Werk

Titel: Present in Kashkay

Autor: Csatö , Eva Agnes

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2001

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0005|LOG_0015

Kontakt/Contact

Present in Kashkay

Éva Ágnes Csató

The Turkic dialects spoken in the Kashkay (Qašqā'ī) tribal union in the province of Fars in Iran are historical dialects of Southwestern or Oghuz Turkic. Although Turcologists have known of these dialects for a long time, they have not yet been closely investigated. This article surveys the present paradigms used in the Kashkay dialects based upon the previously published Kashkay material, Gunnar Jarring's texts and the author's own notes taken in Shiraz.

Éva Á. Csató, Department of Asian and African Languages, Uppsala University, Box 527, SE-753 12 Uppsala, Sweden, and Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, VIC 3086, Australia. E-mail: eva.csato-johanson@afro.uu.se

1. Turkic paradigms

Turkic languages are paragons of morphological regularity. Paradigms are typically characterised by one-to-one relations between grammatical concepts. Stems and suffixes can be unequivocally segmented, morphological variation is easily predictable by phonological rules; see, e.g. Plank (1991). This extreme inflectional economy is a synchronic feature which has been continuously re-established by processes resulting in the restructuring of non-conforming paradigms, loss of converging categories or reinforcement of distinctiveness between converging paradigms. The drift to a high degree of inflectional economy is reinforced by the fact that Turkic has been used as a lingua franca in multilingual communities (Johanson 1992).

The few synchronic morphological irregularities involve simple morphophonological processes, such as contraction, assimilation, etc., which have taken place diachronically and remain synchronically transparent, the contact assimilation between stem and suffix consonants in *git-ti* 'went' versus *al-dı* 'took', portmanteau morphemes resulting from contraction, and the like. However, there are also some types of irregularities which do not have any straightforward explanations. Their origin must be sought in far-reaching complex processes. The paradigms of intraterminal verb forms are the most notorious examples of a palimpsest produced by diverse layers of intricate historical changes. Even closely related Turkic dialects may differ considerably and in unpredictable ways with regard to the intraterminal paradigms.

Intraterminality is a viewpoint or aspect category conveying the speaker's perspective as directed at the event in its course. The speaker presents the event as 'on-go-

ing' without taking its limits, i.e. its beginning and the point when it is regarded as accomplished, into account. I refer to Johanson (2000) for a detailed account of the terminology applied here. Intraterminality may be combined with different temporal markers. Intraterminal present forms are the nonfocal aorists, such as Turkish *gelir* 'comes, has the habit to come' and the so-called 'new presents' that emerged as high-focal intraterminal categories, as, for instance, Turkish *geliyor* 'is coming / comes'. Intraterminal pasts include the Turkish past aorist *gelirdi* 'would come / used to come' and the high-focal intraterminal past *geliyordu* 'was coming'. A high degree of focality implies more focus on the situation prevailing at the deictic *nunc*. The English progressive, for instance, is high-focal. A well-documented diachronic tendency is for present categories to become gradually defocalised and this, in its turn, triggers the emergence of new high-focal presents. The history of Turkic intraterminal categories manifests itself as a chain of such developments.

The discussion here will mostly be confined to the present tense use of the intraterminals. Therefore, the term 'present' will in some contexts be used as referring to intraterminal forms, such as *gelir* and *geliyor,* in general. In some other contexts, it will denote, as is traditional in Turcology, a particular historical category of Turkic languages called 'the new present', such as *geliyor* versus the older intraterminal category, the aorist.

The historical relationship between the markers employed in the different intraterminal paradigms, i.e. between the old aorists and the more recent present forms, in Southwestern (Oghuz) Turkic are difficult to give a simple account for; see Johanson (1975), (1976), and (1989). The irregularity of the aorist paradigm is an old phenomenon observed in the earliest records of Turkic.

2. Intraterminal paradigms in diachronic perspectives

The aorist paradigm in Old Turkic was irregularly formed with phonologically unpredictable suffixes "*-yUr*, or rarely *-r*, after vowels, *-Ur* after causative, passive, reflexive and co-operative-reciprocal stems, *-Ir* after *-(X)t* stems, and *-Ar* after most simple stems and denominal and deverbal stems in *-(X)K*" (Erdal 1998: 145-146). Allomorphic variation of both high and low vowels in a suffix is unusual in Turkic, as one and the same suffix has either only low or only high vowels. Thus, we normally find either a variation between *a, e (o, ö)* or between the high vowels *i, ï, u, ü.* The morphologically and lexically ruled variation between high and low vowels in the aorist suffix is, thus, exceptional. This can be explained by assuming that it developed from a compound:

> "The so-called 'aorist' in *-(y)Vr*, the first known intraterminal form of Turkic, functions as the only present tense in Old Turkic, as it still does in Yakut. It is probably a combination of the old converb ending in *-(y)V* and a form of the old copula verb *er-* 'be'. In Old Turkic, the suffix variant *-yUr* is preserved after stem-final vowels, e.g. *bāšlāyur* 'lead', but it was later on contracted, e.g. *bāšlāyur > bašlār > bašlar*. There had probably been a similar development after originally short stem-

final vowels, forms such as *atáyur* and *kelíyur* being contracted to *atar* 'throws', *kelir* 'comes', etc" (Johanson 1998: 116).

The converb suffix of the lexical verb combined with the copula 'be' meaning 'V-ing is' developed into the grammaticalised marker of intraterminality.

