

Haptačahaptāitiš

Festschrift for Fridrik Thordarson

On the occasion of his 77th birthday

Edited by Dag Haug and Eirik Welo

Novus forlag – Oslo 2005

Instituttet for sammenlignende
kulturforskning

Participles in Caucasus Turkic

Lars Johanson

Introduction

The present article will discuss the origin of the Turkic intraterminal participle in *-EGEn*. Previous studies have failed to give an account of the origin of this participle. I will suggest that the original form included the copula verb *er-* 'to be', which has also been involved in the grammaticalization of other verb forms, e.g. certain present tense forms. The same pattern of grammaticalization may also have been copied into Bulgarian. For the terminology applied here, see Johanson (1998 and 2000a).

Turkic participles in *-GEn*

Most Turkic languages possess a participle in *-GEn*, e.g. *kel-gen* (from *kel-* 'to come'), *al-yan* (from *al-* 'to take'). In Oghuz Turkic, Chuvash and Khalaj, the initial velar has been lost, e.g. Turkish, Azerbaijani, Turkmen *gel-en*, Chuvash *kil-en*, Khalaj *kel-en*. In Turkish *-(y)En*, the consonant is preserved as a palatal glide *y* after vowel-final stems, e.g. *başla-yan* (from *başla-* 'to begin'). In the Turkic languages of the Caucasus area, the suffix is represented as *-GEn* in the Kipchak Turkic languages Kumyk, Noghay and Karachay-Balkar, whereas it has the form *-(y)En* in the Oghuz Turkic language Azerbaijani.

The participle in question often refers to both the present and the past (Deny 1921:567: "participe présent-passé").

Turkic participles in *-EGEn*

However, many languages also exhibit intraterminal ("present") participles of some kind. A few languages of the Northern Caucasus area possess an intraterminal participle in *-EGEn*, often with habitual or iterative meanings: 'doing', 'being in the habit of doing'. In all dialects of Kumyk, a language of the old western Kipchak Turkic type (Benzing 1959:404; Berta 1998:313) it is a productive participle marker with the shape *-EGEn* after consonant stems and *-yGEn* after vowel stems, e.g. *gel-egen* 'coming', *al-ayan* 'taking', *başla-yyan* 'beginning'. It stands in paradigmatic opposition to *-GEn* participles, e.g. *gel-gen* 'having come', *al-yan* 'having taken', *başla-yan* 'having begun'. The *-EGEn* participle also occurs in Black Noghay, e.g. *bar-ayan* 'going', *tur-ayan* 'standing'. It is also found in the northern part of Azerbaijan, close to the Kumyk-

speaking area of Dagestan, especially in the dialects of the Derbent region, e.g. *gel-egen* ‘coming’.

There are remainders of this participle in other dialects, e.g. Karakalpak *Ber-egen qolum al-ayan* ‘My giving hand is taking’ (from *ber-* ‘to give’ and *al-* ‘to take’) (Baskakov 1952:431). It is also preserved in the conservative language Chuvash of the Volga area and Khalaj of Central Iran, e.g. Chuvash *kil-eken* ‘coming’, Khalaj *kül-egen* ‘laughing’. Khakas, spoken in Southern Siberia, has a similar participle in *-iGen*, used with some verbs of motion, e.g. *par-ıyan* ‘going’, *kil-ıgen* ‘coming’.

This is obviously an old participle preserved in a few peripheral and conservative varieties of Turkic. It has been maintained relatively long in the western part of the Turkic world, and is still typical of the northern Caucasus area.

Note that the Oghuz Turkic language Turkmen has an analogous opposition between an intraterminal (“present”) participle in *-yE:n*, e.g. *al-ya:n* ‘taking’, *gel-ye:n* ‘coming’, and a postterminal (“past”) participle in *-En*, e.g. *al-an* ‘having taken’, *gel-en* ‘having come’. (For intraterminality and postterminality, see Johanson 2000a.)

Adjectives in *-EGEn*

These paradigmatic participles are closely related to, but still to be distinguished from, deverbal adjectives in *-EGEn* that express qualities involving intensity, duration, iteration and habituality, e.g. Chaghatay *tut-ayan* ‘rapacious’ (from *tut-* ‘to grasp’), Kazakh *köş-egen* ‘nomadizing’ (from *köş-* ‘to migrate’), Tuvan *xoy-uyan* ‘shying’ (from *xoy-* ‘to shy’), Turkmen *ür-egen* ‘barking’ (from *ür-* ‘to bark’, *dep-egen* ‘kicking’ (from *dep-* ‘to kick’), Turkish *gez-eğen* ‘planet, ever wandering’ (from *gez-* ‘to stroll, to wander’).

In modern Oghuz Turkic languages such as Turkish, *-EGEn* and *-GEn* are allomorphs of the same marker, the former occurring after monosyllabic stems, the latter after bisyllabic stems. This distributional rule is sometimes ignored by grammarians. The forms *çalış-kan* ‘diligent’ and *ol-ağan* ‘usual’ do not represent two different types, and *-EGEn* is not simply “a rare by-form” of *-GEn* (Lewis 1967:223). The form *çalış-kan* ‘diligent’ has not developed from **çalış-yan*, but rather from **çalış-ayan*.

The emergence of *-EGEn*

How did the participle in *-EGEn* emerge? Bang (1918:36) considered the possibility that it is derived from a vowel-final converb by means of *-GEn*. This

option is less probable since the suffix *-GEn* is only added to verbal stems.

Some Turcologists assume a combination of an expanded vowel-final verbal stem with *-GEn*. Thus, Menges (1959:478) supposes an old iterative in *-E*, whereas Banguoğlu (1986:229-230) suggests an intensifying suffix *-GE* ('berkitme fiili'), e.g. **tep-ge-gen > tep-egen* 'kicking' (from *tep-* 'to kick, to stamp'). This explanation is problematic since there are no early traces of Turkic intensive markers of this kind (Erdal 1991:524-525).

According to another hypothesis, *-EGEn* has developed from a combination of a vowel-final converb suffix with *tur-γan* 'standing' = *tur-* 'to stand' + *-GEn* (Baskakov 1940:111-112). But this periphrasis is represented, e.g. in Black Noghay, by the quite different construction converb + *tayan* (see below).

My own contention is that *-EGEn* has developed from a combination of a vowel-final converb suffix with the auxiliary **er-gen* = *er-* 'to be' plus *-GEn*. This periphrasis goes back to an old postverbal construction (see Johanson 1998:42) consisting of an intraterminal converb plus the verb *er-*. Its structure is thus very similar to the structure of the English progressive *is doing*.

Use of the auxiliary *er-* 'to be'

Why is the auxiliary *er-* 'to be' likely to have been involved? This auxiliary is used today only in some suffixed forms. For traces of its use as a copula verb in Western Oghuz Turkic languages, see Johanson (1991 and 2000b). Turkish Black Sea dialects exhibit free copula elements such as *iyim* 'I am', *isin* 'you are', *iyik* 'we are' and suffixed forms such as *-ysin*, 'you are' (Brendemoen 1997).

There are also clear traces of an old copula **er* in archaic present tense forms containing a *-y-* element. A postverb construction consisting of a vowel-final converb + **er-ür* must once have served to renew high-focal intraterminality in early Kipchak and Oghuz Turkic dialects spoken over a huge area in the western Turkic world.

The type *ber-i-yir-men* 'I am giving' (from *ber-* 'to give'), found in the old Kipchak source Codex Cumanicus (late 13th century - early 14th century) seems to be formed in this way (rather than with *yür* 'is moving' or *tur* 'is standing'). In the North Caucasus area, Kumyk forms in *-yir* were still in use at the beginning of the 19th century. For the Middle Azerbaijanian type *-eyir* ~ *-eyr*, see Johanson (1989 and 1997:94). Many dialects in the Ponto-Caspian area, on the Balkans, in Eastern Anatolia, in the Azerbaijanian area, etc., have maintained these present tense forms, though with various contractions, *-eyr*, *-iyr*, *-yir*, *-ey*, *-Ey*, *-yr*, *-yi*, *-y*, etc. (For Kashkay, see Csató 2001.)

Examples: Turkish dialects *gid-eyr-um* 'I go', *gid-eyr-em* 'I go', *gid-ey* 'goes'

(from *git-* ‘to go’), *bil-üy* ‘knows’ (from *bil-* ‘to know’), *gel-iy-em*, *gel-iy-m* ‘I come’ (from *gel-* ‘to come’). Azerbaijani dialects *al-eyr*, *al-ey*, *al-ay*, *al-iy* ‘takes’ (from *al-* ‘to take’), *gel-iy-sen* ‘you come’ etc., South Crimean *xorx-ay* ‘fears’ (from *xorx-* ‘to fear’), Northeastern Bulgarian dialects *gel-iy-im*, *gel-iy*, Gagauz dialects *al-iy-m* ‘I take’, *gid-iy-m* ‘I go’.

The Khakas intraterminal participle *-iGen*, e.g. *par-ıyan* ‘going’ is also clearly connected with the present tense form *par-ı* ‘is going’. Both forms are restricted to a few motion verbs. The frontness of the suffix-initial vowel is obviously the effect of **i-*. The finite form seems to go back to **bar-ı er-ür*, the infinite one to **bar-ı er-ken*.

Replacement of the auxiliary

The old intraterminal participle was maintained relatively long in the western part of the Turkic world. The auxiliary verb **er* was later on replaced by *turur* ‘stands’ and *yorür* ‘moves’. The old form was maintained in relict areas.

Kipchak Turkic adopted the analogous pattern vowel-final intraterminal converb suffix + *turur*, e.g. *al-a turur* ‘is taking’ (< ‘stands taking’), with later complete or partial loss of the auxiliary, e.g. Tatar *al-a* ‘takes’, *uqi-y* ‘reads’. As for the intraterminal participles, the “western” type vowel-final converb suffix + *er-ken* corresponds functionally to the “eastern” constructions of the type vowel-final converb suffix + *tur-yan*, e.g. *kel-e tur-yan* ‘coming’, which later developed into *-tayan*, *-digan*, etc. These patterns became typical of wide parts of the eastern Turkic world.

From the 15th century on, Ottoman Turkish began to use a verb ‘to move’ in the same function, e.g. *gel-i-yür*, *gel-i-yor* ‘is coming’ (< ‘runs coming’). The old construction was ousted in the standard variety and preserved in dialects only.

Further questions

There are several interesting relevant questions that cannot be dealt with here. One question is whether even the standard Azerbaijani and Turkmen present tenses, e.g. Azerbaijani *gel-ir* ‘comes’, *başla-yür* ‘begins’, Turkmen *bar-yar* ‘goes’, *işle-ye:r* ‘works’, go back to the pattern vowel-final converb + **er-ür*, rather than to postverbal constructions with **yörür*, etc. This pattern could have developed over intermediate forms such as Azerbaijani *-eyir* ~ *-eyr* (Johanson 1989; 1997:94) and Turkmen *-(I)yEr*, e.g. *bar-iyar* ‘is going’, *gel-iyer* ‘is coming’.

Another question is whether the Turkmen intraterminal (“present”)

participle in *-yE:n*, e.g. *al-ya:n* 'taking', *gel-ye:n* 'coming', goes back to the pattern vowel-final converb suffix + *e(r)*- 'to be' + *-yEn* (< *-GEN*).

There are also several intriguing problems of a contact-linguistic order.

The western South Caucasian languages Mingrelian, Laz and Svan, spoken in immediate Turkic neighborhood, form high-focal intraterminals by means of infinitized 3rd p. sg. imperfect forms plus auxiliaries. The result is highly reminiscent of the *-EGEn* type. The structural similarities may have an areal linguistic explanation (Bernard Christophe, personal communication).

East Caucasian languages display focal present tenses derived from periphrases with a verb 'to be', e.g. Avar *Dica lengun xer beguleb bugo* 'I am turning over the hay with the pitchfork'. This phenomenon is directly comparable to the early Turkic construction and may be relevant from an areal-linguistic point of view (Jost Gippert, personal communication).

In the discussion concerning possible Turkic models for copying evidentials into Bulgarian, I have stressed the fact that the opposition of the South Slavic participles *xodel*, derived from the imperfect stem, and *xodil*, derived from the aorist stem, parallels the Turkic distinction between *bar-ayan* (intraterminal) and *bar-yan* (postterminal) found in some Kipchak Turkic languages of the Pontic area (Johanson 1996). Thus *-EGEn* corresponds to the imperfect participle, and *-GEN* to the aorist participle. The type *-EGEn* must have been widespread in the past, at least in some old Kipchak Turkic languages that once played a dominant role in the Pontic area. It is, as we have seen, still alive as a paradigmatic participle in Caucasus Turkic.

References

- Bang, W. (1918) *Monographien zur türkischen Sprachgeschichte* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1918, 12), Heidelberg.
- Banguoğlu, T. (1986) *Türkçenin grameri* (TDK yayınları 528), Ankara.
- Baskakov, N. A. (1940) *Nogajskij jazyk i ego dialekty. Grammatika, teksty i slovar'* (Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut jazyka i pis'mennosti narodov SSSR), Moskva-Leningrad.
- Baskakov, N. A. (1952) *Karakalpakskij jazyk. 2. Fonetika i morfologija*, 1, Moskva.
- Benzing, J. (1959) "Das Kumükische", in Deny, J. et. al. (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*, Aquis Mattiacis:391-406.
- Berta, Á. (1998) "West Kipchak languages", in Johanson, L. and É. Á. Csató (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*, London:301-317.

- Brendemoen, B. (1997) "Some remarks on the copula in a 'micro-dialect' on the Eastern Black Sea coast", *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 33:2-8.
- Csató, É. Á. (2001) "Present in Kashkay", *Turkic Languages* 5:104-119.
- Deny, J. (1991) *Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanli)*, Paris.
- Erdal, M. (1991) *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon* (Turcologica 7), Wiesbaden.
- Johanson, L. (1981) *Pluralsuffixformen im Südwesttürkischen* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, 1981: 9), Wiesbaden.
- Johanson, L. (1998) "The structure of Turkic", in Johanson, L. and É. Á. Csató (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*, London:30-66.
- Johanson, L. (1989) "Aorist and present tense in West Oghuz Turkic", *Journal of Turkish Studies* 13:99-105.
- Johanson, L. (1996) "On Bulgarian and Turkic indirectives", in Boretzky, N., W. Enninger and Th. Stolz (eds.) *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte. Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen* (Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 24), Bochum:84-94.
- Johanson, L. (1997) "A grammar of the 'lingua turcica agemica'", in Kellner-Heinkele, B. and P. Zieme (eds.) *Studia Ottomanica. Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 47), Wiesbaden:87-101.
- Johanson, L. (2000a) "Viewpoint operators in European languages", in Dahl, Ö. (ed.) *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin, New York:27-187.
- Johanson, L. (2000b) "Traces of a Turkic copula verb", *Turkic Languages* 4:235-238.
- Lewis, G. L. (1967) *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford.
- Menges, K. H. (1959) "Die aralo-kaspische Gruppe", in Deny, J. et. al. (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*, Aquis Mattiacis:434-488.