

opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,
Lingüística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 35, 2019, Especial N°

20

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

ISSN 1012-1537/ ISSNe: 2477-9385

Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas
Maracaibo - Venezuela

Language Units Expressing the Notion of Degree or Quantity on Turkic Monuments

Zauresh Akhmetzhanova¹

¹ Faculty of Philology and Educational Sciences, Suleyman Demirel University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
Akhmetzhanova-2017@list.ru

Yermukhamet Maralbek²

² Al-Farabi Kazakh National, University. Research fellow at the Institute of Linguistics named after Ahmet Baitursynuly
y.maralbek@inbox.ru

Yerlan Kassenov³

³ Institute of Philology and Multilingual Education, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
yerlan.kassenov.75@bk.ru

Marzhan Kerembekova⁴

⁴ Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Research fellow at the Institute of Linguistics named after Ahmet Baitursynuly, Almaty, Kazakhstan
kerembekova.m1986@rambler.ru

Abstract

The aim of the study is to investigate the language units expressing the notion of degree or quantity on Old Turkic monuments via comparative qualitative research methods. As a result, formation and transferral methods for the notion of quantity are clearly rooted in three linguistic levels: phonetics, lexicon, and grammar. In conclusion, the category of measure even in the Old Turkic period, a foundational historical period in the development of the Kazakh language, has reached the level of a general language category with its lexical and grammatical forms and methods fully formed.

Keywords: Turkic, language, Kazakh, quantity, constructions.

Unidades de idioma que expresan la noción de grado o cantidad en los monumentos de Turkic

Resumen

El objetivo del estudio es investigar las unidades de lenguaje que expresan la noción de grado o cantidad en los antiguos monumentos turcos a través de métodos de investigación cualitativa comparativa. Como resultado, los métodos de formación y transferencia para la noción de cantidad están claramente enraizados en tres niveles lingüísticos: fonética, léxico y gramática. En conclusión, la categoría de medida incluso en el período antiguo turco, un período histórico fundamental en el desarrollo de la lengua kazaja, ha alcanzado el nivel de una categoría de lenguaje general con sus formas y métodos léxicos y gramaticales completamente formados.

Palabras clave: turco, lengua, kazajo, cantidad, construcciones.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, Kazakh linguistics has developed quickly in many new directions with the advent of internationally current scientific linguistic methods, which have made possible many investigations that were not open to the tools of the structural linguistics current until recently in the field. One such quickly developing new direction in Kazakh linguistics is the functional direction, beginning in the 1990s with the work of Akhmetzhanova. She noted that Semantic units singled out general and private,

highlighted and veiled, hidden, actualized only with the strong context support (Akhmetzhanova, 1989). As a method of investigation, functional linguistics can be considered an opposite direction to structural linguistics: from content to form rather than the reverse. That is, in structural linguistics, language units are classified into groups and classes, whereas in functional linguistics classification is made across main language units, considered together in terms of their function.

In the article, context analysis, lexical and semantic, functional and grammatical, historical and comparative analysis are used. Linguistic units related to measurement are classified, and semantic groups used frequently are defined. Using historical and comparative methods, lexical and grammatical development of these units from Old Turkic to modern Kazakh is traced. Also, in order to define their semantic peculiarities and functional character, pragmatic peculiarities and stylistic functions are looked at in context analysis. The full transcription and Kazakh translation of the monumental Old Turkic inscriptions were done by Aidarov (1986; 1990), whose work we thus rely on heavily. In addition, Tomanov's (2002) historical-grammatical works on Old Turkic and on Kipchak have been of value. Particularly essential for us was a work these three authors wrote together, *Language of the Old Turkic written monuments* (Aidarov et al., 1971).

2. METHODOLOGY

Functional studies consider language notions first at the level of phonetics. One important direction for phonetics in measure semantics is intonology, or the study of lexical and expressive intonation at levels of word, sentence, text, and communicative act. As per Pardo (2018), the main units of intonation are intonemes. A number of intonemes expressing notions related to quantity can be inferred on Old Turkic monuments based on comparison with the Kazakh. Considering it comparatively, we believe that the below words found on the monuments have the degree of intonation. Semantically paired words: anygh ukus // azdy-kop few and many, erur-barur // zhure-zhure go and come, iyaryn-kiche // kuni-tuni day and night, tunli-kungli // kuni-tuni day and night, etc. Superlative syntactic words: azkyna // az ghana few only.

Pronouns of degree: ancha //munsha this, ancha // osynsha this, ancha // sonsha that, buncha // munsha this, buncha // sonshama that,yncha // sonsha, etc. Qualitative adjectives: az //az (few),yeme //kop (many, much), kop // kop (many, much),ukush // kop (many, much), yrak // zhyrak (long away) , uzun// uzak (long or distant),benggu // mangi (forever, everlasting), kichig // kishkene (younger, smaller), uchrughlugh // ulken (big), ulugh // ulken (big),tolku //auyr (heavy), etc. (Aidarov, 1990). In these words, the degree of meaning of the measure is modified in conjunction with intonation when it is placed on a different vowel. However, empirical

evidence of this is hard to gather given that no speakers of the Turkic language can be recorded and their intonation measured.

At the lexical level, quantity is expressed by qualitative adjectives, numerals, pronouns of degree, and adverbs. We cannot analyze all the lexical and grammatical peculiarities of these words within the scope of one article. Therefore, we limit ourselves to identifying their basic ways of formation and their functional-semantic nature, which are as follows;

Some qualitative adjectives on the monuments that are formed of a single word or are part of a phrase designate the notion of degree. In modern Kazakh, degree is also observed in adjectives (biyik tall, zhuka thin, zhuan fat, kalyn fat, uzyn long, ulket big, kishi small, etc.). In fact, however, the quality and degree of a thing are two different notions.

On the monuments we can find the following qualitative adjectives which express the notion of quantity: az // az few, iyeme // kop many, much, kop // kop many, much, kop // koptep more, ukush // kop many, much, ulugh // kop many, much iuika // zhuka thin, iinchge iyogan bolsar // zhinishke zhuandasa thin getting thick, iyuiyka kalyn // zhuka kalyndasa thin getting thick, iyaghuk // zhakyn close, yrak // zhyrak far, ozung uzun bolzun // ozin uzak zhasa live a long life, uzun // uzak far, uzun tonlugh // uzun kiyimdi long dressed, benggu // manggi everlasting, kichig // kishkene little, uchrughlugh // ulken big, ulugh // ulken big, tolku // auyr heavy, iyablak // nashar bad, iyabyz // alsiz weak, etc. (Aidarov, 1990). As we observed, the aforementioned

lexical units express different types of notions: numeric degree, the quantity of distance in a horizontal or vertical position, the degree of time, and weight and size.

Approximate quantitative degree: For example, *Eligche er tutdymyz ol ok tun budunyn saiya ytymyz ol sabygh esidip on ok begleri buduny kop kelti iyukuntu // Eludei (around fifty warriors) erin ustadyk, tutkyndady sol tuni khalyk saiyn elshi zhiberdik, ol khabardy estip on ok bekteri, khalky tugel keldi, zhugindi (Aidarov, 1990).* Aidarov translated the phrase *eligche* erinto Kazakh as *eludei* er around fifty warriors. He preserved the general meaning of the phrase and made a proper interpretation.

3. DISCUSSION

Numerical interpretation is also done at the grammar level (both morphological and syntactic levels). Here, the notion of quantity is formed by affixes that convey plurality from the numbers and actions of things and phenomena. They are divided into two groups by type of quantitative meaning: The first group expresses the numeric degree of the things, whereas the second group expresses their quantitative degree. The respective types are as follows.

