



Supplementary Notebook (RTEP - Brazilian academic journal, ISSN 2316-1493)

THE ROLE OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL TURKIC WRITTEN MONUMENTS IN THE STUDY OF MODERN TURKIC LANGUAGES

Aygul Hajiyeva¹

¹*Manuscripts Institute, Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences
elchinibrahimov85@mail.ru.*

Abstract: The paper deals with the role of ancient and medieval Turkic written monuments in the study of modern Turkic languages. Being the sources of history, complex form of social life and institution, administrative and social hierarchy, religion, and worldview of the Turkic peoples, they also give a possibility to trace the formation of the Turkic languages, their phonetic, lexical and grammatical systems. This study is based on descriptive, historical comparison, and comparative analysis methods. The methodology is a logical and philosophical theory applied to the historical development of language facts and addresses to the works of prominent turkologists in this aspect. For example, the history of agglutinative words system in Turkic languages, vowel prolongation and their types in Turkish phonetics, the problems arising in the learning of modern Turkish language vocabulary, the differentiation of syncretic affixes and adverbs.

Keywords: Ancient, medieval, Turkic, monuments, manuscripts, comparison, phonetics, lexical, morphology.

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to investigate the role of ancient and medieval Turkic written monuments in the study of literary languages of Turkic peoples, which includes in a large geographical area such as Mongolia, Altay, Buryatia, Central Asia – Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Caucasus area, comprising 41 languages and dialects, belonging to the modern Turkic languages family, and perspective, its contribution to Turkology and in general linguistics. For this we are following four main points based on the texts of these monuments:

1. To identify prolonged vowels that have historically existed in the Turkic languages, their basic features, and remnants in the Turkic context;
2. which lexical components these ancient and medieval monuments clarify;
3. the global character of the morphological development of the language and in particular the problem of shaping agglutinative character of Turkic languages
4. How modal words and particles get through morphological development
5. To determine morphological development of the Turkic languages through the regularity of modal words and particles.

Description of the study: Monuments of ancient Turkic writing appeared in the middle of the V-X centuries which is considered a common Turkic period, among them, the Gok (blue) Turks monuments were created between the fifth-seventh centuries AD. Being written in ancient Turkic alphabet, the so-called stone monuments (daş kitabələr, bitikçi), are the common legacy of Turkic civilization and a part of human cultural heritage. The English philosopher A. Toynbee highly appreciates such ancient culture and civilization samples of the world and guides their place in world culture (Тойнби 2006; Gold 1961).

Contemporary Turkic languages have an agglutinative structure, although other language structures are not excluded either. Turkologists are faced with the problem of the formation of an agglutinative language structure, its main incentives, which language structure it replaces and how it is argued. From the middle of the last century, an idea arose between European and Soviet Turkologists that the ancient Turkic, the basis of modern Turkic languages, had an amorphous linguistic structure, and later - in the Altai era - was completely transferred to the agglutinative linguistic system. The difficulty is that these traces in the Old Turkic monuments of the Middle Turkic period (V-X centuries AD) are practically lost. The main traces of these transformations appear in sentences and in the context of substitute grammar.

For example, phrases as “black people of Tengri” (Malov, 1951:111), or “men are people of arrows”, can serve as remains of amorphous linguistic structures. Before turning to the interpretation of the question, let's consider such a fact about the possibility of transition to the language structure mentioned above on an example of the Chinese language. The agglutinative tendency in modern-day Chinese language started in the 13th and 14th centuries and observed by linguists the genetic link between the auxiliary words and the full meaning words, laid the foundations of a grammar of lexical units (chunks) theory.

This extremely slow process resulted with some renewal in morphological elements in Chinese. Although the amorphous linguistic structure has a dominant linguistic structure in this language, accordingly and indirectly it proves that the Turkic languages went a similar way of changing the structure of the language from an amorphous to to the agglutinative linguistic structure. However, should be considered another hypothesis as *the evolutionary nature of changes in language structure*. This point was mentioned by S.G. Huseynov (Hüseynov 2019:14) with reference to Edward Sapir (Сепир 1993:171), *arguing that traces of other linguistic structures can be found in all languages*.

Following this concept, he believed that along with the amorphous linguistic structure of the ancient Turkic language, linguistic and fluctuating linguistic structures have a certain dimension and determine the mechanism of transition to agglutinativity. According to him, the transitional link from the amorphous linguistic structure to the

agglutinative was an auxiliary word. This kind of argument should also be based on ancient written sources. As far as archaeological sources are crucial for historical science, so are ancient written sources are of equal importance for the dialect materials of languages.

