

*Sonderdruck aus/Offprint from*

# Turkic Languages

Edited by  
Lars Johanson

in cooperation with  
Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen,  
Éva Á. Csató, Peter B. Golden, Tooru Hayasi, Birsal Karakoç,  
Astrid Menz, Irina Nevskaya, Sumru A. Özsoy, Elisabetta Ragagnin,  
Saule Tazhibayeva and Abdurishid Yakup

25 (2021) 1

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The journal **TURKIC LANGUAGES** is devoted to linguistic Turcology. It addresses descriptive, comparative, synchronic, diachronic, theoretical and methodological problems of the study of Turkic languages including questions of genealogical, typological and areal relations, linguistic variation and language acquisition. The journal aims at presenting work of current interest on a variety of subjects and thus welcomes contributions on all aspects of Turkic linguistics. It contains articles, review articles, reviews, discussions, reports, and surveys of publications. It is published in one volume of two issues per year with approximately 300 pages.

Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and all correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Lars Johanson, Turkic Languages, Department of Slavistics, Turcology and Circum-Baltic Studies, University of Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany. The email address [johanson@uni-mainz.de](mailto:johanson@uni-mainz.de) may also be used for communication.

Books will be reviewed as circumstances permit. No publication received can be returned.

Subscription orders can be placed with booksellers and agencies. For further information please contact: Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Germany; fax: 49-611-530999; e-mail: [verlag@harrassowitz.de](mailto:verlag@harrassowitz.de).

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <https://www.dnb.de/> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <https://www.dnb.de/>.

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2021

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.

Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printing and binding by Customized Business Services GmbH

im Auftrag der KNV Zeitfracht GmbH

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

<https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/>

ISSN 1431-4983  
eISSN 2747-450X

DOI Zeitschriftenreihe 10.13173/1431-4983  
DOI Titel 10.13173/TL.25.1

## Contents

### Turkic Languages, Volume 25, 2021, Number 1

Editorial note by Lars Johanson ..... 1

#### Obituaries

Bernt Brendemoen: In memoriam Semih Tezcan (1943–2017) ..... 5  
Hendrik Boeschoten: In memoriam Barbara Flemming (1930–2020) ..... 9  
Anett C. Oelschlaegel: Erika Taube (November 22, 1933–July 3, 2020) ..... 12

#### Articles

Aynur Abish: Swaddle and cradle, Kazakh *böle-* and *besik* ..... 15  
Musa Salan & Osman Kabadayı: On the formation of the Kazakh verb *zertte-*  
‘to examine’ ..... 20  
Ainur Bayekeyeva & Saule Tazhibayeva & Uldanay Jumabay & Irina  
Nevskaya: Kazakh anthroponyms derived from metal and mineral terms ..... 26  
Nurungul Mamut: The vowel system of the Atush dialect of Uyghur:  
Phonological processes, triggers and consequences ..... 41  
Raihan Muhamedowa: The suffix  $\{-(I)š\}$  in comparison with other action  
nominals in Modern Uyghur ..... 55  
Ninel V. Malyševa & Igor A. Danilov & Marina A. Osorova: Yakut names of  
wild edible plants ..... 79  
İsa Kerem Bayırlı: Asymmetric coordination in Turkish ..... 88  
Tacettin Turgay & Halil İskender: A semantic account of partial reduplication in  
Turkish ..... 107

#### Reviews

Marcel Erdal: Review of Klára Agyagási, 2019. *Chuvash historical phonetics. An areal linguistic study. With an appendix on the role of Proto-Mari in the history of Chuvash vocalism.* (Turcologica 117.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz .... 130  
Serkan Şener & Éva Á. Csató: Review of the *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Turkic and Languages in Contact with Turkic (Tu+4)*, 2019. Published online by the Linguistic Society of America ..... 142

Appendix. Recommended Transcriptions and Notations in TURKIC LANGUAGES . i–v



## Editorial Note

*Turkic Languages*, Volume 25, 2021, Number 1. DOI: 10.13173/TL.25.1.001

In the present issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES three papers are devoted to Kazakh.