Language units with quantitative meanings are formed by means of affixes such as *-myz, -miz, -dymyz, -timiz* (in Kazakh: *-myz, -miz, -tyk, -tik*) that in turn express the numeric degree. For example: *apamyz*

// babamyz our ancestor, echumiz // our grandfather, Suledimiz // soghystyk we fought, Sunushdimiz // soghystyk we fought, konturdymyz // kondyrdyk we get it landed etc. (Aidarov, 1990).

Affixes -cha, -che (-sha, -she) form the meaning of quantity when comparing size, volume, or quantity of one thing with another. For example: kanyñ subchai ugurtu // kanyñ sudai akty your blood streamed like water, sunukung taghchai ugurtu // suiyeging taudai zhatty your bones laylike mountains (Aidarov, 1990). In the phrases, despite affixes -cha,-che being used in a function of comparison like affix -teg, there are differences in lexical and grammatical meaning. Affixes -cha, -che compare the quantity, action, and process of a certain thing; the comparative view of quantity and size of a certain thing dominates over comparison based on their features (Indriastuti, 2019; Lee et al., 2018; Khorrami et al., 2015).

Affixes -ycha,- iche, -ycha, -che used with participles form language units that express the notion of time degree. For example Olurtukyma oltechiche sakynyghma turk begler budun egrip sebinip toktamys kozi iyoka ru kerti. Bodke ozum oluryp buncha aghyr tarug tort bulukdaky budungha itidim // Kaghan bolganymda olgenshe (in anticipation, look forward to) oilaghan turki bekteri suiyinip, kuanyp khandyk takty zhoghary kordi. Takky otyryp, munsha mykty erezhelderdi, zangdardy, duniyening tort buryshyndaghy khalyktardy igerdim (Aidarov, 1990). This passage narrates the desire of feudal lords to have Bilge elected as a lord (kaghan) for all Turkic nations. That desire is reflected in the word oltechiche (olgenshe) anticipate,

look forward to. That word, in its literal meaning, expresses the distance between the start of a dream or ideal until the end of the lives of those dreamers. In the text, the degree of the desire of those feudal lords is figuratively compared with this degree.

4. RESULT

In the monumental texts, language units that express the notion of degree are found to be illustrated at the syntactic level, by syntactic constructions, analytical formants and syntactic parallels. Clear illustrations of these syntactic methods are as follows:

Quantitative constructions: This kind of syntactic construction consists of three components: Numerals, quantitative word, and noun or verb. These three components are connected one to another through the syntax, forming a unified quantitative construction, which provides any kind of the quantity of one thing or action or phenomenon is given by this construction. By this construction, then, one group of newly formed quantitative units expresses the quantity of a thing and the other the quantity of an action. Based on these features of their meaning, they can be divided into two groups: Material quantity: *bes tumen su // bes tumen /bes myn/ five thousand soldiers, bir tumen aghy altun kumush* etc. (Aidarov, 1990).

As we see, the words, *batyma, kat, atlygh, tumen* express the quantity of a certain thing by means of numerals. For example, *Iyeti*

otuz yashymda kyrk az tapa suledim, sunug batyma karygh sokshen // Zhiyrma zheti zhasymda kyzyk azgha karsy soghystym, sunggi boiy kardy (snow from spear height) arshydym (Aidarov, 1990). This text narrates how Bilge khagan (the lord), fighting against Kyryk az, cleaned snow from spear height; that is, the quantitative construction sunug batyma karygh expresses the depth of snow which can be measured with the length of a spear. A literal translation of the construction would be sunggi batpa kar; the scholar did a free translation to preserve the meaning.