The fact that the above hypothesis find its confirmation on facts from ancient Turkish written sources, brings us closer to the essence of the hypothesis. Consider the term “*tæg*” in modern Turkic languages: *Tamudağı taq(uyğur ab. 46, 18)*; *ten,ri tağ tənridə bolmuş türk bilgə kağan (KT k, 1)* (Tamag tag (Uigur ab. 46, 18); Ten, Tengue Turkish Knight) (KT k, 1) (Clauson 2007: 185-196). A.Shukurov notes that “*Tæg*” (IB, 36) as an independent verb developed in parallel (as potposition) with its derivative-grammatical unit. “*İlqərü Şantun yazıka taqi sülədim, taluyka kiçik tağmədim*” (Şükürov 2015:392). F. Zeynalov notes in his monograph that this fact is traced with some phonetic changes in most of the Turkic languages (Zeynalov 1971:105). The lexeme “*tæg*” is actively used in modern Azerbaijani and in most Turkic languages. Speaking of complex syntactic units, acad. K.M.Abdullaev calls adverb “then” and conjunction “and” as a connective means among its components. He rightly accepted this concept and emphasized the fact that lexical units can be grammatically positioned situationally, and demonstrated the logic of reproduction’ origin, historically existed in Turkic languages (Abdullayev 1999:249).

Apparently, the first variant separates us from a millennium and is still actively used in the analogical form, with relatively minor differences. The relative difference means the differences in the semantic structure of the verb “*Tæg*” in evolutionary path until today. Thus, the comparative interpretation of modern Turkic languages with ancient Turkic written monuments allows us to say about preposition, affix, and verb versions of “*Tæg*” lexeme.

The fact that grammatization in lexical units is formed in the Middle Turkic period allows concluding that books that the transition from amorphous to the agglutinative linguistic structure can be explained by referring to ancient monuments of this type. Despite the controversy in the Turkology studies on the affix reproduction’s origin and development, some of the affixes are noted as independent vocabulary; most of these approaches are accepted. Such a complex problem, of course, cannot be fully explained with comparison of modern language facts. Therefore, it is possible to visualize the ancient landscape of the spoken language, and to determine the logical model of development trajectory for thousands of years. This feature is universal for other language families as well.

When speaking of the formation history of the predicative suffix -dır⁴ in the Oghuz group of Turkic languages, we find some well-grounded facts in medieval manuscripts, including R.Baghdadi’s “Divan”:

Zahidin zövqi-riya batinin etmiş viran,
Zahir əgərçi ki, məmur dūrūr dünyası (Bağdadi, 1012).
(The thrill of dream has ruined the hermit’s inner peace,
Though his world is apparent.)

In the combination “Məmur dūrūr” “dūrūr” is the initial form of the Modern Turkic predicative suffix -dır⁴. It is also appealing that the initial variant mentioned in R.Baghdadi’s divan is almost very passive according to the criterion of active usage; the modern variant of the same suffix (-dır⁴) enjoys a complete advantage which means in R.Baghdadi’s period the suffixation of the word “dūrūr” was being accomplished. The

similar feature can be observed in M.Fizuli's ghazals too. As it is obvious, both the ancient Turkic tablets with inscriptions and the medieval Azerbaijani literary monuments provide significant materials in the solution to the global problems of Turkic grammar. A theoretical comment can be consolidated with their help.

Problems such as vowel and consonant phonemes amount in phonetics of modern Turkic languages, harmony law, prolonged vowel, have not yet been fully explained in modern Turkology. Some Turkologists believe that the differences in the phonetic system of modern Turkic languages exist due to their exposure to different Turkic dialects and other languages.

This assumption is based on the study of vowels and consonants in ancient written Turkic sources and their comparison with modern Turkic languages, which suggests that the emergence of the mentioned differences in Turkic languages are related to the branching of dialects toward separate languages, dialectic interventions and impact of neighboring languages accelerated this process. This process became the main topic for many works on theoretical linguistics. This investigation is mostly interested in prolonged vowels in some modern Turkic languages, especially in the Uighur-Oguz group of Turkic languages (Tuva, Tofas, Khakas, Shor, Barabin Tartars, Chulum Tartars) and in the Turkmen language from the Oguz language group. In this case, we have to confirm that the short and prolonged variants of vowels exist in ancient Turkic Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions. Short vowels are also present in the modern Oguz group. B. Serebrennikov explains the gradual weakening and the disappearance in some languages of long vowels in this way: "The phenomenon of long vowels loss process vowels occurring in the majority of Turkic languages is a characteristic feature of subsequent transformation of ProTurkic vocalism" (Serebrennikov 2002).

