

TURKIC MORPHOLOGY SEEN BY THE ARABIC GRAMMARIANS THE PASSIVE

Robert Ermers

Radboud Universiteit, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Résumé

Cette contribution se penche sur les analyses des verbes passifs et résultatifs en turcique menées par les grammairiens arabes. Dans la théorie grammaticale arabe, certaines formes sont corrélées à une valeur unique. En arabe, il y a essentiellement deux types de passif : un passif apophonique interne, indiqué par une variation des voyelles à l'intérieur de la racine verbale, e. g. /fa'ila/ → /fu'ila/, et un passif marqué par le préfixe *in-* attaché à la racine, autrement la forme VII, qui donne l'infinitif *infi'āl* ; toutefois les formes verbales de la forme VII sont en outre souvent interprétées comme des verbes résultatifs. En turcique, les verbes peuvent être construits au passif en ajoutant au radical un suffixe **-VI-** (dans certains cas **-Vn-**), e. g. **'ur-** 'frapper' → **'ur-ul-** 'être frappé'. La forme **-Vn-** en turc peut également exprimer la forme réfléchie, e. g. **'ur-un-** 'se frapper soi-même'. Il existe en outre d'autres suffixes qui peuvent marquer le passif. Cela pose des problèmes aux grammairiens, qui les traitent de manières diverses encore que voisines : la distinction entre les deux passifs en arabe, l'absence de résultatif en turcique, le passif en turcique, la notion de radical en turcique opposée à celle de racine en arabe, les critères qui distinguent les passifs en **-VI-** des passifs en **-Vn-**, pour n'en nommer que quelques-uns.

Mots-clés

[?]Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī, *Al-Tuhfa al-Zakiyya fī l-Luġa al-Turkiyya*, grammairiens du turcique en arabe, Ibn al-Muhannā, *Kitāb al-Qawānīn li-Dabṭ al-Luġa al-Turkiyya*, Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī, passif en arabe, passif en turcique, théorie grammaticale arabe.

Abstract

This paper deals with the analyses of medieval Arab grammarians of passive and resultative verbs in Turkic. In Arabic grammatical theory, certain forms are correlated with unique meanings. In Arabic there are basically two types of passives: first, an internal apophonic passive, indicated by a vowel shift within the verbal root, e.g. /fa'ila/ → /fu'ila/; secondly, a passive indicated by the prefix *in-* attached to the root, i.e. Form VII, which results in the infinitive pattern *infi'āl* — yet verbal forms construed according to the VII paradigm are in addition often interpreted as resultative verbs. In Turkic, verbs can be passivized by adding an **-VI-** to the verbal stem (under some criteria this is **-Vn-**), e.g. **'ur-** 'hit' → **'ur-ul-** 'be hit'; the Turkish **-Vn-** form also expresses the reflexive form, e.g. **'ur-un-** 'hit oneself'. In addition, other suffixes may indicate passivization. This poses problems for the grammarians, which they tackle in similar but also very distinct ways: the distinctions between the two passive forms in Arabic, the missing resultative in Turkic, the passive in Turkic, the notion of stem in Turkic versus root in Arabic theory, the position of the inserted element, the criteria according to which the Turkic passive form is not **-VI-** but instead **-Vn-**, to name but a few.

Keywords

[?]Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī, *Al-Tuhfa al-Zakiyya fī l-Luġa al-Turkiyya*, Arabic grammatical theory, Ibn al-Muhannā, *Kitāb al-Qawānīn li-Dabṭ al-Luġa al-Turkiyya*, Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī, passive in Arabic, passive in Turkic, Turkic grammars in Arabic.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE SOURCES

Arabic treatises of other languages present an intriguing type of source material for a number of reasons. These treatises, written by specialists educated in the Arabic grammatical tradition, deal with Turkic vocabulary, grammar, morphology and phonology. In their concise descriptions and analyses, they apply extant concepts, yet they occasionally find that they have to adapt them to this new language. In this contribution, I intend to analyse what their authors write about the passive and about passive constructions.¹

The sources used for this paper are the following:

Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk by Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī (eleventh century; ed. Kültür Bakanlığı 1990);

The Margin Grammar —a large compilation of sections on Turkic grammar (eleventh-fourteenth century) in the margins of a copy of the *Kitāb al-ʿIdrāk* Veli ed-Din manuscript;

Kitāb al-ʿIdrāk li-Lisān al-ʿAtrāk by ʿAbū Ḥayyān al-ʿAndalusī (fourteenth century; ed. Caferoğlu 1931);

Al-Tuḥfa al-Zakiyya fī al-Luġa al-Turkiyya, anonymous (fourteenth century; ed. Halasi-Kun 1942);

Kitāb al-Qawānīn al-Kulliyya li-Dabṭ al-Luġa al-Turkiyya, anonymous (fourteenth century; ed. Kilisli 1928);

Kitāb Ḥilyat al-Insān wa-Ḥalbat al-Lisān by Ğamāl al-Dīn ibn al-Muḥannā (thirteenth-fourteenth century; ed. Kilisli 1921).

Most of them date from the fourteenth century, the one exception being *Dīwān* whose original dates from the eleventh century (al-Kāšġarī, *Dīwān*; Auezova 2005; Dankoff 1982-1985).² All of these sources have been edited and published, except the one I have called the Margin Grammar.

The Margin Grammar is an as yet unpublished grammar of Turkic, scribbled in the margins and between the lines of the Veli ed-Din *ʿIdrāk* MS. The author of the Margin Grammar is unknown; in fact, it is probably not an entirely original work, considering the fact that a considerable number of fragments are almost literal copies from other known sources, mainly *Qawānīn*, *ʿIdrāk* and *Dīwān*, while the style and set-up of some others shows strong resemblance to *Tarġumān* (ed. Houtsma 1889) (Ermers 1999: 41f).

Of these sources, ʿAbū Ḥayyān’s work is of particular interest, because, in addition to *ʿIdrāk*, other works of his on Arabic grammar have been preserved, such as his

¹ The author wishes to thank the anonymous reviewer for his critical remarks.

² The importance of *Dīwān* is so great, that most Turkic peoples, from Turkey to Kazakhstan, claim it as part of their cultural heritage. In addition, *Dīwān* formed the basis for Clauson’s etymological dictionary of Turkic languages (Clauson 1972).

Irtiṣāf (e.d al-Namās 1984, 1987, 1989) and his commentary on Ibn Mālik's *Alfiyya*. This makes it possible to compare his statements on grammar in *ʿIdrāk* with passages in his other studies.

The sources describe different varieties of Turkic. *Dīwān* describes Ḥāqānī, a Turkic language spoken in Central Asia at the time, whose modern descendant is Sariğ Yugur or Yellow Uygur (Clauson 1965). The fourteenth-century sources describe the language of Mamlūk military slaves in Egypt and Syria, who spoke a Kipchak language — probably (Crimean) Tatar — with Oğuz (Turcoman) material (Berta 1998). A precise determination of the Turkic language described in each work is complicated, one reason being that there are large overlaps between languages and subgroups regarding morphology and vocabulary, and another that the Arabic script as it is used in the sources does not easily allow for the expression of nuances in vowels, such as the distinction between e/a, o/u and ö/ü respectively (Ermers 1999).

From both morphological and syntactical perspectives, there are considerable differences between Arabic and Turkic. Most Arabic nouns, verbs, and adjectives can be derived from a root, whereas in Turkic word formation is based upon stems. Not surprising, therefore, is the notion that in Arabic grammar a central concept of a verbal root (rather than a stem) was developed, consisting of consonants to which other consonants (*ḥurūf*, sg. *ḥarf*) are added as prefixes and infixes, thus adding derived meanings (*maʿnā*, pl. *maʿānī*) and forming new patterns (*wazn*, pl. *ʾawzān*) that are more or less predictable in form and function. Probably for this reason, the Arabic grammatical tradition could develop into a functional grammar, in which given forms (and positions) are correlated with certain meanings (see e.g. Bohas and Guillaume 1984; Owens 1988 & 1990; Versteegh 1995 & 1997; Sheyhatovitch 2018: 169ff; Ayoub and Versteegh 2018). This perspective was enhanced by the divine status of Arabic as the language of the Qurʾān, which, it was believed, thus could only have been chosen because of its perfectness and logic in form and structure. As this perspective on grammar was the only one available, all scholars were educated in this model regardless of their origin.

2. PASSIVE IN ARABIC AND IN TURKIC

2.1 Arabic Morphology: Consonants of Augmentation (*ḥurūf al-ziyāda*)

Arabic uses morphological infixes, prefixes and suffixes which are placed onto a three-consonantal root. In the Arabic grammatical tradition, the notion of prefixes and infixes to this root is illustrated in an abstract way with the help of the paradigmatical root *f-ʿ-l*, which in turn is derived from the verb *faʿala* ‘to do’.³ When filled with the appropriate vowels, the pattern *faʿala* signifies ‘he did’.

³ See, e.g. Yavrumyan (2006).

With the help of the appropriate paradigmatic form, the base consonants from any root can easily be distinguished from any additions. In Arabic grammar, the augmented meaningful elements are called *ḥurūf al-ziyāda*; all augments are consonants. For example, the augmented consonant in the paradigmatic form *ʔa-fʔala* (paradigm IV in Western studies of Arabic) is *ʔa*, and the same holds for the prefix *in-*, *in-faʔala* where the augment is *n* only (paradigm VII). After the insertion of the pre- and infixes, often a (secondary) shift of the vowels (*naql al-ḥaraka*) occurs, for example, often the first root consonant, *f*, loses its vowel.

In some paradigms, meanings are added by the simultaneous augmentation of two consonants. For example, the paradigm (VI) *ta-f-āʔala* signifies reciprocity, i.e. the action of the verb is carried out together or reciprocally by several agents.

Note that in the Arabic morphological tradition the concept of long vowels as morphemes did not exist. The so-called long vowels were understood as a sequence of a consonant, a glide, preceded by a vowel sign: *ā* = /aʔ/,⁴ *ī* = /iy/, *ū* = /uw/. In this way, for example, the verbal pattern of the conative form, *fāʔala*, is understood as /faʔʔala/, and the additional meaning is attributed to *ʔalif*, represented as /ʔ/.

Earlier (Ermers 1999: 270-282) I analysed how Arab grammarians dealt with transitivity and causativity in Turkic. My conclusions were that they tried to uphold their theories regarding the correlations between form and function for Turkic as well (see also Ermers 2007). Yet they had to recognize that in other languages functions could be expressed by different syntactical and morphological elements that did not resemble their Arabic counterparts.⁵ They were forced, to some extent, to engage in comparative and universal linguistics. In this contribution, I intend to examine how they dealt with the passive form.

2.2 Two Types of Passivity in Arabic

In Arabic grammar, there are two distinct notions of the passive. The first is the so-called internal or apophonic passive of the verb, on the pattern *fuʔila*. This passive stands out in Arabic grammar because it is not expressed by means of an infix or, in Arabic terms, a meaningful particle, but by a vowel change: *faʔala* → *fuʔila*. The imperfect tense is subjected to changes in the pattern too: *yafʔilu* → *yufʔalu*. The subject of an internal passive verb is referred to in Arabic grammatical theory as *an-nāʔib ʔan al-fāʔil*, which can be translated as “subject by proxy” or “substitute subject” (Soltan 2009: 535). The verb is “built for the patient” or “the logical object” (*mabnī li-l-mafʔūl*).

4 /ʔ/ represents the *ʔalif*, which is preceded by /a/ (*fatha*), which then can only be realised as a long vowel (see Bohas and Guillaume 1984: 256-259).

5 It remains to be investigated whether they discerned new functions that were unknown to the Arabic system.

In the traditional Arabic grammatical theory, passivization is regarded as a process in which the agent of a transitive verb (*fiʿl mutaʿaddin*) is deleted or kept hidden or “unknown” (*mağhūl*), although not absent, leaving the former object and the verb (Bazzi-Hamzé 2007b: 94). “The subject of the apophonic passive in Arabic is obviously not the agent of the process but rather one who is affected by the process” (Maalej 2008: 224).

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|----------------|
| (1) | <i>ḍuriba</i> | <i>zayd-un</i> |
| | hit.PASS.3sg.PAST | Zayd-NOM |
| | ‘Zayd was hit [by someone]’ | |

This new situation is reflected in the verb, which assumes a new vowel pattern. Then there occurs a (superficial) syntactical shift, in which the direct object of the original verb assumes the subject position, i.e. the syntactic role of agent, and receives a corresponding nominative case ending (Carter 1981: 168ff).

The second way for indicating a passive is the use of the pattern *infiʿāl*. This pattern indicates an action without an evident cause:

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|
| (2) | <i>in-kasara</i> | <i>al-kaʿs-u</i> |
| | COMPL-break.3sg.PAST | DEF-glass-NOM |
| | ‘the glass broke (by itself)’ | |

The *infiʿāl*-pattern by itself expresses an action which the subject carries out by itself, without an agent being implied. According to Abboud-Hagggar (2006: 616), it “was used as an alternative for the internal passive” in early texts, such as Qurʾanic Arabic.

However, the *infiʿāl* pattern is also used in relation to the semantical notion of *muṭāwaʿa* ‘compliance’, where there is a cause implied; hence Larcher’s (2003: 69) interpretation as a ‘résultatif’. Versteegh (2014: 119) explains the morphological reasoning behind compliance as follows:

Muṭāwaʿa was regarded as the opposite of *taʿdiya*, that is, decreasing the valency of the verb with one, for example, *kasara* ‘to break [transitive]’ versus *inkasara* ‘to break [intransitive]’; *ʿallama* ‘to instruct someone about something’ versus *taʿallama* ‘to be instructed, to become learned in something’ (Larcher 2012: 75-77). What mattered to the grammarians was the fact that the augment (*ziyāda*) correlated with an additional meaning.

“[t]here is implicit causation underlying all forms of compliance” summarizes Maalej (2008: 225), e.g. *fatahtu l-bāba fa-nfataḥa* ‘I opened the door and it opened’ (An-Nādirī 1995: 353 *apud* Maalej 2008: 225). An-Nādirī, still according to Maalej (2008: 226), writes that the complier is not necessarily intransitive (*lāzim*), it can also be transitive (*mutaʿaddī*), which makes sense when the *muṭāwaʿa* is basically

a resultative. The *muṭāwāʿa*, from a morphological perspective, therefore does not depend on one single verbal pattern, but can be expressed with several, intransitive and transitive, i.e., VII *infiʿāl*, *infaʿala*; VIII *iftiʿāl*, *iftaʿala*: *gamamtu-hu fa-ḡtamma* ‘I saddened him, so he was filled with grief’; V *tafaʿʿul*, *tafaʿʿala*: *kassartu l-ʔaqlāma fa-takassarat* ‘I broke the pencils, so they broke’ (Maalej 2008: 226), and others.⁶ Larcher (2009: 642) writes that Form VII itself is already “the resultative of Form I”, although “in many dialects it is used as a passive of the base form.” The internal passive has become rare in modern Arabic dialects, and this process must have begun a long time ago (Carter 1981: 171). It subsists in some modern dialects on the Arabian Peninsula, e.g. in Qatar it occurs with the *u-i* form, e.g. *ḥad qutil hina?* ‘was somebody killed here?’ (Belova 2009: 306), while for Oman the imperfect 3msg form prefix has been registered, e.g. *yibāʿ* ‘it is sold’ (Al-Balushi 2016: 107; for Yemen see Simeone-Senelle 1997: 407). Instead of the internal passive, therefore, in most variants of Arabic the passive is expressed by means of consonantal prefixes and infixes to the verbal root. As a consequence, the distinctions between the agent-less *fuʿila* passive on the one hand and patterns like *infiʿāl* on the other have disappeared.

