ORIGIN OF SOME VERBAL FORMS COMMON TO TURCIC AND MONGOLIAN LANGUAGES

(On the problem of the Altaic Speech community).

BY

N. A. BASKAKOV

Moskow

Of considerable interest in connection with the Altaic speech community problem is the verbal form with *-žee/-čee*, *-žī/-či*, *-ž/-č* (< *-žuquj/-čuquj*) occurring in the Mongolian languages¹ and the verbal form with *-žyx/-čyx*, *-žyq/-čyq*, *-ču* occurring in some Turkic languages, viz.: (a) with *-žyx/-žik*, *-čyx/-čik* in Khakass,² (b) with *-čyq/-čik*, *-čuq/-čük*, *-žyq/-žik*, *-žuq/-žük* in Touvinian,³ and (c) with *-ču/-čü* in Kirghiz.⁴

In Khakass the affix *-čyx/-čik*, *-žyx/-žik* (negative form: *-mažyx/-mežik*, *-bažyx/-bežik*, *-pažyx/-pežik*) in combination with the verbal stem forms the past historic tense and denotes a recently accomplished action, e.g.:

ür paržyx, as *paržyx*, as *tasxytyny üstine čyxčyx*. 'He travelled near, he travelled far, and climbed to the top of a snow-pass.'

ib toldyra čon čylžyx 'People filled the whole yourta.'

čidip, *adyn altyn stolbaa paljažyx*, *žigün asčyx*, *izen piržik*, *irkün altan mendi piržik* 'Having come, he tied his horse to a golden post, opened the door, said a greeting and having crossed the threshold, bowed.'⁵

Besides, also in Khakass, the form with *-čyx/-čik* (with variants) is part of the complex conjugate stems of the past perfect tense of the subjunctive mood, i.e., forms of the type: *par-ar-žyx-pyn* 'I would go' (negative form: *par-bas-čyx-pyn* 'I would not go') or *par-γaj-žyx-pyn* 'I daresay I would go' (negative form *par-ba-γaj-žyx-pyn* 'I daresay I would not go'), e.g.:

adymnyj tujyaxtaryn innnebizeržtkp̄n 'I would like to cure the hoofs of my horse'; *kižee čaxsy kün polyan polza, min suya somarya pararžyaxpyn* 'If it had been a good day yesterday I would have gone to bathe.'

anda xalyan polzay, irelenip čörgejžiksij 'If you had remained there, you would have suffered (for no reason).'⁶

The form with *-čyx/-čik* in Khakass corresponds semantically to the forms *baryp edim* 'I rode' in the indicative mood and *barar edim* 'I would ride' in the subjunctive mood, e.g., in Kazakh,⁷ which suggests, in the composition of the Khakass complex forms with *-čyx/-čik* as well, the presence, genetically, of some auxiliary verb, e.g. the verb *er-/ir-* 'to be' the eroded stem of which was in the position between the principal verb and the affix *-čyx/-čik*, i.e. < *par* (+?) + *čyx* + *pyn* 'I went' (< *par-yp ir* + *čik p̄n*); *par* + *ar* (+?) + *čyx* *pyn* 'I would go', though this verb is absent in Khakass and Touvinian while other forms correspond to these forms in Kirghiz.

This form has the same meaning in Touvinian in which, however, it is expressed by a considerably larger number of phonetic variants of the affix *-čyq/-čik*, *-čuq/-čük*, *-žyq/-žik*, *-žuq/-žük* (negative form: *-bažyq/-bežik*, *-pažyq/-pežik*), viz., in combination with a verbal stem it makes the past tense form indicating that the "action or state did take place or did not, and the speaker confirms it, for example, *kelčik men čop*, 'surely, I came' or *kelbežik men čop* 'surely, I did not come.'"⁸

This form is especially indicative for Touvinian. "The principal meaning of the forms with *-čyq*," note F. G. Iskhakov and A. A. Palmbakh, "is a categorical statement or confirmation (reminder) that the action in question did actually take place."⁹

However, if we turn to the above examples, we can readily see that the semantic value of this form—the imperfect past tense with a shade of doubt—occurs in Khakass and Kirghiz as well; cf. *alčyq (čop)* 'he surely took'; *baržyq (čop)* 'he surely ate'; *köržük be?* 'surely he did not see'; *bolčuq* 'surely he was', etc.¹⁰

It is interesting to compare the forms with *-čyq* with periphrastic combinations consisting of the participle *-an* and the particle *ijik*, e.g. *siler xoorajya čoraan ijik siler čop* 'surely you rode to the city' and *siler xoorajya čoržuq siler čop* in the same meaning.¹¹

F. G. Iskhakov and A. A. Palmbakh suppose that a more comprehensive form *čoraan ijik* historically reduced to the form *čoržuq* owing to the trend in the Eastern Turkic languages towards a kind of elision in which the first element *čoraan* reduced to *čor* while the particle *ijik* > *žik* > *žuq* and "thus," according to the authors, "the analytical construction *čoraan ijik* is transformed into the synthetic *čoržuq*".¹²

This conjecture is rather probable if we accept the hypothesis on the identity of the particle *ijik* with the past tense form of the auxiliary verb *er-/ir-* *irdik* > *i(r)di(k)*, i.e., the identity of the forms *čoraan ijik* and *čorayan idi* (< *irdik*). What makes this hypothesis even more probable is the fact that the particle *ijik* often occurs in Touvinian also in combination with the participle with *-ar/-er*, *-yr/-ir* making the subjunctive form of the verb; cf. *sen dūūn kelgen bolzuŋza, eki bolur ijik* 'It would have been good if you had come yesterday'; *daarta ajas xūn bolur bolza, eki bolur ijik* 'It would be good if it were a clear day tomorrow.'¹³

Thus, in Touvinian both combinations with past tense participles (*aq qys kelgen ijik be?* 'Has Akkus come?') and combinations with future tense participles (*bolur ijik* 'would be') correspond very well to the connotations *kelgen edi* 'he has come', *bolur edi* 'would be' in other Turkic languages where the verb *er-/ir-* lingers mainly in derelict forms. It is quite possible that the form *ijik* in Touvinian is also derelict form of the past tense with *-dyq* > *dy* from the verb *er-/ir-* 'to be, to exist'.

In Kirghiz the form with *-čyq* is derived by a phonetically elided affix only with the mute initial *č* and only with back- and front-row labial vowels, i.e. only in two variants *-ču* and *-čü* which remain constant for both stems with labial vowels, e.g. *ūjčü* 'he piled up', *ötčü* 'he went by' as well as for stems with non-labial vowels, e.g. *alču* 'he took', *berčü* 'he gave', etc.

In Kirghiz the affix *-ču/čü* derives several simple and complex forms of the past tense.

Joining directly the verb, the affix *-ču/-čü* derives a conjugate stem of the past continuous tense, e.g.,

murun qapčyyajdan at aray ötčü 'Formerly the horse was barely passing through the crevice';

atadyñ kedejligin bilbej "sary maj žejmin" dep qyjnačusyŋ

'Disregarding the poverty of your father, you kept tormenting (him) by saying "I want to eat melted fat"';

azoo degendi üšintip qarmačubuz 'This is how we were chasing an unbroken (horse)';

men kičine kezde abamdar bolup žylyga žajlooyo ǵyǵuq 'When I was a boy, I and my uncle were rising (i.e. migrating) every year to the dzhaylau'.¹⁴

The negative form of the same past continuous tense in Kirghiz is derived by the negative link *emes* which occurs in the position between the affix *-ču/-čü* and the affix of the person, e.g. *men barču emesmin* 'I was not in the habit of going'.

At bir baspajman degen žerin üč basat dep qaryjalar ajlsa išenčü emesmin 'If the old men said that the horse stepped three times on the spot he did not wish to step on I would not believe it'.

kün sajyn qoroo šypyryp otun žaryp, samoor qajnatyp, suu tašyp žanyym tynču emes 'Every day, as I swept the court, chopped wood, put up a tea urn and carried water, my soul was not resting'.

Besides, the past continuous form with *-ču/-čü* in Kirghiz can be modified by modal particles in combination with which the principal form acquires various modal shades.

In combination with the modal particle *ele* the form with *-ču/-čü* expresses the pluperfect continuous tense witnessed by the speaker himself, e.f.:

el čelinde žoo tursa, žigit üjde žatču bele?! 'If a foe stands at the border of the land surely a Djigit must not lie at home!';

kürkeden kürkede žürgen kezinde üksejüp žaman körünčü ele 'When she walked from hen-coop to hen-coop, she looked shaggy'.¹⁶

In combination with the modal particle *eken* the form with *-ču/-čü* expresses the pluperfect continuous indefinite tense, with a shade of doubt as to the authenticity of the communication, e.g.:

čaar ajyyn özüñ özü tozup qaryšqyr kelse, čapčyp taštap uuru kelse, atynan tištep yrytyyp žiberip žure berčü eken 'The dappled colt protected himself; if a wolf came he would, you see, strike with his front leg, if a thief came, his teeth biting, he tossed him, you see, off the horse'.¹⁷

In combination with the words *oqşojt* and *öydönöt* the form with *-ču/-čü* expresses a conjectural shade, e.g.

al mal qajtarču oqşojt 'He seems to be (then) heroing cattle';

aħmat aňčylyqqa čyqču öydönöt 'Aħmat, it seems, used to go hunting'.¹⁸

Defining the semantic value of the tense verbal form with *-ču/-čü*, B. O. Oruzbayeva notes that this form cannot combine with specifying adverbs *byltır* 'last year', *keče* 'yesterday', *erten menen* 'in the morning', *murunıy künü* 'the day before yesterday'. In combination with these adverbs, writes Oruzbayeva, the verb may be only in the form with *-yan* or *-dy*, e.g.: *byltır ğajloočular suusamırda ğajlayan* (or) *ğajlady* (but not *ğajlaču*) 'Last year the cattle breeders spent the summer on Suusamır'.¹⁹

This property of the form with *-ču/-čü* emphasizes, first of all, its meaning as the form of the preterite or pluperfect tense, and second, the multiplicity, recurrence and continuity of the action it expresses.

Isolating the form of the past tense with *-ču/-čü* in Kirghiz as a special verbal form, we should not confuse it with the imperative mood form expressed by the verbal stem and particles *-čy/-či*, *-ču/-čü* expressing entreaty or command. Incidentally, in Kirghiz the past tense form with *-ču/-čü* and the imperative form with the particle *-čy/-či*, *-ču/-čü* is differentiated at least for stems with non-labial vowels, e.g. *alčy* 'take it!' and *alču* 'he took' and as a rule is never confused.

More frequently the past form with *-ču/-čü* is confused in Kirghiz with the secondary participle with *-uuču/-üüčü* (< *-uwču/-üwčü* ~ *-uyču/-ügčü* ~ *-yuču/-güčü*) which derives from the combination of a noun of action with *-uu/-üü* (< *-uw/-üw* < *-uy/-üg* ~ *-yu/-gü*) with the affix of profession *-čy/-či*, *-ču/-cü* and which, along with the complete form with *-uuču/-üüčü*, also occurs in an abbreviated form with *-ču/-cü*, which led some investigators to the confusion of these verbal forms, entirely different genetically and semantically.²⁰

Thus the form *-čyx/-čik* ~ *-ču/-čü* in Khakass, Touvinian and Kirghiz is a common form deriving the verbal stem of the past tense with a relatively (similar semantic value: past continuous imperfect (incomplete) action).

As was indicated earlier,²¹ the form with *-čyx/-čik ~ -ču/-čü* in some Turkic languages (Khakass, Touvinian, Kirghiz) is common with the Mongolian form of the past tense of unexpected action *-žee/-čee*, *-ži/-či*, *-ž/-č* (< *-žuquj/-čuquj*)²² and ascends to a single form (evolved phonetically in three variations: (a) *-dyγ/-dig*, *-dyq/-dik* (in the stem of the past tense with *-dy/-di*), (b) *-čyx/-čik* extant in Mongol and some Turkic languages (Khakass, Touvinian, Kirghiz); and (c) *syq/-sik* surviving in the language of the Yenisey-Orkhon records,²³ cf. *ilgärü kün tosyqqqa* 'forward to the sunrise'; *quryγaru kün batsyqqyna* 'back to the sunset'; *tutsyq jir* 'a country in which a tribal union can be set up'²⁴ and (d) *-juq/-jük* preserved in the Old Uigur language; see for example, *bolmajuqqqa* 'for not being'; *bolmajuqlary* 'they not found'; *tägmäjük ärmış* '(years and times) were not fulfilled'.²⁵

All the above phonetic variants of the same form of the past participle are closely connected genetically between themselves and, as is indicated above, with the Mongolian form with *-žee/-čee*.

The form with *-žee/-čee* in Mongolian serves as the conjugate stem of the third past tense denoting an action which occurred long ago and is unknown to the listener until the moment of speaking, i.e. with a semantic value similar to that of the form with *-čyx/-čik ~ -ču/-čü* in Khakass, Touvinian and Kirghiz; cf. examples from Mongolian:

öpöödör bat xotoos iržee 'Today Bat came, it turns out, from the city';

žamjan gancaaraa javž tombaya 33 čono atžee 'Zhamyan, it turns out, killed alone 33 wolves'.²⁶

This form is also called the past tense of unexpected action in the indicative mood by G. D. Sanzheyev²⁷ who regards the form *-žuquj/-čuquj* as its most complete prototype.²⁸

G. I. Ramstedt,²⁹ noting this form in the Mongolian literary language, also regarded it genetically common with the general Turkic form of the past tense with *-dy/-di*. According to Ramstedt, the affixes of this form *-žu/-ču ~ -ži/-či* having the modified original *-dj/-tj* with a subsequent vowel, correspond to the Turkic *-dy/-di*.

The hypothesis on the common origin of the forms with *-dyq/-dik ~ -tyk/-tik* (> *-dy/-di*, *-ty/-ti*) and *-čyx/-čik ~ -žyq/-žik*

(> -čü/-čü ~ žü/-žü || -čy/-či ~ -žy/-ži, -žee/-čee -ž/-č, etc.) is also confirmed if the general Turkic form with *-dy/-ty* is regarded as a more recent formation ascending to the form *-dyq/-dik* ~ *-duq/-dük*³⁰ and the new form with *-žü/-čü* ~ *ži/-či* to the fuller form with *-čyq/-čik* (in the Old script Mongolian language these forms ascend to a fuller form *-žuquj/-čuquj*³¹ just as a more recent Kirghiz form *-čü/-čü* corresponds to an older Khakass form *-čyq/-čik*, *-žyq/-žik* and Tuvinian *-čyq/-čik*, *čuq/-čük*, *žyq/-žik*, *žuq/-žük*.

However, while establishing a common genesis of the above forms with *-dyq*, *-čyq* and *-syq* on the one hand and noting the presence of parallel forms in Khakass, Tuvinian and Kirghiz with *-dy/-ty* and *čyχ/-čü*, in a similar sense of the past tense as well as a restricted occurrence of the form with *-čyq*, it is only the eastern Turkic languages for which we can suppose that the form with *-čyχ* is a characteristic form for the Mongolian languages only, while in the Turkic languages—Khakass, Tuvinian and Kirghiz—it is a relatively new borrowing from the Mongolian language all the more so that it is the eastern Turkic languages, in contrast to their western counterpart, that are strongly influenced by Mongolian phonetically and lexically as well as morphologically.

Notes:

¹ Г. Д. Санжеев, Сравнительная грамматика монгольских языков, М.-Л., 1953, стр. 59.

² Н. А. Баскаков, А. И. Инкижекова-Грекул, Хакаско-русский словарь, М., 1953, стр. 457-458, 462-463.

³ Ш. Ч. Сат, Тувинский язык. Тувинско-русский словарь, под ред. А. А. Пальмбах, М., 1955, стр. 689-690.

⁴ В. О. Орузбаева, Формы прошедшего времени в киргизском языке, Фрунзе, 1955, стр. 36-47.

⁵ Н. А. Баскаков и А. И. Инкижекова-Грекул, *op. cit.*, стр. 458.

⁶ Н. А. Баскаков и А. И. Инкижекова-Грекул, *op. cit.*, стр. 463.

⁷ КазІргІ казак тілі, Алматы, 1954, стр. 311.

⁸ Ш. Ч. Сат, *op. cit.*, стр. 689-690.

⁹ Ф. Г. Исхаков, А. А. Пальмбах, Грамматика тувинского языка, М., 1961, стр. 375-379.

¹⁰ Ф. Г. Исхаков, А. А. Пальмбах, *op. cit.*, стр. 376-377.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, стр. 379.

- ¹⁴ Ibid., стр. 379.
- ¹⁵ Тувино-русский словарь, под ред. А. А. Пальмбах, М., 1955, стр. 189.
- ¹⁶ Б. О. Орузбаева, *op. cit.*, стр. 40-41.
- ¹⁷ Б. О. Орузбаева, *op. cit.*, стр. 43-46.
- ¹⁸ Б. О. Орузбаева, *op. cit.*, стр. 46.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Б. О. Орузбаева, *op. cit.*, стр. 46.
- ²¹ Б. О. Орузбаева, *op. cit.*, стр. 44.
- ²² Ср. И. А. Батманов, Грамматика киргизского языка, в. III, Фрунзе, 1940, стр. 50; Б. О. Орузбаева, *op. cit.*, стр. 39-40.
- ²³ Н. А. Баскаков, А. И. Инкижекова-Грекул, Хакасско-русский словарь, М., 1953, стр. 458.
- ²⁴ Г. Д. Санжеев, Сравнительная грамматика монгольских языков, М.-Л., 1953, стр. 59; А. Бобровников, Грамматика монгольского языка, Казань, 1849, стр. 356-360-363.
- ²⁵ A. v. Gabain, *Alttürkische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1950.
- ²⁶ С. Е. Малов, Памятники древнетюркской письменности, М.-Л., 1951, стр. 27-28.
- ²⁷ Ibid., стр. 190.
- ²⁸ Б. Х. Тодаева, Грамматика современного монгольского языка, М., 1951, стр. 108-110.
- ²⁹ Г. Д. Санжеев, *op. cit.*, стр. 59.
- ³⁰ Г. Д. Санжеев, *op. cit.*, стр. 59.
- ³¹ Г. И. Рамstedt, Введение в алтайское языкознание. Перевод А. С. Слоним, под ред. Н. А. Баскакова, М., 1957, стр. 117.
- ³² См. Н. А. Баскаков, Причастие на -ды -ты в тюркских языках, Труды Московского Ин-та востоковедения, т. 6, М., 1952.
- ³³ Г. Д. Санжеев, *op. cit.*, стр. 59. Ramstedt considers it wrong to regard the form with *-ŋu/-ŋu* ascending to the fuller form with *-ŋuquj/-ŋuquj*.