The aorist marker underwent further processes of semantic and formal weakening. Its original morphological form has become opaque. From a high-focal intraterminal category it developed into a general intraterminal conveying a vague meaning of general habit, inclination to do something, etc., and its original function was, in many Turkic varieties, taken over by new high-focal present forms. They developed as a result of grammaticalisations of postverb constructions, which originally ex-pressed actionality contents such as durativity (see Johanson 1998: 114-115). The postverb constructions were based on a converb in -(y)V or -Ib and the aorist of a postverb expressing position or movement, such as 'sit', 'lie', 'stand' and 'move'. These new intraterminality markers rendered a high-focal, i.e. more to the actual present oriented meaning, e.g., the Uzbek high-focal form *kèl-e-yåtir* [come-CONVERB lie-AORIST] 'is just coming'. Verbs meaning 'move' were grammaticalized as presents in Oghuz dialects, as, for example, *yaz-a yorïr* [write-CONVERB move-AORIST] 'moves writing' > 'is writing' > 'writes'.

As a result of such innovations, most Turkic languages today have competing in-traterminal paradigms, the aorist and another so-called 'new present'. The new pres-ent developed from a converb suffix and the aorist of the postverb. This morphologi-cal form was analogue to the historical material that the aorist suffix itself developed from. The forms of both markers are, consequently, morphologically closely related and contain similar morphemic material. The formal distinction between them could easily become fuzzy, due to assimilation, contraction and other morphophonological processes. The morphophonological changes are enhanced by the fact that the post-verb does not, as a rule, bear stress. Since Turkic languages drift towards economic and regular morphology the two paradigms have undergone changes that result in clearer formal distinctions. It is not the task of this article to account for the complex processes involved; the aim of the following discussion is more modest. I would like to indicate here only some aspects of the actual changes in a schematic way in order to outline some tendencies relevant for the treatment of the Kashkay material.

3. Intraterminal paradigms in Oghuz

The historical development of the aorist has been the subject of many investigations (e.g. Adamović (1985), Johanson (1975), (1976) and (1989) and the references given in them, especially to the important work of Gerhard Doerfer). In Old Anatolian, the variants of the aorist suffix were reduced to -A(r) attached to monosyllabic stems and -U(r) attached to polysyllabic stems and a closed set of monosyllabic stems. This variation is preserved in modern standard Turkish manifesting an archaic feature of this language. The suffix variant containing a high vowel—in standard notation *I*— has four variants in Turkish. Thus, we have seven variants in Standard Turkish:

anla-r 'understands', *sal-ar* 'sets free', *dön-er* 'turns', *konuş-ur* 'speaks', *öldür-ür* 'kills', *getir-ir* 'brings' and *anlat-ır* 'explains'. A lexically defined group of monosyllabic verbs take high suffixes, for instance, *al-ır* 'takes', *gel-ir* 'comes', *ol-ur* 'becomes' and *öl-ür* 'dies'.

Azerbaijanian, the most important Turkic language in Iran, has two intraterminal paradigms: the old aorist built with *-(y)Ar* and the new present formed with *-(y)Ir*. The aorist has undergone some changes, as its standardised form reveals. Analogous to the present, it is consistently introduced by a *y* after vowel stems. Moreover, the vowel is always low. Thus, the present of the verb *al-* 'take' is *al-ïr* and the aorist is *al-ar*. The shift from high vowel to low vowel in the aorist was motivated by the emergence of the so-called neutral vowels.

> "It is sometimes thought that the generalization (of the aorist vowel) took place as a result of the rise of a present tense form of the type *bilür*, which thus happened to coincide with the aorist. This view does not seem to be correct. It is certainly true that the aorist unification was necessary to distinguish the aorist from the present tense (with its high suffixal vowels). But the process of differentiation started long before the modern type of present tense arose, so that the actual historical coincidence of an aorist (*bilür*) with a present tense (*bilür*) is highly improbable. The way to the aorist (*biler*) seems to have gone via (*bilər*). At the so-called indifferent stage, the original labial vowel was subject to the attraction of the unequivocally low morphophonemes. In other words: for the restructuring of the Azerbaijanian aorist we assume (1) a shift from {U} to central vowels of the {ə} type and (2) a further lowering to {A}" (Johanson 1989:101).

Neutral vowels in the aorist are documented in some Kashkay varieties; see the discussion below. As a result of the standardisation of the two markers, both paradigms have become highly economical with phonologically predictable suffix variants. Similar standardisation of the aorist vowel is observed in languages belonging to other sub-branches of the Turkic language family, as well. The aorist in Standard Uzbek, for instance, is built, with few exceptions, with the suffix *-(A)r*.

The paradigms in non-standard Turkic varieties show greater variation. For instance, some Northern dialects have a present form in *-iy*, such as *geliy* 'comes', which is also found, among others, in some Black Sea dialects of Turkish (Brendemoen, forthcoming) and in Northeastern Bulgaria.

The morphological distinction between the paradigms is made in Standard Turkmen in a different way. The aorist is *-A:r* with fusion of the stem final vowel and the present *-yA:r*. Thus the aorist of the verb *al-* 'take' is *al-a:r* and its present is *al-ya:r*. Here, it is not the vowel quality but the syllabic structure of the suffix that has a distinctive function.

