

## THE DEVELOPMENT HISTORY OF TENSE CATEGORY IN TURKIC LANGUAGES

<sup>a</sup>RENA HUSEYNOVA

<sup>a</sup>*Azerbaijan University of Language, 22, S.Vurgun Str., AZ1078, Baku, Azerbaijan*  
email: *rena.huseynova70@inbox.ru*

**Abstract:** The history of the development of the tense category in Turkic languages is considered in the article. The main purpose of the research conducted within the article is to study the tense category in Turkic languages from the point of view of historical development and to analyze the tense category in diachronic plan on the basis of materials of different Turkic languages. For the first time in the article based on the materials of the Altai, Turkish, Tungus-Manchurian, Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Tatar and other Turkic languages the tense category is investigated in a comparison. The comparative, historical-comparative and typological methods of linguistics were used in the research. In order to shed light on the degree of development of the research topic and to justify its relevance, the scientific and theoretical literature is also studied extensively and comprehensively. As the principles of concrete classification of tense forms in the grammar of Turkic languages have not yet been determined it confirms the relevance of the research. In the article as a result of research based on the materials of the Turkic languages the author concludes that the forms of tense observed in the stages of historical development of the Turkic languages have more modal shades. This is due to the fact that they are closely related to the aspect category. The analysis of the scientific-theoretical literature presented during the research and the obtained scientific results may have special importance for Turkologists, researchers conducting research on the history of language.

**Keywords:** Aspect category, Linguistics, Modality, Tense category, Turkic languages, Verb.

### 1 Introduction

Time which is determined by the relationship to the speech moment is usually called absolute time and the forms expressing it forms of absolute time. Relative time is the time of one action in relation to the time of another. Forms of relative time are usually observed in complex sentences. Grammatically time is one of the forms of reflection in the language of objective, really existing time but perceived by a person in its segments, intervals, in its moments.

The meaning of time can be expressed in a language not only by the system of verb forms but also by other linguistic means. The semantic category of time expressed by various linguistic means is called temporality. Time can be expressed by the syntactic structure of a sentence too.

The morphological category of the tense of a verb is a system of opposed series of forms that indicate the relationship of an action to the time of its implementation. The structure of the system of tense forms in their relation to the type of the verb testifies the absence of identity between grammatical tense and ideas about the division of real time. The basis of the tense category of the verb is formed by the tense forms within the indicative mood. Each of the opposed series of forms of tense is characterized not only by its inherent categorical grammatical meaning but also by special means of expression. These means include on the one hand affixes and on the other the types of stems to which these affixes are attached.

The tense category is often dealt with from a purely philosophical point of view and at the best from a semantic point of view in the process of linguistic research. As a result the importance of its rich morphological features is decreased while determining the grammatical meaning of this category thereby not only controversial points but also false ideas are appeared and this makes it more concretized.

The tense category of verb is a reflection of objective time and refers to the action relation of the speech moment or to any other speech moment which is taken as the basis of time relations. In Turkic languages the verb tenses are an interesting and complex category. The large number of Turkic languages, the diversity of tense forms, the unique history of development of each Turkic language along with similar features also acquired a number of different features.

The main purpose of this research is to shed light on the history of the development of the tense category in the Turkic languages

and to carry out the necessary analysis on the basis of language materials.

### 2 Literature Review

The extensive and detailed study of verb tenses in Azerbaijani linguistics is connected with the name of academician A.A.Akhundov [1]. M. Huseynzadeh notes the verb tenses under the title of "tense category". He shows the traditional three tenses of the verb: past, present and future tenses. The author writes that the past tense consists of the categorial past tense and the narrative past tense and the future tense consists of categorial and non-categorial future tense forms [9].

M.B. Asgarov's book "Tense forms, adverbial verb forms and functional semantic relations between them" (2002) is also distinguished by its original approach to the problem. Y. Karimov's "Verb tenses in Azerbaijani and Kazakh languages" (1973), R. Sadigov's "Objective and grammatical tense relations in different system languages" (1973), F. Jahangirov's "Periphrastic tense forms in English and their expression forms in Azerbaijani" (2003), L. Huseynova's "The system of continuous tenses forms" (2005), B. Jafarova's "System of verb tenses in English and Azerbaijani languages" (2006), G. Hasanova's "Comparative typology of verb tenses" (2009) are recent successful steps which can be assessed in this field [7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14].

