

IRSTI 16.01.07

<https://doi.org/10.26577/JOS.2022.v103.i4.03>**S.B. Utebekov** Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Kazakhstan, Turkistan
e-mail: senuteb@gmail.com**DENOMINATIVE AND DEVERBAL SUFFIXES
IN KÖKŞETAV COPY OF DIVÂN HIKMET**

Denominative and deverbial suffixes in the historical texts of Turkish are rich both in terms of number and their functions. We encounter different functions of denominative and deverbial suffixes which is the main subject of our article in the Kökşetav (Kazakhstan) copy of Divân-ı Hikmet. We confirmed nearly twenty suffixes like {+Aç}, {+An}, {+çl}, {+dAş}, {+GA}, {+GU}, {+llk}, {+IUĞ}, {+nçl}, {+mAn}, {+slz}, {+rAK}, {-AK/ -K}, {-(U)K/ -(I)K}, {-(U)G/ -(I)G}, {-GAn}, {-GUçl}, {-GUIUĞ}, {-KUn}, {-ş}etc. in the text. In general, these suffixes have the same phonetic features as Chagatai Turkish but besides that, we can see the traces of these suffixes not only in Old Turkish but also in contemporary Turkish Dialects. Therefore, we can regard these suffixes as a follow-up of suffixes that were used before the Chagatai period. In the article, these issues will be examined in detail.

Key words: Ahmed Yesevi, Divan-i Hikmet, the version of Kokshetau, Deverbial Suffixes, ancient works.

С.Б. Өтебеков

Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Қазақстан, Түркістан қ.
e-mail: senuteb@gmail.com**«Диуани Хикметтің» Көкшетау нұсқасында
есім тудырушы жұрнақтар**

Түркі тілдерінің көне және ортағасырлық ескерткіштерінің тілінде есім тудырушы жұрнақтар саны жағынан мол, қызметі жағынан көпқырлы болып келеді. Мақаламыздың зерттеу нысанына айналып отырған «Диуани хикметтің» Көкшетау қаласында сақталған нұсқасында да түрлі қызметтер атқаратын {+Aч}, {+An}, {+чл}, {+dAш}, {+FA}, {+FY}, {+лық}, {+лҰғ}, {+нчы}, {+mAn}, {+сЫз}, {+pAK}, {-AK/ -K}, {-(Y)K/ -(I)K}, {-(Y)F/ -(I)F}, {-FAn}, {-FҰчы}, {-FҰлҰK}, {-KҰн}, {-н} секілді жиырмадан аса зат есім тудырушы жұрнақтың қолданылғанын көруге болады. Бұл қосымшалар фонетикалық жақтан шағатай тілінің ерекшеліктерін көрсетеді десек те, бұлардың ізін түркі халықтарының көне дәуірлік тілінен де, қазіргі түркі тілдерінен кездестіре аламыз. Сондықтан да ескерткіш тілінде қолданылған зат есім тудырушы жұрнақтар көне дәуірлерден бері қолданылып келе жатқан қосымшалардың шағатай тілі дәуіріндегі нұсқалары ретінде бағалануы керек. Мақалада осы мәселелер арнайы қарастырылады және әрбір формаға тілдік талдау жасау барысында синхронды және диахронды әдістер қолданылатын болады.

Түйін сөздер: Ахмет Ясауи, Диуани хикмет, Көкшетау нұсқасы, жұрнақтар, көне ескерткіштер.

С.Б. Утебеков

Международный казахско-турецкий университет им. Ходжа Ахмеда Ясауи, Казахстан, г. Туркестан
e-mail: senuteb@gmail.com**Словообразовательные аффиксы
в Кокшетауской версии рукописи «Диван-и Хикмет»**

В языке древних и средневековых памятников тюркских языков словообразующие суффиксы многочисленны и многогранны в функциональном отношении. Словообразовательные аффиксы, встречающиеся в Кокшетауской версии рукописи «Диван-и Хикмет», названной по местности, где она была сохранена (Казakhstan), и составляющие основу нашей статьи, использованы в разных функциях. Количество словообразовательных аффиксов и других аффиксов и окончаний, определённых нами в этой рукописи, как {+Aç}, {+An}, {+çl}, {+dAş}, {+GA}, {+GU}, {+llk}, {+IUĞ}, {+nçl}, {+mAn}, {+slz}, {+rAK}, {-AK/ -K}, {-(U)K/ -(I)K}, {-(U)G/ -(I)G}, {-GAn}, {-GUçl}, {-GUIUĞ}, {-KUn}, {-ş}, составляет около двадцати. Несмотря на то, что эти аффиксы с точки зрения фонетических явлений имеют характеристики чагатайского языка с точки зрения фонетики, следы этих окончаний можно увидеть как в исторических, так и в современных тюркских языках. Исходя из этого, можно сделать вывод, что словообразовательные аффиксы

данного произведения использовались в периоды до чагатайского языка. Это тема подробно исследуется автором статьи. При исследовании аффиксов используется как диахронический, так и синхронные методы.

Ключевые слова: Ахмет Яссауи, Диван-и Хикмет, Кокшетауская версия рукописи, словообразовательные аффиксы, древние произведения.

Introduction

Hodja Ahmed Yesevî who is the founder of Turkish Sufi Literature lived in Karakhanid Period so we also need to look for the linguistic features of this period in his works. Even though some examples show the linguistic features of Karakhanid Turkish in the *Kökşetav (Kazakhstan) copy of Divân-ı Hikmet*, in general, it is seen that it wrote out in the Period of Chagatai Turkish (after XVII. century) We examined the subject in our Ph.D. dissertation and the articles and notices as well (Utebekov, 2020; Utebekov, 2022; Akar-Utebekov, 2020a; Akar-Utebekov, 2020b).

