Zhanarka Ibrayeva* – candidate of philological sciences, associate professor of the Department of russian language and literature of the Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai, Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: igb1006@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1487-5513.

Поступила в редакцию 10.08.2025
Принята к публикации 26.09.2025

https://doi.org/10.53360/3080-3861-2025-3(3)-2
IRSTI: 16.21.49

N. Biray
Pamukkale University, Turkiye, Denizli
ORCİD: 0000-0002-4168-220X
e-mail: biraynergis@mail.ru

STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC AND FUNCTIONAL FEATURES OF THE WORDS «EMES», «EMEY», AND «EMEN» IN KAZAKH LANGUAGE

Abstract. The first known form of the complementary verb we see in Turkish texts today is «er-». It can be said that «er-/ir» is a typical form for Köktürk, Uighur, and Karakhanid Turkish. The verbal noun «er-» in Old Turkish is used in the forms of «er-» > «e-» or «ir-» > «i-» with the omission of the «r» sound in today's Turkish dialects. In today's Kazakh Turkish, the verb «er-» > «e-» is used. The negative version of the complementary verb «e-/i-» is met with words such as «not», «tügil», «tügül», «emes», etc. in different Turkish dialects. In Kazakh Turkish, the word «emes» is generally used, and the word «tugil» is rarely used to express negativity. However, it is also seen that different forms derived from the verb root «e-», such as the word «emes», are used. In the paper, in addition to the word «emes», which is one of the inflected forms of the verbal noun «e-» and used for the negative meaning in Kazakh Turkish, the words «eme» and «emen» are used with minor differences in meaning and function. Although the functions of these words in the texts they are used sometimes have the same meanings, they can sometimes undergo minor changes.

The way these three words are used in Kazakh Turkish, the places they are used, the meaning they add to the sentence or the language unions they are in, and whether they come from the same source constitute the main subject and research purpose of the paper. In this article, the functions of «emey» (not, of course), «emen» (not(im), never) and «emes» (not, -madık) in Kazakh Turkish are analyzed. It was also tried to be answered whether they are homophones and share the same root.

Keywords: kazakh Turkish, er- > e- verb, verbal noun, complementary verb, enclitics, modal, emes, emey, emen.

Introduction

The study of auxiliary verbs and their historical transformations provides important insights into the development of Turkic languages. Among these, the Old Turkic auxiliary verb er- «to be» occupies a central role, as it not only functioned as a copula but also developed into multiple grammaticalized forms across different Turkic dialects. In the course of time, the consonant -r- was dropped, giving rise to the shortened forms e- and i-, which are actively used in modern varieties. In Kazakh Turkish, this historical process has produced several derivatives of e-, notably emes, emen, and emey, each serving as a marker of negation but with nuanced semantic and functional distinctions.

The negative form emes corresponds closely to the Turkish değil and functions both as a predicative negator and as an analytical marker of verbal negation. The form emen, which appears to be a contracted version of emespin, carries a personal and emphatic dimension, often functioning as a first-person singular negative. Meanwhile, emey demonstrates semantic diversification: in one usage it expresses negation, while in another it conveys strong affirmation or certainty, similar to the meanings «of course» and «surely». This duality highlights the capacity of forms originating from the same root to diverge semantically and pragmatically.

By analyzing these forms in the context of Kazakh Turkish, the paper seeks to clarify their functions, their etymological relationship, and their place within the broader system of Turkic negation

strategies. The findings not only shed light on the dynamics of grammaticalization but also demonstrate the interplay between morphology, semantics, and syntax in shaping the structure of Kazakh Turkish.

Materials and methods

The present study is based on the examination of historical and contemporary linguistic materials that document the evolution and functional usage of the auxiliary verb er- and its derivatives in Kazakh Turkish. The primary sources include classical Old Turkic texts such as the Köktürk inscriptions, Uighur manuscripts, and Karakhanid works, where the auxiliary verb er-/ir- is frequently attested. In addition, later written traditions, including Chagatai Turkish and Kipchak language monuments, were considered to trace the phonological changes (er- > *e- / i-) and the development of negative forms such as ermez, emes, emen, and emey.

Modern Kazakh literary texts, proverbs, and oral traditions were also utilized as significant data sources. Examples from authors such as Mäshhūr Jüsip Köpeyev, M. Äwezov, Ä. Kekilbaev, and M. Shakhanov provided authentic contexts in which the words emes, emen, and emey appear. These data allowed for observing their semantic nuances, syntactic roles, and pragmatic functions in natural discourse.

The methodology employed is primarily descriptive and comparative. Descriptive analysis was used to categorize the forms of emes, emen, and emey according to their morphological structure and syntactic distribution. Comparative analysis was applied to identify similarities and differences in their functions across Turkic dialects, with reference to Kyrgyz, Altay, Nogai, Uzbek, and Turkish parallels. In addition, insights from established Turkological studies (Clauson, Gabain, Eckmann, Banguoğlu, Pekacar, Turışev, and others) were incorporated to ensure theoretical grounding.

