



Section 2. General philology and linguistics

DOI:10.29013/EJLL-26-3-30-38



FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT STAGES OF COMPLEX SUBORDINATE SENTENCES IN TURKIC LANGUAGES. (BASED ON AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGE)

Akhmadova Faqana Mammadali kyzy¹

¹ PhD student in Philology, Linguistics Institute named after
I.Nasimi of Azerbaijan National Academt of Sciences

Cite: Akhmadova F.M. (2026). *Formation and Development Stages of Complex Subordinate Sentences in Turkic Languages. (based on Azerbaijani language).* European Journal of Literature and Linguistics 2026, No 3. <https://doi.org/10.29013/EJLL-26-3-30-38>

Abstract

The article examines the formation and the main stages in the development of complex subordinate sentences in the Turkic languages, based on Azerbaijani as one of the most representative languages of the Oghuz group. It explores the historical evolution of the means of expressing subordination – from intonational patterns and asyndetic structures to the formation of a developed system of conjunctions, connective words, morphological markers, and functional elements. The role of intonation, verbal morphological forms, affixes, and functional parts of speech in the emergence and structural complication of complex subordinate constructions is analyzed. Special attention is given to controversial issues concerning the syntactic status of participial and converbal constructions within the system of subordinate clauses, particularly their relation to predicative structures and the problem of distinguishing between phrase syntax and sentence syntax. The functioning of the conjunction *ki*, the processes of its grammaticalization, semantic differentiation, and its role in establishing subordinate relations in various types of complex subordinate sentences are examined in detail. On the basis of comparative-typological and historical-comparative analysis, the study identifies both common and distinctive features of complex subordinate structures in Azerbaijani and other Turkic languages, and traces the interrelation between the development of subordination and the evolution of the written literary norm. It is demonstrated that the increasing structural complexity of complex subordinate sentences is directly connected with the development of abstract thinking, the expansion of functional styles, and the refinement of syntactic means of text organization, as well as with the general tendency toward structural standardization and normalization of the literary language in historical perspective. The obtained results make it possible to clarify the typological position of Azerbaijani within the system of Turkic languages in terms of the development of subordinate syntactic structures. The study also outlines

перспектив for further research in the field of historical syntax and grammaticalization processes in the Turkic languages.

Keywords: *Turkic languages, Azerbaijani language, complex subordinate sentence, subordination, syntax, grammaticalization, conjunction ki, sentence typology, historical development of syntax*

Introduction

In the development of the language system, syntactic structure occupies a special place, and one of its most complex forms is the complex sentence with subordination. This sentence type reflects not only the structural richness of a language, but also serves as an important indicator of the level of logical reasoning, abstract thinking, and the development of the written literary language. From this perspective, “determining the status and boundaries of complex subordinate sentences within syntax has consistently remained a relevant issue in linguistics (Musaoğlu, M., 2005). Researchers rightly note that one of the central problems of syntax is precisely the delimitation and proper classification of simple and complex sentences, particularly complex subordinate constructions (Habibova K. A., 2009, p. 18). This position is also confirmed in modern comparative syntax, where the classification of subordinate clauses is regarded as “one of the most controversial issues in syntactic theory,” and many existing classification systems are considered flawed due to their lack of a unified underlying principle (Yunusov, D., & Arabov, V., 2015, p. 185).

It is well known that in the early stages of language development, simple sentences and coordinate complex sentences predominated, whereas complex subordinate sentences emerged at later stages, largely in parallel with the formation of the written literary language. The historical development of the Turkic languages demonstrates that various formal means were formed to express relations of subordination, resulting in the emergence of structurally rich models of subordinate constructions. It has been noted in particular that in Turkic languages a “relatively large set of formal types is available” for the realization of subordinate clauses, and this formal diversity constitutes an important indicator of the language’s historical evolution (Tüngüç Çelik K., 2020, p. 16). At the same time, it is emphasized that each complex syntactic unit can be realized in

different structural variants within the paradigm of complex sentences, which clearly demonstrates the developmental dynamics of subordinate constructions (Yunusov, D., & Arabov, V., 2015, p. 185).