Denominative and deverbal suffixes in the historical texts of Turkish are rich both in terms of number and their functions. The number of denominative and deverbal suffixes in the *Kökşetav (Kazakhstan) copy of Divân-ı Hikmet* is twenty. 12 of them are denominative suffixes and 8 of them are deverbal suffixes. These suffixes need to be evaluated as a follow-up of denominative and deverbal suffixes in Old Turkic and periods before the Chagatai period. The derivational suffixes in the text have the linguistic features of Chagatai Turkish. Besides, we can encounter suffixes that have the features of the other Turkish Dialects.

Justification of the choice of article and goals and objectives

It is well known among Turkologists that different views are depending on, which of the Turkic languages “Divani Hikmet” refers to. Scholars such as E. Rustamov, and T. Menzel say that it was written in the ancient Turkic language, F. M. Koprulu, G. Aidarov, A. Kuryshzhanov, M. Tomanov claims that it was written in the Turkic language Karakhan / Kahaniya, K. Eraslan, A. Guzel in the Chagatai language, A. Najip, A. K. Borovkov, R. Syzdykova, E. Bertelster assert that it was written in the Oguz and Kypchak languages, A. N. Kononov, N. Baskakov, L.K. Kadyrov believe that it was written based on the Karluk-Uigur languages, and A. Vamberi, A. Mukhtarov, U. Sanakulov – that it was written in Uzbek, whereas K. Eraslan, U. Tursunov, B. Urnunboev and A. Aliyev show that

in each variant there are features of different local dialects. Scholars such as K. Zhubanov, A. Kaidar, and M. Orazov consider it as the work of mixed languages. And Kemal Eraslan says that Kazakh, Turkmen, Tatar, and especially Uzbek linguistic features prevail in the book of wisdom (2010: 429), as well as Uzbek in the Tashkent manuscript and Kazan Tatar in the Kazan print (2000: 38). The inconsistency of opinions requires a special study of the linguistic features of “Divani Hikmet”, even an in-depth analysis of the grammatical forms, phonetic phenomena, and stylistic features used in the work based on diachronic and synchronic methods. At the same time, the problem of word formation is also waiting for its solution. Thus in our article, taking into consideration that the main way of forming words is the grammatical way, we strive to analyze the name-forming suffixes used in Divani Hikmet (Kokshetau version) based on ancient, medieval works and documentations of contemporary Turkic languages.

Scientific research methodology

The main topic of the article is “Divan-i Hikmet”, one of the most common monuments of the Turkic people, therefore, the description and comparison of the use and features of derivational suffixes in historical periods will be described and compared. In this regard, in the article, we will use the diachronic and synchronous methods. Each grammatical form is analyzed in the narrative based on scientific opinions and the conclusions of linguists.

Results and their discussion

A. Denominative Suffixes

The suffix {+Aç}: This suffix adds the word the meaning like love, diminutive, extension, caressing and has “the function of strengthening” in Ergin (Ergin, 2009: 224). And Eker stated that when adds to the couple of adjectives that mean color (kıraç “like grey”, bozaç “like grey”) this suffix gives the meaning of “approach, closeness, similarity” (Eker, 2006: 348).

The suffix can be seen in a few examples in the different periods of Turkish (Tekin, 2016: 80; Ga-

bain, 2007: 43; Eraslan, 2012: 94; Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 13; Kalsın, 2004: 95; Toparlı, 1992: 77; Argunşah, 2013: 101; Eckmann, 2017: 47).

In Old Turkish, this suffix is seen as the form of $\{+(X)\ç\}$ (Tekin, 2016: 79-80), in the Old Uyghur Period $\{+\ç\}$, (Eraslan, 2012: 94), in the texts in the Period of Karahanid and after $\{+(A)\ç\}$ (Taş, 2015: 24; Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 13; Eckmann, 2017: 47). This suffix preserved itself in some examples in Contemporary Turkish Dialects (Korkmaz, 2009: 34; Alkaya, 2008: 210; Serebrennikov-Gadjieva, 2011: 98).

We can see this suffix in just one example in the text:

yalañaç “naked” (75b/1) (< *yalay* “naked” ET.)

The suffix $\{+An\}$: The function of this suffix is seen in rare examples like *eren* “saint”, *oğlan* “boy”, *bodun* “clan”, and *kızan* “girl” and used in nearly all periods of Turkish and especially in Old Turkish, has not become definite” (Korkmaz, 2013: 104). Accordingly, there are different views about the function of the suffix. In Gabain’s opinion, this suffix gives the meaning of loyalty and reinforcement to the word (Gabain, 2007: 44). In Şinasi Tekin’s opinion, the suffix $\{+An\}$ is used for people who have a particular power (Tekin, 1976: 160). Gürer Gülsevin explained that the suffix “makes plural as the categorical suffix” (Gülsevin, 2017: 122). Mehmet Ölmez counts this suffix as one of the suffixes which give the meanings of “community, plurality, collectiveness” in Old Turkish (Ölmez, 2019: 249).

Talat Tekin stated that this suffix has a connection with the plural suffix in Mongolian $\{+n\}$ (Tekin, 2016: 97). Necmettin Hacıeminoğlu thinks that the suffix may derive from the denominative suffix $\{+A\}$ deverbial suffix $\{+n\}$ (Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 14).

