

On The Old Turkic Verbal Noun Suffix {-dOk}

Talat Tekin
(Ankara)

As is generally known, the Old Turkic suffix {-dOk} forms verbal nouns expressing past actions: *üzä kök täñri asra yağız yer qılın-toq-da* “When the blue sky above and the brown earth below were created...” (Kül Tigin E 1), *bil-tök-üm-ün ö-dök-üm-ün bunça bitig bitidim* “With what I know and remember, I have written all this inscription” (Külü Chor S 3); *bilmä-dök-üg-in için* “on account of your not knowing” *qazyan-toq-in için* “since he won”, *täñri yarlıqa-doq-in için... qayan olortum* “By the grace of heaven... I succeeded to the throne” (Kül Tigin S 9), [*qañım*] *qayan uç-doq-da* “When my father, the kaghan, passed away...” (Bilge Kaghan E 13-14) *olor-toq-um-a...* “When I succeeded to the throne” (Bilge Kaghan E 2), etc.

The verbal nouns in {-dOk} are also used predicatively in Orkhon Turkic. But the examples are mostly negative predicates in {-mAdOk} and the reason for this is the fact that the negative of the past tense in {-mİş} is formed, as a rule, with the suffix {-dOk} added to negative stems in Old Turkic, a verbal predicate like {-mAmİş} being absent: *itinü yaratunu u-madoq, yana içikmiş* “(The Turkic people) apparently did not organize themselves (well), and they again were submitted (to the Chinese)” (Kül Tigin E 10, Bilge Kaghan E 9), *anta kisrä inisi açisin täg qılın-madoq ärinç, oyli qañın täg qılın-madoq ärinç* “Then the younger brothers were apparently not created like their elder brothers, and the sons were apparently not created like their fathers.” (Kül Tigin E 5), *qañ yorıp elteriş qayanqa adrı-l-madoq yañıl-madoq* “(My) father (always) marched (behind) Elterish Kaghan and he did not separated from him (or) did not betray him” (Ongin R 3), [*bükäg*] *jükdä säkiz oğuz toquz tatar qal-madoq* “There were neither the Sekiz Oghuz nor Tokuz Tatar left in [Bükeg]ük” (Shine-Usu E 1), *qarluq işinä käl-mädök* “The Karluks apparently did not come to their allies” (Shine-Usu

S 1), *tāñri una-madoq* “Heaven was apparently not pleased with it” (IB 38), *ulug āb örtänmiş; qatıña tāgi qal-madoq, bükiñä tāgi qod-m<ad>oq, tir* “(The omen) says: A big house was burnt; nothing remained right to its floors (and) nothing was left to its corners” (IB 9), etc.

The only affirmative example I was able to find in the inscriptions is the following sentence: *ābkä tāg-dök+üm* “I arrived in the camp” (Ongin R 2).

Şinasi Tekin believes that the verbal nouns in the examples given above are not the predicates of the main clauses, but they are the predicates of the dependent (subordinate) clauses. He argues as follows: “Bilindiği gibi ET’den itibaren *-duq* eki, isim, sıfat ve yardımcı cümle yüklemi olarak yaygın bir şekilde kullanılmıştır. Fakat bunların dışında ve bunlarla birlikte yan yana oldukça eski metinlerde bir de ‘tarz ve zaman yardımcı cümlesi’ teşkilinde kullanıldığını görüyoruz. Bu kullanım tarzı, şimdiye kadar hemen hiç dikkati çekmemiş ve hep ana cümlenin yüklemi olarak telakki edilmiştir (bk. mesela AGr. 224, 3); buna sebep de, herhalde bu fonksiyonun daha ET devrinde bir iki müphem örnek dışında tamamiyle ortadan kalkmış olmasıdır.” (1987: 156).