Basically, prolonged vowels remained in the Yakut, Turkmen, and non-Turkic Persian languages, the remnants manifest themselves in other Turkic languages. Loss of prolonged vowels apparently happened rapidly, as the change of long and short vowels is almost identical in almost all Turkic languages. In some of the Turkic languages, closed vowels have also changed. In the two-syllable words, the vowels of the second syllables were not very stable. They have been assimilated and were influenced by their predecessors" (Serebrennikov, Hacıyeva 2002:14). It is still controversial that the use of prolonged vowels that have been preserved in some of the modern Turkic languages, in particular in the Turkmen and Yakut languages, that is, the issue of phonosemantic characterization requires deeper research. Ancient Turkic inscriptions along with dialects are can help us to solve this problem.

"Phonetically, the Turkmen language distinguish from other Turkic languages with a number of non-essential features, such as various vowel lengths, in some cases with in differential semantics (ōt fire— ot grass....); s and z (in any position) – as interdental θ and ð; labial assimilation of vowels after the "wide" vowels from the first syllable [inscription dogan (brother) should be pronounced doga°n], and et al. In Tekin dialect are onserved samples of inner flexion: dūr - he is staying- instead of durar; gēr - he is coming — instead of geler, et al. Along with imperfective particle (alýān - taking, berýēn - giving), there is also perfect (alan - who took, beren -who give). Syntactically important to note the remnants of the so-called predictability category and the possibility by means of *alan* and *beren* forms, to convey in various cases a number of shades that are expressed in Russian by the system of subordinate clauses" (Интересные факты о туркменском языке. <https://www.diplom.md/ru/turkmen/>).

In Russian original:

“Фонетически туркменский язык отличается от других языков тюркской системы рядом несущественных особенностей. Это долготы гласных, в известных случаях имеющие дифференциальное значение (d̄t огонь — ot трава, и т. д.); s и z (в любой позиции) — как межзубных θ и δ; губная ассимиляция гласных после «широких» гласных 1-го слога [при начертании dogan (брат) произносятся doga^on] и т. д. В текинском диалекте характерны случаи «внутренней флексии»: d̄r он стоит — вместо durar, ḡer он приходит — вместо geler и т. д. Кроме причастия несовершенного вида (al̄yān берущий, ber̄yēn дающий), имеется также и причастие совершенного вида (alan взявший, beren давший).

Синтаксически важно отметить остатки так называемой категории сказуемости и возможность посредством упомянутых форм alan и beren в различных падежах передавать ряд оттенков, которые по-русски выражаются системой придаточных предложений” (Интересные факты о туркменском языке).

Following aforesaid, there are three notable facts:

1. Prolonged vowels exist in the Turkmen language;
2. Thus, has phonemic peculiarities and has an inflective core.

However, the researcher of Tuvian language Saaya Ojumaа Maadyr-Jolovna (Саая Оюмаа Маадыр-Соловна) believes that there was no initial prolongivity in Turkic languages; this is later situational form.

“The issue of “primary” longitudes in Turkology persists one of the controversial. Regarding the presence of “primary” longitudes in the Turkic languages in the dissertation, we adhere to the opinion that the indicated prolongivity did not exist in the Turkic languages initially, their presence in ancient Turkic languages is probable. Perhaps, in the ancient Turkic languages there was a process of lengthening of vowels specified by position and was probably a regional phenomenon. The opinion is justified by the fact that the materials of the Orkhon-Yenisei spruptres as well as and medieval monuments recorded using Arabic graphics indicate that long vowels in the root words existed. In addition, scientists note the presence in the ancient Turkic languages of the positional vowel length associated with the quality of the subsequent consonant. There was a contrast between deaf and voiced consonants at the end of monosyllabic words and at the end of the first syllables of polysyllabic words. Such an opposition is explained by the laws of syllable construction, expressed in the interdependence of the nature of the second consonants and vowels in the syllables type (C) VC: voiced consonants followed long vowels, and the deafness of the final consonants was related to the vowel's brevity, i.e. voiced consonants follow positionally prolonged vowels, and deaf ones follow short ones” (Маадыр-Ооловна 2005:142).

Russian ooriginal:

Вопрос о «первичных» долготах в тюркологии остается одним из спорных. В отношении наличия «первичных» долгот в тюркских языках в диссертации мы придерживаемся следующего мнения: указываемые долготы не существовали в тюркских языках изначально. Но допускается их наличие в древних тюркских языках. Возможно, в древнетюркских языках имел место процесс удлинения гласных, обусловленное позицией. Он совершался неравномерно, и, вероятно, был региональным явлением. Высказываемая точка зрения обоснована тем, что материалы орхоно-енисейских рунических памятников и средневековых памятников, зафиксированных с помощью арабской графики, орхоно-енисейские

рунические памятники написаны иероглифом, и нет там арабской и ре могло бытъв ту пору там-RG) свидетельствуют, что долгие гласные в корневых словах существовали. Кроме того, учеными отмечается наличие в древнетюркских языках позиционной долготы гласных, связанной с качеством последующего согласного. Существовало противопоставление глухих и звонких согласных на конце односложных слов и в конце первых слогов многосложных слов. Такая оппозиция объясняется закономерностями построения слога, выразившимися во взаимозависимости характера вторых согласных и гласных в слогах типа (C)VC: звонкие согласные следовали за долгими гласными, а глухость конечных согласных была связана с краткостью гласного, т.е. звонкие согласные следуют за позиционно долгими гласными, а глухие -за краткими» (Маадыр-Ооловна 2005:142).

It is obvious that the author does not accept the first vowel longevity in the Turkic languages, while agreeing the later situational prolongivity. It is worth noting that in modern Turkish, positional extension covers a number of syllables at the orthoepic level, which means, the later extension was preserved in modern Turkish. However, the extensions found in the Turkmen and Uighur-Oguz languages, cannot be regarded as later extension.

The existence of long vowels on the root morphemes in Orkhon-Yenisei and Medieval Turkic monuments is determined by the fact that this problem has a deeper history and a strong base in the earlier Turkic phonetic system. Another concern is the phonemic features of long vowels in the Turkmen language and the ability to preserve the signs of internal inflexion. This characteristic can be traced in the "gör—göz" (see-eye) ratio of the modern Azerbaijani language. The fact that the verb "gör" (to see) derives from the noun "göz" (eye) is obvious: without "gör", the word of the göz" would not have been formed. Nowadays, this kind of word forming is not inherent to the modern Azerbaijani language. But researches in diachronic level reconstruction confirm that inflexional structure had a certain place in the ancient Turkic languages.

LINGUISTIC ALTERATIONS ON THE BACKGROUND OF DIFFERENT HISTORICAL EVENTS AND FOLLOWING DIFFERENT CULTURAL CROSSROADS FOR TURKISH ETHNNOSES

A comprehensive analysis of the peculiarities of the Turkish language based on ancient Turkic inscriptions give clues to understanding modern-day vocabulary, which is a significant part of all modern-day Turkic languages. Current phonetic and semantic alterations have relative differences in languages, mostly because of the different historical events and related cultural crossroads are different for Turkish ethnoses. For example, after the formation of the Ottoman Empire, the Arabic language expanded to this empire as the influence of the Islamization of Turkic civilization, displacing the original Turkic words in Ottoman Turkish about 30 percent. This process also involved Persian-speaking Muslims, decreasing the role of recently prestigious Persian language. In addition, the influence of neighboring elite Greek and some European languages on the Turkish lexicon actually shaped the new style of Turkic language, a language for court writing and later for newspapers, magazines, poetry, which definitely distinguished from the Turkish peasant's spoken language.

Thus, the Ottoman Turkish was severely affected by the alien intrusion. The Kemalist movement, which began in the early 20th century, was characterized by attempts of renaming and clearing the language from those lexical “contamination, replacing the borrowings words with the Turkic words the ancient Turkic lexicon. Thus, the refinement of the Turkish language vocabulary at this stage of history was the result of the new historical transformation.

Y. D. Yeremeyev noted that “Also replaced the words that have long been included in the Turkish vocabulary with artificially created neologisms: Arabism *istiklal* (independency), *ingilab* (revolution), *millat* (nation), Persian *şehir* (city) has been accordingly called “bağımsızlık”, “devrim”, “ulus”, “kent”. Like any attempt to cleanse the vocabulary of impurities, this movement also was not perfect/ In abovementioned cases, *ulus* is the derivation from Mongolian, “kent” ended up in Turkish from the Sogdian language in Central Asia time. Neologisms, however, did not completely supplant their predecessors. Old vocabulary serves as a reserve of synonyms, which is also explained by the requirements of a good style” (Еремеев 1980).

In Russian original:

“Даже давно и прочно вошедшие в обиход заимствования они стали заменять искусственно созданными неологизмами. Так, арабизмы «истикляль» (независимость), «инкыляб» (революция), «миллет» (нация), персизм «шехир» (город) пытались заменить новыми словами — «багымсызлык», «деврим», «улус», «кент». Кстати, «улус» — отнюдь не тюркское, а монгольское слово; «кент» — тоже не исконно тюркское, а иранское— оно было еще в согдийском языке, откуда его заимствовали древние тюрки.. Неологизмы, однако, не вытеснили окончательно своих предшественников. Старая лексика служит резервом синонимов, что объясняется и требованиями хорошего стиля” (Еремеев 1980).

Thus, the ancient Turkish vocabulary has not lost its basic function even in modern times. There are even some of the lexemes used in ancient Turkic, are actual for some Turkic languages and were processed without any phonetic modification. Bashkir language researcher of Akilova M.A. gave the samples of nature names actual in the modern Bashkir language and similar to that of the Orhon-Yenisei inscriptions: “A study of the vocabulary of the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments demonstrates the following: most of the language of written monuments are made up of words that are common to Turkic languages. These words include the part of the vocabulary that is most often used in people's everyday lives: the names of words related to family relationships, seasons, concepts of time, parts of the human body, nature, what is on the surface of the earth, and related to the social life of a person; words indicating character and quality, numerals, etc. This phenomenon manifests a the more stable position of vocabulary compared to phonetics” (Акилова <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=25324987>).

In Russian original: “Исследование лексики Орхоно-енисейских памятников показывает нам следующее: большую часть языка памятников письменности составляют слова, которые являются общими для тюркских языков. К этим словам относится та часть лексики, которая особенно часто используется в жизни людей: названия слов, связанных с родственными отношениями, временами года, понятиями времени, частями тела человека, природой, тем, что находится на поверхности земли, с социально-общественной жизнью человека; слова, обозначающие характер и качество, числительные и т.д. Это явление

демонстрирует более устойчивое положение лексики по сравнению с фонетикой” (Акилова <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=25324987>).

He notes that the zoonyms in the ancient Bashkir and in modern Bashkir language has changed without phonetic modification: “*At*- horse, *yylki* –horse, *kashkalak* – the bird loon, *karğa*- crow, *бака* -frog, *yulan* - snake, *kaplan* -leopard, *кабан* -wild boar, *тәкә* - goat, etc. Another part of the animal names underwent various phonetic transformations as a result of the sounds alternation (eg, *e > e: kekyk > kakuk* -cuckoo; *s > d: as > ad* "ermine-stoat", etc.), epenthesis (eg, *arišlan > arydlan* - lion), metathesis (e.g. *qimışka > kyrmydka* - ant), loss of sounds (e.g. *barsmuq > burhik* -badger), haplology (e.g. *jabaqulaq > yabalak* - owl), etc.” (Акилова <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=25324987>).

In Russian original:

“*am* «лошадь», *йылкы* «лошадь», *кашкалак* «гагара», *карға* «ворона», *бака* «лягушка», *йылан* «змея», *каплан* «леопард», *кабан* «кабан», *тәкә* «козел» и т.п. Другая же часть древнетюркских наименований животных претерпела различные фонетические изменения, которые возникли в результате чередования звуков (напр, *e > э: кекык > кэкук* «кукушка»; *s > д: as > ад* «горностай» и др.), эпентезы (напр., *arišlan > арыдлан* «лев»), метатезы (напр, *qimışka > кырмыдка* «муравей»), выпадения звуков (напр, *barsmuq > burhik* «барсук»), гаплогонии (напр, *jabaqulaq > yabalak* 'сова') и т. д.” (Акилова <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=25324987>).

