

Werk

Titel: Notes on -QAlAQ in Shor

Autor: Nasilov, Dmitrij M.

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2005

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0009 | LOG_0038

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Notes on *-QALAQ* in Shor

Dmitrij M. Nasilov

Nasilov, Dmitrij M. 2005. Notes on *-QALAQ* in Shor. *Turkic Languages* 9, 229-233.

The affix *-qalaq-* is found in Khakas, Tuva, Altay, Shor, Chulym-Turkic, Bačat-Teleut, Baraba and Tomsk Tatar Turkic. The analytical markers *-a + elek* and *-a + ilik* are considered to be its analogues in Kirghiz and Yakut along with Dolgan. The described forms of all Siberian Turkic languages are characterized by the similar meaning of an action which has not yet taken place; the secondary nature of the origin of their markers is obvious. The author assumes that these forms go back to a combination of the intensifying particle (*e*)*le* and the negative predicative noun *joq* with either the adverb *-a/-y/-u* or the verbal noun *-ig/-gi/-yq/-qy/-qu*.

Dmitrij M. Nasilov, Moscow State University, Institute of Asian and African Studies. Ul. Oranžerejnaja, 20. 141200, Puškino, Russia.

The Shor language is a part of the area of Turkic languages where the verbal marker *-QALAQ* functions as a participle or as a tense stem, e.g. *tüle-gelek at* ‘a horse has not been saddled yet’, *šiq-qalaq ay* ‘a moon that has not risen yet’, *at-qalaq kiyik* ‘a roe that has not been killed yet’; *aŋči kel-gelek* ‘the hunter has not come yet’, *at-qalaq-pyn* ‘I have not shot yet’, *taŋ čari-ŋalaq pol-ŋan* ‘the dawn has not broken yet’.

This suffix is also observed in Khakas, Tuvan, Altay Turkic, Chulym Turkic, Bačat Teleut, Baraba and the Tomsk variety (Esipova 1993: 17). Tofan astonishingly stands out against these languages. Accepted counterparts of this affix are the markers *-A + elek* and *-A + ilik* in Kirghiz and Yakut (also Dolgan) respectively; they also function as predicates (Korkina 1970: 239; Ubrjatova 1985: 31, 1988: 471). All these forms share a similar meaning, the expression of a quality or a condition that has not yet appeared; in other words, the action has not occurred yet, but is expected (the Altay grammar of 1869, Dyrenkova 1941), not occurred yet at the time being (O. Böhtlingk). Unrealized action is meant here. However, some authors give a different evaluation of the predicative use of the form as *verbum finitum*: Korkina defines Yakut *-A ilik* as “the mood of the unfulfilled action”, e.g. present tense *En miigin iitt-ahata ilik-kin* ‘You have not given me either food or drink yet’, and past tense *Utuya ilik ete* ‘(S)he had not slept yet (at that time)’ (1970: 247-249). According to Čispijakov, the respective Shor form is “the past imperfect verb tense”, e.g. *Ayaš pürülen-gelek* ‘The tree has not lost its leaves’ (1992 : 116). Tadykin believes that in Altay Turkic the participle *-GALAQ* only conveys (negative) past tense meaning relative to the moment of speech, e.g. *Ol bar-ŋalaq* ‘He had to go, but he had not gone

yet' (1971: 90). In Čulym Turkic, the main meaning is said to be an action which has not taken place in the past, e.g. *Qoy soq-qalaq-pis* 'We have not slaughtered the sheep yet' (Birjukovič 1981: 67). Isxakov & Pal'mbax consider the same form in Tuvan as the future of the expected time (1961: 391).

Comparing the semantics of the mentioned forms with Yakut *-A ilik* and Kirghiz *-A elek*, Korkina concludes that they are not only similar to each other at present, but probably have a common origin (1970: 246). Ubrjatova recognizes the common origin of the given affixes too, relating them, however, to the secondary participle forms of a later origin (1985: 32). As for the origin of these forms, the authors of the comparative-historical grammar of the Turkic languages adhere to the same opinion (1988: 471). Schönig considers a common source of the forms although he notes the difficulties of explaining the final results of a development from a common archetype, "if this archetype existed" (1998: 135).

It follows from the explanations quoted above that the Yakut and Kirghiz forms represent an earlier stage of a development that led to the replacement of the analytical forms by the suffix *-QALAQ*. This raises some questions about the original form of the first and second components of the analytical construction. Though there are different opinions on this, it is common to suppose an original ambiguity of the component *ilik / elek*. E. I. Korkina says that it is difficult to solve the problem of the etymology of *ilik / elek / kalak* and that this question has to be studied specially (1970: 246). Ubrjatova defines *ilik* as a word meaning 'which not... yet' (1976: 54). Ščerbak leaves *elek* without comments (1977: 160, 1981: 96). Böhlingk (1989: 471) and Monguš & Sat (1968: 611) assume a separate word, Yakut *ilik* 'not happening yet', 'not having occurred yet', Tuvan *elek* 'it is too early' (*e-+-lek?*), 'till, until'. Judaxin interprets Kirghiz *elek* as a verbal negation 'still not yet' (1965: 947).

Most researchers probably agree that the second component of the construction is *ilik / elek*. The next question concerns the first component of the construction. It seems to be clear for Yakut that this is a form of the common Turkic geconverb *-A/-y*. Böhlingk first expressed this opinion (1989#: 415), and his view is supported by modern Yakut linguists. The similar problem concerning Kirghiz is solved in the same way (Judaxin 1965: 947).

As for the affix *-QALAQ*, its initial velar is derived from an ancient verbal noun *-GU/-GI* (Ščerbak 1981: 178; Birjukovič 1981: 66), *-IG/-IK* (Sat 1959: 79), or *-GAn* (Castrén 1857: 74; Benzing 1959: 4). A number of specialists in Turkic philology assume a variant of *-IIQ/-IUQ* in this affix (Birjukovič 1981, Jusupov 1985: 83). Jusupov takes this suffix to go back to *elek*, cf. the participle suffix *-GIIIQ* expressing a potentiality in Tatar dialects and in some other Turkic languages (1985: 83). This comparison with the form marker *-GIIIQ* <*-GUIIU*, well known from Old Uyghur documents, with the particle *elek* is semantically weak (and probably also phonetically).

In Old Turkic, *-GUIIUQ*, derived from *-GU*, was used to express future action accompanied by the same modality nuances typical of *-GU*, i.e. the necessity and obligation, e.g. Old Uyghur *bilgülük ol* 'should be known', *bilgä biliginä sizik köñül*

turyur-ma-yuluq ol 'it is impossible to doubt his wise competence', *üzük sözlä-gülük ärmäz men* 'I shall not tell a lie', *darnini säkiz yüz qata oqı-yuluq ol* 'he must recite the formula eight hundred times'.

The etymologies just quoted do not explain the suffix *-LAQ*, if it is not a rest of *elek*. This suffix does not seem to mark verbal forms and can hardly be correlated with *-GUIUQ*.

As mentioned, the forms under discussion have in all Siberian languages the meaning of an action which has not taken place. According to Ubrjatova, it should be expedient to try to explain its negative semantic. Attention should also be drawn to Benzing's etymology, which is not mentioned in the works cited. Benzing derives the Altay-Sayan suffix *-GALAQ*, as well as the Kirghiz and Yakut forms from the analytical construction **-yan + ele + yoq* (1959: 4), which probably includes the intensifying particle *ele*, characterized by a wide range of functions, e.g. in Kirghiz (Batmanov 1940: 64-68). Batmanov refers Kirghiz *ele* to the category of "syntactic words" like *eken* and *emes*. The particle *ele* can be compared also with the Common Turkic expressive-emphatic particle *la* (*ele* < /e/ + *le*). In Old Turkic and Middle Turkic this particle is often added to the verb, intensifying the action or condition expressed by it, conveying a categorical shade of meaning, e.g. *öldüm-le* 'I have died!' (Ščerbak 1987: 99-100). In Kirghiz, the combination of the past tense marker *-DI*, the perfect marker *-GAN* or the past iterative marker *-čU* with *ale* allocates the action as a separate episode after which the further narration will follow. In combination with the present-future marker *-A* or with the presumable future marker *-Ar* gives them the meaning of the opportunity to perform an action in the future (Batmanov 1940 : 66). The intensifying role of *ale* is very significant in this case.

Benzing's construction makes the negative semantics of the considered form transparent. The use of *yoq* for verbal nouns negative forms creation is a widespread Turkic phenomenon (Ščerbak 1981: 97). This negative predicative *yoq* is added to *-GAN* and the nouns of action in *-IG* and *-GU*, which have played a considerable role in development of tense system in the Turkic languages (Blagova 1958). Such forms are found in Old Uyghur, e.g. *baliqtaqı ig toya ketgüsi yoq* 'there is pestilence in the city, and the infection will not leave'. Tadykin remarks that in Altay Turkic, the participle *-GALAQ* and the negative form of the participle *-GAN* are often inter-changeable. The meaning of *-GALAQ* is close to the negative form of *-GAN*; it consists of combination of this participle with the word *yoq* 'not available' (1971: 88). The same semantic conformity is observed in Fu-yü Kirghiz (Schönig 1998: 136⁶).