The suffix appeared in some stereotyped words in the texts of periods after Old Turkish (Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 14; s. 92; Taş, 2015: 24; Kalsın, 2004: 92; Toparlı, 1992: 77; Akar, 2018: 126; Gülsevin, 2017: 122; Argunşah, 2013: 101). As Korkmaz stated, this suffix “lost its vitality allied with the stem” in Turkey Turkish and other contemporary Turkish Dialects (Korkmaz, 2009: 35). B. A. Serebrennikov and N. Z. Gadjieva stated that the suffix “lost its meaning of reduction in most instances” (Serebrennikov-Gadjieva, 2011: 98).

We determined just the example *eren* “saint” (11a/2; 48b/2) (< *er* “man, person”) that is derived from this suffix in *DHK*. When we look at the research, the word *eren* was used with the meaning of “men” in Orkhon Turkish (Tekin, 2016: 299) and

“saint, man, sir” in Old Uyghur Turkish (Gabain, 2007: 264).

The suffix $\{+\çI\}$: The main function of this derivational suffix which has been used since Old Turkish and the other periods of the Turkish language, is to derivate words relevant to profession and occupation. The suffix has been transferred to the other languages from Turkish. For example, the form of *+ci* has still been used in Mongolian (Pope, 1992: 114; Gabain, 2007: 42; Eraslan, 2012: 95). Some proposed that this suffix is related to the denominative suffix $\{+\çIK\}$ and some proposed it is related to the suffix $\{+sA\}$. Some researchers affiliated the suffix with the word “human, person” in Chinese and Korean (Qazaq Gramatikası, 2002: 297). E. V. Sevortyan stated that the suffix is related to the suffix $\{+LI\}$ which is used as an adjective (Sevortyan, 1996: 84), and A. N. Kononov stated that the suffix has a relation with the suffix $\{+\şII\}$ which also derivates adjectives (Kononov, 1972: 103).

In the text, we can see the suffix in the following examples.

yalğançılar “liars” (66a/10; 85b/7),

elçi “ambassador” (23b/10),

yol başçısı “leader, head” (23b/11).

As we can see from the examples we have identified, this suffix reports a person’s inclination, addiction, and habit for an action. Sızdıqova stated that in the St. Petersburg copy of Hikmet’s (saying of Hodja Ahmed Yesevi) there are no examples of derivational suffix $\{+\çI\}$ that directly added to a noun without the word *yalğançı* liar” (Sızdıqova, 2004: 112).

The suffix $\{+dAş\}$: This suffix adds to word meaning like togetherness, companionship, commitment, connection, etc. (Eraslan, 2012: 97; Gabain, 2007: 46; Toparlı, 1992: 78; Eker, 2006: 350), has been seen in all periods of Turkic Language (Tekin, 2016: 80; Gabain, 2007: 43; Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 14; Taş, 2015: 24; Kalsın, 2004: 99-100; Toparlı, 1992: 78; Yavuz, 2002: 215; Karamanlıoğlu, 1994: 26; Akar, 2018: 129; Gülsevin, 2017: 125; Argunşah, 2013: 103; Eckmann, 2017: 48). Gabain stated that this suffix is related to suffixes $\{+tag\}$ and $\{+tam\}$ and consisted of locative case suffix $\{+ta\}$ and the word *iş* “companion” (Gabain, 2007: 46). In the opinion of Serebrennikov and N. Z. Gadjieva, “the first part of this suffix is the affix of the locative case, the second part is the reflection of the old suffix of the collective plurality” (Serebrennikov-Gadjieva, 2011: 98). K. Menges and S. H. Moratov stated that “*daş*” is a word that means “friend” and it is formed through conjugation.

There are two stereotyped examples was derived from this suffix in *DHK*.

karındař “brother/sister” (43b/4; 46a/10),
yoldař “companion, fellow” (55b/2).

The suffix {+ĜA}: This suffix, which is not active in Old Turkish, appears in some stereotypes in different periods of the Turkish Language (Gabain, 2007: 43; Eraslan, 2012: 97; Tař, 2015: 40; Karamanliođlu, 1994: 28). The suffix gives to noun the meaning of “be out of” and is similar to suffix {+ĜA} which is seen newly formed words like *belge* “document” in Turkey Turkish (Ergin, 2009: 224; Eker, 2006: 351). Also used with animal words like * ek rke* “grasshopper”, and *kumursga* “ant” (Eraslan, 2012: 97) and the words have diminutive meanings like *awi ga* “old”, *kurtga* “granny, an old girl” (Tař, 2015: 38).

In our text, {+ĜA} suffix is included in the following stereotyped examples. These examples we identified are used as nouns, adjectives, and prepositions.

 zge “else, other” (10a/9; 27a/2; 37b/7),
birge “together” (3b/3; 20a/9).

The suffix {+ĜU}: We can see this suffix in Old Turkish words which notify qualities like *edg * “good, useful”, *bařgu* “have a white spot on the forehead”, *in k * “rest, peace”, *oglangu* “polite, fresh”, *karagu* “blind” (Tekin, 2016: 81; Eraslan, 2012: 97; Tař, 2015: 40), words which notify feature of characters like *belg * “mark, sign” (Tař, 2015: 40), words like * lg * “scales”, * algu* “instrument”, *yanu* “echo”, *uyku* “sleep”, *sevg * “love”, *yiyg * “food”, *kaygu* “worry” that derivate stuff names and abstract nouns (Eraslan, 2012: 97; Tař, 2015: 40). This suffix appears in some stereotyped words in various periods of Turkish (Gabain, 2007: 45; Karamanliođlu, 1994: 28).

The suffix is mentioned in the *DHK* only in the following two examples:

karanđu “darkness” (49a/10; 85a/4),
kayđu “worry, sorrow” (56b/8).

