Modal analytical forms formed on the basis of participial forms ending with -ya, -yah in Yakut and -ar in Tuvan
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Abstract. The article provides a comparative analysis of modal indicators in the Yakut and Tuvan languages. We are talking about analytical grammatical indicators that were formed on the basis of participial forms ending with -yah and -ya in the Yakut language and the participle ending in -ar in the Tuvan language. These participial forms are the main forms in the verb system of the compared languages; they are polyfunctional participles of the past tense. And it is the ability to express by them the attribution of an action (a sign of an action) to the sphere of time that has not passed that allows them to form on their basis a variety of modal meanings - ought, necessity, assumption, desire and unreality.

1 Introduction

The Yakut and Tuvan languages, together with the Tofa and Khakass languages, according to the classifications of Turkic language researchers, belong to one branch of the development of Turkic languages – Uighur [10, p. 733; 1, p. 186]. The languages belonging to this group retain common features in the field of phonetics, morphology and vocabulary, which unite them with the language of the ancient Uighurs. Common features characterizing the Uighur group of languages are a) the presence of t~d~z instead of y in the middle of a word, for example, atah ~ adak ~ azah instead of ayak ‘leg’; b) the presence of t~s instead of y at the end of words, for example, kut- instead of kuy- ‘pour’ and pos (ins. boj), pozym (ins. bojym ‘myself’; c) preservation of the sonorous g at the end of the word (tag ‘mountain’). The languages of the Uighur group are also distinguished by significant features of the grammatical structure and vocabulary [1, p. 186].

Comparative studies on the materials of the Yakut and Tuvan languages regarding grammatical phenomena have been carried out in a number of works (see, for example, new works [14, 16, etc.]).

2 Materials and methods

The ancient Uighur polyfunctional form ending in -gu, defined as a future participle or as a form of a verb name with a modal meaning of possibility and obligation, gave in modern South Siberian Turkic languages participial forms ending with -gu deg, -guluk. In the Yakut language, this form has a sonorous correspondence of -ya [12, p. 88; 13, p. 28; 11, p. 90-91].

The combination of -gu deg, -gy deg, -gadyk, -gadyj, -kadyj (the second component ending with deg/dyk/dah/dyj ‘as’) functions as a participle with the meaning of the future presumptive tense in the Shor, Teleut, Altai [13, p. 28], as a form of modality in the Tofa [9, p. 165], as a form of the presumptive mood in the Khakass, Altai and Tuvan [3, p. 198; 2, p. 352; 7]. It is believed that the combination of -yu tāg even in the ancient Uighur language expressed the modal meaning of supposition, doubt, hint of the possibility of the realization of an action or phenomenon [7, p. 70].

In the verb systems of the South Siberian Turkic languages, the ancient form ending with -yu is preserved only in a connected form, whereas in the Yakut, the -ya form is a very active multifunctional form. It is a finite form, which enters as a form of the future tense into the indicative, other verb forms are formed on its basis. In the Yakut, the form ending with -yu was strengthened by the affix -h (-ah, -yah) and formed the participle ending with -gah, which in the modern Yakut has the form ending with -yah and is the only multifunctional participle of the future tense [15, p. 116].

In the Tuvan, the form ending with -gy deg serves as an indicator of the probability mood [8] and is included in the structure of the modal particle of possibility as part of the analytical participle form. The first component of it is the participle ending with –ar – the central form in the Tuvan verb system.

When the main verb forms in the languages under consideration, the participles ending with -yay-yah in the Yakut and with the -ar form in the Tuvan are functionally comparable.

Each participial form in the Yakut and Tuvan has a specific temporal meaning and has the potential to create a certain modal-specific meaning. Taking various affixes and combined with modal and auxiliary verbs, they form
analytical forms of participles, complex tense forms, mood forms, modal and specific forms. And one of the functions of participial analytical forms is the expression of modal values.

3 Results and Discussion

The article presents a comparative analysis of the analytical forms of modality that arose, on the one hand, on the basis of the future participle ending with the -yah and -ya form in the Yakut and, on the other hand, the participle ending with -ar in the Tuvan. As an auxiliary element in the participial analytical forms of the Yakut, the auxiliary verbs er- and ebit- are the most active, going back to the ancient insufficient verb e-li-). Tuvan modal particles iyik, ertik also ascend to it, which also participate in the expression of modal values.

Analytical participial forms in the Yakut and Tuvan convey the meanings of ought, necessity, assumption, desire and unreal modality. The latter meaning is conveyed by forms of the subjunctive mood.

Glossing conventions


Obligative

In the Yakut, two analytical forms with the meaning of the ought are formed on the basis of the -yah form: -yah tustaah (tus ‘duty’ + affix of possession -laah), -yah keringneeh (kering ‘duty, measure’ + -laah). The first has the meaning of duty with a touch of obligation, obligation and necessity [5], while the second expresses duty, which manifests itself as an internal property of the subject of action [6]. For example:

(1) yak. Komsomolka östööhhö beyetin tühen bierie suoh tustaah (NG. UD. 58)

komsomolka östööhö beyet-i-n
komsomolka enemy-DAT herself-POSS3s-[tüh-en
[drop-CVB-ACC AUX-P/F not
bier-ie suoh
[drop-CVB-ACC AUX-P/F not
tustaah]

‘Komsomolka is obliged not to drop her honor in front of the enemy’.

(2) yak. Miehe tyl bierbikkit byhyyttynan, subu kurdük etieh ceriineehpin (GC. OS. 31)
miehe tyl bier-bik-kit
kitbyhyyttynan
me word give-P/P-2nd since
subu kurdük [et-ich seriir-neeh-pin]

this as if {say-P/Fobliged-PTCL-1s}

‘Since you gave me your word, I am obliged to say this’.

The Tuvan also has an analytical form ending with -ar uzhurlug (uzhur ‘rule’ + affix of possession -lyg), which conveys the meaning of the obligation dictated by various external circumstances and conditions [3]. Examples:

(3) tuv. Shivittig ulzu meen sayak aydim chide bergen dep bilir uzhurlug (ED, EH, 165)

Shivittig uluz-u meeng
sayak
Shivittig people-POSS my
pacey ayd-im [chid-e ber-gen]

horse-POSS [miss-CV AUX-P/P]
dep bi-lir uzhurlug
that know-P/PTCL should

‘The people of Shivittig should know that my pacer horse is missing’.

Modality of necessity

The modality of the necessity in the Yakut is expressed by analytical forms formed by a combination of participles ending with the -yah and -ar + affix belonging to baar (turar) and -yahaysha baar. Thus, the participle ending with -yah in the word baar ‘is’ expresses the modal meaning of necessity with a touch of desire:

(4) yak. Bu katen turar tahayn koroah baar (SD. D 64)

bu {kat-en tur-ar}
it {dress-CV AUX-P/PF}
tah-ya-n {koy-uh baar}
clothes-POSS-ACC {see-P/P there.is}

‘It would be necessary to see her clothes in which she is dressed’.

In the Tuvan, the analytical form on -ar herek (herek ‘necessary, necessary’) expresses the meaning of the “external” necessity in the highest degree of categoricity due to objective external circumstances [15]. For example:

(5) tuv.... kanchap-chop-daa turgash, planny kuasedir herek (LH, HH, 207)
kanchap-chop-daa tur-gash
whatever-PTCL be-CV
plan-ny küüssed-ir herek
plan- ACC fulfill-P/PTCL necessary
‘... whatever it is, it is necessary to fulfill the plan’.

“Subjunctive modality”

The “subjunctive modality” in the Yakut and Tuvan is expressed, as in other Turkic languages, according to the scheme: the form of the future participle is combined with an auxiliary verb. The latter component can be represented both by the ancient insufficient verb e-li- in a more archaic way, and by the auxiliary verb tur- with the meaning of “being”. In the Yakut, this meaning is transmitted in two analytical forms: -ya et- + short predicate affix, -ya ebit- + predicate affix [4].
In Tuvan, it is an analytical form based on the participle ending with -ar in combination with the particle ijik (an insufficient verb i- in the ancient form of the past tense on -juk) by both named auxiliary verbs. And the main form of the conditional subjunctive mood in the Tuvan is the form ending with -ar ijik.

In the Yakut and Tuvan, the forms ending with -ya et- and -ar ijik can express the meaning of an assumption or a guess of the speaker about the possibility or impossibility of an action. For example:

(6) yak. Оҕо lor ajdaan-nar а sügün olorduo suoh ete (AA. SK. 605)
оҕо-лор аждаан-нар-А sügün олор-д-уо суох ете
'The noise of the children would not let them sit quietly'.

(7) yak. Algahaatsayn buolaaraj, kihi bert könö kihi buolo uo ete (AA. SK. 179)
[алгахаа-таң-ын буолаарай]
[мистаке-ASSUM-2s AUX-PREM/3s]
kihi bert könö kihi person very direct person
[буол-уо ete]
[be-P/PF AUX3s]
'If everyone starting a family met true love... how nice it would be'.

The next meaning of the form in the Yakut is a wish, a parting word, a dream of the speaker (more often in the 1st and 3rd persons):

(11) yak. Kergennener ere kihi baryta d'инneech taptaly kösröö buollar... üchügei da buolo uo ete (NY. Seh. 541)
керженнер-ере киhi барыта мери-RLP/F only person беc-3s
diirneeh taptal-y [kör-s-ör-o] true love-ACC [see-REC-P/PrF/3s
buol-lar] üchügei da [буол-uo AUX/COND] nice PTCL [be-P/PF
ete] AUX/3s
'If they gave me a scholarship, I could study'.

Further, this form in both languages regularly expresses the meaning of reproach, accusation, indignation (in the 2nd sometimes in the 3rd person). Intonation is of great importance here. For example:

(12) yak. Урут урыр-е, акарыя (AA. CK. 213)
urut {урур-е}  акарыя fool
'I should have invited you earlier, you fool'.

(13) tuv. Men erte bilgen bolzumza, shagda-la chedip keer ijik men
мени что вёлгён болзумза, шагда-ла чедип кир ижик мени
'I would be in his place (lit. if I) would have received several higher educations'.

The same form in the Yakut can express the statement and intention of the speaker if there are conditions for its commission:

(9) yak. Mikitetti subu korbut үүбүүлөт, ol kinigeleri kini sieteleen kabihie suoga etc... (AA. SK. 669)
Микиэдээ субу корбүт
suddenly.it.turns.out that book-PL.-ACC
kini [sie-teleen kebih-ie suos-y-a
he [eat-ITER AUX-P/F not-3s
eto]
AUX/3s]
'Nikita is not only now we see (we have known him for a long time), he would not «eat» those books'.

The same form in both languages regularly expresses the meaning of reproach, accusation, indignation (in the 2nd sometimes in the 3rd person). Intonation is of great importance here. For example:

(12) yak. Урут урыр-е, акарыя (AA. CK. 213)
urut {урур-е}  акарыя fool
'I should have invited you earlier, you fool'.

(13) tuv. Men erte bilgen bolzumza, shagda-la chedip keer ijik men
мени что вёлгён болзумза, шагда-ла чедип кир ижик мени
'I would be in his place (lit. if I) would have received several higher educations'.

The same form in the Yakut can express the statement and intention of the speaker if there are conditions for its commission:

(9) yak. Mikitetti subu korbut үүбүүлөт, ol kinigeleri kini sieteleen kabihie suoga etc... (AA. SK. 669)
Микиэдээ субу корбүт
suddenly.it.turns.out that book-PL.-ACC
kini [sie-teleen kebih-ie suos-y-a
he [eat-ITER AUX-P/F not-3s
eto]
AUX/3s]
'Nikita is not only now we see (we have known him for a long time), he would not «eat» those books'.

(10) yak. Stipendija bierdeller үүреним etc (AA. SK. 685)
‘He would have left anyway’;

c) intentions:
(16) yak. Uol ebitir ɨy buollar, beyem ideber, metallurgist ıdetiger, uoretieh etym (NY. Seh. 493)
oebl-ibr ɨy buol-lar
boy  back-HTCL/2s  this  be-COND
beyem  ide-ber
myself  profession-PSS/1s  DAT
metallurgist  ide-ti-ger
metallurg  profession-PSS/3s-DAT
[üoret-ih  eti-m]
{teach-P/PF  AUX-1s}
‘If you were a boy, I could teach my profession as a metallurgist’;

d) inducement, appeal:
(17) yak. Өсөң, Тооромохум, аhyah etir (AF. TA. P. 57)
{oğ-m  Tooromoh-um
child-PSS/1s
Tooromoh-PSS/1s
[ah-yah  et-ııır]
{eat-P/PF  AUX-2s}
‘My child, Toromos, would eat’.

In the Yakut, the subjunctive mood forms [4] also functions ending with -ya ebit, which expresses the speaker’s attitude to the perfect or expected possible or desirable action of the subject:

a) preferably-subjunctive meaning
(18) yak. Tyяl küühimbeter, içhügej buoluo ebit (NG, 5)
tyal küüh-ibe-ter
wind get.stronger-NEG-COND
AUX-P/PF  PTCL-PAST/3s
‘It would be good if it were not for the wind’;

b) possibly-subjunctive modality
(19) yak. Tyyj, ehe baar-a buollar, miine tüühüö
tyyj  ehe baar-a  buol-lar
well bear  ectr-PSS  AUX-COND miin-e
[AUX-P/PF  ebik-kin]
AUX-PTCL/2s
‘Well, if he was a bear, it turns out, he would sit right (on top) of him’.

Desiderative
In the Yakut, combinations of participles ending with -ar and -yah in the form of accusative/ dative / genitive /main cases are used to express the desired modality in combination with words having the semantics of desire, intention, aspiration (baja ‘desire, aspiration; hunting, desire, dream’; sanaa ‘thought, dream, goal, aspiration, intention, desire’; ‘thought, thought, intention, intention, desire’; tolkij ‘thought’, etc.). For example:

(23) yak. Kolhuozka бaryan багилаах осолору
{ba-yan  bagilaah  osolorus
kolhoz-ka  ba-yar  bagala
collective.farm-DAT
wish-PSS
footnote-

23

häarchadïtyy satyyr ebikkit (ser. TP. 275)
kolhoz-ka  bar-yan  ba-
集体.farm-DAT
wish-PSS
{hachadh-tay-

23

{ebikkit
AUX-PTCL/2s
‘Refuses, they intend to prevent children wishing (aspiring) to go to the collective farm’.

(24) yak. Ürdük üorehe tutarsyah bagiilaah kellibit
ürdürük.üorehe  tut-tar-s-yah
university-DAT
enter-CAUS-REC-P/F
başa-laah  kel-l-ibit
desire-PSS
come-PTCL/PAST
‘We came with a desire to enter a university’, where the form ending with -yah bagiilaah (sanaa) (the name of the action) acts as a circumstance.

In the Tuvan, in addition to the synthetic forms of desiderative (-sa, -ksa), there is a similar Yakut form ending with -ar küteldig, where the second component is translated as ‘having a desire, having a desire’. It is regularly used in speech. For example:
4 Conclusion

Thus, in the South Siberian Turkic languages, verb forms dating back to the ancient form ending with -γυ are used with the service element тāг with the meaning of assimilation and express the meanings of assumption and possibility. In Yakut, the ancient form ending with -γυ actively functions in the sound ending with -γα and one of its functions is the expression of modal values as part of analytical forms. Functionally, it corresponds to the participial form ending with -аγ in the Tuvan.

A comparative analysis of the analytical forms of modality formed on the basis of the forms ending with -γα and -γαγ in the Yakut and the participle ending with -аг in the Tuvan showed the following.

1. The compared participial analytical forms with modal meanings in the Yakut and Tuvan reveal structural correspondences. Differences are found in terms of semantics with respect to additional meanings, while the basic meanings coincide.

2. The modality of duty in the Yakut and Tuvan have structural correspondences in “the form of the participle -γαγ-аг + lexemes with the meaning ‘duty, rule’ + affix of possession” – -γαγ тустааг, -γαγ керинөөгө, -аг узұрлуг. Yakut forms of indebtedness convey both “external” and “internal” indebtedness. At the same time, in the Tuvan, only “external obligation” is marked.

3. The modality of necessity in the Yakut is conveyed by complex analytical forms: -γαγ-аг in the form of accessories + баар лиүрөр, -γαγ-ылбөк баар. The lexeme баар ‘is’ gives the modal meaning of necessity a shade of desire. In the Tuvan language, the form ending with -аг хөрөк expresses an “external” categorical necessity.

4. The unreal modality represented by the analytical forms of the subjunctive mood in the languages under consideration is expressed, as in other Turkic languages, by structures constructed according to the scheme “future participle form + auxiliary verb in the form of the past tense/ particle”.

5. The presumptive modality in the Yakut is conveyed by the form ending with -γαγ көрүү with the meaning of a conceivable, apparent, presumptive action or quality of the object. In the Tuvan, the participial form болгө дөг particle expresses an assumption conditioned on external signs. Participation in the analytical forms of the assumption of the elements of “assimilation” of көрүү and дөг is characteristic both for the languages under consideration and for the Turkic languages of Southern Siberia.

6. Analytical means of expressing the desired modality on the basis of participle forms ending with -аγ and -γαγ in the Yakut and Tuvan include words adjacent to them with the semantics of desire, intention, aspiration.
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