

## Werk

**Titel:** A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages (2)

**Autor:** Schöning, Claus

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 1997

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0001](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0001) | LOG\_0037

## Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)  
SUB Göttingen  
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1  
37073 Göttingen

✉ [info@digizeitschriften.de](mailto:info@digizeitschriften.de)

# A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages (2)

Claus Schönig

Schönig, Claus 1997. A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages (2). *Turkic Languages* 1, 262-277.

## 4. Interactive areas between Central Turkic and non-Central Turkic units

Some features reveal the strong areal interaction between Central Turkic and non-Central Turkic units. Thus the forms of the agent noun of the type (verbal noun) +čI show a distribution more or less identical to that of the genetic \*tağliğ-feature (see 3.1.). Among the genetically connected Central Turkic branches (see 3.1.) we find in Oghuz -IjI, in Kipchak (including Uzbek) \*-UwčI and in South East Turkic New Uigur -GUči; in the areal group North East Turkic we have \*-A(:)ččI, see 3.2.2.<sup>1</sup> As for non-Norm Turkic, Khalaj has the same suffix -GUči as New Uigur, see also 4.1.3. The Chuvash form -ĂvśĂ resembles the Kipchak form (see also 4.2.1.).

The picture of internal connections can be refined by means of another feature, the development of first syllables consisting of a palatal vowel and a weak consonant, of which at least one element is labial, see Schönig (1992a). Again we obtain an inner segmentation of Kipchak not greatly different but more differentiated than that based on \*tağliğ, see 3.1. Oghuz, mainly Western Oghuz, behaves differently from Kipchak, which itself resembles South East Turkic, see 4.1. Besides the special position of Uzbek between Kipchak and South East Turkic, see 3.1., this feature also stresses the transitory position of Turkmen between Oghuz and Western Central Asian Turkic (WCA, see 4.1.1.2.). At the same

<sup>1</sup> See Schönig (1991). In some South Siberian Turkic units we find additional forms like -(I)GčI in Tuvan (TuvGr 313) or a suffix -čI (< \*-(I)GčI?) in Khakas.

time we mainly see Western Oghuz and the non-Norm Turkic units designated by a higher degree of archaicism. Again, neither South Siberian Turkic nor North East Turkic appear as relevant groups. In Kipchak, except for Kirghiz-Kipchak, these sound groups have converged in *üy*, in Volga Kipchak in *öy*; in Mishar Tatar and Karaim the “Far West” (see 6.) has variants with (sometimes unetymological) final *-w*, see Berta (1989) and Schönig (1992a). In Kirghiz-Kipchak we find *üy* besides contracted forms with long labial vowels. Here, New Uigur and Uzbek behave like Kipchak languages of the non-Kirghiz type, but Uzbek has not consistently changed *äv* into *üy*, *öy*. In the case of *äv* Altay Turkic uses, besides *öy*, forms in which labiality still has not crossed over to the vowel. Here, Yenisey Turkic and Fu-yü with *ib* are different from modern Kipchak (including Kirghiz-Kipchak) and Sayan Turkic and more closely resemble the afore-mentioned languages in the west and south. New Uigur sometimes has kept *ŋ* or produces an unetymological *g*. South Siberian Turkic, excluding Altay Turkic (see 3.2.4.), preserves *-g* and *-ŋ* in word-final position. While Turkmen shows its affinity to Western Central Asian Turkic (see also 4. and 4.1.1.2.) by having developed many *y*-variants, Western (and Khorezmian) Oghuz (and some New Uigur dialects) together with the non-Norm Turkic units Lena Turkic and Chuvash demonstrate a clear tendency to preserve the feature of nasality, e.g. *\*söŋgök* ‘bone’ > Azeri *sümük*, Turkmen *süŋk*; Chuvash *šämă*; Yakut *uŋuox*; Uigur (dialectal) *söŋäk*. Khalaj is also conservative regarding *äv* and nasality.

#### 4.1. Oghuz and non-Oghuz Central Turkic

Some features can be used to tie Kipchak and South East Turkic closer together while at the same time separating them from Oghuz; of South Siberian Turkic at least its Kipchakoid constituents demonstrate connections to Kipchak-South East Turkic. Most of the non-Oghuz Central Turkic units express (im-)possibility of performing an action by use of the verb connection *-A al(-ma)-*; besides, in many units forms like *-p bol-* or *-sA bol-* exist, see Schönig (1987a). The form *-A al(-ma)-* is attested in most of the Kipchak and South East Turkic languages, in Salar, Yellow Uigur, Tuvan and perhaps in Chuvash.<sup>2</sup> South Siberian Turkic

<sup>2</sup> For Chuvash *-ay-* < *\*-A al-*, see Benzing (1959c: 721) and Levickaja (1976: 54-55).

Altay, Yenisey and Chulyum Turkic use *-A/p al-*. All these *-A/p al-* and *-A/p- bol-* forms seem to be absent in Oghuz, see also 4.1.2. Lena Turkic has the enigmatic suffix *-(A:)yA-*.

For the verb ‘to cry’ we find in Kipchak and South East Turkic *\*yġla-* forms (< *\*hiġla-*, see Doerfer 1995) like Tatar *yġla-*, Karačay-Balkar *ġġla-*, Kazakh *žġla-*, Uzbek *yġla-*, New Uigur *ġġla-*. Kirghiz-Kipchak (and Bashkir) has *ġyla-*, which as *\*iġla-* matches the South Siberian Turkic forms like Yenisey Turkic Shor, Khakas *ilġa-*, Sayan Turkic, Tuvan, Karagas *iġla-* etc. *Fu-yü ġilġi- ~ yilġi-* is a (non-Kirghiz-) Kipchak South East Turkic form with Yenisey Turkic metathesis. Yellow Uigur (*yġla- ~ iġla-*) has intermediary forms between Kipchak-South East Turkic and South Siberian Turkic. Again non-Norm Turkic Chuvash *yġr-* and Lena Turkic Yakut *ġta-* are deviant forms; Khalaj *hiġla-* shows preservation of *h-*, see 2.2.1. The Oghuz forms do not follow a common pattern. In Western Oghuz Qašqa’i of Firuzabad (Doerfer 1990a: 114) and the Turkmen literary language we find *aġla-*, in Afshar (*h*)*aġla-* (Doerfer 1989b: 399), in Sonqori and Khorasan Turkic *yġla-*. We may assume that the Oghuz *aġla-* forms are secondary or go back to a stem different from *\*hiġla-*.

#### 4.1.1. Oghuz

Here I only list Oghuz features not already mentioned in previous chapters. Common to all modern Oghuz languages is preservation of the verb *\*bāŋzā-* ‘to resemble’. The word *\*čojuq* for ‘child’ mainly exists today in the Oghuz area.<sup>3</sup> Among its modern features, Oghuz has produced suffixes with initial vowel, which require binding consonants (see Schönig (1995a) and 4.1.3.2.). In all Oghuz units *n* is used as a binding consonant for the genitive suffix; the other binding consonants for dative and accusative are different at least between Turkish, Azeri and Turkmen.

<sup>3</sup> Severtjan (IV: 28) gives *jujuq* for neighboring Uzbek. Róna-Tas reads *čojuq* in one of the Nagyszentmiklós inscriptions (1990: 21), which would mean it is also attested in Bolgar Turkic.

#### 4.1.1.1. The internal segmentation of Oghuz

Oghuz can be divided into Western (and Southern) and Eastern Oghuz (mainly Turkmen).<sup>4</sup> Western Oghuz has a binding consonant *y* in the post-vocalic forms e.g. of the dative in *-(y)A*, the gerund in *-(y)Ip*, the verbal noun in *-(y)Iš* or the participle in *-(y)An*, whereas Eastern Oghuz Turkmen has long vowels due to contraction; but the Western Oghuz future suffix *-(y)AĵAK* is *-ĴAK* in Turkmen.<sup>5</sup> To express impossibility Turkish has preserved the Old Turkic *-A u-* construction (from *\*u-* 'to be able to') in *-(y)AmA-*, whereas it uses *-A bil-* to express possibility. In Azeri (im-)possibility is expressed by the biverbal construction *-A bil(-me-)*, the same as in Kipchak, South East Turkic and Chuvash. Replacement of the vocalic gerund by the gerund in *-B* is found in Turkmen, Baraba and North East Turkic (see 4.1.). In most branches of modern Turkic except Oghuz, case-marked *\*qay-*stems can be used to ask for places, directions, aims, sources and the like. In Oghuz we find interrogative pronouns like Turkish *nerede* or Turkmen *nirede* (derived from *ne* 'what'), while Azeri employs the same derivational element *+rA* in *\*hara+* on a *\*qa(n)-*stem, see Schönig (1995c).

#### 4.1.1.2. Turkmen and Western Central Asian Turkic

Turkmen has a whole set of features separating it from Western Oghuz and tying it somehow closer to other Central Turkic and Border Turkic units. Thus, it has, like Kipchak, South East Turkic and South Siberian Turkic, replaced the perfect participle in *\*-mIš* by *\*-GAn* (> *-An*). Of these *\*-GAn*-Turkic groups only modern South East Turkic has not preserved the Old Turkic 3rd ps.poss. accusative form *\*+(s)In* consistently. Like in Kipchak and South East Turkic (Literary Uzbek and New Uigur), there are no formally analogized negative *-mA-*forms of the gerund in *-B* and the vocalic gerund, instead *\*-mAyIn*-forms appear, whereas South Siberian Turkic often has *-BAy-*forms. We may assume that these features were preserved in or passed over to Turkmen by areal interaction in the Western Central Asian Turkic area (see 4.). This is supported by the fact that we indeed find common Turkmen and WCA Kip-

<sup>4</sup> For a more detailed internal segmentation of Oghuz, see Doerfer (1990b).

<sup>5</sup> The *-AĵAk*-forms in Crimean Tatar, Caucasus Kipchak, Tatar and Uzbek must be exported Ottoman forms; perhaps Nogay *-AyAK* belongs here, too.

chak-South East Turkic features not found in Kipchak and South East Turkic units outside this area, e.g. the marking strategies in relative clauses, the headword of which is not referentially identical with the subject of the relative clause. We can observe the Western Central Asian Turkic units Uzbek, Kazakh, Turkmen (and even Salar, which perhaps originated there or at least has some genetical ties to this area) together with Kirghiz-Kipchak and Lena Turkic regularly using constructions in which a possessive suffix on the headword refers to the subject of the relative clause. The neighboring areas of the “Far West” (Chuvash and Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak) and the “Far East” (New Uigur, Yenisey Turkic and Karagas) do not employ such constructions regularly, if they use them at all. They employ types with no possessive subject marker—neither on the headword of the relative clause nor on the participle, which serves as a nonfinite predicate of the relative clause. Only Western Oghuz and Khalaj have regular possessive subject marking on the *-DIK*-participle, a form almost exclusively used for such types of relative clauses. Sayan Turkic is divided into two groups: The first group is represented by the Tuvan literary language, which has all three types. The second group is represented by Karagas following the Chuvash-Kipchak model, see Schönig (1992b and 1993a).

Many of these WCA Turkmen features can be described as made up of Oghuz material along Western Central Asian Turkic patterns. Although Turkmen has reflexes of Old Turkic *ń* (see 3.2.4.1.), it has a *y*-form *haysi* for the attributively used Old Turkic pronoun *qa:ńo* ‘which’ like the other units in the Western Central Asian Turkic area and has no *n*-forms like Western Oghuz-Khalaj (see 4.1.3.3. and Schönig 1995c). Additionally, the marking system of perfective versus cursive participles reveals the same isoglosses. Chuvash, Lena Turkic and Western Oghuz show no formal connections between the opposing forms. In Turkmen the cursive participle *-yAn* is marked against the perfect participle *-An* by the same marker *y*, which is used to mark the renewed present tense form *-yAr* against the aorist form *-(A)r*. This means Turkmen uses the sign of cursivity common to Oghuz and going back to the verbal connection *\*-A yori-* similar to the way Kipchak(oid) and South East Turkic languages use the marker *\*-A tur-* (or at least contain traces of such a use): They render the oppositions expressed as *\*-GAn : \*-A turġan* with

the participles, as  $-(V)r : *-A \text{ turur}$  with the present tense forms.<sup>6</sup> Also, the Old Turkic verb  $\dot{i}:d-$  ‘to send’, which has survived in North East Turkic and Chuvash, and its “long forms” going back to  $\dot{i}:du \text{ ber-}$  ‘id.’ in Kipchak and South East Turkic are both missing in Western Oghuz, but Turkmen has—like the Western Central Asian Turkic units—a (non-auxiliary) verb  $ibär-$  ‘to send’; as an auxiliary in comparable function it uses  $goyber-$ , which may go back to  $*qoyu \text{ ber-}$ , which is perhaps the original Oghuz counterpart to  $\dot{i}:du \text{ ber}$ . Incidentally, one can see that Turkmen seems to have adopted the system of biverbal constructions expressing actionality from Western Central Asian Turkic.

Sometimes the transitory position of Turkmen between Western Oghuz and Central Turkic leads to a whole variety of forms bearing one function, as in the case of biverbal compositions with the verb  $bašla-$  ‘to start, to begin’. The preceding verb can appear with gerunds in  $-A$  and  $-B$  as well as with the dative of the verbal noun in  $-mAK$ ; the literary language has  $-(y)Ip \text{ bašla-}$ , for  $-A \text{ bašla-}$  and  $-mAGA \text{ bašla-}$ , see Benzing (1939) and 4.1.3. In the case of the sound group  $*äv$ , Turkmen, different from Western Oghuz (like Kipchak and some South East Turkic units), tends to shift the feature [+labial] onto the vowel, so that we often

<sup>6</sup> If we also take into account the Lena-Sayan Turkic data (see 3.2.4.1.) we may assume that North East Turkic became an interactive area after the development of special strategies of cursivity marking in Kipchak(oid), South East Turkic and the different Oghuz branches (see Johanson 1976b). Sayan Turkic stopped on a very archaic level, Lena Turkic never made an attempt of recursivation, perhaps because it was isolated from the other Turkic units while the recursivation of the present tense forms was going on. We find cursivity in Western Oghuz marked with the same element  $y < *-A \text{ yorī-}$  as in Eastern Oghuz. The Kipchak(oid) and South East Turkic units employ the element  $*-A \text{ tur-}$ . Especially in the east of this area, a second wave of renewal must have taken place, in which the connections  $*-A/p \text{ yata turur}$  played a particularly important role. Only after these renewals had taken place, could the before-mentioned constellation have been formed. Chuvash shows a renewed cursive present tense form of the Kipchak type  $*-A \text{ tur-}$ . With respect to the many Tatar influences on Chuvash (see 4.2.1.), it seems very likely that the renewed present tense form is also due to such an influence. The marking system of participles in Chuvash does not show a corresponding element, on the contrary: At least today the perfect and cursive participles  $-nĀ$  and  $-Akan$  do not formally establish a privative opposition, but see fn. 11.

find results like *öy*. Different from Western Oghuz, in Turkmen we sometimes find preservation of \**G* after the end of the first syllable, perhaps under Western Central Asian Turkic influence, see Doerfer (1990b: 32).

Turkmen has not adopted the paradigms of politeness, which are typical of non-Oghuz Western Central Asian Turkic, see 4.1. and 6.

#### 4.1.1.3. Western Oghuz

Western Oghuz often shows traces of its relatively isolated position in the extreme southwest. Azeri has had intensive interaction with Persian, Turkish has had additional interaction with Greek and other Indo-European languages of the Balkans, Gagauz has been in contact with Slavic languages. As results of such interaction we find e.g. elaborate systems of complex conditional forms absent in other branches of Turkic or subordinated clauses with finite predication (the latter mainly in New Turkic Azeri and Gagauz, see Schönig (1993b)).

Within Western Oghuz the transition from Turkish (representing Western Anatolian Turkic) to Azeri (Eastern Anatolian Turkic) can be demonstrated by features such as preservation of deep vowels, e.g. Old Turkic *bädük* > (Azeri) *böyük* > (Turkish) *büyük* 'big', nasalization of word-initial \**b*- in Azeri if a nasal consonant follows (see fn. 16) and the penetration of the personal marker of the 1st ps.pl. \*-*K* into other paradigms than those of the *di*-preterite and the conditional in Azeri. For these and other features see Doerfer (1990b: 14).

Another set of features appears in Azeri and Turkmen, but is missing in Turkish. Quite a number of these are Central Turkic, like the reflexive pronoun *öz* or the postvocalic accusative in *-nI*.<sup>7</sup> A radical form of analogization is the negation of the aorist *-mAr*, which has penetrated the paradigms of both languages, but can sporadically be found in other units, too, e.g. in Western Siberian Tatar, see Axatov (1963).

One of the individual features of Turkish e.g. in the area of lexicology is the replacement of the old word *söjök* 'bone' by *kämik*.

<sup>7</sup> In transitory Azeri dialects *+yI* appears. Khorasan Turkic (according to Tulu 1989) behaves, with postvocalic dative and accusative forms *+yA* and *+nI*, like Azeri.



#### 4.1.2. Archaic features in Oghuz and Border Turkic

As can be seen from the paragraphs above, Oghuz, especially Western Oghuz, has a special position within Central Turkic by having preserved many more Old Turkic features than other Central Turkic units. In this respect Oghuz often behaves like Border Turkic (see above 3.2.4.1. and 4.). Here, as with Oghuz / non-Norm Turkic features (see 4.1.3.), in most of the cases the question, whether or how an Old Turkic feature is preserved, can be used to separate Western Oghuz from Turkmen. Thus, Old Turkic vowel length is preserved in long vowels or diphthongs in Turkmen as well as in Lena Turkic and Khalaj (see Doerfer 1971) and long \**ö*: as (*ä*)*va* in Chuvash. Western Oghuz, Sayan Turkic, Salar and Yellow Uigur have short vowels but contain reflexes of vowel length in the consonants following them, see Janhunen (1980), Johanson (1986b), Schönig (1991).

Many of the archaisms of Turkmen are common to Eastern Border Turkic: The Turkmen form of the 1st ps.sg. points to \*-*AyIn*, the Western Oghuz ones to \*-*AyIm*, see Schönig (1987b). Like Lena-Sayan Turkic and Chuvash it has no \*-*K*-marker for the 1st ps.pl. imp., see 3.2.5. Turkmen and Lena Turkic are the only units which today use *-ŋ* exclusively to designate the imperative of the 2nd ps.pl.

In the case of the word for 'lip', Oghuz (*dudaq*, *dodaq*) together with Khalaj (*dudaq*) and Chuvash (*tuta*), but also far-eastern Salar (*dodax*) point to a form \**tutaq*, while most of the other Turkic languages have \**ärin*,<sup>8</sup> again Lena Turkic with *uos* (< *ağiz* [+ *okanie*]?) stands apart.<sup>9</sup> Western Oghuz has preserved a short form *äl* of Old Turkic *älig* 'hand' like Khalaj and Salar (for the long forms see 3.2.). Normally it is replaced by \**qol* meaning both 'hand' and 'arm', see also 4.1.3.

#### 4.1.3. Oghuz and non-Norm Turkic

Another set of features which is even absent in Border Turkic is attested in non-Norm Turkic and Oghuz (in most cases in differing shapes in Western Oghuz and Turkmen). Like Lena Turkic, Khalaj and Western Oghuz, Turkmen still uses Old Turkic *-mAdOK* as the negation of the

<sup>8</sup> For these two words, see Doerfer (1988: 59, 104, 174-176, 237). Maybe the words for 'fishing pole' in Turkish (*olta*) and Chuvash (*välta*) belong here too.

<sup>9</sup> See Doerfer (1988: 101-102). For *okanie* in Yakut, see Ivanov (1980).

perfect participle, although it has given up the *-mIš*-participle in this function, see 4.1.1.2. Western Oghuz has kept the *-mIš*-form, but shows, besides *-mAdOK*, completely analogized negative forms—in the case of the participles as well as the gerunds. Of the latter, only forms like Turkish *-mAdAn* remind us of older stages with common negations. Regarding the sound group *äv* Western Oghuz is more conservative than Turkmen (see 4.) and has—like non-Norm Turkic—preserved the labial consonant, e.g.: *äv* ‘house, home’: Ottoman *äv*, Gagauz *yev*, Azeri *ev*, *öv*, Turkmen *öy*, Khalaj *häv*. Perhaps the use of *\*qizil* for ‘gold’ in Azeri, Turkmen dialects and Lena Turkic belongs to these features, too. Different from Turkmen, the Azeri literary language does not have the word *altin*, see Doerfer (1965: 85), Cincius & Bugaeva (1979), Schönig (1990).

Especially Western non-Norm Turkic and Oghuz employ biverbal forms for ‘to begin to x’ by using the verbal noun in *-mA(K)* of the verb meaning ‘x’. In Oghuz we find *-mAGA bašla-*, while in Khalaj *-mAKKA häna: sa- / ba'šla-* is rare, see Doerfer (1988: 136). Chuvash has *-mA pušla-* and an alternative form *\*-A bašla-*, which connects it with many Kipchak units. Dative-marked forms of other verbal nouns can be found e.g. in Tatar *-(V)rGA kërëš- / totin-* (aorist) or in New Uigur which uses dative forms of the verbal noun in *-(I)š* and *bašla-*. Turkmen has (like in the case of the (im-)possibility form, see 4.1.1.1.) a form with the gerund in *-B* (which is also in use on the border of the Kipchak area and in Yenisey Turkic) sometimes alternating with *-A*-forms like in Kumyk. Khalaj and New Uigur have preserved the archaic use of *-GII* or *-GIII* in such constructions. Replacement of *bašla-* by other verbs can be found in Khalaj and Lena-Sayan Turkic.

Another common Oghuz-Chuvash-Khalaj feature is the necessitative suffix Oghuz *-mAll*, Chuvash *-mAllĀ*, Khalaj *-mAlU(G)* (competing with the form *-GUIUk*, see Doerfer (1988: 145), which is also used in New Uigur). The sporadic appearance of *-mAll*-forms in Tatar or in Uzbek may be due to later Ottoman language export.

#### 4.1.3.1. Western Oghuz and non-Norm-Turkic / Border Turkic

Some Old Turkic features have only survived in Western Oghuz and non-Norm-Turkic. Thus, only Western Oghuz, Khalaj, Lena Turkic

have preserved the participle in *\*-DOK*,<sup>10</sup> *ürüŋ* ‘white’ has only survived in Lena Turkic (Yakut *ürüŋ*), Khalaj (*hürüŋ*) and Anatolian dialects (see *ürün* (I + II) in DS XI: 4071, and Schönig (1987a)). The *\*-mlš*-participle is still used only in Western Oghuz, Lena Turkic and Salar. Additionally, the participle has survived functionally narrowed in some Western Central Asian Turkic languages (mainly in Eastern Oghuz Turkmen and South East Turkic; for Uzbek see Kononov (1960)). Moreover Western Oghuz Gagauz and Lena Turkic still employ non-analogized forms of positive and negative participles like the Old Turkic *\*-mlš*, *\*-DOK* : *\*-mADOK*-system. Chuvash has a common negative form *-mAn* for both the cursive and the perfect participle.<sup>11</sup> Another common feature of Western Oghuz (and perhaps under its influence Crimean Tatar) and Border Turkic units like South Siberian Altay Turkic and Yenisey Turkic Khakas (especially Sagay) or non-Norm Turkic Lena Turkic is the existence of an instrumental case suffix of the type *+(I)nAn* ~ *+nAn* or the like, see Schönig (1997).

#### 4.1.3.2. The Oghuz-Chuvash connection

We can isolate a set of features somehow connecting Oghuz units and Chuvash closer together. The word for ‘navel’ in these two branches goes back to something like *\*gö:bäk*, while all the other languages point to something like *\*kindük*. Most of the South Siberian Turkic units in addition have a “short form” *kin*, Lena Turkic and Karagas only have *ki(:)n*. In Radloff’s materials we also find for Yenisey Turkic Khakas and Sagay only *kin* ‘Nabel des Moschustieres, Moschusbeutel’ (II 1344), but no *kindik*, whereas an alternative “short form” *kin* is only attested for the Altay Turkic dialects Altay, Teleut and Lebedin (Quu). However, these data need careful interpretation and should not be taken

<sup>10</sup> *\*-DOK* > Yakut *-TAx* (very limited in use, see JakGr 237), Khalaj *-DUK* (rare, see Doerfer 1988: 129), Oghuz *-DIK* (very common).

<sup>11</sup> If we assume as the underlying proto-Chuvash system (perfect(-neutral) participle : cursive participle) : negative participle = (*\*-An* : *\*-AGAn*) : *\*-mAn*, we obtain a formal marking system, which resembles on the positive side of the complex opposition (in brackets) the marking system of cursivity against perfectivity / neutrality in Kipchak, South East Turkic and Turkmen, see 4.1.1.2. As a whole, the complex opposition parallels the marking system of *-B-* and the vocalic gerunds in Kipchak, South East Turkic and South Siberian Turkic.

as a hint for internal differences between South Siberian Turkic idioms. Especially Western Oghuz is tied closer to Chuvash by the existence of the verb *barin-* ‘to take shelter, to lodge’, which seems to be paralleled only by Chuvash *purän-* ‘to live’. Besides lexical features we find an astonishing parallel in suffix structure, mainly in that of case suffixes: Chuvash and Oghuz have kept the Old Turkic type of genitive suffix  $^{*+}(n)I\eta$  with the structure  $+(C)VC$ ; most of the modern units have produced by analogy genitive suffixes of the frequent type  $+CVC$ .<sup>12</sup> In Chuvash and Oghuz the  $+(C)VC$ -type has spread onto the dative and the accusative suffixes too. In other Turkic units it can be found only sporadically. So we find an accusative suffix of this Chuvash-Oghuz type  $\dots V.nl$  in Lena Turkic. Salar has a dative suffix  $+(G)A$  (see Dwyer 1997), which perhaps has emerged independently by internal analogy. For Khalaj, see Doerfer (1988: 87-88).

I assume the Oghuz-Bolgar connection to date back before the collapse of the Khazar empire (or even earlier).

#### 4.1.3.3. The Oghuz-Khalaj connection

The beginnings of the Oghuz-Khalaj connection may date back to the period before Kāšgārī. Doerfer assumes that the modern Khalaj language is connected with the language of Kāšgārī’s Arghu tribe (see Doerfer 1987). There are no real facts known about the history of the Khalaj. But what we can see is that areal interaction between Oghuz and Khalaj has been remarkable. I think we may assume generally that in all cases of the Khalaj-Oghuz (at least during the last few centuries: Khalaj-Azeri) exchange of features, the small group of Khalaj speakers has been on the receiving end.

Both branches have preserved the Old Turkic negative aorist in  $-mAz$  instead of today’s more common  $-mAs$ ,<sup>13</sup> present tense forms going back to  $^{*}A\ yor\dot{i}$ -, future forms in  $-(y)(A)JAK$  or gerunds in  $-(y)(A)-rAK$ . The Khalaj personal endings of the 2nd ps.pl.  $-(rs/y)A\eta Iz$  clearly resemble Oghuz forms like  $^{*+}sI\eta Iz$ .

<sup>12</sup> Today the suffix is  $+nI\eta$  in most of the units. Khalaj has  $^{*+}(U)\eta$ , Salar  $+niyi$  (see Dwyer 1997). The genitive is missing in Lena Turkic, see Schönig (1990).

<sup>13</sup> Chuvash has preserved this form only in the negative present tense copula *mar* <  $^{*}ärmäz$ . The Lena Turkic  $-BA\dot{t}$ -forms could also have developed after the sound change  $-z > -s$ .

We find numerous hints especially for Western Oghuz-Khalaj interaction. Only in this area do we encounter a systematic development *\*b- > v- or Ø-* in the four words *var-* ‘to arrive’, *var* ‘exists’, *ver-* ‘to give’ and *ol-* ‘to be, to become’.<sup>14</sup> From the Old Turkic pronoun *qa:ño* ‘which’ (see Doerfer 1988: 108) attributively used *\*qan*-forms have only survived in Khalaj (*qa:ni(si)*) and Western Oghuz, e.g. Turkish *hangi*, Gagauz *angî* (< *\*qanu + GI ?*) or Azeri *hansî* (< *\*qanu + si*); for Qumanda *qanji* see Schönig (1995c). Perhaps another archaic element preserved in the Khalaj-Oghuz area is the 2nd ps.sg. imperative suffix *-GII*, which is attested only in Khalaj (in the language of children’s games, see Doerfer (1972: 300)), in Chulym Turkic (Pritsak 1959a: 627) and—enlarged by a suffix *-An/än*—in Azeri dialects (Agazade 1967: 88). It seems that constructions consisting of a finite verbal form and the conditional copula *\*ärsä* are limited to the Western Oghuz-Khalaj area and to Sayan Turkic (Tuvan and Karagas, not Toja, see Rassadin (1978: 229–230)). Another feature common to Western Oghuz and Khalaj is the regular use of possessive marked *+DIK*-participles as verbal cores of relative clauses, see also 4.1.1.2.<sup>15</sup>

Some archaic features are preserved only in Khalaj and Turkish and a few other units, e.g. the Old Turkic 1st. ps.pl. imperative suffix *\*-Allm* (which also exists in the Yenisey Turkic Khakas Beltir unit) or preservation of the verb *\*bul-* ‘to find’ in Khalaj, Turkish and Lena Turkic, which in the other units is replaced by *\*tap-* which exists in Yakut, too, and means ‘to hit (the target)’.

On the whole, the before-mentioned segmentations are quite well reflected in the distribution of different postpositionally or enclitically used elements meaning ‘with’. In Western Oghuz the form *ilä* predominates in the literary languages, while e.g. some Anatolian dialects also use *bilä* and *birlän*. At the same time, enclitic forms of the type *+(y)lä(n)* (sometimes already showing sound-harmonic forms) can be found in all types

<sup>14</sup> In the case of *var-* we also find a characteristic shift in meaning because the Western Oghuz-Khalaj forms correspond to *bar-*, which in other and in older Turkic units means ‘to go (to a point)’. In Yellow Uigur and Salar we sporadically find *ol*-forms of *\*bol-*, but only as one of a few alternatives like *bol-* or *vol-*, see Tenišev (1976a and 1976b).

<sup>15</sup> In Tuvan sometimes possessive marking on the headword appears together with other participles, see Schönig (1992b).

of substandards and dialects. The same holds true for neighboring Khalaj. The transitory state of Turkmen again is apparent in the area of postpositions, with Turkmen having Western Oghuz *ilä* besides (mainly) *bilä(n)* and (rarely) *birlä(n)*. The only other modern Turkic unit which has preserved a *birlä*-form to some extent is non-Norm Turkic Chuvash with *përle*. The more successful form was *bilä(n)*, which exists in various forms with final *n* in Standard Tatar, Misher Tatar, Uzbek, New Uigur, Yellow Uigur and—as the only South Siberian Turkic unit—Chulym Turkic Küärik (+*BllAŋ*). According to its transitory state between Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak and Western Oghuz, Crimean Tatar has *bilän* besides *ilän*. We find oscillation between (postpositional and enclitic) *\*b*-forms with and without final *n* in Kumyk, Balkar, Baraba and Salar; at least in Chuvash dialects an enclitic form *+pala(n)* can be found besides the before mentioned postposition. While South Siberian Sayan Turkic prefers postpositional *bilä*-forms, the remaining Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic shows a strong tendency to use *\*bilä* enclitically. In this respect Chulym Turkic Küärik (see above) resembles more closely the Kipchak units Crimean Tatar, Kumyk, Misher and Orenburg Tatar, Baraba and Kirghiz-Kipchak Altay Turkic with their *\*(+)mInAn*-forms. In some of these units as well as in Karaim and Chuvash we have short forms of the type *\*+mA(n) ~ \*+BA(n)*. WCA Kipchak (Kazakh, Karakalpak, Kirghiz) is especially characterized by *\*menen*-forms showing a tendency to become enclitic, too. Fu-yü gains a special position by having shortened postpositional forms *bil*, *bul*. Lena Turkic and Yenisey Turkic Khakas (probably the Sagay dialect) stand apart by not having a postpositional unit going back to *bi(r)lä(n)* but using at least one grammatical suffix somehow connected with the Old Turkic suffix of the instrumental case; this again may point to a (temporary?) closer connection between Lena Turkic and components of Yenisey Turkic Khakas at least in earlier times, see Schönig (1997) and 3.2.4.

#### 4.1.3.4. The Turkish-Lena Turkic connection

Turkish in the extreme southwest and Lena Turkic in the extreme northeast of the Turkic area are connected by some exclusive features like preservation of the sequence *b-...-n* in Turkish and some Yakut dia-

lects.<sup>16</sup> Mainly in the same area the verb *\*tön(ün)-* is used to express ‘to turn around, return, go home’ and cognates of the Old Turkic reflexive pronoun *käntü* have survived.

The latter two features can be used to classify all of Turcia in a way more or less according to patterns already described. Turkish, Lena Turkic and sometimes Tatar (see TTAS III, 288) employ forms of a verb *\*tön(ün)-*,<sup>17</sup> Chuvash uses *tavrän-* < Old Turkic *tägzin-*, Kipchak, South East Turkic and non-Turkish Oghuz (= non-Turkish Central Turkic) mainly have forms going back to Old Turkic *qadit-*. South Siberian Turkic is individually characterized by forms of Old Turkic *yan-*. The forms of the reflexive pronouns produce a parallel isogloss. The *qadit-* languages have *öz*, the *yan-* languages forms of Old Turkic *\*bod*. If Chuvash *xă+* cannot be connected with Turkish *kendi* < Old Turkic *käntü*, Turkish is the only living Turkic language still using the Old Turkic form as a reflexive pronoun. The form *kini* in Lena Turkic may go back to *käntü*, but it is used as the 3rd ps.sg. personal pronoun, so that the *\*tön(ün)-* languages except Tatar are at least connected by preservation of the word *\*käntü*.

#### 4.2. Kipchak and non-Norm Turkic

Kipchak shares some features with the non-Norm Turkic units Chuvash and Lena Turkic. A lot of Chuvash-Kipchak features can be explained by relatively young but intensive contacts in the Volga area. Lena-Kipchak features may be coincidental or point back to early contacts. Some

<sup>16</sup> Very common is the change of initial *b-* to *m-*, if a nasal (or—especially in South Siberian Turkic, but sometimes also in Kipchak—a guttural) follows at the end of the first syllable. Another type is perhaps caused by a Samoyedic substratum in South Siberian Turkic (see Menges 1955-56): Regressive nasalization of word-initial *\*y-* > *n-*, *ń-* by a nasal or a guttural fricative at the first syllable border in some South Siberian Turkic units, e.g. Tuba *ńa:s*, Karagas *ńes* < *\*yığač* ‘tree’, Qumanda, Quu *ńan-*, Shor *nan-* < *\*yan-* ‘to return (home)’. See Schönicg (1993c). But cases like Salar *neme*, *nemä* < *yemä* ‘food’ demonstrate that this type of assimilation exists outside the Turkic-Samoyedic area, too.

<sup>17</sup> According to Kāšgarī *tön-* was Oghuz (see Dankoff & Kelly III: 197) and can be found only sporadically in other Turkic languages, see also Clauson (1972: 515a) and Tenišev (1961: 241).



of these features even belong to a greater Northern Turkic interactive area, see 5.

#### 4.2.1. The Kipchak-Chuvash connection

Chuvash has one of the classical features in common with Kipchak, the development of *tag* > \**taw* (Chuvash *tu / tāv*+). At the same time, the development of this feature helps to isolate Lena Turkic (which has contracted forms), whereas the remaining Turkic units have preserved -*g*, -*x* or at least non-labial reflexes of it. Another Chuvash-Kipchak feature is the 2nd ps.sg. imperative particle noted as *čU* or *šU* in Kāšgarī (today sometimes reduced to -*č* or -*š*). Besides in Chuvash (-*čă*), it is attested in Kirghiz, Nogay, Caucasian Turkic, Bashkir, Tatar dialects and Uzbek, see Schönig (1987b: 206).

Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak (VUC Kipchak), i.e. Tatar, Bashkir, Karachay-Balkar and Kumyk, has another feature in common with Chuvash. In both groups we find \*+*IGIz* instead of \*+*IŋIz* for the possessive suffix of the 2nd ps.sg., see also 5. Other common features are the use of the same types of relative clauses (see 4.1.1.2.) or use of \*-*A turur* as a renewed present tense form (see 4.1.1.1.). The fact that the system of participle marking in Chuvash did not follow the Kipchak model makes it impossible to say whether its ancestor joined a Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak area perhaps even before the renewal of cursive finite forms had begun merely resisting a renewal of the participle system (see 4.1.1.2.). One must also bear in mind that the system of phase-specifying biverbal constructions with gerunds seems somehow copied from a Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak model.

#### 4.2.2. The Kipchak-Lena Turkic connection

There seems to be an old connection between Lena Turkic and Kipchak. Thus, especially Lena Turkic and the Kipchak languages weaken *p* and *K* while they keep *t* in intervocalic position. In addition, Lena Turkic shows some structural similarities with the Kipchak languages in the area of phonotactical rule sets (see 5.1.). It seems possible that the Lena Turkic-Kipchak connection is more precisely a Lena Turkic-Kirghiz-Kipchak connection, see 5.1.1.



### 4.3. South East Turkic and Khalaj

A common New Uigur-Khalaj set of features seems to consist of the use of the agent noun *\*-GUčI*, the necessitative suffix *\*-GUIUK*, *-GAI* *-GIII*-forms as the connecting deverbal unit in the case of constructions with *bašla-* to express 'to begin to x', and generally doubled intervocalic consonants in numerals, see 4., 4.1.3. and 6.1. It is still unclear whether these common features indicate a closer connection in earlier times between the ancestors of South East Turkic and Khalaj.

*(To be continued.)*

Corrigenda to part 1:

p. 121, line 5: ... (see Erdal 1993) use of a gerundial unit *-sA...*  
should be: ... (see Erdal 1993), and the use of a gerundial unit *-sA ...*

p. 124, footnote 4: ... Mrass-dialect of Shor...  
should be: ... Kondoma-dialect of Shor...

p. 125, line 7: ... loss of the plural marker *+lAr ...*  
should be: ... use of the plural marker *+lAr ...*