2.3 Passive Forms in Turkic Languages

In all Turkic languages, semantic and voice changes to verbs are added to a *stem*. The morphemes added can involve one or more consonants (and occasionally vowels). The most common passive suffix is **-(V)l-**, **ört-** ‘cover’ → **ört-ül-** ‘be covered’, **kör-** ‘see’ → **kör-ül-** ‘be seen’ (Róna-Tas 1998: 75; Johanson 1998: 42). In Kazakh (and Turkish), the verbal form with **-l-** is bi-functional. It serves to form both “non-passives without implied agents”, e.g. **yesik aš-il-di** ‘the door opened’ (Kazakh), and “true passives with implied agents” ‘the door was opened (by someone)’ or, in other words, “intransitivized transitive verbs” (Şahan Güney 2006: 128).

When a verbal stem ends in a vowel or **-l-**, **-(V)n-** is in Turkic used to indicate passivization, e.g. **sı-** ‘break (trans.)’ → **sı-n-** ‘break’ (Clauson 1972).⁷ This then coincides with the verbal suffix **-(V)n-** which indicates reflexivity, e.g. **yu-** ‘wash (trans.)’ → **yu:-n-** ‘wash oneself’ (*ibid.*: 870 & 942). Therefore, verbal forms in **-n-** under some conditions can express either passivity or reflexivity, e.g. **kör-ün-** (< **kör-** ‘see’): ‘to be seen’ (passive), ‘become visible’ (reflexive). A third signification of **-(V)n-** is the middle voice, e.g. Karakhanid **al-ün-** ‘take for oneself’

⁶ Khawla (2012: 129-130) lists eleven verbal patterns for the *muṭāwīʿ*, one of them, in *fuʿila*, as in *ḡadaʿahu fa-ḡudiʿa* ‘he deceived him, so he was deceived’.

⁷ Clauson (1972) notes the rare form **al-il-** as a passive of **al-**; also **bil-il-** ‘be known’ (< **bil-**) (Berta 1998: 160).

(< **al-** ‘take’) (Johanson 1998: 42). The form of the vowel **V** in the passive and reflexive suffixes is subjected to the principles of fourfold vowel harmony in nearly all Turkic languages: u/ü (rounded: back/front) and i/i (unrounded: back/front). These cannot be rendered in Arabic script (on Kipchak passive suffixes, see Berta 1998: 160).

3. PASSIVE AND COMPLIANCE IN THE SOURCES

The question is how the sources deal with passivization and compliance as semantic concepts, how they link the voice to morphemes such as **-(V)I** and **-(V)n-**, the distribution of these morphemes, and the concepts these morphemes are associated with —i.e. the internal passive or a derived form— and which terminology is used for the notion of stem for suffixes.⁸

The Turkic passive is dealt with in the sources in different contexts. Unlike Arabic, the past tense verb is not close to the unmarked form, but expressed by an ending, **-DI**, attached to the stem. The Turkic stem alone expresses the imperative. Some sources, as we shall see, discuss the passive in the context of the passive participle, which in Turkic merely requires the appropriate passive suffix to the stem, plus one other suffix which expresses the participle. In Arabic, the passive participle is expressed by means of a combination of a pre- and infix.

In *ʿIḍrāk*, ʿAbū Ḥayyān uses three different expressions: the first is related to the voice of the verb (*mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu* ‘[the verb] whose agent is not expressed’), the second to the consequences for the syntax (*al-nāʾib ʿan al-fāʿil* ‘substitute agent’), and the third to the semantic notion of the resultative (*muṭāwaʿa*, lit. ‘compliance’).

3.1 The Distribution of *l* and *n*

In some sources, the logic behind the distribution of *l* and *n* is not explained at all. In the Margin Grammar for example, the author writes quite vaguely that the rule regarding the use of *l* and *n* is what one actually hears (*al-samāʿ*: MG 36a top). Kāšġarī writes at the entry **ʿaġirla-n-** (< **ʿaġirla-** ‘praise’, *ʿukrima* ‘he was praised’) that *n* in this verb can be replaced (*mubdala*) by *l*, yielding the alternative form **ʿaġirla-l-**, but he does not explain why (*Dīwān* 148,6; Clauson 1972: 94).

The Margin Grammar writes that an unvocalized *l* is added before the marker of the personal pronoun (*muḍmar*), i.e. probably in case of the past tense verb, or before the marker of the future tense (*istiqbāl*) (MG, 37B right) —an important

⁸ In the sources, the vowels in Turkic morphemes are occasionally not explicitly written; in those cases, a period is used in the transcription, e.g. **-I-** and **-n-**.

note, since in Arabic the imperfect tense, used for the future tense, contains elements that express gender and number.

Kāšgarī states:

For every biradical (*tunāʿī*) transitive (*mutaʿaddī*) verb, if you add an *l* to it, it becomes an intransitive (*lāziman*) and passive verb (*mağhūlan*) as explained before.
Wa-kull fiʿl ʿidā kāna tunāʿiyyan mutaʿaddiyan fa-ʿidā ʿadħalta fihi al-lāma yakūnu fiʿlan lāziman wa-fiʿlan mağhūlan kamā maḏā. (Dīwān 490)

The anonymous author of *Qawānīn* provides a short analysis:

The substitute agent (*al-nāʿib ʿan al-fāʿil*).⁹ The rule (*qāʿida*) in this is that you insert (*tuḡhim*) an unvocalized *l* [or an unvocalized *n*] between the imperative form and whatever marker follows.

Al-nāʿib ʿan al-fāʿil – al-qāʿida fihi ʿan tuḡhim lāman sākina [ʿaw nūnan sākina] bayna fiʿl al-ʿamr wa bayna mā yalī min ʿalāma. (Qawānīn 26)

The author does not elaborate further. Yet ʿAbū Ḥayyān in a very concise manner provides more detailed rules regarding the distribution of **-n-**:

If [the verb] is unradical or biradical, and its second consonant is either vocalised or a silent *l*, or if [the verb ends in] **lā**, which serves the action (*ʿamal*), the addition (*mazīd*) is an unvocalized *n* (*ʿIdrāk* 133).

ʿAbū Ḥayyān bases his distribution of **-n-**, on the following criteria:

1. the verb is unradical, i.e. CV- or
2. the verb is biradical:
 - a. the final consonant of the [biradical] verb is vocalized (i.e. the stem ends in a vowel), i.e. CVCV- or
 - b. it ends in an (unvocalized) *l*, i.e. CVI- or
3. the verb, of any length, ends in **lā-** (examples below).

Qawānīn describes four contexts which determine the form of the suffix, i.e. when an *n* is used:

The rule (*dābiṭ*) regarding the position (*mawḏiʿ*) of the *n* is [1] that the verb¹⁰ consists of one single consonant, like *y* [i.e. **ya-**] meaning ‘eat!’ (*ku*), [2] or of two consonants, the second of which is vocalised (*mutaḥarrik*), like **tuša**, meaning ‘spread!’ (*ufruš*), [3] or it consists of two consonants the second of which is not vocalised, but it is an *l* [that is used], e.g. **ʿal** meaning ‘take!’ (*ḥuḏ*), **ša**l meaning ‘throw!’ (*irmi*), [4] or the verb has more consonants, the final one being **lā** which serves the action (*ʿamal*) [i.e. used to construct denominal verbs], e.g. **yumruq-lā** [*< yumruq* ‘fist’] ‘punch!’ (*ulkum*) **ʿaylā!** ‘work!’ [*< ʿay ~ e:ḏ*

⁹ On *al-nāʿib ʿan al-fāʿil*, cf. Bazzi-Hamzé (2007a: 82).

¹⁰ Correction for ‘noun’: R.E.

‘material’¹¹) (*iʿmal*) and **sūy-lah!** [< **söz** ‘word’] ‘talk!’ (*taḥaddat*) and the like. These are the positions of the *n*, and all the rest [is] the position of the *l*. [5] So you say in the constructions of these examples according to their order: **yi-n-il-dī** [‘he was eaten’] and **tuša-n-dī** [‘it was spread’], **ʔal-in-dī** [‘it was taken’], **ṣal-in-dī** [‘it was thrown’], **yumruq-la-n-dī** [< **yumruq** ‘fist’ > **yumruq-la-** ‘to punch’] [‘he was punched’] and **sū-la-n-dī** [< **sū** ‘water’ > **sū-la-** ‘to water’] [‘it was watered’] and use this as a general rule (*qis*).

*Wa-l-dābiṭ li-mawḍiʿ al-nūn ʔan yakuna al-ismu [sic, al-fiʿl, R.E.] [1] ʿalā ḥarf [wāḥid] naḥwa ya bi-maʿnā ʿkul. [2] ʔaw ʿalā ḥarfayni wa-l-tānī minhumā mutaharrrik naḥwa tuša bi-maʿnā ufruṣ. [3] wa-ʿala ḥarfayni wa-l-tānī minhumā sākin wa-lakinnahu lām, naḥwa ʔal bi-maʿnā ʿḥud, wa-ṣal bi-maʿnā ʿirmi. [4] aw yakūna al-fiʿl ʿalā ʔaktar min ḍālika wa-ʔāḥiruhu lā, allati li-l-ʿamal naḥwa yumruq-lā¹² bi-maʿna ʿulkum, ʔaylā bi-maʿnā ʿiʿmal ʿwa-sūyilah bi-maʿnā ʿtaḥaddat ʿwa-naḥwa ḍalika. Fa-hāḍihi mawḍiʿ al-nūn wa-mā ʿadāḥā mawḍiʿ al-lām. [5] Fa-taqūlu fī bināʔ hāḍihi l-ʔamṭila ʿalā t-tartīb **yi-n-il-dī wa-tuša-n-dī, ʔal-in-dī, ṣal-in-dī, yumruq-la-n-dī wa-sū-la-n-dī wa-qis ʿalā ḍālika. (Qawānīn 26)***

If we rephrase *Qawānīn*’s statements in a more formal notation, the following picture of the distribution of *n* emerges:

1. CV— one consonant, e.g. **ya-**;
2. CVCV— two consonants, a vowel follows the second consonant, e.g. **tuša-**;
3. CVI— two consonants, the last one being an *l*, e.g. **ṣal-**;
4. **-lā**— verbal stem ends in **-lā**— this category includes denominal verbs— e.g. **yumruq-lā-**, a denominal verb from **yumruq** ‘fist’.

Yet the examples *Qawānīn* gives still deviate from these rules. For example, instead of **yi-n-il-dī**, [‘it was eaten’], which contains a combination of *n* and *l*, i.e. a two passive suffixes on the stem **yi-** ‘to eat’, one would expect a form like **yi-n-**.¹³ Another point is that in his account the anonymous author does not account for the distribution of *l*.

If we combine this statement with ʔAbū Ḥayyān’s concise summary, it evolves that they are essentially identical:

1. (CV)CV— one or two consonants;
2. (CV)CVI— two consonants, the final one being an *l*;
3. verbal stem ending in **-lā**.

11 Clauson (1972: 57).

12 Em. by the editor.

13 The variant **ye-n-** does exist in the same meaning. The Turkic verb **yaŋ-** (pronounced with front vowels as [yeŋ-] ‘to beat, conquer’, **yeŋ-** [Clauson 1972]) has a regular passive form, i.e. **yaŋ-il-** ‘be conquered’. In Ottoman Turkish, the two verbs **yen-** and **yeŋ-** have merged into **yenmek** ‘to overcome’, ‘to be eaten’ (Redhouse 1978 [1890]).

The limitation in both sources on the number of consonants is difficult to understand as there are many verbs consisting of more than two consonants, not ending in **-lā** to which **-n-** can be added.

3.2 *L and n as Markers of the Internal Passive*

All sources deal with the internal passive, yet not in the same way. *Qawānīn*, for example, relates Turkic *l* and *n* to the Arabic *u-i* pattern in the unmarked verb: “The rule (*qāʿida*) in this is that *n* is that you insert (*tuḡhim*) an unvocalized *l* [or an unvocalized *n*] between the imperative form and whatever marker follows” (cf. also 4.1). Examples (without Arabic equivalents) are **ya-n-il-dī** ‘it was eaten’ (which contains a double passive, one **-n-** directly after the stem, **ya-** ‘eat’, and a second passive suffix in **-il-**), **tuša-n-dī** ‘it was spread out’ [**< tuša-**], **ʔal-in-dī** ‘it was taken’ [**< ʔal-** ‘take’], **ša-l-in-dī** ‘it was set free’ (**< šal-**), **yumruq-la-n-dī** ‘he was punched’ [**< yumruq-la-** ‘to punch’ [denominal v. **< yumruq** ‘fist’], **sū-la-n-dī** ‘it was watered’ [**< sū-la-**, denominal v. **< sū-** ‘water’] (*Qawānīn* 26).¹⁴

ʔAbū Ḥayyān briefly discusses the passive form with **-VI-** under the heading “Chapter on the addition” (*al-Qawl fī al-ziyāda*) where a great number of nominal and verbal are listed (*ʔIdrāk* 111-116). He writes: “[the **I**] is added (*tuzādu*) as an indication (*dalālatan*) that [the verb] is ‘formed for the passive form’” (*bināʔ al-fīʔ li-l-mafʕūl*) (*ʔIdrāk* 115), i.e. the internal passive:

- (3) **ʔur-il-dī**
 beat-PASS-3sg.PAST
 ‘he was beaten’

Not only *l*, according to ʔAbū Ḥayyān, but also *n* serves the function of marker of the internal passive as well. Elsewhere, in the “Chapter on the Substitute of the Agent” (*ʔIdrāk* 133), ʔAbū Ḥayyān gives the following examples of *n* and the internal passive: **ya-dī** -*ʔakala*, **ya-n-dī** -*ʔukila*; **ši-dī** - *kasara*, **si-n-dī** - *kusira*. Some of these examples recur in a summary under the header “the logical object whose agent is not mentioned” (*al-mafʕūl mā lam yusamma al-fāʕilu-hu*) (*ʔIdrāk* 112) albeit without translations into Arabic.

3.2.1 *The Passive Participle*

The author of the Margin Grammar chooses an approach based upon the passive participle, which in Turkic is marked by a passive stem plus the ending **-KAN**:

¹⁴ *Qawānīn* repeats this same text almost literally when describing how the passive participle is formed (p. 51; see discussion in 3.2.1).

[1] The “passive participle” in Arabic —as is well-known— can only be [derived] from the transitive verb (*al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī*); the same is true in Turkic.

[2] Its marker (*ʿalāma*) [i.e. of the passive participle] is that you insert (*tudhīl*) an unvocalized (*sākin*) *l* or an unvocalized (*sākin*) *n* between the basic imperative verb (*fiʿl al-ʿamr al-muğarrad*) and the marker of the connected agent (*al-fāʿil al-mawṣūl*).

[1] *Ism al-mafʿūl – wa-qad ʿulima fī al-ʿarabiyya ʿannahū lā yakūnu ʿillā min al-fiʿl al-mutaʿaddī fa-kaḍālika fī al-turkiyya.*

[2] *Wa-ʿalāmatuhu ʿan tudhīla bayn fiʿl al-ʿamr al-muğarrad wa-ʿalāma al-fāʿil al-mawṣūl lāman sākinan (sic) ʿaw nūnan sākinan (sic).* (MG 36a top)

The author here says, first, that a passive form can only be construed from a transitive verb. This is not entirely true, because in Arabic grammar intransitive verbs, e.g. *ḍahaba* ‘go’, the formation of impersonal passives is allowed (Girod 2007: 315): e.g. *ḍuhiba ʿilā al-quḍsi*, lit. ‘it was went to Jerusalem’ (Saad 2019 [1982]: 2).

He then explains that the marker *l* is put after the stem, but before **-KAN**. He exemplifies this with **wur-ğān** (*al-dārib*) ‘the hitter’ and **wur-ul-ğān** (*al-maḍrūb*) ‘the one that is hit’. He then analyses the participle ending **-ğān** as the marker of the connected agent (*al-fāʿil al-mawṣūl*), and thus appears to assign other significations to it, perhaps because this same ending is also used for the active participle. The Turkic ending does not contain any information regarding gender, number or passivity:

(4) **wur-ğān**
hit-PART.PAST
‘the hitter’, ‘who was hit’

(5) **wur-ul-ğān**
hit-PASS-PART.PAST
‘the one that is hit’

A similar statement can be found in *Tuhfa*. The passive participle (*ism al-mafʿūl*) and the passive according to the pattern *fuʿila* (*al-mabnī li-mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu*):

Its marker [i.e. of the passive participle] is an unvocalized *l* which follows (*talī*) the verb (*fiʿl*) [i.e. the verbal stem] in the three tenses (*ḥālāt*) for all pronouns.

ʿAlāmatuhu lām sākina talī al- fiʿl talāt ḥālāt fī jamʿ aḍ-ḍamāʿir. (*Tuhfa* 47v5)

The Arabic examples given here, surprisingly, contain conjugated verbs with the internal passive rather than their passive participles, e.g. *musiktu* (‘I was taken’) and their Turkic equivalents with **-(V)l-**, e.g.:

(6) **ṭūt-ül-dū-m**
take-PASS-PAST-1sg
‘I was taken’

3.2.2 K as a Marker of Passivity

In Turkic, there is a considerable number of deverbal adjectives ending in $-(V)K$ ¹⁵ (i.e. **-ik**, **-uq**, etc.).¹⁶ It makes sense to consider it a marker of passivity, albeit in a limited context, e.g. **ač-uk** ‘open’ (< **ač-** ‘open’), **yar-uq** ‘split’ (< **yar-** ‘to cleave’), **oy-uq** ‘hole’ (< **oy-** ‘to hollow out’), and **yül-ük** ‘shaven’ (< **yül-** ‘to shave’).¹⁷ The formation of these adjectives is, as far as I know, not productive.

These adjectives in $-(V)K$ can be translated with passive participles in Arabic. This is the approach chosen in *Tuhfa*. *Tuhfa* (p. 48r) lists thirteen Arabic passive participles (of the *mafʿūl* pattern) along with their Turkic equivalents, all of them ending in **-Vq/-Vk**, e.g. *maftūh* – ‘**ag-īq** ‘open’, *mašqūq* – **yār-īq** ‘split’, *maḥzūz* – **kārt-īk** ‘notched’ [**kert-** ‘to notch’],¹⁸ suggesting that $-(V)K$ is a marker of passivity. As we shall see, Ibn Muḥannā too considers *q* to have this function (cf. 4.3.1), but he mistakes **sin-uq-** for a verbal stem.

Kāšġarī takes this same reasoning regarding the use of the variants of $-(V)K$ one step further as he considers them verbal augments in relation to the passive voice of a verb (p. 328). He gives two exemplifying phrases with a verb in $-(V)K$ which he translates with an Arabic internal passive. Note that in Turcological studies $-(V)K$ is not considered a productive suffix with verbal stems.¹⁹

- (7a) **bass-iq-tī** ‘ar
buyyita al-raġulu
 ‘the man was suddenly attacked’

The Turkic verb [**bassiq-**], Kāšġarī writes, derives from an original form (*ʔaʃl*) **bas-dī** plus the *ħarf q*. **Bas-** is, in fact, a common verb which is used in the sense of ‘to attack’.

- (7b) ‘ar **baliq-ti**
ġuriħa al-raġul
 ‘the man was wounded’

¹⁵ K represents the morphemes *k* or *q* depending on whether the word is pronounced back or front.

¹⁶ Note that in Clauson’s transcription of Turkic **-q** is not used. Whether a word is pronounced back or front is to be inferred from the vowels.

¹⁷ Cf. Clauson (1972: 22, 962, 270 & 928).

¹⁸ Cf. Clauson (1972: 22, 962 & 738).

¹⁹ According to Clauson (1972: 337), Kāšġarī here mistakes the **-q** for the suffix **-siq**.

In Kāšgarī's view, the verb in 7b too consists of a stem (**bal-**) plus the suffix *k/q*. In Turcology though, **balıq** is not derived from the stem **bal-**, but from an obsolete stem **ba:**.²⁰ Kāšgarī seems to acknowledge this, because he lists **bālīg** as a noun elsewhere in his work, with the meaning 'the wounded one' [*al-ğarīh*, p. 205; also p. 107 & 131]. Perhaps a more accurate translation of 7b therefore may be 'the man was a wounded one'.

3.3 Turkic l and n as Markers of *infi'āl* and *muṭāwa'a*

The grammarians could not always decide whether the Turkic augments *l/n* stood for the internal passive or for other forms. It appears that they prefer the *infi'āl* rather than the internal passive, possibly because this also involves the addition of a consonant.

?Abū Ḥayyān in his ?*Idrāk* deals with the *l/n* both in the context of the internal passive, as I discussed above, but also in the compliance. He writes:

If the verb consists of one consonant (*'alā ḥarf wāḥid*), like their utterance 'he broke (tr.)' (*kasara*) **si-dī**, in the compliance (*muṭāwa'a*) a silent *n* is used instead of an *l*. Thus for 'he broke (intr.)' (*inkasara*) you say **si-n-dī**.

Fa-in kāna al-fi'l 'alā ḥarf wāḥid naḥwa qawlihim kasara si-dī fa-l-ḥarf allaḏī gī'a bihi li-l- muṭāwa'a nūn sākina badala al-lām fa-taḡulu fi inkasara si-n-dī.
(?Idrāk 110)

He does not give any other conditions for the change.

On the same page, ?Abū Ḥayyān, again, discusses this *l* under the heading of "consonant of the compliance" (*ḥarf al-muṭāwa'a*). There he translates the Turkic passive verbal form 3.sg **kas-il-dī** with Arabic *in-qata'a*, which we can analyse as follows:

(8) **in-qata'a**

PASS.RESULT-cut-3m.sg.PAST

'it was cut' (?Idrāk 110, 12-15)

It is difficult to tell at this point whether ?Abū Ḥayyān here refers to the *muṭāwa'a* in the semantical-interpretative sense, or whether he interprets all instances of *infi'āl* as *muṭāwa'a* throughout. The lack of any context in this phrase suggests that the latter may have been the case.

The author of the Margin Grammar is more explicit. According to him [in Turkic], no distinction is made between the "passive form" (*mā lam yusamma fā'iluhu*) and the *infi'āl* form: they overlap. In Turkic, he writes:

20 Cf. *ibid.*

[1] There is no difference between this form [i.e. the form in *fuʿila*] and the *in-fiʿāl*-form; both are rendered by means of addition (*ziyāda*) of the *l*, regardless of whether it is in the past tense (*māḍī*) or the future tense (*mustaqbal*).

[2] You say for example **ʾur-ul-dī** i.e. ‘he was beaten’ (*ḍuriba*) and likewise **aṣ-il-dī** ‘he was hung’ (*ṣuliba*), and **ʾiĉ-il-dī** ‘it was drunk’ (*ṣuriba*) and the like.

[3] The difference between *al-infiʿāl* and [the form *fuʿila*] is that *al-infiʿāl* is intransitive (*lāzim*) [while] this [the base form without **-l-**] is transitive (*mutaʿaddin*). [...]

[4] the *infiʿāl* occurs with an *n*, you say **ʾari-n-dī** [‘he is cleansed’] or the *in-fiʿāl*-form of ‘the cleansing’ (*al-naẓāfa*), and likewise **kur-u-n-dī** [‘he is seen’] or the *infiʿāl*-form of ‘the staring’ (*al-ʾibṣār*).

[1] *Bāb mā lam yusamma fāʿilu-hu – lā farqa bayna-hu wa-bayn al-in-fiʿāl fī ziyāda al-lām fī l-māḍī wa-l-mustaqbal*; [2] *taqūl min ḍālika ʾur-ul-dī ʾay ḍuriba wa-kaḍālika ʾaṣ-il-dī ʾay ṣuliba wa-kaḍālika ʾiĉ-il-dī ʾay ṣuriba wa-naḥwa-hunna*. [3] *Wa-l-farq bayna al-infiʿāl wa-bayna-hā ʾanna al-infiʿāl lāzim wa-ḥaḍā mutaʿaddin* [...] [4] *wa-qad yaʾtī al-infiʿāl bi-l-nūn fa-taqūlu ʾar-in-dī ʾay infaʿala min al-naẓāfa w-kaḍālika kur-un-dī ʾay infiʿāl min al-ʾibṣār*. (MG 52A right)

The reference to the tenses is not without importance either. In Arabic, the past tense verb of the 3.m.sg is the standard form without any additional consonants. The present/future tense (*muḍāriʿ* or *mustaqbal*) is formed by means of an extra prefix and a change in the pattern of the stem, e.g. in *ḍaraba/yaḍribu* (‘he hit’/‘he hits or will hit’). In the Turkic verbal paradigm, these are only added to the verbal stem.

According to Kāšġarī, the effect of the insertion of *n* is that “the verb shifts from transitivity to intransitivity” (*fa-lamma ʾadhalta al-nūna yuqlabu al-fiʿl min al-taʿdiya ʾilā l-lāzim*: (*Dīwān* 490),²¹ Kāšġarī suggests that both in Turkic and Arabic there is a similar morphological process in which the *n* causes intransitivity.²²

ʾar tukūn yaz-dī (*ḥalla al-raġul al-ʿuqda*) ‘the man loosened the knot’ but then the *n* is attached and they say **tukūn yaz-in-dī**²³ i.e. ‘the knot is loosened’ (*inḥallat al-ʿuqda*) and the verb has become intransitive because of the attachment of the *n* to it.

ʾAr tukūn yaz-dī ʾay *ḥalla al-raġulu al-ʿuqdata tumma yulḥaqu bi-hi al-nūn fayuqālu tukūn yaz-in-dī* ʾay *inḥallat al-ʿuqdatu fa-ṣāra al-fiʿl lāziman bi-ʾilḥāq al-nūn bihi*. (*Dīwān* 490-491)

21 If we take this remark to also be valid for verbs with *-il-*, this is not entirely true, because there are verbs without *-l-* that are transitive, e.g. **igle-l-**, (< **igle**: ‘be sick’); a disease **igle-l-dī** ‘was suffered’ (Clouston 1972: 107).

22 Kāšġarī elsewhere remarks that the *n* in general causes intransitivity, e.g. for the medio-passive or reflexive verbs (596-597).

23 Correction for **yaz-li-n-dī**, which Kāšġarī mentions as an alternative later on in the text.

Perhaps they maintain that the functions of *n* in Turkic and Arabic here coincide, i.e. namely passivization of transitive verbs.²⁴

3.3.1 *Ibn Muḥannā on the Internal Passive and infīʿāl*

In his work *Ḥilyat al-Insān*, Ibn Muḥannā writes a brief yet elaborate explanation of the passive forms. He announces a discussion of three items: “the fourth chapter on [1] the verb whose agent is not mentioned (*fīʿl mā lam yusamma fāʿiluhu*), i.e. the *fīʿila* form [2] the form *infīʿāl* and [3] the form *tafaʿʿul*”²⁵ (*Ḥilyat* 129). The patterns *infīʿāl* and *tafaʿʿul* are in Arab grammar often used in the context of compliance (*muṭāwaʿa*).

Then Ibn Muḥannā proceeds with a description of four instances in which in Turkic an unvocalized *l* is added. His point of departure is formed by the contexts in which one of the passive forms is used in Arabic. The first of these is the internal passive (*maḡhūl*) in which the *l* is, in Ibn Muḥannā’s terms, inserted (*ʿadḡalta*) to the “roots” (*ʿuṣūl*) of the verb, e.g.:

- *ʾaḡaḡa* — **ʾal-dī**, *ʾuḡiḡa* — **ʾal-il-dī*** ‘he took’, ‘he was taken’;
- *ḡaraba* — **ʾur-dī**, *ḡuriba* — **ʾur-ul-dī**, ‘he hit’, ‘he was hit’;
- *kasara* — **sin-dur-dī**, *kusira* — **sin-dur-l-dī**, ‘he broke’, ‘he was broken’.

In all of these examples, the Arabic equivalents have the internal passive. The Turkic forms differ from another. The choice for **ʾal-il-** is peculiar, for the regular passive form of **ʾal-** is, according to the rules, **ʾal-in-**, **ʾal-il-** being quite rare (Clauson 1972: 145). Further, **sin-dur-** is surprising too, because it is a causative form (**-dur-**) and the passivization process shown here (**sin-dur-ul-**) thus contains a cluster of one causative and one passive suffixes.

Secondly, Ibn Muḥannā explains, the unvocalized *l* in Turkic occurs as a marker where in Arabic the verbal pattern *infāʿala* is used. He illustrates this with the following examples:

- *ṡahura* ‘he was clean’ — **ʾarī-dī**, *ṡaṡahhara*²⁶ — **ʾar-il-dī** ‘he was cleansed’;
- *ʿallaqa* ‘he hung’ — **ʾas-dī**, *taʿallaqa* — **ʾas-il-dī** ‘he was hung’;
- *farrāqa* ‘he separated’ — **taḡ-dī**, *tafarrāqa* — **taḡ-il-dī** ‘it was dispersed’.

Interestingly, while all Turkic forms indeed contain a passive in **-VI-**, none of the Arabic examples are an actual illustration of the VII pattern (*infāʿala*).

24 A step further would be the suggestion that Kāšḡarī believed that *-n* has a cross-linguistic signification and that it is the same morpheme in the two languages.

25 Numbers added: R.E.

26 Note that *ṡaṡahhara* is the passive form to *ṡahhara* ‘cleanse’, not *ṡahura*, as Ibn Muḥannā seems to be asserting here.

Instead, they are all V forms (*tafa^{ss}ala*). Perhaps Ibn Muhannā did not intend to refer literally to the VII *infa^aala* form but rather the notion of *mutāwa^a* often associated with this pattern.

In the third place, according to Ibn Muhannā, a *q* is used as a marker of passivity, e.g.:

- *kasara*, **s.n-dī** ‘he broke’, *takassara*, **s.n-uq-dī** ‘it was broken’.

Yet a verbal stem **s.n-uq-**, as far as I know, does not exist; the form **sin-uq** is an adjective to which, in a regular procedure, a past tense ending can be added (Clauson 1972: 837). Moreover, while no doubt derived from the verb **si-** ‘break’, the adjective already contains **-n-**, which denotes passivity. In proposing here *q* as a suffix, Ibn Muhannā either follows Kāšgarī (cf. 3.2.2), who also proposes *q* as a marker of passivity, albeit with a less adequately chosen example, or, alternatively, he has had access to sources used by Kāšgarī.

In a fourth statement, Ibn Muhannā remarks that instead (*‘iwaq*) of the *l* and the *q* an unvocalized *n* can be used. The condition for using *n* is, he writes, that the preceding consonant is vocalized with an *a* (*maftūh*) or a *u* (*maḍmūm*). This same *n* also serves as the marker of the equivalent to the V *tafa^{ss}ul* pattern, the reflexive:

- *ḡasala* — **yū-dī** ‘he washed’, *tagassala* — **yū-n-dī** ‘he washed himself’
- *ḥarraka* ‘he moved (tr.)’ — **t.brā-dī** ‘he moved (intr.)’, *taḥarraka* — **t.brā-n-dī** ‘he (was) moved’.

Ibn Muhannā here appears to be saying that in regard to *n*, in Turkic no difference is made between the internal passive and the other passive forms. However, again, neither of the two examples he gives is an internal passive. In addition, his choice of the second Turkic example, **t.brā-dī** is not very adequate, since it is intransitive and clearly not the equivalent of the transitive verb *ḥarraka*.²⁷

3.3.2 Kāšgarī on the Combination of *l* and *n*

The suffixes *l* and *n* occasionally occur in combination with each other in Turkic verbs, e.g. **yaz-l-in-** ‘become loose’ and **yuv-lu-n-**²⁸ ‘roll’. In the reasoning of the Arab grammatical tradition, doubling poses a problem, since these are both meaningful suffixes which essentially serve the same function. Although Kāšgarī (490-411) does not mention this theoretical problem, he analyses the facts in some detail, in relation to the passive-reflexive verbs **yaz-li-n-** ‘become loose’ and **yuv-lu-n-** ‘roll (pass.)’ [**yuv-** ‘to roll (trans.)’], which convey the same meaning as the simpler alternative passive forms **yaz-il-** and **yaz-in-** and **yuv-ul-**, respectively. In Kāšgarī’s analysis, many of the issues discussed above come together:

²⁷ Hence its causative form **tepre-t-**, cf. Clauson (1972).

²⁸ Cf. *ibid.*: 987.

- [1] Then the *n* is combined (*turakkabu*) with the *l* and they say **yaz-li-n-dī**, i.e. ‘the knot loosens by itself’ (*inḥallat al-^ʿuqdatu bi-ṭab^ʿihi*) (*sic*).
- [2] They also say **ʿar tubuq yuv-dī**²⁹ ‘the man rolled the ball’ (*dahraḡa al-raḡul al-kurrata*). Then they say **tubuq yuv-ul-dī** ‘the ball was rolled by the action of something else’ (*duhriḡat al-kurra bi-fi^ʿili ḡayrihi*). The same applies in case of [the Arabic verbal form] *tadahraḡa* ‘it rolled (intr.)’ [i.e. there is no implied agent]. Then the *n* is attached to it (*yulḡaqu*), and they say **yuv-lu-n-dī**, i.e. ‘it rolled by itself’ (*tadahraḡa bi-ṭab^ʿihi*).
- [3] Before the attachment of the *n* to the *l* [i.e. **yaz-il-**], the verb was transitive (*lāziman*) in two aspects (*waḡhayni*). One of them³⁰ was that the action affected it [i.e. the semantic object] (*wāqi^ʿan ʿalayhi*) through an unknown agent (*fā^ʿil maḡhūl*) and the verb follows the same course (*maḡrā*) as the *l* in it.³¹
- [1] *tumma turakkabu al-nūn ma^ʿa al-lām fa-yuqāl yaz-li-n-dī ʿay inḥallat al-^ʿuqdatu bi-ṭab^ʿihi* [2] *wa-kaḡālika yuqālu ʿar tubuq yuv-dī ʿay dahraḡa al-raḡul al-kurrata. Tumma yuqālu tubuq yuv-ul-dī ʿay duhriḡat al-kurra bi-fi^ʿli ḡayrihi wa-kaḡālika ʿiḡā tadahraḡa tumma yulḡaqu bihi al-nūn fa-yuqālu* [491] **yuv-l-un-dī** ʿay *tadahraḡa bi-ṭab^ʿihi*. [3] *fa-qabla ʿilḡāq al-nūn bi-l-lām kāna al-fi^ʿl lāziman ʿalā waḡhayni, ʿahaduhumā kāna yaḡūzu ʿan yakūn al-fi^ʿlu wāqi^ʿan ʿalayhi min fā^ʿil maḡhūl fa-yaḡrī al-fi^ʿ-lu maḡrā al-lām fihi*.

What Kāšḡarī appears to be saying in this section is that **yuv-ul-** is a passive form with an implied, hidden (or unknown) agent. Yet after the addition of the *n*, resulting in **yuv-lu-n-**, which contains a (vowel shift and a) combination of suffixes —impossible in Arabic—, the verb loses the notion of implied or hidden agent and the action is carried out by itself (*bi-ṭab^ʿihi*), expressed in Arabic by a passive-reflexive form such as *tadahraḡa*.³² Thus he not only distinguishes semantically and functionally the Arabic internal passive from the *infi^ʿāl*-form, he also assigns distinct functions to Turkic verbal morphemes.

3.4 The Distinction between Stem and Root

While in Arabic the pre- and infixes are inserted before the verbal (or nominal) root called *ʿaṣl*³³ and between its consonantal elements, in Turkic all suffixes are attached to an (almost) invariable stem and clustered to one another. Because of the distinct qualities, the Turkic stem cannot be equivalent to the Arabic root

29 On **yuv-** cf. *ibid.*: 873.

30 Contrary to what one would expect here, a second aspect is not mentioned.

31 On *maḡrā*, see Maróth (2009: 13).

32 Kāšḡarī adds in a subsequent passage on the same page that tetra-radical (*rubāʿī*) verbs that are the result of a procedure of combining, such as **yuv-lu-n-dī**, are transferred (*manqūla*) from a bi-radical (*tunāʿī*) verb (**yuv-**) to tri-radical (*tulāʿī*), and from tri-radical to tetra-radical.

33 On *ʿaṣl*, cf. Baalbaki (2009: 191); Bohas and Guillaume (1984).

In the Margin Grammar and in *Qawānīn*, as we have seen above, therefore the terms *fi'l al-ʿamr* ‘imperative verb’ and *fi'l al-ʿamr al-muğarrad* ‘the bare imperative verb’ are used. This makes sense, because the Turkic bare stem, devoid of any suffixes, conveys the imperative. Other sources (*Tuḥfa*, *Dīwān*) use *fi'l* for the verbal stem. Ibn Muḥannā uses once ‘roots’ in relation to verbs (*ʿuṣūl*, see 3.3.1). In yet another context, the Margin Grammar uses *al-ʿaṣl al-mufrad al-muğarrad* ‘the basic bare root’ (MG 36B top).

4. CONCLUSIONS

It is obvious that the Arab grammarians recognized the two Turkic suffixes, *l* and *n*, that are attached to the verbal stem in order to indicate the passive form. Yet there are different points of confusion as to the distribution of these suffixes. For example, for some reason they link the distribution of the *n* to mono- or biradical verbs.

Another problem is the signification. In Arabic, the passive can be expressed by means of an internal passive along the patterns */fuʿila/* —a change within the root (*wazn*)— or */mafʿuwl/*, or via changes to the root, VII *infaʿala* or V *tafaʿʿala* each signifying different things. While the internal passive refers to an unknown, hidden agent, the VII and V forms refer to an absent agent, the subject of the verb carries the action out by itself. These forms are used in the concept of compliance, the resultative (*muṭāwaʿa*) in which an agent carries out the action, while there is a causing element. In Turkic no such differences exists and *n* can be assigned the same signification as the equivalent suffix in Arabic: intransitivization. Most sources take the functional overlap of *l* and *n*, when transferred to Arabic, for granted; only the Margin Grammar explicitly says that they coincide. It seems the authors are confused by this overlap; they would have preferred to assign the Turkic suffixes *l/n* distinct functions.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Primary sources

- Al-Andalusī, ʿAbū Ḥayyān. *Kitāb al-ʿIḍrāk fī lisān al-ʿAtrāk*. Ed. by A. Caferoğlu. Istanbul: Evkaf. 1931.
- *Kitāb Manḥaj al-sālik fī al-kalām ʿalā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. by S. Glazer. New Haven CT: American Oriental Society. 1947.
- *Irtiṣāf al-Ḍarab fī Lisān al-ʿArab*, vol. I, II, III. Ed. by M.A. al-Namās. Cairo: Al-Madanī. 1984, 1987, 1989.
- Halasi-Kun, T. ed. *Al-Tuḥfa al-Zakiyya fī al-Luġa al-Turkiyya / La langue des Kiptchaks d’après un manuscrit arabe d’Istanbul*, II, *Édition phototypique*. Budapest: Bibliotheca Orientalis hungarica. 1942.
- Houtsma, M. Th. ed. *Tarġumān Turkī wa-Ağami wa-Muġālī / Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar nach der Leidener Handschrift*. Leiden: Brill. 1889.

- Ibn Al-Muhannā, Ğ.-D. *Kitāb Hilyat al-Insān wa-Halbat al-Lisān*. Ed. by M.R. Kilisli. Istanbul: Matbaa-ı Âmire. 1921.
- Al-Kāšgarī, M. *Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk. Facsimile edition of Ali Emiri 4189*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı [Ministry of Culture]. 1990.
- Kilisli, M.R. ed. *Kitāb al-Qawānīn al-Kulliyya li-Dabt al-Luġa al-Turkiyya*. Istanbul: Evkaf. 1928.

Secondary sources

- Abboud-Haggag, S. 2006. Dialects: Genesis. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 1, 613-622. Leiden: Brill.
- Al-Balushi, R. 2016. Omani Arabic: More than a dialect. *Macrolinguistics*, 4/4: 80-125.
- Auezova, Z.-A. 2005. *Mahmud Al-Kashgari: Diwan Lughat at Turk*. Kazakhstanskie Vostokovednye Issledovaniia. Almaty: Daik Press.
- Ayoub, G. and Versteegh, K., eds. 2018. *The foundations of Arabic linguistics*, III, *The development of a tradition: Continuity and change*. Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics 94. Leiden: Brill.
- Baalbaki, R. 2009. Aşl. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 192-195. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Bazzi-Hamzé, S. 2007a. Fāʿil. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 2, 83-84. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- 2007b. Fiʿl. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 2, 90-96. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Belova, A.Gr. 2009. South Semitic languages. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 300-315. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Berta, Á. 1998. Middle Kipchak. In *The Turkic languages*, ed. by L. Johanson and É.Á. Csató, 158-166. London: Routledge.
- Bohas, G. and Guillaume, J.-P. 1984. *Étude des théories des grammairiens arabes*, 1, *Morphologie et phonologie*. PIFD 112. Damascus: Institut français de Damas.
- Carter, M.G., ed. 1981. *Arab linguistics: An introductory classical text with translation and notes*. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series 3, Studies in the history of linguistics 24. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Clauson, G. 1965. An Eastern Turki-English dictionary. By Gunnar Jarring. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 56, Nr. 4. Pp. 338. C. W. K. Gleerup, Lund. 1964. Kr. 50.
- 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dankoff, R. and Kelly, J., eds. 1982-1985. *Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī, Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk)*. 3 vols. Sources of Oriental languages and literatures; Turkish sources 7. Cambridge MA: Harvard University.
- Erners, R. 1999. *Arabic grammars of Turkic: The Arabic linguistic model applied to foreign languages & translation of ʿAbū Hayyān al-ʿAndalusī's Kitāb al-ʿIdrāk li-Lisān al-ʿAtrāk*. Studies in Semitic languages and Linguistics 28. Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill.
- 2007. The use of morphological patterns in Arabic grammars of Turkic. In *Approaches to Arabic linguistics presented to Kees Versteegh on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, ed. by E. Ditters & H. Motzki, 435-453. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 49. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Girod, A. 2007. Impersonal Verb. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 2, 315-318. Leiden: Brill.
- Johanson, L. 1998. The structure of Turkic. In *The Turkic languages*, ed. by L. Johanson and É.Á. Csató, 30-66. London: Routledge.
- Khawla, M.F. 2012. Al-muṭāwaʿa wa-taʿšīšu-hā fī al-ʿArabiyya. *Majallat Jāmiʿat Tīkrīt Li-l-ʿUlūm al-Insāniyya*, 19/10: 122-135.

- Larcher, P. 2003. *Le système verbal de l'arabe classique*. 1st ed. Didactilangue. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'université de Provence.
- 2009. Verbs. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 638-645. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- 2012. *Le système verbal de l'arabe classique*. 2nd ed. Manuels. Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence.
- Maalej, Z. 2008. Middle verbs. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 3, 224-227. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Maróth, M. 2009. Qiyās. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 11-14. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- An-Nādirī, M.A. 1995. *Naḥw al-luġa al-ʿarabiyya: Kitāb fī qawāʿid an-naḥw wa-ṣ-ṣarf*. Beirut: Al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya.
- Owens, J. 1988. *The foundations of grammar: An introduction to Medieval Arabic grammatical theory*. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series 3, Studies in the history of the language sciences 45. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: J. Benjamins.
- 1990. *Early Arabic grammatical theory: Heterogeneity and standardization*. Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series 3, Studies in the history of the language sciences 53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: J. Benjamins.
- Redhouse, J.W. 1890. *A Turkish and English lexicon. Shewing in English the significations of the Turkish terms* (Re-pr. 1978). Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları.
- Róna-Tas, A. 1998. Proto-Turkic and the Genetic question. In *The Turkic languages*, ed. by L. Johanson and É.Á. Csató, 67-80. London: Routledge.
- Saad, G.N. 2019 [1982]. *Transitivity, causation and passivization: A semantic-syntactic study of the verb in Classical Arabic*. Library of Arabic Linguistics 4. New York: Routledge.
- Şahan Güney, F. 2006. Functions of the so-called passive morpheme –(I)l- in Kazakh. *Bilig*, n° 36: 125-137.
- Sheyhatovitch, B. 2018. *The distinctive terminology in Šarḥ al-Kāfiya by Raḍī l-Dīn al-ʿAstarābādī*. Studies in Semitic languages and linguistics 96. Leiden: Brill.
- Simeone-Senelle, M.-Cl. 1997. The Modern South Arabian languages. In *The Semitic languages*, ed. by R. Hetzron, 378-423. London: Routledge.
- Soltan, U. 2009. Transitivity. *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics* 4, 535-542. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Versteegh, K. 1995. *The explanation of linguistic causes: Al-Zağğāgī's theory of grammar : introduction, translation, commentary*. Amsterdam studies in theory and history of linguistic science 75. Amsterdam/Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins.
- 1997. *Landmarks in linguistic thought III: The Arabic linguistic tradition*. Routledge History of Linguistic Thought Series. London/New York: Routledge.
- 2014. *The Arabic Language*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Yavrumyan, M. 2006. *Das System der Verbalstämme in der Arabischen linguistischen Tradition. Elemente der morphologischen und semantischen Analyse*. Bayreuth: Universität Bayreuth.