Aynur Abish discusses the relation between the Kazakh noun *besik* ‘cradle’ and the verb *böle-* ‘to swaddle’. Are they etymologically related to each other? Hypotheses on the etymological status of *l* and *s* < *š* are discussed. The Oghur language Chuvash is an “*l*-language”, and all remaining languages are “*š*-languages”. Chuvash *l* corresponds to Common Turkic non-initial *š* in *šil* (шӓл) ‘tooth’ vs. Common Turkic *ti:š* and Kazakh *tis*. Volga-Bulghar has Oghur forms such as *ja:l* ‘year’. Mongolic has *gölige/gölöge* ‘puppy’, corresponding to Common Turkic *köšäk* ‘young animal’. Non-Altaiacists view these as early loans from Turkic. Samoyedic *\*kii* ‘winter’ was copied from an Oghur word containing the same final consonant. The corresponding Chuvash word is *χil* (хӓл) ‘winter’, but Common Turkic has *kiš*; cf. Kazakh *kis*. A first hypothesis for the correspondences is advocated by Altaicists. They regard the corresponding words as cognates and reconstruct an element “*l2*”, which is represented by *l* or *lč* in Oghur Turkic and Mongolic, but has shifted to Common Turkic *-š-* and *-š*. Non-Altaiacists assume that the words were copied from Turkic to Mongolic. They take Proto-Turkic *\*š* to be primary and explain Oghur Turkic *l* or *lč* as correspondences in terms of lambdacism, i.e. replacement of *š*. The Mongolic *l* forms are considered copies from Oghur Turkic. Oghur *l* represents a specific original sound. Róna-Tas & Berta (2011) claim that one early Proto-Turkic type of *š* existed and changed to *lč* in West Old Turkic. The consonant *l* was unstable in this cluster. Johanson suggests that the Proto-Turkic segment *\*l\** was a combination of *l* with a palatal element, realized as *\*lj* in Oghur. This gave rise to a variation *l* ~ *š* in Turkic. The Chuvash segment lost the palatal element, and the Common Turkic segment lost the lateral element but preserved the palatal element, ending up in *š*, e.g. *ta:š*, *ya:š*. Róna-Tas and Berta hypothesize that two similar verbs may have influenced the history of the word for ‘cradle’. One meant ‘to swaddle’, ‘to lay in the cradle’, and the other meant ‘to rock the cradle’. The puzzling relation between the two cannot be explained, since their connections are phonetically and morphologically unclear. But the discussion concerns the proposal that the Proto-Turkic segment *\*l\** was a combination of *l* with a palatal element. This gave rise to a variation *l* ~ *š* in Turkic. The Chuvash segment lost the palatal element. The Common Turkic segment lost the lateral element, but preserved the palatal element, ending up in *š* > Kazakh *s*.

Musa Salan and Osman Kabadayı deal with the etymology and formation of the Kazakh verb *zert-te-* ‘to examine’, ‘to scrutinize’, ‘to evaluate’. On the evidence of the corresponding Karakalpak verb *izert-le-* ‘to research’, it is argued that the verb goes back to the East Old Turkic verb *eđer-* ‘to pursue’, ‘to follow’. The paper also discusses several other possible ways to account for the morphological structure of

the suffix. The possibility that *-t-* is a parasitic sound is eliminated, since it is uncommon in Kazakh and Karakalpak. Two suffixes can come into consideration to explain the added *-t-*. One is the deverbal noun suffix *-(U)t*, although it is not attested in early works. An argument for it is that it can be followed by the denominal verb suffix *{+lA}*. The other suffix is the causative marker in *{-t-}*. If the stem includes a causative suffix, it can take a frequentative suffix in *{-lA-} ~ {-DA-}*, an option that is not entirely dismissed.

Ainur Bayekeyeva, Saule Tazhibayeva, Uldanay Jumabay and Irina Nevskaya contribute an article on Kazakh male and female anthroponyms derived from appellatives denoting metals and minerals. The Kazakh people have known the terminology of mining, ore processing and smelting for centuries. The terminology of the mining industry in the Turkic world was widely used in medieval Eurasia by speakers of Old and Middle Turkic languages. The spread of the industry went hand in hand with the use of mining terminology by the Turks, also for forming personal names. Numerous Turkic anthroponyms derived from metal and mineral names are found in both ancient and modern sources. A study of Kazakh first names shows that there are more than 160 masculine and feminine anthroponyms containing terms referring to metals and minerals in lexicographical sources. They are mostly composite, formed according to the pattern of an appellative plus an additional component, often a title or a general term denoting a person. Those components tend to be grammaticalized as evaluative markers, honorifics or markers of hypocorism. As structural components of first names they do not render evaluative semantics. Kazakh masculine personal names are mostly derived from names of metals and ores, i.e. natural materials that have not been made or processed by human beings. Feminine personal names are mostly derived from terms used for minerals and gemstones.

Two papers are devoted to Uyghur.

Nurungul Mamut treats the vowel system of the Atush dialect of Uyghur with its phonological processes, triggers, and consequences. The paper is based on extensive data collected during three research trips between 2011 and 2014. It questions the widely accepted opinion that the local variety in this region is a sub-dialect of the Central dialect together with the Kashgar variety of Uyghur. The paper deals with the vowel inventory compared to standard Uyghur and other Uyghur dialects. It is argued that the vowel system is characterized by special features. The dialect has only seven, not eight vowel phonemes, /a/, /e/, /i/, /o/, /ö/, /u/, /ü/. Although the vowel *ä* exists, it does not have any distinctive function as in other Uyghur dialects but is realized as an allophone of /e/. The dialect also differs in other respects. The occurrence of *ö* and *o* in non-first syllables and the occurrence of *e* in the coda position in mono- or polysyllabic words is not restricted as in other Uyghur dialects. The missing vowel phoneme results from the raising of *ä*. This phonological change has occurred under the influence of intensive contact with Kirghiz.

Raihan Muhamedowa treats the suffix {-I}š} in comparison with other action nominals in Uyghur. The main functions of Uyghur action nominals in {-I}š} are compared to the less productive infinitive suffix {-mAK} as well as the subordinators {-GAn}+{-IİK} and {-(y)(i)dīyan}+{-IİK}. Some types of complement clauses are discussed in which these suffixes are used. Uyghur {-I}š} has two basic functions. It derives nouns from verbs and appears as a subordinator in different types of non-main clauses. In complement clauses, it competes with {-GAn}. The paper systematizes complement-taking predicates in Uyghur according to their choice of action nominal or participial suffixes. Case forms of action nominals in {-I}š} are grammaticalized as converbs. In converb clauses, there is a choice between {-GAn} and {-I}š}. The paper discusses what semantic and syntactic features Uyghur action nominals in {-I}š} share with Turkish action nominals in {-mA} and how they differ from Turkish {-(y)}İš}.

One paper is devoted to Yakut.

Ninel V. Malyševa, Igor A. Danilov and Marina A. Osorova deal with Yakut names of wild edible plants. The names encode essential information about the material and spiritual culture of the Yakuts. The article discusses the morphological structure and the lexical-semantic features of the names. These reflect plants' external similarities with other plants or objects, place of growth, peculiarities of morphological structure, color, characteristics of growth, nutritional properties, surfaces, and practical uses. Some plant names were inherited from previous linguistic communities and some were borrowed from cognate or non-cognate languages. Because of the long-lasting cohabitation of Yakuts and Russians, copies from Russian are frequent. On the other hand, some non-derivative stems go back to Mongolian and Tungusic forms, which testifies to Yakut's close linguistic contacts with these languages. The Yakut names are thus interesting sources for research on the Yakut language contacts. The article analyzes 42 phytonyms and 48 percent of the entire vocabulary of wild edible plants is formed according to semantic principles. Seven names are based on external similarity with an object. Five names refer to the place of growth. Three names describe the morphological peculiarities of the plants. One name specifies the plant's color and another one the characteristics of its growth. One name denotes nutritional properties of the plant. One describes the plant's surface, and one refers to the practical use of the plant.

Two papers are devoted to Turkish.

İsa Kerem Bayırlı deals with Turkish asymmetric coordination. His paper examines the syntax and semantics of the clausal coordinator DA. Temporal and causal interpretations associated with this morpheme cannot be analyzed as implicatures. This leads to the claim that the coordinator is intrinsically asymmetric. Building on the analysis that coordination at the tense-phrase level is always asymmetric, the author suggests that DA can only be used for coordination and provides independent evidence for this claim. The author shows that DA can be used to conjoin tense

phrases but not complementizer phrases. He thus accounts for the relations between the syntactic and the semantic properties of DA. He finally discusses two alternatives to this analysis, and shows that they fail to explain the relation between the syntactic distribution and the semantic properties of DA.

Tacettin Turgay and Halil İskender analyze the factors governing the scope of partial reduplication in Turkish and propose a new semantic account of it, placing particular emphasis on why certain forms are unattested. Whether or not a given adjective participates in partial reduplication can be determined based on its semantic class. Scalar adjectives can, but non-scalars cannot. The authors demonstrate that, among scalar adjectives, partial reduplication is also sensitive to maximal/non-maximal contrast. The former yields “completely” semantics, while the latter yields “very” semantics. The model they propose captures both the class of adjectives that can undergo partial reduplication and the resulting interpretation. The proposal contrasts with earlier ones since it provides principled reasons for the class of partially reduplicated adjectives.

Three obituaries are included. Bernt Brendemoen writes on Semih Tezcan (1943–2017), Hendrik Boeschoten on Barbara Flemming (1930–2020), and Anett C. Oelschlaegel on Erika Taube (1933–2020). The issue concludes with reviews by Marcel Erdal and Serkan Şener & Éva Á. Csató.

An appendix containing recommendations for Turcological transcriptions and notations can be found at the end of the issue.

*Lars Johanson*





# On the formation of the Kazakh verb *zertte-* ‘to examine’

Musa Salan & Osman Kabadayı

Salan, Musa & Kabadayı, Osman 2021. On the formation of the Kazakh verb *zertte-* ‘to examine’. *Turkic Languages* 25, 20–25. DOI: 10.13173/TL.25.1.020

This study deals with the etymology of the Kazakh word *zertte-* ‘to examine’, ‘to scrutinize’, ‘to evaluate’. On the evidence of the Karakalpak verb *izertle-* ‘to research’, it is argued that the verb goes back to East Old Turkic *eđār-* ‘to pursue’, ‘to follow’. Alternative analyses of the suffixes are discussed.

Keywords: Kazakh, Karakalpak, etymology

*Musa Salan, Faculty of Literature, Department of Modern Turkic Languages & Literatures, Bartın University, Bartın, Turkey. E-mail: msalan@bartin.edu.tr*  
*Osman Kabadayı, Institute of Philology and Multilingual Education, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.*  
*E-mail: kabadayiosman@yandex.com*

## 1. Introduction

The etymology of the Kazakh verb *zertte-* ‘to examine’, ‘to scrutinize’, ‘to evaluate’ has not been dealt with in any earlier Kazakh linguistic study. This paper proposes an etymology and discusses several possible ways to account for its morphological structure.

## 2. The word in early sources

Literate Kazakhs used to write in Chaghatay Turkic, which was a common written language during the 14th–19th centuries. Thus written records of early Kazakh are limited; see Malov (1941). The verb under study in this article, *zertte-*, does not appear in Budagov’s (1869) and Radloff’s (1893–1911) exhaustive dictionaries. We can find it in a text written by the Kazakh pedagogue İbiray Altınсарın (1841–1889).

## 3. The word in linguistic works

Numerous works on Kazakh are silent about the verb *zert-te-*. The only etymological dictionary of Kazakh, *Қазақ тілінің қысқаша етімологиялық сөздігі* (1966), which contains a limited word stock, does not furnish information on it. Two etymological dictionaries covering all modern Turkic languages, Räsänen (1969) and Sevortjan (1974), do not include this word.

## 4. The morphological makeup

### 4.1. The base

The voiced sibilant /z/ does not occur in native Turkic words in word-initial position, except in onomatopoeics. The Kazakh verb thus looks like a denominal verb based upon a foreign stem. However, Karakalpak, the closest relative to Kazakh, preserves a form *izert-le-* ‘to research’, ‘to do analysis’, ‘to prospect (subsoil)’ «исследовать, делать анализ; разведывать (недра)» (Baskakov 1958: 288). We assume here that Kazakh *zertte-* has developed from the same original form.

The first phonological difference between the Karakalpak and Kazakh words is the lack of the initial vowel in Kazakh. Initial vowel deletion is not uncommon in Kazakh; examples include *nan-* < *inan-* ‘to believe’, *ruw* < *uruw* ‘to believe’, *sen-* < *isen-* ‘to trust’. Vowel deletion has not been studied by Kazakh scholars from a diachronic perspective. Instead, they have focused on elision or apheresis; see Keleşbaev & Aġanov (1951: 43–44), Ķaliev (1984: 40), Mırzabekov (1993: 105). Vowel elision before the phonemes /r/ and /l/ in word-initial position is discussed in Balakaev et al. (1954: 119–120) and Myrzabekov (1993: 41), but vowel deletion before /z/ has never been studied.

Nevertheless, thanks to the Karakalpak form, we can assume that the stem of *zertte-* was *\*izer-*. This can be traced back to East Old Turkic *eđär-* ‘to pursue’, ‘to follow’ (Clauson 1972: 67a *eđer-*). The verb is still in use in modern Turkic languages with meanings such as ‘to follow’, ‘to pursue’, ‘to chase’, ‘to look for’, ‘to accompany’ (Sevortjan 1974: 1: 242). As close relatives in the Kipchak sub-branch of Turkic, Kazakh and Karakalpak would be expected to have the base *\*iyer-*. The development  $\delta > z$  appears in Karakhanid *izär* (Borovkov 1963: 122–123) and is peculiar to certain languages (Johanson 1998: 83; Schönig 1997: 124; 1999: 64). Kazakh *izgi* [izri] ‘holy’ supports the idea that Karakalpak and Kazakh once had the base *\*izer-*. Róna-Tas assumes that Tatar *izgi* «изге» is a literary adoption from Middle Turkic and a copy from Volga Bulghar (1982: 155).

### 4.2. Causative {-t-}, deverbal noun formative {-(U)t}, or a parasitic sound /t/?

Kazakh *zer-t-te-* and Karakalpak *izert-le-* have an element before the final derivative suffix. This element may be a morpheme or a parasitic sound. Turkic causative suffixes appear when they are needed for syntactic reasons. The causative marker {-t-} is petrified in Khakas *izär-t-*, which must have lost its bare stem *izär-* long ago. If the element is a causative suffix, we have to assume the bare stems of *\*zer-* and *\*izer-*, but these have not survived. Moreover, causative forms such as Karakalpak *\*izert-*, and Kazakh *\*zert-* are not attested. This does not mean that {-t-} is not a causative suffix.

The deverbal marker {-(U)t} mostly forms action nouns (Erdal 1991: 308). It attaches to verb stems ending in vowels as {-t}, and to those ending in consonants as {-Ut}. Verbs ending in a vowel and /r/ also get {-t}, e.g. *adür-t* ‘distinction’, ‘differ-

ence' < *ad̄ir-* 'to separate'. *Ḳutaḍyu bilig* contains a derivation that preserves {-U)t}, *eḍer-t-ç̄i* (Arat 1947: 253). The marker {-ç̄I} is a denominal suffix and attaches only to nominal stems (Erdal 1991: 310). Thus \**eḍär-t* must have been derived at some earlier time. Kazakh and Karakalpak probably made use of this unattested stem.

The third possibility is that the *-t-* is a parasitic sound. The transitive stem of *zert-te-* did not require a transitivizer; this is an argument against analyzing *-t-* as a causative suffix. If the formation was \**izer-le-* with a deverbal suffix {-IA-}, then the neighborhood of two liquids would have brought about a parasitic dental, e.g. East Old Turkic *kwl̄rā- ~ kw̄ldrā-* 'to resound', *çalra- ~ çaldra-* 'to rattle' (Erdal 1991: 471). See some modern material in Eckmann (1955: 11). Kazakh has a few instances of addition of dentals, e.g. *žum̄irt-ka* 'egg'; cf. East Old Turkic *yumur-ga ~ yumurt-ga*, *sip̄irt-k̄i* 'broom', *sip̄ür-gü*, *šegirt-ke* 'locust', *čekür-gä*, *žaman-draḡ* (dialectal) 'worse', *žaman-raḡ* (Räsänen 1949: 233), *ülkön-drök* 'bigger' < *ülken-rek* (Menges 1959: 466). These are mostly examples from previous periods. Addition of dentals cannot be regarded as a frequent phenomenon in Kazakh.

#### 4.3. Denominal verbalizer {+IA-} or deverbal frequentative/intensifier {-IA-}?

Two possibilities are at hand for the word stem, a noun stem \**eḍär-t* and a verbal stem \**eḍär-t-*. Each requires different derivatives; i.e. the noun stem can be followed by the denominal verbalizer {+IA-}, while the verbal stem, on the other hand, can be followed by the deverbal frequentative/intensifier suffix {-IA-}. The former is by far the most productive Turkic denominal verb formative, throughout all periods. In Kazakh, this suffix like others starting with *l*, is phonologically conditioned, depending on the preceding phoneme, e.g. *basta-* < *baš-la-* 'to begin', *iste-* < *iš-le-* 'to work'. This phenomenon is lacking in Karakalpak, where we find *izert-le-* and not \**izert-te-*. The derivational suffix {+IA-} attaches mostly to vowel stems, e.g. Codex Cumanicus *arç̄i-la-* 'einen Streit beilegen', *ota-la-* 'heilen' (Grønbech 1942: 40, 180); Armeno-Kipchak *abra-la-* 'to take care', *čürgä-lä-* 'to wrap', *titrā-lä-* 'to shake', 'to rock' (Salan 2019: 69–70). For modern variants, see Çelikbay (2011: 79–80).

Concerning the possibility that the suffix is a frequentative/intensifier, the following can be said.

Zajačkowski deals with Mamluk Kipchak verbs derived with {-IA-}, and also provides Old Ottoman examples. He remarks that verb stems expanded with this suffix sometimes have slightly different meanings (1954: 27–28). Karamanlioğlu adds the Codex Cumanicus example *ota-la-* 'to heal' (1994: 51). Collecting more instances from Codex Cumanicus and Armeno-Kipchak texts, Salan amplifies the material regarding {+IA-} (2019: 69). Räsänen regards {-IA-} as a variant of the frequentative suffix {-AIA-} (1957: 166). For modern Turkic variants, Çelikbay remarks that in some verbs {-IA-} does not denote repetition of the action, whereas in other verbs it does. He discerns two cases of {-IA-}. One is {-IA-} as a variant

descending from {-GİLA-/KİLA-}, which denotes repetitive meaning. The other is {-IA-} which does not have a particular function (2011: 79–80).

The question arises whether Kazakh and Karakalpak possess such a frequentative or intensifier formative, or any suffix which carries out the same function. Karakalpak employs varieties of frequentatives as follows: {-KİIA-}, {-GİIA-}, {-UwIA-}, {-wLA-}, {-mAIA-}, {-BAIA-}, {-mAKIA-}, {-BAKIA-} (Baskakov 1952: 360–362, 1958: 823–824). Kazakh has some verbs expanded with {-IA-} ~ {-DA-}, {-GİIA-}, {-mAIA-} ~ {-BAIA-}, {-GİštA-} (Orazbaeva et al. 2005: 336; Mamanov 2010: 18, 21) that express repeatedness. Only {-IA-/DA-} might be important for us, as *zer-t-te-* solely can have {-DA-}. This Kazakh variant of repetition requires verbs endings in vowel. It also has a rare usage after verbs ending in a consonant, e.g. *žaniš-ta- < žaniš- + -la-* ‘to crush’, *bük-te- < bük- + -le-* ‘to bend’, *ür-le- < ür-* ‘to blow’. Consequently, we suppose a deverbal formative, a frequentative, in *zert-te- < izer-t-le-* to be plausible.

## 5. Conclusion

The etymology of the Kazakh word *zertte-* ‘to examine’, ‘to scrutinize’, ‘to evaluate’ and the corresponding Karakalpak verb *izertle-* ‘to research’, goes back to East Old Turkic *eđer-* ‘to pursue’, ‘to follow’. Alternative analyses of the suffixes are discussed. The possibility that *-t-* is a parasitic sound can be eliminated, since it is uncommon in Kazakh and Karakalpak. Two formatives can come into consideration to explain the *-t-* added to the EOT verb stem *eđer-*. One of these is the deverbal noun formative {- (U)t}, though it is not attested in early works, and the other is a causative {-t-}. An argument for {- (U)t} is that it can be followed by the denominal verb formative {+IA}. If the stem includes a causative suffix then it can take a frequentative in {-IA-} ~ {-DA-}. This possibility cannot be entirely dismissed.

## References

- Arat, R. R. 1947. *Kutadgu Bilig 1: Metin* [Kutađyu Bilig 1: Text]. İstanbul: Milli Eđitim Basımevi.
- Balaķaev, M. & et al. 1954. *Qazırgı Qazaq tılı (Leksika, fonetika, grammatika)* [The contemporary Kazakh language. Lexicon, phonetics, grammar]. Almaty: Qazaq SSR Ǵılım Akademijasınıń Baspası.
- Bang, W. 1918. *Monographien zur türkischen Sprachgeschichte* [Monographs on the history of the Turkic language]. Heidelberg.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1952. *Karakalpakskij jazyk 2. Fonetika i morfologija* [Karakalpak language 2. Phonetics and morphology]. Moscow.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1958. *Karakalpaksko-russkij slovar'* [Karakalpak-Russian dictionary]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrnyx i natsional'nyx slovarej.
- Borovkov, A. K. 1963. *Leksika sredneaziatskogo tefsira XII-XIII vv.* [The lexicon of Central Asian tafsir of XII–XIII cc.]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literaty.
- Budagov, L. Z. 1869. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' turetsko-tatarskix narečij 1–2* [Comparative dictionary of Turkish-Tatar dialects 1–2]. Saint Petersburg.

- Çelikbay, A. 2011. Çağdaş Türk lehçelerinde bir tekrar fiili yapma eki: -GILA-/KILA- [A de-verbal frequentative in modern Turkic languages: -GILA-/KILA-]. *Türkbilim/Türkoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi* 21, 73–86.
- Clauson, G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Eckmann, J. 1955. Türkçede *d*, *t* ve *n* seslerinin türemesi [Addition of consonants *d*, *t*, and *n* in Turkish]. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı–Belleten* 3, 11–22.
- Erdal, M. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation: A functional approach to the lexicon* 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Grønbech, K. 1942. *Komanisches Wörterbuch: Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus* [Koman dictionary: Turkish word index to Codex Cumanicus]. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard.
- Johanson L. 1998. The History of Turkic. *The Turkic languages*. (Edited by Lars Johanson and Éva Á. Csató). London, New York: Routledge, 81–125.
- Қалиев, B. 1984. *Қазақ тіліндегі дауістің діббістәрдің редуксіyası* [Vowel reduction in the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Қазақ SSR Ғілім Баспасы.
- Karamanlioğlu, A. F. 1994. *Kıpçak Türkçesi grameri* [A grammar of Kipchak Turkic]. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Қазақ тілінің қысқаша етімологиялық сөздігі [A brief etymological dictionary of the Kazakh language]. 1966. Almaty: Ғілім баспасы.
- Keşesbaev, S. & Аханов, K. 1951. *Қазақ тілі грамматикасы I Фonetика мен морфология* [A grammar of Kazakh language 1. Phonetics and morphology]. Almaty: Қазақтiң Мемлекеттiк Оқу Қуралдар Баспасы.
- Malov, S. E. 1941. K istorii kazaxskogo jazyka [On the history of the Kazakh language]. *Izvestija Akademii Nauk Sojuza SSR, Otdelenie literatury i jazyka*, 3, 99–100.
- Mamanov, I. 2010. *Қазіргі Қазақ тілі* [The contemporary Kazakh language]. Pavlodar: S. Torayyіrov аtындай Павлодар мемлекеттiк уніversітеті. Menges, K. H. 1959. Die Aralokaspische Gruppe [The Aralo-Caspian group]. Deny, J. et al. (eds) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*, 1. Aquis Mattiacis apud Franciscum Steiner. 434–488.
- Mіrzabekov, S. 1993. *Қазақ тілінің фонетикасы* [The phonology of the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Қазақ уніversітеті.
- Orazbaeva, F. & et al. 2005. *Қазіргі Қазақ тілі. Оқу қуралы* [The contemporary Kazakh language, Teaching material]. Almaty: Print-S.
- Radloff, W. 1893–1911. *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte* 1-4 [A preliminary of a dictionary of the Turkish dialects 1–4]. St. Petersburg.
- Räsänen, M. 1949. *Materialien zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen* [Materials on the sound history of Turkish languages]. Helsinki: Studia Orientalia Edidit Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- Räsänen, M. 1957. *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen* [Materials on the morphology of Turkish languages]. Helsinki: Studia Orientalia Edidit Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- Räsänen, M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologisches Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen* [A preliminary etymological dictionary of Turkish languages]. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Róna-Tas, A. 1982. Three Volga Kipchak etymologies. *Studia Uralo-Altaica*, 17, 152–157.

- Salan, M. 2019. *Tarihî Kuzeýbatı Kıpçakçası fiil yapım ekleri ve tarihî karşılaştırmalı etimolojik fiil sözlüğü* [Verb formatives and diachronic-comparative etymological dictionary of old northwestern Kipchak]. İstanbul: Hiperlink.
- Schönig, C. 1997. A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages 1. *Turkic Languages* 1, 117–133.
- Schönig, C. 1999. The internal division of modern Turkic and its historical implications. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 52: 1, 63–95.
- Sevortjan, È. V. 1974. *Ètimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov (Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurskie osnovy na glasnye)* [An etymological dictionary of Turkic languages (Common Turkic and inter-Turkic stems with initial vowels)]. Moscow: Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut jazykoznanija.
- Zajączkowski, A. 1954. *Vocabulaire Arabe-Kiptchak de l'époque de l'État Mamelouk Bulgat Al-Mushtağ Fi Lugat-at-Turk Wa-l-Qıfcağ 2, Le verbe* [The Arabic-Kipchak vocabulary of the period of the Mameluk State: Bulğa al-muštāğ fi luğa at-turk wa-l-qifčāğ 2, The verb]. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.