By combining diachronic investigation with synchronic observation, the study seeks to highlight both the historical roots and contemporary functions of these negative forms in Kazakh Turkish.

Results and discussion

The auxiliary verb er- «to be» in Old Turkic has survived in modern Turkic dialects in the forms e- ~ i-. Through the addition of suffixes such as -di, -miş, -se, -ken, -mes ~ -ves ~ -bes, forms like edi/idi, emiş/imiş/nimes (ne imiş), ese/ise, eken/iken, emes/eves/ebes were produced and have been used in combination with both nouns and verbs.

According to Clauson, the auxiliary verb e- «to be» must always appear with a predicate (something, somewhere, etc.) and cannot be used independently in the meaning of «to exist». Rather, it generally occurs after participial forms of other verbs as an auxiliary. In the earliest periods, the verb was fully inflected; however, the consonant -r- began to be elided at an early stage, after which tense markers were attached in harmony with the preceding vowel. Some inflections appear without -r- [1].

Gabain states that the verb e-/ė-/i- (< er-/ir-mek) became partly or fully grammaticalized in Turkish and has functioned as an auxiliary verb since Old Turkic times. She emphasizes that this auxiliary verb is never used with adverbial verb forms but sometimes with finite verbs and frequently with nouns, thus attaching itself to all kinds of nominal categories [2].

Banguoğlu points out that the form erür disappeared, and only its grammaticalized derivatives have remained in usage. This development narrowed the scope of verbal inflection, leaving e- to survive in only four inflected forms.

Türk, in the conclusion of his study on the main auxiliary verb er- in Kutadgu Bilig, notes that the construction ermez was used with the meaning «not» [3]. Cumakunova argues that contemporary forms such as ey-, iy-, ir-, ar-, e-, a- derive from er-, and that forms such as eken, emes, ele, imiş are continuations of er-. She also remarks that the form er-mez > emes shows the negative function of the suffix -mez [4].

Eckmann states that in Chagatai Turkish the verb ė(r)- does not have a complete inflectional paradigm; the existing forms include ė(r)ken and ė(r)geç. In the negative present tense, forms such as ė(r)-mes mėn, ėrmen are also attested [5].

Karaağaç explains that the verb er- functioned as the main auxiliary verb in denoting both existence and events: when attached to words and phrases, it expressed existence (thus forming

nominal sentences), and when attached to clauses, it conveyed events, forming compound verb conjugations [6].

Şçerbak states that negation in nouns is expressed by particles such as tägül~dägül~däyül in Old Oghuz, deyil in Azerbaijani and Turkish, tügĭl in Bashkir and Tatar, dįl in Gagauz, tüyül~tül in Karachay-Balkar, tŭvīl in Nogai, däl in Turkmen, and dialectal forms such as zäl, läl, näl, säl; ermäs~emäs in Old Uzbek, emes in Kazakh and Kyrgyz, eves in Tuvan, ämes in Uzbek, emäs in Uighur, and çoğıl in Khakas [7]. He notes that the second group of negatives is derived from forms of definite past tense and definite future tense, providing the following examples: in Kazakh, kelmegen ve kelgen emes «he did not come»; in Nogai, barmayaķ ve barayaķ tŭvīl; in Kyrgyz, cazbaçuman ve cazçu emesmin «I did not write» [7].

Serebrennikov points out that as early as Old Turkic, auxiliary verbs such as er-, bol-, and occasionally tur- were combined with finite verbs, more often with nominal forms, and thus could attach to all types of nouns. He notes that the form derived with –maz is itself a noun, used as a predicate, as in the example: ol ögrünçümüz tükäti sözlägü täg ärmäz «our joy is not something that can be fully expressed» (i.e., our joy cannot be described) [8]. According to him, in Kipchak languages the negative form of the copula e- (<er-), namely ėmes «not, impossible», is highly widespread. He argues that the consonant -r- in er- was never an essential part of the root, and that the verb originally appeared in a single-vowel form e-. Furthermore, he stresses that the various present-tense forms of the auxiliary e- in the Turkic literary languages should be understood as the result of its functional overlap with other grammatical markers of present tense. Ultimately, e- was replaced by «existential» words like var, leading to its complete elimination from the present tense system [8].

Bodrogligeti, in A Grammar of Chagatay, describes the auxiliary er->e- as a verbal noun, citing forms such as erkän, ekän («existence, being») and the gerundial forms ergäç, egäç («as soon as, immediately, … once»). He demonstrates the use of the form ermäs in negative conjugations, presenting contrasts like erür män / ermäs män. He underlines that such forms are employed in the simple past, reported past, and conditional tenses [9].

İlhan discusses the negative forms ermes, emes, emestür, emes turur, ermestür, ermes turur, emphasizing that these are the negative conjugations of the auxiliary verb er-. He notes that the most frequent attested variants are ermez, ermes, emes [10].

Koç observes that the Old Turkic verb er- underwent the transformation er- > e- in Kazakh Turkish, yet in contemporary usage, e- does not function as a productive verb and cannot be freely conjugated like other verbs. Among its derivatives, emes has become established as the primary marker of negation («not») [11]. In modern Kazakh Turkish, emes functions as the negative of the substantive verb in the present tense, e.g., oquvşı emespin «I am not a student» [12].

