Werk

Titel: Notes on Uyghur verb morphology

Autor: Rentzsch , Julian

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2008

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0012|LOG_0031

Kontakt/Contact

Notes on Uyghur verb morphology

Julian Rentzsch

This contribution discusses the etymology of selected forms of inflectional verb morphology in Modern Standard Uyghur in a historical-comparative perspective.

Julian Rentzsch. Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität, Seminar für Orientkunde, D-55099 Mainz. E-mail: rentzsch@uni-mainz.de

Processes of grammaticalization are often accompanied by morphological reduction. At some point, the etymological origin of a given item is no longer transparent. In many cases, however, it is possible to reconstruct its origin by the means of typological comparison and the evaluation of pre-modern linguistic data.

Some Uyghur aspect items look particularly opaque at the first glance. Moreover, Uyghur verb paradigms offer forms that seem to be irregular. Yet, most of these forms result from regular diachronic developments. It is just that the origin of the 'irregular' forms is no longer immediately obvious.

This contribution comments on selected items of the morphological inventory of the Uyghur verb from an etymological perspective. My claims are supported by data from other modern and pre-modern Turkic varieties.

-Edu

The Uyghur item *-Edu* represents the first renewal of intraterminality[1] after the defocalization of the so-called Aorist in *-Vr*.[2] Today, it is a low focal intraterminal marker [–PAST (+INTRA^{LF})], commonly labelled 'Present-Future Tense'. The vowel /E/[3] surfaces as /i/ after consonantal stems and as /y/ after vocalic stems. The original /E/ turns up again in interrogative forms.

The most simple paradigm (i.e. not negated, not interrogative) of *bar-* 'to go' looks like this (cf. UETITL 928, Friedrich 2002: 108, De Jong 2007: 124):

	Singular	Plural
1st person	*barimen*	*barimiz*

---

[1] For the terminology, see Johanson 2000.

[2] For the sake of convenience, the archimorphemes are given in a simplified representative form, e.g. *-Ivatidu* for *-(I)vatidu*, *-Er* for *-(E)r* and *-Vr* for *-(V)r*.

[3] That is, /a/ or /e/ according to the sound harmony features of the stem.

2nd person[4]	*barisen* *barisiz* *barila, baridila*	*barisiler*
3rd person	*baridu*	*baridu*

The word form *barimen* 'I go, I shall go' derives from the Middle Turkic morphosyntactic complex *bara turur men* 'I am just going', which consists of the intraterminal converb in *-E* and the Aorist of the verb *tur-* 'to stand' (Johanson 1995: 89-90). *Bara turur men* literally means 'I stand goingly'. This construction arose as a consequence of the defocalization of the Aorist in *-Vr*, which was the sole finite intraterminal item of Old Turkic. The third person form *baridu* (< *bara turur*) preserves traces of the auxiliary *turur*, namely the dental plosive and the high labial back vowel.

The form in *-E turur* existed in Khorezmian Turkic (13th century, Eckmann 1959: 134). In Chaghatay (15th century), the corresponding form was *baradur*, preserving the segmet *-dur* in all persons (e.g. 1st person singular: *baradurmen*).

Equivalents to this item exist in many other Turkic languages in various forms: Uzbek has *boradi* with delabialized vowel, Kazakh *baradï*, where *-DI* undergoes palatal harmony, Kirghiz has *barat*, with /t/ being the only remnant of *turur*, and Kazan Tatar has *bara* with no trace of *turur* left. Conversely, Altay Turkic preserves */t/ in all persons: *baradïm, baradïŋ, barat, baradïbïs/baradïq, baradïɣar, barat/baradïlar* (Baskakov & Toščakova 1947: 282).

The Uyghur respectful 2nd person singular *baridila/barila* obviously derives from **bara tururlar*. This is originally a 3rd person plural.[5] The form in *-dila* preserves a trace of *turur*. A reflex of *tururlar* is preserved in both variants in the backness of the (original) plural suffix, which appears invariably as *-la*, also in front words (*kèlila/kèlidila* 'you come').

Further traces of *turur* turn up in the 1st person question forms, which are *baramdimen* for the singular and *baramdimiz* (< **bara mu turur biz*) for the plural. These seemingly "irregular" forms (De Jong 2007: 126) are etymologically perfectly motivated, the only irregularity being the unpredictability of the instances in which the element *-di-* turns up. I would suggest that the general tendency to morphological simplification and shortening which has triggered the loss of *-di-* in most of the other forms is overruled by the tendency to avoid the long ("geminated") consonant /mm/

---

[4]   The different forms of the second person singular represent different layers of politeness: The usual form is the ending in *-siz*, while *-sen* implies intimacy and *-(di)la* is honorific. The form in *-(di)la* is given as *-la* by Friederich (2002: 108), as *-dila* and *-la* by De Jong (2007: 124) and as *-dila* by UETITL: 928. The normative spelling and pronunciation dictionary UETITL provides an additional plural form in *-sizler*.

[5]   The use of the 3rd person plural as a respectful form for the second person is familiar from other languages, e.g. German *Sie* (which, different from Uyghur, is used both for the 2nd person singular and plural).

in *barammen, *barammiz, which would not be an improvement in terms of articulatory simplicity against baramdimen, baramdimiz.[6]

For the 1st person singular and plural, there are also the alternative forms baramdim and baramduq.[7] These are formed in analogy to the "Preterite" in -Di (bardim, bardiŋ/bardiŋiz/bardila, bardi, barduq, bardiŋlar, bardi), cf. the remarks on -Iptu below.

Standard Uzbek has the question particle following the personal ending: boramanmi 'do I go?', boradilarmi 'do they go?' etc. (cf. Kononov 1960: 209). Consequently, the "irregularities" of Uyghur do not happen in Uzbek.

I should quickly comment on the 2nd person plural form barisiler as well: It will be immediately obvious that the personal ending -siler always contains a front vowel,[8] regardless whether the verb it is attached to is front or back. This is a reflex of the frontness of the postponed pronoun this suffix originates from: *bara turur senler. Note that the corresponding suffix in Kazakh undergoes palatal harmony: barasïŋdar, kelesiŋder (cf. Balakaev et al. 1962: 331). Kazakh is more "progressive" than Uyghur in this respect, as the suffix concerned has become harmonized.

-Etti

The low focal intraterminal past [+PAST (+INTRA^{LF})] in -Etti is the exact past equivalent to -Edu. Both in terms of form and meaning, it is directly related to the Chaghatay form in -Edur ėdi, which in turn can be reconstructed as *-E turur erdi, hence baratti '(s)he would go' < baradur ėdi '(s)he was going' < *bara turur erdi.

However, this item is often erroneously identified as the past of the so-called Aorist, i.e. < *barar ėdi (Pritsak 1959: 560, Friederich 2002: 171). In a review of my book on aspect in Uyghur (Rentzsch 2005, here: p. 94), Yakup (2006: 197) criticizes my etymologization of -Etti as "mit Vorsicht zu lesen". Unfortunately, Yakup does not mention the reason for his objection. I shall nevertheless explain in detail why I am right.

First, morphologically there is no reason to believe that /r/ developed to /t/: A shift like that would be quite unique in the history of Turkic. The process /r/ tends to

---

[6] This is of course not to say that forms like *barammen and *barammiz are principally impossible. It has just not come to be in the Turkic varieties underlying Standard Uyghur.

[7] Friederich (2002: 111) gives the singular form -Emdimen in parentheses and records -Emduq as the only plural form. UETITL (928) gives only the long form (yazamdimen, kėtemdimiz). De Jong (2007: 126) mentions all the forms but records a difference in meaning. There is also different information on the respectful 2nd person singular: UETITL gives -Emdila, while both Friederich and De Jong mention -Emla. At any rate, all the variants mentioned do occur in written Uyghur texts. – Compare the Uyghur interrogative form baramduq with the Altay non-interrogative form baradïq already quoted.

[8] This statement concerns the vowel /e/ only, as there is no systematic opposition between /i/ and */ï/ in Uyghur.

undergo in Uyghur is simply the elision of /r/ with a compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, e.g. *<kördi>* /*kö:di*/ (not **/kötti/*). Morevover, the negative form of *baratti* is *barmaytti* < *barmaydur èdi* (an item which is well established in Chaghatay). If *-Etti* were derived from *-Er èdi*, the corresponding negative form should be *barmasti* or *barmas idi*.[9] It is of course completely unthinkable that there was not only a shift /r/ > /t/ in the positive form, but also an additional shift /s/ > /y/ (which is also atypical in Turkic) in the negative form, which would still leave the long /tt/ unexplained.

Further evidence is given by the positive form of stems ending in a vowel: The *-Etti*-form of *bašla-* 'to begin' is *bašlaytti* (< *bašlaydur èdi*); if the assumption *baratti* < *barar èdi* were correct, we would expect a form like **bašlatti* < *bašlar èdi*, which we do not get (UETITL 928 (3)).

While the evidence given so far should be enough to prove the development *-Etti* < *-Edur èdi* < **-E turur erdi*, the larger Turkic context provides further facts that support this etymology. Functionally, *-Etti* is the [+PAST] equivalent to *-Edu* not only in Uyghur. Other Turkic languages have corresponding forms going back to **-E turur erdi*, too:

Tatar has *bara idĕ* '(s)he was going' (TatGram 2: 113-116), which is the anteriorization (+PAST) of the focal intraterminal ("Present Continuous") in *-E* (*bara* '(s)he is going' < *bara turur*; *kile* '(s)he is coming' < *kele turur*).

Altay has the forms *barattï* and *braattï* (Baskakov & Toščakova 1947: 278), the first of which is almost identical in shape to its Uyghur correspondence. Also Kirghiz is able to anteriorize the intraterminal in *-Et*, resulting in *barat ele* (Imart 1981: 2035-2040).

It *is* true though, that Standard Uzbek and Kazakh do *not* have a past equivalent to *-Edl*. Instead, these two languages use *-Er edi* as a correspondence to *both -Edl* and *-Er* (Kazakh: *barar edi*, Balakaev et al. 1962: 348; Uzbek: *borar edi*, Kononov 1960: 225).[10] The situation in Uzbek may in fact have added to the confusion concerning the Uyghur item *-Etti*.

However, Uzbek dialects do have past correspondences to *-Adi*, and consequently direct correspondences to Uyghur *-Etti*. Shoabdurahmonov (1984: 147-148) mentions forms like *otaddi* 'he would pass' and *uraddi* 'he would beat' for the dialect of Namangan (Ferghana valley) and *bilætti* 'he would know' for the dialect of Qorako'l (Buxoro province). These forms are erroneously considered a regressive assimilation

---

[9] The latter form (*barmasidi*) does in fact exist, namely as the negative form of *bararidi*, which is the past of the "Future" in *-Er*. Cf. UETITL 953 (40).

[10] Yet, it is also possible to use Kazakh *baradï* and Uzbek *boradi* in past contexts, if the feature [+PAST] is sufficiently marked by surrounding items. The same option exists in Uyghur as well (Rentzsch 2005: 55, 76).

of *-ardi* (Shoabdurahmonov 1984: 147); however, in fact they mirror the same development as in Uyghur, i.e. *otaddi* < **ötedi edi* < *ötedur èdi* <**öte turur erdi*.[11]

In other Uzbek dialects, there is a morphological type **baraydi*, which is wrongly etymologized as *-(a)r-Edi* > *-(a)-y-Edi* > *-(a)y-di* (Shoabdurahmonov 1984: 147). The form *båraydim* 'I would go' is recorded for the dialects of Shahrisabz, Qarshi (both in the Qashqadaryo province) and the Qarluq varieties of Southern Tajikistan, forms like *yuriydim* 'I would run' for Qarnob (Qashqadaryo) and forms like *yuræyde* 'he would run' and *haydæ:ydim* 'I would drive' for Forish (Qashqadaryo). Rather than developments from **-Ar edi*, these forms are the exact morphological correspondences to Tatar *bara idĕ*, i.e. formations in which all traces of **turur* have disappeared completely: **bara idi*, **yüre idi*, **(h)ayday idi*.

Finally, the question form of Uyghur *-Etti* should be commented on. This appears quite regularly as *-Emti*, e.g. *baramtim* 'would I go?' < **bara mu turur èdim*. The negative question form, and the question form of stems ending in vowels are formed analogously with *-mEmti*, e.g. *barmamtim* 'would I not go?'. The regular form would be **barmaymtim* < **barmay mu turur èdim* with the unwieldy consonant cluster /ymt/.

-Ivatidu

-Ivatidu and *-Ivatatti* represent the next stage of focal renewal after *-Edu* and *-Etti*. Hence, *-Ivatidu* carries the linguistic value [–PAST (+INTRA^{HF})], while *-Ivatatti* is the anterior correspondence [+PAST (+INTRA^{HF})]. A convenient designation for these items for everyday use could be 'Present Continuous' and 'Past Continuous'.

Once the etymologies of *-Edu* and *-Etti* have been understood, establishing the origin of *-Ivatidu* and *-Ivatatti* is very easy. These renewals of intraterminality are composed of the converb in *-Ib* and the auxiliary *yat-* 'to lie down, to lie' in its *-Edur* and *-Edur èdi* form respectively. Hence, *bèrivatimen* 'I am going' derives from **barïb yatadurmen*. Underlying the latter form is a hypothetical **barïb yata turur men*, which never actually existed as at the time the focal renewal was taking place, the preceding item *-E turur* had already been reduced to *-Edur*. Stems ending in vowels behave as we would expect (*išlevatimen* < **išleb yatadurmen*).

Negation forms are *barmayvatimen* (< **barmay yatadurmen*), involving the negative of the *-Ib*-converb, *-mEy*, and, alternatively, *bèrivatmaymen* (< **barïb yatmaydurmen*), with the negation suffix *-mE* on the auxiliary *yat-*. The two forms differ in the scope of the negation: In *barmayvatimen* (the more common form), the intraterminal aspect takes the negated verb into its scope ('Right now, I am [not going]'), the Turkish correspondence being *gitmiyorum*, while in *bèrivatmaymen* the negation takes the intraterminal aspect into its scope ('It is not the case that [I am going]'), the Turkish correspondence being *gidiyor değilim*.

---

[11]   It is very well possible that these forms were not standardized in Uzbek precisely because they were not recognized as independent forms in their own right.

Given that *-Ivatidu* historically is segmentable into *-Ib* and the *-Edu*-form of *yat-* (i.e. *yatidu*), it does not come as a surprise that the question form is constructed in complete analogy to the corresponding form of *-Edu*: *bėrivatamdimen/bėrivatamdim* (< **barïb yata mu turur men*), etc.

Focal intraterminals formed with the postverbial *yat-* are found in many Turkic languages of Central Asia, e.g. Kirghiz (*oylop jatat* '(s)he is thinking', Imart 1981: 2140-2143), Kazakh (*kele žatïr* '(s)he is coming', Balakaev et al. 1962: 338) and Uzbek.

Uzbek has standardized (at least) two finite focal intraterminals involving *yat-*:

There are forms like *boryapman* (1st person) and *boryapti* (3rd person, Kononov 1960: 211) which derive from **bara yatïbturmen* (**bara yatïb turur men*), etc. (Johanson 1995: 93), i.e. the converb in *-E* with the focal postterminal form ('Perfect') of *yat-* 'to lie down, to lie' (cf. below, *-Iptu*).[12]

Another formation type is *yozayotirman* (Kononov 1960: 212) with an underlying **yaza yata turur men*, which is basically the same type of formation as in Uyghur, except that the main verb is marked with the converb in *-E*, not in *-Ib*. However, the "Uyghur type" with *-Ib* is found in a couple of Uzbek dialects in shapes like *-våt/-våtti* with phonetic variants going as far as *-åt/-ut*. Shoabdurahmonov (1984: 160) calls this type one of the most productive present tense suffixes of Uzbek dialects ("Hozirgi zamon formasini yasovchi eng mahsuldor affikslardan yana biri"). It occurs in Toshkent and the surrounding dialects, in some dialects of the province of Namangan, in the Qarnob dialect of the province of Samarqand and in the dialects of Qorakoʻl of the province of Buxoro.

The paradigms are mutually very similar. The forms given for Qarnob can serve as an example: *yåzvåtmæn, yåzvåtsæn, yåzvåtti, yåzvåtmiz, yåzvåtsiz, yåzvåtti* 'I am/you are/(s)he is/we/you/they are writing' (< **yazïb yatadï* < **yazïb yata turur*). In Toshkent, the /t/ undergoes regressive assimilation: *korvåmmæn, korvåssæn, korvåtti*, etc. 'I am/you are/(s)he is seeing' (< **körib yatadï* < **körib yata turur*). The forms given for Qorakoʻl deserve special attention: While *getivåtmæn, getivåtsæn* and *getivåti* 'I am/you are/(s)he is going', which closely resemble the corresponding Standard Uyghur forms, look as if they were derived from **kėtib yata turur*, the 3rd person plural is given as *getivåtiptilæ* (Shoabdurahmonov 1984: 161). This form, without doubt, has developed from **kėtib yatïbturlar* (i.e. involving the *-Ibtur*-form of *yat-*). Possible explanations for this phenomenon are that either *getivåtmæn*, etc. derive from the same construction, but have lost the /p/, or the data for Qorakoʻl has been elicited from two different co-existing paradigms. As the dialects of the Ferghana valley that use the **-E yatïbtur*-type for the focal intraterminality (e.g. Andijon) preserve a trace of the /p/ rather than of the /t/, it seems more reasonable that there are two co-existing formation types in Qorakoʻl. Uzbek dialect forms like

---

[12]   *Yatïbturmen* 'I have lain down, I am lying'; hence: **bara yatïbturmen* 'I am lying goingly' > 'I am going'.

yǎzvǎtti (< **yazïb yatadur*), while preserving reflexes of both the /t/ in *yat-* and of the /d/ of *-dur* in the length of /tt/, represent a stronger degree of contraction than Standard Uyghur *yèzivatidu*.[13]

As we have seen, in the South East Turkic area intraterminality renewals involving the postverbial segment *-Ib yat-* and those involving *-E yat-* occur side by side. While in Uyghur, forms with *-Ib yat-* have become standardized, Standard Uzbek prefers forms with *-E yat-*. This is not only true for finite items (e.g. Uyg. *-Ivatidu* vs. Uzb. *-yapti* and *-ayotir*) but also for participles (Uyg. *-Ivatqan* < **-Ib yatqan* vs. Uzb. *-ayotgan* < **-E yatqan*). However, during the first wave of renewal of intraterminality after the Aorist in *-Vr*, both languages – and even Turkic languages far beyond the south eastern group – make use of the converb in *-E* (Uyg. *-Edu*, Uzb. *-Adi* < *-E turur*; cf. also the participles Uyg. *-Ediɣan*, Uzb. *-Adigan* < *-E turɣan*).

-Ivatatti

As the Uyghur high focal intraterminal past ("Past Tense Continuous"), *-Ivatatti* is analysable as *-Ib* and the *-Etti* form of *yat-* (i.e. *yatatti*); all inflection forms of this item are formed in analogy to *-Etti*:

> *bèrivatattuq* 'We were going' < **barïb yata turur erduq*
> *barmayvatattuq* 'We were not going' < **barmay yata turur erduq*
> *bèrivatmayttuq* 'It was not the case that we were going' < **barïb yatmay turur erduq*
> *bèrivatamtuq* 'Were we going?' < **barïb yata mu turur erduq*
> *barmayvatamtuq* 'Were we not going?' < **barmay yata mu turur erduq*
> *bèrivatmamtuq* 'Was it not the case that we were going?' < **barïb yatmay mu turur erduq* (cf. UETITL 930 (6))

Further items

The items discussed so far were all intraterminals. These are the forms that look most abnormal and irregular in Uyghur. Finally, I would like to comment on two units outside the intraterminal domain.

The first of these is *-Gilivat-*, which is combined with various aspectual and modal endings (UETITL: 942-948; see also Friederich 2002: 208, De Jong 2007: 131-132) and has imminental meaning ('to be about to', cf. Turkish *-mEk üzere*). *-Gilivat-* is composed of the converb *-GEli*, which has final meaning ('in order to') and the auxiliary *yat-* 'to lie down, to lie'.[14] E.g. *barɣilivatimen* 'I am about to go' (lit. 'I am lying in order to go'). Regularly, we would expect a form like **barɣiliyatidu*. The /v/ is either a dissimilation from /i/, or an analogy to *-Ivatidu*. The same phenomenon

---

[13]   The Turfan dialect of Uyghur has a form in *-(I)vattu* which is similar to the Uzbek dialect forms from Toshkent, Qarnob, etc. (cf. Yakup 2005: 125).

[14]   The combination of *-GEli* with *yat-* in the same meaning is already attested in Old Uyghur (Gabain 1974: 132, 163).

can also be observed in the negation form of *-Ivatidu*, which is *-mEyvatidu*, not *-mEyyatidu*.

The second is *-Iptu* (< *-Ib turur*), which is a postterminal item ("Perfect") with evidential shades of meaning. The paradigm is as follows:

	Singular	Plural
1st person	*bėriptimen*	*bėriptimiz, bėriptuq*[15]
2nd person	*bėripsen* *bėripsiz* *bėripla, bėriptila*[16]	*bėripsiler*
3rd person	*bėriptu*	*bėriptu*

Traces of **turur* turn up in the 1st persons (*bėrip-ti-men* < *barïb turur men*, *bėrip-ti-miz* < *barïb turur biz*) and in the respectful second person (*bėrip-ti-la* < *bėrip turur-lar*). In early Chaghatay, all persons contained traces of **turur*: *barïbtur men/sen/biz/siz/lar* (cf. Bodrogligeti 2001: 241). Modern Turkic languages are very diversified in this respect. Some of them preserve remnants of **turur* in the third person only (e.g. Azerbaijani *içibdir*, Rahmati & Buğday 1998: 53; Uzbek *yozibdi*, Kononov 1960: 221; Kazakh *suwrettepti*, Balakaev et al. 1962: 342)[17] while in Kirghiz it appears in all persons (Imart 1981: 1827):

	Singular	Plural
1st person	*barïptïrmïn*	*barïptïrbïz*
2nd person	*barïptïrsïŋ* *barïptïrsïz*	*barïptïrsïŋar* *barïptïrsïzdar*
3nd person	*barïptïr*	*barïšïptïr*

Altay Turkic always preserves a trace of **turur*, but optionally deletes the *-Ib*: *bar(ïp)turum, bar(ïp)turuŋ, bar(ïp)tïr*, etc. (Baskakov & Toščakova 1947: 283).

The Uyghur 1st person plural variant *bėriptuq* is an analogy to forms like *barduq* 'we went', *bėrivatattuq* 'we were going', etc., which contain the marker /K/, which has developed in most varieties of Turkic in the 1st person plural of the neutral aspect ("Preterite") in *-DI* and the past copula *idi*.[18]

---

[15] The variant in *-Iptuq* is not mentioned by the UETITL (932 (8)), but does occur in written Uyghur texts.

[16] Friederich (2002: 133) mentions only *-Ipla*, while UETITL (932 (8)) and De Jong (2007: 141) mention only *-Iptila*.

[17] Compare the forms of the second person singular: Azerbaijani *içibsən*, Uzbek *yozibsan*, Kazakh *suwrettepsiŋ*.

[18] Siberian Turkic forms like Tuvan *keldivis* 'we came' (Isxakov & Pal'mbax 1961: 365), and the form *bårduvzæ/bårduz* 'we went' (Šoabdurahmonov 1984: 118) in the Toshkent dialect of Uzbek continue the Old Turkic tradition of *-DVmVz* (cf. Gabain 1974: 112-113).

Note that in Uyghur, although the negation of the converb *-Ip* is *-mEy* (not
*-mEp), a negative perfect in *-mEptu* has been introduced (UETITL 932 (8)), while
in Chaghatay a form like *barmaydur* functions as the negation to both the focal in-
traterminal (present tense) in *-Edur* and the postterminal (perfect) in *-Ibtur* (Schönig
1997: 211-217, Bodrogligeti 2001: 241).

References

Balakaev, M. B. & N. A. Baskakov & S.K. Kenesbaev (eds.) 1962. *Sovremennyj kazaxskij jazyk. Fonetika i morfologija*. Alma-Ata: Akademija Nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.

Baskakov, Nikolaj A. & Toščakova, T. M. 1947. *Ojrotsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Inostrannyx i Nacional'nyx Slovarej.

Bodrogligeti, András J. E. 2001. *A grammar of Chagatay*. (Languages of the World, Materials 155.) München: LINCOM.

De Jong, Frederick 2007. *A grammar of modern Uyghur*. Utrecht: Houtsma.

Eckmann, János 1959. Das Chwarezmtürkische. In: Deny, Jean et al. (eds.). *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*. 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner, 113-137.

Friederich, Michael 2002. *Uyghurisch Lehrbuch*. In Zusammenarbeit mit Abdurishid Yakup. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Gabain, Annemarie von 1974. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. 3. Auflage. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Imart, Guy 1981. *Le kirghiz (turk d'Asie Centrale Soviétique). Description d'une langue de littérisation récente*. 2 vols. Aix-En-Provence: Université de Provence.

Isxakov, F. G. & A. A. Pal'mbax 1961. *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury.

Johanson, Lars 1995. Mehrdeutigkeit in der türkischen Verbalkomposition. In: Erdal, Marcel & Tezcan, Semih (eds.). *Beläk bitig. Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag*. (Turcologica 23.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 81-101.

Johanson, Lars 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. (EUROTYP 20-6.) Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 27-187.

Kononov, A. N. 1960. *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR.

Rahmati, Nehmat & Buğday, Korkut 1998. *Aserbaidschanisch Lehrbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rentzsch, Julian 2005. *Aspekt im Neuuigurischen*. (Turcologica 65.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schönig, Claus 1997. *Finite Prädikationen und Textstruktur im Babur-name (Haiderabad-Kodex)*. (Turcologica 31.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. Sh. (ed.) 1984. *O'zbek xalq shevalari morfologiyasi*. Toshkent: O'zbekiston SSR "Fan" Nashriyoti.

TatGram: *Tatarskaja grammatika*. 3 vols. Kazan': Akademija Nauk Tatarstana 1995-1997.

UETITL: *Hazirqi zaman uyγur edebiy tiliniŋ imla ve teleppuz luγti*. Ürümči: Šinǰaŋ Xelq Nešriyati 1997.

Yakup, Abdurishid 2005. *The Turfan dialect of Uyghur*. (Turcologica 63.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Yakup, Abdurishid 2006. Review of Julian Rentzsch, *Aspekt im Neuuigurischen*. *Orientalia Suecana* 55, 195-198.