

Передня Александра Дмитриевна

ОБ ИНСТРУМЕНТАЛЬНОМ ПАДЕЖЕ В ДРЕВНЕУЙГУРСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Данная статья посвящена развитию инструментального падежа в тюркских языках. Основной интерес представляет падежная система древнеуйгурского языка, в том числе вопрос о разграничении показателя инструментального падежа -у(n) и одного из показателей винительного падежа ((-у?), (- ну), -у(n)). В результате исследования были определены функция и значение инструментального падежа. Функция инструментального падежа заключается в описании орудия, предмета или участника действия, благодаря которым оно совершается. Таким образом, значение данного падежа - "орудность".

Адрес статьи: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/8-2/40.html

Источник

Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики

Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 8(62): в 2-х ч. Ч. 2. С. 139-143. ISSN 1997-2911.

Адрес журнала: www.gramota.net/editions/2.html

Содержание данного номера журнала: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/8-2/

© Издательство "Грамота"

Информация о возможности публикации статей в журнале размещена на Интернет сайте издательства: www.gramota.net

Вопросы, связанные с публикациями научных материалов, редакция просит направлять на адрес: phil@gramota.net

УДК 811.512.1

*This article focuses on the development of the instrumental case in the Turkic languages. The emphasis was made on the study of the case system in the Old Uyghur, including the distinction between the **-(y)n** form as the indicator of the instrumental case and the **((-y)), (-ny), -y(n)** form as the indicator of the accusative case. As a result the author of the research was able to determine the function and the meaning of the instrumental case. The function of the instrumental case is to represent the material or accomplice with which or with whom the action is produced. Thus this case has the “instrumental” meaning.*

Key words and phrases: Turkic languages; Old Uyghur; instrumental case; accusative case; modern Turkic languages.

Perednya Aleksandra Dmitrievna

Saint Petersburg University

alexandraperednya@gmail.com

REGARDING THE INSTRUMENTAL CASE IN THE OLD UYGHUR

Introduction

This article focuses on the development of the instrumental case in the Turkic languages. The emphasis was made on the study of the case system in the Old Uyghur language based on materials that date from 9th-14th centuries. At the same time other Turkic languages, primarily of Oguz subgroup are used as a source of information on the further development of the instrumental case. When conducting research interest was drawn to the similarity of some case forms, namely the coincidence of the **-(y)n** form. This form (suffix) transmits not only the instrumental case but also the accusative case after the suffix of possession. We will also discuss some points of view regarding the origin of this form and illustrate these assumptions based upon factual material. The interest in this subject was caused by the appearance of a new point of view, according to which the **-y(n)** form in the Turkic languages, having the overall general grammatical meaning, is able to transmit as the information on instruments of action and information on the direct object, wherein the possessive and transfer function emerges, most probably, not immediately and already as a secondary [1, c. 47-48].

The author of this point of view concludes that if we assume that this form was one of the first means of representation of case relations, the process of diachronic development could lead to the occurrence of forms, which gradually took over the function of the transmission of more specific relations. Wherein the **-(y)n** form was used as the more general one, which expressed the same rather wide range specter of relations between the objects [Там же, с. 48]. It is important to add that the above-mentioned point of view occurred in the material of the language of the runic inscriptions. In order to support this assumption, it is important to carry out a grammatical analysis of the texts of the manuscripts, as well as to establish the graphic features.

The Old Uyghur

The Old Uyghur is considered to be one of the ancient Turkic languages. Traditionally it is regarded as part of the Oghuz subgroup [13, c. 35-46]. Old Uyghur is represented by manuscripts, woodcuts, wall inscriptions, inscriptions on objects, etc. of different content. Manuscripts and xylographs, most of which are religious texts, attract the most interest as object of research; there are also legal and personal documents. Religious manuscripts can be divided into Buddhist, Manichaeic and Christian according to their content. The documents were also written in different scripts - Runic, Uighur, Manichaeic, Brahmi, etc. Most of them are translations from the Chinese, Sogdian or Sanskrit [11, c. 83-90; 12, c. 245-270] and are allocated in Turfan, as well as Dun Juan and Xinjiang dating back to IX-XIV centuries. “Yrq bitig” or the ‘book of omens’ is considered to be one of the earliest representatives of the Old Uighur (roughly IX-X centuries) although it was written in the runic script. The language found in this manuscript is closer to the Oghuz-Uyghur rather than Oghuz-Tukuj. We can also find original texts among manuscripts, composed by Uighur authors [18, p. 13]. Such texts deserve a special place among the monuments, since they give evidence of the established to the XIV century Old Uyghur language. Like any original works they are deprived of the influence of another language; the influence can be noted while analyzing the morphological and syntactic features of the “translated” manuscripts. Such monuments demonstrate a high level of education of translators and sometimes it is possible to determine whether the monument is original or not only by the colophon, which clearly describes the function of the author - either the translator or the original author.

Instrumental case in the Old Uyghur

Researchers have determined a different number of case forms in the Old Uyghur. Some believe that there are seven case forms: primary (or direct), accusative, instrumental, locative, ablative and possessive (or genitive) [7, c. 32-37]. Others find eight cases in the language and allocate such affixes as genitive (Genitiv), dative (Dativ), accusative (Akkusativ), locative-ablative (Lokativ-Ablativ), ablative (Ablativ), instrumental (Instrumental), equative (Äquativ) and directive (Direktiv) [16, p. 86-89]. The name form is sometimes ranked as a case and is denoted as an indefinite (Kasus indefinites); researchers argue that this form is a name with null-terminated and functions as nominative or as an indefinite form of a name [Ibidem, p. 86]. There is also another point of view that according to which there are nine cases in the Old Uyghur: the main, genitive, dative, dative-directive, accusative, locative, ablative, instrumental and comparative [3, c. 40]. Twelve case forms are described in the Grammar by M. Erdal: nominative, genitive,

accusative, dative, locative, ablative, instrumental, equative, directive, partitive-locative, simulative and comitative [15]. The research study of the Old Uyghur monuments led to the identification of seven case forms in the language: genitive, accusative, dative, locative, ablative, instrumental and equative. The instrumental case in the Old Uyghur was of the most interest among other cases. This case signals that the subject called the base-form is either a tool, or the subject, with whom the action is performed. The instrumental case represents the material or accomplice with which or with whom the action is produced. This instrumental case has the following suffixes in the Old Uyghur: after both consonants and vowels: **-yn, -in**.

For example:

...saqynč-yn söz-in qylynč-yn on türlüg suj jazıuq qyl-tymyz ersär [2, c. 230]...

thought-INST word-INST deed-INST ten type sin peccancy make-PST-1.POSS.PL be-COND

"...If we make ten different sins or peccancies by thought, word and deed..."

or

...kün-kä tort alqyş azru-a täñri-kä kün aj täñri-kä küclüg täñri-kä burqan-lar-qa bir bilig-in aryy köñül-in alqansyq törü bar_erti [6, c. 112]...

power god-DAT Buddha-PL-DAT one knowledge-INST pure heart-INST praising law-3.SG.POSS be-PST

"...There was a law [to commit] praising of the God Zervan, the god of the sun and moon, the mighty god and Buddha four times a day with single knowledge and a pure heart..."

The Uyghur texts, as well as the runic, give evidence of the possible use of the **-(y)n** form as accusative after suffix of possession:

...ol jämä jäk-lär jalañuq lar-nyñ ät-in ji-jü kan-yn iç-ip bagarsuq lar-yn ätöz läri-ñä jürgäjürlär ärdi [17, p. 42]...

those and demon-PL human-PL-GEN meat-3SG.POSS_ACC eat-CONV blood-3SG.POSS_ACC drink-CONV intestines-PL-3POSS_ACC body-3PL.POSS-DAT wind-IMPRF.3PL

"And those demons, having eaten the meat of a human, drank their blood and winded their intestines over their own bodies..."

Other Turkic languages

In order to present a complete picture of the instrumental case in the Turkic languages we should conduct a comparative analysis of the studied forms in languages of the Oghuz subgroup and in the languages of other subgroups. First of all, we should turn to the first Turkic written manuscripts.

1. Old Turkic languages

1.1 The Tonyuquq's Memorial Complex

The Tonyuquq monument gives a rather clear distinction between **-(y)n** form as indicator of the accusative case after the possessive suffixes and **-(y)n** form as indicator of the instrumental case. In the first instance the N sign was more commonly used. This also applies to those word forms in which, according to the runic writing rules, you would expect to find the **n** sign:

NJmlobNjnk

[...qan-yn bul-majyn...] [6, c. 56]

khan-3SG.POSS-ACC have-NEG.CONV

"...not having their own Khan..."

zmTRrorlogmokirkNizukjgoC

[...čoyaj quz-i-n qaraqum-yy olur-ur_erti-miz...] [Там же]

Chugay-quz-3SG.POSS.ACC Karakum - ACC live-IMPRF-1PL

"...We inhabited the Chugay-quz and the Karakum..."

mDTLSNiSUSqnu

[...on oq sü-si-n sülä-t-dim...] [Там же, c. 26]

ten arrows army-3SG.POSS.ACC conduct a campaign- CAUS-PST.1SG

"...I led to campaign the army of «ten arrows»..."

In the example **b** we can see both forms: **-yy** (in bold) and **-y(n)** (underlined). In both cases it is the accusative. Also the second example includes the accusative after the 3rd person suffix of possession. Thus *čoyaj quzin* (NizukjgoC) should be considered a noun with the accusative suffix after the suffix of possession. The accusative suffix is written with the "N" sign. Here we also witness the Izafe (type 2), in which the components are organized in a one-way relationship, where the head-word governs its dependent, they are connected by a suffix. In our example *on oq* (qnu) is the governor and *sü* (N) – the dependent with the possessive suffix (3rd person, singular) *-s(y)* (N). Therefore the *-y(n)* (N) is the accusative case after the possessive suffix.

The **n** sign was used to mark the instrumental case:

mDTžursirojnlojlo

[...ol jol-yn jory-sar unč ti-dim...] [Там же, c. 58]

that road-INST go-COND possible say-PST.1SG

"...if we go that way it is possible I said..."

mDTiCmrjrjrojnlojob

[...bu jol-yn jory-sar jara-mačy ti-dim...] [Там же]

this road-INST go-COND suit-NEG.PRS.PTN say-PST.1SG

"...if we go this way it is unsuitable I said..."

Examples **a** and **b** demonstrate the use of similar structures that contextually form a single text; the **n** sign is an instrumental case.

Another example illustrates an exception when the **n** sign is the accusative case. It is noteworthy that I.V. Kormushyn interpreted the **-(y)n** form as accusative suffix used after the possessive [5, c. 90].

pDSnibSlo
[...*ol sab-yn äsid-ip...*] [6, c. 58]
that word-3SG.POSS-ACC hear-CONV
“...when he heard his words...”¹

The use of the postposition *saju* confirms the fact that the **н** sign is the accusative case word form which includes the possessive suffix. This postposition is only found after the accusative suffix in texts of that period of time. Such combination occurred as the result of the origin of the postposition *saju*; it is the adverbial participle of the verb *saj-* (*saju* < *saj-* + *-(j)a*), which in turn assigns the accusative. In the following example, the word form with accusative is marked with one line, and the postposition is in bold.

zmtlujsNindobNOTqlu
[...*oloq tün bodun-y-n saju y-tymyz...*] [Там же, c. 59]
that night tribe-3SG.POSS-ACC to send-PST.1PL
“...we send (envoys) to each tribe that night...”

1.2 The Kultegin's Memorial Complex

When considering the other monuments' material of which could shed light on the question of difference of the considered forms, it should be noted that those can be attributed to the monument in honor of Kul Tigin and Bilge Khagan and the Ongin inscriptions.

For example, the monument in honor of Kul Tigin doesn't demonstrate a clear distinction between the use of the **ᠨ** and **н** signs as accusative or instrumental.

We can also find accusative after the suffix of possession in two different variants: **N** and **n**, what is more, the first sign is frequently used even in word forms with front vowels (**a**) and back vowels (**b**).

a) SmRiBiNNiSURUTNiLiakngkCgbt
[...*tabyač qayan-qa il-i-n törü-si-n al-y bir-mis...*] [Там же, c. 21]
Tabgach khan-DAT land-3SG.POSS-ACC power-3SG.POSS-ACC
take-AART-PRF
“...they gave their land and the power to the Tabgach...”

b) LGDiSiTKUTnmbs
[...*saby-m-yn tükäti esid-gil...*] [Там же, c. 19]
words-1SG.POSS-ACC fully listen-IMP.2SG
“...Listen to all of my words...”
DiSiTKUTnmbsub
[...*bu sab-ym-yn edgüti esid...*] [Там же]
this word-1SG.POSS-ACC properly listen-IMP
“...listen to my words properly...”

Interesting are the cases in which we can find the duality of the **-(y)n** form. It can either be the instrumental case, or the adverbial word-formative suffix. The inscription itself is rather complex, this could indicate its origin from another more ancient inscription. They are functionally close and indicate some sort of a feature.

The words *jadaγyn jalaγyn* (nhljngdj) in the example iTLKanjnhljngdjUTiJULUndub [...*bodun ölü jitü jadaγyn jalaγyn jana kälti...*] [Там же, c. 24] “...the people dying and perishing, on foot and naked, returned again...” are interpreted as adverbs, formed with the adverbial word-forming suffix.

1.3 Yrğ bitig

The thorough analysis of Yrğ bitig (“Book of Omens”), a later manuscript (8-9th century) written in the Old Turkic script, showed that the use of **N** and **n** inscriptions was clearly differentiated. The **N** inscription was used as the accusative case suffix after the possessive suffix (**a**), whereas the **n** inscription – mostly as the instrumental case (**b**).

a) NmRUJiNNimçDBS
[...*säb-dük-im-in ji-jür -män...*] [Там же, c. 78]
love-SAF-1SG.POSS-ACC eat-PRS-1SG
“...I eat what I love...”

b) NmrtutNimkudalpt
[...*tapla-duq-ym-yn tut-ar -män...*] [Там же]
like-SAF-1SG.POSS-ACC catch-PRS-1SG
“...I catch what I like...”

There are also such examples in which we find both accusative after the possessive suffix (the **N** sign is underlined) and the instrumental case (the **n** sign is in bold). This in fact clearly emphasizes the difference between

¹ according to the translation by S. E. Malov [6, c. 67].

the two forms. The following phrase *NpiSKniClikNimksguruknutl* [...*altun qoruysaq-ym-yn qylyč-yn käsi-pän...*] [Там же, с. 80] (gold belly-POSS.1SG-ACC sword-INST cut-CONV) "...having cut my golden belly with a sword..." gives an example of the use of both accusative after the possessive suffix and the instrumental case. This example clearly illustrates the fact that each form has its own inscription.

2. Modern Turkic languages

Let's take a closer look at the instrumental case in some modern Turkic languages, mainly of the Oghuz subgroup. Some languages, like the Gagauz, lack the suffix **-yn**; its function is replaced with the so-called 'new' instrumental case, the **-nan** form. In the Gagauz we can witness the following examples [14, p. 268]:

кары-сын-нан
wife-3SG.POSS.-INST
'with his wife'

or
ушак-нан
child-INST
'as a child'

A similar form can also be found in the Yakut [4]. For example:

кими-нен
who-INST
'whom'

It is noteworthy that the Yakut language preserved the **-yn** form. Although, according to the Grammar of the language, this form is considered as a relict without its grammatical meaning [Там же, с. 148]. For example:

элиг-ин
hand-INST*
'by hand'

Grammars of the Azerbaijani language do not include instrumental into the case paradigm due to the lack of such a form. The postposition **ilə (-la/-lə)** is used to transmit the functions of the instrumental case [10, с. 164]. For example: *tahta ilə* 'with a board', *sevinclə* 'with happiness', etc. The Modern Turkish also uses the post position **ile (-la/-le)** in cases where an instrumental would be needed. For example: *uçak ile* 'by plane' and etc. Although, some researchers believe that it may also be the 'new' instrumental case which originates from a postposition [9, с. 134]. For example: *ellinne* 'with his/her hand' and etc. It is noteworthy that this 'new' case is common to the regions of Edirne and the north-eastern part of Bulgaria, making it more of a dialectal form.

Conclusion

1. The studied material allows us to claim that the two forms, the accusative after the possessive suffix and the instrumental case, are not of the same origin. The two variants of the inscription of the form **-(y)n** indicate that apparently there were two forms with a similar pronunciation and sometimes, or most likely at all times, different inscriptions. We can also find such "coincidental" similarities in the inscriptions (spelling) in other languages, for example, the modern Turkish language, in which forms have similar pronunciation and even spelling, but come from a different origin. For example, *-madan* can be an adverbial participle¹, as well as a "masdar" + suffix - ablative case (*-madan < -ma + -dan*). Therewith the author of this article supports the point of view according to which the accusative after the possessive suffix should be distinguished from the instrumental case and are of a different origin in the Old Turkic language.

2. There is a possibility that the so-called "objective case" could have existed; it was probably the first case to emerge due to the need to show the fact that the object was not the subject. However, the so-called "objective case" was most likely the accusative case, which was used in the primitive language for the purpose of separation of subject and object of the action. It is also noteworthy that in the language of the ancient Turkic runic monuments, many postpositions govern the accusative, including **üçün** ('because').

3. The **-nan** form, most probably, ascends to the postposition **irlar *birlar ilar birlar ile birle*. It is common for a postposition to grammaticalize and turn into a suffix.

References

1. Губайдуллина М. Э. К вопросу о функциональном использовании падежных форм с показателями *-(y)n* и *-(y)u* (в памятниках древнетюркской рунической письменности) // Вопросы тюркской филологии. М., 2006. С. 40-48.
2. Дмитриева Л. В. Хуастуанифт. (Введение, текст, перевод) // Тюркологические исследования. М. – Л., 1963. С. 214-233.
3. Кондратьев В. Г. Грамматический строй языка памятников древнетюркской письменности VIII-XI в. Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1981. 191 с.
4. Коркина Е. И., Убрятова Е. И. Грамматика современного якутского литературного языка. М.: Наука, 1982. 496 с.
5. Кормушин И. В. Древние тюркские языки. Абакан: Изд-во Хакасского гос. ун-та им. Н. Ф. Катанова, 2004. 336 с.
6. Малов С. Е. Памятники древнетюркской письменности. М. – Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1951. 352 с.
7. Насилов В. М. Древнеуйгурский язык. М.: Издательство восточной литературы, 1963. 124 с.
8. Покровская Л. А. Грамматика гагаузского языка. Фонетика и Морфология. М.: Наука, 1964. 300 с.
9. Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Региональные реконструкции / отв. ред. Э. Р. Тенишев. М.: Наука, 2002. 767 с.
10. Севортян Э., Ширалиев М. Грамматика азербайджанского языка. Баку: Элм, 1971. 412 с.
11. Телицин Н. Н. Этнокультурные условия возникновения и развития уйгурской письменности // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Серия 13. Востоковедение. Африканистика. 2010. № 1. С. 83-90.

