

**ON THE SOME EXPRESSIONS IN OLD
TURKIC INSCRIPTIONS: KT EAST 38TH AND
T 23RD LINES**

**Eski Türk Yazıtlarındaki Bazı İfadeler Üzerine: KT Doğu 38. ve
T 23. Satırlar**

Hüsnü Çağdaş ARSLAN¹

Abstract

Our examination is the part of a large work handling the accusative case in the linguistic materials of the Old Turkic which consists Çoyr, Köl Tigin, Bilge Kagan, Tunyuquq, Ongi, Köli Çor, Süci, Şine-Usu, Taryat, Tes, Yenisey and Kyrgyzstan inscriptions, and also the fortune book called Irk Bitig which are written by Old Turkic (runik) alphabet and according to the informations in the sources written on them. In Old Turkic inscriptions a name in the nominative case can be an indefinite object of a sentence or a clause. This is referred to as an accusative case without suffix. And the definite object case is formed by adding the suffixes +g/+ğ to the stems without possessive suffix, the suffix +n to the stems with possessive suffixes. This case is also formed very rarely by adding +nl after the personal and demonstrative pronouns in the plural case and +I after the personal and the demonstrative pronouns in the singular case. It is known that different works have been done since the end of the 19th century and especially from the beginning of the 20th century on the Old Turkic inscriptions. Nowadays these works are carried out by field researchers intensely. However, in addition to reading and interpretation problems related to the inscriptions, phonetic and morphological discussions still remain. Reading problems are especially focused on the words that we cannot trace in today's vocabulary with damaged parts, while the problems of interpretation focus on the translations without taking into consideration the structure of Turkish language. In this study, accusative suffixes were explained using the method of the surveying literature in an approach that addresses the problems of reading and translation in relation to the Old Turkic inscriptions, and the opinions on the readings of the expressions in Köl Tigin East 38th and Tunyuquq 23rd lines were presented. By these arguments, it is aimed to point to translation problems in Old Turkic researches and to contribute to the morphological studies of Old Turkic.

Key words: Old Turkic, inscriptions, accusative case, Köl-Tigin, Tunyuquq.

Öz

Araştırmamız, Eski Türk (Runik) alfabesiyle yazılmış Çoyr, Köl Tigin, Bilge Kağan, Tunyukuk, Ongi, Köli Çor, Süci, Şine-Usu, Taryat, Tes, Yenisey ve Kırgızistan yazıtları ile Irk Bitig adlı fal kitabından oluşan Eski Türkçe dil malzemelerinde ve onlar üzerine yazılan kaynaklarda bulunan veriler ışığında belirtme durumunun ele alınmasıyla ortaya çıkan geniş bir çalışmanın parçasıdır. Eski Türk yazıtlarında yalın hâldeki bir ad, bir cümlecğin ya da cümlelerin belirsiz nesnesi olabilir. Buna eksiz belirtme durumu denir. Belirli nesne durumu ise; iyelik eksiz gövdelere +g/+ğ, iyelik ekli gövdelere +n eklerinin eklenmesiyle kurulmaktadır. Bu durum, nadiren de çokluk kişi ve işaret adlarından sonra +nl; teklik kişi ve işaret adlarından sonra +I ekinin getirilmesiyle oluşturulmaktadır. Eski Türk yazıtlarıyla ilgili XIX. yüzyılın sonu

¹ Öğretim Görevlisi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Türk Dili Bölümü, hcarslan@cu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4618-2105, ResearcherID: E-7866-2018

ArticleHistory:

Received

17/09/2018

Received in revised form

17/09/2018

Accepted

07/12/2018

Available online

15/12/2018

ve özellikle XX. yüzyılın başından itibaren farklı çalışmalar yapıldığı bilinmektedir. Günümüzde alan araştırmacıları tarafından bu çalışmalar yoğun bir şekilde sürdürülmektedir. Ancak yazıtlarla ilgili okuma ve anlamlandırma sorunlarının yanı sıra ses ve biçim bilimsel tartışmalar da hâlen yerini korumaktadır. Okuma sorunları özellikle zarar görmüş kısımlarla günümüz söz varlığında takip edemediğimiz sözler üzerinde yoğunlaşırken anlamlandırma sorunları Türkçenin yapısını kimi zaman dikkate almadan yapılan aktarmalar üzerinde yoğunlaşmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, literatür tarama yöntemi kullanılarak Eski Türk yazıtlarıyla ilgili okuma ve aktarma sorunlarına değinen bir yaklaşım içerisinde belirtme durumu ekleri açıklanmıştır. Köl Tigin Doğu 38. ve Tunyukuk 23. satırlardaki ifadelerin okunuşlarıyla ilgili görüşler sunulmuştur. Bu görüşlerle Eski Türkçe araştırmalarında aktarma sorunlarına dikkat çekmek ve Eski Türkçenin biçim bilgisi çalışmalarına katkı sağlamak amaçlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Eski Türkçe, yazıtlar, belirtme durumu, Köl-Tigin, Tunyukuk.

Introduction

It is known that many works have been done since the end of the 19th century and especially from the beginning of the 20th century on the Old Turkic inscriptions. Nowadays these studies are also carried out by field researchers. However, in addition to reading and interpretation problems related to the inscriptions, phonetic and morphological discussions still remain. Reading problems are mostly focused on the words that we cannot trace in today's vocabulary with damaged parts, while the problems of interpretation focus on the translations without taking into consideration the structure of Turkish language. In this study, accusative suffixes were explained in Old Turkic inscriptions in an approach that addresses all these problematic areas. The expressions in Köl Tigin [KT] East 38th and Tunyukuk [T] 23rd lines are discussed and it was intended to contribute the Old Turkic researches.

1. Examination

1.1. The Accusative Case in Old Turkic Inscriptions

Let's take a look at how the accusative case is provided according to the expressions in Old Turkic inscriptions:

Indefinite object: In Old Turkic inscriptions a name in *the nominative case* can be an *indefinite object* of a sentence or a clause. This is referred to as an accusative case without suffix (see Tekin, 2016, p. 100; Erdal, 2004, p. 362-365):

Sekiz er ölürdüm. "I killed eight men." (Elegest I)

Edgü söz sab ulti kelir tir. "(He) says he's coming with good word(s)/news." (Irk Bitig [IB] 7)

Irak erser yablaq ağı birür yağuk erser edgü ağı birür. "If it is away, (it) gives bad goods, if it is close (it) gives good goods." (KT South 7)

Bunča bitig bitidim. "I've written all these inscriptions." (Köli Çor South 3)

Definite object:

+g / +ğ: It is explained that the accusative suffix comes to the names in the nominative case or the names without a possessive suffix (see also Arslan, 2018, p. 108-109; Ölmez, 2017, p. 52; Tekin, 2016, p. 102).

Çığan+ı+ğ bay kulti az+ı+ğ üküš kulti. "(He) made the poor (one) rich, and made the less (one) more." (Bilge Kagan [BK] East 14)

17) *Kağan at+i+ğ bunta biz birtimiz.* “We have given the title of Kagan here.” (BK East 17)

Sırlım kunçuy+u+ğ birtimiz. “We gave my sister princess.” (KT East 20)

Ol yulki+ğ alıp igi(t)tim. “I took that herd of horses and fed.” (BK East 38)

Bunča bedizçi+g tuyğun elteber kelü[r]ti. “Tuygun Elteber brought all these artists.” (KT Northeast)

Eliğ yıl iş+i+g küç+ü+g birmiş. “(He) served fifty years.” (KT East 8)

Kırkız+i+ğ uka basdımız. “We raided Kyrgyz(es) asleep.” (T 27)

+n: This suffix is added to the stems with a possessive suffix (see also Arslan, 2018, p. 109-110; Ercilasun, 2016, p. 372; Ölmez, 2017, p. 52; Şirin, 2015, p. 42-45; Tekin, 2016, p. 102):

a. It is added to the words which take singular 1st personal possessive suffix:

Sabım+i+n tüketi eşidgil! “Listen my word(s) thoroughly!” (KT South 1)

Meniñ sabım+i+n şımadı. “(Chinese Emperor) did not break my word.” (KT South 11)

Yegenim+i+n atım+i+n kördüm. “I saw my nephews, my grandchildren.” (Süci 8)

Tapladukum+i+n tutar men sebdüküm+i+n yiyür men. “I keep what I like, I eat what I love.” (IB 4), etc.

b. It is added to the words which take singular 2nd personal possessive suffix:

Antağıñ+i+n üçün igidmiş kağanıñ+i+n sab+i+n almatın yir sayu bardığ. “You went everywhere without considering your khan who fed you and not taking his word because of you are so.” (KT South 8-9; BK North 6-7)

Türük bodun eliñ+i+n töröñ+i+n kem artatı [udaçı erti](?) (KT East 22); *Türük bodun eliñ+i+n törög+i+n kem artatı [ertji](?)* (BK East 19) “The Turkish people, who would break your state and your custom?”

Kanıñ+i+n kodup içikdiñ. “You left your khan and became addicted.” (T 3)

Urı oğluñ+i+n kuul kıltığ. “You've made your son a slave.” (BK East 20), etc.

c. The accusative suffix is only +n in the words which take 3rd personal possessive suffix naturally:

Köl tiginin altun+i+n kümüş+i+n ağış+i+n barım+i+n tör[t bıñ] yulki+s]i+n ayağma tuyğut... “Tuygut who protects the gold, silver, fortune, wealth (and) four thousand good horses of Köl Tigin...” (KT Southwest)

Eb+i+n barım+i+n kalısız koop kelürti. “(He) brought his house, full of his property.” (KT North 1)

[O]ğl+i+n yutuz+i+n anta altım. “I took his son (and) his wife there.” (BK East 38)

Kağan+i+n tutdumuz yabgu+si+n şad+i+n anta ölürti. “(We) kept their Kagan, (he/they) killed their Yabgu (and) Shad there.” (T 41-42)

Berta reads this expression as “*türgeş qayan buyruqı az tutuqıy eliğin tut’dı*” (Berta, 2010, p. 115, 162) and gives its translation as “Türgeş kağanının *buyruku* Az *tutukunu* elinden tuttu (The *buyruq* of Türgiş Kagan held the *tutuq* (prisoner) of Az (people) from his hand).” (Berta, 2010, p. 196). On this expression in KT East 38th line many researchers also write approximately similar readings, translations and explanations such as the above mentioned ones (On this expression you can see also Aydarov, 1971, p. 277-303; Orkun, 2011, p. 46-47; Radloff, 1987, p. 3-40.).

Firstly I thought that the expression *az totoğ+u+ğ elig+i+n tutdı* has two accusative suffixes *+ğ* and *+n*. This situation could show that there is an example of the use of consecutive accusative suffixes in KT East 38th line. This usage of consecutive accusative suffixes fulfills the appositival function (for “the usage of consecutive accusative suffixes” and “its the appositival function” see also Arslan, 2018). But then I read the full text of the inscription again, looked at the context and I changed my mind. I think that Thomsen was mostly right about the translation of KT East 38th line (Thomsen, 2011, p. 152, 229, 230). In my opinion, this expression means “The officier(s) of Türgiş kagan held a small number of prisoner(s) in his/their hand(s).” and the suffix *+n* in “*𐰽𐰺𐰍*” (*e)l(i)g(i)n*) is an instrumental suffix but, its function is locative in this case. The word (*e)l(i)g(i)n*) can be explained as *elig+i* (3rd personal possessive suffix)+*n* (the instrumental suffix). The verb phrase *eligin tut-* means “to hold/to keep on his/her/their hand(s), to put in hand, to keep control of”. Furthermore, *az totoğ* means “a small number (*az*) of prisoner[s] (*totoğ*)” and *+u* is a connective vowel, *+ğ* is an accusative suffix.

b. 𐰽𐰺𐰍𐰺𐰍𐰽𐰺𐰍 : 𐰽𐰺𐰍𐰽𐰺𐰍 : 𐰽𐰺𐰍𐰽𐰺𐰍 *Bu yol+i+n yorisar yaramaçı tédim.* (T 23).

Malov reads the expression in T 23rd line as “Bu jolyn jorysar, jaramačy, tidim...” (Malov, 1951, p. 62), and he translates into Russian from Old Turkic as “Я сказал: Не годится, если идти этим путем...” (Malov, 1951, p. 67) which means “I said that if (we) go this way, it won't be good (for us).” in English. It is obvious that Malov reads these runic words, 𐰽𐰺𐰍𐰽𐰺𐰍: 𐰽𐰺𐰍𐰽𐰺𐰍, as *bu yolın yorisar*, not *bo yolun yorisar* and we can translate this expression into English as “if (we) walk on this way” or “if (we) go this way” approximately.

M. Erdal says that in the title “The instrumental” of his book: “In *bo yolun yorisar* ‘if we walk this way’ (Tuñ I S8) the way is the ‘means’ for carrying out one’s aim.” (Erdal, 2004, p. 378).

T. Tekin says that in the title “Araç Durumu” (the instrumental) of his book *Orhon Türkçesi Grameri (The Grammar of Orkhon Turkic)* on the expression of T 23rd line: “if (we) go (on) this way, it won't be good (for us).” (Tekin, 2016, p. 110). M. Ölmez also says the same translation like Tekin (2016, p. 110) on the expression of T 23rd line in the title “Birliktelik/Berberlik Durumu: +(X)n” (the comitative case) of his book, but remarks it in a different title: *bu yol+un yorisar yaramaçı* “if (we) go (on) this way, it won't be good (for us).” (Ölmez, 2017, p. 56). Berta reads this expression as “*bo yolun yorisar yaramaçı tédim [...]*” (Berta, 2010, p. 44, 65) and gives its translation as “Dedim ki: Eğer bu yol ile gidersek [bu] yararlı olmayacak (I said that if (we) go on/by this way, it won't be good (for us).” (Berta, 2010, s. 88)³ and accepts the *+n* in the word 𐰽𐰺𐰍 as an instrumental or comitative suffix. He writes the different readings made by Giraud (1961), Rybatzki

³ We conclude that Berta defines the suffix *+n* in the word 𐰽𐰺𐰍 *yolın* or *yolun/yolun* as an instrumental or comitative suffix. Because the translation of the expression into Turkish from Hungarian made by Emine Yılmaz is also in the instrumental case.

(1997), Orkun (1936), Malov (1959), Aydarov (1971) on the word YD *yoln* or *yolun* as a note. On this expression in T 23rd line the other researchers also write approximately similar readings, translations and explanations such as the above mentioned ones (You can see also Aydarov, 1971, p. 319-334; Giraud, 1961; Orkun, 2011, p. 108-109; Radloff, 1987; Rybatzki, 1997; Tekin, 1994).

In my opinion, this expression means “I said that if (we) go this way, it won't be good (for us).” and the suffix *+n* in “ YD : YD ” *bu yoln yorsar* is not an instrumental or a prepositional suffix. The expression *yoln yor-* which means “to go a way, to walk a path” letter by letter in Turkish can be explained as *yol+ı* (the connective vowel)+*n* (the accusative suffix) *yor-* (the verb which means “to go, to walk”). Furthermore, according to Turkish in Turkey, it is used like this: *yol yürü-* (infinitive form), but *bu yol+u yürü-* (the demonstrative adjective+ the noun+ the accusative suffix+ the verb). At the same time, we can detect easily the structure *a demonstrative adjective + the noun+accusative suffix + the verb (bu yol+accusative suffix + yor-)* many times in Kutadgu Bilig [KB] written by Yusuf Has Hacib: Especially KB 3322 (*yorsa yoluğ*), 5171 (*yori bu yoluğ*) and 6373 (*yormaz bu yarlığ yoluğ*) (Arat, 1947, p. 336, 516, 630). And it shows that if the verb phrase *yol yor-* takes a demonstrative adjective (for example *bu*) before the noun *yol*, the noun *yol* takes an accusative suffix.

Conclusion

In Old Turkic inscriptions *the accusative case* is provided by two ways as the forms with and without suffix. *Accusative case without a suffix (indefinite object case)* or the form without suffix is defined that a name in the nominative case can be an indefinite object of a sentence or a clause. The forms with a suffix or *accusative case with a suffix (the definite object case)* is formed by adding the suffixes *+g/+ğ* to the stems without possessive suffix and the suffix *+n* to the stems with possessive suffixes. This case is also formed very rarely by adding *+nl* after the personal and demonstrative pronouns in the plural case and *+l* after the personal and the demonstrative pronouns in the singular case. In this case it can be said that the accusative suffixes are in 4 different forms in Old Turkic inscriptions.