The suffix {+IIĜ}: This suffix has been the most active and widely used suffix from Old Turkish, which derivates abstract nouns, tool, community, qualification, profession, rank, authority, and place names, both temporary and permanent words expressing loyalty (Tekin, 2016: 83; Eraslan, 2012: 97; Gabain, 2007: 44; Hacıeminođlu, 1996: 14; Tař, 2015: 57-66; Kalsın, 2004: 108-109; Karamanliođlu, 1994: 29; Akar, 2018: 130; G lsevin, 2017: 127). The suffix is also “same in Mongolian” (Gabain, 2007: 44).

In *DHK*, this suffix is used not only in Turkish words but also in loan words, and sometimes it co-

mes up with examples that do not have vowel harmony.

 ařıklık “amorousness” (22a/2) (< * ařık* Ar. “lover”),
bendelik “slavery” (8b/5) (< *bende* Far. “slave”),
d ny lık “wealth” (57b/6),
g afillik “inattention” (28b/6), (< *g afil* Ar. “unwary”),
h rlık “valuelessness” (4b/4; 44a/9), (< *h r* Far. “worthless”),
karılık “old age” (53a/8) (< *karı* “old”),
kulluk “slavery; worship” (6b/6; 40b/9),
m nlik “selfishness, arrogance” (8b/7; 40b/3) (< *m n* “I”),

m nminlik “selfishness,” (48a/10) (< *m n* “I”),
yařlık “tearful” (9a/10) (< *yař* “tear”),
yigitlik “youth” (53a/7) (< *yigit* “young”), vb.

The suffix {+IUG}: This suffix, which adds an expression of presence, belonging, affiliation, and interest to the word to which it is added in Old Turkish, was widely used in different periods of Turkish (Gabain, 2007: 44; Eraslan, 2012: 99-100; Ercilasun, 2007: 167; Tař, 2015: 48-57; Kalsın, 2004: 106-107; Argunřah, 2013: 105; Eckmann, 2017: 50). In Old Turkish, the consonant at the end of the suffix was always in tone. In the text we have examined, the tone at the end is preserved in a few examples:

atlıđ “named” (69b/7) ~ *atlık* (10b/1; 55a/9),
derdlig “sorrowful” (40b/10),
munluđ “worried” (14a/3) (< *mun* “worry, sorrow”),
t rl g “various” (12b/1; 34b/2),
yanlıđ “like similar” (11b/4; 38a/10),
y zl g “faced” (19a/1), vb.

In our text, as in the texts of the Chagatai Turkish period (Argunřah, 2013: 104; Eckmann, 2007: 49-50), generally, the consonant at the end of the suffix becomes toneless and is altered with the other denominative suffix.

h řiyetlik “sacred” (30b/7),
ihl řlik “eager” (27b/8),
kulaklık “clever” (53b/3),
nece yillik “a lot of years” (40a/7),
riy zetlik “mortify the flesh” (33b/1),
siy hatlık “travel” (43b/3),
tıđlık “with sword” (33b/7),
tokukluk “nubbly” (70a/10), vb.

However, there is no incident of elision of the sound / ğ /, / g / of the suffix {+ IIĜ} as in the Khorezm, Kipczak, and Old Anatolian Turkish in *DHK* (Akar, 2018: 130; G lsevin, 2017: 127-128; Kalsın, 2004: 110; Toparlı, 1992: 79; Karamanliođlu 1994: 31; Yavuz, 2002: 216). R. Sızdıqova stated that she did not encounter the example in which the

consonant / ğ /, / g / disappeared in the St. Petersburg copy of *Divan-ı Hikmet* (Sızdıqova, 2004: 111).

The suffix {+nçI}: This suffix which derives ordinal numeral adjectives, was used in all periods of the Turkish Language. The suffix is seen in Old Turkish as {+(X)nç} (T. Tekin, 2016: 82; Eraslan, 2012: 101). In the text of Karakhanid Turkish, it is seen {+InçI} form of this suffix (Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 62). Also, this form of the suffix also can be seen in the texts of Khorezm, Alton Orda, and Kipczak, Chagatai Turkish (Hacıeminoğlu, 1997: 71-72; Karamanlıoğlu, 1994: 96; Eckmann, 2017: 85; Argunşah, 2013: 105). In the meantime, while the {+lAnçI} form of the suffix can be seen in Chagatai Turkish (Eckmann, 2017: 85), in the period of Old Anatolian Turkish it was used just in the form of {+InçI} (Akar, 2018: 130). There are various and complex views on the origin of the suffix. Şçerbak suggests that this suffix is the same as the deverbal suffix {+ nç} (Şçerbak, 1977: 147). Bang considers the vowel /i / at the end of the suffix as a 3rd person-possessive suffix (Bang, 1934: 18).

In our text, this suffix is only seen in the example of *törtünçi* “fourth” (75b/6).

The suffix {+mAn}: There are different views about the origin and function of this suffix. Especially in terms of its structure and function, we come across various opinions about the origin of this suffix, since it is similar to the words *man* “person, human”, *manend* “similar”, *manang* “similar, like” seen in Indo-European and Arabic languages. Some claim that this suffix is a quotation, while others claim that this suffix was also used in old Turkish and passed from Turkish to other languages. Another opinion about the suffix is whether this suffix is the same as the deverbal suffix {+ mAn}

The suffix appears in a few words in Old Turkish, such as *ataman* “high, head (title)”, *kökmen* “bluish”, *kölmén* “little lake” (Tekin, 2016: 82; Eraslan, 2012: 100) and derives adjectives. That is why T. Tekin explains this suffix as “derives diminutive adjectives” (Tekin, 2016: 82). K. Eraslan reports that this suffix is “seen in certain words with the expression of diminution and resemblance as a denominative suffix” (Eraslan, 2012: 100). Z. Korkmaz “+ mAn suffix is a suffix that derives adjectives that characterize individuals from adjectives. She stated that it adds the function of “exaggeration, excessive” to the adjective (Korkmaz, 2013: 58). M. Ergin defends the same idea as Z. Korkmaz and he compared the suffix of deverbal noun {+mAn} and pays attention that the suffixes *göç* ~ *göç-*, *şiş* ~ *şiş-* in the words *göçmen* “migrant”, *şişman* “fat” both used as noun and verb

in Turkey Turkish. He accepted that the words *göçmen* and *şişman* was denominative nouns (Ergin, 2009: 224). According to T. Banguoğlu “With the more or less vivid aspect in our language, the suffix -men comes to adjectives and almost all of them have derivated adjectives that characterize people with the expression of “a little”” (Banguoğlu, 2015: 197).

This suffix can be seen in the texts of Middle Turkish in the words like *Türkmen* “very strong > a name of an ethnic group” *kölemen* “a name of a political Turkish group”, *karaman* “very dark > a kind of sheep”, *kösemen* “ram which goes ahead of the herd and butt so much” (Korkmaz, 2018: 42-43). And it appears in two examples in the text we have examined:

ağmen “white, whitish” (27b/1),

ğaraman “black, blackish” (27b/1).

The suffix {+sIz}: This suffix, which has been widely used in Turkish for a long time, derives words expressing absence, absence, incompleteness, and negativity from nouns as the negative form of {+ IUĞ} which derives adjective words in our text. In this respect, {+ sIr} in Old Turkish is similar to the privative suffix {+ sÄr} in Chuvash Turkish. According to some linguists, this is the combination of the suffix of denominative verb {-sI} and deverbal suffix {-z} (Gabain, 2007: 45-48; Eraslan, 2012: 101-102; Levitskaya, 1976: 128-129). This suffix, which is generally widespread in Turkish with the form of a narrow vowel, has the form of a wide vowel {+sAz} in Old Uyghur Turkish texts (Gabain, 2007: 45; Eraslan, 2012: 102). While both unrounded and rounded forms of this suffix are used especially in Old Turkish and Karakhanid, Khorezm, Chagatai, and Kipchzak area, (Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 15; Taş, 2015: 75-81; Hacıeminoğlu, 1997: 43-44; Karamanlıoğlu, 1994: 33; Tekin, 2016: 83; Paketli, 1985: 26; Eckmann, 2017: 51), in Anatolian Turkish texts written up to the 17th century, it appears only in the form of a round vowel (Akar, 2018: 112-113; Korkmaz, 2013: 104).

In the text we are examining, this suffix is always used with an unrounded vowel. Therefore, when the round vowel comes after words ending with syllables, it is seen that it is out of labial harmony. The suffix added to Turkish and quoted words and derives nouns, adjectives, and adverbs:

ağılsız “stupid” (45a/9),

amelsiz “worshipless” (14a/8),

bāğsız “gardenless” (74a/6),

ışksız “without love” (38b/6),

könülsiz “reluctant” (33a/5),

melānetsiz “condemning” (44b/1),

mihnetsiz “effortless” (44b/1),
p rsiz “pir, founder of an order” (7a/6),
sansız “countless” (31b/6; 42a/8),
 u lesiz “without flash” (49a/10),
t psiz “bottomless” (50a/3; 72a/2),
uyatsız “shameless” (60b/8), vb.

However, in the text, we can see the suffix {+sIzIn}, which consists of the combination and fusion of the instrumental suffix {+In} and the abessive suffix {+sIz} as seen in some texts of Karakhanid Turkish (Ta , 2015: 81). This suffix derivatives adverb which express absence and the lack of expression like in Turkey Turkish:

ikr rsızın “without accepting” (48b/5).

The suffix {+rAK}: This suffix that we can see in different periods of Turkic Languages (Gabain, 2007: 105; Eraslan, 2012: 101; Ta , 2015: 70-73; Ata, 2002: 68; Karamanlio lu, 1994: 96; Eckmann, 2017: 82; Argun ah, 2013: 130; Akar, 2018: 131), gives the meaning of superiority, strengthening and comparison to the word to which it is added to nouns, adjectives, and adverbs. The suffix is used in nearly all Turkish Dialects except Yakut, Altay, Gagauz, and Turkey Turkish (Serebrennikov-Gadjiev to 2011: 98). This suffix can be added to loan words like Eckmann said (Eckmann, 2017: 82).

In the text we analyzed, the suffix {+rak} was added to the Persian word *bih* “beautiful, good”, which is mentioned in thirteen places:

bihrak “more beautiful, better” (37a/1, 37a/10, 37a/2, 37a/6, 37a/8, 37b/10, 37b/2, 37b/4, 37b/6, 37b/8, 38a/1, 38a/3, 37a/4).

B. Deverbal Suffixes

The suffix {-AK/ -K}: This suffix, which derivatives object names from verbs, is thought to be in the form of {-GAK} in Old Turkish and {-AK} in Middle Turkish by lowering the palatal consonant in Old Turkish (Yelten, 2009: 158). However, the suffix appears both in the form of {+GAK} and {+Ak} in some words such as *Kulak* ~ *kulgak* in Old and Middle Turkish. It can be seen elision the /g/ sound of this suffix has become widespread since Karakhanid Turkish and its two forms are used together (Ta , 2015: 129).

Regarding the origin of this suffix, B. A. Serebrennikov and N. Z. Gadjieva state that it is formed as a result of the compound of -k  and -ak suffixes (Serebrennikov-Gadjieva, 2011: 98).

