About system of cases in Turkic languages: synchronic and diachronic aspects

Marhaba Tursunova[1], Shara Mazhitayeva[1], Zhandos Smagulov[1], Yeldos Tuite[1], Bektursyn Kaliev[1], Zhanar Rustemova[1], Gulbaram Khamzina[2], Zhanar Talaspaeva[2]

[1]Karaganda State University named after academician E.A. Buketov, Kazakhstan
[2]North Kazakhstan State University named after M.Kozybaev, Kazakhstan

Abstract. The article is devoted to the question of a genitive case in modern Turkic languages in comparative-historical aspect. There is in the article analyzed the general prominent features for a genitive case in Turkic languages which is proved by an analyzed language material. The description of features of a genitive case on the basis of researches on kypchak, oguz, bulgar, karluk, and uigur-oguz groups of languages are considered phonetic variants of the terminations of the given case, history of their development, and also some features in separate languages. With the purpose of revealing of the general features, distinctions and features of a genitive case in Turkic languages materials are resulted of monuments of ancient Turk writings, and also are presented data on historical grammar of Turkic languages.

Keywords: Turkic languages, comparative morphology, case terminations in Turkic languages, ancient Turkic language, modern Turkic languages, comparative-historical researches

Introduction

It has been long since comparative research of the systems of various related and unrelated languages held [1].

Various research works that make a comparative analysis of phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical subsystems of different languages of the world are written.

These are works J. Deny [2], E.D. Polivanov [3], T. Givón [4], J.H. Greenberg [5], J.A. Hawkins [6], P. Ramat [7], B.S. Comrie [8], G.Malinson, B.J. Blake [9], K. Graenbech [10], W.L. Chafe [11], N. Chomsky [12], G.J. Ramstedt [13], V. N. Yartseva [14], C.E. Yakhontev [15], K. Beysenbayeva [16], Dzh. Buranov [17], V.D. Arakin [18], J.K. Tjumebeav [19]. etc.

Comparative research of Turkic languages began in the Middle Ages with M. Kashgari's known work "Dictionary of Turkic languages" ("Diuani lugat at-turk") [20].

We can refer works of P.Melioranski, V.Radlov, A.Tsherbak, I.Batmanov, N.Dmitriev, M.Rjasenen, S.Malov, N.Baskakov, kazakh linguists G.Aidarov, A.Kurushzhanov, M.Tomanov, A.Kaidarov etc. to synchronic and diachronic researches of Turkic languages.

Turkic studies as a branch of general linguistics started developing in the second half of the 19th century. Works of the Western European researchers such as B.D.Golderman, to A.Pava de Curtey (France), E. Rossi (Italy), Y.Gammer-Purgshtal (Austria), J. U.Redkhauz (Great Britain), T.Tsenker, W. Bang (Germany), A.Pann, A.Katula (Romania) on osmanistics became a basis for the formation of Turkic studies.

In modern Turkic languages comparative morphology the parts of speech, suffix, the development of terminations's history, its characteristics in modern languages are considered and the importance of the historical-comparative research is actual in considering above mentioned problems.

Case terminations are one of the problems which show the common characteristics of native Turkic languages, define the similarity of these languages. On the process of the comparison of characteristics of case terminations in Turkic languages one can assume the phonetic peculiarities in termination variants,the difference according to the quantity of case terminations, the features of simple and possessive cases.

Materials and methods

*Nominative case***.** There is no special form of nominative case not only in kazakh language but in all Turkic languages. But despite of it, nominative case has its own grammar sense, even not having its own special grammar form, and the word that is in null form has its own syntactic function.

Genitive case. On monuments genitive case means that thing, act are peculiar to definite person. The word that is in genitive case is never used separately.They are always used with possessive terminations. This characteristic is peculiar to general Turkic languages.

There are these kind of phonetic variants of genitive case in language of ancient writings: -yng, -ing, -ung, -nyng, -ning, -nung,-nang, -neng. This type of terminations are often used in many Turkic languages [21].

A.N Kononov assumes that the first form of genitive case was -yng, it was used as possessive termination in ancient time, it was as the ending of conjunctive pronoun and indicative pronoun. And the history of form -nyng he connects with the change features of pronoun. He considers that the last sound of pronoun transferred into affix as the result of morphological displacement [22].

And Ramstedt explains this way: firstly genitive termination as in the form of –n was added to the stem that is ended to consonants it added before vowel to itself. And then –nyng as the result of the last sound's displacement of stem to affix [23].

In modern Turkic languages the first peculiarity in genitive case that attracts attention is that adding begins with the consonants or vowels.

E.V. Sevortiyan in the article called «Category of the case» considers the genitive case terminations as two groups, addings as -yn, -in, -un,-ung used in south-west languages group, addings as -yng, -ing, -ung, ung used in orhon-enisei monuments and Turkic language, addings as -nyng, -ning,-nung,-nuing,-tyng, -ting, -dyng, -ding, -nyn, -nin, -nun, -nuin, -tyn, -tin, -dyn, -din used in other Turkic languages [24]. As in ancient writings in modern Turkic languages the genitive case begins with vowels in many group of languages,and also with the consonants in some group of languages. In writings Orhon-Enicei as an ancient monument the case begins with the vowel, this type of usage in some modern languages is the legal continuation of an ancient language.

The languages in which there is a total type of termination of genitive case and beginning with the consonants, this languages are Kazakh, the Kara-kalpak language, Nogai, Tatars of Kyrym, Tatar, Altai, Bashkurt, Uigurian, Uzbek, Tofa, Khakass, Shor. In these languages termination –nyng is used by several variants according to the syngarmonizm.

In Uzbek language there is a variant of genitive case termination -ning, and it is not characterized by the syngarmonism, but it is added only by one variant.

Though the termination of genitive case begins with consonant sound the sound "ng" comes as "n" in Kyrgyz, Karaiym, Azerbaidjan, Gagauz languages that is not as in other languages.

In Kyrgyz language such terminations as –nyn, nin, - nun, -niyn, -dyn, -din, -dun, -diyn, -tyn, -tin, -tiyn, -tun, in Karaiym language -nyn, nin, - nun,-nyun, in Azerbaidjan, Gagauz languages –nyn, nin, -

nun, these variants are given not as "ng" as in other Turkic languages but it's given as "n". These features in these languages according to the genitive case show Kyrgyz language's difference from Altai language that is included in Kyrgyz-Kypshak language group, and the difference of Karaiym language from other Turkic languages. And we take into account that in Azerbaidjan and Gagauz languages genitive case termination begins with the vowel sound, the word is used as the adding of genitive case which is added when it is finished to vowel sound. We should take into consideration that in these languages there's no "ng" sound as the comparison with Turkic languages in Ogyz group.

The following variant of genitive case termination differs that it begins with the vowel sound, and it is used in Turkic, Gaguas, Azerbaidjan languages in Ogyz group. In these languages there are types of genitive case termination that begins with vowels, also with consonants and it is added to the last sound of the word and changes according to it.

The variants of the genitive case termination in languages of Ogyz group are seen as it begins with the vowel or consonant and also correspondence of "n-ng" sounds and it is given in Turkic Language as -(n) in; in turkman language -yng, -ing, -ung, -ying, -nyng, -ning, -nung, -nying; in Gaguas, Azerbaidjan languages -yn, -in, -un, -yin, -nyn, -nin, -nun, -nyin variants.

In Turkic languages there's no last consonant of genitive case termination, that is to say, beginning with consonant and ending with the vowel variant, it is used in Kumyk, Karashai-Balkar, Salar languages. In these languages the genitive case is given with the termination ny and its variants as ni,-nu, -nyu and it is corresponded to the addings of accusative case: Child-child's, window-window's, house-house's, lake-lake's (Kumyk language), mountain-mountain's, sheep-sheep's, donkey-donkey's (Karashai-Balkar), stone-stone's, brother-brother's, water-water's, arm-arm's (salar).

In Karashai-Balkar language the genitive case termination differs according to the simple case and possessive case. In many Turkic languages dative case, locative case, accusative case after the I, II, III genders possessive termination is added in different way as the comparison with the simple case. And in Karashai-Balkar language this concept takes place in genitive case,and it is added as the adding of the genitive case –y, -i after the I,II gender of possessive termination: *zhashym-zhashymy, zhashyng - zhashyngy* – son-son's; kiyezim-kiyezimi-eyes-eyes', your eyes-your eyes', etc.

In the Chuvash language the genitive case are given with the help of such terminations as –an (-

ăn)/-en (-ĕn), -nan (-năn)/-nen (-nĕn), -iyan (-jăn)/-iyen (-jĕn [25].

Although in the Yakut language there are eight cases, there is no genitive case that is used in other Turkic languages. About this M.Tomanov. Assumes following way: «Among the Turkic languages the Yakut language is the only language in which there is no genitive case. In the Yakut language with the usage of termination -ta gives the meaning of genitive and locative case in our language. This feature of the Yakut language is explained as the impact of Mongol language» [26,86]. And also there are opinions that consider the absence of the genitive case because this case wasn't in the history of Turkic languages. About this fact scientists consider this way: «We dare to assume that the genitive case was absent in an ancient period of Turkic language. It was changed into izaphetic construction. Only the Yakut language among modern Turkic languages kept this ancient form, as there is no formed genitive case in it» [27,76]. This is the fact that concerns to the history of genitive case. We can assume that genitive, accusative terminations may be used in reserved form and give the possessive meaning with suffixes as -niki/-diki/-tiki.

In modern Turkic languages when genitive ending is added to the words as *I* (men*), you(sen),he(ol)* that main form comes to the meaning my,your,his\her (with phonetic changes): man-manim, san-sanin, o-onun (azerbaidjan); min-minem, sin-sineng, ul-anyng (tatar); men (I) - meeng, sen (you) - seeng, ol(he) - oong (tuva), my-mine, you-your, he-his (turkman); men(I) –menym (my), sen (you)-senin (your), etc. In ancient Turkic monuments one can notice the example of *I* and *you* pronouns used as *my-mine*.

Dative case. In ancient Turkic writings dative case expressed the meaning of direction and destination, and used with the terminations as -a, -e, -gha, -ge, -ka, -ke, -ghary, -geri, -gharu, -geru, -karu, -keryi, -ngaru, -ngeryi, -ra, -re, -ru, -ryi, -iya, -iye [28,121].

Some scientists consider this form of the dative case descended from Koran and from affix –ru, and they understand the adding –ru as the dead identity that has been used in the construction of some words. It's true that there are words which emphasize the direction of action taking to its stem the endings –ru, ryi. For instance: bangaru (to me), ebgeryi (to the house) [29,101].

In modern Turkic languages in fact the termination of dative case is used in –gha, -ge, -ka, -ke variants, but in salar, Turkman, Azerbaidjan, Caguas, Hakas, Chuvash languages there is a variant that begins with the vowel sound. In other languages the function of –a, -e endings in dative case are added

after I,II gender of possessive ttermination, and this fact doesn't concern to the possessive case in mentioned languages. Also, endings as –iya, iye which are used in construction of some words in ancient monuments one can see in languages of Ogyz group: masaiya (to the table), ghapyiya (to the door), Moskvaiya (to the Moscow) and others.

One of the features of dative case termination in modern Turkic languages that there are simple case and possessive case. As in kazakh and other turkic languages there is no difference in Uzbek, Uigur languages between simple case and possessive case in endings of dative, accusative, locative cases, that is to say case terminations are added after possessive termination without any changes. Examples: Kuninga on som tomady. – He earns 10 som for a day. Tugan atasyna bardy - He went to his own grandpa.

There is no doubt that there were own features of simple case and possessive case in Turkic languages of ancient period. The dative case in ancient monuments there were words as "oglyma(to my son), turkime, kyzyma (to my daughter), apama (to my sister)", in these words endings -a,-e are added to possessive termination, but in example "budunumka, elimke, oglumka" endings in dative case -ka,-ke are added though it is possessive word.

One of the main features of adding dative case ending in Turkic languages is the form of pronouns in dative case.

In declension of pronoun words, especially in declension of conjunctive, indicative pronouns there are some changes in regularity of case system. These differences are definitely connected with the presence of ancient forms and ancient grammar constructions in the usage of pronouns.

The form of conjunctive pronouns in dative case attracts attention in language of ancient writings and also in modern Turkic languages. In modern Kazakh language the usage of "to me", "to you" in ancient heritages were used as banga, manga, sanga, maa, mana, maga, manga, saha, sanga, saa [27]. The usage in modern Turkic language is divided into four group:

The usage in the form of *Manga,sanga*: in azerbaijan – maena, saena; in Chuvash –mana,sana; in Turkman, Uigur – manga, sanga; in Tatar – minga, singa; in tuva – mengge; the usage in the form of *maga, saga*: in Nogai, kumyk, Kyrgyz, shor – maga, saga; hakas – magha, sagha; Altai – mege, sege; the usage in the form of *'to me'(magan), 'to you'(sagan)*: in Kazakh, karakalpak – 'to me', 'sagan'; the usage in the form of *Menga, senga*: in Uzbek – menga, senga. Making a group of these one can notice that the words 'me' and 'you' keep their stem in some languages, but in some languages they change into '*ma*' and '*sa*'. It's clear that this fact is connected

with the conjunctive pronouns' history. The reason is that through the written heritages, through works of scientists, '*me*', '*you*' words were in the form of 'ma', 'sa'.

The feature of *maga,saga,mege,sege* of conjunctive pronouns as *me, you* in the dative case is the definite picture of dative case which is added to *ma, me, sa, se* stems. This fact is clearly seen in Uzbek language. In above mentioned language without any changes the ending of dative case -*ga* added to pronouns *me, you*: menga*, senga.*

The usage in Kazakh, karakalpak languages attracts attention with its characteristics and the opinions of scientists are different about it. About this fact Ibatov. A in his work "From the history of pronouns in Kazakh language '' assumes that ancient Turkic ending -*garu* became -*gar*, later changed into -*gan* or there were changes in places of sounds 'n', 'g' through metathesis [30,69].

If we express our own opinion, dative case –*ga is* added to the stem *ma,sa*, and sound –n stayed in its place according to our speech. Even if it is used as «maga» the sound –n is heard. The same phenomenon takes its place in possessive case. In locative case in simple declension the endings -da, -de, in possessive case -nda, -nde. It seems sound –n is moderator sound, because, -n sound is heard in examples 'balasyda, akeside' (son, father). In words *magan (to me)*, sagan (to you) the sound –*n* is moderator sound and that's why we connect it with possessive case of accusative case.

Accusative case. In ancient Turkic monuments the endings of accusative case -gh, -g, -ygh, -ig, -ugh, -yig, -n, -yn, -in, -un, -yin, –ny, -ni, -nu, -nyi used.

All endings of accusative case used in Turkic languages are grouped into -ny/ni variants. As the comparison with other languages the ending of accusative case is seen in a special way in Chuvash language. In this language this ending is used in the form of -a, -na, that is to say, it is pronounced with open vowels. Forms -ygh, -ugh, -ig, -yig are not used in modern Turkic languages. But in Mongol language it is often used as the variant of accusative case.

In modern Turkic languages -ny, -ni,-dy, -di, -ty, -ti variants of accusative case are the main variants of Turkic languages, and -a, -na, that is to say,with open vowel in Chuvash language, because in modern Turkic language the ending in accusative case doesn't begin with such vowel. And in Gaguaz, Turkic languages, and in some Azerbaijan dialects the accusative case consists of vowel sound -y,-u, but it is added as -iy, -yi,-iu to the bases which ended to vowel sounds.

Locative case. The terminations of locative case in ancient writings are: -da, -de, -ta, -te, -nda, -nde, -nta, -nte,words in locative case are used in the sense of location and season: oguzda, balykda, kaganda, kongilte, ierinte, iyashymda, sungushte, iolta (on the road), balasynda, etc. [29,124].

Terminations of locative case -da, -de, -ta, -te, dae, -diya are peculiar to many modern Turkic languages. In Chuvash language locative case is given with terminations -ra, -che, one can compare termination -ra with these endings of ancient Turkic writings. Locative case which is used in adverbs in Kazakh language- common Turkic phenomenon.

Initial case. In ancient written monuments termination of inital case is rarely used, other case terminations do its function. There is opinion that the form of inital case has appeared lately. In monuments inital case means the place of action and is given with endings -tan, -ten, -dan, -den, -dyn, -din, -tyn, -tin: oguzdantan, onden, beriden, iyrdan, kuntin, attyn.

In modern Turkic languages inital case terminations are divided approximately into three types. The first is the ending -dan that is given with open vowel and its variants. It is in all languages except Uygur languages. The second is in Uygur language –din that is used with short vowel.

In all Turkic languages inital ending used in –n sound, and in Altai it's ended to -ng sound, -dang, -deng, and in Hakas, shor languages -dang, deng, -nang, -neng. This is the third form.

Instrumental case. Instrumental case in Orhon-Enisei wtitings is given with endings –yn, -in, -un, -yin: kolyikin, kulkakyn.

In ancient written monuments auxiliary verb is used which expresses the meaning, does function of instrumental case: inim Kultegin birle sozleshdimiz – Inim Kulteginmen soilestim (I talked to my brother Kultegin) [29,128].

Instrumental case is used in Kazakh language with its special grammar form, with its own features, in Karaiym language this case answers the questions *with whom?*, *with what?* With the help of endings -ba, -be. In other Turkic languages auxiliary *bile (bilen)* does the function of this case. Case termination which is close to meaning of instrumental case is -nang, -neng in Hakas: *argyzynang* - with a friend, tofas (-sha, -she: *bo oruksha* - with this way, *ang* izinshe - with trace of animal), Chuvash (-pa, -pe: *samahpa* - with word).

In Yakut language one can say similar to this case instrumental one (-ynan, inen, -unon, -yinon: *byahnynan* - with a knife) and (-lyyn, -tyyn, -dyyn: ogotunuun -with child).

Conclusion

Making a conclusion, case terminations in modern Turkic languages are kept from ancient Turkic period, not having changed much. There are

terminations that are not used any more. In language of ancient monuments some cases did the function of other ones, were not used systematically, but it didn't lose its trace at once. The conjugation form between pronoun conjugation and possessive conjugation in an ancient period of Turkic history hasn't kept that feature in modern languages.

Corresponding Author:
Dr.Tursunova Marhaba
Karaganda State University named after academician E.A. Buketov,
Mukanov street, 14-84, Karaganda, 100026, Kazakhstan
e-mail: S_mazhit@mail.ru

References
1. Humboldt Wilgelm von. Ueber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwickelung des Menschengeschlechts, Volume 2 (German Edition): www.classes.ru/grammar/171.Gumboldt/source/worddocuments/2.htm. ISBN: 978-5-8764-3656-6.
2. Deny, J., 1921. Grammaire de la langue turque. Paris.
3. Polivanov, E.D., 1934. Russian language grammar in comparison to the Uzbek language. Tashkent.
4. Givón, T., 1990. Syntax: A functional-typological introduction: Vol.2. A.; Ph.
5. Greenberg, J.H., 1974. Language typology: A historical and analytic overview. – The Hague; P.
6. Hawkins, J.A., 1985. A comparative typology of English and German: Unifying the contrasts. – Austin (Texas).
7. Ramat, P., 1985. Typologie linguistique. Paris.
8. Comrie, B.S., 1981. Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology. Chicago.
9. Malinson, G. and B.J. Blake, 1981. Language typology: Cross-linguistic studies in syntax. A.
10. Graenbech, K., 1936. Der tuerkische Sprachbau. Kopengagen.
11. Chafe, W.L., 1971. Meaning and Structure of Language. Chicago University.
12. Chomsky, N., 1970. Deep Structure, Surface Structure and Semantic Interpretation: Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics. Tokyo.
13. Ramstedt, G.J., 1904. Ueber die mongolische Pronomen// Journal de la Societe Finno-ougrienne. Helsinki, Bd.23. Heft 3.
14. Yartseva, V. N., 1963. Principles of typological research of related and unrelated languages. Moscow.
15. Yakhontev, C.E., 1965. About morphological classification of languages. Moscow-Leningrad.
16. Beysenbayeva, K., 1988. Comparative grammar of the Russian and Kazakh languages. Alma-Ata.
17. Buranov, Dzh., 1983. Comparative typology of English and Turkic languages. Moscow.
18. Arakin, V.D., 1979. Comparative typology of English and Russian languages. Leningrad.
19. Tuymebayev, Zh., 2008. History of the Turkic-Kazakh-Mongolian ethnolanguage relationship. Astana. 366 p.
20. Kashgari, M. Dictionary of Turkic languages ("Divan-lugat at turk"). Date Views 20.03.2014 www.peoples.ru/science/philosophy/kashgary/
21. Tomanov, M., 1988. Historical grammar of Kazakh language. Almaty. 264.
22. Kononov, A.N., 1956. Grammar of modern Turkish language. M.-L. 917 p.
23. Ramstedt, A., 1957. Introduction to Altai linguistics. Moskow, 152 p.
24. Researches in comparative grammar of Turkic languages, 1956. Part II. Morphology. Moscow: AN SSSR, 334 p.
25. World languages: Turkic languages, 1996. Moskow. 543 p.
26. Tomanov, M., 1992. Comparative grammar of Turkic languages. Almaty: Kazakh University, 190 p.
27. Serebrennikov, B.A. and Z. Gadjievan, 1986. Comparative-historic grammar of Turkic languages. Moscow: Science, 302 p.
28. Aidarov, G., A. Kuryshjanov and M. Tomanov, 1971. The language of ancient Turkic written monuments. Almaty, 272 p.
29. Esenkulov, A., 1976. Endings in ancient Turkic languages. Almaty, 239.
30. Ibatov, A., 1966. From the history of pronouns in Kazakh language. Almaty. 77 p.

5/1/2014