According to Jankowski, the form emes belongs to the sphere of «historical commonality» and «shared historical literary language» among the Central Asian Turkic languages [13]. In Kazakh Turkish, the auxiliary verb er-/ir- appears in the form emes to express negation, functioning similarly to değil in Turkey Turkish. In this usage, the auxiliary has lost its lexical meaning and even diverged from its original phonological structure. Kazakh Grammar also notes that forms like emes have fossilized and are used analytically as negators of the copula. These forms are said to combine only with tense categories, e.g., aytqan emespin «I did not say», turaqtay alar emes «he could not endure», qol jetetin emes «not attainable» [14].

Tüymebayev and Sağidolla classify emes as the negative form of the auxiliary verb [15]. İlhan, in his book on negation, emphasizes that negation is expressed both structurally and semantically through two different pathways [10]. In some Turkic dialects (e.g., Altai), emes also serves to form negative pronouns: kem de emes «no one», qaçan da emes «never», ne de emes «nothing» [16].

In Kazakh Turkish, it is observed that three distinct forms-emes, emen, and emey-have developed from the inflected forms of the copula e-. This study examines the usage, functions, and developmental processes of these three forms, and investigates whether they are functionally equivalent and whether they share a common etymological origin.

The Usage and Meanings of Emes in Kazakh Turkish

The form emes derives from ér-mez, where the suffix is a nominal negative marker. Through the sound change –z > –s, the suffix –mas, –mes developed, and in some dialects, it further shifted through m- > -b > -p into –bAs, –pAs [17].

After nouns, meaning «not»: Erlik bilekte emes, jürekte (Proverb).

(Bravery is not in the arm but in the heart).

Bul ömir bir kün şattıq, bir kün eges, / Tirliktiñ barlıq mäni külkide emes, / Bolsın meyli köl jalğız, terek jalgız, / Meniñ jalğız boluvım mümkin emes.

(This life is one day joy, one day quarrel; / The whole meaning of existence is not in laughter; / Let the lake be alone, the poplar be alone, / Yet my being alone is not possible).

Conjugated with personal endings (emes+pin/siñ/piz/siñiz(der)) meaning «I am not/you are not/etc»:

Bötenim emes-siñ, erteñ tuvısım bolayın dep otırsıñ (B. Tilegenov, Aqqaynar).

(You are not a stranger; you are saying you will be my kin tomorrow).

With case markers, meaning «the one who is not» / «that which is not»:

Osı kez urı emesti urı ğıp qutırtıp, talay saqqa jügirtip, ağaş atqa mingizip jatqan päleli kez ğoy (M. Äwezov, Qaraş).

(At that time, it was a troubled period when one who was not a thief was turned into a thief, provoked, burdened with troubles, and set upon a wooden horse).

With finite verbs, expressing negation:

Daladağı davıstardıñ azınasuvınan tük estiler emes (Oral tradition).

(From the intensifying sounds of the steppe, nothing could be heard / nothing was audible).

Functioning as the equivalent of the negative suffix –mA-:

Kelinniñ osınşa abdırağış boluvı tekten-tek emes ekenin Altın şeşey de aytpay-aq sezgen sonda (Len. Jas).

(That the bride’s great anxiety was not for nothing, even Altın Mother could sense then without it being said).

Dereksiz abstraktsıyalıq uğımdardı da budan artıq jandandıruv, qolmen ustağanday etüv mümkin emes şığar (Ä. Täjibayev, Ömir).

(It must be impossible to make abstract notions without basis more vivid than this, to render them as tangible as if held by hand).

As a second negator after a negative verb, producing an affirmative meaning:

Künniñ munşa ajarsızdanuvı bir qısañşılıq tuvğızbay ketken emes (J. Ormanbaev, Jılqışılar). (The dimming of the sun certainly did cause difficulties, it cannot be said otherwise).

Atağı şıqqan zergerdiñ aldına mal tüspeydi emes… (Ä. Kekilbaev, Ürker).

(It is not that livestock never came before the famous jeweler… [i.e., of course they did]).

Used together with joq («not»), yielding an affirmative sense:

Respublikamızdıñ keybir oblıstarında ağaşsız, suvsız jerler de joq emes (Qaz. Ädeb.).

(In some regions of our Republic, there certainly are treeless, waterless places).

Can also take case markers:

–Erkegi, erkek emesi? –Äriyne, erkegi. Urğaşısı kerek emes. (Külkim.., 81).

(–The male one, not male? –Of course, male. The female one is not needed).

Onıñ bas bolğanımen, barlıq adamğa tän osaldıq – maqtansüygişтikten qur emestigin ayğaqtattı (Ä. Saraev, Bozqıraw).

(Although he was the head, it proved that the weaknesses inherent to all people – such as pride and boastfulness—were not absent in him either).

The Usage and Meanings of Emen in Kazakh Turkish

Eckmann, when discussing the present/continuous tense forms of the verb ér-, provides examples such as ér-mes mén and érmen; érmes sén, érmeng [5]. From this, we may infer a contraction and lexicalization process from ér-mes mén > érmen.

According to Turışev, the auxiliary word emen (er+me+n) and emey (er+me+y) are derived from the verb e- (er-) through the negative suffix –ma/-me and became fixed forms. These auxiliaries, emen and emey, do not convey any temporal meaning to the words they attach to (Iskakov A.); they add only grammatical value, do not accept tense markers, and function as fossilized mediators of negation [18].

S. Isayev notes that the future participle suffix –man, -men, -ban, -ben, -pan, -pen was combined with the auxiliary verb e- (emen). K. Jubanov also shows the earlier paradigm of er- as: erdi, erken, ermes; now as: edi, eken, emes. This suggests that emen, emey are shortened forms of the negative suffix of the presumptive future tense [18].

As a negating form, emen frequently appears in the works of M.J. Köpeyev, often in combination with participles in -ğan/-gen. For example:

Ketedi onı tağı birev alıp, / Qaltağa körgen emen aqşa salıp.

(Then someone else takes it, / but I have never seen him put the money into his pocket).

The auxiliary emen also occurs with nouns:

Han da emen, töre de emen, qoja da emen; / Kerüvenmin el aralap mal alısqan (Meşhur Jüsip).

(I am not a khan, not a noble, not a cleric; / I am a caravaner who travels across the land trading goods).

It further combines with adjectives:

Eşkimnen artıq emen meniñ özim, / Ayaq-qol, jurtpen birdey, qulaq-közim (Meşhur Jüsip).

(I am no different from anyone; / My hands and feet, my ears and eyes are the same as the people's) [18].

Abbreviated forms of personal endings are often attached to participles. For instance, the negative forms of -mın/-min are shortened and used as barğam, kelgem, sürgem, jürgem. In this respect, the variants negen/degen also appear. They are generally used in the negative singular form of verbs such as ökinbeymin (ökinben) «I do not regret», ayamaymın (ayaman) «I do not spare», jibimeymin (jibimen) «I do not release». These forms are not used in other inflections, but when spoken with strong emphasis and forceful intonation, they convey emotional nuance and a modal meaning.

Thus, there is not much difference in meaning between the auxiliaries emen and emey. These are old forms. The negative form emes shows person-related variations such as emes, emey, emegende. The participial present suffix -r was replaced by -s, added after the negative suffix -ma: e-me-s. When the adverbial suffix -y is added to this negative form, the auxiliary emey is derived [18].

The author states that the word emen is a shortened form of the conjugated structure emespin and is used with the meaning «–me-dim / I did not» [18]. As for emes, it is explained as the negative participial form of the auxiliary verb e- and functions with the meaning «not» [18].

After nouns, meaning «not»:

İyt emen jönin tappay lağarğa (Mäshhūr Jüsip/ÄP).

(I am not a dog to return to prison without finding my way.)

Xan da emen, töre de emen, qoja da emen, / Kerüvenmin el aralap mal alısqan (Mäshhūr Jüsip/ÄP).

(I am not a khan, not a noble, not a cleric; / I am a caravaner who travels among the people trading goods.)

Eşkimnen artıq emen meniñ özim (Mäshhūr Jüsip/ÄP).

(I am not greater than anyone, I am no different from others.)

With -gen + emen, expressing «have not …, never …-miş/di-º»:

Men tayaqtı molladan jegen emen (Mäshhūr Jüsip/ÄP).

(I have never been beaten by the mullah / I have not eaten the stick from the mullah.)

Ketedi onı tağı birev alıp, / Qaltağa körgen emen aqşa salıp (Mäshhūr Jüsip/ÄP).

(Then someone else takes it, / but I have never seen him put the money into his pocket [I have not seen / I am not one who has seen].)

With -Ar emen, expressing the meaning of «will not, shall not»:

Qattı uyalttı; bedelin tüsire, abıroysız etti. Joq, umıtar men emen (M. Äwezov, Şığ. /ÄP).

(It deeply shamed me; it lowered my dignity, disgraced me. No, I shall not forget.)

The Usage and Meanings of Emey in Kazakh Turkish

Eckmann notes that the negative forms of the converbial suffixes -a, -e, -y, and -p are formed with -ma-y, -me-y [5]. In this context, the form -mA-yın should also be considered.

According to Bodrogligeti, the suffix –may/-mäy is used as the negative of the converbs -a, -e, -p [9]. When used adverbially, it conveys modal or conditional meaning. It is also employed «to form the negative mood of the present perfect tense»: kör-mäy tur biz («we have not seen yet») [9]. Another converbal suffix functioning equivalently is –mayın/-mäyin, which also carries modal and conditional functions [9].

Pekacar, in his article On the Word Emey in Kyrgyz and Altay Turkish, discusses the word emey as used in various senses in these dialects. He points out that in both Kyrgyz and Altay Turkish, the word carries the meanings «not», «of course», «certainly». He emphasizes that this form does not appear in other Turkic written languages. In Kyrgyz Turkish, emey has two distinct functions: (1) meaning «not», and (2) meaning «of course, certainly, it will (surely) be so». In Altay Turkish, however, it conveys meanings such as «not, perhaps», functioning as a rhetorical confirmation rather than a genuine question. In this sense, it does not express doubt but rather full certainty and decisiveness on the part of the speaker.

Turışev also defines the meaning of emey as «at least», «nearly, almost» [18]. While the word can sometimes stand alone with the meaning «not», it is more frequently used in the form emey nemene, meaning «if not … then what…?» [18].

After nouns, with two possible functions: (1) ‘not, not but rather’ / ‘if not … then what’; (2) ‘of course, certainly’

In this construction, the phrase değil de ne(dir) («if not … then what») also implies meanings such as «of course» or «definitely». Thus, examples can be grouped together:

Men emey sen be? Qadam basqan sayın Şekerdiñ qarğısına uşırap jürgen kim? Sen emey men be?

(Is it not me but you? With every step, who is it that falls under Şeker’s curse? Is it you, not me?)

Qazaqta: «E-e, men seniñ ağayınıñ emey, alaşıñ ba edim» – degen söz «düşpanıñ ba edim» degen sözdiñ mänisinde jüredi (S. Seyfullin, Şığ./ÄP).

(In Kazakh usage: «Eee, was I not your relative but from another clan?» actually carries the sense of «Was I your enemy?»)

Avzıña salğan mäsväk ağaş emey arqan ba? (QÄTS).

(That which you put in your mouth, is it not a miswak stick but a rope?)

Oyın emey bu jalğan şın deymisiñ, / Qalsañ biyge şığa almay ündeymisiñ (Mäshhūr Jüsip/ÄP).

(Is this not a game—would you call this false world true? / If you cannot rise to leadership, will you call out?)

After nouns in the forms emey nemene and emey kim, it conveys the meaning of «if not … then what», thereby expressing certainty, emphasis, or inevitability.

Alıstan qızıl körinse, / Manat emey nemene, / Köterilip uşqan soñ, / Qanat emey nemene, / Eki jaksı bas kosa, / Sanat emey nemene! (Buqar/ÄP).

(If from afar gold shines, is it not surely a manat? / Since it takes off and flies, is it not surely a wing? / When two noble people join together, is it not certainly wisdom?)

Eki kisi urssa, / Ağat emey nemene! / Eki jaqsı söylesse, – / Sağat emey nemene! / Mingen atın boldırmay, / Märeli jerge jetkizse, / Qanat emey nemene! (Musa Saqqulaq/ÄP).

(When two men fight, is it not certainly a mistake? / When two noble men converse, is it not surely a clock (a precise measure)? / If the horse ridden reaches the finish line without tiring, is it not surely winged?)

… bizdiñ ömir jasımızdı urlap jürgen osılar emey, kim? (Mäshhūr Jüsip/ÄP).

(… are not those who steal our youth precisely them? Of course, it is they!)

With -ĞAn/-ĞAnI emey nemene, it strengthens the sense of «not, if not … then certainly»:

Oñbağan emey nemene – / Ötirik sözge aldanıp (Äy Mahambet joldasım/ÄP).

(Is it not surely a disgrace –/ to be deceived by false words?)

Endeşe, kiyeli qazaq jeriniñ topırağın künde tabanımen basıp, avasın jutqanına mise tutpay, «suv işken qudığına tükirgen» Aleksey Gonçarov mırzanıñ «jañıluvı» savdıñ tamağın işip, avruvdıñ sözin söylegeni emey, nemene? (Jas Alaş).

(Thus, despite treading daily upon the sacred Kazakh land and breathing its air, Aleksey Goncharov's «error», as one who spat into the well he drank from, was nothing other than eating the bread of the healthy and speaking the words of the sick – is this not precisely the case?)

Endi Qurtqa sasadı, / Betinen qanı qaşadı, / Oñ etegin basadı / Sasqan emey nemene, / Aş küzendey bügildi, / Qurtqa jannan tüñildi (Qobılandı Batır/ÄP).

(Now Qurtqa was frightened, / The color drained from her face, / She pressed upon her skirt, / Was she not frightened? / She bent like a hungry marten, / Qurtqa lost all hope.)

In expressions such as bar emey and ol emey, the meaning of «certainly, of course» becomes even stronger:

–Üyiñizde qurığanda radio bar şığar?

–Bar emey! [25].

(–Surely you must have at least a radio at home? / –Of course, I do!)

–Bar ma? / –Bar emey. [26].

(–Is there? / –Of course, there is.)

–Ol qazir qayda? Bar ma? / –Bar emey. Quday da kerek qılmaytın adamdar boladı. [26].

(–Where is he now? Is he there? / –Of course, he is. There are even people whom God Himself does not deem necessary.)

Sonda da közi sañılavğa qadaluvda edi. Sırtqı esik aşıla berdi… Sonıñ qalpağı… Kelipti… Jetipti… Kim boluvşı edi ol emey? [27].

(Yet his gaze remained fixed on a single point. The outer door suddenly opened… His cap… He had come… He had arrived… Who else could it be, if not him? Of course, it was he!)

