

STEREOTYPIC UNITS AND FORMULAS IN OLD TURKIC WRITINGS: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Shahnoza Tulagonova ¹, Nodira Sadullaeva ², Nodir Rakhmatullaev ³
Nigora Khadjieva ⁴, Nilufar Kholbobaeva ⁵

Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan.

(tulagonova_shahnoza@mail.ru, nodinamozovna@gmail.com, rahmatullaevnodir@gmail.com, ninishka12@gmail.com, xolbobaeva90@mail.ru)

Keywords: ancient Turkish language, Turkish letters, formulas, stylistic units, stereotypical units.

Abstract: This article is devoted to the stylistic features of ancient Turkic writings - stereotypical units and formulas. There are clichéd units in the scriptures. At first glance, it seems that they arose due to tautology, simplicity of the text, or inaccuracy of the author. Only if you delve deeper into the essence of the lyrics will you realize that these are not just repetitions. These units are further divided into types. However, the stereotypical units we study differ significantly from similar units. In fact, the units denoted by these terms are used repeatedly in the texts. In this respect they are similar. In particular, two types of such events can be distinguished in ancient Turkic writings.

Introduction

Stereotyped units are used repeatedly in the text of Old Turkic inscriptions. It is not difficult to understand from the text of the words that these units are not simple tautology. In the first studies, terms such as epic cliché, epic formula, stylistic formula, and formulas were given to this phenomenon. In today's studies, the term stereotyped units is used more often in relation to this phenomenon.

The units referred to by these terms are used repeatedly in the texts. In this respect they are similar. However, when one focuses on the intended use of these units, their differences begin to emerge. Formulas in official documents are considered the main components that form the text of these documents, and they serve as templates in the texts. Stereotyped units that are remembered as soon as they are read are later reused by other authors. These patterns of artistic thinking move from work to work. Of course, in this process, the influence of folklore is great. Because it takes some time for such expressions to become stereotyped units. Undoubtedly, these units, like proverbs and wise words, are the product of folk art. Whether these units came in the form of a sentence or a word combination, they fulfilled the artistic and semantic task assigned to them. In other words, stereotypes have become artistically and stylistically elaborated expressions. As a result, the most appropriate way to express a certain reality is with the help of these units.

Repetitive units in the text of ancient Turkic writings are formulas. The tradition of composing the text is important in the selection of such units. This traditionalism is based on the religious and philosophical thinking of the people.

Material and Methods

I. Stebleva's research contains deep thoughts about stereotypic units [1]. The poetics of the text of Turkish writings, its unique style and the study of stereotypical units are highlighted in a number of monographs by T. Tekin [2]. In addition, there are studies of scientists such as N. Akyaljin [3], H. Gokdayi [4], J. Erol [5], Sh. Serkan [6], A. Dogan [7] in this regard. The poetics of ancient Turkic writings and their relationship with folk oral creativity are revealed in the researches of N. Rahmanov [8]. The study of

¹  <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4395-6143>

²  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9303-7130>

³  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4350-7675>

⁴  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4794-2639>

⁵  <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0136-7906>

stereotypical units in the texts did not escape the scientist's attention. The next significant work in Uzbek Turkology was done by Q. Sadikov [9]. The latest research in this field is visible in Q. Omonov's work [10].

Comparative-historical, semantic-stylistic, analysis-synthesis, etc. methods of analysis were used to illuminate the problem raised in the article.

Results and Discussion

Turkologist I.V. Stebleva in his research recognizes stereotypic units as stylistic formulas and divides them into types in terms of content[1]. Scientist N. Rahmonov, who studied the poetics of Kul Tigin's memoirs, refers to them as stereotyped formulas [8, 221]. In today's studies, the term stereotyped units is used more often in relation to this phenomenon [11, 119].

There are certain differences between these units. By knowing their content, it is possible to determine the boundaries between the same units. It is appropriate to divide the standard expressions found in the text of ancient Turkic letters into two types:

1. Stereotyped units.
2. Formulas (stylistic formulas).

These terms are explained in linguistic dictionaries as follows:

Formula. A fixed phrase is a general name for its structural model, a phrase is a cliché, and so on. Methodical formula [12, 501].

There are places where the term stereotype is given in the explanation of similar terms in linguistics dictionaries:

A stereotyped expression that is compressed, mechanically (involuntarily) repeated in the same form either in typical speech and domestic contexts or in a certain literary genre, dialect, etc. A cliché phrase. Russian: ho'kizday baquvvat; salom ayting; aytilganlarga bog'liq holda; masala o'z yechimini kutmoqda. (strong as an ox; say hello; depending on what was said; the issue is waiting for its solution) Language cliché [12, 197].

Also, in the definition of the word stereotype in another dictionary of linguistics, terms such as cliché, copy, sample, form, template are listed as synonyms [13, 347].

Repetitive units in the text of ancient Turkic writings are formulas. Conventionalism plays an important role in the selection of such units. This traditionalism is based on the religious and philosophical thinking of the people. In particular, in ancient Turkic writings, several recurring phrases and sentences are related to the religious thinking of the people.

One of the most active formulas in terms of application is the combination of *tānri yarlıqaduqin üçün* (because God has chosen). We found this combination in almost all the notes. It is related to the belief of that time, world view and thinking of people of that time. Every success achieved by the heroes of the diary is considered the grace of God. For example:

Tānri yarlıqaduqin üçün, özüm qutum bar üçün qağan olurtum. Qağan olurup, yoq čığan bodunuğ qop qoburtdım. Čığan bodunuğ bay qıltım, az bodunuğ öküş qıltım (Content: Because of God's will, because I have the ability and luck, I became a khagan. Being Khagan, no, I put the poor people on their feet completely. I made the poor people rich, I increased the few people) (Ka.9,10) .

Tānri bilig bārtük üçün, tānri yarlıqadı, Tānri yarlıqaduq üçün, tānri yarlıqazu, Tānri-tāg tānridā bulmuş is often repeated in texts like.

The ancient Turks considered their land, water, and homeland sacred. In the scriptures, the Khagan "for the heaven above and the earth below" – *üzä tānri, asra yer yarlıqaduq üçün* states that he has won great victories.

The ancient Turks had a world view that if they use holy land and water, the people will achieve prosperity and freedom, otherwise, the people will face humiliation. This is expressed by the following formula:

Üzä tānri, iduq yer-sub, ... qağan qutı tapqılmađı erinč, toquz oğuz bodun yerin, subın idip Tabğaçğaru bardı (Content: God above, holy land and water, ... the spirit of the khagan did not help, apparently, nine Oguz people abandoned their land and water and went to Tabgach) (X.24).

In the writing of Kul Tigin: *Üzä kök tānri asra yağız yār qılınuqda ikin ara kisi oğlı qılınmış* – (Content: When the blue sky above and the brown earth below were created, the human child was created between the two) (K.1).

In the letter of Tariyat: *Üzä kök tānri yarlıqaduq üçün asra yağız yer igitük üçün ālimin törümin etinti* – (Content: Blue sky above, brown earth below. My people and my dwellings are established).

There are other formulas in ancient Turkic writings. They are also called titles:

Täñri-täg täñridä bulmuş türük Bilgä qağan bu ödkä olurtum (Content: I sat on this throne as the Turkish Bilga Khagan, who received (grace) from the (glorious) God) (Ka. 1).

In the memorandum of Bilga Khagan: Täñri-täg täñri yar[at]mıš türük Bilga [qağan] sabım (Content: I sat on this throne as the Turkish Bilga Khagan, who received (grace) from the (glorious) God)

In the text of Mo'yun-chor:

«Teñridä bolmıš e-l etmıš Bilgä qağan .. tölis ..». (Content: Bilga khagan Tolis, who received God's grace [achieved God's grace])

The writings tell ordinary people about the difficulties in establishing the state and the heroism shown. Some sentences are repeated in the narrative to emphasize the heroism of the khagan or warlord. For example, in the text of Tonyuquq, the hero himself uses vadoimi epithets to acknowledge his services. Such expressions can be compared to honor, which was used as a special artistic tool by the time of classical literature:

Qağanı alp ärmis, ayğučısı bilgä ärmis. Ol äki kiši bar ärsär, sāni tabğacığ ölürtäči tir-män (Content: The king is a giant, and the councilor is wise. If those two people are there, they will kill you, you bastard) (Ton. 10).

Qağanı alp ärmis, ayğučısı bilgä ärmis, qačan äñirsär, ölürtäči kük (Content: As long as his lord is a giant, as long as his counselor is wise, as long as he is angry, he will defeat us.) (Ton. 21).

Qağanı alp ärmis, ayğučısı bilgä ärmis, qačan äñirsär bizni ölürtäči kük, tämis. (Content: He said that if his king is a giant, if his councilor is wise, if he seems to be angry, he is going to kill us.) (Ton. 29).

Such an honorary formula comes to Kul tigin:

Bil(g)ä qağan ärmis, alp qağan ärmis, buyruqı yämä bilgä ärmis ärinč, alp ärmis ärinč, bāglāri yämä, bodunı yämä tüz ärmis (Content: (They are) a wise king, a noble king, because his ministers are wise, because they are brave, because their leaders and people are righteous) (K. 3).

As an image qağan, i.e. the word “khaqan” bilgä (wise, knowledgeable), alp (alp, value, strong) like; ayğučı, that is, the word “counselor” bilgä used with traditional epithets such as.

Formulas are also frequently used in the text of the Enisei writings. When we read these monuments, we can see the typical features of the genre of mourning.

Siz, elim-ä, qunçuyum-a, oğlanım-a, sizim-ä, altmıš yaşımda (adırıl-tım) (Content: You are my people, my princesses, my sons, you, at the age of sixty (I left) (E.9.4).

This example is taken from the Uyuk tarlak inscription. Such sentences are found in memoirs such as Uyuk Turan, Elegesh, Begru, but they are not exactly repeated.

The basis of the formula is the suffix -a and the word adırıl-tım. -a suffix means reference. The deceased addresses his relatives through this suffix. This is what is said about this supplement:

“The addition of the sound -a (ay) to the word increases the appeal effect, strengthens sincerity, adds to it the tone of supplication, mutual closeness” [14, 101].

Formulas are subject to etiquette or convention. They often arise through a specific text and speaker's (writer's) goal and request. In tombstone texts, the expression of mourning and sadness comes to the fore. That is why words like adırıl-tım, bökmädım were accepted as formulas.

According to genre requirements, there are several formulas in “İrq Bitigi” as well. The summaries of about one hundred sections are anča bilinlär, edgü ol (so know, [this work] is good), anča bilin, anığ edgü ol (so know, [this work] is very good), anča bilinlär, asığ bar, edgü ol (so know, it is useful, [this work] is good), anca bilinrär, yabız ol (so know, [this work] is not good), are formulas such as take a leaf (so know [this work] is very bad).

Regarding this formula, R. Alimuhamedov says: “according to the structure of the texts meaning good and bad in the work, it reminds us of stereotypical units. Because they have the same mold” [15, 130].

The existing formulas in official documents are the main components that form the text of these documents and they serve as templates in the texts. These formulas are included in official documents with the need to ensure accuracy and formality.

Formulas found in ancient Turkic writings can also be seen in the literature of the later period. In particular, Yusuf Khos Hajib's work “Kutadgu Bilig” has some similarities with formulas found in ancient Turkish writings, as Professor B. Tokhliev

pointed out: “The literature of the 11th century was a unique bridge between the old and new eras, and was the starting point of new traditions” [16, 8] can be interpreted as.

In this sense, in the writings of the Orkhun and Uighur khanates, the antitheses of heaven and earth are found in the formulas:

Üzä kök täñri asra yağız yār qılınuqda ikin ara kisi oğlı qılınmıs

(Content: when the blue sky above and the brown earth below were created, between the two, a man - a human child - was created) (Ka. 1).

Talking about the history of the hero's ancestors, he begins the story from the beginning - the creation of the human child.

Let's turn to the example of “Kutadgu Bilig”:

Yağız yār yaşıl kök kün ay birlä tün

Törütti xalayıq öd ödlük bu kün.

(Content: Gray earth, blue sky, day, moon and night,

He created mankind, era, times and days)[17, 2].

In accordance with the traditions of the ancient Turkic peoples and Islamic literature, the preface of the works began with the praise of God. When Yusuf Khos Hajib also spoke about the creation of the whole being, the purpose of this was to praise the creator. In both examples, the word land is given by the epithet “yağız”. In scriptures, this epithet is always used together with the word “yār”. The same situation is observed in “Kutadgu Bilig”. Only in some places is the word “qonğır” synonymous with “yağız”. But the word meaning “heaven” and its epithets also have a slight change.

Formulas in ancient historical-artistic writings can be divided into two types in terms of application:

1. Stereotypical units common to ancient Turkic written monuments.
2. Stereotypical units common to monuments created in a certain period or literary environment.

For example, the combination *Teñridä bolmıš* (God's grace) at the beginning of most ancient Turkic texts. This stereotypical unit is found in the introduction to the records of the Blue Turkic khagans, Kul tigin and Bilga khagans, and the records of the Uyghur khagans Mo'yun-chor and Tariyat.

A clear example of the second type of use of formulas is the word *adırlıtm* in the writings of Enisei. This word is not used stereotypically in other writings than the Enisei writings. There are also several examples of formulas common to Kokturk plants Tonyuquq, Kul tigin, Bilga khagan plants.

Formulas become more active under the influence of literary traditions, religious-philosophical views. Most of the ancient historical-artistic writings begin with the combination *Teñridä bolmıš* (favored by God). The heroes of the work attribute all their success to the blessings of their gods.

Üzä täñri, asra yār combinations are also included in the general formulas for memos.

Sometimes the author gives an artistic polish to these combinations. That is, he says “the blue sky above”, not “the sky above”. It is noteworthy that now the author equates the next combination with the previous one. When the author mentions the blue sky above, he certainly represents the earth below with its color.

From the examples, it is understood that the formula *üzä täñri, asra yār* was one of the common expressions for ancient Turkic letters.

And stereotypical units have become stereotyped units because they are the most productive artistic expression of a certain reality, elaborated in terms of style and content. These units, which are still remembered, were later used by other authors. These patterns of artistic thinking move from work to work. Of course, in this process, the influence of folklore is great. Because it takes some time for such expressions to become stereotyped units. At the beginning, a sentence that was thought out and spoken by someone to express a certain reality is imprinted in the memory of others and is used repeatedly in similar situations. These figurative expressions help the work to be polished. Undoubtedly, these units, like proverbs and wise words, are the product of folk art. These units, whether in the form of a sentence or a word combination, performed the artistic-semantic task assigned to them. In other words, stereotypes have become artistically and stylistically elaborated expressions. As a result, the most appropriate way to describe a certain reality is represented by these units. To be more precise, stereotype units are chosen in the same way as phraseological units are included in the text according to need in the statement of opinion.

Stereotypical units are used more often in artistic texts and are distinguished from the text by their inherent artistic and stylistic aspects. For example: taqlī-bōri qatīlsun - the stereotype of “lambs and wolves mix”.

The stereotypic units from the old Turkic writings are found in the Turkish poetic fragments used in the work “Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk”, albeit in a reworked form. This unity, reflecting a noble desire, is a general expression of a high level of harmony and integrity. It also appears in the following poem:

Endik kiši tetilsün,
El törü yetilsün,
Toqlī-bōri qatīlsun,
Qañğu yemä sawīlsun.

(Content: Let’s open the sorrow with our sword, so that the fools will come to their senses, the country will be healed, the lambs and the wolves will live in peace, and the sorrow will go away from us.)(18, 55].