In the earliest periods, relations of subordination were primarily expressed through intonation: later, however, the development of specific syntactic means – such as conjunctions, connective words, particles, and affixes – created the conditions for the systematic formation of this sentence type. In Azerbaijani, the structure of complex subordinate sentences, the interrelation of their components, and the role of connective devices have been interpreted from various theoretical perspectives in linguistic scholarship. In this respect, relations of subordination are not viewed as a fixed and immutable mechanism, but rather as a dynamic syntactic system that has undergone formal and semantic variation throughout historical development (Yunusov, D., & Arabov, V., 2015).

The issue of whether participial and converbal constructions should be treated as subordinate clauses remains one of the most controversial problems in Turkology. Research has shown that such constructions do not fully possess the structural and functional properties of independent subordinate clauses; rather, they function more as extended constituents of a simple sentence. Studies conducted on the basis of Azerbaijani data have scientifically demonstrated that participial, converbal, and infinitival constructions are not subordinate clauses within compound or complex sentences, but instead serve as expanding components of the simple sentence (Musaoğlu, M., 2005). This approach is consistent with contemporary syntactic conceptions that view subordination as a gradable phenomenon and acknowledge the existence of intermediate stages between subordinate clauses and word combinations (Yunusov, D., & Arabov, V., 2015).

This problem is not merely terminological in nature; it is of fundamental importance for accurately determining the boundaries be-

tween sentence syntax and the syntax of word combinations. For this reason, the study of the structural-semantic and functional properties of complex subordinate sentences is regarded as one of the central directions of modern syntactic research. Classifications based on the structure, meaning, and function of complex subordinate sentences have played a significant role in the development of syntactic theory in Azerbaijani linguistics (Musaoğlu, M., 2005).

Methods and Materials

The methodological foundation of the research is based on systemic and functional approaches widely accepted in contemporary linguistics. In order to determine the syntactic nature and structural characteristics of complex subordinate sentences, the descriptive method was employed. Through this method, the grammatical relations between the main and subordinate clauses, the means of expressing subordination, and the functional role of connective devices were consistently analyzed.

In addition, the structural-semantic analysis method was applied to investigate the semantic relations between the components of complex subordinate sentences, the semantic load of subordinate clauses, and the ways in which they function in relation to the main clause. Particular attention was devoted to the syntactic status of participial and verbal constructions, and their similarities and differences with subordinate clauses were identified through analytical examination.

The study also made use of historical-comparative and comparative-typological methods. These methods enabled the tracing of the emergence and developmental stages of complex subordinate sentences, as well as the comparison of Azerbaijani data with syntactic facts from other Turkic languages. As a result, the development and functional differentiation of connective devices in the formation of complex subordinate constructions were evaluated within a broader Common Turkic context.

The empirical base of the research consists of written sources representing various stages in the development of the Azerbaijani literary language, samples of classical poetry, contemporary language data, and scholarly studies

devoted to the problem of complex subordinate sentences. The selected materials were systematized and subjected to analysis; the findings were subsequently generalized and used in formulating theoretical conclusions.

Result

The complex subordinate sentence represents the final stage in the development of linguistic structure. By this, we mean that in any given language, the coordinate complex sentence historically preceded the subordinate complex sentence: simple sentences were linked to one another by means of intonation, thereby forming coordinate constructions. In fact, in the earliest periods, subordinate complex sentences – like coordinate ones – also arose solely through the intonational combination of simple sentences (Habibova K., 2011, p. 80), that is, through the subordination of one sentence to another by intonational means.

Auxiliary words and functional parts of speech emerged only at later stages of language development, since these – especially conjunctions – constitute more complex and abstract phenomena of thought, products of highly developed abstract reasoning. The existence and degree of development of complex subordinate sentences serve as indicators of a language's cultural and developmental level. From this perspective, the Turkic languages, and particularly Azerbaijani, may be regarded as among the most highly developed languages of the world.

It should also be noted that the emergence and development of complex subordinate sentences are closely connected with the formation and evolution of the written literary language; in spoken discourse and oral literary language, such constructions are not used as extensively. For this reason, Q.Kazimov writes: "Prior to the formation of the written literary language, intonation, a limited group of connective words, and the suffix *-sa/-sə* were more actively employed to link the components of a complex subordinate sentence; in later periods, connective words and a number of nationally borrowed conjunctions expanded their function. Therefore, connective devices should be studied together with subordinate clauses" (Kazimov G., 2000, p.12).