In the turkological literature there are different opinions and controversial points and contradictions concerning with the system of verb tenses and their number in Turkic languages. In turkology the division of tense forms is based on several principles.

A.N. Kononov in his work "Grammar of the modern Uzbek literary language" (1961) divided the verb tenses into two parts: simple and complex. In the book "Grammar of the Tuvan language" (1961) verb tenses are presented under the title "mood" and it is shown that the indicative mood consists of three tense forms as past, present and future tense.

E.I. Korkina (1970) presents the verb tenses within mood. The author conveys the number of verb tenses in Yakut language and attributes the tenses to the following forms: present-future tense, future tense, near past (definite) tense, narrative past tense, resultative past tense I, resultative past tense II, episodic past tense, unfinished past tense (imperfect), distant past tense, episodic distant past tense.

"The grammar of the Altaic language" (2005) had an influence on the subsequent descriptions of the Turkic languages and in terms of the further interpretation of analytical verb constructions with the meaning of the action modes of the verb. P.M. Melioransky considered that in the Kazakh language verbs do not convey the meanings of perfection, imperfection, repetitiveness of action which are inherent in Russian language however various shades of action in this language can be conveyed using combinations of special verb forms [22]. In the most famous and authoritative old grammars of the Turkic languages the issues of transferring various characteristics of the verb action are touched upon in one way or another and described some synthetic and analytical means of their implementation in a particular language.

The study of the structure of modes of action in Turkic languages had begun and the latest publications contain the first important results of this work. For the Uzbek language the foundations of such an approach were laid by Academician A.N. Kononov in his grammar when considering the forms of the verb that express the nature of the course of action — the shades of "instantaneousness, dynamism, duration, inchoativeness, repetition, direction of action ..." [16] and were developed in A.Khodzhiyev's monograph on auxiliary verbs [15].

V.I. Rassadin presents verb tenses in the Tofa language under the title of tense category. He divides tense forms into two parts: simple and complex; and divides verb tenses into three parts: past tense, present tense and future tense. The author divides the past into three: definite past tense, perfect past tense, subjective past tense; present tense into three: ordinary present tense, concrete present tense, continuous present tense; and future tense into two: definite future tense, future tense with the probability meaning [25]. In his work "Morphology of the Tatar literary language" D.G. Tumasheva divides verb tenses into two parts: synthetic analytic tenses [31]. D.G. Tumasheva presents the tense of the verb in the language of the barabin Tatars under the title of indicative mood [32]. As with other Turkic languages the language of the Barabin Tatars includes three categories of logical time consisting of 10 grammatical tenses: present tense, past tense and future tense. The author uses four forms of the present tense — present I, present II, concrete present tense, continuous present tense; three forms of future tense — future I (present-future tense), future II (probable future tense), future III (expected future tense); shows three forms of the past tense — definite past, subjective past, perfect past tense. N.N. Ganashia that there are nine tense forms in the indicative mood in the Turkish language [13]. In her dissertation T. Afandiyeva divided past tense forms of verbs into two forms: simple and complex forms.

She included the simple forms of the past tense of the verb the categorical and narrative past tense forms but to the complex forms: I perfect, II imperfect, the future past, the distant past, the continuous past, the important past, the necessary past, the desired past, the conditional past [5].

In Turkic languages the past tense form is given under different names. Of these the indefinite past and the perfect past predominate. In Azerbaijani linguistics the form which expresses the result of the work done in the past or showing the result is called the narrative past tense.

The Turkish linguists expressed different attitudes to the past tense form formed by the suffix *-miş* and called this form by different terms. M. Ergin writes: "... we refer to the past tense learned to describe an action that was done in the past and which we did not see or know at the time it was done" [3]. Turkish linguist Z. Korkmaz in her "Glossary of Grammar Terms" presents this tense form of under the title of "heard past tense" [20].

In this scientific literature which having been reviewed researchers have focused more on the principles of classification of verb tenses in Turkic languages. As part of our research we will look at the history of the development of the tense category in Turkic languages.

In Turkish languages unlike other tenses of the verb the morphological features of the present tense form are distinguished by their diversity. Since most modern Turkic languages use only one morphological indicator to express the present tense, the forms of the present tense are not as many as the forms of the past tense. This is also due to the fact that the past covers a wider period of time than the present. However while the main morphological indicators of the past are stable in most Turkic languages it is difficult to say the same about the indicators of the present time.

### 3 Materials and Methods

The object of the research is historical development of the tense category in the Turkic languages. For achieving this goal the set of methods are used. The theoretical is allowed to identify the basic provisions and formulate the conclusions of scientific intelligence (analytical-synthetic, induction-deductive, generalization and systematization). Analyzing the language materials on the Turkic languages it is compared with Tungus-Manchu languages.

### 4 Results

In Turkic languages the tense forms of the verb stand out with their branched system in the written monuments. Almost all forms appeared in the period after the primary and secondary (derivative) names of the action and retain these features until modern times [29,183p, p.69-73]. I.V. Kormushin agrees with A.M.Sherbak's views. M.A. Baskakov attributes such noun forms to the functional forms of the verb — *masdar* [2].

A.N. Kononov divided the verb tenses into two parts: simple and complex and showed these verb forms: present-future tense, present concrete tense, present continuous tense, definite past tense, perfect past tense, subjective past tense, future tense with probability meaning, definite future tense, historical definite future tense. He noted nine simple tense forms of the verb, complex forms of the past tense, indefinite imperfect, definite imperfect, continuous past tense [16].

Russian linguists hold two views on the past tense form of the verb in the tense system. The first is that linguists present the verb by increasing the number of past tense forms. This mainly varies between 5-12. Another group of linguists divides the tense system of verbs into simple and complex forms and includes some of the forms presented in the past in complex forms [4].

If we look at verb forms as well as the history of participle and adverbial participle we can see that they are referred first to analytical forms and then to synthetic forms; the tense forms made the nucleus of the changing word forms of verb and they interacted with categories of person, quantity and indicative category.

When analyzing the emergence and development of tense forms in the Turkic language group it should be noted that the diversity of deictic indicators can be seen in the early period of the language. Thus in the Turkic languages in most tense forms there are traces of pronouns in the declension paradigm [21]. A.A. Kononov shows that except for the preterite and its complex forms in the Orkhon language in all tense forms in the last position personal pronouns are used for example: *qorqur biz* "we are afraid" [17]. Looking at the emergence of perfect forms in the Turkic languages the author restored the ancient affix *-di* (modern *-st*) as an ancient form of belonging to the third person singular.

Since E.I. Korkina presents the tenses of the verb within the mood system he conveys the number of them to ten and attributes the tenses to the following forms: present-future tense, future tense, near past (definite) tense, narrative distant past tense, resultative past tense I, rezultative past tense II, episodic past tense, unfinished past tense (imperfect), distant past tense, episodic distant past tense [19]. We can see that this division is almost the same with the A.A. Kononov's division but E.I. Korkina mentions only eight past tense forms of the verb. The author gives extensive information about the tenses of the verb, their semantic features. And he gave the extended information about two tense forms - the near past (definite) and the unfinished past (imperfect).

However in Turkic languages the ancient tense form of the verb is *-ты / -ды* preterite form. Its declension paradigm is distinguished by special endings and does not coincide with the pronoun form. However this argument cannot be taken as a fact of the lack of deictic indicators in the ancient Altaic languages. This pattern shows that "preterite forms had reductions in personal endings faster than other forms and were separated from participles in the verb function" [21].

In most Turkic languages the tense system is three-dimensional and the organization of time as a whole is based on the speech moment as the center. Accordingly in narration as a rule the past, present and future tenses are emphasized. Turkic languages can be an example of this. It is observed that in the ancient Turkic written monuments all three tenses was developed. However "the language of monuments and the shades of meaning

expressed by verb tenses in modern Turkic languages may not sometimes correspond" [24].

In Turkic languages the ancient form of the present tense is a marked form with the indicator *-a*. B.A. Serebrennikov and N.Z. Hajiyeva considered indicator *-a* as an "ancient word-forming affix expressing multi-action or continuous action" [28; 6]. I.A. Kormushin considers the zero forms which later formed *-a / -y / -u* as the ancient form of the present tense. "In the language of ancient Turkic written monuments, the verbs used in the present tense express the contrant action in addition to the used action in the present tense" [24]. In the Oghuz languages in some dialects of the ancient Ottoman Turkic language traces of *-a* form can be found, for example: ancient-osm. *верэвэн* — "I give", *аласын* — "you take", *унавэз* — "we hope".

Another form of the present tense as well as the future tense is the participle form *ap / -эp / -ыp / -ур*. The meaning of this participle is more modal expressing the situation and feature of the subject. This also gave the shade of modality and probability [28; 6].

It should be noted that in most Turkic languages this form reflects the meaning of the future tense however it is used in the present tense too. It is an interesting fact that in the XV-XVI centuries there was a marked indicator of present tense in the monuments of ancient Azerbaijan which is noted by B.A. Serebrennikov and N.Z. Hajiyeva [28; 6]. The influence of this fact can be seen in the Turkic dialects, modern Azerbaijani as well as in the ancient Kumyk and southern Karakalpak dialects [6].

B.A. Serebrennikov and N.Z. Hajiyeva assume that in Turkic languages *-y* existed as a special indicator of the present tense and was connected to the *-a* or *-y* basis of the present tense. It is an interesting fact that this suffix coincides with the Indo-European present suffix which was noted in the ancient Greek and Gothic languages.

As for the past tense form in the general Turkic language *-ды / -ты* (preterite) indicator is the past tense form then it passes to *-ган* and *-мыш* (perfect) indicator. A.M. Sherbak shows that all forms are correspondingly at the level of the existence of the proto Turkic language [29]. N.Z. Hajiyeva notes that the general Turkic form of the past tense differs in semantic capacity and type neutrality. It should be noted that in the development of Turkic languages there was a tendency of the formation of past with different type meanings. It can express both the finished movement and the movement that did not reach the border [6]. A. Rajabli shows that "in the language of monuments, there is a regularity in the using of the t-variant and d-variant of the categorial past tense verb suffix. In the language of Yenisei monuments, it is impossible to determine the regularity in the using of any of these suffixes" [24].

As for the formation of the present tense form most turkologists such as A.P. Poseluyevsky, N.K.Dmitriyev, J. Denny, R. Brockelman believe that it is derived from the verb *-ыт / -ит*. B.A. Serebrennikov and N.Z. Hajiyeva confirm this opinion too. The personal indicators of the past tense are based on possessive affixes and the tense form had a perfect meaning [28; 6]. The deictic indicators are based on the emergence of ancient and general Turkic tense forms which later became tense indicators. Another tense form formed during the period of the proto Turkic language *-ар / -ыр* is an analytical form of the present tense. This form is used to convey the meaning of the past tense corresponding to any definite moment of the past tense, for example in Krime-Tatarian language: *ал* — "to receive".

The ancient form *-ган* and *-мыш* of the past resultative (perfect) form can be attributed to the ancient forms of the Turkic language. I.V. Kormushin notes that these tense forms "derive their source from adverbial participle and infinitives" [21]. However *-ган* form has a later origin. In Turkic languages the future tense forms had a brighter modality.

A.M. Sherbak notes that the forms of the future tense are numerous and differ from each other in modal shades. He gives an example from the Uyghur language and shows that two forms of the future tense can be put forward (compare: *баpap* and *бармакчы*). This confrontation is not related to the expression of time differences in terms of the coordination of time, the sequence of actions. "The first is approximation, the second is intention, the last meaning is specific" [29]. "In the language of monuments, verbs expressing indefinite future tenses are rarely used in the form of *verbum finitum* (finished verb), in most cases they act as participle, and in many cases serve to make complex tense forms of verbs" [24].

It should be noted that with the exception of Chuvash language the future tense in most Turkic languages is the suffix *-ыр / -ар*. *-Ar* is older. It is based on the general Turkic aorist form and is considered by many researchers as the aorist-futurum form or the present tense form. For example, in the ancient Kipchak language *-ar* indicator reflects the meaning of the present and future tenses.

In the Oghuz languages the grammatical future form *-аçак / -азақ* is typical which is widespread in many languages of the southern area such as Uzbek and Uyghur languages. Unlike other languages in Tuvin, Khakas, and Shor languages *-ar* form has an approximate future tense [10].

## 5 Discussion

The Turkic tense system is represented by absolute and relative quantities of time, their formation originated in ancient times and has some common features with tense forms in the ancient Indo-European languages. Some tense forms have shades of modality, closely related to the type category.

The tense system of the general Tungus-Manchu languages is embodied by the confrontation of perfect and present forms. I.B. Kormushin notes that tense indicators in the general Tungus-Manchu present tense presents as zero morphemes and shows that "the last minimal time opposition is formed by the confrontation of zero preterite and non-past forms" [21]. In addition to the zero form semantically *-ca* and *-da* formants is predominant in the present indicator system. Considering the development of present forms in the Tungus-Manchu language the author notes that "the further development of the system of present forms takes place under a single paradigm integration of morphological type indicators: some indicators (*ca* and *-da*) are unproductive, forming a subclass of irregular verbs in many languages; more productive indicators are a combined system of zero and *-ra* indicators. As a result of the complete change, for the verbs with *-n* ending the indicator *-a* is formed in many languages, in other languages like nanay, ulch languages the indicator *-da* became the indicator of present with *-n* basis" [21]. As for the perfect tense forms they are the ancient indicator *-ça*, for example in the Paleoasian-evenk language *бака-ча-в* — "I find".

The most commonly used forms in Turkic languages are *-a* and *-r*. The primary form serves to determine the present tense while the second (derivative) form is used to indicate an event that occurs both in the present and in the future. However it should be noted that the tense forms in the Turkic languages are similar to some tense forms in the ancient Indo-European languages mainly the use of the suffix *-y* in the ancient Greek and Gothic languages. The suffix *-r* is of particular interest and is found in Latin and Hett languages in the future tense.

The past tense system of the Turkic verb stands at the speech moment as the main starting point. This system is characterized by a large number of simple and relative tenses the most common of which are past definitive and past resultative tense. We can find the given tense forms in the proto Turkic language. Traces of relative Turkic tense can be found in the proto language which indicates its early formation. Turkic languages had a modal and type neutrality in the past and in the later stages of language formation, acquires aspect meaning.

As for the formation of the future tense most Turkic languages have an approximal future and a future categorical tense confrontation: the first of which is present in almost all Turkic languages and has *-ar* form, and the second expresses different forms.

The tense system of the general Tungus-Manchu language is based on the speech moment as the last point in the determining grammatical tense and the forms of present and perfect differ. The semantic meaning of tense forms is broader. Thus "in the Evenk language, the present tense form of the verb with the *-ra* suffix is broad in terms of semantics" [26]. In the Tungus-Manchu languages the tense category is closely related to the aspect category. The different types of construction depend on the onset of motion, finishing, flow of motion in time, and so on is proof of that.

## 6 Conclusion

Comparing the tense system of the Turkic and Tungus-Manchu languages we can note the corresponding similarity. Both systems are three-dimensional based on the speech moment, interact with the aspect category, participle forms, adverbial participle forms, conditional-tense adverbial participle, predicative forms of the verb are used to express the grammatical meanings of tense in the given languages. There is a lot of overlap within the tense forms. Thus *-ra* present form can be considered general Altaic. Some similarities between the Altaic tense system and the Indo-European tense system can be seen. In the present paradigm this similarity is reflected in the fact that many Turkic and Indo-European languages (Latin, Turkish, Tungus-Manchu) have a zero indicator and the *-y* indicator (in all languages studied except Tungus-Manchu and Latin). The indicator and its variants can be seen in preterite forms (in all languages except ancient Greek and Latin).

The indicator *-(e) (a)z-* can be seen in the system of future tense forms the remnants of this indicator can be found in Hett, Latin and ancient Turkic languages. The indicator *-a* has a special place it is expressed in both present and past tense forms in all languages except Hett language. This shows that these tense forms run the same tense indicators. They acquire special features over time but in some forms they retain their original traces of origin.

The tense system of Turkic languages is accompanied by absolute and relative tense. The formation of tense forms in these languages dates back to ancient times and many of the tense forms observed here have some similarities with the tense forms in the ancient Indo-European languages.

The forms of tense observed in the stages of historical development of the Turkic languages have more modal shades. This is due to the fact that they are closely related to the type category.

## Literature:

1. Akhundov, A.A. (1961). *Verb tenses*. Baku: AUL publication.
2. Baskakov, N.A. (1981). *Altaic language group and its research*. Moscow: Nauka.
3. Ergin, M. (1967). *Turkish language knowledge*. Sofia: Narodna prosveta.
4. Fakhraddingizi, G. (2010). *Time category in Turkic languages*. Baku: Elm ve Tehsil.
5. Hajiyeva, N.Z. (1958). *The system of the forms of the past tense of the verb in the modern Azerbaijani literary language*. (PhD thesis). Mooscow.
6. Hajiyeva, N.Z. (1990). *The Turkic languages. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Moscow. 527-529.
7. Hasanova, G. (2009). *Comparative typology of verb tenses*. Baku: Nurlan.
8. Huseynova, L. (2005). *The system of continuous verb forms*. (PhD thesis). Baku.
9. Huseynzade, M. (1983). *Modern Azerbaijani language*. Baku: Maarif.
10. Iskhakov, F.G., & Palmbach, A.A. (1961). *Grammar of the Tuvan language. Phonetics and morphology*. Moscow: IVL.
11. Jafarova, B. (2006). *The system of verb tenses in English and Azerbaijani languages*. Baku.
12. Jahangirov, F. (2003). *Periphrastic tense forms and their expression forms in English and Azerbaijani language*. (PhD thesis). Baku.
13. Janashia, N.N. (1972). *The system of time and declension in the Turkish language: Problems of Turkic languages*. Baku: Elm.
14. Karimov, Y. (1973). *Verb tenses in Azerbaijani and Kazakh literary languages*. (PhD thesis). Baku.
15. Khodzhiyev, A. (1966). *Auxiliary verbs in Uzbek language*. Tashkent.
16. Kononov A.N. (1960). *Grammar of the modern Uzbek literary language*. Moscow-Leningrad: Izd. AN. USSR.
17. Kononov, A.N. (1980). *Grammar of the language of the Turkic runic monuments of the 7th-9th centuries*. Leningrad: Nauka.
18. Korkina, E.I. (1970). *Declension of the verb in the Yakut language*. Moscow: Nauka.
19. Korkina, E.I. (1970). *Mood category in the Yakut language*. Moscow: Nauka.
20. Korkmaz, Z. (2007). *Grammar Terms Dictionary*. Ankara: TDKYayınları.
21. Kormushin, I.B. (1984). *Systems of verbs in Altai languages*. Moscow: Nauka.
22. Melioransky, P.M. (1987). *Brief grammar of the Kazakh-Kyrgyz language: Phonetics and etymology. Part I*. St. Petersburg.
23. Ragimov, M.Sh. (1987). *History of the formation of verb inflections in the Azerbaijani language*. (PhD thesis). Baku: AN ASSR.
24. Rajabli, A. (2006). *The language of ancient Turkic written monuments*. Baku: Nurlan.
25. Rassadin, V.I. (1978). *Morphology of the Tofalar language in the comparison*. Moscow: Science.
26. Robbek, V.A. (1992). *Grammatical categories of Even verbs*. SPb: Nauka.
27. Sadigov, R. (2004). *Objective and grammatical temporal relations in different system languages*. Baku: Nurlan.
28. Serebrennikov, B.A. (1986). *Comparative-historical grammar of Turkic languages*. Moscow: Nauka.
29. Shcherbak, A.M. (1981). *Essays on the comparative morphology of Turkic languages. Verb*. Leningrad: Nauka.
30. The grammar of the Altaic language. (2005). *Altaic Languages – Monumenta Altaica*. Gorno-Altaysk: AK CHECHEK.
31. Tumasheva, D.G. (1964). *Morphology of modern Tatar literary language*. Kazan: Kazan University Publishing House.
32. Tumasheva, D.G. (1968). *The language of Siberian Tatars. Part II*. Kazan: Kazan University Publishing House.

## Primary Paper Section: A

## Secondary Paper Section: AI