The content of this stereotypical unit is enriched by several methodological tools. In particular, taqlī-bōri (lamb and wolf) are opposed to each other in terms of meaning. A sheep is weak by nature, and a wolf is a predator. Sheep have always been a prey for wolves due to their weakness and inability to resist their prey. In a metaphorical sense, the sheep refers to the oppressed people, and the wolf refers to cruel, warlike people (enemies). Tired of constant war and looting, the people made toqlī-bōri qatīlsun wishes for peace. This sentence is also expressed in “Kutadgu Bilig”:

Qutuldı boñun ketti emgäklärı,
Qozı birlä qatlıp yurıdı bōri.

Content: The people became happy, their troubles disappeared,

The lamb and the wolf mingled [17, 208].

Stereotypic units express the thought or reality being expressed. Therefore, they are freely chosen for use in the text. The difference between them and the formulas can be clearly observed in the following verse taken from “Kutadgu Bilig”:

Bayat atı bilä sözüg başladım,
Törütgän, igidgän, kečürgän iđim.

Content: I began to speak in the name of God,

He is the one who created, nurtured and forgave [17, 249].

Another example:

Bitigünlä aldı bu qağaz bitig,
Bayat atı birlä bitidi bitig
Bayat atı birlä sözün başladı,
Törütgän, igidgän, kečürgän iđi.

Content: He took a notepad with ink,

In the name of God (ie bismillah) he began to write a letter.

He began his speech with the name of God (that is, by writing bismillah),

It is the owner(s) who created, maintained, and forgave [17, 249].

This stanza is repeated several times in the text of the work, that is, the author quotes it both at the beginning of the work and at the beginning of some new chapters. There are also several letters in the plot of the work, which also begin with the above verses. We will consider this part of the text as an example of formulas.

The above example is known as Turkish basmala [19, 259]. It is known that basmala is a formula regularly used in the literature of Muslim nations. It is the beginning of every work. Täñri-täg täñridä bulmuş, which exists in the Old Blue Turkish inscriptions, and the formulas created under the influence of religious thinking related to land and water, and basmala, tahmids,

which took a stable place in the introduction of works in later periods, are similar in terms of their function. In this sense, Turkish researchers call the formulas in the work “Hibatu-l-haqaiq” as standard words. And he cites the following as an example:

1. Bismillahirrahmanirrahim;
2. Bu kün tegsü mendin durud;
3. İlāhi kečürgān iđim-sen, kečür;
4. Uğan rahmat etsün;
5. Kerāk qıl ‘ijābat kerāk qıl’ itāb[3, 105].

Conclusion

Formulas and stereotypic units have a common feature of repetition in texts. The different aspects are repeated based on factors such as the fact that the formulas obey the traditions of text composition, the expression of the laws of religious and philosophical thinking in the language, and the genre and style of the text. And stereotypical units are stabilized due to the ability to convey the intended idea, the depicted reality in an impressive and figurative way.

In ancient Turkic writings *tāñri yarlıqaduqın üçün* (for God's sake), *tāñri küč bertük üçün* (because god gave strength), *tāñri bilig bertük üçün* (because god gave knowledge), *üzä tāñri, asra yer yarlıqaduq üçün* (because the sky is shining above and the earth is shining below), *tāñri-tāg tāñridā bulmuş* (a Turk who has received (grace) from the blue (glorious) God), *Tāñri-tāg tāñri yar[at]mıš* (Sentences or combinations such as blue (glorious) received from God (grace) are among the formulas formed on the basis of religious thinking and taken from texts.

Examples of formulas that arise based on the genre of the text and its laws are the verb participles *adırlıtm* (I left) and *bökmädım* (I didn't have enough) in Enisei writings with the reference affix -a. It is also of the same type in “İrq Bitigi”. *anča bilinlär, edgü ol* (so know that [this work] is good), *anča bilin, anıg edgü ol* (know that [this work] is very good), *anča bilinlär, asıgı bar, edgü ol* (so know that it is beneficial, [this work] is good), *anča bilinlär, yabız ol* (know that [this work] is not good), *anča bilin, yablaq ol* (know that [this work] is bad), *anča bilinlär, anıg yablaq ol* (know that [this work] is very bad) there are formulas like.

In the text of Old Turkic writings, certain combinations and sentences became stereotyped units as a result of intertextual repetition. Therefore, phraseological units are imprinted in the memory of the language owner, ready to be used in speech. Stereotypic units, like phraseology, are linguistic material. Stereotypic units have different variants. Phraseologisms are stable, and their composition is indivisible, but both units have lived in the language for a long time as carriers of a single meaning. Also, some stereotypic units include phraseological units.

References:

- [1] Stebleva I.V. Poetics of ancient Turkic literature and its transformation in the early classical period – Moscow: Nauka, 1976. – 214 p.
- [2] Talat Tekin. Orhon Yazıtları. Kül Tigin, Bilge Kağan, Tunyukuk. 2. Baskı. – İstanbul: Simurg, 1998 – 128 s.
- [3] Necmi Akyalçın, Damla Aydoğan. Atabetü'l-hakayık'da yer alan ikilemeler ve kalıp sözler // Homeros. – № 3. – Çanakkale/Türkiye, 2020. – SS. 105-112.
- [4] Gökdayı H. Türkçede Kalıp sözler. – Ankara: Kriter Yayınevi, 2015. – 112 s.
- [5] Erol Ç. Türkiye Türkçesinde Kalıp Sözler Üzerine Bir İnceleme. – İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2007. – 144 s.
- [6] Serkan Şen. Eski türkçede gök ile yerin adlandırılışında renklere dayalı deyim aktarmalarından yararlanma ve ‘kara’ sözcüğünün kökeni üzerine // İlmi araştırmalar. Sayı 24. – İstanbul, 2014. SS 129-136.
- [7] Doğan Aksan. Göktürk yazıtlarında söz sanatları güçlü anlatım yolları // Türk dili araştırmaları yaylığı – Belleten. Cilt 38. – İstanbul, 1990. – SS. 1-12.
- [8] Rahmonov N. Poetics of Kultegin monument. / Immortal monuments. - T.: Science, 1989. The same author. Turkish khanate. - T.: Abdulla Qadiri, 1993. - 392 p.
- [9] Sadikov Q. Blue Turkic Inscriptions: The Text and Its Historical Interpretation. - T.: ToshDShI, 2004. - 144 p.
- [10] Omonov Q. Basics of Uzbek documentary: emergence and historical development. - T.: ToshDShI, 2016. - 192 p.
- [11] Sadikov Q. Turkish documents created in the early and middle ages. - T., 2016. - 349 p.
- [12] Akhmanova O. Dictionary of linguistic terms. – M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966. – 608 p.
- [13] Zhrebilo T.V. Dictionary of linguistic terms. 5th edition. – Nazran: Pilgrim, 2010. – 610.
- [14] Mahmadiyev Sh. Stylistic formulas in the language of Uzbek folk epics: filol.fan.nomz. ... diss. - T., 2007. - 181 p.
- [15] Alimukhamedov R. Sources of ancient Turkic-Moni literature. - T.: ToshDShI, 2016. - 183 p.
- [16] Tokhliev B. Yusuf Khos Hajib's “Kutadgu Bilig” and the perfection of some genres. - T.: Acr Press, 2004. - 119 p.
- [17] Yusuf Khos Hajib. Good knowledge. Preparator and author of the introduction: Q. Karimov. - T.: Science, 1971. - 965 p.

- [18] Mahmoud Koshgari. Devonu Dictionary-t-Turkish. Preparator and author of the introduction; Q. Sodikov. - T.: Gafur Ghulam, 2017. - 488 p.
- [19] Sadikov Q. The late Turkish basmala and Navoi's work in "Kutadgu Bilig" // Proceedings of the international scientific-theoretical conference on the subject of Alisher Navoi and the 21st century. - T., 2019. - p. 259-261.