In the text we examined, this suffix is used in the following examples:

b lek “division” (43b/10) (< *b l-* “divide”),
korkak “fearful” (33a/4) (< *kork-* “fear”),
tilegim < *tilek* “wish” (86b/8) (< *tile-* “wish”),

y rek “heart” (5b/7; 63a/1; 74a/3) (< *y r-* “walk”),

kula  “ear” (28a/6; 72b/11) (< **kul-* “hear”).

The suffix {-(U)K, -(I)K}: It can be said that this suffix, which derives nouns and adjectives from verbs, is much-used in Old Turkish (Tekin, 2016: 88; Eraslan, 2012: 106). It was also much used in periods of Karakhanid, Khorezm, Old Anatolian Turkish, Kıp hak, and Chagatai (Hacemino lu, 1996: 20-21; Hacemino lu, 1997: 49-50; Ta , 2015: 153; Akar, 2018: 133-134; Karamanlio lu, 1994: 41; Argun ah, 2013: 108).

We can see several examples of this suffix in *K k setav Copy of Div n-ı Hikmet*.

b c k (1b/3) ~ *b c k* “half, semi-” (72a/5) (< *bi -* “cut”),

sınuk “broken” (1b/6; 9a/10; 25a/5) (< *sin-* “break”),

a uk “open, bare” (3b/7) (< *a -* “open”),

yazuk “sin” (8b/1) (< *yaz-* “sin”),

 ur k “decay” (41a/4) (< * ur -* “decay”),

kuru  “dry; empty” (57b/9) (< *kur-* “set up, stretch”),

buyru ın < *buyruk* “order” (45b/4; 55b/8) (< *buyur-* “order”),

artuk (37b/11) (< *art-* “increase”), vb.

The suffix {-(U)g/ -(I)g}: This suffix which is much-used and extensive, seen in different periods of Turkish (Tekin, 2016: 87; Eraslan, 2012: 105; Hacemino lu, 1996: 18-19; Kalsın, 2004: 124). However, in some periods of Turkish, especially in Khorezm Turkish, the consonants /g/ and /g/ at the end of this suffix have started to disappear. Although the suffix /g/ and /g/ at the end of words with more than one syllable has disappeared in Khorezm, Kıp hak, and Chagatai texts, it is preserved in some stereotyped words (Kalsın, 2004: 125; Karamanlio lu, 1994: 41; Argun ah, 2013: 107).

In the Anatolian area, the suffix /g/, and /g/ disappeared and their place was replaced by a connecting vowel (Akar, 2018: 135). In *DHK*, the suffix /g/ and /g/ have been preserved in many examples. In some examples, the suffix of /g/ and /g/ is seen to get unvoiced and compounded with –(U)k/–(I)k. Therefore, it is a little difficult to separate these suffixes from each other.

kattuk (48a/10) ~ *kattig* “severe, hard, strong; unmerciful” (46b/5; 50a/4) (< *katt-* “harden, become tough”),

tirig “alive” (45a/4) (< *tir-* “live, survive”),

yarag “gun, equipment; preparation” (31b/7) (< *yar-* “split”),

yarug “light, bright” (79b/1) (< *yaru-* “brighten, shine”), etc.

Sometimes, we can encounter examples that formed elision of /ğ/ and /g/ consonants.

ağrı “pain, bother” (60b/6) (< *ağrığ*) (< *ağrı-* “get sick”),

ölü (45a/1) “dead” (< *ölüg*) (< *öl-* “die”).

The suffix {-ĠAn}:, this suffix which is a verbal adjective suffix, derived permanent nouns from some verbs. This suffix tends to derive permanent words and it is seen in the texts in periods of Karakhanid, Khorezm, Kıpçak, Old Anatolian Turkish, Chagatai, and especially in Old Turkish (Tekin, 2016: 87; Kalsın, 2004: 127-128; Taş, 2015: 130; Karamanlioğlu, 1994: 37-38; Akar, 2018: 132-133; Argunşah, 2013: 107). But later, in Oghuz Turkish this suffix became widespread as {-An}. Regarding this, A. Akar explains, “In Oghuz Turkish, the suffix takes on the task of verbal-adjective as -An with the elision of / g / at the beginning of the suffix, in some words (*çalışkan* “hardworking”, *yapışkan* “sticky”, *dövüşken* “combative” ...) it is seen that the suffix is transformed into -Gan form through semi-stereotyped “ (Akar, 2018: 133). Some researchers claim that the suffix is compounded with the deverbal suffixes -k and -An (Serebrennikov-Gadjieva, 2011: 99-192). This suffix which derived from words has the meaning of habit and duration, found in DHK in an example of *yaratkan* “creator”.

yaratkan (5b/10; 6a/3; 41b/10) (< *yarat-* “to create”).

The suffix {-ĠUçI}: This suffix, which has been used extensively since Old Turkish, derives nouns that indicate profession and occupation. The consonants of /ğ/ and /g/ exist within the structure of the suffix which compounded with {-ĠU} and + {-çI} preserved in the texts of Old Turkish, Karakhanid, Khorezm and Chagatai periods (Tekin, 2016: 87-88; Gabain, 2007: 52-53; Taş, 2015: 136-140; Kalsın, 2004: 110; Argunşah, 2013: 133). In the text of Kıpçak and Old Anatolian Turkish, firstly consonants /ğ/ and /g/ turn into /y/ and then disappeared (Karamanlioğlu, 1994: 39; Akar, 2018: 133). In some of the contemporary Turkish Dialects, the consonants /ğ/ and /g/ turned into /v/~/w/. In Kyrgyz Turkish, which has strong labial harmony, this suffix turned into -Oç (U) / -UÇU (Kasapoğlu Çengel, 2005: 149).