¹ The form of the adverbial participle *-madan* comes from the old Turkic participle *-matin ~ -mati*

12. Телицин Н. Н., Передня А. Д. Древнетюркская литература (VI-XIV вв.) // Литературы стран Азии и Африки. Начальный период развития. СПб.: Издательство Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета, 2012. С. 245-270.
13. Тенишев Э. Р. Тюркоязычных письменных памятников языка // Языки мира. Тюркские языки. М.: Индрик, 1997. С. 35-46.
14. Doerfer G. Das Gagausische // Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta. Wiesbaden, 1959. Vol. 1. P. 260-271.
15. Erdal M. A Grammar of Old Turkic. Boston: Brill Leiden, 2004. 182 p.
16. Gabain A. v. Alttürkische Grammatik. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1950. S. 86-89.
17. Müller F. W. K. Uigurica. Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1910. Abhandlung III. 110 p.
18. Tekin Ş. Buddhistische Uigurica aus der Yüan-Zeit. Budapest, 1980. 13 p.

Abbreviations of Grammatical Terms

1 – first person	CONV – converb	POSS – possessive
2 – second person	DAT – dative	PRF – perfect
3 – third person	IMP – imperative	PRS – present
AART – aktionsart	IMPRF – imperfect	PST – past
ACC – acusative	INST – instrumental	PTN – potential
CAUS – causative	NEG – negative	SAF – substantive-adjective form
COND – conditional	PL – plural	SG – singular

ОБ ИНСТРУМЕНТАЛЬНОМ ПАДЕЖЕ В ДРЕВНЕУЙГУРСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Передня Александра Дмитриевна

*Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет
alexandraprednya@gmail.com*

Данная статья посвящена развитию инструментального падежа в тюркских языках. Основной интерес представляет падежная система древнеуйгурского языка, в том числе вопрос о разграничении показателя инструментального падежа **-y(n)** и одного из показателей винительного падежа (**(-yγ)**, **(-ny)**, **-y(n)**). В результате исследования были определены функция и значение инструментального падежа. Функция инструментального падежа заключается в описании орудия, предмета или участника действия, благодаря которым оно совершается. Таким образом, значение данного падежа – «орудность».

Ключевые слова и фразы: Тюркские языки; древнеуйгурский язык; инструментальный падеж; винительный падеж; современные тюркские языки.

УДК 8.800

Статья раскрывает содержание понятия квинтэссенции языка. Подход к материалу исследования основан на полипарадигмальности, что побуждает авторов обращаться в ходе исследования к данным когнитологии, логики и философии, в рамках чего осуществляется интерпретация научного познания объекта «язык». Таким образом, предпринимаются попытки адаптировать методологические принципы исследования сопоставительных наук для формирования новых научных парадигм.

Ключевые слова и фразы: язык; познание; мышление; сознание; диалектическая гносеология; интегральный подход.

Петрова Елена Александровна, д. филол. н., доцент

Галиева Дина Аслямовна, к. филол. н., доцент

Уфимский юридический институт МВД России

eleina.froloff@yandex.ru

О ПОЛИФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ПРИРОДЕ ЯЗЫКА КАК ОБЪЕКТЕ НАУЧНОГО ПОЗНАНИЯ

Диапазон современных лингвистических исследований довольно широк и основывается на онтологическом, гносеологическом и методологическом уровнях познания. Философия, а также динамика научного познания обуславливают взаимосвязь новейших научных парадигм в языкознании (логический анализ языка, логико-когнитивный анализ языка, лингвопрагматический анализ языка, когнитивно-дискурсивный анализ и др.), что обеспечивает методологическую базу для нахождения новых способов решения проблем, возникающих перед исследователем. Язык в этом случае исследуется как часть деятельности человека, а объекты лингвистики анализируются с позиции их значимости для человека, так появляется интегральная наука – антропологическая лингвистика, которая изучает «человека в языке», «язык в человеке», «язык для человека», во всех его проявлениях. В современных обзорах методологии и перспектив развития языкознания учеными делается вывод о том, что существует большое разнообразие мнений и теорий при истолковании одних и тех же фактов и освещении одних и тех же объектов науки, и что при этом имеет место нежесткий, расплывчатый характер лингвистических понятий [3, с. 22-24].