brother, sister-in-law, the younger relatives of the wife” in the field of contemporary Turkish language. (Li 1999:290-293)

The word *baltır* and *baltız* found in the period of Old Uighur Turkic in the meaning of “the younger sister of the wife” (Li 1999:290) has the forms of *baldız* and *baldır* in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk. However, when the information in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk is taken into account, there is a difference of meaning between these two forms. According to this, *baldır* means “step-, not blood-related” and it makes determinative constructions such as *baldır kız* “step-daughter” or *baldır oĝlan* “step-son” by coming before the words daughter and son. (Atalay 1992:I-457) And the word *baldız* is defined as “the younger sister of the wife of a man”. In the rest of his explanations, Kāşġarî tells that “*baldız* is not used for the sister of the man, *sinil* is used for her”. (Atalay 1992:I-457)

According to the explanations of Kāşġarî, it can be claimed that the words *baldır-baldız* is firstly used to express the relationships that are not blood-related. The relationship expressed by the words *baldız-baldır* can be understood as a kind of legal relationship.

The form *baldır* which is seen near the form *baldız* in Old Turkic and in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk later makes us think that this word may have been borrowed from a *r* language in very old times. The difference of meaning seen in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk between the forms *baldız* and *baldır* must have occurred later as a result of the need for a new word.

2.1.3.2 Eke- Ekek/Eçe-Eçi- Eze

These words that belong to two groups which stand in different article beginnings and one of which comes from the root *eke* and the other from *aç-eçe* are used in different meanings as the names of the relatives in different Turkish dialects. In parallel with the changes in the system of relationship and the development in the society, the terms related with relatives may change rapidly. As a result, the meaning of a word which shows relationship at the beginning may have widening or narrowing in the meaning. In the words *eke* and *eçe* and the words that are derived out

of them which will be analyzed by us, there is a widening of meaning and it can be seen that those words are used for different terms of relationship according to dialects.

The topic that the words in these two groups and the members of each group may come out of the same root is a situation that needs analysis. Here, the problem of whether there is a common root between the words *eke* and *eçe* which find place at the beginning of different articles will be tried to be solved.

This word which originally means “the close woman relative who is older than the one and younger than his father” or in other words “younger aunt(the father’s sister)” and “elder sister” ,but later only meant “elder sister” (Clauson 1972:100)is found out as *eke* in the oldest texts (Tekin 1988:Kültigin K:9) , and left its place to *egeçi* in the Mongolian in the Middle Turkic period.

Eke, which is a homophonous word lives in some contemporary Turkish dialects in the meanings of “father, uncle, elder brother”. It may be true to think this form as a deformed form of *aka/ağa* from the Mongolian. (Clauson 1972:100)

This word can be found both in the field of historical and contemporary Turkish language in the forms of *eke*, *ekeçi*, *egeçi*, *egeç*, *igeçi*, *ikeçi*, *igeç*, *ehke* and with the meanings of “elder sister, sister-in-law, older woman, aunt(both the mother’s and the father’s sister)” .(Li 1999:172-174)

Grønbech states that the form *egeçi* comes from the Mongolian. According to Li, ç,c sounds found in forms such as *ekeç-egeç-egec*, *egeci-egeçi-ekeçi* must be originally diminutive suffixes and –i that comes after must be third person singular possessive suffix. (Li 1999:173-174)

This word is supposed to be in the form of *ěkŏà* in the Main Altaic Language with a meaning of “the younger sister”. *Kaka* and its *ağa* form used today in the meaning of “master, elder brother, father” are connected to the mentioned form in the Main Altaic Language. The word *eke* came out of the children’s language as it is with most of the terms used for relatives and it can be found in all fields. Because of the irregularity of –g- in the word *egeçe* in the Mongolian and the similarity of meaning with the Turkish meaning, this word can be thought to have

been borrowed from Turkish and to have entered into the Mongolian language.(Starostin vd. 2003:499-500)

Besides, the registration of Kāşğarî for the word *eke* as *Oğuz Turks call this eze* will be helpful to make the origin of the word clear and to find a connection of root with other words which are known to have the same roots with the words *eke*, *eçe* and *eçe*.

The information given by Kāşğarî about this word in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* is as below:

eke : “the elder sister. Oğuz Turks call this *eze*.” (Atalay 1992:I-90)

ekeç: “the girl who is intelligent from her youth, who makes everyone love herself as a sister. This word is used for the girls as a love word.” (Atalay 1992:52)

Meanwhile, *ekek* “used commonly” which is used in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* together with the word *işler* “woman” is another word to be connected with the word *eke*. Although the word *ekek* is not used in the meaning of “woman” alone, verb forms that come out of this word with affixes state this word means “the commonly used woman”. Since the verb *ekeklemek* means “to swear, to say the commonly used woman” in *Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk* (Atalay 1992:I-310), connecting this word to the root *eke* is possible. It is also possible to think with the sound +k added to the end of the word *ekek*, a difference is created between it and its root *eke* and phonetic changes differ the meaning.

2.1.3.3 Eçe-Eçi-Eze

The word which is supposed to have developed out of the *açV3* form in the Main Altaic Language and whose *açı*, *eçi*, *ece*, *eçe*, *eçi*, *eze*, *ede* forms are found in the historical and contemporary dialects of Turkish expresses various terms for relatives such as “the elder relative, ancestor, father, uncle, aunt, elder sister, aunt (father’s sister), mother, grandmother, grandfather, husband, etc.”.

The *açı eçe*, *eçi*, *eze* forms which are clear to have derived from the same word may show some differences in meaning from one dialect to the other. For example, while the word *eçi* means “beautiful woman, queen” in one dialect, in another dialect it may mean “the elder sister, aunt (father’s sister), mother”. (Li 1999:107, 125, 130, 139, 141,171,172)

Clauson, after making the explanation that the words *eçe* etc. are the ones which express relationship and respect, states some forms are related with *ece* “head, leader, lord, manager” in the Mongolian and they are borrowed, but the forms *eçe*, *eçi* and *eçi* are certainly Turkish forms. Clauson, after expressing the words *eçe* and *eke* are words that determine double meaning lineage, shows the forms of these words in Anatolian dialects and refers to the explanation of Kāşgari in which he focused on the *-ç-* > *-k-* change and connecting words to the same root. (Clauson 1972:20)

While he does not give any information about the origin of these words in the dictionary called *Drevnetyursky Slovar* (Nadelyaev 1962:162), according to Tietze, this word is taken from the form *ece(n)* in the Mongolian. (Tietze 2002:686)

This word seen for the first time in Orhun Inscriptions with the meaning of “ancestor, grandfather” (Tekin 1998:KT D-I, 13, 19; BK D-3,12), became to be used for the different terms of relationship with some phonetic changes in its stem in later periods.

There are four words which we believe to have come from the *açV* root in the Main Altaic Language and which are seen as *açi*, *eçe*, *eçi*, *ve eze* in *Diḡānu Luḡāti't-Türk*. The words *açi* and *eçi* mean “old woman, grandmother” whereas *eçe* and *eze* mean “the elder sister”.

The fact that the difference of meaning between these words is created by phonetic changes is seen clearly.

The real difficulty for us is to create a connection of origin between the words *eke* and *eçe* which have been analyzed under different article titles. As mentioned above, two different roots are designed for these words in the Main Altaic Language. However, as stated above, in the form of *egeçe*, which means “sister” in the Mongolian and shares the same root with the Turkish word *eke*, because of the irregularity of *-g-* and the similarity of meaning with its Turkish version, it is thought that it may be a borrowed word given to the Mongolian from Turkish. (Starostin vd. 2003:499-500) Besides, there are researchers who evaluate the *eke* form of Turkish as a borrowed word from the Mongolian as well.

Additionally, the word *ece* is accepted to have been borrowed from the Mongolian. In our view both *ece* and *eke* are words that share the same root and they are the common belongings of both Turkish and the

Mongolian. Likewise, the existence of the word seen in the Mongolian as *egeçe* in the Mongor language as *āçi* (Starostin vd. 2003:500) may prove that those two words come from the same root. The fact that the vowel at the beginning of the mentioned word is long shows a secondary length that is the result of an elision.

Kāşğarî not only mentions the words *eçe* and *eze* as sharing the same root and giving only dialectal differences but also as common words between which there is /ç/ /k/ sound change which is within the rules of the language and can be seen in other languages. And this fact increases our belief in the idea that they may share the same root.

To us, these words were derived from a common root and they still exist as *ekeçe-eğçe* in Mongolian. In dialects of Mongolian, through sound elision in the word, it has turned into *āçi*. However, sound elision in Turkish for the word **ekeçe* has taken place earlier and the words *açı*, *eçi* have emerged as a result of the sound elision in the *eçe*. That Clauson also shows these words are absolutely Turkish words is important because of the fact that they were not borrowed from Mongolian. Yet, the word *eke* seen in Turkish must have been borrowed from Mongolian into Turkish in later times. *Eçe* derived from **ekeçe* represents its form in Turkish and *eke* represents its form in Mongolian and both words are used in similar meanings and in parallel forms almost in all Turkish dialects. The word *āçi* seen in Mongolian seems to prove the relation between *ekeçe* and *eçe*.

The alteration in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk between *eçe* and *eze* indicates the alteration between the consonant sounds which come out of the same place. The forms *ede* (Altaic) *ese* (Başkirt) of the word seen in some dialects (Li 1999:172) also show the degree of sound alteration between the sounds /ç/, /z/, /d/ together with dialect differences.

On *eçe* and other related words, the following information is given in Dîvānu Luġāti't-Türk:

eçe: “elder sister. eke. The letter Ā has been translated from,,. Like the words Ād2 ve Ād½, e¾M2 and e¾M½ in Persian.” (Atalay 1992:I-86-87)

eçi: “old woman, grandmother. barsganca.” (Atalay 1992:I-87)

eze: “*eke*: elder sister, Oğuz nation call it *eze*.” (Atalay 1992:I-90)

When the explanations are considered, it is seen that an ascription has been made on a common derivation between *eçe* and *eke* in Dîvānu Luğāti't-Türk; on the other hand, there is also a link between *eze* and *eke*, and the alterations between the words *eke-eçe-eze-eçi* show the alterations between the dialects.

2.1.4 Using Alternation to Indicate the Intensity, Powerfulness, Rareness and Weakness of a Case than the Other

By using the features of sounds found in Dîvānu Luğāti't-Türk or by repeating some sounds, stating that the intensifying degree which the word expresses is more has been provided. Such an alternation example is seen in two words in Dîvānu Luğāti't-Türk:

2.1.4.1 Arığ-Arrığ

In Turkish, some sounds affect the meanings of the words in which they exist. Although this case is the place of origin of the theories on the relationship between objects and nouns put forward by some linguists, this view could not attract supporters on the arguments about the origins of languages and naming the objects. However, it is clear that there are indirect determinants in originating some sounds in Turkish, especially in originating functions of some morphemes.

Ercilasun, who tried to show in his work “Türkçe’de Ek-Ses İlişkisi” (2000:41-47) that some morphemes emerged by attributing some functions directly to the sounds, pointed out some sounds attributed intensification function to some morphemes, and matching-affection function to some.

This relation, which Ercilasun discussed in sound-morpheme level, happened in structure-meaning level in the words *arığ-arrığ* in Dîvānu Luğāti't-Türk. The reinforcing and density compared to main meaning in the word *arığ* have been provided by geminating the constants.

The word *arığ* which was derived from the verb *arıl-* “to clean, to be pure, clean” {-XG} has been used both in the meaning of “clean”

(Atalay 1992:I-63,66, 342) and “pure, unalloyed” (Atalay 1992:I-376) in *Dîvānu Luġāti’t-Türk*. The word has also the meanings such as “entirely, fully” (Atalay 1992:I-103, 230, 237, 241, II-328, III-41) in *Dîvānu Luġāti’t-Türk*.

It is seen that the word *arıġ* is more commonly used as an adverb in the meanings of “entirely, fully” in *Dîvānu Luġāti’t-Türk* and it gives graduation-intensifying to the meaning. Another word created by repeating the sound -r- in this word is *arriġ*. The word *arriġ* has the meaning “very clean” (Atalay 1992:II43). It is seen that the permanence and intensifying functions of geminated sound -r- in the word *arriġ* affect the meaning of the word and increase the stress.

In this word, an alternation example which has provided a semantic change in meaning not by changing sound but by repeating the same sound is seen.

2.1.4.2 Köşige-Kölige/Köşik-Kölik

As being two words indicating the *l:ş* contrast of Clauson, the words ,one of which he bound to *köşi-* “to be an open shadow” and the other to *köli-* “to shadow” verbs, and which he showed as words being derived from these verbs by constructive suffixes, are used as in contrast with each other semantically according to Clauson’s expression. Clauson thinks that the stems of the words are *kölik* and *köşik*, and the suffix -e is added afterwards.(Clauson 1992:719, 753)

According to Clauson, like the nominal stems, the verbal stems of these words are also used as being parallel to each other. Yet, while there is the *köşit* form derived from the form *köşi-*, there aren’t any verbs derived from the form *köli-*. The forms *köli-* and *köli-r* (Atalay 1992:III-272) which are found in DLT and which mean “to bury” can be representing a euphemism for the verb *köm-* “to bury”. (Clauson 1972:716)

Şinasi Tekin, who reduced the verbs *köşi-* and *köli-* till the root **kö-*, claims that two different stems are formed from these roots by the constructive suffixes *l* and *ş* and the forms *köşi-*, *köşige-köşik*, and *köli*, *kölige-kölik* are derived from these. As for Clauson, he also refers to the root unity between the verbs *köli-* “to bury” and *köm-* “to bury”, and

claims that as there isn't a constructive suffix as *-m* in Turkish, either these two words do not come from the same root, or the *-m* letter is formed by the sound assimilation with the reflexive suffix *-n* and states that these words could be claimed to be akin to each other only in this way. (Tekin: 2001:25-31)

Between the two word groups coming from the same root, which are seen in DLT, there are sound- meaning alterations produced by *l :ş* equivalence and these sound alterations cause semantic diversities. The semantic diversity in these words is related with the *l :ş* equivalence and is ,especially, seen between the words *köşige* and *kölige*, the degraded diversity between darkness and lightness of the shadow is at the same time related with the functions of the sounds *l* and *ş*. As stated in the Ercilasun's study, to which we referred above, the *l* sound plays a great role in the emergence of suffixes which have strengthening functions , such as reinforcing, clarifying, continuity and exaggeration and these functions of the sound are directly charged onto the functions of the suffix. (Ercilasun 2000:41-47)

The strengthening function of the *l* sound, which Ercilasun mentioned about in his review of the functions of sounds, must have influenced the meaning of the *kölige* form that while the meaning of the word *köşige* is “light, weak shadow”, the word *kölige* is used as “dark shadow” in DLT.

The sound-meaning relationship between these two words and their difference indicates both the diversities in dialect and the influence of the properties and functions of the sounds on the word.

The only examples of the semantic diversities provided by the *l :ş* sound equivalence are not *köşige-köşik*, *kölige-kölik*. Another word couple is *tüş* and *tül*, which we run across among the Old Turkic period works and which come from the same root but have some minor semantic differences. Apart from these, there are some more other words in Turkish which show differences in meanings with the *l :ş* sound equivalence. Words, such as *tel:-teş-*, and *döl:döş* are some of them. (Kara 2004:35)

The *l :ş* equivalence in these words and the minor differences between their meanings are similar to the relationship and differences between the words we have studied, *kölige-kölik* and *köşige-köşik*.

Rona Tas, who studied the words *tüş* and *tül* in his article on dreams, witchcraft and fortune-telling in the Altaic world, examined the forms of the words in Old Turkic, which were seen as *tülek* and *tölük/g* in the Altaic language, and intended to show that this word and the Turkish word *tüş* were the same. Claiming that the form *tölök* in Chuvash went back to an older *tülük* form, Tas states that there is a *tül* form in the first syllable of this word and the *-k* at the end is the same sound as in the word *pilek* “five” in Chuvash, so there is the word *beş* in Turkish as the equivalent of *pilek* in Chuvash.

According to Tas, we see *l* in Chuvash as the equivalent of *ş* in Turkish languages. On the other hand, we can see the word *tüş* in forms with *l* in Old Uigur, Yellow Uyghur and the Yakut languages. Thus, the lexical synonymy of the words *tül*, *tüş* and the phonological synonymy (= equivalent interpretation) of *ş:l* do not overlap.

In the following parts of his article, Tas states that the form *tülük* had been borrowed from the Mongolian in the early Chuvash-Bulgaria period, and this form could be brought back to the form *tölge*, or an older form *tölöge*. The same case is seen in *silüge* > *şülge* > *şışek* > *tişek* or *balgasun* > *balık*, and the phonetic relationship is regular. Again according to Tas, while *tüş* means “to see a dream”, the forms *tül*, *tülük*, *tölge* are related with fortune-telling. Taking into consideration that fortune-telling through sleeping is common among the Chuvash people, Tas claims that there is a difference between the forms with *ş* and the forms with *l* seen in the examples of *tüş* and *tül*, one of which indicates seeing a dream and the other fortune-telling through sleeping. (Tas 1972:227-236)

In the light of the explanations of Tas, we can claim that the form *kölige* is Mongolian whereas the form *köşik* is Turkish. The word *köşik* indicates the Turkish form of the word **gēla* (Starostin vd. 2003:I-537-538) seen in the Main Altaic period; the form *kölige* seen in DLT shows that this word is borrowed from the Mongolian afterwards. The form *köşige* into *kölige*, and the form *kölik* into *köşik* must have taken shape by analogy.

We see in DLT that Kāşğarî gives this information on these word couples:

köşik : “blanket, curtain.” (Atalay 1992:I-409)

kölik: “shadow” (Atalay 1992:I-409)

köşige: “light shadow”(Atalay 1992:I-448)

kölige: “dark shadow” (Atalay 1992:I-448)

2.1.5 Referring to Alternation for Separating the Whole and the Part of the Whole from Each Other

By making a few phonetic changes within the stem of the two words in DLT in order to make a difference between the whole stem of an object or an organ and the pieces that could be considered as being their parts and to derive new words that could express these, new words which have different meanings from the original ones were derived. The derived words were used to name the parts of the whole to which they were connected. The words to be studied here, *bağayuk-bağayağ* and *tèrgi-tèrgü* are the words derived through alternation in accordance with this aim.

2.1.5.1 Bakanak-Bağayağ /Bağanuğ-Bağayuk

These words were derived from the word *Bağa* “kurbağa” and came into being by comparing the organs or objects to the living things in the nature. (Clauson 1972:316-317). In DLT, as a dot is put on and under the fourth letter of these words, they could both be read with *n* and *y*. This shows that these words developed from the forms *bağañak*.

Whereas the forms *bakanak* and *bağayağ* are used as “each of the nails of hoofed and cloven hoofed animals” (Atalay 1992:III-177), the forms *bağanuğ* and *bağayuk* mean “ the piece of meat found between the hooves of horses” (Atalay 1992:III-177), and shows the part formed on the whole or the part connected to the whole. The semantic difference between the two couples of words is provided by the alterations between the vowels seen at the end of the word. The words which were expressed by Atalay as could be read in two different ways, existed only as *bağanak* and *bağanuğ* in the translation of DLT prepared by Dankoff and Kelly.(Dankoff 1984:II-241)

2.1.5.2 Tèrgi/Tèrgü

Between these two words one of which means “dining table” and the other “various meals on the table; order, line”, a small semantic difference is provided by making changes in the vowels at the end of the words.

Though Clauson mentions that there is an etymologic difficulty in connecting the word *tèrgi* to the verb *tèr-*, stemming from the case that the *-gi* and *-ki* suffixes are not considered as being constructive suffixes deriving nouns from verbs in the Karahan Turkic (Clauson 1972:544), we consider that with regard to their origins there is a relationship between this word and the word *tèrgü* which can be connected to the verb *ter-*.

Indeed, in contrast to Clauson, Räsänen evaluated the words *tèrgi* and *tèrgü* together, and drew attention to the fact that there was a semantic parallelism between the dining table and the meals on the table and that this same parallelism was also found between *tevsî* and *kâse* (Räsänen 1969:475).

Concerning the two words one of which shows the whole and the other, the parts on the whole, we see these explanations of Kasgarlı in DLT:

Tèrgi: “dining table. şu savda dahi gelir *tilin tèrgige tegir*... (In this word comes *tilin tèrgige tegir*, indeed...)” (Atalay 1992:I-429)

Tèrgü: “various meals on the table; order, line.” (Atalay 1992:I-428)

2.1.6 Referring to Alternation in order to Create Differences among the Meanings of the Word by Benefiting from the Difference between the Voiced – Unvoiced Sounds Written as the Same with the Arabian Letters

The only word to be studied under this title is *bekeç-begeç*. In his piece of work, Kasgarlı clearly states that the difference between the meanings of this word which include both the title and reduction is provided by phonetic alternation.

2.1.6.1 Bekeç-Begeç

The word *beg* is made from the words “prince, sir”, by the +*Aç* reduction suffix. According to Kāşgari, the word *beg* is with soft *kef*, “g”. On the other hand, another form of it which means “prince” is with strong *kef* “k”, and the word should be *bek* in this case. As the forms *bekeç* and *begeç* are not different from each other when written in the Arabian letters, Kāşgari explained in details how to separate these words from each other by indicating the properties of the sounds. The sound alteration present within the word stem shows the semantic differences, as well. The *begeç* form of the word is not present in DLT. We become aware of this form through the explanations made in the piece of work. In these examples, it is seen that the alternation is provided by the alteration made between the consonants whose starting points are close to each other.

Kāşgari’s explanation in which he mentioned about the phono-semantic alteration seen in the words is quite interesting:

bekeç-begeç : “the fame of the auspicious, told as *Bekeç arslan tegin*, indeed. This word indicates reduction when said with soft *kef*. And it means “little lord”, which indicates feeling pity for and loving; since *beg* is with soft g.” (Atalay 1992:I-357-358)

2.2 Alternation in Verbs

The number of the verbs in which alternation is seen in DLT is quite few. In these verbs, with the differences seen among the vowels, there emerge some semantically small differences. These differences are usually related with the realization force of the action, and sometimes differ from each other as a result of the small changes made in the actions of people and animals. On the other hand, we also see that with the consonant alteration made within the stem of the verbs coming from the same origin, these verbs can possess other meanings related to their original meanings, showing diversities though trivial. There are also verbs, which come from the same root but which have opposite meanings as a result of some sound alterations. The verbs in DLT in

which alternation is seen can be studied under these titles in accordance with the sound- meaning relationships:

2.2.1 Referring to Alternation for Expressing the Realization Frequency or Infrequency, Deepness or Staying on the Surface

Each material gives a light and a degree of reflecting this light. The objects' degree of reflecting light is related with the structure of the particles which form them. The Turkish people must have recognized that the objects reflect light in different degrees as in their languages they needed words that would show the differences among the objects' degrees of reflecting light ie. their brightness. In order to satisfy this need, they benefited from a word they already had in their language and by making some sound alterations within the stem of the concerning word, they derived a new word that would show the difference between the brightness of two objects. In DLT, there are the words *yoldrı-* and *yaldrı-* which come from the same root and which indicate this difference.

On the other hand, it seen that alternation is applied in a verb in order to differ the similar actions of the human beings and animals from each other, and to make it clear whether the action is made in deep or on the surface. In DLT, the words *çom-/çöm-* and the ones derived from these, *çomtur-/ çömtür-* are present for studying in this direction.:

2.2.1.1 Yaldrı-/Yoldrı-

They are verbs that were derived from* *Ya-* “to glisten, to glimmer” root verb. From this root verb, many words such as *yal-*, *yarı-*, *yaşu-*, *yaruk*, *yaşuk* are derived. (Sağol 2004:2511-2527) The *yalrı-* *yaşu-* “to glisten, to glimmer” couple seen in Old Uyghur texts indicate that these words are developed from a hypothetical root **ya-*. (Nadelyaev 1969:230)

This verb stem can be seen as *yalrı-* in Old Uyghur texts, yet in DLT these words are present in two forms as *yaldrı-* and *yoldrı-* (Clauson 1972:923). According to Clauson, it is not rational that Kāşğarī separates these words and claims that there is a difference between them.

The difference which Clauson does not find as being rational is not concerned with the origins of the words, but with the object's aspect of

reflecting brightness and the grading of the brightness. While one of these indicates to the light itself, the other indicates the glimmer of light on objects. The semantic difference provided by the sound alterations between the verbs *yaldır-* and *yoldır-* is expressed in these sentences of Kāşğari:

yaldırđı: “*kün yaldırđı:* the sun glowed little, glistened little. It is expressed like this again, if the lightning, fire or similar things glisten little...” (Atalay 1992:III-437)

yoldırđı: “*ķılıķ yoldırđı:* the sword glistened. It is used like that, if any essence or metals glisten, as well. If the letter È is the above, it means light, if the letter È harfi is otre, then it means the glistening of any essence.” (Atalay 1992: III-437)

2.2.1.2 Çom-/Çöm-, Çomtur-/Çömtür-

The verb which developed from the word *šomo* “to go down, to immerse” and the word meaning “dipper” in the Main Altaic Language and which is seen as *çom-* and *çöm-* “to go down, to swim, do dive, to take out with dipper, to dive into deep, dipper”(Starostin vd. 2003:1342) in Proto Turkic is one of the oldest words in Turkish.

It can be clearly seen within the historical development course of Turkish that the vowel of this word has changed as wide-circular thick or thin, wide-straight thick or thin. The changes within the vowels have caused change in the meanings, as well. Yet, in contemporary Turkish dialects, it is not possible to recognize this relationship or the degree of the change.(Clauson 1972:422)

By making sound alteration, both the the difference between the human beings’ and animals’ entering into water and immersing, the determination of the level of the immersement and diving action and the difference in depth are displayed. While between the words *çom-* and *çöm-* which are the root of the words, there is a semantic difference used to differentiate between the similar actions of the humans and animals in DLT, between the verbs *çomtur-* and *çömtür-*, which are formed by the causative suffix, it is aimed to determine the levels of diving and immersement and to determine the deep and the deeper one, and the

semantic difference showing the concerning measurement difference is provided by sound alteration. On the other hand, these words which come from the same root also have a relationship with the verb *yun-* “to bath”, and though there may be some exceptions to that, the verb *yun-* is usually used for describing the cleaning actions of humans (themselves and other things). There are two measures which make us correlate this verb with the verb *çom-/çöm-*. One of them is phonetic and the other semantic. The phonetic one is related with the *ç->y-* alteration seen at the beginning of the word in Turkish, and also in some Contemporary Turkish dialects, is mentioned about by Kāşğarî in DLT, and sampled with the words *çet- ~yet-* and *çun-~yun-* (Atalay 1992:II-314) . As for the semantic measure, to establish a relationship between *yun-* and *çom-/çöm-* is a little bit more difficult, though not impossible. The action of bathing requires getting into water or, when considered past, immersing in water. As a result of this requirement, it is possible to establish a relationship between *çom-/çöm-* and *yun-*. A more scientific relationship is that among the meanings of the word in Tunguz language, there remains “to pour water into one’s hand” (Starostin vd. 2003:1342), and in this case, it possible to establish a more realistic relationship between *yun-* and *çom-/çöm-* .

In DLT, we have these information stated by Kāşğarî on the verbs *çom-/çöm-* and *çomtur-/çömtür-* and the semantic difference of them:

çomdi: “*oğlan suwda çomdı*: the boy dived in water.” (Atalay, 1992: II-26)

çömdi: “*ördek suwda çömdi*: the duck dived deeply in the water. This infinitive of the latter is with „ and the former with , . in order that the difference between the two verbs be recognized.” (Atalay 1992:II-26)

çomtur- : “*ol anı suwğa çomturdı*: he plunged him in the water.” (Atalay 1992: II-182)

çömtür- : “this is plunging more deeply than the former.” (Atalay 1992: II-182)

2.2.2 Referring to Alternation in order to have the Abstract Words Express Different Cases

It is seen in DLT that the abstract verbs are separated to express an abstract action and a different case related with this action. One separation here is the phonetics alteration, and the other is the semantic difference caused by this alteration. The only verb which shows such difference and which we have studied here is the one that has *sakın-/sağın-* forms.

2.2.2.1 Sakın-/Sağın-

There are different views about these two verbs with regard to their origins. They are brought back to the origin *sa-* “to calculate, to count” by some scientists and seen as the reflexive form of *sak-*, which is derived from this verb.

Clauson states that the verb *sakın-* had developed from the verb *sa:k-* “to think”; yet, it meant “to think thoroughly about something, to wish for” or “to think about something passionately, to worry about something”. (Clauson 1972:812)

Clauson also suggests that the verb *sağın-* might have emerged as a result of the fact that the *-k* sound which was present in the verb *sak-* got unexpectedly voiced during an early period. According to Clauson, this voiceness, indeed, could be explained by the longness of the first vowel of the verb. (Clauson 1972:812)

Marcel Erdal also brings the verb *sakın* back to the root *sak-*. Contrary to Clauson, he states that this word could not be associated with the verb *sa-*. As for the reason of that, Erdal shows the shortness of vowel of *sak-* in Turkoman Turkish, and the longness of the vowel of the verb *sa-*. (Erdal 1991: 514, 612)

Referring to the views of Marcel Erdal, Mehmet Ölmez, who studied the couples *oduğ* and *sak-*, states that there cannot be any relationship established between the verbs *sa-* and *sak-*. (Ölmez 1998: 35-47)

In the light of Clauson’s views regarding the issue and considering the verbs’ meanings “to think, to calculate, to worry”, it could be said that these two verbs could be connected to the verb *sa-*.

That Kāşğarî gave these two verbs one after the other and reported that the difference between these two verbs is related with voiceness-unvoiceness also supports our view of these verbs as the words with the same root but with different meanings. The explanations of Kāşğarî are stated below:

sağındı: “*ol maÆa eĖgü sağındı* : “he thought of me as being good. He cultivated good opinions about me and hid these in him. If he helps through words, this is used, as well.” (Atalay 1992: II-153)

saķındı: “*Ol mindin saķındı*: “here, it is stronger compared to the former word.” (Atalay 1992: II-153)

Results:

1. As a result of our study, it is seen that most of the words in DLT in which alternation is seen are noun originated.
2. A great number of the noun-originated words in which alternation is seen are cultural words. And a large number of these consist of type, family words and kinship names.
3. It is observed that the Turkish people did not find it difficult to find new words for the new terms that had emerged as a result of their changing religions during the historical course, and that, in order to satisfy their needs, they found equivalents of these terms by making sound alterations within the stem of the words they had already possessed.
4. It could also be found in these studies that in Turkish, apart from the common methods, grading is made without putting a prefix or a syllable to the head of the word, but by repeating a vowel in the word root; and this case also influences the meaning of the word.
5. That many words in which alternation is seen have been borrowed from kindred languages or that they indicate to phonetics alterations seen among the Turkish dialects is important in that it shows the words with the same origins differentiate from each other with respect to semantics in different dialects and the words taken from these different dialects take place together in Karakhanid Turkic. A similar case can also be seen today among the same originated words of Turkish and the other Turkish dialects

6. Alternation seen in the verbs is mostly referred to showing the realisation level of the action. On the other hand, the alternation seen in abstract verbs is very limited, and serves to charge different meanings to the verbs that are the same in origin.

7. Alternation is a phonic event which influences the meaning. It is seen in DLT that in the noun-originated words in which alternation is seen, the consonants alter mostly and the vowel alterations are less frequent. The case is the opposite for the verbs, and the alternation seen in limited cases is provided mostly through vowel alterations.

8. The limited number of alternations in DLT has been seen since the earliest periods of Turkish, and this is used as a way of derivating words. It also shows that Turkish has a way of deriving words apart from using suffixes.

References

- AALTO Pennti (1955) "On The Altaic Initial P-*", *Central Asiatic Journal*, Volume I, pp. 9-16
- AKSAN Doğan (1995) *Her Yönüyle Dil Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim*, TDK Yay., Ankara.
- _____ (2000) *En Eski Türkçe'nin İzlerinde, Simurg*, İstanbul
- ATALAY Besim (1992) *Divanü Lûgati't- Türk Tercümesi*, Volumes I-IV TDK Publ., Ankara,
- AYDEMİR Hakan (2003) "Altaic Etymologies: Toz, Toprak, Togosun" *Turkic Languages*, Vol. 7, Number 1, pp. 105-143
- BANG W. (1996) *Köktürkçeden Osmanlıcaya*, Translator : Tahsin Aktaş, TDK Publ., Ankara
- BARUTÇU F. Sema (1989) "Altaycada Kelime Başı /p/", *Fırat Üniversitesi Dergisi (Sosyal Bilimler)*, 3 (2), pp.1-40
- BROCKELMANN K. (1928) *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Mahmud al Kaşgaris Divân Lûgat at-Türk*, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica I, Leipzig
- _____ (1954) *Osttürkische Grammatik Der Islamischen Litteratur Sprachen MittelAsiens*, Leiden

- CAFEROĞLU Ahmet (1968) "Filolojide İnsan ve Hayvan Soybirliği", *TDAY-Belleten*, TDK Publ., Ankara, pp. 1-15
- CANPOLAT Mustafa (1999) "*Kaşgarlı Mahmud ve Etimoloji*", *Dîvânü Lûgati't-Türk Bilgi Şöleni Bildirileri*, Türksoy-TDK, Ankara, pp. 19-29
- CLAUSON, Sir Gerard (1957) "The Turkish Y and Related Sounds", *Ural Altaische Bibliothek, Studia Altaica*, ss.33-45
- _____ (1958) "The Earliest Turkish Loan Words İn Mongolian", *Central Asiatic Journal*, Volume IV, pp. 174-187
- _____ (1972) *An Etymological Dictionary Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford
- ÇAĞATAY Saadet (1978) "Uygurca Hendiadyoinler", *Türk Lehçeleri Üzerine Denemeler*, Ankara Üniversitesi, DTCF Publ., Ankara, pp. 29-65
- _____ (1954) "Türkçede η-ğ Sesine Dair" *TDAY-Belleten*, TDK Publ., pp.15-30
- D. LESSİNG, Ferdinand (1995) *Mongolisch-Englisch Dictionary*, Bloomington-Indiana
- DANKOFF, R., KELLY, J. (1982-85) *Compendium Of The Turkic Dialect*, Vol. I-III, Harvard University Publ.
- DERLEME SÖZLÜĞÜ (1963-1982) Volumes I-XII, TDK Publ., Ankara
- DOERFER, Gerhard (1963-1975) *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im NeuPersischen*, I-IV C., Wiesbaden
- ERCİLASUN Ahmet Bican (2000) "Türk Dillerinde Ek-Ses İlişkisi", *TDAY-Belleten*, Ankara, pp. 41-47
- ERDAL Marcel (1977) "İrk Bitig Üzerine Yeni Notlar" *TDAY-Belleten*, pp.87-119
- _____ (1979) "The Chronological Classification of Old Turkish Texts", *Central Asiatic Journal*, Volume XXIII, pp. 151-175
- _____ (1991) *Old Turkic Word Formation I-II*, Wiesbaden
- _____ (2004) *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, Brill, Leiden-Boston
- EREN Hasan (1995) "Türkçede Doublet Örnekleri", *Türk Dili*, Number 523, July, pp.731-736
- _____ (1999) *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*, Ankara,

- EYUBOĞLU İsmet Zeki (1991) *Türk Dilinin Etimoloji Sözlüğü*, Sosyal Publ., İstanbul
- GEDİKLİ Yusuf (2004) “Dılmaç~Yalabaç (Yalavaç Denklemi)” *V. Uluslar arası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirileri*, Ankara, pp. 1203-1222
- GRØNBECH K (1995) *Türkçenin Yapısı*, TDK Publ., Ankara
- HACIEMİNOĞLU Necmettin (1991) *Türk Dilinde Fiiller*, Kültür Bakanlığı Publ., Ankara
- HEİNTZ Joos, SCHÖNİG Claus (1991) “Turkic Morphology as Regular Language”, *Central Asiatic Journal*, Volume 35, pp. 96-122
- KAŞGARLI Mahmud (1990) *Dîvânü Lûgati't-Türk*, Tıpkıbasım, Ministry of Culture Publ., Ankara
- _____ (2005) *Dîvânü Lugâti't-Türk*, Translation, Adaptation, Arrangement: Seçkin Erdi, Serap Tuğba Yurtsever, Kabalcı Publishinh House, İstanbul
- KARA Mehmet (2004) *Ayrı Düşmüş Kelimeler*, Çağlar Publ., Ankara
- KARAAĞAÇ Günay (1996) “-ş/-ş-, -l/-l- >y Nöbetleşmeli Kök Alomorfları” *3.Uluslararası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirileri*, Ankara, pp. 593-599
- KELLY James (1972) “Remarks on Kaşgari’s Phonology, 1. Linguistic Terminology”, *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, Band 44, pp. 179-193
- _____ (1973) “Remarks on Kaşgari’s Phonology, II. Orthography”, *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, Band 45, pp. 144-162
- _____ (1976) “Remarks on Kaşgari’s Phonology, III. Structure of the Diwan”, *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, Band 48, pp. 151-158
- KORKMAZ Zeynep (1992) *Gramer Terimleri Sözlüğü*, TDK Publ., Ankara
- KUN T. Halasi (1950) “Orta Kıpçakça k-/k- Ø Meselesi” *Türk Dili ve Tarihi Hakkında Araştırmalar I*, Ankara, pp.45-61
- KUZNETSOV, Petro İ. (1995) “Türkiye Türkçesinin MorfoEtimolojisine Dair”, *TDAY-Belleten*, Ankara, pp.193-262
- Lİ Yong-Song (1999) *Türk Dillerinde Akrabalık Adları*, Simurg

- MAHMUDOV K. (1992) "XI. ve XV. Yüzyıllar Arasında Yazılmış Eserlerin Dilinde $d > z > t > y > g$ veya $d/z/t/z/y/g$ Fonetik Olayı" *Journal Of Turkish Studies Vol. 16*, Harvard, pp. 97-105
- MENGES Karl H. (1966) "Ablaut in Altaic", *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, 38, Wiesbaden, pp.1-3
- MİLLER Roy Andrew (1999) "Turkic $\text{ş, z} :: \text{Chuvash l, r}$ revisited", *Turkic Language* 3, pp.3-42
- MOLLOVA Mefkûre (1975) "Orta Türkçenin Bazı Fonetik Çizgileri", *Bilimsel Bildiriler 1972*, TDK Publ., Ankara
- MUTTALLİBOV Süleyman (1960-1967) *Türkiy Süzler Devanı (Devanu Lugatit Türk)*, Volumes I-IV, Taşkent
- NADELYAEV M., NASILOV M., TENİŞEV P., ŞERBAK A.M. (1969) *Drevnetyurkskiy Slovar*, Leningrad
- NALBANT, Mehmet Vefa (2006) "Türkçede Tarihî Türk Dili Alanında Fonksiyon Değiştirmeye Bir Örnek: Tut-Fiili", *Bilig Dergisi*, Bahar, Number 38, pp.137-148
- NASKALİ GÜRSOY Emine (1996) "Kelime Gövdesinde Ses Değişmesi İle Yapılan Küçültmeler ve Bir Ablaut Örneği", 3. *Uluslar arası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirileri*, TDK Publ., Ankara, pp. 491-494
- ÖLMEZ Mehmet (1998) "Eski Uygurca odug sak İkilemesi Üzerine" *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 8, ss. 35-47
- POPPE, N. (1952) "Plural Suffixes In the Altaic Languages", *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, Volume: XXIV, pp.65-83
- _____ (1992) *Moğol Yazı Dilinin Grameri*, Translator : Günay Karaağaç, Ege Universtity Publ., İzmir
- _____ (1993) *Altay Dillerinin Karşılaştırmalı Grameri*, Translator : Zeki Kaymaz, Rabat
- RÄSÄNEN Marti (1957) *Materialien Zur Morphologie Der Türkischen Sprachen*, Helsinki
- _____ (1969) *Versuch Eines Etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*, Helsinki
- RÖHRBORN Klaus (1977-1987) *Uigurisches Wörterbuch*, Lieferung 3, Wiesbaden,

- SAGOL Güliden (2000) “Köken Bilgisi Araştırmalarına Katkıları”, *V. Uluslar Arası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirileri*, TDK Yay., Ankara.
- SARI Mustafa (2004) “Türkçede Ses ve Anlam İlişkisinin Farklı Bir Yönü”, *V. Uluslar Arası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirileri*, Ankara, pp. 2577-2584
- SERGEİ Starostin, DYBO Anna, MURDAK, Oleg (2003) *Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages*, Volumes. I-III., Brill, Leiden-Boston
- ŞEN Serkan (2001) “Anlam İyileşmesi ve Kötüleşmesine Divanü Lûgati’t-Türk Merkezli Örnekler”, *Türk Dili*, Number: 591, March, pp. 268-275
- TAS A. Rona (1972) “Dream, Magic Power and Divination In The Altaic World”, *Acta Orientalia Academia Scientiarum, Tomus XXV*, Hungariace, pp. 227-236
- TEKİN, Talat (1958) “daha Zarfı ve da/de Edatı Hakkında”, *Türk Dili*, VII, pp. 560-562
- _____ (1969) “ Zetacism and Sigmatism in Proto-Turkic” , *Acta Orient. Hung.* , XXII, pp.51-80
- _____ (1986a) “İslam Öncesi Türk Şiiri”, *Türk Dili*, Number : 409, January 1986, pp. 2-42
- _____ (1986b) “Karahanlı Dönemi Türk Şiiri”, *Türk Dili*, Number : 409, January 1986, pp. 81-157
- _____ (1988) *Orhun Yazıtları* , TDK Publ., Ankara
- _____ (1989) *XI. Yüzyıl Türk Şiiri, Divânü Luàati’t-Türk’teki Manzum Parçalar*, TDK Publ., Ankara
- _____ (1994) *Tunyukuk Yazıtı*, Simurg, Ankara
- _____ (1995) *Türk Dillerinde Birincil Uzun Ünlüler*, Simurg, Ankara
- _____ (2000) *Orhun Türkçesi Grameri*, Türk Dili Araştırmaları Dizisi-9, Ankara
- _____ (2003) *Makaleler I*, Prepared for publishing by: Emine Yılmaz-Nurettin Demir, Grafiker Publ., Ankara
- _____ (2004) *Makaleler II*, Prepared for publishing by: Emine Yılmaz-Nurettin Demir, Öncü Kitap, Ankara

- TEKİN Şinasi, (1992) "Eski Türkçe", *Türk Dünyası El Kitabı*, C II, Ankara, pp. 69-119
- _____ (2001) *İştikaçının Köşesi, Türk Dilinde Kelimelerin ve Eklerin Hayatı Üzerine Denemeler*, Simurg, İstanbul
- TARAMA SÖZLÜĞÜ (1974-1988) I-VIII, TDK Publ.. Ankara
- TIETZE Andreas (2002) *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatı*, Volume 1, A-E, Simurg, İstanbul-Wien
- VARDAR Berke (2002) *Açıklamalı Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*, Multilingual, İstanbul

Abbreviations:

- DLT** : Dîvânü Luğâti't-Türk
- KB** : KıtaÇğı Bilig
- KT** : Kül Tigin Monument
- BK** : Bilge Kagan Monument
- T** : Tunyukuk Monument