In some examples in the text we have examined, this suffix is preserved in its old form.

ēşitküçi “audient” (70b/3) (< *ēşit-* “to hear”),

bērgüçi “giver, supplier” (87a/1) (< *bēr-* “to give, to supply”),

sorguçılar “inquirer, an interrogator” (28b/3) (< *sor-* “to ask, to inquire”).

The suffix {-ĠUIUG < -ĠU-IUG}: The suffix is compounded with the suffix {-ĠU} which deriva-

tes abstract and concrete nouns, equipment names, and adjectives the denominative suffix {-IUĠ} and we can see in two examples in the text.

The suffix adds the meaning of quality to the word:

bilgüüg “knowledgeable” (77b/9) (< *bil-* “to know”),

sorgüüg “to be asked” (77b/10) (< *sor-* “to ask”),

körgüüg “to be seen” (78b/10) (< *kör-* “to see”).

The suffix {-KUn}: This suffix which derives permanent nouns from verbs, has been used in Turkish from old (Tekin, 2016: 89; Eraslan, 2012: 106). According to Güler Gülsevin this suffix derives words which means “passive voice -mış” as adding to “both transitive and intransitive verbs” (Gülsevin, 2017: 146). According to Korkmaz, “the addition to more intransitive and less transitive verbs has derived adjectives stating that the verb is complete because it shows in terms of function ... Some of these adjectives have become known by going through the stage of stereotyping” (Korkmaz, 2009: 81-82). Different examples of this suffix have been determined in the texts of the periods of Karakhanid, Khorezm, Kıpçak, Old Anatolia, and Chagatai (Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 20; Kalsın, 2004: 110; Karamanlioğlu, 1994: 41; Akar, 2018: 133; Argunşah, 2013: 108). B. A. Serebrennikov and N. Z. Gadjieva stated that this suffix which appears in stereotyped words in contemporary Turkish dialects, is related to the verbal-adjective suffixes {-KAN} < {-ĠAn} and just separated from them in terms of vowels. They declared that the suffix {-ĠAn} is the “ablaut” form. (Serebrennikov-Gadjieva, 2011: 99-100, 193).

In the text we have examined, we encounter only one example derived from this suffix:

şatkun “betrayal” (23b/6) (< *sat-* “to betray”).

The suffix {-ş}: This suffix, which derives names expressing the outcome of an action, has been widely used from Old Turkish to today (T. Tekin, 2016: 90; Gabain, 2007: 55; Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 26-27; Taş, 2015: 169-172; Kalsın, 2004: 110; Karamanlioğlu, 1994: 44). B. A. Serebrennikov and N. Z. Gadjieva point out that this suffix is seen as a part of the verbal adjective suffix {-mİş} (Serebrennikov-Gadjieva, 2011: 103). The suffix is also used as a verbal noun in Kirgiz and Tatar Turkish (Alkaya, 2008: 235; Öner, 1998: 76). Such usage is based on very old texts (Hacıeminoğlu, 1996: 163; Akar, 2018: 190; Karamanlioğlu, 1994: 44). Z. Korkmaz stated about the stereotyping of the suffix that this suffix like the suffixes of -mak / -mek and -ma / -me which essentially derives movement and occupational names from verbs, lost its main feature using ste-

reotyping and derivated object names which means mainly abstract concept (Korkmaz, 2018: 55-56).

This suffix appears in the example of *ülüş* “share, percent” (10b / 6) (<üle- “to distribute, to share” ET), which has been used in *DHK* for a long time.

Conclusion

There is information that Hodja Ahmed Yesevi’s most famous work, *Divan-ı Hikmet*, which has even introduced the name of Yesevi to the world, has hundreds of copies in different countries all over the world. One of them is the copy in the Museum of Literature and Art in the city of Kökşetav, Kazakhstan. The copy has the characteristic features of Chagatai Turkish both phonetically and morphologically like in other copies of the work. However, it is not true to say that about twenty suffixes (12 of them are denominative suffixes, 8 of them are deverbal

suffixes) pertain to Chagatai Turkish. Because in the work, besides Chagatai, we can see the characteristics of Kipchak Turkish and sometimes Oghuz Turkish. Therefore, we can evaluate denominative and deverbal suffixes in the work as the continuation of the suffixes used in the periods before Chagatai, especially in Old Turkish.

It is remarkable that in the text we examined, the suffix {+mAn} which states comparison as agglutinated to adjectives (*aķmen*, *ķaraman*), and the suffix {+sIzIn} which derivates adverbs (*iķrārsızın* “without keeping quite) are rarely used. The suffix {+IUĖ} which derivates adjectives, gets voiced and turned into {+IUĖ} (*hāşiyetlik ka’be*, *iķhlāşlık kul*, *ķulaklık tālibler*). Consonant /G/ which is, in the end, adverbial suffixes of {-(U)Ė/ -(I)Ė}, sometimes preserved and sometimes disappeared (*ya-raĖ*, *tirig*, *aĖrı* < *aĖrıĖ*, *kōfri* ~ *kōfriĖ* < *kōpriĖ*, *ōlü* < *ōlüĖ*).

References

- Akar, Ali – Senbek Utebekov (2020a). “Divân-ı Hikmet’in Ses Uyumu Üzerine (Kökşetav Nüshası)”. *Karadeniz Araştırmaları*. XVII/65: 217-233.
- Akar, Ali – Senbek Utebekov (2020b). “Divani Hikmettiñ Morfonologiyalıq Siypatı (Kökşetav Nushasının Negizinde)”. *El-Farabi atındaĖı Qazaq Ulttıq Universiteti Habarşısı, ŞıĖstanıv Seriyası*. Sayı: 2 (93): 107-115.
- Akar, Ali (2018). *OĖuzların Dili, Eski Anadolu Türkçesine Giriş*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- Alkaya, Ercan (2008). *Sibirya Tatar Türkçesi*. İstanbul: Turkish Studies.
- Argunşah, Mustafa (2013). *ÇaĖatay Türkçesi*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları.
- Ata, Aysu (2002). *Harezm-Altın Ordu Türkçesi*. İstanbul: Kebikeç Yayınları.
- Bang, W. (1934). *Turkologishie Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarichen Institut*, Ujb. XIV, 3, 18.
- BanguoĖlu, Tahsin (2015). *Türkçenin Grameri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- Eckmann, János (2017). *ÇaĖatayca El Kitabı* (Günay KaraaĖaç, Çev.), İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Eker, Süer (2006). *ÇaĖdaş Türk Dili*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.
- Eraslan K. Ahmed Yesevi Divân-ı hikmet’ten seçmeler. – Ankara: T. C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2000. – 504 s.
- Eraslan K. Hoca Ahmed Yesevi ve Emir Timur hakkında bir belge // Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat araştırmaları. – Ankara, 2010. s. 353-448.
- Eraslan, Kemal (2012). *Eski Uygur Türkçesi Grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican (2007). *Makaleler, Dil-Destan-Tarih-Edebiyat*. Ankara: AkçaĖ Yayınları.
- Ergin, Muharrem (2009). *Türk Dili*. İstanbul: Bayrak Yayınları.
- Gabain, A. von. (2007). *Eski Türkçenin Grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Gülsevin, Gürer (2017). *Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde Ekler*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- HacıeminoĖlu, Necmettin (1996). *Karahanlı Türkçesi Grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- HacıeminoĖlu, Necmettin (1997). *Harezm Türkçesi ve Grameri*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Kalsın, Şirvan (2004). *Harezm Türkçesinde İsim*, Ankara Üniversitesi Doktora Tezi, Ankara.
- KaramanhoĖlu, Ali Fehmi (1994). *Kıpçak Türkçesi Grameri* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- KasapoĖlu Çengel, Hülya (2005). *Kırgız Türkçesinin Grameri*. Ankara: AkçaĖ Yayınları.
- Kononov A. N. (1972). *Grammatika Sovremennogo Turetskogo Literaturnogo Yazıka*. Moskova-Leningrad.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep (2009). *Türkiye Türkçesi Grameri (Şekil Bilgisi)*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep (2013). *Türkiye Türkçesinin Temeli OĖuz Türkçesinin Gelişimi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep (2018). *Türkçede Eklerin Kullanılış Şekilleri ve Ek Kalıplaşması Olayları*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Levitskaya, L. S. (1976). *İstoriçeskaya Morfologiya Çuvaşskogo Yazıka*. Moskva: Nauka. Sevortyan, E. V. (1996). *Affiksi İmennoĖo Slovoobrazaniya v Azerbaydjanskom Yazıke. Opit Sravnitel’nogo İssledovaniya*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Levitskaya, L. S. (1976). *İstoriçeskaya Morfologiya Çuvaşskogo Yazıka*. Moskva: Nauka. Sevortyan, E. V. (1996). *Affiksi İmennoĖo Slovoobrazaniya v Azerbaydjanskom Yazıke. Opit Sravnitel’nogo İssledovaniya*. Moskva: Nauka.

- Ölmez, Mehmet (2019). *Köktürkçe ve Eski Uygurca Dersleri*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları.
- Öner, Mustafa (1998). *Bugünkü Kıpçak Türkçesi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Poppe, N. (1992). *Moğol Yazı Dilinin Grameri* (Terc: G. Karaağaç). İzmir.
- Qazaq Gramatikası* (2002). Astana: A. Baytursinov atındağı Til Bilimi İnstitu, 2002.
- Şçerbak (1977). *Oçerki po Sravnitel'noy Morfologii Tyurskih Yazıkov (İmya)*. Leningrad.
- Serebrennikov, B. A. ve Gadjeva, N. Z. (2011). *Türk Yazı Dillerinin Karşılaştırmalı Tarihi Grameri*. (Tevfik Hacıyeva, Mustafa Öner, Çev.). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Sızdıqova, Rabiğa (2014). *Yasavi Hikmetleriniñ Tili*. Almatı: El-Şejire Baspası.
- Taş, İbrahim (2015). *Kutadgu Bilig'de Söz Yapımı*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Tekin, Şinasi (1976). Eski Türkçe. *Türk Dünyası El Kitabı* (ss. 142-192). Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü.
- Tekin, Talat (2016). *Orhon Türkçesi Grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Toparlı, Recep (1992). *İrşâdü'l-Mülük Ve's-Selâtin*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Utebekov, Senbek (2020). *Divân-ı Hikmet'in Dil İncelemesi – Kökşetav Nüshası – (Metin – Gramer – Dizin)*. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Muğla.
- Utebekov, Senbek (2022). *Divân-ı Hikmet'in Kökşetav Nüshası Giriş – Gramer Özellikleri – Metin – Dizin*. Monografi/ Senbek Utebekov. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları. – 446 s.
- Yavuz, Orhan (2002). *Kansu Gavri'nin Türkçe Divanı*. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmalar Enstitüsü Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Yelten, Muhammet (2009). *Eski Anadolu Türkçesi ve Örnek Metinler*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayını.