

## Some results of the research system-synchronous modern dialect of the Tatar language

Ferits Yusupovich Yusupov and Irina Sovetovna Karabulatova

Kazan Federal University, Tatarstan str, 2, Kazan, 420021, Russian Federation

**Abstract.** This article analyzes the study of modern dialects of the Tatar language. The authors were carried out dialectological expeditions over the years of various regions of residing Tatars. The authors have drawn parallels with the different groups of Turkic languages. The specific layer is highlighted in the diasystem, which we nominally call as oguzisms. They belong to archaism category and have the anachronistic character. Their presence in all specific systems shows that these forms were frequently used, but later they were superseded by “rival” forms. It seems probable that these forms were derived from old-Kipchak language. Nowadays they are considered as the old-Turkic layer of origins. The authors provide new classification parameters to allocate Tatar dialects.

[Yusupov F.Y., Karabulatova I.S. **Some results of the research system-synchronous modern dialect of the Tatar language** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(7s):246-] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 50

**Keywords:** Turkology, Tatar language, modern dialect, Classificatory features of dialects, verb

### Introduction

Researchers are studying the Turkic languages from different positions. However, the main line of research is based on the ethnography of speaking and contrastive linguistics. The first is directed represented widely in the American studies. The second direction is typical for scientists of the post-Soviet space [1; 2]. U. Schamiloglu draws attention to the problems of comparative linguistics Central Asian languages [3; 4].

The process of semantics development and functional usage of non-finite verb forms of dialects of Tatar language was determined by interaction of all elements of the given system. These features are typical for the study of other languages [5]. With the course of time some of these elements lost their activity and turned into the archaic forms, forming the diasystems' periphery of non-finite verbs. The others, on the contrary, expanded their semantic and functional possibilities, turned into the strong links of the diasystem, penetrated into its core part. The most striking instance of this is the development of the particle forms with **-mysh**, **-dyk**, **-ysh**, which moved into the weak link of the Tatar language diasystem with the course of time; and the particle forms with **-gan**, that penetrated into its core part.

As it is seen from materials of Turkic languages monuments, the other formations, belonging to group of indicative forms in present, gemmated from the non-finite verbs relatively recent and got their further development [5]. Thus, the temporary forms with **-asy**, **-achak**, **-yr**, **-gan**, **-mak**, **-uakar** have appeared and they are conjugated by means of personal affixes [6]. Step-by-step the other non-finite (Infinitive, participles and adverbial participles, action nouns) and finite forms of Tatar verb have stood out from multivalent and multifunctional non-finite stems [7; 8]. In this case the extremely significant example is

the formation of infinitive forms from archaic action nouns (as **uku faydaly / reading is useful**) and participles. The formation of participles became complicated by means of additional morphological features as a result of grammatical designation of target's meaning that contains in the origin. So are the formations with **-makka**, **-maga**, **-maa**, from the forms for **-mak**, **-uga**, **-ot**, **-u**, **-yrga**, **-ot**, **-yr** and so on.

Materials of written monuments of Turkic languages give some possibility to follow up this process [9]. Shifts of the semantic ground and formation of the new grammar forms as a result, that happened in the history of Turkic language development, and Tatar verb in particularly, are clearly observed at the example of formation of participle forms of Tatar language dialects.

As it is known non-finite verb forms, especially ancient participles, possessed the wide spectrum of semantic potential. For example, in many written monuments forms with **-yr**, **-gy**, **-mak** are fixed in a function of participle as well as in a function of action noun, infinitive and deverbative noun. Traces of such polyfunctional usage of non-finite verb forms are observed in many dialects of Tatar language nowadays. The demonstrative example in this case are forms with **-asy**, **-maly**, **-gan** that are used in the function of all finite and non-finite verb forms.

It is known that the semantic fullness of just the same form in different languages and dialects can be different [10; 11; 12]. Nevertheless, the accompaniment of the main meaning with those modality nuances, that formed the core part of the semantics of the origin, stays unchanged. It should be emphasized, that the whole complex of different modal nuances, which reside in ancient participial stems, is present in all stages of development of the given category. It is important to say, that with the course of

time the main nuances were not lost but in some cases even became appreciably stronger. And the complication of concerned forms by means of different grammatical means, which stress and strengthen their modal content, helped to it.

Some of the archaic participle stems work in various modal constructions. The most important from all these modal nuances are meanings of potentiality, ought, obligation. They are additionally complicated by slight nuance of Future. Later many of the similar meanings of the archaic participial stems will be transferred into temporal forms of indicative mood; or the nuances of these meanings will let know in forms of imperative and optative moods and in other moods too (for example, conditional one).

For the period of some centuries non-finite and finite verb forms of Tatar language developed in parallel. For example, monuments of Turkic languages give evidence that Past tense with **-gan** developed simultaneously with an expansion of field usage of forms with **-gan** as a verbal noun. The similar development way passed non-finite and indicative forms with **-yr**, **-asy**, **-achak**, **-uchy**, **-mak** and etc. With the indicative category development on the basis of ancient semantic complex the paradigmatic meanings of temporal forms were slowly forming. And they were complicated by additional nuances of grammatical semantics.

As it is known the emersion of indicative forms on the basis of non-finite stems was possible, first of all, due to their ability to express both attributive and predicative relations. At the first stages of indicative forms development the action subject was expressed only by personal pronoun. The non-affixal usage of some participial stems of Tatar dialects in the function of predicate (e.g., **-uly**, **-uchan**), etc.) and conjugation of some temporal forms without personal affixes prove it. The fact of conjunction of some temporal forms with the help of possessive affixes should be taken into consideration as an intermediate link in a process of finite forms transformation into non-finite ones.

Polysemanticism and multifunctionality were not typical only for ancient participial forms. The diffusive meaning was typical to adverbial participles also, and their initial forms in particular. Besides performing their main functions, adverbial participles with **-a**, **-ä**, **-j** and **-yp** in Tatar language dialects serve as a ground for formation of some indicative forms. In all dialects regularly conjugated Present-Future tense is formed by means of adverbial participle stem. The form of the third-person singular and plural is the classificatory feature of Tatar dialects, according to which dialects systems are contradistinguish to each other.

The situation with stem **-yp** is another. The given form in Tatar language dialects could not become the global base for formation of indicative forms. In the standard language the form with **-yp** is used only as an adverbial participle, but in Tatar language dialects it forms different indicative forms of Present, Past and Future tenses. Past tense that formed by means of adverbial participle stem with **-yp** is known in all dialects. The usage of non-finite verb forms in predicative function served them as a prerequisite for the progressive transition into indicative forms. It is remarkable that indicative forms of Tatar dialect, formed at the adverbial participle base, strongly penetrated into regularly verb conjugation, whereas forms, formed by means of participles, can have synthetical (by means of personal and possessive affixes) as well as analytical (non-affix) conjugations. The performing of attributive functions as well as predicative ones by non-finite dialect forms of Tatar language and the presence of analytical and synthetical types of indicative forms conjugation are explained by incompleteness of the transition of the non-finite Tatar verb forms into the finite form class at the present stage.

Isoglosses of such occurrences occupy the great area, spreading beyond Tatar dialects expansion.

The core part of Tatar language diasystem consists of the following elements:

Participle: **-uchi-** / **(-uzy)**; **-gan**; **-yr**; **-a torgan**; **-yrlyk**; **-yrdai**

Adverbial participle: **-yp**; **-a**, **-ä**, **-i**, **-gach** (relatively all phonetic variants), **-ganchi-** (relatively all phonetic variants), **-mastan**, **-mas**, negative forms of **-myi**, **-muicha** (relatively all phonetic variants).

Infinitive: **-yrğa** (negative **-maska**), **-mak**

Action noun: **-u/-y**, **-ysh**, **-mak**, **-mysh**, **-gy**.

Indicative Mood. Present Tense. Present tense form with **-a**; the usage of this tense without special affixes (**ul kulä/ ul kilya** (He is coming); **kosh ocha** (The bird is flying), past tense with **-dy**, **-gan**, **-yp**, **-a ide**, **-dy ide**, **-a torgan yde**, **-gan ide**, Future with **-yr**.

Imperative Mood. The formation of the first-person of the optative mood by means of affixes **-yi**, **-ai**. They are phonetically changed variants of the old form with **-gai**. These variants have different allocation according to dialects (**ashyim**, **ashyjim**, **ashayim**, **ashain**).

Conditional mood. General usage of forms with **-sa**, **-sya/-sä** (**barsa**, **kilsya/kilsä**, **bulsa**).

Jussive mood. Forms with **-makchi**; **-mak bul**; **-yrğa telim**.

Subjunctive mood. Forms with **-yr ide**; **-a ide**; **-dy ide**

However, these core parts of the diasystem have dissimilar allocation in specific systems and

characterized by different of usage degree. First of all, it refers to different phonetic variants of adverbial forms, participles with **-ar, -a torgan**, infinitive with **-yrga**, Past Tense with **-yp, -dy ide**; Imperative with **-ing, -gyn**, subjunctive with **-dy, - ide** and so on. The structural links of some verb categories are fully in the core part of the diasystem. For example, all forms of action noun are core elements. At the same time one needs to mention that action noun with **-u/-y** is excessively represented in all dialects, but forms with **-ysh, -mysh, -mak, -gy** are not distinguished by Polysemanticism and multifunctionality, and their usage is lexically limited.

Nevertheless, many of them perform their different features in dialect classification. Elements, which unite the diasystem with other Kipchak languages, also present in its periphery. Among them there are adverbial particles with **-gally, -ganny**, participles with **-mak, makzy**, infinitive with **-ugs, -mak, -maga, -maa** and etc.

Classificatory features of dialects

The middle dialect.

2. Participle with **-asy, -achak, -maly(-mally), -yshly(-yshlyk), -uchan**; adverbial participles *with* **-yshlyin, -gally, -ganny, -synga, -dagysynnan, -maisa, -maisy, -myisa, -myisy, -macha, -machyr, myichan, -myisan, -myichik-, -maiynchy, -maiyncha, -maiynsy, -minsa, -manchy, -mancha, -gachyn, -gachynnan, -gachtynnan, -gys**; usage forms with **-asy, -maly, -maga, -maa, -ma, -uga** in the function of the infinitive

3. The presence of Present Tense forms with **-uchan, -uda**;

4. In all subdialects of this dialect the third-person in Present Tense is formed without special affixes (**bara, ala kaita**);

5. The forming of the second-person plural of Present Tense with **-a**, Future Tense with **-yr**, Past Tense with **-gan** by means of complicated affix **-sygyz (barsagaz, alyrsygyz, kyurgyansegez)**;

6. The presence of Future Tense forms with **-asy, -achak**; Past Tense with **-ganda, ganda ide, -uchan ide, -achak ide, -yr ide**;

7. combination of Past Tense with **-dy** with conjunctive words **isya/isä, ky** which express causative-consecutive relations;

8. conjugation of Past tense with **-gan** by means of possessive affixes (II type of conjugation: **bargan-nym, bargan-nyng, bargany-byz, bargany-gyz**) is more typical for subdialects of the middle dialect;

9. the use of contracted variant forms with **-a ide, -adyr ide, -gan ide, -yr ide, -dy ide, -a torgan ide: barayiy, barganyiy, baradyryiy, bara torganyiy**;

10. the first person in Optative Mood is formed by means of affixes **-yi-m, yi-k, -ai-ym, -ai-yk (ashyim, ashaiym)**;

11. variants with **-yi-ym, -yi-yk** have the local limited character;

12. the presence of the construction with **-asy kilya/asy kilä, -asy kalgan, -asy ikyan/ -asy ikän, -asy bulgan** in the meaning of wish;

13. the usage of forms with **-yrga itya/ yrga itä, -maga itya/ maga itä, -maga telim** in the meaning of intention;

14. forms of Subjunctive Mood with **-asy ide, -achak ide, -gan bulyr ide**.

Comparative study of the diasystem of the middle dialect on the usage of non-finite forms, indicative and oblique moods revealed the inhomogeneity of its structure elements. Besides core elements that bring together languages of Kipchak group, there is a deep layer of oghuzisms that appears for the one of the features of the classification. The whole quantity of such elements in the middle dialect (dialect of Kazan Tatars) is more than in other dialects of Tatar language. In distinction from Mishar dialect and dialects of Siberian Tatars where such peculiarities appear for the archaism and doesn't form some valuable isogloss, oghuzisms in the middle dialect are characterized by polysemy, multifunctionality and their active usage. Forms, that are common with oghuz languages, have strongly marked local character. First of all they are spread on the territory of Middle Volga region, Lower Prikam'e area (Republic Tatarstan, neighboring districts of Chuvash, Mari and Udmurt republics, Kirov area). We find interesting parallels with the Chuvash language [13]. It comes under notice the fact that many from these forms "work" in the neighboring Chuvash language.

Semantics and functions of these forms in the middle dialect are wider.

Mishar dialect:

- Participle with **-dachy**;

- forming of negative forms of adverbial participle with **-yp, -a, -y (j)** with the help of affixes with **-map, -myintcha, -mintchy, -minza, -miienzja/ miyinzjä**;

- the use of Participle variants with **-ganchy** with the first narrow vowel affix: **-gincha, -ginza, -ginzy, gynza** and also the presence of full variants that were formed with help of word **chak** ("time"): **-ganchak, -ganchyk, ganzak, -gynzak, -ganzak, -gynchak, -gynchyk, -gynchak**;

- the activity in all subdialects of the Infinitive with **-yrga** as the only form of this category;

- the versatility of the conjugation system, that is the lack of variants' variety of personal affixes: the formation of the 3d Person of Present Tense with

the help of affix **-dyr** (**ul kilyader** «he is going/coming», **bala un'idyr** «the child is playing»...);

- keeping the independence of the auxiliary verb **ide** in complicated forms of Past Tense (**bar aide**, **bargan ide**, **baradyr ide**, **bara torgan ide**);

- the activity only the one form of Future Tense: form with **-yr**;

- the formation of the 1<sup>st</sup> person of the Optative mood with the help of **-yi-m**, **-yi-ym**, **-yi-k**, **-yi-yk** affixes;

- keeping the old form of Optative mood with **-gay** in the construction with **-gay ide**, and also the contracted variant **-gaidy**;

- the use of construction with **-gy kel** - in the meaning of desire;

- the expression of the intention meaning with forms **-yrga at'a**, **-yrga keli**, **-ma keli**.

According to the material of the studied morphological area Mishar dialect is mainly the one whole in its structure on the whole territory of expansion. The differences between subdialects are insignificant and lead to keeping the archaic features which we defined as the Old Turkic layer. Oghuz features in Mishar dialect, comparing with middle dialect, kept few.

Furthermore, there are language occurrences on the neighboring territories the activities of which can be explained only by the influence of the middle dialect. Basically Mishar dialect is Kipchak and in some predominate peculiarities reveals its affinity with Kumik, Karaim, Karachay-Balkar, Crimean Tatar languages.

It must be mentioned the affinity of Mishar dialect with the language of the written monument Codex Cumanicus and Armenian-Poloves documents of XVI-XVII centuries and also its similarity in use of indicative and oblique moods with the Morphology of Tatar literary language.

Dialects of Siberian Tatars are contradistinguished to other dialects of the Tatar language in the structure elements of their diasystem. The distinctive feature of these dialects is the variety of variants of the represented forms. These dialects are characterized by:

1) participles with **-gylyk**, **-gytai**, **--atygan**, **-mak**, **-makzy**;

2) adverbial participle with **-gansyn**, **-gasyn**, **-gazyn**, **gachyn**, **-gazyk**, **-yshta**;

3) the shorten use of adverbial participle with **-yp** (**par-paryp kil**);

4) negative forms of the Participle with **-maiyn**, **-myin**, **-min**;

5) infinitive with **-galy**;

6) the presence of specific forms of Present Tense with **-uchy**, **-aty**;

7) the active use of analytic forms with **-atygan**, **-yap utir**, **- yap iat**, **-a iat**;

8) the formation of the 3d person of Present Tense with affixes

**-ty**, **-t-yi**;

9) the use of complicated personal affixes with **-pyslar**, **syngys**, **synglar** in forms of Present Tense and the contracted affix **-s<-syz**;

10) the use of affixes **-bis**, **byslar**, **ngys**, **-ngkys**, **ngnar**, **-ngar** in the form of Past tense with the 1<sup>st</sup> person with **-dy**;

11) conjugation of the form with **-gan/ -raH** with the shortened participle affix (**barga -m**, **barga -syz**);

12) joining of the personal affixes in the form with **-gan yuk** directly to the stem with **-gan** or to the modal-predicative word **yuk**: **pargan -myn yuk**, **parnan yuk -man** "I have not gone yet" ...;

13) Joining the question part **-myfor** the 2<sup>nd</sup> person directly to the stem with **-gan**: **pargan-mysyn**; **par-gan-my-sys**; "you have also gone";

the use of affix **-ypty** for the 3d person in the conjunction of the form with **-yp**;

the presence of the special form of the Past Tense with **-ypty**, that conjugate with the personal affixes;

the presence of Past Tense with **-aty ite** ите and its contracted conjugation (**alatyity**, **alatyity.. alatym**, **alatyk**);

the use of contracted variants of the Indicative forms: **-gaianty**, **-gaity**, **-ganty**, **gaiy**, **-atyity**, **-atygan ite**, **atyhan it**, **atyhaiynty**, **atygan**;

the presence of Future Tense with **-mak**, **-galak**;

the formation of the negative forms of Future Tense with the help of affix **-masty**;

the use of shortened affix for the 2<sup>nd</sup> person in plural of Future tense with **-yrs**, **-yrsyz**;

the formation of the 1<sup>st</sup> person form of Optative mood with the help of affix **-aiyn** ( **min parayin** " (I will go (I want))");

the use of pleonastic and contracted affixes for the 1<sup>st</sup> person in plural of optative **mood -aiyklar**, **-aiyklar**, **-aiykylaryng**, **aiyagyng**, **-alak**, **-alan**;

the use of the construction with **-gy kilya** in the meaning of desire (wish);

the presence of the forms of Jussive mood with **-mak**, **-galty**; **-mak itya**, **-galy itya**, **-galy otur (uty)**;

the use of conditional mood with **-mak ite**.

The mixture of structural elements is typical for dialects of Siberia Tatars. It is explained by the complicated formation history of dialects themselves. According to the main features dialects of Siberia Tatars are characterized by Kipchak features. They reveal the particular cognation with Tatar language and its dialects and also with other Kipchak languages. The results of synchro-systematical study prove the

conclusion that according its main features Tobol-Irtysh dialect is close to Kipchak-Nogai subgroup, especially to Kazakh, Nogai and Karakalpack languages and also to dialects of Kumik, Karachai-Balkar languages and etc (Present Tense forms of Indicative mood: **alypty, alatygan, (alatyn), alyp utyr, alyp yatyr, - uchy (-uza), uchy (uzy), - ite**; Future Tense forms with **-mak, -makzy**; the presence of the construction with **- gy kil** in the meaning of intention and etc.) Besides, Tobol-Irtysh dialect possesses some range of features that make it closer to the Altai, Khakass, Tuva, Shor, Tofalar languages.

Having Kipchal stem, Baraba dialect reveals the definitive cognation with Siberia- Turkic languages (the presence of indicative forms with **-galak, -galak it;** the presence of Present Tense with **-aty: alatym, alatyh, alatyk;** the shortened usage of Past tense with **- gan: parga-m, parga-n, parga-bys;** the use of affix **- t/-m** for the 3d person: ul parat “ge is going/coming”...; the use of 1<sup>st</sup> person form of Optative mood **alak** and etc).

It is found a specific layer of grammar features in dialects of Siberia Tatars which is common with Uyghur, Uzbek and other languages of Middle Asia area and also with their written monuments: “Motive as Barrens Wild Field and Russian Forests as his antagonist began to dominate in historiography and national consciousness. Folklore sources also reveal similarities in grammar and semantics” [13: 129].

In conclusion it must be paid attention to the diversity of the given forms, their multivariation and also the presence of different affixes of the same person in dialects confirms the participation of different components in the formation process of the studied dialects and ethnic groups. It shows their close interaction with other Turkic languages in the process of their further development. First of all, we attribute Middle and Mishar dialects to such dialects. The strict commonality of indicative forms and conditional mood and consistent conjugation system are typical for the finite form system of Mishar verb. It proves its character of formation.

These facts prove that the modern system of dialects of the Tatar language in the evolutionary development.

#### Corresponding Author:

Dr. Yusupov, Kazan Federal University, Tatarstan str, 2, Kazan, 420021, Russian Federation.

12/05/2014

#### References

1. Yusupov, F.Y., 2013. Morphology of Tatar dialect language. The verb categories.. Elazig: Telif, pp: 605.
2. Schamiloglu, U., 2006. Muslims in Russia, The Growth and Influence of Islam In the Nations of Asia and Central Asia.. Philadelphia: Mason Crest Publishers, pp: 150.
3. Schamiloglu, U., 1992. The Umdet ül-ahbar and the Turkic Narrative Sources for the Golden Hordeand the Later Golden Horde. In Central Asian Monuments, edited by H. B. Paksoy. Istanbul: Isis, pp: 81–93.
4. Grieve, J., D. Speelman and D. Geeraerts, 2013. A multivariate spatial analysis of vowel formants in American English. Journal of Linguistic Geography, 1(1): 31- 51.
5. Yusupov, F.Y., 2004. Morphology Tatar dialect language. Kazan: Fan, pp: 592. Yusupov F. Y. 1986. Studying of Tatar verb. - Kazan: Tat. book. publ. – 287 p.
6. Bisang, W., 2004. Dialectology and typology — an integrative perspective. In B. Kortmann (ed.), Dialectology meets typology: Dialect grammar from a crosslinguistic perspective.. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp: 11–45.
7. Karabulatova, I.S., F.S. Sayfulina and B.Z. Ahmetova, 2013. Ethno-lingual aspect of modern functioning of Russian dialects in North Kazakhstan (on an example of Kostanai region). World Applied Sciences Journal, 27((Education, law, economics, language and communication)). Date Views 01.01.2014 /www.idosi.org/wasj/wasj27(elelc)13/28.pdf.
8. Subtelny, M.E., 2010. Tamerlane and His Descendants: From Paladins to Patrons. The New Cambridge History of Islam., 5(The Eastern Islamic World, Eleventh to Eighteenth Centuries): 169–200.
9. Buchstaller, I. and S. Alvanides, 2013. Employing Geographical Principles for Sampling in State of the Art Dialectological Projects. Journal of Linguistic Geography, 2(1): 96 – 114.
10. Chambers, J.K., 2010. Geolinguistics of literacy.. in Language and space: An international handbook of linguistic variation, De Gruyter Mouton (issue 2), pp: 627–643.
11. Wikle, T., G. Bailey, J. Tillery and L. Sand, 1993. Some patterns of linguistic diffusion. Language Variation and Change, 5(3): 359–390.
12. Vovina, O., 2006. Islam and the Creation of Sacred Space: The Mishar Tatars in Chuvashia. Religion, State & Society, 3(34). Date Views 24.03.2014 www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/rss/34-3\_255.pdf.
13. Karabulatova, I.S., 2005. Introduction to regional ethnolinguistics. Moscow: Prometheus, pp: 148.