Conclusion

The auxiliary verb er->e- transfers the nominal element it accompanies into the verbal category without causing a semantic change and without adding an aspect of motion description within the agglutinative system of Turkish. Based on the examples examined, the following conclusions may be drawn concerning its functions and meanings:

The verb e- (er->e-) functions as the main auxiliary verb expressing existence and events. By attaching to the end of words or word groups, it forms nominal sentences; by appearing at the end of clauses, it produces compound verb conjugations. The form emes corresponds to the meaning of «not», as in Turkey Turkish değil, and functions like the negative derivational suffix -mA-. These forms are fossilized. It also serves analytically as a word denoting verbal negation.

The word emen is the shortened form of the conjugated structure emespin. It represents the 1st person singular negative form of the auxiliary verb e- and is used with the meaning «not». Like emes, it conveys the sense of «not» and functions similarly to the negative suffix -mA-.

The word emey carries two meanings: (1) «not / if not … then what», and (2) «certainly, of course». Thus, although structurally the same, it has undergone fossilization and semantic change, acquiring two distinct functions. The «not» meaning is used with words and word groups like emes and emen to express negation. This use often appears in rhetorical or confirmative questions, expecting the interlocutor to acknowledge the assertion based on evidence. Its second meaning, «certainly, of course, surely», does not imply interrogation but rather expresses strong assertion. In this function, it may appropriately be described as an «enclitic» used for intensification. This usage is comparable to the functions noted by Pekacar in Kyrgyz and Altay Turkish.

Taken together, the data suggest that emes, emen, and emey originate from the same root. All three derive from the verb e-, and while they share semantic commonalities, emey, with its meaning of «certainly, of course, surely», demonstrates that words derived from the same root may develop

into parallel structures with distinct semantic and functional roles. The first type of emey denotes «not», formed with the verb root e- plus the negative derivational suffix -mA- and the present tense suffix -y. The second type, conveying «certainly, of course, surely», represents the form of e- with the suffix -mAy. In particular, its usage in expressions such as bar emey and ol emey suggests that over time emey may assume a modal function in Kazakh Turkish, as it does in Altay and Kyrgyz Turkish.

References

1. Clauson G. An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish. Oxford, 1972. – 988 p.
2. Gabain A.M. von Grammar of Old Turkic. Transl. M. Akalın. Ankara: TDK Press, 1988. – 344 p.
3. Türk V. The main auxiliary verb *er-* in Turkish with reference to Kutadgu Bilig. Proceedings of the 5th International Turkish Language Congress II (20-26 September 2004). Ankara: TDK Press, 2004. – P. 2993-3006.
4. Cumakunova G. The development of the verb *i-* in Kyrgyz. Proceedings of the 3rd International Turkish Language Congress, 1996. Ankara: TDK Press, 1999. – P. 233-237.
5. Eckmann J. Manual of Chagatai / transl. G. Karaağaç. – Istanbul: Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Press, 1988.
6. Karaağaç G. Turkish grammar. – 2nd ed. – Ankara: Akçağ Publishing, 2013.
7. Şçerbak A.M. Essays on comparative morphology of the Turkic languages / transl. Y. Karasoy, N. Hacızade, M. Gülmez. – Ankara: TDK Press, 2016. – 512 p.
8. Serebrennikov B. A., Gadjieva N. Z. Comparative historical grammar of the Turkic written languages / transl. T. Hacıyev, M. Öner. – Ankara: TDK Press, 2011. – 392 p.
9. Bodrogligeti A. J. E. A grammar of Chagatay. – Munich: Lincom Europa, 2001. – 590 p.
10. İlhan N. Negation in the Turkish language. – Istanbul: Kesit Publishing, 2017. – 280 p.
11. Koç K., Oğuz D. Kazakh Turkish grammar. – Ankara: Gazi Bookstore, 2004. – 512 p.
12. Biray N., Ayan E., Ercilasun G. K. Contemporary Kazakh Turkish. – Istanbul: Bilge Culture-Art Publishing, 2015. – 336 p.
13. Jankowski H. I and some common features of Central Asian Turkic languages // Journal of Turkology. – 2010. – Vol. 17. – №2. – P. 131-142.
14. Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan; A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics. Kazakh grammar: Phonetics, word formation, morphology, syntax. – Astana, 2002. – 784 p.
15. Tüymebayev J., Sağidolla G. Comparative descriptive grammar of Kazakh and Turkic languages (Phonetics–Morphology). – Astana, 2016. – 456 p.
16. Baskakov N. A. Altai language // Languages of the World: Turkic Languages. – Bishkek: Kyrgyzstan Publishing House, 1997. – P. 179-187.
17. Eraslan K. Nominal verbs in Old Turkic. – Istanbul: Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Press, 1980. – 120 p.
18. Turışev A. Q. History of the Kazakh literary language (Methodological guide). – Pavlodar: S. Toraighyrov Pavlodar State University, 2010. – 200 p.
19. Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Kazakhstan; Ministry of Education and Science; A. Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics. Dictionary of the Kazakh literary language: in 15 vols. – Almaty, 2011.
20. Baydar E. A. S. On the verb i- // TÜRÜK: International Journal of Language, Literature and Folklore Studies. – 2016. – Vol. 4. – №7. – P. 164-171.
21. Koç K. The incomplete auxiliary verb emes in Modern Kazakh and Northeastern Turkic languages // Turkologiya. – 2019. – №1. – P. 80-90.
22. Adebiportal.kz (source of examples).
23. Qamba.info/site/book.
24. Inform.kz.
25. Old.egemen.kz.
26. Qamba.info.
27. Bilim-all.kz. URL: http://bilim-all.kz/article/7176

N. Biray
Pamukkale University, Түркия, Денизли қ.
ORCİD: 0000-0002-4168-220X
e-mail: biraynergis@mail.ru

ҚАЗАҚ ТІЛІНДЕГІ «EMES», «EMEY» ЖӘНЕ «EMEN» СӨЗДЕРІНІҢ ҚҰРЫЛЫМДЫҚ-СЕМАНТИКАЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ ФУНКЦИОНАЛДЫҚ ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ

Аңдатпа. Түркі мәтіндерінде кездесетін көмекші етістіктің ең көне түрі – er- етістігі. Er-/ir- тұлғасы Көне түркі, Ұйғыр және Қараханид кезеңдеріне тән қалып деп айтуға болады. Көне түркідегі er- есімше етістігі қазіргі түркі тілдерінде r дауыссыз дыбысының түсіп қалуы нәтижесінде er- > e-, ir- > i- тұлғаларында қолданылған. Қазіргі қазақ тілінде er- > e- формасы қолданылады. E-/i- көмекші етістігінің болымсыз түрі әртүрлі түркі тілдерінде değil, tügil, tügül, emes сияқты сөздер арқылы жасалады. Қазақ тілінде негізінен emes сөзі қолданылады, ал tügil сирек қолданылады. Сонымен бірге e- түбірінен туындаған басқа формалар да қолданылады. Бұл мақалада қазақ тілінде болымсыздық мағынасын беретін emes сөзінен бөлек, мағынасы мен қызметінде шағын айырмашылықтары бар emey және emen сөздері қарастырылады. Бұл сөздердің мәтіндерде қолданылу қызметтері кейде бірдей болса, кейде аздаған өзгерістерге ұшырайды. Қазақ тілінде қолданылатын осы үш сөздің жұмсалу ерекшеліктері, қолданылу орны, сөйлемге немесе тілдік бірліктерге үстейтін мағынасы және бір түбірден шыққан-шықпағаны зерттеу жұмысының негізгі мақсаты болып табылады. Бұл мақалада қазақ тіліндегі emey («емес, әрине»), emen («емеспін, ешқашан») және emes («емес, -мадық») сөздерінің қызметтері талданып, олардың бір түбірден таралғандығы және омофон болып-болмайтындығы анықталды.

Тірек сөздер: қазақ тілі, er- > e- етістігі, есімше, көмекші етістік, энклитика, модальдық, emes, emey, emen.

N. Biray
Pamukkale University, Турция, г. Денизли
ORCID: 0000-0002-4168-220x
e-mail: biraynergis@mail.ru

СТРУКТУРНО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ И ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СЛОВ «EMES», «EMEY» И «EMEN» В КАЗАХСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Аннотация. Самая ранняя форма вспомогательного глагола, встречающаяся в тюркских текстах, – это глагол er-. Формы er-/ir- можно считать типичными для орхоно-енисейского, уйгурского и караханидского периодов. В древнетюркском языке именная форма er- в современных тюркских диалектах используется в виде er- > e- и ir- > i- в результате выпадения согласного r. В современном казахском языке употребляется форма er- > e-. Отрицательная форма вспомогательного глагола e-/i- выражается в разных тюркских диалектах словами değil, tügil, tügül, emes и др. В казахском языке в основном используется слово emes, а слово tügil встречается редко. Наряду с этим фиксируются и другие формы, образованные от корня e-. В данной статье, помимо слова emes, являющегося одной из форм отрицания в казахском языке, рассматриваются также слова emey и emen, которые употребляются с небольшими различиями в значении и функции. Их употребление в текстах иногда совпадает, но иногда имеет определённые оттенки различий. Основной целью исследования является выявление способов употребления этих трёх слов, их функций, семантического вклада в предложение, а также определение их общего или различного происхождения. В статье анализируются функции слов emey («не, конечно»), emen («не(я), никогда») и emes («не, -мадик») в казахском языке. Также ставится вопрос о том, являются ли они омофонами и происходят ли из одного корня.

Ключевые слова: казахский язык, er- > e- глагол, именной глагол, вспомогательный глагол, энклитики, модальность, emes, emey, emen.

Автор туралы мәлімет

Biray Nergis – филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Түркия, Денизли қ., Памуккале университеті, e-mail: biraynergis@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-4168-220X.

Сведения об авторе

Biray Nergis – доктор филологических наук, профессор, Памуккале университет, Турция, г. Денизли, e-mail: biraynergis@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-4168-220X.

Information about author

Biray Nergis – doctor of Sciences, Professor, Department of Contemporary Turkic Dialects and Literatures, Pamukkale University, Turkiye, Denizli. e-mail: biraynergis@mail.ru, ORCID: 0000-0002-4168-220X.

Received 29.07.2025
Accepted 30.09.2025

https://doi.org/10.53360/3080-3861-2025-3(3)-3
ҒТАМР: 16.21.49

Ж.У. Калимова
Шәкәрім университеті,
071412, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей қ., Глинка к-сі, 20 А
ORCID: 0000-0001-8391-8340
e-mail: zhibek_15_10@mail.ru

ҚАЗАҚ ЖӘНЕ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛДЕРІНДЕГІ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМДЕРДІҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ-МӘДЕНИ ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ

Аңдатпа. Мақалада құрылымы тұрғысынан туыстас емес әр тектес тілдер тобына жататын қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі фразеологизмдердің ұлттық-мәдени ерекшеліктері лингвистикалық мәдениеттану ғылымы шеңберінде жан-жақты қарастырылды. Атап айтқанда, тіл мен мәдениеттің арақатынасын саралай отырып, қазақ және ағылшын халықтарының әр кезеңдегі тұрмыстық, тарихи-әлеуметтік және танымдық тәжірибесі негізінде екі тілдегі тұрақты сөз тіркестерінің жасалу жолдары, тілдегі қалыптасу жағдайы сипатталып, мағыналық және тақырыптық топтарға жіктеліп, лингвомәдени талдау жасалды.

Аталмыш мақалада тілдегі тұрақты сөз тіркестерінің мағыналық астарында халықтың өткен тарихының қыр-сыры, салт-дәстүрі, әдет-ғұрпы, дүниетанымы толық көрініс табатындығы және осы көрсетілген факторларды саралай отырып, қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі фразеологизмдердің ұлттық-мәдени ерекшеліктері сипатталып, олардың ұқсастығы мен айырмашылықтары қарастырылғандығы сөз болады.

Тіл-тілдегі фразеологизмдерді салыстырмалы-салғастырмалы әдісті пайдалана отырып, лингвистикалық мәдениеттану аясында зерттеудің маңызы аса зор. Өйткені ұлттық мәдениет, ұлттық болмыс, тіл мен діл тәрізді ұғымдарды тоғыстыратын ұлттық тілдің табиғатын тілдің өзіндік ішкі заңдылықтыры негізінде ғана танып-білу жеткіліксіз. Осыған орай тілдегі тұрақты тіркестердің тылсым құпиясы басқа да ғылым салаларымен (антропология, психология, мифология, этнография, мәдениеттану т.б.) тығыз қарым-қатынас, сабақтастықта зерттеу нәтижесінде мүмкін болады.

Қазіргі таңдағы тіл білімі ғылымының маңызды мақсаттарының бірі – әр тілдің өзіндік ұлттық-мәдени ерекшеліктерін айқындау үшін кешенді әрі жүйелі түрде жаңа бағыттағы зерттеу жұмыстарын жүргізуді жалғастыру. Мақалада осы аталған өзекті мәселелер біршама тиянақты баяндалған.

Мақаламен жұмыс жасау үрдісінде лингвистикалық әдістердің бірнеше түрі, атап айтқанда, сипаттамалы немесе синхрондық әдіс, салыстырмалы-салғастырмалы әдіс, ғылыми талдаудың лингво-мәдени және тарихи-этимологиялық талдау, фактілік материалдарды іріктеп алу және жүйелеу әдістері қолданылды.

Қазақ тілінің түрлі салалары бойынша өзекті мәселелерді туыстас немесе туыстас емес шет тілдермен салыстыра немесе салғастыра зерттеуді әрі қарай дамытудың, жетілдірудің және жақсартудың ана тіліміздің қолданылу шеңберін кеңейтіп, мәртебесінің үстем болуына әсері мол болатыны анық.

Тірек сөздер: лингвистикалық мәдениеттану, фразеологизмдер, ұлттық-мәдени ерекшеліктер, ұлттық мәдениет, салт-дәстүр.

Кіріспе

Мақалада зерттеу нысаны ретінде қазақ және ағылшын тілдерінде ұлттық мәдениет пен тіл сабақтастығы негізінде пайда болған фразеологизмдерді таңдау себебіміз бұрынғы тіл білімі саласындағы қалыптасқан әдеттегі ғылыми зерттеулер мен көзқарастардың орнына, жаңа танымдық бағыттар мен ғылыми ізденістер пайда болды. Сонымен қатар, кейінгі жылдары тіл білімінің лингвистикалық мәдениеттану саласына ерекше көңіл бөлініп, мәдениет пен тіл, мәдениет пен ұлт арасындағы байланыс, мәдениет пен әдет-ғұрып ара қатынастарын жете түсіну, түрлі қыр-сырларын жан-жақты сипаттау, айқындау бағытында ғылыми зерттеулердің жаңа тәсілдері мен тың нысандары қолға алына бастады.