

Personal Enclitics in Modern Uyghur*

Tooru Hayasi
(ILCAA, Tokyo)

Modern Uyghur, like other Turkic languages, has person markers which correspond to the person and number in sentences. They are personal suffixes and enclitics, which occupy the final position of predicates. Suffixes are used when predicates are verbs in the definite past tense and otherwise enclitics are used. Both suffixes and enclitics have first and second person forms, and the lack of suffixes or enclitics generally indicates third person.

As is clear from the account above, personal suffixes of Modern Uyghur are of a common type among Turkic languages. They are always obligatory unless sentences have third person subjects.

The personal enclitics of Modern Uyghur, on the contrary, are not obligatory elements of predicates and sometimes omitted even if sentences have first or second person subjects. In the present paper, I would like to examine how sentences are personally marked in Modern Uyghur, especially concentrating on the usage of personal enclitics.

Three types of person marking

In Table 1 the personal enclitics of Modern Uyghur are shown together with the corresponding personal pronouns.

* An earlier version of this paper was read at the 105th semiannual congress of the Linguistic Society of Japan. I am indebted to three native speakers of Modern Uyghur, Sabit Rozi (born in Ёulja), Tahir Jan (born in Qäšqär) and Märyä Saqim (born in Ürümçi) for the data used here. Their suggestive comments on intuition were quite helpful. I am also grateful to Academy of Social Sciences of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region for providing opportunity to study the Modern Uyghur language in Xinjiang. My thanks are also due to Ruth Besha for the advice and criticism during the preparation for this paper.

	<i>sg.</i>		<i>pl.</i>	
1.	män	-män	biz	-miz
2.	sän	-sän	silär	-silär
	siz	-siz	sizlär	-sizlär
	(sili/özliri-sili/-la/-lä)			

Table 1: Personal pronouns and enclitics¹

Actually the forms of the personal enclitics and pronouns are the same except the first person plural and the second person honorific (or deferential) forms. So, it is true that what we call personal enclitics could be also regarded as the bound allomorphs of personal pronouns. What is relevant here, however, is that Modern Uyghur has two kinds of device for person marking, one outside and the other within predicates. The terminological distinction between personal enclitics and pronouns is, accordingly, practical rather than categorical.

When two devices have the same function, it should be examined whether they are concurrent or exclusive, and, if they are concurrent, which device has priority over the other. Concerning personal pronouns and enclitics of Modern Uyghur, we find three different types of sentences:

- Type A only a personal pronoun occurs,
- Type B a personal pronoun and enclitic cooccur and neither has priority, i.e. either of them can be omitted,
- Type C a personal pronoun and enclitic cooccur but an enclitic is obligatory.

Examples of each type are as follows²

¹ *Siz* and *sizlär* are forms for polite expression, and *sili* and *özliri*, for honorific or deferential expression. The pronouns *sili*, *özliri* and the corresponding enclitics are excluded from the present analysis because of their irregularities. All the pronouns and enclitics except *sili/özliri* and *-sili/-la/-lä* show the same result, so only examples of first person singular are generally cited.

² Examples are cited according to the transliteration of Hahn (1991), except the *soft g*, for

Type A sentences:

- (1) a. Män mana.
 b. Mana män.
 c. *Män mana-män.
 1SG just here-1SG
 'I am here'

Type B sentences:

- (2) a. Män oquvuči.
 b. Oquvuči-män.
 c. Män oquvuči-män.
 1SG student-1SG
 'I am a student'

- (3) a. Män hāzir öy-dä.
 b. Hāzir öy-di-män.³
 c. Män hāzir öy-di-män.
 1SG now house-LOC-1SG
 'I am at home now'

which **ɨ** is used here instead for mere typographical reason. An asterisk indicates unacceptable examples. Only morphemes relevant to discussion are hyphenated. The abbreviations used in the glosses of examples are as follows:

	1st person
	ACCusative
	DATive
	INTentional
	LOCative
perfect	PARTiciple
	PRESent
present	PROGressive
	SinGular
past	SUPPPositive

3 A low unrounded vowel changes into a high vowel in open syllables neither initial nor final.

- (4) a. Män bu bayliq-qa igä.
 b. Bu bayliq-qa igi-män.
 c. Män bu bayliq-qa igi-män.
 1SG this wealth-DAT owning-1SG
 'I own this wealth'
- (5) a. Män kündüzi öy-dä yoq.
 b. Kündüzi öy-dä yoq-män.
 c. Män kündüzi öy-dä yoq-män.
 1SG daytime house-LOC absent-1SG
 'I am not at home during the daytime'
- (6) a. Män aldiraş.
 b. Aldiraş-män.
 c. Män aldiraş-män.
 1SG busy-1SG
 'I am busy'

Type C sentences:

- (7) a. *Män Beyjiñ-gä bar-i(du).
 b. Beyjiñ-gä bar-i-män.
 c. Män Beyjiñ-gä bar-i-män.
 1SG Pekin-DAT go-PRES-1SG
 'I go to Pekin'
- (8) a. *Män Beyjiñ-gä ket-ivati(du).
 b. Beyjiñ-gä ket-ivati-män.
 c. Män Beyjiñ-gä ket-ivati-män.
 1SG Pekin-DAT go-PROG-1SG
 'I am on my way to Pekin'

Examples of Type A are restricted to sentences with *mana* 'just here', *änä* 'just over there' or *qeni* 'where' as a predicate. As is shown in (1), the marker of person either precedes or follows the predicate but does not occur in both positions. In fact, the person marker in Type A sentences is a personal pronoun, no matter where it is placed, because we find no specific form for

personal enclitics, such as the first person plural form:

- (1) d. Mana biz.
e. * Mana-miz.

The person and number of subjects of Type A sentences are, therefore, indicated exclusively by personal pronouns. It is conceivable that such exclusive marking with pronouns could be related to the demonstrative-locative predicates, though further investigation is necessary to make this relationship clear.

Not only personal pronouns but personal enclitics are found in the examples of Type B and Type C. What distinguishes Type C from Type B, as mentioned above, is the priority of personal enclitics over personal pronouns. In Type B sentences, personal pronouns and personal enclitics are almost equivalent. Some sentences have personal pronouns (2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, 6a), some have personal enclitics (2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b), and some have both (2c, 3c, 4c, 5c, 6c). In contrast to Type B sentences, Type C sentences always include personal enclitics whether they have personal pronouns or not. Sentences marked only with personal pronouns are unacceptable (7a, 8a).

What then characterizes the distinction between Type B and Type C? Apparently, the examples of Type B cited above consist of sentences with non-verbal predicates, while those of Type C consist of sentences with verbal predicates. It can be therefore assumed that personal enclitics are obligatory for verbal predicates, and that they are optional for non-verbal predicates. This assumption, however, is not carried out:

- (9) a. * Män kesäl-ikän.
b. Kesäl-ikän-män.
c. Män kesäl-ikän-män.
1SG sick -it-seems-1SG
'I suppose I am sick'

The sentences in (9) have non-verbal predicates,⁴ though they show the

4 Although *-ikän* is originally the participial form of an archaic verb *er-* 'to be', in the

characteristic of Type C, which would characterize verbal predicates according to the assumption above. Thus, whether a predicate is verbal or non-verbal does not influence the different usage of personal enclitics in predicates.

Then, it can be assumed that the type of marking correlates to elements constituting predicates, especially the last elements. At first glance, it appears that, among sentences with predicates which have the same element at the end, the type of person marking does not differ. For example, without exception, sentences containing predicates ending with *-ikän* show Type C marking, and those with *V-maqçi*, Type B marking. This is also the case with predicates consisting of the perfect participle form (*V-kan*) or the past suppositive form (*V-iptu*) of verbs. The former shows Type B marking and the latter, Type C marking:

- (10)a. Män Beyjiŋ-gä bar-maqçi.
 b. Beyjiŋ-gä bar-maqçi-män.
 c. Män Beyjiŋ-gä bar-maqçi-män.
 1SG Pekin-DAT go-INT-1SG
 'I am planning to go to Pekin'
- (11)a. Män xatā qil-kan.
 b. Xatā qil-kan-män.
 c. Män xatā qil-kan-män.
 1SG mistake do-PART-1SG
 'I made (have made) mistake'
- (12)a.* Män mäsçilik-tä seniŋki-gä ber-iptu.
 b. Mäsçilik-tä seniŋki-gä ber-ipti-män.
 c. Män mäsçilik-tä seniŋki-gä ber-ipti-män.
 1SG drunkenness-LOC yours-DAT go-SUPP-1SG
 'I am supposed to have gone to your house while drunk'

framework of the Modern Uyghur grammar, it should be regarded as a kind of auxiliary particle, which can be attached to both verbal and non-verbal predicates.

However, this generalization would not hold true for predicates ending with *-däk* 'like', which functions as an auxiliary particle as well as a postposition:

- (13)a. Män xatā qil-ɣan-däk.
 b. Xatā qil-ɣan-däk-män.
 c. Män xatā qil-ɣan-däk-män.
 1SG mistake do-PART-like-1SG
 'I think I have made mistake'
- (14)a.* Män mäščilik-tä seniŋki-gä ber-ipti-däk.
 b. Mäščilik-tä seniŋki-gä ber-ipti-däk-män.
 c. Män mäščilik-tä seniŋki-gä ber-ipti-däk-män.
 1SG drunkenness-LOC yours-DAT go-SUPP-like-1SG
 'I am supposed to have gone to your house while drunk (but I can remember nothing).'
- (15)a. * Sän Yapon-ɣa bar-maqçi-däk.
 b. Yapon-ɣa bar-maqçi-däk-sän.
 c. Sän Yapon-ɣa bar-maqçi-däk-sän.
 2SG Japan-DAT go-INT-like-2SG
 'You seem to be planning to go to Japan'

In examples (13), (14) and (15), predicates end with *-däk* in the same way, although the marking type is different; (13) is Type B, while (14) and (15) are Type C. The observation above clearly shows that the type of person marking, i.e. whether personal enclitics are obligatory or not, cannot be understood from the formal structure of predicates.

Complements of the verb *bol-*

A Modern Uyghur verb *bol-*, which means 'to become', takes various elements as its complements. In some cases it even seems to function as a copula, meaning 'to be'. However, it should be called copula with some reservations because it is not an obligatory element of a predicate, as it cannot occur after some types of predicates. For example, the predicates of (13), (14) and (15) show different results:

- (16) *xatā* *qil-ʁan-däk* *bol-*
 mistake do-PART-like become
- (17) * *mäsçilik-tä* *seniŋki-gä* *ber-ipti-däk* *bol-*
 drunkenness-LOC yours-DAT go-SUPP-like become
- (18) **Yapon-ʁa* *bar-maqçi-däk* *bol-*
 Japan-DAT go-INT-like become

This result suggests the correlation between different marking types of predicates and the possible complements of the verb *bol-*. The predicate of (13), *xatā qil-ʁan-däk*, showing Type B marking, can be the complement of *bol-* as is seen in (16), whereas the predicates of (14) and (15), *ber-ipti-däk* and *bar-maq-çi-däk* (17,18), showing Type C marking, can not be the complement of the pseudo-copula. This also holds true for all kinds of predicate so far examined.

	predicate	marking type	complement of <i>bol</i> ⁵
(2)	N	B	+
(3)	N-CASE	B	+
(4)	<i>igä</i>	B	+
(5)	<i>bar / yoq</i>	B	+
(6)	A	B	+
(7)	V-i	C	
(8)	V-ivati	C	
(9)	-ikän / (-imiš)	C	
(10)	V-maqçi	B	+
(11)	V-ʁan	B	+
(12)	V-iptu ⁶	C	
(13)	V-ʁan-däk	B	+
(14)	V-ipti-däk	C	
(15)	V-maqçi-däk	.C	

Table 2: Marking types and possible complements of *bol-*

⁵ The sign '+' means that the predicate type concerned can occur as the complement of *bol-*.

⁶ In this paper, I have dealt with *-iptu* as one morpheme, though it becomes *-ip* when used

In Table 2, it can be seen that which type of person marking a predicate shows depends on whether or not it can be used as the complement of the verb *bol-*. The correlation seems to be significant enough to rule out the possibility of mere coincidence.

Conclusion

In this paper, it has been shown that in Modern Uyghur three different types of person marking are found; marking with pronouns, optional and obligatory markings with enclitics. Predicates marked exclusively with pronouns form quite a limited class, while all the other predicates, except those consisting of the definite past tense verbs, are marked with personal enclitics either optionally or obligatorily. As far as the examples dealt with here are concerned, it could be concluded that whether or not a predicate needs a personal enclitic as an obligatory element is related to whether or not it can be the complement of the verb *bol-*; i.e. personal enclitics are not obligatory in the predicates which can be the complement of *bol-* 'to become' and vice versa.

As is mentioned above, the verb *bol-* also functions as a copula. Then, it could be presumed that predicates that can appear in the position of the complement of *bol-* are secondary predicates which have originally required the copula in order to be predicates, whereas predicates that cannot be the complement of *bol-* are primary ones which become predicates by themselves, i.e. without the support of the copula. If this is the case, we can paraphrase our conclusion in this way: personal enclitics are obligatory for primary predicates, and optional for secondary ones.

Compared with Modern Uyghur, Modern Turkish has personal enclitics which are almost always obligatory when used in sentences with subjects in first or second person. Such difference in the behavior of enclitics appears to

with the second person enclitics; e.g., *ber-ip-sän*, *ber-ip-siz* and *ber-ip-silär*. In case *-ip* is considered the essential form of the suppositive morpheme, it might be a counter example for the account shown here, because verbs with this suffix can be the complement of *bol-*, as follows (the vowel of *-ip* drops when preceded by vowel-final stems):

Bu kitap-ni oqu-p bol-di. 'He/she has read this book'

However, it is also problematic whether or not the post-predicate *-ip* should be identified with the converb suffix *-ip*, found in the sentence above.

correlate with the degree to which the grammaticalization of personal pronouns into enclitics has taken place. It is apparent that personal enclitics of Modern Turkish have become rather distinct from personal pronouns in terms of forms, but personal enclitics and pronouns of Modern Uyghur are almost isomorphic. However, the problem is so intricate that such superficial observation could provide nothing but some clues. Further investigation into the structure of predicates of Turkic languages, from both synchronic and diachronic aspects, would be necessary to resolve this problem.

REFERENCES

- Hahn, Reinhard F. 1991. *Spoken Uyghur*. Seattle & London: University of Washington Press.
- Кайдаров, А. Т. 1969. *Развитие Современного Уйгурского Литературного Языка 1*. Алма-Ата: Наука.
- Наджип, Э.Н. 1968. *Уйгурско-русский словарь*. Москва: Советская Энциклопедия.
- Šinjaŋ Uyƣur Aptonom Rayonluq Millätlär Til-Yeziq Xizmiti Komiteti. 1985. *Häzirqi Zaman Uyƣur Ädäbiy Tiliniŋ Imlä Lubiti*. Ürümçi: Šinjaŋ Xälq Näsriyati.
- Tömür, Xämit. 1987. *Häzirqi Zaman Uyƣur Tili Grammatikisi (Morfolo-giyä)*. Beyjiŋ: Millätlär Näsriyati.
- 新疆大学中国語文系 (編) 1982「維漢詞典」烏魯木齊: 新疆人民出版社
- 易坤秀, 高士傑 1989「基礎維吾爾語」北京: 中央民族学院出版社