To prove his view Ş. Tekin gives some of the examples I mentioned above. But most of his translations are incorrect. For example Ş. Tekin translates the passage *qañ yorıp el-teris qayanqa adrılmadoq, yañılmadoq tāñri bilgä qayanta adrılmalı, azmalı tiyin ança ötlädim* into Turkish as follows “*nasıl* baba(mız) hareket edip El-Teris Kağan’dan *ayrılmamış ve ona ihanet etmemiş ise* biz de Tanrı Bilge Kağan’dan ayrılmayalım, inhiraf etmiyelim diye böyle tavsiye ettim” (ibid.). This translation cannot be correct; because there is no *ärsär* “ise” at the end of the first sentence ending in *adırlmadoq yañılmadoq* and the phrase *biz yämä* “biz de” is absent at the beginning of the second sentence. The fact of the matter is that the negative of the past tense in {-mİş} was formed with the suffix {-mAdOk} in Old Turkic, as I have already mentioned above. Consequently *qañ yorıp elteris qayanqa adrıma-dog yañılma-dog* is an independent clause. The same is true for the other examples ending in {-mAdOk}, i.e. they all are finite forms. So is the predicate of the main clause in the following passage taken from Manichäische Erzähler: *qanğı xan ögi qatun äşidip ekün kälip oylınga näçä ayt-sar nng kiginç birmädük... ol ödün şntudn xan atıyları-nga qatı-qı-yan ay-mış*. Ş. Tekin translates this sentence into Turkish as follows: “Hükümdar babası, kiralıçe anası bunu duyunca her ikisi de gelmişler. Oğullarına ne söyledilerse, o (bunlara) hiç cevap *vermeyince*; o zaman

hükümdar Şantudan... asilzadelerine kesin olarak demiş ki..." (ibid.). This translation is incorrect. It is obvious that there are two sentences in this passage. The first sentence ends in *birmädök* and with the phrase *ol ödün* a new one begins. It seems that the grammatical explanations and examples for the use of verbal nouns in {-dOk} as finite forms in MK (DLT II 60-62) have somehow escaped from the attention of Ş. Tekin (see below).

As is generally known, MK gives many examples for the predicative function of the verbal nouns in {-dOk} in the dialects of the Suvars, Kipchaks and Oghuz. Here are some of them: *[ol] ya: qurdoq* "He strung the bow", *män ya: qurdoq* "I strung the bow", *biz ya: qurdoq* "We strung the bows", *olar ta:γqa aydoq* "They climbed the mountain", *biz aydoq* "We climbed", *olar äwkä kirdök* "They entered the house", *ol anı urdoq* "He beat him", *män munda turdoq* "I stood up here", *män anar tawar birdök* "I gave him livestock", *män yarmaq tirdök* "I collected money" (DLT II 60-62), *qadaş timiş qaymadoq, qadın timiş qaymış* (DLT I 403, III 245) "If you said 'kinsman', he showed no respect to him; if you said 'relative by marriage', he showed respect to him" (EDPT 674), etc.

As is seen, the verbal predicate in {-dOk} does not take the possessive suffixes in the Middle Turkic dialects mentioned by Kashgari. But in MK, I was able to find at least one example in which the predicate in {-dOk} has taken the 3rd person possessive suffix: *Yälkin bolup bardoqı könlüm anar baylayu* "(My beloved) went as a traveller and I tied my heart to his love" (DLT III 309). It is very clear that *yälkin bolup bardoqı* is an independent clause here, *bardoqı* being its predicate. It seems that the verbal predicate in {-dOk} may also take the possessive suffix in Karakhanid Turkic if the subject is the third person.

Here it should be recalled that two similar Danube Bulgarian finite forms with the 3rd person possessive suffix also occur in the Buyla Jopan inscription in Greek letters: *buyla zoapan tesi dügetögi, butaul zoapan tagrogi. içigi täsi*. It is not an easy task to translate this short inscription on the drinking cup (*içigi täsi*). But the finite verb forms *dügetögi* and *tagrogi* here may best be explained as the Chuvash-type verbal predicates coming from the older forms like **düger-tök-i* and **taη-dog-i*, respectively, the final *-i* being the third person possessive suffix.

The same predicative use of the verbal noun in {-dOk} is seen also in Volga Bulgarian where the suffix occurs as {-tOw+i} and {-rOw+i} < {*-dOk+i}: *wafa:ti baltowi* "he died" (lit. "his death occurred") < **bo:l-dog+i*,

a:xirata batowi “he/she went to the other world” < **bar-doq+i*, *dinya:ran köçröwi* “he passed away from the world” < **köç-dök+i*, etc.

In Old Anatolian Turkish, too, the past tense of the 3rd person of the plural is formed with the suffix {-dUk}: *varduq* “we arrived”, *galdük* “we came”, etc. There is no doubt that this OAT suffix {-dUk} is nothing but the suffix [-dOk] of deverbals originally (cf. MK *biz ya: qurdoq* “we strung the bows”, *biz aydoq* “we ascended” above).