As regards the use of *yoq* in tense paradigms, specific attention should be paid to the negative forms of the present tense in Yellow Uigur *-u + yoq-tır*. In this form the negative *yoq* is added to the common Turkic converb in *-U/-A/-y*, e.g. *men kel-ü yoq-tır* 'I do not go, I am not going' (Tenišev 1976a: 86); cf. Salar *piser var-yox-tır* 'we do not go, we are not going' (Tenišev 1976b: 140). The use of *yoq* in tenses is observed in Čulym Turkic too (Birjukovič 1981: 46-58). These examples show that *yoq* can be added to adverbial forms.

Thus, the origin of Yakut *ilik* and Kirghiz *elek* may be a combination of the intensifying particle and the negative word *yoq*, i.e. *(e)le + yoq > elek/ilik*. This complex component was combined either with the converb in *-U/-A/-y* or with the verbal noun *-IG/-GU/-GI*, marking the analytical form with a negative value of an action that has not happened. The analytical form was used in attributive and predicative functions, and it could be substantivized, as in Yakut. Benzing's suggestion of *-GAn* as the first component is more problematic since it assumes complicated phonetic changes. Consequently, Ubrjatova's opinion to the effect that the Yakut and Sayan forms may be secondary formations of the participle can be accepted. The Shor participle and tense marker *-QALAQ* may thus be the result of a phonetic development of an ancient analytical construction.

References

- Batmanov I. A. 1940. *Grammatika kirgizskogo jazyka 3: Tipy otglagol'nyx obrazovanij i ix funkcii*. Frunze: Kirgizizdat.
- Benzing, J. 1959. Classification of the Turkic languages. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 1-5.
- Birjukovič R. M. 1981. *Morfologija čulymsko-tjurkskogo jazyka*. Saratov: Knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Blagova G. F. 1958. Sootnositel'nye glagol'nye formy i ix razvitie v uzbekskom jazyke. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 1958: 4.
- Böhtlingk O. N. 1889. *O jazyke jakutov*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Castrén M. A. 1857. *Versuch einer koibalischen und karagassischen Sprachlehre*. St.-Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Čispiyakov E. F. 1992. *Učebnik šorskogo jazyka*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Dyrenkova N. P. 1941. *Grammatika šorskogo jazyka*. Moskva & Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
- Esipova A. V. 1993. *Opredelitel'naja funkcija pričastij v šorskom jazyke*. Novosibirsk.
- Grammatika 1869. *Grammatika altajskogo jazyka*. Kazan': Izdatel'stvo Kazanskogo universiteta.
- Isxakov F. G. & Pal'mbax A. A. 1961. *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Judaxin K. K. 1965. *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Slovarnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Jusupov F. J. 1985. *Neličnyje formy glagola v dialektax tatarskogo jazyka*. Kazan': Tatknigizdat.
- Korkina E. I. 1970. *Naklonenija glagola v jakutskom jazyke*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Morfologija 1988. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov: Morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Sat Š. Č. 1959. Pričastie v tuvinskom jazyke. In: *Učenyje zapiski TuvNIJALI* 3. Kyzyl: Kyzylskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Schönig C. 1998. A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages 3. *Turkic Languages* 130-151.

- Ščerbak A. M. 1977. *Očerki po sravnitel'noj morfologii tjurkskix jazykov: Imja*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Ščerbak A. M. 1981. *Očerki po sravnitel'noj morfologii tjurkskix jazykov: Glagol*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Ščerbak A. M. 1987. *Očerki po sravnitel'noj morfologii tjurkskix jazykov: Narečije, služebnye časti reči, izobrazitel'nye slova*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Tadykin V. N. 1971. *Pričastija v altajskom jazyke*. Gorno-Altajsk: Altajskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Tenišev Ė. R. 1976a. *Stroj saryg-južurskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Tenišev Ė. R. 1976b. *Stroj salarskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Tuvinsko-russkij slovar'*. 1968. Moskva: Slovarnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Ubrjatova E. I. 1976. *Issledovanija po sintaksisu jakutskogo jazyka 2: Složnoe predloženie 1*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Ubrjatova E. I. 1985. *Istoričeskaja grammatika jakutskogo jazyka*. Jakutsk: Jakutskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.