



<https://doi.org/10.70728/b.series.fil.v08.i08.078>

THE CONVERB AS A COHESIVE DEVICE LINKING THE STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC RELATIONS OF INTRA-TEXTUAL SENTENCES

Guler Suleymanova

Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University

Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Philology

suleymanlielgun2015@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-5657-6410

Abstract Cohesion mechanisms in language are fundamental tools that ensure the structural and semantic integrity of sentences in both oral and written speech acts. Understanding how inter-sentential connections are established within a text is essential for identifying the functional possibilities of language and strategies for textual coherence. Converbs represent one of the most frequently utilized categories in this process.

The primary objective of this research is to determine the cohesive functions of converbs within prose texts, specifically focusing on their substitutive role within the predicate—one of the principal parts of the sentence—and how this function influences the expression of various semantic nuances.

Keywords: intra-textual sentences, converb, structural semantics, cohesive device.

MATN ICHIDAGI GAPLARNING TARKIBIY-SEMANTIK ALOQALARINI BOG'LOVCHI KOGEZIYA VOSITASI SIFATIDA RAVISHDOSH

Rezyume Til metodidagi kogeziya mexanizmlari ham og'zaki, ham yozma nutqda gaplarning tarkibiy va semantik yaxlitligini ta'minlaydigan asosiy vositalardir. Matn ichidagi gaplararo aloqalar qanday o'rnatilishini tushunish tilning funktsional imkoniyatlari hamda matn koherentligi strategiyalarini belgilash uchun muhimdir. Ravishdoshlar (ravishdosh shakllari) ushbu jarayonda eng ko'p qo'llaniladigan kategoriyalardan biridir. Ushbu tadqiqotning asosiy maqsadi nasriy matnlarda ravishdoshlarning kogeziy funktsiyalarini aniqlash, bunda ularning gapning asosiy bo'laklaridan biri bo'lmish kesim tarkibidagi o'rin bosuvchi rolga hamda ushbu funktsiyaning turli semantik nozikliklarni ifodalashga ko'rsatadigan ta'siriga alohida e'tibor qaratishdan iborat. Tadqiqotda turli nasriy matnlarga nisbatan qo'llanilgan lingvistik tahlil va tarkibiy-semantik modellashtirish usullaridan foydalanilgan. Ravishdosh shakllarining gapdagi pozitsion xususiyatlari, ularning boshqa grammatik kategoriyalar bilan o'rin almashish salohiyati va matn ichidagi bog'lanish chastotasi qiyosiy tahlil yordamida o'rganilgan.

ДЕЕПРИЧАСТИЕ КАК СРЕДСТВО КОГЕЗИИ, СВЯЗЫВАЮЩЕЕ СТРУКТУРНО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ ВНУТРИТЕКСТОВЫХ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ

Резюме Механизмы когезии в языке представляют собой фундаментальные инструменты, обеспечивающие структурную и семантическую целостность предложений как в устной, так и в письменной речи. Понимание того, как устанавливаются межфразовые связи внутри текста, имеет существенное значение для определения функциональных возможностей языка и стратегий текстовой когерентности. Деепричастия (деепричастные формы) являются одной из наиболее часто используемых категорий в этом процессе.

Основная цель данного исследования заключается в определении когезивных функций деепричастий в прозаических текстах с особым акцентом на их замещающей роли в составе сказуемого — одного из главных членов предложения — и на том, как эта функция влияет на выражение различных семантических оттенков.

В исследовании использованы методы лингвистического анализа и структурно-семантического моделирования, примененные к различным прозаическим текстам. Позиционные характеристики деепричастных форм в предложении, их потенциал замещения другими грамматическими категориями и частота внутритекстовой связи были изучены с помощью сравнительного анализа.

Ключевые слова: внутритекстовые предложения, деепричастие, структурная семантика, средство когезии.

INTRODUCTION

Historical Overview and Academic Context. The study of converbs within Turkic linguistics has a long and distinguished history. This category was first systematically introduced into the field in the first half of the 19th century by the prominent scholar Mirza Kazim Bey, who provided extensive commentary on the morphological characteristics of these units. Subsequently, in 1857, R. Budagov expanded upon these findings in his work, *Practical Grammar of the Turkic-Azerbaijani-Tatar Language*, detailing the unique features of the suffixes identified by his predecessor. While the classification of converbs encountered certain inconsistencies during the Soviet period—most notably in the 1951 publication *Grammar of the Azerbaijani Language*—foundational research continued through the efforts of Turkologists such as A.M. Shcherba, N.K. Dmitriyev, and V.V. Vinogradov. Within Azerbaijan, linguists including V. Aliyev, N. Mammadov, H. Mirzayev, and Q. Kazimov have contributed significantly to the understanding of the etymology, morphology, and syntactic roles of converb suffixes.

Problem Statement. Despite this extensive scholarly background, the majority of existing research has approached converbs primarily through the lens of morphology or

simple sentence syntax. From the perspective of modern text linguistics, a critical function of these units has remained largely unexplored: their capacity to facilitate **cohesion**. In prose texts, converbs do not merely function as grammatical forms; they serve as universal cohesive markers that link sentences both structurally and semantically in a chain-like fashion. Their role as determinant elements within a context allows them to act as both meaning-expanding factors and structural anchors.

Object and Subject of Research. The object of this study is the variety of converb forms utilized within Azerbaijani prose. The subject is the specific mechanism by which these forms—particularly the suffixes *-ib*⁴, *-anda*², *-arkən*, *-dıqca*, and *-araq*—establish connectivity between textual components, their determinant functions, and the semantic integrity they provide within asyndetic (unconjugated) constructions.

Objectives and Tasks. The primary objective of this paper is to elucidate the role of converbs as cohesive devices that ensure both semantic expansion and structural integrity within literary discourse. To achieve this, the following tasks are addressed:

1. To identify the functional load of various converb suffixes in establishing intra-sentential relationships (time, manner, and sequence).
2. To demonstrate how converbs, acting as substitutes for the predicate, enhance stylistic efficiency and prevent redundancy through ellipsis.
3. To analyze the structural-semantic interaction between converbs and other grammatical elements, such as intonation and internal pauses, within the framework of a text.

By examining these elements, this study aims to prove that the converb is not only a morphological unit but a vital text-building element essential for the fluidity and coherence of the Azerbaijani language.

The term “converb” was first introduced into Turkological linguistics in the first half of the 19th century by Mirza Kazim Bey, who extensively discussed the features of morphological units belonging to this category (1, p. 335). Following him, R. Budagov published his work *Practical Grammar of the Turkic-Azerbaijani-Tatar Language* in 1857, where he elaborated on certain notable characteristics of the suffixes identified by Mirza Kazim Bey (2, p. 207). In the Soviet period, particularly in the book *Grammar of the Azerbaijani Language* published in 1951, the morphological units related to converbs were not properly classified (3, pp. 251–260). Although scholars such as A.M. Shcherba (4, pp. 167–170), N.K. Dmitriyev (5, pp. 75–78), V.V. Vinogradov (6, pp. 380–383), as well as Azerbaijani linguists V. Aliyev (7, pp. 260–270), N. Mammadov (8, pp. 378–387), H. Mirzayev (9, pp. 158–159), Q. Kazimov (10, pp. 403–408) and others have addressed the etymology and morphological and syntactic features of converb suffixes, they have not examined their role as cohesive devices in linking intra-textual sentences an aspect of considerable importance.

One of the main structural-semantic features of converbs in prose texts is that they function as determinant elements within context, forming constructions that serve both as

meaning-expanding factors and as cohesive devices. Let us consider separately the cohesion of linguistic units with converb suffixes within intra-textual sentences.

1. **Cohesion of converbs with the suffixes -ib⁴, -yib⁴.** Words formed with these suffixes are closely connected to the overall content of the sentence and serve to link preceding and following sentences. For example: *“İpçin nallatdığı Qəmər atı səhər tezdən qaşovlayıb, tumarladı və yer yaş olduğundan atın quyruğunu səliqə ilə düydü”* (11, p. 16).

This asyndetic compound sentence consists of three parts, in which the performed actions are arranged sequentially. The converb with the suffix “-yib” (*qaşovlayıb*) in the first part is linked in a chain-like manner with the verb *tumarladı*, both expressing past tense meaning. The sequential semantic relation is evident: first, the horse is brushed, then groomed and finally its tail is neatly tied. The four-variant converb suffix “-ib” can, depending on stylistic considerations, form synonymy with the suffix “-araq.” This synonymic relation becomes clear when the sentence is reformulated as: *“Qəmər atı səhər tezdən qaşovlayaraq tumarladı.”* In this case the sequential semantic connection is preserved.

In the formation mechanism of asyndetic compound sentences and in the process of their semantic linkage, converbs function as highly universal and unique linguistic markers. For example: *“Qatırçı rəng verib, rəng aldı”* (11, p. 17). Here, along with intonation, the suffix “-ib” plays a significant role in connecting the two components of the sentence, complementing each other. Undoubtedly, there is a reason for the muleteer’s psychological state, which is explained in the preceding sentence by Allahveran’s anger toward him. Thus, the sentence containing the converb is structurally and semantically connected both to the preceding and the following sentences.