The quantitative construction has one more special form, in which one of three components is omitted from structure of the construction. Even on the monuments we can find this type of quantitative unit: iyeti iyegirimi sunusdi // on zheti / ret / soghysty fought 17 times bes sunusdi // bes / ret /soghysty fought 5 times, iyeti sunusdi // zheti / ret / soghysty fought 7 times, iki iyanyka sunusdim // ekinshi ret taghy soghystym I fought the second time once again, bing iylyk tumen kunlik // myng zhyldyk, tumen kundik thousand years, ten days, etc. (Aidarov, 1990). As we see, despite the omission of one component, the quantitative meaning is not affected. This process can thus be understood as a contraction of components in the structure of the construction that is needed as per language norms. It is not clearly illustrated in the construction, but is kept in mind as an allogical component. In any case, its meaning is logically clear.

Analytical formants: There are many syntactic ways of expressing the notion of quantity, and we can find plenty of them in

the texts of the monuments. The analytical formants expressing the notion of degree are divided into at least four types, as follows: The first ones are formed in an analytical form when numerals and possessive endings (affixes) are in syntactic connection, (number)+ i, (number)+y. In the texts of monuments we can find the following quantitative formants: bir ulugi iyadagh // edi bir bolegi zhayau one group is on foot, eki ulugi atlygh // eki bolegi atty the second group is on horses, etc. (Aidarov, 1990).

The aforementioned form expresses a part of the entire quantitative degree, which is also considered a certain quantitative degree. The second type are formed when possessive endings (affixes) and numbers are used in the form y+(number), i+(number). We can find the following quantitative formants on the monuments: susiuch bing ermis // askeri ush myng eken with three thousand arms, and others. Here, affix -y forms a meaning of possession and collection. When coming together with numerals in analytical form, it points to the collective meaning of a certain thing.

The third type is formed when some words in ablative case and adjectives are connected syntactically and used in analytical form (O)+ artuky (dan)+arty kmore than. We can find the following quantitative formants on the monuments: ai artuky tort kun // aidan artyk tort kun 4 days more than a month, etc. (Aidarov, 1990). Here in the phrase precisely speaking about the quantitative meaning of a period of time, bir ai tort kun 1 month and 4 days expresses the time. This way of expressing the quantity of time is slightly different from In

Kazakh generally accepted norms. Here, the places of the syntactic components have been changed, but the meaning is expressed without any mistake or confusion.

Tomanov (2002) gives the following explanation for this syntactic phenomenon: There were many other ways of counting in the Old Turkic language. First of all, a word expressing ten being followed with the word *artyk* and then comes the necessary unit. For example: *kyrk artuk iyeti – kyryk artyk zheti, otuz artyk tort, otuz artuk bir*), etc. A numeral quantitative phrase like *zhuzden zhiymasy artyk* is a sign of this kind of usage. We share the view of (Tomanov, 2002). This kind of different system of counting decimals is given in the medical book of *Oteiboidakh Tileukhabyluly*. Shows that auxiliary structure and syntactic tools played significant roles in expressing the notion of quantity in the counting system of the Old Turkic language (Santos et al., 2016).

The notion of measurement is also formed when a word in the dative case and syntactic words are used in the analytical form. For instance, by means of formants like *ka+tegi, a+tegi, (gha+deiyin, na+deiyin)* we can form language units expressing a process between its starting point and the period that continues until its end. These units are used to express the notions of the quantity of time and distance. For example: *Temir kapygh kategi irtimiz // temir kakpagha deiyin kudyk we chased until the iron gate, kun toghyska, batyska tegdi // kun shyghys pen batyska deiyin zhetti the sun reached west and east,*

bashyna tegicherig itdim // basyna deiyin sherikter koidym; I placed arms until the beginning, etc. (Aidarov, 1990).

All these phrases express the notion of the distance of a certain process that started at a certain point and continued until a certain point. If the starting point is expressed by dative suffixes -ka, -a, the ending point is expressed by a syntactic word *tegi*. For example *Temir katygh kategori irtimiz anta iyanturdymyz // Temir kakpagma deiyin kudyk sonda kaitardyk* we chased him until the iron gate and got him back (Aidarov, 1990). The passage narrates how Turkic nations fighting had reached the iron gate in the south, distant from the steppe. Of course, this territory refers to quantitative notions composed like volume, square, and distance.