Post-Soviet Turkic republics, which had regained their independence after collapsing of the Soviet Union, faced with adoption the new alphabet instead of Cyrillic, which was approved during Russian domination native was considered Ancient Turkic alphabet, used in Orkhon-Enisei inscriptions. But no one of them could replace due to invisible political matters, some satisfied with the substitution for the Latin alphabet. The issue of replacement of some Russian borrowed words with those from the ancient Turkic lexicon also remained ambiguous. The morphology of the Turkish languages is very sophisticated. This is related, from one side, to morphosemantic of the categories, and on the other hand, they have sufficient morphological characteristics and they have a transparent function. The study of controversial points in some categories in the Turkic languages make it necessary again to refer to ancient Turkic written monuments. For example, in present-day Chuvash language, the affix **-(i)l; -(i)n** does not exist as passive voice. According to G. Ramstedt, the explanation of this fact is in Turkic languages this function of the affix has been shaped in later stages of development (Рамстедт 1957:149).

The matter comes with the derivation of it from the root-constructed word. In addition, there is a variation of passive voice *ııl* in the Yakut language, and *-ılın;-lın* in the Altai dialect. In this form, they are recorded in both the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments and in Oguz epic medieval *Kitabi Dede Gorgud*. World-formative peculiarities of the verb types affixes in the current Azerbaijani language have caused considerable controversy among Turkologists. Because of the substantial functional differences of these affixes, their correlation persists to be unclear and generates much discussions.

B. Serebrennikov and N. Hajiyeva justify derivation of type affixes from derivational affixes in this way: “... in modern Turkic languages, traces of ancient adjective often carry the meaning of the passive voice, but do not retain the passive voice’s affix. Azerbaijani. Compare: Azərb. *Burm-a 'burulm-uş'* (twist, to be twisted'), Turkish *yarm-a 'parçalanm-ış'* (half, to be splitted), tuv. *uzuk 'üzülm-üş'* (ring, to be torn), türk, *kırqm*

'*qırılm-ış, sindirilm-ış*' (broken), et al. It seems that on the basis of this, G.I. Ramsted considers that the passive voice in the Turkic languages was of late origin and he is trying to prove that passive voice affixes initially served as an indicator for derivational affixes (Serebrennikov B., Hacıyeva 2002:258). The passive voice, widely used in the ancient Turkic monuments, is the most common morphological indicator in the modern Azerbaijani language. Turkologists use this fact to refer its beginning to ancient Turkic scriptures.

Thus, the use of these affixes not as a type, but rather as a derivational affix in the Chuvash language enhances the hypotheses by B. Serebrennikov and N. Hacıyeva, and argues the fact that the verb types affixes are not functionally fully differentiated. Complicasy occurs also because modern Turkic languages do not have a model of transformation model of the lexical affixes to grammar affixes. In this case, it is necessary to respond to G. Ramsted's and others' definition of the lexical *derivation* affixes: in deeper semiotics, the gap between grammar and lexical affixes are reduced. Most probably, the type affixes' double function of lexical and grammar derivation – thus, syncretic affixes in modern Turkic languages differed from synonymic figurines, both in their vocabulary and in their vocabulary (Hüseynov 2019:138-140). Such a view can be regarded as a logical continuation of the views of G. Ramstedt and B.Serebrennikov and N. Hacıyeva.

Thinking changes with the evolution of humanities. and new relations, worldviews emerge. It is a multilateral process that combines human consciousness and psychology, having a unique impact on the language context. Elaboration of modal words and ascertainment of their place in the morphological system of the language could be a good example. It is known that the improvement of analytical thinking comes together with the necessity to analyze and discuss life events and define attitude, based on the life experience. This attitude is usually expressed in *modal words*. Information about their origin and formation in the language system is possible again at the ancient Turkic monuments: modal words in these monuments are almost non-existent. This means their formation dates back to the after-X-XI centuries. In Kitabi Dada Gorgud we find modal words *gərək ola, əlbəttə* (must). Therefore, it is possible to conclude that although the ancient Turkic monuments did not have modal words, there were lexical means with close expression, and modal words and the formation of their phrasing occurs in more recent history. In R.Baghdadi's "Divan", for example, the verbal modal word "dutalım" is very active:

Dutalım, bənzər imiş arizi-yarəgüli-al,
Andan, ey bülbül, anə biz deyəlim dilbərmi (Bağdadi, 1035).
(Suppose, she were a beauty with her face like a red flower,
Oh nightingale, shall we call her a charmer?)

Or

Dutalım, bülbülsən, ey Ruhi, bu naleşlər nədir?
Xarxari-hicr ayırmış qanai gülşəndən səni (Bağdadi, 1025).
(Suppose, you were a nightingale, oh Ruhi, why are these laments?
The sorrow of departure has severed you from the human garden of roses.)

These facts enable us to state that in Azerbaijani the modal words had already been in an accomplished form. Therefore, the formation history of the modal words should be sought further back in the periods prior to R.Baghdadi.

Another example could be an *adverb*: even in modern-day Turkology, there is no exact criterion for identifying the adverb as part of speech. The reason is, on the one hand,

the adverbs are relatively later formed in comparison with the other parts of the speech, and, on the other hand, they preserve the signs of the speech part from which they are isolated. Orkhon-Yenisei scriptures indicate adverbs' formation intensified during their writing process period; for this time an adverb established its place in morphological structure with its adverb-derivation-peculiarities. Later this process is accelerating and expanding its scope. A. Shukurov extracted following adverbs from these Gok (Blue, Haven)-Turk monuments: *Kičə-gecə* (night); *küntüz-gündüz* (day); *amti-indi* (now); *yarın-səhər* (tomorrow); *səhər vaxtı* night and day (Şükürov 2015:133). Also, the presence of derivative adverbs and adverbation of words are evidence of the aforesaid concept.

When speaking of the word combinations in the Turkic languages including Azerbaijani in the issues of Turkic and Persian attributive word combinations (izafet) and their usage ratio for centuries, the medieval Azerbaijani manuscripts provide us with some well-grounded information. For instance, in R.Baghdadi's "Divan" the Persian and Turkish attributive word combinations (izafet) are used in parallel, sometimes in a ghazal there are only Turkish attributive word combinations, while in others both Persian and Turkish attributive word combinations are used. Given this fact, we can state that in the ghazals written in the style of classic poems in Azerbaijani poetry the 15th-16th centuries are the period when the Turkish izafet was in rivalry with the Persian izafet and gained strength.

Apparently, as in any modern language research, ancient Turkic written texts are the main source for modern-day studies on the history of linguistics. These monuments include Orkhon-Yenisei scriptures, Y. Balasagunlu's "Kutatqu-Biliq", M. Kashgari's "Divani-Lügətät Türk" (Dictionary), "Kitabi-Dede Korgud" and others.

CONCLUSION

Various linguistic concepts, theoretical and factual materials, in particular, Turkologists, were addressed at the investigation. When speaking about the agglutinative a linguistic system formation in Turkic languages structure, and tracing a combination of amorphous, agglutinative and flexible language structures inherent to Turkic period scriptures, we referred to Edward Sapir's approach. According to Sapir's concept, that monotonous character could not be necessarily applied to all language structures, there are always traces of other derivative structures. Further comparative analysis of Turkic languages' parallel samples gave a clue to the agglutination trajectory.

In Turkic languages, prolonged vowels are divided into two groups, as initial and secondary. Turkologists are not unanimous on this categorization. Examination of the facts from the Uighur-Oguz group allows you to express an opinion that present-day Turkmen and Yakut languages kept initial prolonged class. Along with this fact, the Turkmen language kept flective structure as well. Consequently, the above-stated concept on the possibility of transition from amorph to agglutinative linguistic structure finds confirmation. The vocabulary of current Turkic languages contains lexical and grammatical layers of ancient and medieval Turkic written monuments, and despite the centuries gap, covers the needs of the language matters. Ancient Turkic monuments, as well as medieval Azerbaijani manuscripts (R.Baghdadi) are a reliable source in terms of the formation of the parts of speech in Turkic languages and the location of the

morphological system of the language. This investigation suggested the samples of modal words and adverbs.

This study allows to conclude that ancient and medieval Turkic written monuments play a major role in the analysis of current problems in the Turkic languages. They provide compelling evidence for the study of phonetical, lexical and grammatical matters of the modern-day Turkic languages.

REFERENCES

- 1 Abdullayev, K.M. Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri. Bakı: Maarif. 1999. 249s.
- 2 Акилова М.Ф. Некоторые следы языка Орхон-Енисейских памятников в современном башкирском и других тюркских языках, на материале названий относящихся к природе - Современные проблемы науки и образования. – 2015. – № 1 (часть 1) <https://www.science-education.ru/ru/article/view?id=19664> Derives 30 August 2019.
- 3 Akilova M.F. Nekotorye sledy yazyka Orkhono-Eniseyskikh pamyatnikov v sovremennom bashkirskom i drugikh tyurkskikh yazykakh, na materiale nazvaniy otnosyashchikhsya k prirode - Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovaniya. – 2015. – № 1 (chast' 1).
- 3 Gerard, Clauson . Dil Araştırmaları Dergisi.Cilt: 1 Sayı: 1 Güz 2007, 185-196 ss.Türkçede Sekizinci Yüzyıldan Önce Kullanılan Ekler1..Çev. Uluhan Özalan.
- 4 Gold, Milton. "Toynbee on the Turks in the near and Middle East." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, no. 3/4 (1961): 77-99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25202446>.
- 5 Hüseyinov Ş.Q. Türk dillərində şəkilçilərin töprəmə yolları. Bakı: Maarif, 2019.278 s.
- 6 Serebrennikov B., Hacıyeva N..Türk dillərinin müqayisəli tarixi qrammatikası.Bakı: Səda 2002.
- 7 Şükürov Ə.Qədim Türk yazılı abidələrinin dili. Bakı: Maarif, 2015,408.
- 8 Zeynalov F. *Müasir türk dillərində köməkçi nitq hissələri*. Bakı: Maarif, 1971,311.
- 9 Еремеев Д. Е. *На стыке Азии и Европы: очерки о Турции и турках*. (1980) <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1609258/> Derived 2 September 2019.
- 10 Yeremeev D. Ye. *Na styke Azii i Yevropy: ocherki o Turtsii i turkakh*. (1980).
- 11 Ивин Александр Архипович. Философия истории - *Теория локальных цивилизаций А. Тойнби* - <https://fil.wikireading.ru/59293> Derived 2 September 2019.
- 12 Ivin Aleksandr Arkhipovich. *Filosofiya istorii - Teoriya lokal'nykh tsivilizatsiy A. Toynbee*.
- 13 Интересные факты о туркменском языке. <https://www.diplom.md/ru/turkmen/> Derived October 2, 2019.
- 14 Interesnye fakty o turkmenskom yazyke. <https://www.diplom.md/ru/turkmen/> Derived October 2, 2019.

15 Малов С.Е. Памятники древнетюркской письменности. Тексты и исследования. М.-Л.: АН СССР, 1951, 451 с.

16 Malov S.E. Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti. Teksty i issledovaniya. M.-L.: AN SSSR, 1951, 451 s.

17 Рамстедт Г. И. Введение в алтайское языкознание М.: ИВЛ, 1957, 254 с

Ramstedt G. I. Vvedenie v altayskoe yazykoznanie M.: IVL, 1957, 254 s.

18 Маадыр-ооловна, Саая Оюмаа. Долгие гласные тувинского языка - В сравнении с тюркскими языками Южной Сибири и монгольскими : АКД (кандидата филологических наук) : 10.02.20. - Новосибирск, 2005. - 142 с. РГБ ОД.

19 Maadyr-oolovna, Saaya Oyumaа. Dolgie glasnye tuvinskogo yazyka - V sravnenii s tyurkskimi yazykami Yuzhnoy Sibiri i mongol'skimi : AKD (kandidata filologicheskikh nauk) : 10.02.20. - Novosibirsk, 2005. - 142 s. RGB OD.

20 Сепир, Эдвард. Е. Язык. М-Л 1934, 243с.

21 Sepir, Edward. E. Yazyk. M-L 1934 , 243с.

22 Сепир, Эдвард. *Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии*. Переводы с английского под редакцией и с предисловием доктора филологических наук проф. А. Е. КИБРИКА. Москва: Издательская группа «Прогресс»

«Универс», 1993, р. 171 http://tlf.msk.ru/school/sapir_school.htm Derived 25 September 2019.

23 Sepir, Edward. *Izbrannye trudy poyazykoznaniiu ikul'turologii*. Perevodys angliyskogo pod redaktsiye is predisloviem doktora filologicheskikh nauk prof. A. Ye. KIBRIKA. Moskva: Izdatel'skaya gruppa «Progress» «Univers», 1993, p. 171.

24 Тойнби, Арнольд Джозеф. "Исследование истории." (2006).

25 R.Bağdadi. Divan II cilddə. II cild. Bakı. Elm və Təhsil .2011.