The expressions in Köl Tigin East 38th line can be translated into English from Old Turkic as “The officier(s) of Tūrgeš kagan held a small number of prisoners in his/their hand(s).” and in my opinion the suffix *+n* in “ Y ” (*e)l(i)g(i)n*) is an instrumental suffix, but its function is locative in this case. The word (*e)l(i)g(i)n*) can be explained as:

elig+i (3rd personal possessive suffix) *+n* (the instrumental/locative suffix).

eligin tut-: “to hold/to keep on his/her/their hand(s), to put in hand, to keep control of”.

The expressions in Tunyuquq 23rd line can be translated into English from Old Turkic as “I said that if (we) go this way, it won't be good (for us).” and in my opinion the suffix *+n* in “ YD : YD ” *bu yoln yorsar* is not an instrumental or a prepositional suffix. Because the expression *yoln yor-* which means “to go a way, to walk a path” letter by letter in Turkish can be explained as:

Bu (the demonstrative adjective) *yol+ı* (the connective vowel)+*n* (the accusative suffix) *yor-* (the verb which means “to go, to walk” in the infinitive case). Furthermore, the examples in Kutadgu Bilig show that if the verb phrase *yol yor-* takes a demonstrative adjective (for example *bu*) before the noun *yol*, the noun *yol* takes an accusative suffix.

References

- ARAT, R. R. (1947). *Kutadgu Bilig I metin*. (1. baskı). İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- ARAT, R. R. (1979). *Kutadgu Bilig III indeks*. İstanbul: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü.
- ARAT, R. R. (1991). *Eski Türk Şiiri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- ARAT, R. R. (1999). *Kutadgu Bilig I metin*. (4. baskı). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- ARSLAN, H. Ç. (2018). Kök-Türkçede Belirtme Durumu, Belirli Nesne Eki {+I} ve Ardışık Belirtme Durumu Eklerinin Açıklama İşlevi. In *Түрк Дүйнөсү: Билим - өнөр булагы конференциясы*, pp. 105-117, 3rd-4th March 2018, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan.
- AYDAROV, G. (1971). *Yazık orhonskih pamyatnikov drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti VIII veka*. Alma-Ata.
- AYDIN, E. (2007). *Şine Usu yazıtı*. Çorum: KaraM Yayınları.
- AYDIN, E., R. ALİMOV, F. YILDIRIM (2013). *Yenisey-Kırgızistan yazıtları ve Irk Bitig*. Ankara: BilgeSu Yayıncılık.
- AYDIN, E. (2014). *Orhon yazıtları (Köl Tegin, Bilge Kağan, Tonyukuk, Ongi, Küli Çor)* (2. baskı). Konya: Kömen Yayınları.
- BALCI, M. (2011). *Orhun yazıtları -Türkçedeki ilk çalışmalar-*. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi.
- BARUTÇU ÖZÖNDER, F. S. (2006). *Çöyr yazıtı. Modern Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Eylül 2006, 3 (3), ss. 108-124.
- BERTA, Á. (2010). *Sözlerimi iyi dinleyin... Türk ve Uygur runik yazıtlarının karşılaştırmalı yayını*. (Çev. Emine Yılmaz). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- CANPOLAT, M. (1992). Eski Anadolu Türkçesindeki belirtme durumu (accusativus) ekinin kökeni üzerine. *Türkoloji Dergisi*, X. Cilt, Sayı: 1: 9-11. Ankara: DTCF Yayınları.
- CLAUSON, Sir G. (1961). Notes on Irk Bitig. *Ural-Altaysche Jahrbücher*, Volume 33. Wiesbaden: 218-225.
- CLAUSON, Sir G. (1972). *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- DOERFER, G. (1963). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen I*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- DOERFER, G. (1965). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen II*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- DOERFER, G. (1967). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen III*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- ERCİLASUN, A.B. - Z. AKKOYUNLU. (Haz.) (2015). *Kâşgarlı Mahmud Dîvânü Lugâti't-Türk, giriş-metin-çeviri-notlar-dizin* (2. baskı). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- ERCİLASUN, A.B. (2016). *Türk kağanlığı ve Türk bengü taşları*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
- ERDAL, M. (1991). *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon Vol. I-II*. Wiesbaden.
- ERDAL, M. (2004). *A grammar of old Turkic*. Leiden-Boston: BRILL.
- ERGİN, M. (1996). *Orhun abideleri* (20. baskı). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.
- GABAIN, A. von (1950). *Altürkische grammatik* (2. Verbesserte Auflage). Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- GIRAUD, R. (1961). *L'inscription de Baïn Tsokto*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- GRØNBECH, K. (1995). *Türkçenin yapısı*. (Çev. Mehmet Akalın). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- GÜLSEVİN, G. - E. BOZ (2010). *Eski Anadolu Türkçesi*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- KONONOV, A. N. (1980). *Grammatika yazıka Tyurkskih runičeskih pamyatnikov VII-IX vv*. Leningrad: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.

- KUZNETSOV, P. İ. (1997). Türkiye Türkçesinin morfoetimolojisine dair. *TDAY-Belleten* 1995: 193-262. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- MALOV, S. Ye. (1951). *Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti teksti i issledovaniya*. Moskva: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.
- MALOV, S. Ye. (1952). *Yeniseyskaya pis'mennost' Tyurkov teksti i perevodi*. Moskva-Leningrad: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.
- MALOV, S. Ye. (1959). *Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti Mongolii i Kirgizii*. Moskva: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.
- MERT, O. (2009). *Ötüken Uygur dönemi yazıtlarından Tes – Taryat - Şine Us*. Ankara: Belen Yayıncılık.
- MERT, O. (2015). *Köli Çor yazıtı ve anıt mezar kompleksi*. Erzurum: Zafer Medya Ofset Matbaacılık.
- NADELYAYEV, V. M., D. M. NASİLOV, E. R. TENİŞEV, A. M. ŞÇERBAK (1969). *Drevnetyurkskiy slovar'*. Leningrad: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.
- NASİLOV, V. M. (1960). *Yazık Orhono-Yeniseyskih pamyatnikov*. Moskva: İzdatel'stvo Vostoçnoy Literaturi.
- ORKUN, H. N. (1936). *Eski Türk yazıtları* (1. baskı). İstanbul.
- ORKUN, H. N. (2011). *Eski Türk yazıtları* (Birleştirilmiş 3. baskı). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- ÖLMEZ, M. (2013). *Orhon-Uygur hanlığı dönemi Moğolistan'daki eski Türk yazıtları metin-çeviri-sözlük* (2. baskı). Ankara: BilgeSu Yayıncılık.
- ÖLMEZ, M. (2017). *Köktürkçe ve eski Uygurca dersleri*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları.
- ÖNEN, Y. - C. Z. ŞANBEY (1993). *Almanca-Türkçe sözlük* (1, 2). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- ÖZKAN, M. (2013). *Türk dilinin gelişme alanları ve Eski Anadolu Türkçesi*. (4. baskı). İstanbul: Filiz Kitabevi.
- RADLOFF, W. (1987). *Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei 1-2*. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller Verlag [Facsimile].
- RECEBOV, E. – Y. MEMMEDOV (1993). *Orhon-Yenisey abideleri*. Bakü: Yazıçı.
- RYBATZKI, V. (1997). *Die Toñuquq-Inschrift*. Szeged.
- ŞİRİN, H. (2015). *Kül Tigin yazıtı -notlar-*. İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.
- ŞİRİN, H. (2016). *Eski Türk yazıtları söz varlığı incelemesi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- TEKİN, Ş. (2002). Eski Türkçe. In *Türk Dünyası El Kitabı İkinci Cilt Dil- Kültür- San'at* (3. baskı). Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü: 69-119.
- TEKİN, T. (1994). *Tunyukuk yazıtı. Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi (5)*. Ankara: Simurg Yayıncılık.
- TEKİN, T. (2006). *Orhon yazıtları* (2. baskı). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- TEKİN, T. (2016). *Orhon Türkçesi grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- TEKİN, T. (2017). *İrk Bitig eski Uygurca fal kitabı*. (2. baskı) N. Demir, E. Yılmaz (Haz.). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- THOMSEN, V. (1896). *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées (= Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, V)*, Helsingfors.
- THOMSEN, V (2011). *Orhon yazıtları araştırmaları* (2. Baskı). (Çev. Vedat Köken). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- TİMURTAŞ, F. K. (1994). *Eski Türkiye Türkçesi XV. yüzyıl gramer-metin-sözlük*. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi.
- ÜSTÜNOVA, K. (2008). *Türkiye Türkçesi ad işletimi (biçim bilgisi)*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları.