

Word-formation System of Orhon Old Turkic Manuscripts

Aisulu Kupayeva

L.N. Gumilyev Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan

Abstract: The word-formation system of Modern Turkic languages was formed in the result of a long period process of development. Its development history goes back to VI-VII centuries and takes its beginning from the Old Turkic written monuments. The Orhon written monuments are the oldest written records of the Old Turkic language, which survived to the present day. As a valuable heritage of shared historical period of all Turkic peoples, it needs new points on comparative methods of research by comparing Old Turkic language with modern Turkic languages in the connection with the history and worldview of Turkic people.

The vocabulary stock of a language is unstable and it is enriched by means of borrowings and derivatives. There is quite a difference between word-stock of Old Turkic language and word-stock of modern Turkic languages. It was scientifically proved, that in the language of Old Turkic manuscripts there were both root words and derivatives. The types of derivatives in Orhon monuments are derived words, compound words and lexical-semantic variations. According to linguistic materials, in the language of Old Turkic monuments there were morphological, syntactic and semantic manners of derivation.

Key words: Orhon Old Turkic Monuments, derivatives, analytic method, synthetic method, semantic variations

Valuable heritage of shared historical period of all Turkic peoples and the primitive Turkic runic writing have attracted the attention of all scholars from different countries since Russian scientists as N. Vidzen, S. Remezov and a Sweden officer, who was exiled to Siberia, Philip Johan von Strahlenberg declared about stele with unknown writings along the rivers Orhon in Mongolia and Yenissei in Siberia. If we take into consideration primitive information in the works of eastern scientist Atamalik Zhuveini, the date of Orhon manuscripts were found in the territory of Mongolia as soon as the stellas with unknown writings had been discovered along the Yenissei river. Orhon Runic writing monuments was discovered and presented to the whole world by Russian scientist N. M. Yadrintsev, who came across with these monuments during his travel to Mongolia on the instructions of East and West Siberia Geographical society. N. M. Yadrintsev declared that he had found Chinese hieroglyphs and runic writings similar to the Yenissei runes in Mongolia. In the result of expedition he made copies of unknown writing and introduced them to the world of science, since that Orhon monuments have been an object of research [Sartkozhauly, 2012]. The earliest period of Orhon-Yenissei monuments research history captures the discovery and presentation of monuments to the world of science.

In 19th century scientists deciphered the texts of old monuments, the next task of researchers was to identify the inheritants of this

intellectual wealth. In 1889 the East Siberia department of Russian Geographic Society organized an expedition to Mongolia. V.V. Radloff conducted research works in the territory of Mongolia to decipher the runes in 1891. But his attempt was not fruitful. As runic writings were not deciphered for a long time, different hypotheses were told about it. Some scientists supporting the hypothesis about original concernment to Greece culture and the others held to different opinions relating it to old Mongolian, old Finnish, Scythian and Slavonic writings failed in deciphering the manuscripts. Finally, the scripts were deciphered by V. Thomsen, a Danish scholar and professor of Copenhagen University, on the 25th of May 1893. V. Thomsen made a report about it at the conference of Royal Academy of Science of Denmark, which made a great impression on scientists of the world on 15 December of the same year. In his report V. Thomsen declared that it was written in protolanguage of Turkic languages. The first words he had read were «täŋri» and «türk». Soon V. Radloff read the whole text with the help of Thomsen's method, after which he made the translation of monuments.

The monuments found in Mongolia were epitaphs written on stelae of Bilge Kagan (also known as Moŋgŋliyan), the 17th Kagan of East Turkic Khanate and his brother, military commander Kultegin.

Later not far from this region, along the Selenga river the stele of Tonikuk, a wise adviser of three Turkic Kagans, was found by the brothers Klemens. The next problem scientists argued about was the origin of Turkic alphabet. There were three different hypotheses about the origin of Turkic runes: 1. Aramaic, 2. Sogdian, 3. Original Turkic runic alphabet (Sartkozhauly, 2012). The Aramaic origin of Turkic runes was offered by V. Thomsen and supported by O. Donner, P.

Millioransky, A. Cherbak. G. Klosson, V. Levshits and S. Klyashtorny took its beginning from Sogdian alphabet (Klyashtorny, Levshits, 1978). According to the hypothesis of N. Aristov 29 symbols of Orhon runes out of 38 are similar to Turkic signs and 20 of them to signs of Kazakh tribes (Aristov, 1896). Nowadays this last hypothesis found its supporters among Turkologists. A Kazakh Turkologist Kh. Sartkhozha offers an opinion that Old Turkic Runic alphabets were originated on the basis of world-view philosophy of Old Turks (Sartkozhauly, 2012).

A group of scientists researching the grammar of runic writings pointed to conclusions on phonetic system and morphological structure of manuscripts. A great contribution made to this field of investigation are the works of V. Radloff, P. Millioransky, S. Malov, E. Tenishev, A. Kononov and N. Baskakov (Amanzholov, 2003).

The monosyllabic system, historical development of lexis and the nature of root words of old Turkic language are being investigated by B. Sagyndykuly, Zh. Mankeeva and M. Eskeeva.

As anthropocentrism, a present day scientific trend, became widely used in the world of science, this gave a rise to requisite for investigating the texts in a new way. It means to research a language in consequence with history, culture and worldview of ethnos. N. Shaimerdenova, a Kazakh Turkologist, expressed outlandish ideas about old Turkic world view in consequence with the language of Orhon monuments. However researching the language of Orhon old Turkic monuments has a century long history, it needs new points on researching linguistically. Important views on word forming system of the language of OTM are covered in the works of Turkologists as G.

Aidarov, Amanzholov and T. Tekin . T. Tekin made a significant contribution to the research of the language of OTM.

In the language of Old Turkic monuments there were derived words as well as root words. As I have mentioned above according to their structure and way of formation they are divided into derived words (root word+suffix), compound words (derived of two independent root words) and lexical-semantic variations of the same word (N. Oralbay, K. Kurmanaliyev, 2011).

New words in the language of OTM are formed with the help of suffixes as *-ig*, *- uš*, *-dim*, *- čī(i)*, *līγ(lig)* and etc. (*utir-ig*, *bil-ig*, *ur-uš*, *ke-dim*); words formed of two root words (*kün-tüz*, *temir-kapı*, *jašıl uguk*, *benğü taš*), semantic-lexical variations of the same words also refer to the word formation system of OOTM (*qat 1) raw*, *layer 2)a fruit* *3) name of an animal* *4) to freeze* and *5) to mix*).

Above-mentioned examples may serve as a proof that in the language of OTWM new words were formed in analytic, synthetic and semantic ways of word formation. Some forms of word formation system of OTWM are active in modern Turkic languages and some are went out of usage (Aidarov G, 1971). This means that word formation system of the language is a stable phenomenon. Because word forming elements, methods and models are not changeable. Word formation system of the language is not separated from the developing process of the language. Though there may occur some changes in word formation system of the language, this process is very slow and these changes occur as a result of active use of some models existing in the language.

In order to identify the methods, types and models of word forming mechanism of a language root and suffix must be differentiated.

As we know root word consists of one morpheme, if the word consists of more than one morpheme it is a derived root. In word formation analysis, not only roots are taken into consideration, but suffixes are also play an important role. Suffixes as well as roots are main element of word formation.

Except analysis of word formation that uncover the structural peculiarities, semantic analysis helps to study the semantic link between root word and derived word. Because derivations are closely related to their root word.

Analytic method of word formation is the oldest and wide spread method. This method of word formation is actively used in the system of modern Turkic languages. In this word-forming manner, the words are not derived with the help of suffixes but formed of more than one root word with an independent meaning and they form a new word. The names of places like *Kadyrhan jyš*, *Temir kapyγ*, *Ö tüken* are good examples of words formed in the analytic method of word formation.

According to the view of some scientists researching the language of Old Turkic monuments in consequence with the worldview of Old Turkic people, the names of places in the text represent physical space, a concept of space in old Turkic worldview which is related with the meaning a huge territory (land) which they defended from enemies. These a huge number place names indicates that on the one hand all events described in the texts really existed, if we take into consideration the existence of the names of some of those toponyms (for instance: *Irtıš*, *Tibet*), on the other hand Turks knew the territory they inhabited very well and geographically challenged. Therefore, *Kadyrhan jyš* implies probably nowadays Hinggan Range (N. Shaimerdinova, 2009).

Concerning the historical location of the place of *Temir kapyγ* Turkologists have different points of view. V. Bartold states that *Temir kapyγ* is a mountainous passage of Talky, which leads from Mongolia to Ile (N. Shaimerdinova, 2009). However, some scientists state that it a western boundary of Turkic Khanate and mountainous passage of Buzgala on the way from Balha to Samarkand (Milliyoransky, 1899). It is formed of words *temir* meaning “a metal” and *kapyγ* “a door”, consequently the word ‘*temir kapyγ*’ implies a meaning ‘strong’ and ‘safe’. In connection with this *Temir kapyγ* means boundary, hedge, therefore to reach *Temir kapyγ* meant to achieve one’s goal or to win (N. Shaimerdinova, 2009). The place name of *Ötüken* implies a valuable meaning, a place with beautiful nature and blagapriyatny for people to live. The word formed of *öt(ü)* - ‘grass’ and *ken-* ‘place’ meaning ‘*otty ken*’ very green or grassy land a heavenlike place.

We can find other examples of compound words like *küntüz* (during the day or in the afternoon) – consists of two root words with independent meaning and this compound word still exist in Kazakh language with a sound change of *t~d*; *beγgu taş* (a stone with writings on it) *beγgu* *adj.*-immortal, everlasting, age long + *taş* *noun* -stone and which implies ‘immortal message for the next descendants’. The word ‘*taş*’ is used as a component of personal names, place names and metaphoric words and often met in Turkic epics. In ancient times ‘*taş*’ (stone) thought to be a symbol of wisdom and had a meaning of ‘strong as a stone’ (*Sravnitel’no-istoricheskaye gramatica tjurkskih yazykov*, 2006).

Alliterating words like *jer-sub* (land and water), *eçüm-apam* (ancestors), *eb barım* (house and home) are derived in analytical manner.

The compound word *jer-sub* is used in the meaning of ‘land’, ‘divinity’. As we know in ancient times Turkic people believed and prayed in *Tayri* ‘sky god’, ‘heaven’, *Umaj* ‘earth god’ and *Jer-sub* ‘personification of cult of water and land’. In their worldview *Jer-sub* inhabited in the land of *Ö tüken* (*Sravnitel’no-istoricheskaye gramatica tjurkskih yazykov*, 2006). Also turkic people worshiped and respected the ancestors ‘*eçüm-apam*’ and this can be seen in the phrase taken from the monument of Kul Tegin: “*Eçümüz apamız tutmuş jer sub idisiz bolmazun*” (*KTb* ₁₉) May land of our ancestors will never be left without owner (*Drevnetjurksky slovar*, 1969). The main root word in the derivative *eb-barimis* the word ‘*eb*’ with the meaning of ‘house’, ‘home’ and the second element ‘*bari*’ or ‘*barq*’ the meaning of which is ‘building’ and derived from the verb ‘to build’. This compound word has two meanings ‘house, household’ and ‘family’. In modern Kazakh language it has changed its form as *üi-işi* (*üi*- ‘house’, *işi*- ‘family’) , *üi-žai* (*üi*- ‘house’, *žai*- ‘place’) but with the same meaning ‘household’ and ‘family’.

In synthetical word forming method the new word is derived of root word with independent meaning and word forming suffix. The meaning of derived word is directly related to the meaning of root word. For example:

abla – “to hunt” in which the meaning of derived word is directly related to the meaning of the root word “*ab*” –animal + suffix -la.

azça –”very few” related to the meaning of root word “few”

başçı – “leader” – root word meaning “head”

The second main element in derived word is – word-forming suffixes. Suffixes have definite functions in synthetic manner of word formation. The function of suffixes is to add a lexical meaning to a

derived word. However, some of the suffixes just modify the meaning of root words. In connection with this word - forming suffixes are divided into:

- Suffixes which add a lexical meaning to a derived word: *bil-ge* (*bil-* "to know" and *bilge* - wise), *ekin-lig* ("seeding" - "cultivated plants"), *eblig* (*eb*-house, *eblig*- married)
- Suffixes, which just modify the meaning of root word: *eki-nti*, *bes-inç* *jegirmi-nç* etc.
- A meaning extension of suffixes had begun in the period of OTWM.

For example: suffixes *-ıǵ/-ig* were suffixes with several meanings: *bilig* – it forms an abstract noun wisdom, in *uçuq-* it forms an animate object. In addition, this suffix used in *bitig* – it adds a meaning of writings. Because of this in modern Kazakh, the number of suffixes with several meanings are increased. The suffix – *lıq* in OTWM forms a noun and an adjective.

The next word-forming method used in WTWM is lexical semantic variations. In this word formation method the form of words are not changed, instead of this one word may have more than one meaning.

- *jan* 1) side and party 2) to return, to come back.
- *qat* 1) raw, layer 2) a fruit 3) name of an animal 4) to freeze 5) to mix
- *jaş* 1) young man 2) tear
- *jüz* 1) face 2) to swim (Drevnetjurksky slovar', 1969)

Suffixes as – *lıq /lig* (*erdemlig*, *ekinlig*, *eblig*, *atluğ*), negative making suffixes –*syz/-siz* (*buñ-syz*, *sub-syz*, *kergek-siz*, *san-syz*), *-čï/-čï* adds the meaning of professional occupation to a derived word: *armaqčï*, *aiğučï*, *it-küčï* (*et- do*, *complete*, "builder") are still actively used in

modern Turkic languages. For example in Kazakh language the suffix –*lıq* /*lig* , negative making suffixes –*syz*/-*siz* are used in formation of words as *balalıq* with the meaning ‘childhood’ formed of root word *bala* ‘a child’ and suffix –*lıq*; *muhsız*, *susız* with the same meaning as old Turkic derivatives *buñ-sız* ‘griefless’, *sub-sız* ‘without water’ and are formed of words *muñ* ‘grief’, *su* ‘water’ and negative making suffixe –*syz*. The suffix –*çı*/ –*çı* which adds the meaning of professional occupation in modern Kazakh exists with a sound difference –*şı*/–*şı*: *žumis* ‘work’ + –*şı* meaning ‘worker’ (*baqtaşı*, *balyqşı*, *etikşı* etc).

- The suffix –*meç* in Old Turkic word *eg-meç* (meaning aunt) came out of usage and became passive in modern Turkic languages.

Summing up above-mentioned linguistic facts we can say that in word formation system of OTWM frequently used word-forming manner is synthetic one. The most of the derivations are formed by synthetic manner adding suffixes to root words some of them which is now in modern Turkic languages actively used and some of them became passive.

The word formation system of OTWM is the same as in Modern Turkic languages. In connection with this we can say that WFS is stable and the changes in it is very slow process.

Abbreviations used in the article:

WFS – word formation system

OTWM- old Turkic writing monuments

OOTM – Orhon Old Turkic Monuments

Reference

- Aidarov G.** Yazykorhoskih pamyatnikov drevnetjurkskoipiscmennosti VIII veka. Almaty: Nauka.
- Amanzholov A.** Istoriya i teoriya drevnetjurkskogo pisma (2003). Almaty: Mektep.
- Aristov N.Y.** Zametki ob etnicheskom sostave tjurkskikh plemen I narodnistei I svedenye ob ih chislonnosti. ZhS, 277-456 Drevnetjurkskii slovar'. Moskva: Nauka.
- Klyashtorny S.G., Levshits V.A.** Otkrytiye I izuchenye drevnetjurkskikh I sogdiiskikh epigraphicheskikh pamyatnikov Tsentralnoy Azii (1978). Novosibirsk.
- Oralbay N., Kurmanaliyev K.** Sozhasamnyng zhalpy teoriyalykh maseleleri. Pavlodar: Tipographya Sytina, 2011
- Sravnitelno-istoricheskaya grammatica tjurkskikh yazykov (2006). Moskva: Nauka
- Shaimerdinova N.G.** Reprezentatsiya v yazike drevnetjurkski kartina mira (2009). Astana: ArmanPV
- Sartkozhauly K.** Orhon Muralary II kitap (2012). Almaty:
- Stebleva I.V.** Poyeziya tjurkov VI-VIII C. Moskva, 61-63

Received 17 Sep 2013, Screened 7 Oct 2013, Accepted 19 Nov 2013