From another perspective, one may observe ellipsis in the sentence, which can be reconstructed as: *“Qatırçı bir rəng verib, qatırçı bir rəng aldı.”* The omitted elements are repetitions, and their inclusion would make the sentence cumbersome. This demonstrates that, as a cohesive device, it is not sufficient to consider only the predicate “verib”; rather, all lexical units in the sentence contribute to the cohesive function.

From a syntactic point of view, the sentence answers the question: *“What did the muleteer do? — The muleteer changed color and then regained it.”* The subject, being the actualized component, answers the question “who?” Thus, the converb is organically connected with the predicate and indicates the manner of the action expressed. The sentence “Qatırçı rəng verib, rəng aldı” is constructed on the basis of homogeneous components, which are interconnected through various semantic relations. A. Mashadiyev, referring to this feature, notes that *“among all converb forms in Turkic languages, the most frequently used is the form with the suffix -ib⁴ (-yib⁴). It appears that the widespread use of this form is due to its ability, in many cases for stylistic purposes, to substitute parts of homogeneous predicates and to express a wide range of meanings”* (12, p. 584).

The converb with the suffix “-ib⁴” requires that the word preceding it in the sentence occur in the dative case; therefore, such constructions may also be referred to as verbal combinations with adjacency relations. For example: *“Keçən ay dəvəçinin kənddə neft satdığı*

günüin axşamı başımı yastığa qoyub, təzəcə huşa getmişdim, qulağıma hənirti gəldi” (11, p. 17).

In this structurally complex sentence, the first component of the verbal construction “yastığa qoyub” appears in the dative case, realized through the suffix “-a” attached to the noun “yastıq.” It should also be noted that this type of adjacency-based verbal construction functions in the sentence as an adverbial modifier of time, since it answers the question “when?”, while at the same time prominently expressing the manner of the action. Thus, the converb phrase “yastığa qoyub,” containing a nominal component, is linked with the clause “huşa getmişdim” and indicates the manner in which the action is carried out, answering only the questions “how?” and “in what way?”. In general, word combinations and constructions formed with the converb suffix “-ıb⁴” function as adverbials of manner in the sentence and operate as cohesive devices.

1. **Cohesion of converbs with the suffixes -anda², -yanda².** Considering that grammar books present contradictory views regarding the etymology of this suffix, it may briefly be stated that it historically developed through the addition of the locative case suffix “-da” to the independent word “an,” which denotes “time” or “moment.” From ancient periods to modern Turkic languages including Old Turkic, Old Azerbaijani, and Old Uyghur the word “an” has functioned with the meaning of time and continues to be used in this sense (13, p. 111). Converbs with the suffix “-anda” possess specific structural-semantic features, syntactic functions within the sentence, grammatical relations with the words they combine with, and the ability to function as cohesive elements. In intra-textual sentences in constructions containing this suffix, the first component is dependent, and under the requirement of the second component, it appears in the accusative case. For example: “*Təpəni aşanda, o saat tanıdım*” (11, p. 17).

In this two-component sentence, the converb “aşanda” links the components, and the question “when?” can be directed to the first component, including the word “təpəni,” from a syntactic perspective. Thus, the first component “təpəni aşanda” is semantically and contextually connected to the second component and specifies the time at which the action in the sentence takes place. The cohesive relation between the clauses is realized both through the converb “aşanda” and through the pause-based intonation, which may be regarded as a dual function of cohesion. Consider another example: “*Yol meşədən keçib açıqlığa çıxanda ağ və sarı təpələrin arasındakı bağlı-bağatlı rayon mərkəzi göründü*” (11, p. 18).

Structurally, this sentence consists of two parts: the first part is expressed by a determinant adverbial of time, while the second part contains an extended predicate. Accordingly, the questions “when?” and “what happened?” may be posed to the first and second components respectively. This demonstrates that converbs actively function within the components of adverbials of time, thereby fulfilling a cohesive role. In the first component, the word preceding the converb “açıqlığa çıxanda” is in the dative case and the converb is in an adjacency relation with it. From a stylistic perspective, the suffix “-anda”

has synonyms in the language such as “-kan, -kən, -arkan, -ərkən.” Replacing “açıqlığa çıxanda” with “açıqlığa çıxarkən” does not cause any structural or semantic disruption.

2. **Cohesion of converbs with the suffixes -kan, -kən, -arkan, -ərkən.** As noted, substituting converbs with the suffixes “-anda, -əndə, -yanda, -yəndə” with the morphological markers “-kan, -kən, -arkan, -ərkən” does not result in any grammatical inconsistency in the structural-semantic organization of the sentence. For example: “*Cantarak oğlan yumruğunu qaldırmaq istəyəndə (istəyərkən) Nazim onun boynunu qoltuğuna keçirib bir göz qırpmında kürəyini yerə gətirdi*” (11, p. 29).

This simple sentence consists of three parts: the first includes the converbs “istəyəndə / istəyərkən,” the second contains the converb “keçirib” and the third is formed by the verb “gətirdi” at the end of the sentence. The action expressed in the first component extends semantically to the second and third parts; if the converb “istəyəndə/istəyərkən” appears in the first component, then the converb “keçirib” in the second part continues the action and finally the verb “gətirdi” completes the thought, after which a new sentence begins.

1. **Cohesion of converbs with the suffixes -dıqca, -dikcə, -duqca, -dükcə.** Converbs formed with these suffixes, when used in intra-textual sentences, are connected with the main verbs and specify the temporal progression of the action expressed in their semantic structure, thereby functioning as cohesive markers between the components of simple sentences. For example: “*Söhbət uzandıqca Bəsirənin narahatçılığı daha da artırdı*” (11, p. 116).

In this sentence, the converb “uzandıqca” not only indicates the continuation of the action expressed by the independent verb “artırdı” in the final part of the sentence, but also develops the causal relationship between “the prolongation of the conversation” and “the increase in Bəsirə’s anxiety” in the subsequent sentences. Within the framework of a paragraph, it serves to connect sentences through the converb “uzandıqca.” There is no doubt among linguists that the converb suffix “-dıqca, -dikcə, -duqca, -dükcə” historically derives from the combination of the participial suffixes “-dıq, -dik, -duq, -dük” with the locative case suffix.

2. **Cohesion of converbs with the suffixes -araq, -ərək, -yaraq, -yərək.** This morphological marker, which etymologically developed across Turkic languages on the basis of the model “ar+aq,” functions in sentences by linking independent verbs with respect to manner of action, state, condition and sometimes cause. For example: “*Onun mərkəzi qəzetlərdə ara-sıra məktubları dərc edilməsinə baxmayaraq hələlik ortalığa çıxan jurnalist kimi tanınmırdı*” (11, p. 203).

In this sentence the converb “baxmayaraq” divides the structure into two parts and connects with the negative verb “tanınmırdı” occurring at the end, expressing the manner in which the action is carried out, that is, how, in what way and under what conditions it occurs.

Conclusion. Since the primary function of cohesion in intra-textual sentences is to link syntactic units structurally and semantically, converbs represent one of the most unique morphological categories contributing to the formation and realization of this process. As a

result of such interconnections, extended constructions emerge; these constructions form sentences, and sentences, in turn, constitute the text as a whole.

REFERENCES

1. Kazym-bek, M.A. *Grammar of the Turkic-Tatar Language*. Kazan, 1939.
2. Budagov, L. *Practical Guide to the Turkic-Tatar-Azerbaijani Dialect*. 1857.
3. *Grammar of the Azerbaijani Language*, Part I. Baku: ANAS Publishing, 1951, 330 p.
4. Shcherbak, A.M. *Grammar of the Old Uzbek Language*. Moscow–Leningrad, 1968.
5. Dmitriyev, N.K. *Grammar of the Bashkir Language*. Moscow, 1965.
6. Vinogradov, V.V. *Modern Russian Language*, Vol. I. Moscow, 1970.
7. Aliyev, V.U. *The Converb in the Azerbaijani Language*. Baku: API Publishing, 1989, 103 p.
8. Mirzayev, H.I. *The Verb in the Azerbaijani Language*. Baku: Maarif, 1986, 320 p.
9. Mammadov, H. “The Converb.” In: *Modern Azerbaijani Language*. Baku: Elm, 1980, pp. 378–387.
10. Kazimov, Q.L. *Modern Azerbaijani Language: Morphology*. Baku: Elm and Education, 2016, 608 p.
11. Ildirimoglu, Ali. *Journalist by Force (Novel)*, Parts I–II. Baku: AS Polygraph, 2011, 680 p.
12. Mashadiyeva, A.Ə. “Functionalization of Non-Finite Verb Forms.” In: *Functional Morphology of Turkic Languages*. Baku: Elm and Education, 2024, pp. 570–614.
13. Huseynli, N., Mammadova, Y. *Genealogy of Turkic Languages: Sumerian and Turkic Lexical Parallels*. Baku: Nağıl Evi, 2012, 356 p.