

Application of Prototype Theory to the Issue of Stability and Variability of Word Order Models in Different Languages

Gulnar Bayram Khalilova ¹

¹ *Odlar Yurdu University*

Koroglu Rahimov street, 13, AZ1072, Azerbaijan

DOI: [10.22178/pos.108-21](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.108-21)

LCC Subject Category: PE1001-1693

Received 15.08.2024

Accepted 28.09.2024

Published online 30.09.2024

Corresponding Author:

gxb_1986@gmail.com

© 2024 The Author. This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

License 

Abstract. Prototypical word order in world languages refers to the ontological side of this syntactic phenomenon. It is fixed and unchanging. The word order exists as a representation of various connection forms between language elements within the syntactic structure. In the context of the prototypical word order, deviating from them and moving in a new direction occurs against the background of the struggle between the old and the new. This global linguistic phenomenon has led to significant changes in the syntactic structure of the language and the formation of a new structure of relations in the old hierarchy. The article covers the initial influences that changed the prototypical sentence structure in Old Germanic and Old Turkic languages. For this purpose, the study used pronouns and adverbs in ancient Germanic languages and pronouns in ancient Turkic languages as research objects. The formation of word order in a sentence in Turkish, as in other languages, is based on the prototype word order. To study this problem, there are a large number of written monuments belonging to the 5th-9th centuries of our era. By studying those materials, we can get some information about the order of words in the monuments in ancient Turkic, in the period when splitting the Great Turkic into dialects was not yet completed. In conclusion, it is said that the signs of the prototypical word order are universal, but each language family has some peculiarities in this direction.

Keywords: prototype; word order; universal; connection; change.

INTRODUCTION

Without looking at the numerous works on the universal features of word order models, which are the most critical problems of syntax in different languages, the study of this topic from the perspective of the prototype theory, which is one of the leading research objects of cognitive linguistics, can open the way to new perspective directions. Studying the word order in languages from a historical perspective is advisable to understand the issue more clearly. For example, one of the problems encountered when studying Old English syntax is the problem of personal pronouns and word order. Prose works touch on this problem from different points of view; their positional characteristics and issues, such as the influence of the Latin language and its position in the text and the dependence of personal pronouns on textual pragmatics during

translations from Latin to Old English, have been clarified.

Personal pronouns have been studied from a descriptive perspective in Old English and word order studies. Although this problem has been involved in research since the 80s of the XIX century and has been studied based on quite deep materials, theoretical ideas about the regularity of word order usage in these studies were absent. However, in the 60s and 70s of the 20th century, the word order in Old English was seriously studied in different texts. Until this time, word order was considered independent in Old English. Despite this, the author [14] concluded his research on word order in Old English and noted an independent word order (SOV, OSV, VSO, VOS, SVO, OVS). According to him, the type of model used in the sentence depends on the communicative-pragmatic

feature and the genre of the work. Since this problem emerged, the main word order has become controversial. For example, in generativist studies, SOV was justified as the main word order, and in others, SOV or SVO. Other variants were explained within the framework of the influence of theme-rheme relations in the sentence. B. Mitchell gives some general comments on this topic. In particular, he notes that for Old English, it is possible to define something as the basic order of elements within a verb phrase (main base). By "main-base", the author does not mean the frequency of using a specific construction; on the contrary, he means such an arrangement of sentence parts that it is possible to obtain other sequences of elements most economically. The author [12] considers this "main" order close to the word order in modern German.

In his research on this problem, the author [11] concludes that the SOV word order is a model of the Proto-Germanic word order, while the SVO emerged in the process of language development. He then considers this model as syntactic archaism. The author [4] considers the distribution of elements in the sentence in terms of subject-verb order as Old English V2, which suggests that Old English is likelier to be V3. The author notes, among other things, that the processing of this or that word order depends on the dialect and time of the texts.

The author [3] concludes that the initial position in the XSV rule is more open to using stress elements because there are many word orders of this type, and XVS is a neutral word order. In Middle English, the number of XVSs has decreased with a relative increase in the number of examples with XSVs. Considering these, the author concludes that the development towards SV began due to the conflict between the syntactic and pragmatic element distribution.

Due to different word orders in Old English, depending on the narrative strategy, the development towards SV began due to the conflict between the syntactic and pragmatic element distribution.

Using the famous passage of the story of Cynewulf from the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, the author showed, for example, that the distribution of sentences with VS or OV in some cases depends on the characteristics of the narrative: 1) OV is used to convey a chain of events within

an episode; 2) VS closes the thematic slide with a transition to a new topic in the story [7].

In the light of the actual division theory, word order in Old English was extensively analyzed in the works of [6, 72–99]. His theory of "communicative dynamism" is based on the idea of increasing or decreasing the dynamism of the elements of the sentence, that is their distribution according to the principle of belonging to the base ("starting point"), "main" or transitional members. The main issue is how much this element develops the speech to increase dynamism. Thus, the most dynamic elements belong to the "core" and the most minor elements to the base ("starting point"). Between these two points, there is a whole scale of dynamics. Thus, when applying this theory to Old English texts, the author concludes that word order in Old English is based more on actual means of division than in Modern English. The author [6] emphasizes that in sentences that can be considered sentences with free word order, in his opinion, the main principle of placing elements is the principle of developing "dynamism".

"Free" word order did not represent "free variation" but was used for different communicative purposes, often complementing each other in the syntactic and thematic distribution of sentence elements. In addition, there was accuracy in the base word order (depending on the sentence type, especially the head and branch clauses and the conjunction) [9, 193]. Ultimately, he concluded that Old English was a language with SOV word order [9, 109].

The author [15], who researched Anglo-Saxon chronicles, decided that the nominal object dominates SVO, VSO, and VO. On the other hand, personal pronoun types such as VOS, OSV, and OVS are used. Generally, the nominal objects are twice as many as the pronominals.

From this, the author makes two generalizations: "When the object is the last main element, it is rarely expressed by a pronoun; secondly, when the object precedes the subject, it is rarely represented by a name" [15, 14].

The author [14] discussed these issues. In the chapter "The Order of Dative and Accusative Objects in Old English", the author examines the function of dative objects in the language using a broad sample of Old English texts. The author first critically analyses several syntactic works

related to these issues in one way or another [10]. Then, by defining the main criteria of the analysis, i.e. distinguishing the types of double objects (nominative and subjunctive, two pronouns, two nominals), as well as four types of sentences (main sentence; subordinate clause; main and subordinate clauses with conjunctions), the most common constructions are defined. Thus, the most frequently used construction is one pronominal and one nominal object [10, 141–143]. The author then examines each type of double object in all the types of sentences he identifies. Investigating the positions of dative and accusative objects, V. Koopman, based on quantitative data, determines that in more than 90% of the examples, there are cases where the object is before the nominal object, 83.9% of the objects are in the dative case [10, 144]. According to the author, the fact that the personal pronouns preceding the nominal subject are in the nominative case can be explained by the fact that the nominative case refers to the person, and the determinative case refers to the object. “In a text, a person is more likely to represent “known” information and therefore to be represented by a pronoun” [10, 144–145].

He concludes that nominal objects are predominant within SVO, VSO, and VO. On the other hand, pronominal objects are primarily used in structures like VOS, OSV and OVS. In SOVn OG, the number of nominal objects is greater than the number of pronominals (33 vs. 18 and 45 vs. 19). However, this difference is unsurprising since there are twice as many nominal objects in general [15, 14].

The sentences in Beowulf exhibit a word order pattern not widely attested in prose. This pattern is attested to varying degrees in most other examples of Old poetry, including English. This reflects the difference between poetry and prose. When we consider those differences, we are faced with various problems. There is an opinion among Germanists that in Old English poetry, there is a word order characterized by verb endings. They explain this by metrical considerations rather than syntactic differences.

On the other hand, they explain the differences between prose and poetry with the archaic character of poetry.

However, determining the date of composition is difficult for poetry. Alliterative poetry is thought to be as archaic as its language. Philological

evidence also supports the likelihood that Beowulf was written down after centuries of transmission.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Continued work on Old English word order leads to generalizations that provide some relatively accurate and independent tests of word order given the position of short adverbs.

Beowulf was passed from mouth to mouth as an example of oral folk literature and was written down in the 9th to 10th centuries. Undoubtedly, it contains archaic examples that do not belong to the 9th to 10th centuries. Negative stem sentences dominate Old English.

Negative verb – topic – “**Ne**” and inflexion of the finite verb “**is**” not confirmed. But some facts have been recorded:

1) a ne sende se deofol ða fyr of heofenum, þeah þe hit ufan come ÆCHom.i.6.13

Satan did not send fire from heaven, although it came from above

“Even though Satan came from above, he did not send fire from heaven.”

b Nolde se Hælend ÆHom.XIV.199 for his blessing

He did not ask for the Lord's prayer, but even if he went away,

“But the Lord did not want to leave him because of his prayer.”

Beowulf shares with other Old English texts this standard strategy of emphatic denial;

negative adverb + finite verb

2) *se þe manna wäs mägene strengest*

on þäm däge þysses lifes. †

Nolde eorla hleo ænige þinga

þone cwealm-cuman cwicne forlætan,

ne his lif-dagas leóda ænigum

Nolde eorla hleo / ænige thinga | þone cwealmcuman / cwicne forlætan Beowulf. 791

anything that protects an unwanted ear keeps the killer alive

“The guardian of the ears was not going to let the mortal guest live”

3) “heard on handa, wit unc wið hron-fixas

“werian þôhton. Nô he wiht fram me
 “flôd-ýðum feor fleótan meahte,
 “hraðor on holme, nô ic fram him wolde.
 “Þâ wit ätsomne on sæ wæron
 / No he wiht fram me | flodyþum feor / fleotan
 meahte,| hraþor on holme,/
 no ic fram him wolde.| Beowulf. 541

The sea could float faster in the water than in the waves far away from me; I didn't ask it to

“In no way could the sea have floated faster than me on the flood waves; I don't want to leave it”.

and gehealdan hêt hilde-geatwe.

Gesprâc þâ se gôða gylp-worda sum

Beówulf Geáta, ær he on bed stige:

“Nô ic me an here-wæsmum hnâgran talige

“gûð-geweorca, þonne Grendel hine;

b | no ic me an herewæsmun / hnâgran talige |
 guþgeweorca, / þonne Grendel hine |

Beowulf. 677

I myself am no more capable of fighting than Grendel himself

“I do not consider myself inferior to Grendel himself in the power of war, in the deeds of war.”

That is, 59% of negative-initial stem sentences have a pre-finite verb, or, more importantly, in the context of Old English word order, a significant 41% of negative-initial sentences have no finite verb. There are several points about the facts mentioned in (3).

First, sentences like those in Old English have a negative beginning, standard (1); secondly, the initial negative element is written with a different vowel, not like *ne*, and not procliticized like *n-*.

In Beowulf, the Oldest English may represent two roots. Negation can be an example of competition in negative-initial sentences with finite V-movement arising in negative-initial sentences due to developmental changes; negative-initial sentences constitute the grammatical environment in which the English language has been throughout its later history. Canonically, the movement from S to V is observed. This is a direction of formation for the SVO structure.

Thus, the positional characteristics of object personal pronouns in Old English depend on several factors. The structural features of personal pronouns (their “weight”) play an important role against the background of the dependence of the distribution of pronominal elements on sentence types and diachronic changes in the arrangement of words in the language as a whole, structural composition), the theme-rhematic unfolding of the narrative, the ratio of nominal and pronominal objects and cases, as well as the originality of the genre and style of the texts play an important role [2].

Word order

Many other short words share the stable position for reinforcing negative adverbs. In the sentence-internal position, “when in a sentence-internal position,” including adverbs “including þa “then”; þonne “then”; nu “now”; eac “also” la “lo” and so on belong here. They do not all occur with any frequency in the exact text.

However, if any of these adverbs are used, they are considered examples regardless of their exact position. In the stem sentences presented, the most variable is the finite verb; the pronominal subjects are always on the left, and the adverbial, nominal subjects are on the right; the position of *ðonne* is indicated. These observations about the position of adverbs and subjects are of particular value:

-first, they form an extreme word order generalization;

- the second is entirely independent of the position of the finite verb. This shows us whether there is any similarity to the word order of the poem, which we can approach from an independent perspective.

Among the short adverbs, “*ða*” “then” is the only one firmly attested in Beowulf.

Acquaintance with all variants of *ða* shows that “*ða*” is a multifunctional word.

Let's look at materials on the English language:

1. It can be used as a demonstrative pronoun;
2. As a binder; as an adverb. As an adverb, it is often used as the first participle
3. Can be used in a sentence-internal position

As an adverb:

“*secge ofersittan, gif he gesêcean deor*

“wīg ofer wæpen, and siððan witig god
 “on swâ hwäðere hond hâlig dryhten
 “mærdō dēme, swâ him gemet þince”
 Hylde hine þâ heaðo-deór, hleór-bolster onfêng
 eorles andwlitan; and hine ymb monig
 snellíc sæ-rinc sele-reste gebeáh.
 Nænig heora þohhte þät he þanon scolde
 eft eard-lufan æfre gesêcean,
 folc oððe freó-burh, þær he âfêded wäs,
 Hylde hine þa heapodeor, hleorbolster onfeng
 eorles andwlitan [5, 688].

As an adverb:

and gehealdan hêt hilde-geatwe.
 Gespräch þâ se gôða gylp-worda sum
 Beówulf Geáta, ær he on bed stige:
 “Nô ic me an here-wæsmum hnâgran talige
 “gûð-geweorca, þonne Grendel hine;

These facts show the close similarity of sentence-internal subjects and adverbs between poetry and prose. Many also confirm the limited use of other short adverbs in sentence-internal positions. For example, there are six forms of ðonne in sentence-internal position.

“gyf þonne Frysna hwylc frêcnan spræce
 †
 “þäs morðor-hetes myndgiend wære,
 “þonne hit sweordes ecg syððan scolde.
 †
 “Âð wäs geäfned and icge gold
 “âhâfen of horde. Here-Scyldinga
 gyf þonne Frysna hwylc frecnan spræce ðæs
 morþorhetes myndgiend wære [5, 1104].

Negation:

“feorran cumene, þät we fundiað
 “Higelâc sêcan. Wæron her tela
 “willum bewenede; þu ûs wel dohtest.
 †
 “Gif ic þonne on eorðan ôwihthe mäg
 “þînre môd-lufan mâran tilian,

Gif ic þonne on eorþan owihthe mæg þinre mod-
 lufan maran tilian [5, 1822].

Although dominant, it is not the only negation pattern in stem sentences, accounting for about 85% of cases. Other examples correspond to singular later Old English sentence negation.

Negation:

“mearcað môr-hopu: nô þu ymb mînes ne þearft
 †
 “lîces feorme leng sorgian.

†

“Onsend Higelâce, gif mec hild nime,
 “beadu-scrûda betst, þät mîne breóst wereð,
 “hrägla sêlest; þät is Hrêðlan lâf,

... / no ðu ymb mines ne þearft/ lices feorme
 lenge sorgian [5, 450].

The occurrence of other short adverbs is limited to primary results. However, the facts about the placement of þa and þonne seem strong enough to establish that the prose parallel appears to be a significant word-order generalization for Beowulf: the position of intra-sentence subjects and short adverbs is fixed; the variable is the position of the finite verb.

CONCLUSIONS

Deviations from the prototype version of the word order are due to the influence of the factors explained above; the location of personal pronouns and adverbs in different positions in the sentence and their connection-membership characteristics created conditions for deviations from the prototypical word order. These can be seen more dynamically when developing the syntactic structure. In this context, dynamism creates new models of those deviations in the substructure based on the prototypical word order. New developments in word order in any language are related to three factors:

1. Emergence of new variants of membership within the sentence. This means forming a new order in the sentence's syntactic structure. However, it does not mean a complete rejection of the prototypical word order; it can be explained as a change in some size ratio. Any deviations in the prototypical word order manifest syntactic struggle within the language; here, deviations from the prototypical word

order occur in all cases due to their inability to fully satisfy communication needs and the search for new ways of expression. Deviation from the prototype brings new connections to the word order within the sentence, leading to a departure from the previous system and their struggle for existence.

2. There is nothing permanent in language. People can express the same idea in several ways. Language has full potential in this regard. However, the potential presence of more operative structures in language gives it a stimulus. The syntactic possibilities of the language stimulate deviations from the prototypical word order. Therefore, when studying the prototypical word order of ancient languages, they do not ignore the most minor deviations between words in a sentence, considering linguistic facts. Because those deviations are manifested in language elements. Therefore, we considered personal pronouns and adverbial activity to study the ratio of the elements of the prototype and the new communication system in ancient Germanic languages.

3. If the prototypical word order structure can accommodate new means of association, it creates tension in that syntactic structure; new features in the traditional word order structure are tote. Because the connection in the word order itself is hierarchical, the new method of connection does not remain unaffected by this system.

This feature reflects the forms of influence on the prototype in the context of new word order formation. The prototype of the word order in ancient Turkic languages differs according to its characteristics. Let's review them.

The formation of word order in a sentence in Turkish, as in other languages, is on the prototype word order. To study this problem, there are a large number of written monuments belonging to the 5th-9th centuries of our era. By studying those materials, we can get some information about the order of words in the monuments in ancient Turkic, in the period when splitting the Great Turkic into dialects was not yet completed. From a logical point of view, it can be considered that based on the facts given to us by those monuments, we can assume the order of words in Turkish languages several centuries before that. First of all, let's consider some facts

related to the word order connection system in ancient Turkish written monuments:

1. Adjective – noun; *yağız yir (Üzə kök tenri, asra yağız yirkilintukta.* [16, 192].
2. Verb Adjective – Noun; *Görür gözüm görməz tag, bilir biligim bilməz tag bolti, özüm sakintim* [13, 416].
3. Pronoun – Noun; *Ol sab, Ol yir, bu öd* [16, 212].
4. Accusative – Verb; *Sabimi esidgil,* [16, 212].
5. Dative – Verb: *Bögü kağan banaru ayitmis* [16, 105].
6. Adverb-verb. *Tokuz Oğuz bəgləri, boduni, sabimin edgüti esid, katiğdi tinla* [16, 269] and etc.

As we can see, the forms that will create a connection for ordering the words in the sentence in the ancient Turkish written monuments do not differ from those of the modern era. This shows that the same means of communication in the sentence also existed in Old Turkic. That is, when determining the prototype of the word order in Turkish languages, these facts provide fundamental facts in the system of joining words in a sentence. Of course, the facts that we are involved in the explanation are not at the level of fully explaining the development of the syntactic structure of the language, especially the word order in the sentence, but they can be a guide for determining the prototype word order in the sentence.

In this process, as in ancient Germanic languages, we should pay attention to the function of pronouns. Pronouns in ancient Turkish written monuments are in a stable state both functionally and formally. The author [13, 198] writes this: "... pronouns in Turkic languages are a part of speech with a very ancient history. In the language of the monuments of the Orkhonyazi, we find a sufficiently developed system of pronouns. On the one hand, such a development of the pronoun system during the time of the Goyturk Orkhon-Yenisei inscription monuments, on the other hand, the almost unchanged pronouns of Turkic languages from the Orkhon-Yenisei period until now, allows us to say that the pronouns in Turkic languages had a long organized period until the V-IV centuries when the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments were established and were already formed by the V century of our era. Therefore, the emergence and formation of pronouns in Turkic languages can be traced back

thousands of years from the Orkhon Yenisei period to the depths of history". After that, he notes that the phonetic differences between the pronouns used in the language of the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments and the language of other Turkic tribes do not show that they have passed the period of their formation, this is an indication of the preservation of the characteristics of their tribal languages. Considering that pronouns are still developing, the author [13, 198] mentions the complete separation of the possessive suffix from pronouns in ancient Turkish written monuments. This means that during the period of Old Turkic written monuments, the possessive suffix was not yet formed as a category in Turkic languages, As can be seen in examples *Ariq ok sən, aqsik, tosik öməzsən*. The concept that the possessive category has not yet been fully formed in ancient Turkish written monuments also requires such an explanation that for any category to be formed in the language, it must have a linguistic base, a prototype. A prototype can also be hypothesized based on facts. Therefore, as the author [16, 128] said, the prototypes of pronouns in Proto-Turkic have two types of pronouns in written Old Turkic monuments. One is the pronoun that includes all the pronouns; the second is the pronoun with very few – this concept suggests that pronouns existed in Proto-Turkic as a prototype of Old Turkic; then, they began to differentiate in terms of meaning and were still unfinished during the period of Old Turkic written monuments. Based on what has been said, is it possible to connect the structure of the word order in the sentence in Turkish languages with the subject-object-subject model? Based on this, such an assumption can be made:

The archetype of pronouns existed in Proto-Turkic. Unlike the pronouns in modern Turkic languages, they were like a prototype of a core meaning and were later differentiated according to their types. A. Sherbak assumes that the sign and personal pronouns were later differentiated. Usually, as this process approaches the past tense, meaning groups of pronouns are formed. In the context of the formation of the personal category, the grammaticalization of sign-person pronouns took place. A. Shukurov notes that personal suffixes in Goyturk and Ancient Uyghur monuments are derived from personal pronouns [16, 146]. As we know, Proto-Turkic was a

language with a more amorphous structure, and later, the economic language structure became active and surrounded the language. Considering this point, we can talk about suffixes during the last stages of Proto-Turkic. Another possibility is that proto-Turkic had a core pronoun-like linguistic element.

Based on all this, it can be considered that the word order in proto-Turkic began with the subject and ended with the subject. The transformation of the pronoun into the personal suffix was already about to be completed in the ancient period of Turkic languages. For example:

Elçi men, (**Boyla kutliğ yarğan mən**). Elçi biz. (Bu atımız umay bəg biz)

Elçi sən. (**Arik ok sən**). Elçi siz (Ərən alp ər siz).

Elçi. (Bubitik bitigmə atisi yollğ Tigin) Elçi.

Külük apa **bən, Kirkiz oğli mən, Tor apa içrətki mən** [13, p. 137].

When we talk about prototype pronouns, we do not mean modern-day pronouns but the "core" pronoun that existed in proto-Turkic. It could appear in two positions at the sentence's beginning and end (SOVs). However, it can be assumed that the second subject became unstressed; therefore, the first subject-pronoun weakened and lost its independence. Therefore, the S-O-S word order in ancient Turkic was changed and turned into an SOV structure research should deepen this hypothesis.

The prototypical word order in world languages has an ontological characteristic. It has universal characteristics. Although German and Turkish languages belong to different language systems and language families, the change in their prototypical word order occurred due to deviations in the syntactic linking system in a unique way. The change of the prototypical word order in the world's languages is related to the forming of a new hierarchical communication system due to the influence of new language elements on the traditional syntactic structure in the language system. It can be considered that the word order in most languages of the world has not necessarily been fixed, and the dynamism of the language has undergone changes in the context. In all cases, the prototype serves as the basis for further development.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullayev, K. (1988). *Azərbaycan dili sintaksisinin nezeri problemleri* [Theoretical problems of Azerbaijani language syntax]. Baku: Maarif (in Azerbaijani).
2. Bondar, V. A. (N. d.). *Sintaksis obyektnix lichnix mestoimeniy v drevne anqliyskix tekstax* [Syntax of object-specific places in ancient anglo-saxon texts] (in Russian).
3. Bech, K. (1998). Pragmatic Factors in Language Change: XVS AND XSV Clauses in Old and Middle English. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 32, 1-2. doi: [10.1515/flih.1998.19.1-2.79](https://doi.org/10.1515/flih.1998.19.1-2.79)
4. Bean, M. C. (1983). *The development of word order patterns in Old English*. Canberra: Rowman & Littlefield.
5. Liuzza, R. M. (Ed.). (2013). *Beowulf* (2nd ed). Broadview Press.
6. Firbas, J. (1957). Some thoughts on the function of word order in Old English and modern English. *Sbornik praci filosoficke fakulty Brnenske university*, 6, 72–99.
7. Hopper, P. J. (1979). *The syntax of the simple sentence in proto-Germanic*. doi: [10.1515/9783110879087](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110879087)
8. Hopper P. J. (1979). *Aspect and foregrounding in discourse*. Retrieved from <https://www.degruyter.com/database/COGBIB/entry/cogbib.5650/html?lang=en>
9. Kohonen, V. (1978). *On the development of English word order in religious prose around 1000-1200*. N. d.: Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation.
10. N. d. (2007). Upotreblenie lichnyh mestoimenij i porjadok [Use of personal pronouns and order]. *Social'nye i gumanitarnye nauki. Otechestvennaja i zarubezhnaja literature*, 6 (in Russian).
11. Lehmann, W. Ph. (1974). *Proto-Indo-European syntax*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/lehmann-proto-indo-european-syntax-1974>
12. Mitchell, B. (1985). *Old English syntax*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
13. Rajabov, A. (2002). *Morphology of the Goyturk language*. Baku (In Azerbaijani).
14. Rybarkiewicz, W. (1977). *The word order in Old English prose and the functional sentence perspective*. *Studia anglica posnaniensia*, 9, 87–93.
15. Shannon, A. (1964). *A descriptive syntax of the Parker Manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle from 734 to 891*. Retrieved from <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/179516>
16. Khudiyev, N. (2015). *The language of ancient Turkish written monuments*. Baku: Science and education.