It is very curious that the predicative function of the verbal noun in {-dOk} still continues in present-day Yakut: *kälbätäx buollaga* (< **käl-mä-dök bo:l-doq+i*) “er ist nicht gekommen”, *källägä suoğa* (< **käl-dök+i yo:q+i*) “er wird nicht kommen” (Böht. 380), etc. Compare *min uon orduga altam buollaga ärä* “meine 16 Jahre sind eben um” or “ich bin eben 16 Jahre geworden ist” (ibid.) in which *buollaga* “it became” (< **bo:l-doq+i*) seems to be identical in meaning with the past tense form *buolla* “it became” (< **bo:l-di*), as has been noticed by Böhtlingk.

The negative finite forms in {-BAAtAx} < {-mAdOk} seem to be more common in Yakut, as it was in Old Turkic: *min än tu:nna:xxar än köñülgün käspätägim* “bei deinen Lebzeiten handelte ich deinem willen nicht entgegen” (< **käbiş-mädök-üm*), *än bu kün annıgar kılalgata suox küni körbötögün* “du sachst unter dieser Sonne keinen tag ohne Sorgen” (< **kör-mädök-ün*), *bi:rbit da ıaljıbataga* “auch nicht einer von uns wurde krank” (*ıaljıbataga* < **a:yri-ma-doq+i*), *alta silga miäxä bi:r da a:s küni kördörbötögö* “(und) hat während sechs Jahren mich keinen hungrigen Tag sehen lassen”, *bisigi tabalarbitın bulbataxıt* “wir funden unsere Renn-thiere nicht”, *äsigi kälbätäxxıt* “ihr kammt nicht”, *kinilär kälbätäxtärä* “sie kamen nicht” (Böht. 381), etc.

* * *

On the etymology of the Old Turkic suffix {-dOk} various theories have so far been put forward.

1. Ramstedt was of the opinion that the suffix *-duq* was originally a deverbals noun in *-q* derived from a secondary verbal stem in *-d-*, *-t-* (Form. 152-153, 163). He compared this suffix with Mo. *-day* forming “Nomen usus” and Tung. *-dig* (ibid.). He also drew attention to the closeness of Trk. *-duq* (*-dıq*, *-dük*, *-dik*) to the past tense suffix *-dim*, *-dıñ*, *-di*, *-dımız*, *-dıñız*, *-dılar* and its use as the past tense suffix of the 1st person of the plural in

Southern Turkic (ibid. 153).

Poppe was of the same opinion. According to him “The suffix *-*day* is a common Mongolian-Turkic suffix. It is a noun in *-*γ/-g* derived from the frequentative verbal stem in *-*d-* which still occurs in Tungus” (1955: 274).

2. According to Bang, the Turkish 1st person plural suffix of the past tense got its initial dental from verbal noun in *-t* (i.e. *-ut/-üt*) and its final *k* from the verbal nouns like *al-iq* and **sa-q* (Stud. 1: 921).

3. Brockelmann was of the opinion that the suffix *-duq/-dük* came into being from the combination of verbal nouns in *t* (seen in the past tense suffix) + the formative *uq*, i.e. the suffix *-uq/-ük* seen in *anuq* “bercit”, *äsriik* “trunken” (1919: 14, 1954: 261).

5. Benzing thought that the past tense participle in *-duq* had probably been derived from the participle in **-d* having either the suffix *+uq/+ük* or the enclitic particle *oq* which later developed into *+uq*, *+ük* (1952: 132).

6. Finally, Ş. Tekin, who does not believe in the predicative function of the verbal noun in {-dOk}, assumed that the compound suffix *-maduq* which he regards as the negative form of the *-p oq* could have been derived from **-mati oq* (ibid. 156-157). In another article published three years later he claimed that the Turkic suffix *-MADUK* comes from the combination of Tokharian *ma te* “yoksa ...-medikçe” with the particle *ok* (1990: 17 * 61).¹

Among these theories only Benzing’s theory, to be more exact, only the second alternative of his theory seems to be sound and satisfactory.

It should be made clear that the Turkic past tense suffix seems to have been derived from verbal nouns in {-*(I)d}, not in {-*(U)t}; because, if the dental of the suffix had been /t/, it would not have developed into /r/ in Chuvash after vowels and consonants except /r/, /l/ and /n/. Thus, the Turkic past tense suffix came into being from verbal nouns in {-*(I)d} plus the possessive suffixes, as Benzing (1952: 131) rightly assumed, i.e. *bardım* “I

¹ This assumption of Ş. Tekin is not plausible; because the dental of the negative gerundial suffix {-mAtI(n)} was a voiceless /t/ originally, whereas that of the participial suffix {-dOk} was a voiced /d/ or even a voiced spirant /ð/.

As for his view about the being of the Turkic negative suffix {-mA-} and the suffix {-mAdOk} of Tokharian origin, I must say that it is indeed a “hayal”, i.e. an imagination, contrary to the linguistic facts, as Ş. Tekin himself admits in this article of his (1990: 16 * 80). Tokharian *ma* being an article of negation placed before the verbs in this language could not in any way be added to verbal stems in Turkic. Besides, Turkic could not possibly be that poor a language as not to have its own system of verbal negation.

went” < *barı-d “a going in the past, a having gone” + -ım, bardıñ “you went” < *barı-d + ıñ “your going in the past”, bardı “he/she/they went” < *barı-d + -ı “his/her/their going in the past”, kältim “I came” < *kälı-d+ım “my coming in the past”, etc.²

As for the suffix {-dOk}, it is, in all likelihood, a combination of this verbal noun suffix {*-(I)d} with the intensifying particle *oqlök*, i.e. *barıd oq “an absolute having gone” > *bardoq*, *kälid ök “an absolute having come” > *kältök*, etc.

The addition of the particle *oqlök* to finite verb forms to intensify them is quite common in Orkhon Turkic. As is known, the particle *oqlök* is very often used to intensify not only pronouns and adverbs, but also the finite forms, especially the past tense forms in Orkhon Turkic, e.g. *tün udımatı küntüz olurmatı, qızıl qanım töküti qara tärım yügürti, işig küçüg bertim ök* “without getting sleep by night (or) rest by day, letting my red blood pour and my black sweat flow, I gave my services (to my kaghan and people)” (Tun. 52), *uzun yälmäg yämä ı(d)ım oq, arquy qarıyuy olıyurdım oq* “I also sent out long-distance patrols, and I established the fortifications and watch towers” (Tun. 53).

In the Tunyukuk inscription the particle *oqlök* is also added to the 3rd person forms of the past tense and the future tense forms in {-DAÇI}. In this case, however, the particle loses its initial vowel. In other words, the vowel of the particle is not dominant: *bini oğuzuy ölürtäçik tir män* ““(The Turkish people) will definitely kill me, the Oghuz’, I say”(11). Here the finite form *ölürtäçik* obviously comes from an older and original **ölürtäçi ök*.

In Orkhon Turkic, the particle *oqlök* may be added once more to the intensified finite forms in -k < ök, e.g. *yañdok yolta yämä öltik-ök* “Those who were routed definitely died on the roads” (Tun. 16), *ol bizni... qaçan näñ ärsär ölürtäçik-ök* “(the kaghan of the Turks), sooner or later, will definitely kill us” (Tun. 20-21), *qaçan näñ ärsär bizni ölürtäçik ök* “sooner or later, he will definitely kill us” (Tun. 29-30).

The finite verb forms formed with the particle *oqlök* are found also in the modern languages. In Chulym Tatar, for example, the future tense is formed

² Shcherbak thinks that the Turkish past tense forms *aldım* “I took”, *aldımız* (!) “we took”, *aldın* “you took” and *aldınız* “you took” come from *aldı-men*, *aldı-biz*, *aldı-sen* and *aldı-siz*, respectively (1995: 193). These etymologies cannot be accepted; because in Old Turkic the past tense forms were formed with the possessive suffixes, not with the personal pronouns: *al-d+ım*, *al-d+ıñ*, *al-d+ı*, etc.

with the suffix *-goql-gök l-oql-ök: paryo:m ~ paryoum* (< *bar-γoq-män*) “ich werde gehen”, *çapqo:η* “du wirst mähen” (Pritsak, Fund. I 628).³ Dulʼzon did not make any comment on the origin of this suffix (YaNSSSR II 459). Poppe, on the other hand, rightly stated that Yakut future tense suffix *-iax /-iäx* comes from **-γaql-gäk* (Fund. I 682). Schönig further assumed that the Chul. **-GOK* and Yak. **-GAK* might have come from an older and original *-GO oq*, i.e. the future noun in *-GO* and the particle *oq* (1989: 278 and note 59). Finally, Stachowski definitely stated that Chulym *-goq* and Yak. *-uox* resulted from the combination of the suffix *-go* and the particle *oq*, i.e. *-goq* < **-go:q* < **-go oq* (1994: 183-188). Thus, Yak. *bul-uoy+um* “I will find” < **bul-goq+um*, *bul-uoy+uη* “you will find” < **bul-goq+uη*, *bul-uoy+a* “he/she will find” < **bul-goq+i*, *kör-üöy+üm* “I will see” < **kör-gök-üm*, *kör-üöy+iη* “you will see” < **kör-gök+iη*, *kör-üöy+ä* “he/she will see” < **kör-gök+i*, etc.

Consequently, it can safely be assumed that the Old Turkic verbal noun suffix {-dOk} comes from the combination of the ancient verbal noun suffix {*-d} with the particle *oqlök*; i.e. **barid oq* > *bardoq*, **kälid ök* > *kältök*, etc.

Bibliography

- ATALAY, Besim, *Divanü Lûgat-it Türk Tercümesi*, I 1939, II 1940, III 1941, IV Dizin “Endeks” 1943, (= MK) Ankara.
- BANG, W. “Studien zur vergleichenden Grammatik der Türksprachen: I”, *SBAW* 1916, 910-921.
- BENZING, Johannes. “Der Aorist im Türkischen”, *UAJb.* 24, 1-2 (1952), 130-132.
- BROCKELMANN, C. “Altosmanische Studien I”, *ZDMG* LXXIII (1919), 1-29.
- , *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Literatur-Sprachen Mittelasiens*. Leiden 1954.
- DULʼZON, A. P. “Čulimsko-tyurkskiy Yazık”, *Yaziki Narodov SSSR, II, Tyurkskie yaziki*, Moskva 1966: 446-466.
- GABAIN, A. von. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Hamburg 1950².

³ The personal ending in Chul. *pargo:m ~ pargoum* is not the pronoun *män*, but the 1st person possessive suffix *-m*. Cf. also Chul. *çapko:η* “you will cut” < **çap-gok-uη*.

- JOHANSON, Lars. *Alttürkische als „dissimilierende Sprache“*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Wiesbaden 1979.
- POPPE, Nicholas. *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*. Helsinki 1955.
- PRITSAK, Omeljan. “Das Abakan- und Čulymtürkische und das Schorische”, *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, I, yay. Jean DENY, Kaare GRØNBECH, Helmuth SCHEEL, Zeki Velidi TOGAN, Wiesbaden 1959: 598-640.
- RAMSTEDT, G. J. *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft II: Formenlehre*. (= MSFOu) Helsinki 1952.
- SCHÖNIG, K. “Das Lenatürkische und die sprachlichen Merkmale des nordöstlichen türkischen Areals”, *Altaica Osloensia, Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Conference, Oslo, June 12-16, 1989*, ed. by B. Brendemoen, Oslo 1991. 263-285.
- SHCHERBAK, Aleksandr M. “Analogy in the Turkic Languages”, *Beläk Bitig, Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. by Marcel Erdal und Semih Tezcan, Wiesbaden 1995, 189-193.
- STACHOWSKI, M. “Das jakutischen Futursuffix -ya(x)”, *JSFOu* 85 (1994), 183-188.
- TEKİN, Ş. “Altun Yaruk’un 20. Bölümü: İligler Qanlarının Köni Törüsün Aymaq (= *Rājaṣāstra*)”, *TUBA* 11 (1987), 133-175.
- , “Türkçede -MA- Olumsuzluk eki ile -DIK+ Eki Nereden Geliyor?”, *Tarih ve Toplum*, Vol. 13, No. 74 (1990), 14-17.
- TEKİN, T. *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 69), Bloomington, The Hague 1968.
- , *Tuna Bulgarları ve Dilleri* (Türk Dil kurumu Yayınları 530). Ankara 1987.
- , *Volga Bulgar Kitabeleri ve Volga Bulgarcası*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 531). Ankara 1988.
- , *XI. Yüzyıl Türk Şiiri*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 541). Ankara 1989.