

A FEATURE OF THE İZAFET IN THE ORHON INSCRIPTIONS

B. S. ADAMS

Although the izafet is so fundamental and characteristic a part of Turkish syntax, it has been the subject of very little detailed study. Apart from references in the appropriate parts of descriptive and practical grammars, there exist only three monographs dealing exclusively with the izafet. These are:

- A.K. Borovkov *Priroda turetskogo izafeta* (The nature of the Turkish izafet) in 'Sbornik ANSSSR N. Ya. Marru', 1937.
- S.S. Mayzel' *Izafet v turetskom yazyke* (The izafet in Turkish), ANSSSR 1957.
- V.G. Kondrat'ev *Konstruktsiya izafeta i pryamoye dopolnyeniye v yazyke pamyatnikov tyurkskoy runicheskoy pis'mennosti* (The izafet construction and the definite object in the language of the monuments of Turkic runic literature), in *Uchënniye Zapiski Leningradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta*, no. 306, 1952.

This paper proposes to supplement the first part of the last mentioned, which deals with the izafet in the Orhon Inscriptions in a totally uncritical manner.

In general, the izafet constructions in the Orhon Inscriptions present few surprises. Four types of izafet are to be listed, which I would classify thus, following Mayzel's order:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| i) Noun in genitive | + Noun with relative suffix. |
| ii) Noun in absolute | + Noun with relative suffix. |
| iii) Noun in absolute | + Noun in absolute. |
| iv) Noun in genitive | + Noun in absolute. ¹ |

¹ Type (iv) is not classified by Mayzel', as its use in Modern Turkish (to which his work is restricted) is only with pronouns of the first and second persons.

The possessive relationship is expressed by types (i) (rare) and (ii), and occasionally by (iv), which Kondrat'ev calls the 'Mongolian' izafet, a term of dubious validity. Type (iii) is used for the expression of non-possessive relationships such as that between a personal name and a title (*Bumin qağan* 'King Bumin'), a geographical name and the feature to which it refers (*Kögmen yış* 'the forested mountain Kögmen') and a number of izafets involving the deverbal nomen in *-duq* / *-dük*. Whether such a phrase as *qañım qağan* 'my father the King' is an izafet or not seems a debatable point; Kondrat'ev holds that it is, on what grounds he does not state; I hold that it is not, on the grounds that the two elements do not form a unity in the same way that the elements of *Bumin qağan* or *Kögmen yış* do. Whereas in these latter examples the proper noun is subordinate to the common, in *Qañım qağan* the two elements retain their individual force – there is no question of any degree of subordination, as is necessary for an izafet).² *Qañım qağan*, Kondrat'ev's izafet type (i) variant 2, is an apposition, not an izafet, and the same applies to his type (i) variant 3 *inim Kül tegin* 'my younger brother Prince Kül'. It is odd that, in referring to Prof. von Gabain's *Altürkische Grammatik* p. 160, he makes no comment on her use of the word *Apposition*.

Thus the izafet constructions in the Orhon Inscriptions fall into almost watertight compartments. The use of the genitive leads to a little overlapping between types (i), (ii) and (iv), but this is so little in evidence that no detailed comment is called for. There is, however, some rather odd overlapping between types (ii) and (iii), and it is on this that this paper will hope to shed some light. The overlap in question occurs in two variants, that involving the deverbal nomen in *-duq* / *-dük*, and that involving nomina of nationality.

The existence of this overlap in izafets of nationality is observed by Kondrat'ev, who merely remarks that the suffixless type (iii) is the commoner. There are, however, certain peculiarities of the 'rarer' type (ii) to which he makes no reference. Nomina of nationality (*Türkü*, *Tavğaç*, *Qırqız*, etc.) are used in the Inscriptions to qualify directly (i.e. in actual juxtaposition in the text) the words *bođun*, 'people, tribal union', *beg* 'lord', *bođ* 'tribe' (?), *qağan* 'king', *el* 'empire', *törü* 'customary practices', *yér* 'territory, land, earth', *suv* 'water', *tenri* 'heaven, God', *sü* 'army', *at* 'name', *er* 'man' and *tirig* 'survivor'. Of these words, only the first four occur qualified by a nomen of nationality in a type

² Mayzel', op. cit. p. 11.

(iii) izafet; the forms *Qırqız yêri*, *Türkü teñrisi* and the like have no correlates of type (iii) formation. The truth of Kondrat'ev's statement is thus seen to depend on a fine point of statistical interpretation – is the commoner form that which occurs in the most collocations, or that of which most instances can be found, in however few collocations?

Detailed scrutiny of these izafets suggests that the semantic status of the nomen of nationality may provide the key to the problem of this apparently meaningless fluctuation of usage. It is frequently evident that Turkish names are, consist at least partially of, or are derivable from meaningful words.³ If such words were to retain their full (assumed) intrinsic meanings, they would, in forming izafets, call for the type (ii) construction, for type (iii) is restricted, as we have seen, to names and the deverbal nomen in *-duq/-dük*. Names have no intrinsic meaning – if a man is called *Ay Bars* we know that he is neither moon nor tiger – but are merely verbal symbols of the concepts to which they are applied. If a shift in the semantic status of the Turkish nomen of nationality were to take place, whereby a fully meaningful descriptive phrase or word became a purely symbolic name, it might <reasonably be expected to begin in collocations involving the most obviously national or tribal concepts – *boð*, *boðun*, *beg* and *qağan*. Let us therefore examine in some detail the use of nomina of nationality with these four words.

Boð. This word occurs thus qualified only in *Şine Usu W 1 Qarluq boð*; the stone is defaced, however, and this reading is by no means certain.

Boðun. This word forms a type (ii) izafet with a nomen of nationality only in *Tonyuquq 1.28 Qırqız boðunı* and *1.30 On Oq boðunı*. Elsewhere it forms this construction only when paired with *beg*: *Tonyuquq 1.42 On Oq begleri boðunı qop kelti yükünti* 'All the lords and people of the On Oq came and did homage'; *Kül Tégin S 2 Toquz Oğuz begleri boðunı bu savımın edgüti eşid* 'Lords and people of the Toquz Oğuz, listen well to my words'. There is surely an error in *Kül Tégin E 22 Toquz Oğuz begleri boðun eşidiñ*, but one would hesitate to pinpoint it in view of *S 10 Türkü begler boðun eşidiñ* and *S 11 Añar körü biliñ Türkü amtı boðun begler* 'See them and know; you present Turkish lords and people'.

³ Sir Gerard Clauson, 'The name Uyğur; JRAS 1963 p. 140 et seq.

Beg. This word forms a type (ii) izafet only when paired with *bodun*, as above.

Qağan. This word forms a type (ii) izafet with a nomen of nationality only in Tonyuquq 1.19 *On Oq qağanı*. In Kül Tégin it occurs only once in such a construction, paired with *él*: E 36 *Qırqız qağanın ölürtümüz élin alrımız* 'We killed the king of the Qırqız and took their empire', which is perhaps better interpreted as a possessive rather than a descriptive izafet. (The pairing of *qağan* – *él* occurs elsewhere, as do the pairings *qağanlığ* – *éllig* and *qağansırmaq* – *élsiremek*.)

The more restricted use of the type (ii) izafet in these collocations in the later monument (I omit from consideration all cases where the nomen of nationality and *qağan* are not in actual juxtaposition in the text) and its apparent limitation to phrases of a rhetorical nature and to pair-words lead one to suspect that it may be an archaism. In Kül Tégin S. 11 we have what is perhaps the result of the adaptation of such a formulaic phrase to an abnormal word-order. The use of the unpaired words *bodun* and *qağan* in type (ii) izafets in Tonyuquq alone would seem to furnish chronological evidence for such a shift in the semantic status of the nomen of nationality as was postulated above.

If this change does in fact take place as conjectured, we might expect to find more use of nomina of nationality as independent substantives in Tonyuquq than in Kül Tégin. In the latter there are only two instances of a nomen of nationality standing alone in an oblique case, N 2 *Qarluquğ ölürtümüz altımız* 'We killed and captured the Qarluq' (formulaic?) and N 8 *Oğuzğaru sü taşıqdımız* 'We advanced on the Oğuz'; the use of postpositions is occasionally found:– E 35 *Qırqız tapa* 'Against the Qırqız', N 7 *Oğuz birle* 'with the Oğuz'. In Tonyuquq, however, we find in the first ten lines alone *Tavğaçqa*, *Tavğaçda*, *Tavğaçığ*, *Tavğaçğaru*, *Qıtanyığ*, *Qıtanyğaru*, *Oğuzuğ* and *Oğuzdantan*.

On the basis of this evidence I would submit that the fluctuation of usage in izafet constructions involving nomina of nationality in the Orhon Inscriptions is a reflection of current usage, which at this time was beginning to regard tribal or national names as proper nouns, instead of the intrinsically meaningful words that they formerly were. As proper nouns always form izafets of type (iii) and nothing else, nomina of nationality begin to do so when they cease to be more than names – and they do so first of all in the collocations in which they are

most obviously proper nouns, those involving the most basically national concepts of all – *boδ*, *boδun*, *beg* and *qağan*.

The other instances of the overlap between types (ii) and (iii) of the izafet in the Orhon Inscriptions are those involving the verbal nomen in *-duq*/*-dük*. These are not capable of so satisfactory an explanation as the izafets of nationality, but some trace of a pattern is discernible. In Kül Tégin the nomen in *-duq*/*-dük* occurs with and without the relative suffix, in the absolute, definite objective and locative cases. The five instances of its use in the locative serve as an illustration of the process that I have sought to demonstrate above the loss of the relative suffix in common collocations. Two of them, both in N 3, have the relative suffix:– *içim qağan éli qamşağ boltuqında*, *boδun éligi ekigü boltuqında* ‘When the empire of my uncle the king was disintegrating, when the people and their ruler became at variance’ ...; two are without it:– E 17 *içim qağan uçduqda* ‘When my uncle the king died’ and E 30 *Qaγım qağan uçduqda* ‘When my father the king died’. From this three possibilities emerge – the relative suffix in N 3 may be necessitated by the intervening words *qamşağ* and *ekigü*; it may be an archaism in a rhetorical phrase; or its use may be standard, its absence a departure from the norm. The first of these is doubtful in the light of E 12 *Teγri küç birtük için* ‘Because Heaven gave (us) strength’, where the interposed word is not sufficient to produce the relative suffix. Rather it would seem that the likely frequency of the euphemistic *uçmaq* for *ölmek* was sufficient to bring about the loss of the suffix. The fifth example, E 17 *içim qağan olurtuqda* ‘When my uncle became king’ is similarly explicable. In the evident paucity of material, however, to make this more than a tentative suggestion would be quite unwarranted.

Of the remaining instances of this variant of the izafet in Kül Tégin, two have a noun as object of the nomen in *-duq*/*-dük*; as in both cases the noun takes the relative suffix, these need not concern us. The five remaining examples all involve the use of the postposition *üçün*. In three of these the nomen has the relative suffix and, as is normal before *üçün*, is in the definitive objective case: S. 9 *teγri yarlı qaduqın için* ‘because Heaven was gracious’, E 6 *Tavğaç boδun... inili içili kikişürtükin için*, *begli boδunlıγ yoγşurtuqın için* ‘because the Chinese made elder and younger brothers quarrel and embroiled nobility and people’. The other two have no relative suffix and are in the absolute: E 12 *teγri küç birtük için* ‘because Heaven gave (us) strength’,

E 15 *teñri yarlıqaduq için* 'because Heaven was gracious'. The only inference from this that seems not too unjustified in view of the extreme paucity of material is that the comparison of S. 9 and E 15 may indicate that the two constructions are interchangeable. Certainly no clear conclusions can be drawn from so few examples.

Change in the Turkish izafet has taken place at all times and is still continuing. Mayzel' (op. cit. ch. XXVI) lists a number of examples illustrating a trend in modern Turkish from types (i) to (ii) and (ii) to (iii), and this is still observable. In the Green Mosque at Bursa there are cards bearing the injunction *Cami duvarına yazı yazmak kat'iyen yasaktır*, which, leaving aside feelings of surprise at their necessity, one would have expected to read *Cami'in duvarına...*. The addition of a suffix is rare, although I once argued over dinner with a well-educated Turkish lady who sought to assure me that *iç pilâv* should be *iç pilâvi*, a view to which she seems to be the sole subscriber.