

81'367.5=512.1

Object lacking elliptical sentences in the work of Zhalairi Zhami'at-Tauarikh

Zhuintayeva Zamzagul Nagashybaevna

candidate of Philological Sciences, associate professor of Buketov Karaganda State University. 100028 Republic of Kazakhstan, Karaganda city, Universitetskaya str., 28. E-mail: E-mail: Zamza_bota@mail.ru

Zhumanbayeva Asem Imanbayevna

candidate of Philological Sciences, associate professor of Buketov Karaganda State University. 100028 Republic of Kazakhstan, Karaganda city, Universitetskaya str., 28. E-mail: Zhumanbaeva.ase@mail.ru

Tursunova Markhaba Akhmetkalievna

candidate of Philological Sciences, associate professor of Buketov Karaganda State University. 100028 Republic of Kazakhstan, Karaganda city, Universitetskaya str., 28. E-mail: T_marhaba@mail.ru

Abstract. The article deals with object lacking elliptical sentences in the work of Kadyrgali Kosymuly Zhalairi «Zhami' at-Tauarikh». The reasons of direct and indirect objects' omission are proved by means of linguistic facts. Also authors dwell on the fact that a text is the reason of incompleteness.

Authors mention incompleteness of the complex sentences in the historical text as well. Examples are provided to prove incompleteness of complex sentences due to the context as noticed in simple sentences. Contextual elliptical sentences are one of the text formative devices. The correlation of the artifact's language with modern Kazakh is also pointed.

Keywords: Elliptic sentences; contextual elliptical sentences; direct object; indirect object; historical text.

«Zhami' at-Tauarikh», i.e. «Collection of chronicles» of the Kazakh scholar, historian, statesman Kadyrgali Kosymuly Zhalairi who lived in the second half of the XVI century and at the beginning of the XVII century is considered to be a unique work in the cultural and spiritual history of the Kazakh people (Mingulov, Komekov, Oteniyazov 1997, P. 3). Among Kazakh scholars this work was first studied by Sh.Ualikhanov. The scholar speaks about the language of the given work. According to the scholar work is written in Chagatai language that is kindred to Kyrgyz (Kaisak) and narrated in an imaginative manner. A poem devoted to Boris is very understandable and written purely in Tatar language without Arabic, Persian words, some words and word combinations are still in use in modern Kazakh language (Valikhanov 1984, P. 244).

R. Syzdykova's work «Language of Zhalairi's Zhami' at-Tauarikh» written in 1989 has to be mentioned in this connection. Author in the given work writes about linguistic, grammatical, stylistic peculiarities of the chronicle, dwells on the remarks on writing and orthography and gives a transcribed text based on Arabic writing (Mingulov, Komekov, Oteniyazov 1997).

Zh. Saduakasuly in his dissertation work titled «Structural types of mononuclear sentences in Kazakh language» refers to B.P. Ardentov's view on elliptical sentences which sounds as follows: «Even though some concepts and notions are considered in thought, they may not be given by specific words. Parts of speech that are necessary for the completeness of the thought are considered to be in thought, they become known from preceding thought or meaning can be understood from the situation of mentioning them». He also refers to V.V. Babaytseva's words on the main criteria for incompleteness which according to her lies in not modifying the nature of the thought to be transferred, but rather depends on the context of the word within its structure. Noting that their views coincide with other scholars of Russian

and Turkic linguistics, based on this view he states that context and situation are one of the main signs of identifying incompleteness.

To be precise, he comes to the following conclusion: notional incompleteness of the clause is noticed when it is out of context and situation, and only in case there is a possibility of finding out the word that can complement it and if it doesn't distort meaning when being used in clause, these sentences can be called elliptical sentences (Saduakasuly 1997, P. 26).

We can notice incompleteness of elliptical sentences not only from omission of its principal part, but also through omission of any other part of the sentence. Moreover omission of the part of speech is related to the context, situation and stylistic purposes. Omission of objects is also connected with such situations.

Two types of object occur in «Tauarikh», both direct and indirect object. Words functioning as direct object similar to the modern literary language are given in the explicit and implicit form of accusative case ending, is linked up to the part deriving from transitive verb, especially to the predicate (Kordabayev 1964, P. 82). Incompleteness of the sentence due to the lack of object depends on the verbal sentence. For the verb requires a noun or any other substantiated noun to be given in one of indirect cases except nominative and genitive, thus being linked to the nouns (Zhakupov 1999, P. 76). Object lacking elliptical sentences can be related to the preceding context and to the subsequent context. For example: 1. Андын соң Оғуз ол қыз ны қабул қылды уа дост тутды. 2. Өңгәлер ге бермеді. 3. Нечүк кім худайны бірлеп білген ерді. 4. Хақ ға нийаз лық ерді – 1. Odan song Ogyz ol kyzdy shyn niyetimen kabyl etip dos kyldy (word-for-word translation: Afterwards Oghuz made friends with that girl sincerely accepting her as a friend). 2. Baskalarga bermedi (word-for-word translation: Didn't give to anyone). 3. Oitkeni kudaidy bir dep bilgen edi (word-for-word translation: For knew that God is the one). 4. Bul hakka shyn berilgendik edi (word-for-word translation: It was a sign of complete devotion to the God). 2-sentence in the extract is the object lacking elliptical sentence. «Өңгәләрге кімді бермегені» – «Whom he didn't give» is noticed by being adjacent from the preceding sentence. And the sentence is complemented as «Өңгәләрге қызды бермеді» – «Didn't give the girl to others». Let's give some more examples from the artifact 1...Мыңар Байку, шул қаум һушин ерді. 2. Уа оң қолны ол билүр ерді. 3. Чиңгиз ханда бу төрт бек ма'лум туруп. 4. Төрт мың ләшкәр билән Жочиға берді. – 1. Mynger Baiku, sol hushin kauymynan edi (word-for-word translation: Myngar Baiku was from that hushin community). 2. Ong kolyn ol biler edi (word-for-word translation: He would have ruled right-hand man). 3. Shyngys khanda bul tort bek aigili edi (word-for-word translation: These four beks (representative of the dominant class of feudal society in Central Asia) were famous in Genghis Khan's land. 4. Tort myng askerimen Zhoshyga berdi (word-for-word translation: He gave Jochi with the army of four thousand people). In the last 4-sentence mentioning whom he gave Jochi (four beks) is understood through preceding sentence. Sentence is complemented as «Төрт бекті төрт мың ләшкәр билән Жочиға берді» (Tort bekti tort myng askerimen Zhoshyga berdi/word-for-word translation: Four beks were given Jochi with the army of four thousand people).

The lack of direct object in elliptical sentences can be defined not only by sentence, but by the adjacent sentence. For instance, based on «Tauarikh»: 1. Өкин Тарқақ уа Һамбақай ханны қаум татар аны тутыб аңа алыб батды лар. 2. Ақаларым менің атамның жадд ерді лер. 3. Күна сиз өлтүрді. – 1. Keyin Tarkak zhane Khambakai khandi tatar kauymy ony ustay ogan (Altan khanga) alyp bardy (word-for-word translation: Later Tatars caught Tarkak and Khambakai khans and gave him). 2. Agalarym mening atamnyng babasy edi (word-for-word translation: My

brothers were ancestors of my grandfather). 3. Kinasiz oltirdi (word-for-word translation: Killed him groundlessly). The last sentence here is used as elliptical. 1-sentence reveals the one who was killed groundlessly. If to complement the sentence we will have the following sentence: «Тарқақ уа Хамбақай ханды кина сыз өлтүрді». Therefore we recognize this sentence as a lacking sentence where direct object aimed at compressing the sentence impacted by the context.

In sentences with intransitive verbs in dative, locative, ablative and instrumental cases indirect objects can be found from context. Sometimes indirect object can be given by one word in another adjacent sentence, and can be understood from the general content of the context (Zhakupov 1998, P. 63). Let's consider some more examples from «Тауарих». 1. Қыз жауап берді. 2. Мен худай ны ешиткенім йоқ, билгенім йоқ, уа ликин сенің сөзің дін уа форманың ге мути болайын, сен не десен, аны қылайын теді. 3. Оғуз айды. 4. Көңлүм тілеген сен турурсын, сені қабул қылдым теді, уа андағ фарманладым сеңе бір худайға иман келтүргіл уа мухиаб аңа болғыл. - 1. Kyz zhauap berdi (word-for-word translation: A girl answered). 2. Men kudaidi esitkenim yok, birak sening sozingnen shykpayin zhane buyriginga riza bolayin, sen ne deseng sony kylayin, - dedi (word-for-word translation: I have not heard of God, but I will obey your words and will be content with your order, I will do whatever you wish, - said). 3. Ogyz aitty (word-for-word translation: Oghyz said). 4. Kongilim tilegeni (zhalgyz) sen, seni kabyt ettim, - dedi, buyrygym da, otinishim de sol, kudaiga iman keltir zhane basyngdy iy, shynymen beril (word-for-word translation: what I really wish is (only) you, I accepted you, - said, my only order and request is believe in God and truly be devoted to him). From the first sentence of the given extract we can see whom girl answered. Sentence is complemented as «Kyz Ogyzga jauap berdi» (word-for-word translation: A girl answered Oghuz), at the same time this sentence denotes interrelation between a dialogue replica, and the way she answered can be understood from the content of other sentences within context. Indirect object in ablative case that is not given in the elliptical sentence, can occur in both adjacent and sentences that are divided by several clauses, also in the general content of the context. For instance: 1. Атасы Қара хан өз атасы Көр хан дын туған ғайат хуб сахиб жамал қызы бар ерді. 2. Аны Оғузға алды. – 1. Akesi Kara khan oz agasi Kor khannin ote ademi sulu kyzy bar edi (word-for-word translation: Kara khan's son, his brother Kor khan had a very beautiful daughter). 2. Sony Ogyzga aityryp berdi (word-for-word translation: Married her to Oghuz). Last sentence is complemented by the word in ablative case given in the first sentence (Көр хан дын – Kor khannan (word-for-word translation: From Kor khan), i.e. by means of adjacent sentence. And the following examples point to distant connection: 1. Үчүнчі Құбылай хан ның (оғлы) Мөңлуқан. 2. Бу һәм Чабун хатун дын туғуб ерді. 3. Аның улуғ хатуны бар ерді. 4. Аты Қуту, қаум қонқырат. 5. Алчы нойан ның оғлыдын туғуб ерді. 6. Аның үч оғлы бар ерді... – 1. Kubylai khannyn ushinshi uly Mengli khan (word-for-word translation: The third son of Kubylai khan, Mengli khan). 2. Bul da Zhabun khatunnan tungan edi (word-for-word translation: He also is a son of Zhabun khatun). 3. Onyng uly khatuny bar edi (word-for-word translation: He had a senior wife). 4. Aty Kutui, kongyrat kauymynan (word-for-word translation: Named as Kutui, of kongyrat origin). 5. Yelshi noyannyng ulyan tuyip edi (word-for-word translation: Father is a son of an ambassador feudal lord). 6. Onyng ush uly bar edi (word-for-word translation: She had three sons).... Based on the 6-sentence here we can see who is the father of her three sons from the 1-sentence preceding it, i.e. complemented by Mengli khan.

Indirect object in the instrumental case is often linked by the verbs coming in the meaning of reciprocal voice. Indirect object in the instrumental case can occur in

both adjacent and sentences that are divided by several clauses. Based on «Collection of chronicles»: 1. Сізлер кім мен дін соң мен буйурған йасақны бузмаңыз, өзге амал чықармаңыз уа тақы Чағатай бу йерде хазр түгүл дүр. 2.Менің уасиатым ны аңа турүңүз. 3. Мубада кім мен кечкен дін соң менің сөзүмні тақы мүлк де тамашамиши қылыңыз. 4. Сізлер һәм андағ болуңуз. 5. Ол халат да бу сөзләр ні тамам қылған (соң) һәр екі оғлы білән, бір бірі білән қучақлашты лар. 6. Уа 'да қылдылар. 7. Йана анларны қайтарды. 8. Өз улус мамлакат ларі не йіберді. 9. Өз ләшкәрі білән Нигиас таба йүзленді. – 1. Sizder menen song men buyirgan zhasakty buzbangyzdar, ozge amal shygarmangyzdar zhane tagy Shagatay bul zherde zhok edi (word-for-word translation: Afterwards me don't dissolve the army I ordered, don't take any other measures and also there was no Shagatay here). 2. Mening osietimdi ogan zhetkzingizder (word-for-word translation: Tell him about my will). 3. Kenet men olsem, mening sozimdi tagi barine aityngdar (If I suddenly die, tell my words to others as well). 4. Sizder de solai bolyngdar dep (word-for-word translation: Wishing you will be like this too). 5. Ol zhagdaida bul sozdermen bitirgen song, ar eki ulymen, bir-birimen kushaktasty (word-for-word translation: In that situation finishing with these words they hugged each-other with both of his sons). 6. Duga kyldy (word-for-word translation: Prayed). 7. Zhane olardy kaitardy (word-for-word translation: And sent them). 8. Oz ulys memleketterine zhiberdi (word-for-word translation: Sent them to their home countries). 9. Oz askerimen Nigiyas zhakka attandy (word-for-word translation: Set out to Nigiyas with his army). The 6-sentence which says «Уа'да қылдылар» is incomplete. The adjacent sentence reveals with whom he prayed («уа'да қылғаны – duga kylgany (word-for-word translation: prayed)», екі оғлы білән – eki ulymen (word-for-word translation: with two sons)).