Discussing the historical development of the means that connect the components of complex subordinate sentences in Azerbaijani, Q.Kazimov writes: "...as in the modern Azerbaijani literary language, historically subordinate clauses are connected to the main clause in three types of relations:

a) A group of subordinate clauses functions in the position of a sentence element that is not overtly expressed in the main clause, thereby replacing it. Such clauses, in terms of function, resemble sentence constituents and answer one of the questions typically associated with them; however, in terms of structure, they differ from them completely" (Kazimov G., 2019, p. 160). For illustration, let us consider the following examples:

(1) *Həq bilir kim, ta əbəd könlümdə vardır ol həvəs* (Khatayi) ("God knows that in my heart that desire exists for eternity.")

(2) *Xoşdur ki, bulam vüsala fürsət* (Fuzuli) ("It is pleasing that I attain the chance of reunion.")

In the example (1) "*Həq bilir*" ("God knows") in the main clause does not contain an explicit object answering the questions *nə? nəyi?* (what? what does He know?); however, the answer to this question is expressed by the second clause – "*ta əbəd könlümdə vardır ol həvəs*" ("that this longing will remain in my heart forever").

In the second example, the predicate "*xoşdur*" ("It is pleasant") lacks an overt subject answering the question *nə?* (what?); yet this function is fulfilled by the subordinate clause following the conjunction "*ki*" – "*bulam vüsala fürsət*" ("that I may find the opportunity for union").

In both examples, the subordinate clauses legitimately function in place of sentence constituents. Undoubtedly, they can quite easily assume the form of a sentence element. When examining the language of historical monuments, it becomes evident that the use of subordinate clauses as substitutes for particular sentence elements has an ancient history. This, in turn, provides grounds for asserting that complex subordinate sentences once emerged as a result of relatively free adjacency relations between clauses.

b) The second group of subordinate clauses differs from the first in terms of its inter-

nal relations. Here, the main clause actually contains a substitute element – a demonstrative pronoun – which answers the required question; therefore, the first clause appears formally complete. However, despite this formal completeness, the meaning remains incomplete or implicit, since the pronoun functioning as a sentence element points to something or someone, yet its real content is not explicitly expressed. In order to overcome this semantic opacity or abstraction, the subordinate clause becomes the real semantic content of the pronoun and provides its explanation. Thus, the subordinate clause does not simply complete the main clause as a whole, but rather serves as the concrete expression of a specific element within it that remains semantically indeterminate.

For illustration, let us consider the following examples:

(3) *Biz ol quşuz ki, dam danəmizdir* (Khatayi) (We are that bird whose grain is the snare).

(4) *Hakim oldur ki, onun olmaya zatında təmə* (Fuzuli) (A true ruler is the one who has no greed in his nature), etc.

In the examples provided, the pronouns "*ol*" and "*oldur*" acquire their real, concrete semantic content within the subordinate clauses.

c) The third group of subordinate clauses differs from the previous two, since here both the main clause and the subordinate clause are formally independent. The main and subordinate clauses enter into a syntactic relationship on the basis of adjacency, forming a unified whole; however, the subordinate clause assists in completing the idea expressed in the main clause. In this type, the subordinate clause is attached to the main clause. It should be noted that in complex sentences belonging to this group, the syntactic connection between the main and subordinate clauses is established through conjunctions and connective words. For example:

(5) *Əgər ayağına düşmək macalım olaydı, Dəxi götürməzdim baş anın əyağından* (Nasimi)

(If I had the strength to fall at your feet, I would never raise my head from them).

(6) *Gərçi düşmənligimdə fənnim çox, Dostluqda da dəxi misalım yox* (Fuzuli).
(Although I am highly skilled in enmity,

In friendship I am likewise without equal).

(7) *Ey sənəm xublar içində sən düşübsən sərəfras,*

Eylə kim bağ içrə rəna sərvi-xoş bala düşər (Khatayi).

(O beloved, among the beauties you have become distinguished,

As in a garden a graceful cypress stands out), etc.

Since in the first and third groups there is a certain degree of proximity in the syntactic relationship between the main and subordinate clauses, it may be assumed that in very early periods this very process played a decisive role in the emergence of subordinate constructions.

Historically, subordinate clauses were used so rarely that it was at times difficult to distinguish them from coordinate complex sentences. A similar situation can be observed in several other Turkic languages with an ancient written literary tradition. G.Kazimov objects to this view, arguing that in complex subordinate sentences with comparative clauses, the main clause precedes the subordinate clause; therefore, one cannot speak of the main clause merely being juxtaposed to the subordinate clause (Kazimov G., 2019, p. 107). Although conditional and concessive (adversative) subordinate clauses may precede the main clause, they are nevertheless connected to it by means of conjunctions, particles, and affixes.

In general, dividing complex subordinate sentences into these three groups does not fully justify itself. The first and second groups are, in fact, almost identical in structural type. The difference lies in the fact that in one case a correlative (pattern) word is used, while in the other it is not. However, even when it is not overtly expressed, it can easily be inferred and restored. Classifying complex subordinate sentences according to the position of their components and the connective devices employed is more productive for studying their present state and historical development.

One of the prominent representatives of Azerbaijani linguistics, E.Abdullayev, who conducted specialized research on complex subordinate sentences and established a distinct scholarly school in this field, identifies four differences in the way the compo-

nents of complex subordinate sentences are connected: “1. One of the means that connect the components of a complex sentence is the conjunction. In coordinate complex sentences, non-subordinating conjunctions are used between the components, whereas in subordinate complex sentences, subordinating conjunctions are employed. 2. While the majority of coordinate complex sentences are constructed without conjunctions, the vast majority of subordinate complex sentences are formed with conjunctions. 3. Pronouns also play a certain role in linking components. However, there is a difference in their usage. In coordinate complex sentences, pronouns participating in linkage replace something already known (or refer to something known), whereas in subordinate complex sentences, they refer to something not yet specified and create the conditions for explanation (i.e., for the use of a subordinate clause). 4. Intonation also plays a certain role in connecting the components of a complex sentence. Between the components of a subordinate complex sentence, subordinating intonation is used, whereas in coordinate complex sentences, non-subordinating intonation is present” (Abdullayev E. Z., 2021, p. 327).

Complex subordinate sentences arise as a result of the combination of simple sentences through a relation of subordination. Therefore, in a complex subordinate sentence, one component is grammatically independent, while the other is dependent on it. The grammatically independent component of a complex subordinate sentence is called the subordinate clause.

The dependence of the subordinate clause on the main clause – its subordination – is formally and grammatically valid; however, in structural terms, the subordinate clause, like the main clause, is formed in accordance with all grammatical rules and, in certain respects, may even display greater structural completeness than the main clause. While the main clause may omit a particular constituent or require further clarification, the subordinate clause (in most cases) contains all of its necessary components and does not require additional explanation.

Although the subordinate clause is regarded as dependent, the following conditions are essential and necessary for its status as a clause:

1. The subordinate clause must express a complete thought.

2. There must be obligatory agreement between its principal constituents; that is, the predicate of the subordinate clause must agree with its subject.

3. Accordingly, the predicate of the subordinate clause must be fully formed.

4. The subordinate clause must be connected to the main clause by means of specific formal markers.

The problem of the subordinate clause remains one of the most controversial issues in Turkology, both with regard to modern Turkic languages and to the ancient Turkic languages (i.e., the language of early written monuments of the Turkic peoples). Some turkologists maintain that verbal constructions (participial and converbal constructions) in Turkic languages function as subordinate clauses within complex subordinate sentences. Although this view is primarily expressed in relation to modern Turkic languages, it is also reflected in certain studies devoted to the language of the Orkhon-Yenisei inscriptions, the earliest written monuments of the Turkic peoples.

For example, the prominent A.Gadimaliyeva writes: “A complex subordinate sentence consists of two or more parts that have been formed as independent clauses. From the standpoint of structural organization, the components of a complex subordinate sentence – the subordinate and main clauses – are united into a single complex whole by means of: 1) connective words; 2) connective pause; 3) the special morphological form of the predicate of the subordinate clause (–duk, –sar)” (Kadimaliyeva A., 2016, p. 227). As can be seen, the author regards verbal constructions with the suffix -duk as subordinate clauses.

Another researcher of the language of the ancient Turkic Orkhon–Yenisei monuments, R.Rajabli, goes even further in this respect. He considers the verbal construction formed by the converb with the suffix -dukda (which he treats as a participle used in the ablative case) to be a temporal subordinate clause; constructions with the converb suffixes -ya, -ğalı, -gəli as subordinate clauses; and participial constructions with the suffix -duk (combined with the postposition *üçün* “for/because of”) as causal subordinate clauses (Rajabli A., 2009, P. 260–261).

What is striking is that, according to A.Rajabli, a participial construction with the suffix -duk used without a possessive suffix but with the postposition *üçün* forms a causal subordinate clause (e.g., *Tenri küç bertük için kanım kağan süsi böri tæg etmiş* (KT 12) – “Because Heaven granted strength, my father the khagan’s army was like a wolf”), whereas the same participial form, when used with a possessive suffix and the postposition *üçün*, does not constitute a subordinate clause (e.g., ... *inili-eçili kinşürtükün için, bağli-bodunhğ yonşurturkun için türk bodun illädük ilin içğinu ıdmış* ... (KT 6) – “... because he set the younger and elder brothers against one another, because he incited the beys and the people against one another, the Turkic people destroyed the state they had established ...”).

From the standpoint of both logic and grammar, there is no essential difference between the participial construction *tenri küç bertük için* and the constructions *inili-eçili kinşürtükün için* and *bağli-bodunhğ yonşurturkun için*. In the works of nearly all modern Kazakh and Kyrgyz linguists, the methodological approach to the problem of complex subordinate sentences follows this same line of interpretation.

In linguistics, it is generally accepted that the predicate of a subordinate clause must be fully formed as a finite verb; however, the -duk form, whether used with or without a possessive suffix, is not a finite verb. It should also be noted that in Turkic languages postpositions do not follow finite verbs, whereas the postposition “*üçün*” (“for/because of”) occurs after verbs marked with the suffix -duk (in both forms). The same can be said about other non-finite verb forms.

If the predicate of a subordinate clause is not fully formed and the verb serving as the governing element in participial and converbal constructions is grammatically incomplete, then such constructions cannot be regarded as predicates of subordinate clauses. From a methodological standpoint, it is likewise incorrect to treat participial and converbal constructions as subordinate clauses, since this would amount to equating the syntax of word combinations with sentence syntax. In fact, participial and converbal constructions belong to the domain of

phrase syntax, whereas subordinate clauses are the object of sentence syntax.

As for the claim that verbal constructions and subordinate clauses perform the same function, this phenomenon is referred to in grammar as grammatical synonymy. If we pursue this line of reasoning further, even constituents of simple sentences may perform the functions of subordinate clauses, yet no one classifies them as subordinate clauses. Participial and converbal constructions are therefore not subordinate clauses within complex subordinate sentences, but rather expanded constituents of an extended simple sentence.

Proceeding from this theoretical position, the role of genuine syntactic connective devices – particularly conjunctions – comes to the forefront in the formation of complex subordinate sentences. In this context, special attention should be paid to the conjunction “*ki*”, which is not of Indo-European origin but of Turkic origin and carries an essential functional load in connecting the components of complex subordinate constructions (Musaoğlu, M., 2005). Indeed, sentences constructed with the conjunction “*ki*” display a universal character across many languages and are realized in various formal configurations, which attests to the cross-linguistic recognition and structural productivity of this pattern (Güven M., (2016). However, in Azerbaijani the use of this conjunction exhibits specific nuances when compared with analogous constructions in other Turkic languages. (Csato E., Johanson L. 2021, p. 8). These specific features reflect the unique developmental trajectory of Azerbaijani with regard to both the semantic load and the syntactic position of the conjunction “*ki*”. Accordingly, this study analyzes the typological classification of complex subordinate sentences in Azerbaijani, traces their diachronic transformations, and examines how they have adapted to modern language norms through comparative-typological methods (Yunusov, D., & Arabov, V., 2015). This approach also encompasses a comparative analysis of complex subordinate sentence structures in Azerbaijani in relation to other Turkic languages, thereby revealing both their shared and distinctive features (Yunusov, D., & Arabov, V., 2015). Furthermore, the study investigates the diachronic development and

morphological and semantic diversity of complement types in the Turkic languages, explaining the complex structure of subordinate clauses through the application of contemporary linguistic methodologies (Rentzsch J., 2021, p. 20). In particular, the increasing use of subordinate clauses formed with the conjunction “*ki*” – beginning with Old Uyghur Turkic and continuing through Karakhanid Turkic, in works such as *Qutadgu Bilig* and *Atabetü'l Haqāyiq*, and especially in Qur'an translations – clearly demonstrates the diffusion of this structure across the Turkic languages and the gradual stabilization of its morphosyntactic features over time (Tüngüç Çelik K., 2020, p. 120). This wide distribution indicates that “*ki*” constructions constitute a natural and functionally productive means of expression in the Turkic languages, even though in some grammatical traditions such sentences are classified within the category of compound (or connected) sentences (Doğan, E., 2020). Such differences demonstrate that the conjunction “*ki*” in the Turkic languages – particularly in Azerbaijani – has undergone various processes of grammaticalization and has become enriched at the morphological, syntactic, and semantic levels (Csato E., Johanson L., 2021; Rentzsch J., 2021). In this context, linguistic discussions concerning the transfer of “*ki*” from Persian into the Turkic languages and its assimilation of certain functions of the interrogative pronoun “*kim*” further clarify its role in the formation of complex subordinate sentences (Doğan, E., 2020).

In the Turkic languages, the main clause and the subordinate clause occupy a relatively fixed position and order within the sentence structure. In complex subordinate sentences, however, the position of the main clause depends on the specific type of complex construction. The position of the main clause varies as follows: in constructions formed with relative pronouns, the main clause follows the subordinate clause; in conjunctive complex subordinate sentences, it most often precedes the subordinate clause, though in some cases it may follow it; and in constructions formed with the conditional mood, the main clause typically follows the subordinate clause.

Depending on stylistic requirements, however, these canonical grammatical positions may change: the main clause may ex-

change position with the subordinate clause, or one clause may occur within the other (Akhmadova A., 2023, p. 129). In linguistic literature, two types of complex subordinate sentences are generally distinguished: monocentric complex subordinate sentences and bicentric complex subordinate sentences.

In a monocentric complex subordinate sentence, the subordinate clause serves one constituent of the main clause. That is, it explains or specifies a particular element of the main clause. In this type, the subordinate clause either replaces a constituent that is formally present but weakly expressed and in need of clarification, or substitutes for a constituent that is not overtly expressed in the main clause (i.e., an omitted element). When such complex subordinate sentences are reduced to simple sentences, the subordinate clause assumes the position of the element in the main clause that it explains or replaces.

In bicentric complex subordinate sentences, by contrast, the subordinate clause does not clarify any single constituent taken separately; rather, it serves the main clause as a whole and explains it in its entirety. According to E. Z. Abdullayev, bicentric complex subordinate sentences originated from coordinate complex sentences. "One of the components of a coordinate complex sentence lost its independence and became grammatically subordinate, that is, it was transformed into a subordinate clause. However, semantically, the two original centers were preserved. For this reason, certain types of subordinate constructions (for example, result, adversative, and temporal subordinate clauses) are bicentric in nature. Accordingly, such subordinate clauses relate not to a specific constituent of the main clause, but to its overall meaning." (Abdullayev E. Z., 2021, p. 130).

In the modern Turkic languages, the development of complex subordinate sentences and the number of subordinate clauses directly depend on the development and variety of the means that connect the components of such sentences. The more numerous, diverse, and structurally developed these connective devices are, the greater the number of subordinate clauses, as well as the richer their semantic variants, stylistic nuances, modes of expression, and grammatical realizations.

For example, among the Turkic languages belonging to the Oghuz group of the Western Hun branch – particularly the Oghuz-Seljuk subgroup – modern languages are considerably richer in the development of conjunctions than those Turkic languages of the Oghuz-Kipchak group within the Eastern Hun branch. Consequently, in the Turkic languages of the Oghuz-Seljuk subgroup, complex subordinate sentences are more highly developed than in the Kyrgyz-Kipchak group; they display a wider range of semantic types, a greater number of subordinate clause constructions, and more varied and diversified means of expression.

Conclusion

The analysis of the historical and structural development of complex subordinate sentences in the Turkic languages, based on Azerbaijani data, demonstrates that subordination represents a relatively late but highly significant stage in the evolution of syntactic structure. Complex subordinate constructions emerged gradually from earlier coordinate and intonational patterns and became systematized through the development of specialized connective devices, including conjunctions, particles, affixes, and morphological markers.

The study confirms that the structural diversity and semantic richness of subordinate clauses directly depend on the degree of development of connective means within a given language. In this respect, the Azerbaijani language, particularly within the Oghuz-Seljuk subgroup of the Turkic languages, exhibits a highly developed system of subordination characterized by a wide range of semantic types and expressive variants. The increasing grammaticalization and functional expansion of the conjunction "ki" further illustrate the dynamic nature of syntactic evolution and the interaction between internal linguistic processes and historical-cultural factors.

At the same time, the research clarifies the controversial issue of participial and converbal constructions, demonstrating that these formations should not be equated with subordinate clauses, since they belong to phrase syntax rather than sentence syntax. This distinction is essential for maintaining methodological consistency in Turkic syntactic studies.

Overall, the findings show that the development of complex subordinate sentences is closely linked to the formation of the written literary language and reflects broader cognitive and cultural advancement. The typological and diachronic perspective adopted

in this study contributes to a deeper understanding of subordination mechanisms in Turkic languages and provides a theoretical basis for further comparative and functional investigations in modern syntax.

References

- Abdullayev E. Z. (2021). Problems of the historical development of Turkic languages. Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publications, 1996. – 176 p.
- Csato E., Johanson L. (2021). On the Grammaticalization of Two Types of “ki” in Turkic. *Journal of Turkology*. 2021. – 31(1). – P. 1–14. URL: <https://doi.org/10.26650/iuturkiyat.994834>
- Doğan, E. (2020). A question of Turkish word order: are ki’li sentences a compound sentence? *Journal of Turkology*. 2020. – 24(2). – P. 177–188. URL: <https://izlik.org/JA23DS64HX>
- Akhmadova A. (2023). Orkhon monuments in the language of words. Bucky, “Science and Education”. 2023. – 304 p.
- Güven M. (2016). Own-Load Relationships in Typological Constructions with Adjective Verbs. *Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences*. 2016. – Vol. 9. – Issue 29. – P. 41–60. URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/usaksosbil/issue/0/285485>
- Habibova K. (2011). “Kitabi-Dada Gorgud” of the principle of economy in the language of epics psycholinguistic interpretation. *Turkology*. 2011. – No. 4. – P. 74–85. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18676015>
- Habibova K. A. (2009). Elliptical sentence in modern Azerbaijani language. – Baku: Science and education. 2009. – 192 p.
- Habibova K. (2014). Composition of a complex syntactic unit. *Foundations of the Institute of Linguistics*. 2014. – 1. – P. 77–81.
- Kazimov G. (2000). Modern Azerbaijani language. Syntax. – Baku: Elm, 2000. – 340 p.
- Kazimov G. (2019). Historical syntax of the Azerbaijani language. – Baku: Elm, 2019. – 607 p.
- Musaoğlu, M. (2005). Azerbaijan Dilçiligi in the Department of Turkish Linguistics and Prof. Dr. Elovset Abdullayev’in Soz Dizimi Ekol (85th Birthday). *Turkish World Language and Literature Journal*. 2005. – 20. URL: <https://izlik.org/JA53FS39XY>
- Kadimalieva A. (2016). Translated sentence in the language of the written monuments of Azerbaijan of the XV century. *Philology topics*. 2016. – No 5. – P. 135–140.
- Rajabli A. (2009). The Language of Orkhon-Enisey Monuments in Ancient Turkic Writing: Morphology. – Baku: Nurlan, 2009. – 291 p.
- Rentsch J. (2021). Complementation Patterns in Ötämiş Hājji’s Čingiznāmā: A Typological Approach to Subordination in Middle Turkic. *Journal of Turkology*. 2021. – 31(1). – P. 15–37. URL: <https://doi.org/10.26650/iuturkiyat.994889>
- Shafigullina A., Gabitova R., & Nizamova G. (2022). Grammaticalization processes in Turkic complementizers: The case of “ki”. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 2022. – 18(2). – P. 145–162.
- Tüngüç Çelik K. (2020). On Envârü’l Hikem and compound sentences with ‘ki’. *Turkish Language Research Yearbook – Bulletin*. 2020. – 69 (June). – P. 115–134. URL: <https://izlik.org/JA23TS22ZZ>.
- Yunusov, D., & Arabov, V. (2015). Comparative Analysis of the Structural Variety of Complex Syntactic Units in the English and Azerbaijani Languages. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. – 5(1). URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n1p184>

submitted 14.06.2026;

accepted for publication 28.06.2026;

published 31.08.2026

© Akhmadova F. M.

Contact: farqana220580@gmail.com