The systems of intraterminals in different Southwestern dialects spoken in the Kashkay confederacy show variation that has not yet been described. In the following, I will discuss what types of variation are present in the scanty material that is accessible for survey at present and outline a specific case of two dialects spoken in

the Abivardi district in Shiraz. Keeping in mind the unpredictability of the develop-
ment of the intraterminal paradigms, it is not possible to assign some sporadic forms
unequivocally to one of the two paradigms without knowing whether the given dia-
lect has two intraterminal paradigms or not and if it has, what morphological mark-
ing is applied in distinguishing between the two.

4. The Kashkay tribal union

The Kashkay tribal union is ethnolinguistically heterogeneous. It is predominantly
Turkic-speaking. The speakers call their language *turki*. The tribal confederacy also
contains groups speaking dialects of the Iranian languages Luri and Kurdish. Most of
the Kashkay are bilingual and speak Persian. The Turkic tribes have different histori-
cal and linguistic background, so that a description of the Kashkay varieties must,
presumably, distinguish between different grammatical systems. It is, therefore,
important to keep in mind that the forms occurring in the published Kashkay texts
may belong to different grammars. The tribal affiliation of the speakers is not always
a sufficient clue in order to define a variety. Speakers belonging to the same tribe
may have developed different linguistic habits. Especially those who have settled
down in towns and use the language differently from nomads of the same tribe. The
term "Kashkay dialects" is used here in a historical / political sense, as, for instance
the term Uzbek or Turkish in referring to all the dialects spoken in the respective
countries. Consequently, I use the name Kashkay to refer to Southwestern Turkic
dialects spoken in the Kashkay confederacy. It is not yet clear what levelling has
taken place among them. There are, most probably, some shared isoglosses, for in-
stance, the personal suffixes. On the other hand, differences between the dialects are
important signals of tribal identity and, they are maintained in the contact situation.

In the light of what is known about the development of intraterminal categories, I
will review the evidence for the Kashkay paradigms based on currently available
material.

5. Intraterminals in Kashkay dialects

5.1. Stein's texts surveyed by Kowalski (1937)

Kowalski (1937) described the Aynallu dialect on the basis of Sir Aurel Stein's notes
taken during an archeological expedition in the province of Fars. It should be men-
tioned here that the Aynallu dialect was not spoken within the Kashkay confederacy.
The nomads in Fars were organised in two confederations at the time Stein collected
his data: the Kashkay confederation and the so-called *iliāte-e-xamse* (Kowalski 1937:
2), which contained, among others, the Aynallu tribe. The Aynallu lived southeast of
Shiraz.

The Aynallu dialect, according to Kowalski, formed the aorist, as Old Anatolian
Turkic, with *-r, -ar, -er, -ur* or *-ür*, as, for instance, *ile-r* 'does', *tut-ar* 'holds', *düš-er*
'falls', *qāl-ur* 'remains', *öl-ür* 'dies', *tök-er-em* 'I pour', *gel-ir* 'comes'. In addition to

the analogue form *ol-ar* 'is', the old form *ol-ur* is also used. The negative forms *öldör-mem* 'I will not kill', *bēr-mez* also *vēr-mēz* 'doesn't give' occur in the texts.

The present has the following variants: *qorχ-ir* 'is afraid', *oχï-ir* 'reads' (in Stein's transcription *okhair*), *gèd-ir-ler-imiš* 'they are travelling', *toχ-i-lar* 'they weave'. The distinction between the two intraterminals is signalled by the vowel quality. The present contains *i* whereas the aorist is standardised with low unrounded or high rounded vowels. The negative suffix is *-mir*, as in *ol-mir* 'doesn't become', *tap-mir-ek* 'we don't find', *soy-mi-lar* 'they don't rob'. The vowel *ö* appears in the transcription in the negated present in *tök-möl-ler* 'they don't pour', and in some other suffixes, such as in the optative in *gör-öm* 'I should see', in the negated *ib*-past: *görmöp* 'haven't seen', in the *di*-past *gördöm*.

Another type of present based on *-A* or *-y* is found in Stein's material.

"Neben dem Präsens auf *-ir* scheint auch eine von dem Gerundium auf *a-, ä-* abgeleitete, von dem ähnlich gebildeten Subjunktiv verschiedene Präsensform vorzukommen: *alaman* 76 'ich nehme', *almaisan* (< *almaiasan*) 152, 153 'du nimmst nicht', *salmaisan* 155 'du wirfst nicht zu'. Da die zwei letzteren Formen aus einer Übersetzung aus dem Osttürkischen stammen, sind sie mit Vorbehalt anzunehmen." (Kowalski 1937: 61-62)

Analogous forms built with *-y* or *-a* are also present in Menges' material, see below. Kowalski compared the Aynallu material with the Kashkay texts published by Romaskevič (1925).

5.2. Romaskevič's texts

Romaskevič's texts include 35 songs collected during his visit to Fars in the year 1914. I give the Kashkay words here in a transliteration of the Cyrillic original. The symbol ['] marks stress. The following indicative present tense forms occur in the first song: *g'al-i'r-am* 'I come', *ver-ma'm* 'I don't give', *bắt-mắz* 'doesn't set', *yắt-mắz* 'doesn't sleep', *öl-ü'r-am* 'I die'. There is also a form *ölda'm* 'I am dying', which Romaskevič explains as a variant of *öli'ram*.[1] This song may represent a dialect in which there is no other evidence of present forms. However, the fact that Romaskevič at least mentions the form *öli'ram* may give some indirect evidence for assuming that he heard other analogue forms. Also in most of the other songs the intraterminal present forms can be interpreted as belonging to an aorist paradigm, for instance, *ged-ma'z* 'does not go', *ol-u'r* 'becomes' (song 2); *eyla-r-a'ŋ* 'you do', *bắxắ'-r* 'looks' (song 7); *čak'al-la'r* (< *ček-er-ler*)'they draw', *eyla'-r* 'does', *g'al-i'r* 'comes', *čắp-ắ'r* 'raids', *vur-u'r* 'attacks', *pozắ'-r* 'destroys', *ắč-ắ'r* 'opens', *čak'a'r* 'draws' (song 8); *day-ma'z* 'does not touch', *bắxắ'-r* 'looks' (song 9). *Saslan-i'r* 'calls out' in song 3 may be a present form. Song 12 contains a negated aorist and a ne-

---

[1]   I thank Christiane Bulut for informing me that she has found similar variation in the Sonqor dialect between *-d* and *-ir*, e.g. *danishdum* instead of *danishirem* 'I speak'.

gated present: *üz-ma'n-am* 'I do not take away', *bil-mir-a'm* 'I don't know'. Further forms are *ver-man-a'm* 'I don't give', *ged-a'r-am* 'I go', *n-e'd-ar-am* (*ne èderem*) 'what shall I do'. Some examples of past aorists are *üg'-a'r-di-ŋ* 'you praised', *soy-a'r- di-ŋ* '(translated as) you scolded'. A non-negated present, *sat-i'r-um* 'I sell', occurs only once in song 14 together with some contracted forms, such as *g'atï'r-r-am* 'I bring', *itï'-r-ram* 'I lose', *yetï'r-r-am* 'I attain' and *ol-ur-dum* 'I was becoming'. Another contracted form, *ver-r-a'm* 'I give' is used in song 24. Such contracted forms can be explained either as presents, e.g. *g'atï'r-r-am* (< *getir-ir-em*) or as aorists (< *getir-er-em*). In the same text the personal suffix in the present form *sât-i'r-um* is -*um*. This form of the first person personal suffix is used also in song 28 in *åγlå-r-um* 'I cry'. Song 16 contains a polysyllabic verb in the aorist formed with -*ur*: *aluš-ur* 'catches fire'.

In addition to the forms such as *bil-ir* 'knows', *qål-u'r* 'remains', *öl-ür* 'dies', *ve'r-man-am* 'I don't give', song 21 contains a form *čakïyu'r* 'draws', which is interpreted by Kowalski as a present form. The present suffix is -*ïyu'r*. The reason for the length of the *i* may be due to metric requirements. The vowel *u* is more common in the aorists than in the present. In Old Turkic and in modern Turkic dialects, such as Khalaj, -*yur* is an allomorph of the aorist after vowel stems (Doerfer 1988: 156). In the present, we would expect *čakïyo'r* and not *čakïyu'r*. Note that Doerfer's texts also contain an analogue form -*iyur*; see below. I quote here the context in which this form is used in song 21.

> *Doulatlï' doulati'n čakïyu'r ranji'n*
> *Maχzūnnå'n širi'n sūz nišānå' qålu'r.* (Romaskevič 1925: 596)
> 'The wealthy (makes use of) his prosperity and endures annoyance.
> His sweet words (i.e. his poetry) remain as a memory from Mahzun.'

Stein's texts contain the Aynallu version of this poem. It is based on the aorist. The corresponding expression is, however, in the optative.

> *kim apara gonje, kim čäkä ränje*
> *gidär däulätlinen däulate gänje,*
> *Mahzunnan šīrīn söz nišāna qālur.*
> '(in der) einer eine Knospe pflückt, ein anderer (nur lauter) Mühe davonträgt.
> Dem Mächtigen geht die Macht und der Schatz verloren.
> Nach (dem Tode des) Mahzūn wird (sein) süßes Wort zum Zeichen
> (Andenken) bleiben.' (Kowalski 1937: 35-36)

Romaskevič's song 21 also includes the aorists *ol-u'r* 'becomes', *čex-a'r* 'takes out', *bul-u'r* 'finds', the form *dil-i'r* 'pierces' built with -*ir* and *de-ya'r* 'says' with -*yar*. Some aorists of polysyllabic verbs are formed with -*ur*. This occurs in song 27: *uyan-u'r* 'wakes up' and *dåyån-u'r* 'leans'.

In summary: The texts contain aorists formed with the suffixes -*r* after vowel stems, except for *de-yar* 'says' and with -*ar*, -*er*, -*ur* and -*ür* after consonant stems.

The suffix *-iyur* in *čak-ïyu'r* 'draws' may be a special, non-contracted form of the aorist. The verb forms *geli'r* 'comes', *dil-i'r* 'pierces', *seslen-i'r* 'calls out' may belong to the present paradigm but not necessarily. In Stein's Aynallu texts the form *seslenireη* 'you sound' is undoubtedly a present. The only clearly present form is *sat-i'r-um* 'I sell'. The same form of the personal suffix *-um* is used in text 28 in the aorists *åγlǎ'-r-um* 'I cry'. Contracted forms, such as *yeti'r-r-am* 'I attain' may belong to both the aorist and the present paradigms. The negated aorist in the first person has two variants: *ver-man-a'm* and *verma'm* 'I don't give'.

Most of the later presentations of Kashkay, as, for instance, Doerfer (1970), are based on Kowalski's observations:

> "Even less than Azerbaijani have the Turkish languages in Southern Persia, those of the Qashqais and the Aynallus, been explored. As a matter of fact, the older material (Romaskevič, Sir A. Stein), already embodied in Kowalski 1937, has remained nearly the only source of our knowledge of these dialects." (Doerfer 1970a: 219)

5.3. Menges' texts

Menges collected some texts in 1950 in Samīrum-i 'Uljā (Upper Samirum) south of Shiraz. Three of them were published in Doerfer et alii (eds.) (1990); see also Menges (1951). The following indicative present tense forms occur in these texts.

The aorist is formed with *-r* after vowel stems, e. g., *ye-r* 'eats', *dè-r* 'says', with *-ur* or *-ir* in *ol-ur* 'becomes', *qoy-ur* 'puts', *vur-ur* 'shoots', *bulun-ur* 'is', *yat-ïr* 'lies', *yaz-ïr* 'writes', *sal-ïr* 'casts', *gel-ir* 'comes', *getir-il-ler* (< *getir-ir-ler*) 'they bring' and *-Ar* in monosyllabics *gid-er* 'goes', *èd-er* 'does', *tut-ar* 'holds', *čïx-ar* 'comes out'. If these forms really belong to one paradigm, then the aorist is built in this dialect in a similar way to Old Anatolian Turkish. The *ï* in, for instance, *sal-ïr* may represent a neutral vowel, see quotation of Johanson (1989) under 3.

The negated forms are interesting. One is the negated aorist formed with *-mas*, e.g. *čïx-mas* 'does not go out'. The other is a compound consisting of *-me + yèr*, e.g. *git-mi-yer-ek* 'we do not go', *yè-me-yer-ek* 'we do not eat'. These forms may be a reflection of an older uncontracted aorist.

According to Caferoğlu & Doerfer (1959: 306), the form *dè-me-y-ler* 'they do not say' in Menges' text is a present tense form derived from the above mentioned suffix of the present *-A / -y*.

5.4. Doerfer's texts

In 1990 Doerfer published some Kashkay poems recorded in Fīrūz-ābād during the first Göttingen-expedition 1968. The poems were read from a manuscript containing specimens of Kashkay literature.

The Kashkay informant commented on the poems in his vernacular. These comments contain the forms *ux-iyur-am* 'I read', *de-r-ek* 'we call' and the non-present forms *de-miš* 'he said' and *de-r-d-ik* 'we have used to call'. The first form is built

with the suffix *-iyu'r* with fusion of the stem final vowel. The form is analogous to the present form *čak-ïyu'r* in Romaskevič's texts, which was discussed above. The second one is an aorist formed with *-r*.

The present forms occurring in the literary texts are similar to the Azerbaijanian forms with the suffix *-(y)lr*. The *y* appears after a vowel, e.g. *de-yir* 'he says'. The suffix vowel is front in *sat-ir-am* 'I sell'. A contracted form *gàydir-am* 'I put on' (< *gàydir-ir-am* ?) also occurs.

The aorist forms are built with *-r*, *-Ar* and *-ur*, e.g. *aǧla-r* 'cries', *ele-r* 'does', *oyna-r-am* 'I play', *de-r-em* 'I say', *uxu-l-lar* (< *uxu-r-lar*) 'they read', *düš-er* 'falls', *ged-er* 'goes', *ed-er* 'does'. Two polysyllabic stems are formed with *-ïr*, e.g. *dulan-ïr* 'goes around' and *yan-ïr* 'burns' in the same text. The aorist of *ol-* 'become, be' is *ol-ur* and that of *bul-* 'find' *bullam* (< *bul-ur-am*) 'I find'. Doerfer accounts for the form *var-r-am* as a contracted form of (< *vur-ur-am*) 'I shoot'. Two negated forms are *üz-men-em* 'I do not take back' and *ul-maz* 'it will not be'.

5.5. Jarring's texts

Gunnar Jarring collected Kashkay texts during the war in Teheran. Jarring's informant was a well-educated Kashkay of the Amaleh tribe, who spoke several languages. His dialect seems to be very near to Azerbaijanian, employing both the present and the aorist paradigms. The first person personal suffix he uses is *-Am* and not *-Um*, as in some other Kashkay varieties.

The aorist is formed with the suffixes *-r*, *-ar*, *-er*, *-ur*, *-ür*, and *-ïr*, for instance, *kišne-r-em* 'I neigh', *ček-er-em* 'I draw', *ise-r-em* 'I want', *bil-l-eŋiz* (< *bil-er-eŋiz*) 'you know', *ol-al-lar* (< *ol-ar-lar*), assimilation *rl* > *ll* 'they will be', *görüreŋ* 'you see', *as-ïr-dï* 'hanged up'. The aorist in the past sometimes exhibit forms in *-ur*, e. g. *vur-ur-di* 'used to shoot', whereas in the present tense it is formed with *-Ar*, e. g. *vur-al-lar* (< *vur-ar-lar*) 'they will hit'. The negated forms are *bil-me-m* 'I don't know', *qo-ma-ŋ* 'you don't allow', *ol-maz* 'it doesn't become', *bulaš-maz-dï* 'it wouldn't have sticked into'.

The present forms are built with *-(y)lr*, e.g. *ed-ir-em* 'I do', *de-yir-eŋ* 'you say', *ged-ir* 'goes', *is-ir-ler* (< *ise-yir-ler*) 'they want'. Negated forms are, e.g., *bil-mir-em* 'I don't know', *getir-mir-eŋiz* 'you don't bring'. Past tense intraterminals based on *-(y)lr* are, e.g. *is-ir-di-m* (< *ise-yir-di-m*) 'I wanted', *čaǧïr-il-ler-di* (< *čaǧïr-ir-ler-di*), assimilation *rl* > *ll* 'they were calling', *ö:l-ir-di* 'was dying'.

5.6. Soper's presentation

Soper's Kashkay informants, like Jarring's, belonged to the Amaleh tribe. But as Soper remarks, their speech is not necessarily representative of the whole tribe:

> "The Qashqay speech represented below was elicited from two educated males [...] Both are from the Amaleh tribe, which is associated with the paramount tribal leadership. Even within such a small community as the Qashqays, noticeable lin-

guistic differences exist [...] and it should not be assumed that the language cited
here represents that of the tribe as a whole." (Soper 1996: 243)

The Kashkay dialect described by Soper (1996) has a present formed with *-iyr* and
the aorist in *-är*.

> "The suffix *-iyr* is invariant and is actually pronounced [i:r]. When it is preceded
> by a vowel in the stem, either that vowel or the initial suffix vowel *-i* may drop,
> except in the case of monosyllabic stems. Suffixes after *-iyr* observe vowel har-
> mony, adhering to the frontness or backness of the last stem vowel unless that
> vowel is a phonemic *i*." (Soper 1996: 254)

For instance, *bišïr-iyr* 'cooks', *ox-iyr* 'reads', *oxo-miyr* 'doesn't read', *ėd-iyr-em* 'I
do', *de-yr-eŋ* 'you say', *gel-iyr-eg* 'we come'. The aorist is built with *-(A)r*, or *-ïr*,
e.g., *qal-ar-am* 'I live', *gel-er* 'comes', *bil-mem* 'I cannot', *de-yer* 'says', *gel-ïr*
'comes', *al-ir-dï-g* 'we would buy', *bulun-ïr* 'are found'.

6. The paradigms

The variation between the two present tense forms indicates that the distinction be-
tween the aorist and the new present has been kept in the varieties just mentioned.
The morphological means employed for marking the distinction vary.

Table 1. Some examples of marking the distinction between the old aorist and the new
present

	Aorist	Negated aorist	Present	Negated present
Old Anatolian	*-r, -Ar, -Ur*			
Turkish	*-r, -A²r, -ï'r*	*-mAm, -mAzsIn, -maz, -mAyIz, -mAzsInIz, -mAzlAr*	*-ï'yor* with fusion of the stem final vowel	*-mIyor*
Turkmen	*-A² :r*		*-(y)A² :r*	
Azerbaijanian	*-(y)A²r*		*-(y)ï'r*	
Aynallu	*-r, -ar, -er, -ur, -ür*	*-mem, -mez, -måz*	*-ir* (with fusion of the stem final vowel) *-A, -y*	*-mir, -mör, -mirek, -milar*

Kashkay Romaskevič	-r, -yar, -yer, -ur, -ïr, -ar, -er	-mAm, -mAnAm -mAs	-ir (-d?) -ïyur (?)	-mirem
Kashkay Menges	-r, -ur, -ïr, -ar, -er	-mAs or -meyer	-A / -y	-meyler
Kashkay Doerfer 1	-r,	-mem, -meŋ, -mez	-iyur with fusion of the stem final vowel	-mirem, -mireŋiz, -mir
Kashkay Doerfer 2	-r, -ar, -er, -ur, -ïr		-(y)ir	
Kashkay Jarring	-r, -ar, -er, -ur, -ür, -ïr	-mem, -maz, -mazdï	-(y)ir	-mirem, -mireŋiz
Kashkay Soper	-ar, -er, -ïr	-maz	-iyr [i:r] with fusion of the stem final vowel	-miyr

The published Kaskay texts do not provide us with sufficient evidence for establishing clearcut parameters of dialectal variation. Some cautious assumptions can, nevertheless, be made for further scrutiny. First, the texts attest intraterminal forms belonging to two paradigms, but much care must be taken in assigning individual forms to one paradigm or the other. Doerfer's and Jarring's texts give unequivocal evidence for the use of two paradigms. In the texts of Romaskevič and Menges, in which the aorist is almost exclusively used, the evidence is not as clear. Second, the aorist shows different degrees of the standardisation of the suffix vowel. Less variation may also be due to the fact that the material is very limited. The suffix vowel may be high or low, but there also are neutral vowels, as, for example, in Soper's account, in which the high vowel is replaced by a neutral [ə] written as *ï*. Variants of the present marker are: *-(y)ir* or *-iyr* [i:r]. Less well attested is the use of *-iyur* and *-A / -y* as present markers. The present is frequently used in Jarring's texts.

The last part of this short survey will deal with a Kashkay variety, which has only one intraterminal category, the old aorist.

7. The Abivardi variety

"The largest single settled Qashqa'i group with a specific identity is the Abivardi (*Bolvardi* represents a more informal usage). The Abivardi originated in Khorasan and is Turkic by origin, possibly Afshar. Members of the group today believe that Nader Shah sent their ancestors to Fars in the eighteenth century [...]. Abivardi consisted of a settled component (Abivardi Khaki, 'Abivardi of the Earth') and a nomadic one (Abivardi Badi, 'Abivardi the Wind')." (Beck 1986: 185)

The variety of *turki* spoken by the majority of speakers living in the Abivardi district has only one intraterminal category: the old aorist. It is plausible to assume that the renewal of the present tense did not take place in this dialect. The aorist is formed with the suffix *-r, -ar, -er*. The suffix vowel is sometimes realised as a middle high neutral vowel *ə*, as in *salər* 'sets free', *daniš-ər-em* 'I speak' and in some particular

words -*i*, such as *gel-ir* 'comes'. The *i* occurs in the third person plural *ol-il-ler* (< *ol-ir-ler*) 'they are' and *ver-il-ler* (< *ver-ir-ler*) 'they give'. In some monosyllabic stems the suffix is introduced by a glide *y*, for instance, *bil-er-em* 'I know', *al-ar-em* 'I take', *aɣla-r-am* 'I cry', but *yu-yar-em* 'I wash', *di-yer-em* 'I say'.

Table 2. Present tense in the Abivardi dialect spoken in Shiraz

bil- 'know'		Aorist
1SG	*bil-er-em*	*bil-mem*
2SG	*bil-er-ēy*	*bil-mēy*
3SG	*bil-er*	*bil-mez*
1PL	*bil-er-ek*	*bil-mek*
2PL	*bil-er-ēyiz*	*bil-mēyiz*
3PL	*bil-el-ler*	*bil-mezler*

8. The role of code-copying in the history of the paradigms

The Abivardis use the name Kashkay to denote the nomadic Kashkays in particular. Therefore, the Kashkay who have recently moved to the Abivardi district in Shiraz are called "Kashkay". The Abivardis regard the language of these "Kashkay" as representing a purer type of Turkic as their own variety. The Abivardis today live in close contact with these Kashkay. There are intermarriages between the groups but the original tribal differences continue to play an important role. The linguistic differences are consciously maintained. The dialectal differences between the present tense forms are especially important and serve as a shibboleth of tribal identity.

The Kashkay texts discussed above, represent varieties that have both the aorist and the present. A system of two intraterminal present paradigms can be regarded as usual in Kashkay, as the analyses of the texts shows.

Table 3. The two paradigms in some Kashkay dialects

bil- 'know'	Present	Aorist
1SG	*bil-ir-em*	*bil-er-em*
2SG	*bil-ir-eŋ*	*bil-er-eŋ*
3SG	*bil-ir*	*bil-er*
1PL	*bil-ir-ek*	*bil-er-ek*
2PL	*bil-ir-eŋiz*	*bil-er-eŋiz*
3PL	*bil-il-ler*	*bil-el-ler*

The aorist paradigm corresponds to the Abivardi paradigm. The present paradigm, on the other hand, is in many cases the translational equivalent of Abivardi aorist forms. Therefore, the Abivardi speakers identify the "Kashkay" present as corresponding to the Abivardi aorist. My observation, which has to be tested in later field work, is that there is a tendency today for non-Abivardi Kashkay speakers living in the Abivardi district to use only the present paradigm, which is formed with the suffix

-*ir*. The forms built with the suffix *-Ar*, are identified as Abivardi forms. Thus the following forms are used in the same function in the two varieties:

Table 4. Translational equivalents in the two varieties spoken in Abivardi

	Abivardi	"Kashkay" spoken in Abivardi
'I escape'	*qač-er-em*	*qač-ir-em*
'I love'	*sev-er-em*	*sev-ir-em*
'I shoot'	*vur-r-am*	*vur-ir-am*
'I come'	*gel-l-em*	*gel-ir-em*
'I wash'	*yu-yar-am*	*yu-yir-am*

Consider the following examples of the use of the *-ir*-forms used by a "Kashkay" speaker in Shiraz.

Her   tayfenin   dili   fark   edir.
each   tribe-GEN   language-3POSS   difference   make:PRESENT
'Each tribe has a different language.'

Babamïn   babasï
father-POSS1SG-GEN   father-POSS3SG

olir   menim biyig boam.
become:PRESENT   I-GEN   great father-POSS1SG
'My father's father is my grandfather.'

The present in the nomadic dialects and the old aorist in the Abivardi variety have become functional equivalents due to the specific contact situation. Interestingly, the speakers do not identify the Abivardi aorist form *gelir* 'comes' used in spontaneous speech with the "Kashkay" present *gelir*. When asked whether this form is an Abivardi form, the answer is that the Abivardi form is *geler*. The two varieties are in other respects converging and copying in both directions is frequent. Speakers also use present forms copied from the other variety.

I do not have sufficient data to conclude that the "Kashkay" variety has lost a category, namely the aorist, because of the present contact situation. There are other Southwestern Turkic dialects in which the aorist has been lost and its function has been taken over by the new present. This seems to be the case, for instance, in the Galūgāh dialect described by Doerfer (1990), in which only the *-ir* forms are used, as shown in Table 5 below. But it is plausible that if the speakers had two paradigms in their original varieties, the contact with the Abivardi dialect could lead them to avoid the use of the aorist.

Table 5. Present in the Galūgāh dialect (Doerfer 1990: 28)

gelị′rem	'I come'	*gelị′rik*	'we come'
gelị′sen	'you come'	*gelị′süz*	'you come'
gelị′	'(s)he comes'	*gelị′ller*	'they come'

Moreover, the Abivardi, the "Kashkay" in Shiraz, and the Galūgāh dialect have a new type high-focal present copied from Persian.

Table 6. High-focal present in the Galūgāh dialect (Doerfer 1990: 28)

Persian model		Galūgāh copy
dāram mīyāyam	'I am coming'	*vara′m gelị′rem*
dārī mīyāyī	'you are coming'	*va′rsan gelị′sen*
dārad mīyāyad	'he is coming'	*var gelịr*
dārīm mīyāyīm	'we are coming'	*va′rikgelị′rik*
dārīd mīyāyīd	'you are coming'	*va′rsüz gelị′süz*
dārand mīyāyand	'they are coming'	*var′lar gelị′ller*

The Persian construction is based on the auxiliary verb *dār* 'have' and an imperfective form of the lexical verb (Windfuhr 1979: 102). Turkic does not have a verb 'have'; thus the copies include the nominal element *var* 'existing'—used in possessive constructions—with a possessive suffix agreeing with the person of the inflected lexical verb, e.g. Abivardi *varim giderem* [existing-POSS1SG go-AORIST-1SG] 'I am just going'. This construction functions as the new high-focal present. The renewal of the high-focal intraterminal category is a characteristic drift in Turkic languages. The copied construction is therefore both typologically and areally motivated. In some cases the development of a new category is "actually more a renewal and a reinforcement of a previously or already existing category" (Joseph 1998: 355).

9. Differentiation in Turkic morphology

The linguistic mechanisms that change paradigms are unpredictable but not haphazard. There are typical, re-occurring types of morphological changes (cf. Joseph 1998: 366). The basic triggering factors are morphophonological processes, restructuring of paradigms, and the development of new categories. This article focuses on the role of differentiation,[2] a factor triggering different types of morphological changes, which have played a crucial role in forming the inflectional paradigms of Turkic. I use the term here to denote the reinforcement or maintenance of

---

[2] The term differentiaton was introduced by Meillet to account for sound changes characterisable as a change to prevent assimilation, see Staffan Fridell (2001), who surveys how this term has been applied in historical linguistics.

(i)   formal distinctions between inflectional paradigms, e.g. the markers of the aorist and the new present;

(ii) the morphological coding of grammaticalised semantic distinctions, e.g. the reintroduction of high-focal categories;

(iii) oppositions between dialects, which are regarded by the speakers as identity markers, e.g. the paradigm of present in Abivardi.[3]

The role of contact between different varieties of Turkic has been emphasised. It is undoubtly significant in the history of Turkic in general because the linguistic situation in the Kashkay confederation, in which Turkic varieties with different historical backgrounds are spoken in one politically defined communicative area, is a scenario typical of many periods in the history of the Turkic languages.

Acknowledgements

References

Adamović, Milan 1985. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden: Brill.

Beck, Lois 1986. *The Qashqa'i of Iran*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.

Bodrogligeti, András 1968. On the Turkish vocabulary of the Işfahan anonymous. *Acta Orientalia Hungaricae* 21, 15-43.

Brendemoen, Bernt (forthcoming). *The Turkish dialects of Trabzon*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Caferoğlu, Ahmet & Doerfer, Gerhard 1959. Das Aserbaidschanische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundemanta* 1. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 280-307.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1970. Irano-Altaistica: Turkish and Mongolian languages of Persia and Afghanistan. In: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.) *Current trends in linguistics* 6. The Hague, Paris: Mouton. 217-234.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1989. *Grammatik des Chaladsch*. (Turcologica 4.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Doerfer, Gerhard & Hesche, Wolfram & Ravanyar, Jamshid (eds.) 1990. *Oghusica aus Iran*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

---

[3]   The term *naboopposition* 'neighbour-opposition' was introduced by the Norwegian dialectologist Amund B. Larsen in his article "Naboopposition – knot". *Maal og minne* 1917, 34-46. (Quoted in Fridell 2001)

Erdal, Marcel 1998. Old Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London, New York: Routledge. 138-157.

Fridell, Staffan 2001. *Differentiation. A neglected concept in historical linguistics?* [Paper presented at the XVth International Conference on Historical Linguistics. La Trobe University, Melbourne, 13-17 August 2001.]

Johanson, Lars 1975. Das tschuwaschische Aoristthema. *Orientalia Suecana* 23-24, 106-158.

Johanson, Lars 1976. Zum Präsens der nordwestlichen und mittelasiatischen Türksprachen. *Acta Orientalia Hungaricae* 37, 57-74.

Johanson, Lars 1989. Aorist and present tense in West Oghuz languages. *Journal of Turkish Studies* 13, 99-105.

Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, 29: 5.) Stuttgart: Steiner. [To appear in English translation with Curzon 2001.]

Johanson, Lars 1998. The history of Turkic. In Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*. London, New York: Routledge. 81-125.

Johanson, Lars 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 27-187.

Joseph, Brian D. 1998. Diachronic morphology. In: Spencer, Andrew & Zwicky, Arnold M. (eds.) *The handbook of morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell. 351-373.

Kowalski, Tadeusz 1937. *Sir Aurel Stein's Sprachaufzeichnungen im Äinallu-Dialekt aus Südpersien*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiętności.

Menges, Karl Heinrich 1951. Research in the Turkic dialects of Iran. Preliminary report on a trip to Persia. *Oriens* 4, 273-279.

Menges, Karl Heinrich 1990. Drei Qašqā'ī-Texte. In: Doerfer et al. (eds.), 135-138.

Plank, Frans 1991. Of abundance and scantiness in inflection: A typological prelude. In: Plank, Frans (ed.) *Paradigms. The economy of inflection*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-39.

Romaskevič, A. A. 1925. Pysni kaškajcev'. *Sbornik Muzeja Antropologii i Étnografii Akademija Nauk* 5.2, 573-610.

Soper, John 1996. *Loan syntax in Turkic and Iranian*. (Eurasian Language Archives 2.) Bloomington, Indiana: Eurolingua.

Windfuhr, Gernot L. 1979. *Persian grammar. History and state of its study*. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton.