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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-yen (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-yen (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-ejen ‘coming’, al-ayan ‘taking’, başla-yayan ‘beginning’. It stands in paradigmatic opposition to -GEN participles, e.g. gel-gen ‘having come’, al-yen ‘having taken’, başla-yen ‘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-eğen* ‘coming’.

There are remainders of this participle in other dialects, e.g. Karakalpak *ber-eğen qolum ał-ayan* ‘My giving hand is taking’ (from *ber-* ‘to give’ and *ał-* ‘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-eğen* ‘coming’, Khalaj *kùl-eğen* ‘laughing’. Khakas, spoken in Southern Siberia, has a similar participle in -EğEn, used with some verbs of motion, e.g. *par-iyan* ‘going’, *kił-iğen* ‘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 -yEn, e.g. *al-yān* ‘taking’, *gel-yēn* ‘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 -EğEn

These paradigmatic participles are closely related to, but still to be distinguished from, deverbal adjectives in -EğEn that express qualities involving intensity, duration, iteration and habituality, e.g. Chaghatai *tut-ayān* ‘rapacious’ (from *tut-* ‘to grasp’), Kazakh *köś-eğen* ‘nomadizing’ (from *köś-* to migrate), Tuvin *xoy-ayān* ‘shying’ (from *xoy-* ‘to shy’), Turkmen *ür-eğen* ‘barking’ (from *ür-* ‘to bark’, *dep-eğen* ‘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, -EğEn and -Eğn 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 *çağıš-kan* ‘diligent’ and *ölgan* ‘usual’ do not represent two different types, and -EğEn is not simply “a rare by-form” of -Eğn (Lewis 1967:223). The form *çağıš-kan* ‘diligent’ has not developed from *çâliš-yan*, but rather from *çâliš-ayân*.

The emergence of -EğEn

How did the participle in -EğEn emerge? Bang (1918:36) considered the possibility that it is derived from a vowel-final verb by means of -Eğn. This
option is less probable since the suffix -\textit{G\textsc{en}} is only added to verbal stems.

Some Turkologists assume a combination of an expanded vowel-final verbal stem with -\textit{G\textsc{en}}. Thus, Menges (1959:478) supposes an old iterative in -\textit{E}, whereas Banguoğlu (1986:229-230) suggests an intensifying suffix -\textit{GE} ('berkitme fiili'), e.g. *\textit{tep-ge-gen} > \textit{tep-e\textsc{en}} 'kicking' (from \textit{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, -\textit{E\textsc{G\textsc{en}}} has developed from a combination of a vowel-final converb suffix with \textit{tur-yan} 'standing' = \textit{tur-} 'to stand' + -\textit{G\textsc{en}} (Baskakov 1940:111-112). But this periphrasis is represented, e.g. in Black Noghay, by the quite different construction converb + \textit{t\textsc{ayan}} (see below).

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

\textbf{Use of the auxiliary \textit{er-} 'to be'}

Why is the auxiliary \textit{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 \textit{i\textsc{yim} 'I am'}, \textit{i\textsc{sin} 'you are'}, \textit{i\textsc{yik} 'we are'} and suffixed forms such as -\textit{ys\textsc{in}}, 'you are' (Brendemoen 1997).

There are also clear traces of an old copula *\textit{er} in archaic present tense forms containing a -\textit{y-} element. A postverb construction consisting of a vowel-final converb + *\textit{er-\textsc{ur}} 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 \textit{ber-i-yir-men} 'I am giving' (from \textit{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 \textit{y\textsc{ur} 'is moving'} or \textit{tur 'is standing'}). In the North Caucasus area, Kumyk forms in -\textit{y\textsc{ir}} were still in use at the beginning of the 19th century. For the Middle Azerbaijani type -\textit{ey\textsc{ir} ~ -ey\textsc{r}}, see Johanson (1989 and 1997:94). Many dialects in the Ponto-Caspian area, on the Balkans, in Eastern Anatolia, in the Azerbaijani area, etc., have maintained these present tense forms, though with various contractions, -\textit{ey\textsc{r} ~ -y\textsc{ir} ~ -ey ~ -\textsc{yi} ~ -\textsc{yi}}, -\textit{yi}, -\textit{y}, -\textit{yi}, -\textit{y}, etc. (For Kashkay, see Csató 2001.)

Examples: Turkish dialects \textit{gid-ey\textsc{r}-um} 'I go', \textit{gid-ey\textsc{r}-em} 'I go', \textit{gid-ey 'goes'}

The Khakas intraterminal participle -iCEn, e.g. par-iyan ‘going’ is also clearly connected with the present tense form par-i ‘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-i er-ür, the infinite one to *bar-i 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 yorir ‘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-gen 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’, baśla-yir ‘begins’, Turkmen bar-ıyar ‘goes’, išle-yer ‘works’, go back to the pattern vowel-final converb + *er-ür, rather than to postverbial constructions with *yörür, etc. This pattern could have developed over intermediate forms such as Azerbaijani -eyr ~ -eyr (Johanson 1989; 1997:94) and Turkmen -lYer, e.g. bar-ıyar ‘is going’, gel-ıyer ‘is coming’.

Another question is whether the Turkmen intraterminal ("present")
participle in -yEn, e.g. al-yan ‘taking’, gel-yen ‘coming’, goes back to the pattern vowel-final converb suffix + e(rt)- ‘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 intraterinals by means of infinitized 3rd p. sg. imperfect forms plus auxiliaries. The result is highly reminiscent of the -GEN 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-yan (intrateriminal) and bar-yan (postterminal) found in some Kipchak Turkic languages of the Pontic area (Johanson 1996). Thus -GEN corresponds to the imperfect participle, and -GEN to the aorist participle. The type -GEN 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.
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