The degree of incompleteness of the pairs of complex sentence can be expressed by means of principal and subordinate parts of the sentence. It is defined either by means of the context within complex sentence or external context. Therefore incompleteness of complex sentences can also be seen from the context as in simple sentences. We can see it through examples in «Zhami'at-Tauarikh» 1.Уа аты, улағы уа келеурме туар қарасы анларның асайыш таба алмағай. 2.Ла чурм андағ атлары арыб, терісі қатыб өлгей. – 1. Zhane atyn, malyn zhane tuar karalaryna (zhylyklarina) zhagday taba almasyn (word-for-word translation: May him not provide his horse and livestock). 2. Attaryn semirtip mine almasyn, kalzhyrap ondai attar aryp, terisi katyp olgei (word-for-word translation: May their horses be fat so that they cannot ride them, may these horses get tired and thin, and die from starvation). We can understand whose horses are mentioned in the 2-sentence from the sentence preceding it, i.e. theirs (анларның /olardyng (theirs)). The sentence in the second component of it is complemented by means of the preceding component as well, i.e. «attarynyng terisi katyp olgei» (word-for-word translation: may their horses die from starvation).

1. Тағ түбүнде бір улуг су ақар ерді. 2. Ол су йақасына туар қарасын йығар ерді. 3. Ол су ның йақасы толса, онда көңлі тынар ерді малым түгәл деб. – 1. Tau tubinde bir uly su agatyn edi (word-for-word translation: There was a great water flowing next to the mountain). 2. Zhan-zhaktan malyn, tuar karasyn tau tubinen agyp zhatkan ulken ozen boyina zhinaitin edi (word-for-word translation: Used to gather his livestock all around along the big river flowing next to the mountain). 3. Ozen zhagasy tolsa, malym tugel dep kongili tynar edi (word-for-word translation: If the riverside gets packed, he would stay peaceful that his livestock is all there). The first component of the complex conditional clause here in the 3-sentence becomes complete as «what makes the riverside packed, i.e. livestock» by means of the

preceding sentence. Indirect object is omitted here. We can see adjacently linked contextual complex elliptical sentences from the given examples.

Бу шараб, тарсур маст еткучіні көңүл йүзі билән көрмес уа йахшыларны уа мундақ маст қылулар. Айтмас лар: йаман туруп йа йахшы. Қолыны маст етсе, та тутмақ, алмақ һөнәр дін қалғай. Уа айағыны маст қылсалар, та шул харақат келмек дін қалғай. Уа көңлүні маст етсе, та кеңес андишасыны жауап айта алмағай. Уа жүмлә хауас уилайат адрак ны шул ішлер дін йығыл ғай. Әгәр шуны очмек дін чарасы болмаса, андағ керек, кім бір айда үч қатла маст қылғай. Нечүк шул үч дін өтсе, хата болғай.. Әгәр бір айда екі хатла маст болса, йахшырақ. Уа әгир өзі ічмесе, андын йахшысы йоқ. – Karashylar ozderi sharap iship zharamas kylyktar zhasap zhane shekse, mas bolushyny kongil zhuzimen kormes zhane zhaksylardi mundai mas kylyktar etpes, zhaman turar alde zhaksy kolyn mas bolsa, sol kolyn ustai almas, onerden kalgai, ayagy mas bolganda, areket kyludan kalgai, kongili mas bolganda, kengesuge, zhauap kaitaruga hali bola almagai, barlyk konil-koyi sol isterden zhinalady (word-for-word translation: If working men drink wine, smoke and misbehave, they got drunk and good men wouldn't drink. A bad one can bear, but a good when gets drunk cannot stand. They want to distance themselves from art, any activity, when one is drunk he cannot even talk and all his mood depends on it). Eger sony ishuden bas tartuga sharasy bolmasa, bylai isteu kerek: bir ayda ush ret mas bolgai, oitkeni sol ush retten assa kata bolgai, eger bir ayda eki ret mas bolsa, zhaksyrak (word-for-word translation: If he is not able to refuse it, then he should do the following: drink wine three times in a month, for if he exceeds it's bad, if he gets drunk twice it's better). Eger ozi ishpese, onan zhaksysy zhok (word-for-word translation: It will be even much better if he doesn't drink). Here the last complex conditional clause «Әгәр өзі ічмесе, андын йахшысы йоқ – Eger ozi ishpese, onan zhaksysy zhok» is elliptical sentence. Direct object of the sentence (if not to drink what? – wine) occurring in the 1-sentence is distantly linked.

Let's pay attention to the following extract. 1. Барс йыл алты йүз екіде уа ақи рәжәб айында. 2. Чиңгиз хан бу йылда елліг екіде ерді. 3. Уа нечүк аның йауқында найман ның падшаһы Тайан хан уа жами өнгін падшаһ лар аның билә бирге ерді. 4. Чиңгиз хан анлар ның барчасын урушуб қачурды. 5. Барча падшаһларны өлтүрді. 6. Анлар ның уотан лары(н), йуртлары ерді, аңа барды. 7. Тайан хан ның тоқуз пайалы ақ туғы бар ерді. 8. Буйурды, аны тікді (61). – 1. Barys zhyly alty zhuz ekide, bastaldy razhab ayinda (word-for-word translation: It began in the year of tiger in six hundred and two, in razhab month). 2. Shyngys khan bul zhyly elu ekide edi (word-for-word translation: Genghis khan was fifty two this year). 3. Onyng uakytynda Naimannyng patshasy Tayan khan zhane barlyk ozge patshalar onymen birge edi (word-for-word translation: That time king of the Naiman's Tayan khan and other kings were together with him). 4. Shyngys khan olardyng barshasyn urysyp kashyrды (word-for-word translation: Genghis khan made all of them run away after the battle). 5. Barshasynyng patshalaryn oltirdi (word-for-word translation: Killed all their kings). 6. Olardyng otandary, zhurtary bar edi, ogan bardy (word-for-word translation: All of them had their motherlands, countries, went there). 7. Tayan khannyng togyz shashakty ak tuyi bar edi (word-for-word translation: Tayan khan had a white flag with nine fringes). 8. Buyirdi, ony tiktі (word-for-word translation: Ordered, and it was set up) (56). «Буйурды, аны тікді» (Buyirdi, ony tiktі (word-for-word translation: Ordered, and it was set up) within this context is elliptical sentence. We can see that several parts of the sentence are omitted. In order to complement the sentence we should pay attention to the context. Who ordered, whom he ordered, when he ordered? If to complement the sentence we'll have the

following sentence: «Шыңғыс хан барыс жылы отандарына, жұрттарына бұйырды, оны тікті» (word-for-word translation: Genghis khan in the year of tiger ordered motherlands, countries, set up it).

We can see that here subject, adverbial modifier, object are omitted. K.A. Mamatova distinguishes following features that are peculiar to contextual complementing:

1. Occurrence of the uncompensated sentences in the context;
2. Occurrence of the speech forms in the sentence that are insufficient on the information level;
3. Meaning is not transferred through words when the component denoting blankness of the syntactic order (object or the adverbial modifier) is insufficient on the information level;
4. Occurrence of the linguistic means capable of compensating syntactic aspects in the context. These issues can be seen from the work of Kadyrgali Kosymuly Zhalaïri «Zhami' at-Tauarikh».

Therefore, contextual elliptical sentences are one of the ways of integrating independent sentences into complex syntactic unit. We noticed it from the language of the artifact. We can even notice that language of the given artifact is closely connected with the modern Kazakh language.

/ C

1. Валиханов Ш. Собрание сочинений в 5 т. – Алма-Ата, 1984. – Т.1. – 431 с.
2. Жақыпов Ж.А. қазақ тілінің функционалды синтаксис. – Almaty, 1999. – 226 с.
3. Жақыпов Ж.А. Сөйлеу синтаксисінің сипаттары: оқулық. – Қарағанды, 1998. – 158 б.
4. Кордабаев Т.Р. Вопросы исторического синтаксиса. – Алма-Ата: Наука, 1964. – 244 с.
5. Мингулов Н., Көмеков Б., Өтениязов С. Қадырғали Жалайыр. Шежірелер жинағы. – Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1997. – 128 б.
6. Садуақасұлы Ж. Структурные типы моноклеарных предложений в казахском языке: [Текст]: филол. ғылым. д-ры ... дис. автореф. /Ж. Садуақасұлы. – Алматы, 1997. – 54 с.

References:

- Kordabayev 1964 - Kordabayev, T 1964, *Issues of the historical syntax*, Gylym, Almaty, 244 p. (in Rus).
 Mingulov, Komekov, Oteniyazov 1997 - Mingulov, N, Komekov, B, Oteniyazov, S 1997, *Kadyrgali Zhalaïr. Collection of chronicles*, Almaty, 128 p. (in Kaz).
 Saduakasuly 1997 - Saduakasuly, Zh 1997, *Structural types of mononuclear sentences in Kazakh language: An abstract of PhD thesis*, Almaty, 54 p. (in Rus).
 Valikhanov 1984 - Valikhanov, Sh 1984, *Abstracts from the collection of essays in 5 v.*, Alma-Ata, V.1., 431 p. (in Rus).
 Zhakupov 1998 - Zhakupov, ZhA 1998, *Features of spoken syntax*, Karagandy, 158 p. (in Kaz).
 Zhakupov 1999 - Zhakupov, ZhA 1999, *Functional syntax of Kazakh language*. Doctoral thesis, Almaty, 226 p. (in Kaz).

• -Та

филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, Е.А.Букетов атындағы Қарағанды мемлекеттік университетінің доценті. 100028 Қазақстан Республикасы, Қарағанды қ., Университетская к-сі, 28.
 E-mail: Zamza_bota@mail.ru

филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, Е.А.Букетов атындағы Қарағанды мемлекеттік университетінің доценті. 100028 Қазақстан Республикасы, Қарағанды қ., Университетская к-сі, 28.
 E-mail: Zhumanbaeva.ase@mail.ru

филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, Е.А.Букетов атындағы Қарағанды мемлекеттік университетінің доценті. 100028 Қазақстан Республикасы, Қарағанды қ., Университетская к-сі, 28. E-mail:: T_marhaba@mail.ru

. Мақалада Қадырғали Қосымұлы Жалаиридін «Жами`ат-Тауарих» еңбегіндегі толықтауышсыз сөйлемдер жайлы баяндалады. Тура және жанама толықтауыштардың жоқ болу себептері лингвистикалық фактілер арқылы дәлелденеді. Сонымен қатар авторлар мәтіннің аяқталмауының себептерін нақты дәлелдер арқылы тұжырымдайды. Авторлар тарихи мәтіндегі толымсыз құрмалас сөйлемдер жайлы баяндайды. Сөйлемдердің толымсыздығын дәлелдеу үшін жай сөйлемдермен салыстыра отырып, мәтін ішінен нақты мысалдар келтіреді. Контекстілердегі эллиптикалық сөйлемдер мәтіннің форма тудырушы құрылымдары болып табылады. Сондай-ақ көне мұра тілінің қазіргі қазақ тілімен байланысы да қарастырылады.

: эллиптикалық сөйлемдер; контекстік эллиптикалық сөйлемдер; тура толықтауыш; жанама толықтауыш; тарихи мәтін.

' -Та

кандидат филологических наук, доцент Карагандинского Государственного Университета им. Букетова. 100028 Республика Казахстан, г. Караганда, ул. Университетская, 28. E-mail: Zamza_bota@mail.ru

кандидат филологических наук, доцент Карагандинского Государственного Университета им. Букетова. 100028 Республика Казахстан, г. Караганда, ул. Университетская, 28. E-mail: Zhumanbaeva.ase@mail.ru

кандидат филологических наук, доцент Карагандинского Государственного Университета им. Букетова. 100028 Республика Казахстан, г. Караганда, ул. Университетская, 28. E-mail:: T_marhaba@mail.ru

. В статье рассматриваются эллиптические предложения с отсутствующим дополнением в работе Кадырғали Косымұлы Жалаири «Zhami 'at-Tauarikh». Причины отсутствия прямого и косвенного дополнения "доказаны с помощью лингвистических фактов. Также авторы подробно останавливаются на том факте, что текст является причиной незавершенности. Авторы также упоминают неполноту сложных предложений в историческом тексте. Приведены примеры, доказывающие неполноту сложных предложений в связи с контекстом, как замечено в отношении простых предложений. Контекстные эллиптические предложения являются одним из формообразующих устройств текста. Отмечается также соотношение языка артефакта с современным казахским языком.

: эллиптические предложения; контекстные эллиптические предложения; прямое дополнение; косвенное дополнение; исторический текст.