5. CONCLUSION

To sum up, the notion of quantity in the Old Turkic language manifests itself in three levels of language. Formation and transferral methods for the notion of quantity are clearly rooted in three linguistic levels: phonetics, lexicon, and grammar. At the level of phonetics, the semantics of quantity is transmitted through intonation: pairs of words, amplifying particles, quantitative names (adverbs of measure and degree), in the form of the qualitative adjective. The concept of measures is encountered constantly in the inscriptions of the targeted monuments.

The semantics of quantity and measure are largely conveyed through adjectives, numerals, names denoting the measure and the number, and some semantic groups of adverbs. According to semantic similarities, these lexemes of measures can be classified into several concepts: number, volume, distance, time, and weight. The concept of measures in the Old Turkic language refers to the exact number of objects and to the number of actions at the level of morphology. In contrast, at the level of syntax, the semantics of the measure is transmitted through syntactic structures, analytical formants, and syntactic parallels, mostly similar to the modern Kazakh language.

The nature of the categories of measures that occupy an important place in the linguistic space of the Old Turkic language can be fully understood only through both structural and functional research. The manifestation of the concept of measure in each level of the Old Turkic language shows that it is very old. In addition, the category of measure even in the Old Turkic period, a foundational historical period in the development of the Kazakh language, has reached the level of a general language category with its lexical and grammatical forms and methods fully formed. This proves once again that the Kazakh language has preserved key linguistic elements of the heritage of the Old Turkic language.

REFERENCES

- AIDAROV, G. 1986. **Language of the Old Turkic Written Monuments**. Almaty: Mektep. Kazakhstan.
- AIDAROV, G. 1990. **Texts of Orkhon Monuments**. Almaty: Science. Kazakhstan.
- AIDAROV, G., ABZHAN, K., & MARKHABAT, T. 1971. **Language of the Old Turkic Written Monuments**. Almaty: Mektep. Kazakhstan.
- AKHMETZHANOVA, Z. 1989. **Principles of Comparative Functional Research of the Kazakh and Russian Languages**. PhD diss. The Institute of Linguistics named after Ahmet Baitursynuly. Russia.
- INDRIASTUTI, H. 2019. **Entrepreneurial inattentiveness, relational capabilities and value co-creation to enhance marketing performance**. *Giap journals*. Vol 7. N° 3. India.
- Khorrami, F. T., Fallah, M. H., & Abadi, H. Z. M. 2015. **The Effect of Unconscious Influences of Satellite Channels on Attitude of Using Satellite**. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 61-67.
- Lee, Y., Capraro, R. M., & Capraro, M. M. 2018. **Mathematics Teachers' Subject Matter Knowledge and Pedagogical Content Knowledge in Problem Posing**. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(2), 75-90. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/2698>
- MARALBEK, Y. 2016. **Pronouns of Quantity**. *Messenger at Kazak National Pedagogical University Named after Abay, Philology Series*. Pp. 60–66. Kazakhstan.
- PARDO, J. 2018. **A comparison of phonetic convergence in conversational interaction and speech shadowing**. *Journal of Phonetics*. Vol. 69, pp. 1–11. Netherlands.

Santos, D., Pinto, J., Rossetti, R. J. F., & Oliveira, E. 2016. **Modelling Altitude Information in Two-Dimensional Traffic Networks for Electric Mobility Simulation.** Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management, 1(3), 191-198.
<https://doi.org/10.20897/lectito.201635>

TOMANOV, M. 2002. **Studies on History of a Language.** Almaty: Ghylym Scientific Press Center. Kazakhstan.



**UNIVERSIDAD
DEL ZULIA**

opción

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 35, N° 20, (2019)

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.

Maracaibo - Venezuela

www.luz.edu.ve

www.serbi.luz.edu.ve

produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve