KHALAJ AND ITS RELATION TO THE OTHER TURKIC LANGUAGES

GERHARD DOERFER

0. Introduction*

The following survey of the Khalaj grammar can only be of a provisional character. Although a large amount of material (57 tapes) has been gathered, only a rather small part of this material has been evaluated. Dr. Semih Tezcan is preparing a "Morphologie des Chaladsch", and this writer a "Phonologie des Chaladsch"; but these works will presumably not be published before 1979. I hope that this survey will be of some use in the meantime.

Khalaj is only one language, but it represents as independent a branch of the Turkic family of languages as, for example, Chuvash; it is not possible to assign it to another Turkic group (Kipchak, Oghuz, etc.). It is spoken (by about 20,000 persons) in 50 villages, situated about 100 miles SW of Teheran (a map was given in Khalaj Materials, see Bibliography, Nr. 7). Each of these villages has a special dialect; the linguistic difference between the most distant dialects is not smaller (it is even bigger) than, to give an example, between Kazan-Tatar and Bashkir or between Rumeli-Turkish and Azerbaizani. Thus, the western dialects, e.g. of Talx-äh, are regarded by other Khalaj as a different language, and this is a well tenable conception.

1. History of investigation of Khalaj. Bibliography

The first scholar to hear Khalaj was V. Minorsky (in 1906); he published an article about it in 1940. Shortly after, Moghaddam published

* The following simplified transcription has been used in this article:
1 Low vowels are not marked.
2 High vowels are marked with dots in some cases (i, ę), in other cases we used accent signs (ó = high o; also ó, ę).
3 ų marks nasalized y of Yakut; i is consonantic i.
a short word-list and some phonological remarks. But the gathering of a sufficient amount of material did not begin before 1968. It is only since that time that the special character of Khalaj has been adequately evaluated. The material was gathered during two expeditions (in 1968 and 1969) and during the stay of a native speaker (Mr. Mosaiyeb Arabgol) in Göttingen (from March to June, 1970). Furthermore, Professor Bazin gathered some Khalaj material during a short trip in Persia (September 29, 1969). The following description of Khalaj is based on these materials. However, since it has been impossible to consider all differences in the forty-seven dialects, I have confined myself to (a) a reconstruction of Proto-Khalaj forms; (b) to a discussion of the forms of the dialect of Xarrāb (which is the best-investigated one, because our main authority, Mr. Arabgol, is a native of that village); and (c) to a discussion of some striking deviations among the dialects.

The following lines present a complete bibliography of works dealing with the Khalaj language (but works on Khalaj history will be omitted). They are enumerated in chronological order. I have numbered the titles of the works, and these numbers will be quoted in the following chapters.

(1) Minorsky, V. The Turkish dialect of the Khalaj, BSOAS 10 (1940), 417–37.
(2) Moghaddam, M. Gāyišhā-yi Wafs wa Āštiyān wa Tafrağ, Irān-kūda 11, Teheran 1318 h.ş.
(3) Doerfer, G. Das Chaladisch - eine archaische Türkische Sprache in Zentralpersien, ZDMG 118 (1968), 79–112.
(7) ——, (with the collaboration of W. Hesche, H. Scheinhardt, S. Tezcan) Khalaj materials, UAS 115 (1971).


The following works of mine have just appeared or are to appear:


(17) *Zur These der drei türkischen “Quantitäten”,* Sovetskaja Tjurkologija Cf furthermore:


2. Phonology

2.1. Vowels

The Proto-Khalaj vowel system is the one characteristic of Turkic:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{i} & \quad \text{u} & \quad \text{o} \\
\text{ä} & \quad \text{i} & \quad \text{ü} & \quad \text{ö}
\end{align*}
\]

However, there are some striking features:

(1) Khalaj has the original system of Proto-Turkic threefold quantity (or pitch-quantity), namely, short: long (or level-long, or half-long): Diphthongal (moved length), e.g. in *hat* ‘horse’; *bəš* ‘head’; *təŨ*
‘narrow’. (Bazin, who investigated the dialect of Dāyān, distinguishes short : half-long : long). In this respect, Khalaj is extremely important for the reconstruction of Proto-Turkic, since it is the only Turkic language which has preserved this threefold opposition (in lento speech). Cf. (7), chapter 13 (pp. 183–267). Even Turkmen (and Yakut) have changed bāš > baš (they generally change long vowels to short ones). The proofs for the originality of the Khalaj quantity system are the following:

a) We have taken Khalaj materials on tape and listened to them rather thoroughly, v. (7). 40.

b) Bazin (who did not know 7) also noticed the same threefold quantity.

c) Arabgol, our native speaker, transcribed the words quoted above (in Arabic script): ht, b’s, t’r; i.e. for him Khalaj bāš does not have a short vowel. (as Turkmen baš does).

d) I requested the Physikalisch-technische Bundesanstalt, in Braunschweig to determine the phonetic annotations according to Grützmacher. These clearly proved an opposition of short : long: somewhat longer + a moved pitch, v. (17).

e) Logical consistency. The generally accepted “explanation”, that in cases like al-Kāšyari bāš > Turkmen baš (although al-Kāšyari qāš ‘brow’ > Turkmen ġāš) we find a “tendency to shorten”, is not a real explanation. (What if an Indo-Europeanist did not know Verner’s law and said that in cases like German ziehen : gezogen, we find a “tendency of h to become g”? A development bāš > Turkmen baš, but qāš > ġāš is unintelligible, whereas the assertion bāš > baš, qāš > ġāš is a genuine explanation.

f) As my student Tezcan has proved in his Ph. D. thesis (Das uigurische Insadi-Sūtra, Berlin 1974, pp. 12, 94)’in some cases in Ancient Turkic not only őt ‘fire’ is written oot, but ot ‘grass’ is also written the same way. Based on Turkmen it seems to be odd that not only does the long ő of őt ‘fire’ appear in this way, but also the short o of ot ‘grass’. However, the Khalaj forms hű’t ‘fire’, uot ‘grass’ (from Proto-Turkic *pőt, ot, respectively) explain the Ancient Turkic way of writing. Another item: qool ‘arm’ > Turkmen ġol, but al-Kāšyari qōl, Khalaj quol, etc.
g) As Mr. Nauta will prove in his dissertation, the Chuvash vowel system can only be explained on the basis of a threefold opposition in Proto-Turkic; e.g. Proto-Turkic *a > Chuv. ĭ, but *ā as well as ā > u.

h) Khalaj agrees with the Karakhanide sources, above all, with al-Kāšyārī. Cf. (7). 217, 234–5 where it has been shown that in correspondence with the Karakhanide words qōl, āš, kōz, ūč, bāš, ār̥, yēl, būr̥–, īl, we find forms with (unmoved) long vowels in Khalaj; whereas Turkmen has short vowels.

(2) On the other hand, we find some Iranian influence: /a/ normally is pronounced [ā] (labialized), e.g., hāt ‘horse’, /ä/ is pronounced [ā] (a vowel between ā and a), like a in English hat. In some villages short and (unmoved) long /a, ā/ have become ā (Xurax-ābād hāt ‘horse’), or we find variants, such as in Dāγān: bāš ‘head’ (older generation, speaker 75 years old) ~ baš (younger generation, speaker 30 years old).

(3) Khalaj has preserved (or may have preserved) some original oppositions (perhaps those between -i and -e, -ī and ē) in the auslaut (just as in Brahmi-Turkic, Yakut, New Uighur), e.g. ākkī (Talx-āb ākkū) ‘two’: yātti ‘seven’, cf. also alta ‘six’ (all dialects). Note: i means closed (high) i, i means open (low) i. Cf. (7). 161–2.

(4) The reduced vowels of Ancient Turkic (= Uighur Turkic i /ī/ ü /u in non-first syllables) have become *ü /u and, later on (cf. point 5), i /u. However, we find many variants. E.g., we normally find qa*-dun ‘relative-in-law’, qa*run ‘belly’, but qā*dīn, qa*rīn in some villages. Sometimes we find such variants as in Mansūr-ābād: qa*dun (isolated), but qādīn ąbā ‘mother-in-law’. The front variant į is rare, but cf. Talxāb kāndāk ‘navel’ = Middle Turkic kindik (whereas Talx-āb has at the same time kālin ‘bride’: Xalt-ābād kāľūn = Middle Turkic kālin). Cf. (7). 173–4.

In some dialects even -i / -ı have become -u / -ü, e.g., Talx-āb ba*jū ‘sister’, ākkū ‘two’.

(5) A remarkable dialectal difference is the development of *ü, *ö. As a general rule, these vowels have been preserved (or only quite slightly delabialized) in the North (e.g., Talx-āb, Xalt-ābād, Ispit, Mīhr-i Zamīn) whereas we find delabialized forms in the South (in the main part of the Khalaj area): ü > i, ö > i, ę, e.g., kīl– ‘to laugh’, kōz ‘eye’ (in the listed villages): kīl–, kīz ~ kēz (in most other villages).
2.2. Consonants

As for consonantism, the following points are relevant:

(1) Khalaj has preserved original t-, k- (in contrast to Azerbaijani): til ‘tongue’, kiz ‘eye’, etc. Cf. (3). 100–1.

(15). The consonants t-, k/q-, p- have been preserved as well, e.g. in Qara-sū topuqum ‘my ankle’, Talx-āb hadaqın ‘his feet (acc.)’, and this quite in contrast to almost all modern Turkic dialects (of Turkish topek : topuğum, ayak : ayağın) but agreeing with Ancient Turkic.


(3) Khalaj has changed Ancient Turkic ā > n (not to y- as most of the Turkic dialects); qanu ‘which’, qu’n ‘sheep’, etc. Cf. (7). 160, 172–3.

(4) Khalaj has preserved Ancient Turkic h- (cf. 10): hiζl, høl ‘wet’ (cf. Azerbaijani, New Uighur höl, Uzbek hal); but in contrast to the Turkic dialects mentioned before it has preserved h- (< Proto-Turkic *p-) in all cases (even in hûr ‘man’, hadaq ‘foot’, etc.). To a Middle Mongolian h- always corresponds Khalaj h-: Middle Mongolian hûrgû ‘to be frightened’ = Khalaj hîrk-, MMo. harq ‘excrement’ = Kh. harq, Mmo. hûtûgûn ‘vulva’ = Kh. hît ‘hole’. Cf. (7). 163–5, (10), (15), (16). For the original character of Khalaj h- < *p- I have found the following proofs:

a) h- never appears prothetically in loanwords (whereas the Azerbaijani dialects with sporadically secondary h- show such forms as haf-tamobil ‘Russian automobil’).

b) Where Azerbaijani, New Uighur, and Uzbek show h-, Khalaj always shows h-, as well (v. hiζl, above).

c) Where Middle Mongolian shows h-, Khalaj does the same (v. hîrk-, above, by the way, cf. also Azerbaijani hûrk-, etc.)

d) Khalaj shows a well-balanced distribution of h- and vowel in the anlaut (whereas secondary h- in Azerbaijani dialects is sporadic).

e) Derived forms always preserve h-, even in such cases which for a native speaker may be etymologically imperceptible, such as hû>tun ‘firewood’, from hû>t ‘fire’.

f) The distribution of the opposition h- : ɔ- is absolutely uniform in all Khalaj dialects, quite in contrast to the Azerbaijani dialects. Con-
sidering the enormous differences among the Khalaj dialects (v. chapter O.) this fact must be a relevant.

g) h- and ḍ- are found in the same positions (= have the same distribution); i.e., they must be different phonemes.

h) Some Ancient Turkic words in a Tibetan source show h- (e.g., hadag ‘foot’ = Khalaj hadaq).

i) Finally, the opposition can be reconstructed for Ancient Turkic, in an indirect way, v. (10).

(5) A characteristic development is that of –y– (and –y–): Whereas in most of the dialects we find –n– (e.g., mānā, sānā ‘to me, to you’ in Naudih, Nadr-ābād, Mūsī-ābād, Saqarcūq, Xurak-ābād, Maucān, Talx-ābād), –y is found in Xarrāb, Xalt-ābād (māyā, sāyā) and the intermediate sound –ū– in Kārdiyān (māūā, sāūā). Actually, we find many variants.

(6) Of course, there are many minor dialect differences. E.g., some dialects have lost –r– before consonants (Ḍāyān guot ‘worm’, elsewhere qūr < *qūr, Talx-āb bōk ‘hat’, elsewhere biryāk and similar forms < *bōrk); throughout all Khalaj stan we find bī ‘one’ (< *bīr). Some Northern dialects show –č > –š (Xalt-ābād, Talx-āb īš ‘three’ : elsewhere īč). We find a large number of assimilations, and similar phenomena. E.g., the word ‘egg’ (ATu. yumurtə) has become yumurqa (most dialects) ~ yumurxa (Maunṣūr-ābād, Maucān) ~ numurqa (Qara-sū, Naudih, Mūsī-ābād) ~ numurxa (Bāγ-i yak, Sīt, Xalt-ābād) ~ numurtgā (Talx-āb); Ispīt yumurta (probably ~ Azeri). The most likely reconstruction may be yumurtqa > yumurtqa (–γ– booming voiceless after voiceless –t–, assimilation) > yumurqa (in most dialects, only Talx-āb—which is in many points isolated and by some Khalaj even considered to be a different language—has preserved –t–) > numurqa (assimilation: y– > nasal n– before the nasal –m–). As to the many differences of dialects, we are just beginning to investigate.

2.3. Stress

Stress is just as in the other Turkic languages (or as in most of them), even in such cases as śuvdā ‘from the house’; šāvē ‘in the house’.
3. Morphology

3.1. The noun

3.1.1. The usual *plural* suffix is 
-\( \text{lar} / -\text{lär} \), no archaic features.

3.1.2. The *case* system of Khalaj shows many striking features. Here are two paradigms, one for a stem ending in a consonant, the other for a stem ending in a vowel (forms of Xarrâb):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Locative</th>
<th>Ablative</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Equative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hâv ‘house’</td>
<td>hâv</td>
<td>hâv-kâ</td>
<td>hâv-i</td>
<td>hâv-čâ</td>
<td>hâv-čâ</td>
<td>hâv-la</td>
<td>hâv-vara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bâba ‘father’</td>
<td>bâba</td>
<td>bâba-qa</td>
<td>bâba-y</td>
<td>bâba’-čâ</td>
<td>bâba-čâ</td>
<td>bâba’-la</td>
<td>bâba’-vara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following points are relevant:

(1) Instead of a special genitive form the nominative is mostly used, just as in Ancient Turkic (and Yakut). The nominative, by the way, is used as *casus indefinitus* in other constructions as well, such as (Maucân) \( i’rdik bâluq ‘we arrived at (our) village’ \); but Persian influence is possible here.

(2) The accusative is in \(-i\) (as in Yakut), even after vowels \( -y < -yi, -i \) (whereas Yakut has \(-ni\)). This suffix may have developed from such pronominal Turkic forms as mân-i ‘me’; but even a development from Ancient Turkic –ig cannot be excluded (e.g., Ancient Turkic ällig ‘fifty’ is represented in the Khalaj dialects by such forms as ällig, ällîs, ällîr, ällî; the accusative in \(-i\) may have been an original *presto* form). At any rate, we do not find an accusative in \(-nî\), neither after vowels (as in Yakut, Azerbaijani, Khorasan-Turkic, Turkmen), nor after vowels and consonants (as in most Turkic languages).

(3) The locative in \(-čA\) is \( = \) the Ancient Turkic *terminalis* (which is sometimes wrongly called “equative”, cf. Ancient Turkic bel-čâ bo-
yoz-ča suwda yorîp ‘up to their hips and throats walking in water’, J.r. Hamilton: Le conte bouddhique du bon et du mauvais prince en version
ouïgoure, Paris 1971, 26). Only in pronominal forms do we find a locative in \(-dA\) (cf. chapter 318).

(4) The ablative is \(-dA\) is the same as in Ancient Turkic and the Yakut Partitive (only in Xalt-ähäd we find \(-dAn\)).

(5) \(-lA\) seems to be an abbreviation of \(bilā\) ‘with’ < Ancient Turkic \(bi\)lā (as in other Turkic languages), rather than the Turkic suffix \(-lA\) (taq-la ‘at dawn’, etc.).

(6) As to \(-vāra\) cf. Persian \(vār\) ‘like, similar, equal’.

3.1.3. The possessive suffixes are (dialect of Xarrāb):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>hāv</th>
<th>bāba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>hāv-im</td>
<td>bāba-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-iy</td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>-(i)miz</td>
<td>-miz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-iż</td>
<td>-yįz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-lāri</td>
<td>-lari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the declension of the possessive suffixes we find the following striking features (apart from variants having merely a phonological explanation, such as \(hāv-in\) ‘your house’, in dialects where Ancient Turkic \(-ŋ\) has become \(-n\):

(1) Even in this case, the genitive is normally like the accusative: \(bābam ŏyli\) ‘my father’s son’ (rather rarely \(bābamuy ŏyli\)).

(2) It is only after the pronominal suffix of the third person that we find the genitive in \(-nuy\) (\(bābasi núy ŏyli\) ‘his father’s son’), whereas in the majority of the Turkic languages \(-nŋ\) (with \(-n\)–) is the normal form. Cf. point (5).

(3) The dative is: \(bāba-m-a, bāba-ya, bāba-si-ya, bāba-miz-qa, bāba-yiz-qa, bāba-lari-ya\); i.e. it resembles the Ancient Turkic system: dative in \(-KA\), after \(-n–\) (i.e. the combination \(-nqa\) > \(-ŋA\) (> \(-yA\) in most Khalaj dialects); only in the first person singular has \(-A\) become the normal form of Khalaj (Ancient Turkic \(-KA \sim -A\)), in analogy to the second person singular.

(4) The accusative form is \(-U, -I\) (after consonants) \(\sim -y\) (after vowels), e.g. (Xarrāb) \(bābamuy kerdūm\) ‘I have seen my father’) : bāba-
siy kerdüm 'I have seen his father' (~, e.g. Mansūr-ābād, diwārīn čū-kīyam 'I shall construct its wall', as in Ancient Turkic).

(5) In the third person, forms without -n- are usual: oylīda 'from his son' (in contrast to Ancient Turkic oylinda). This is the same analogical development as in New Uighur. Only in the genitive form -n- has been preserved (cf. point 2).

(6) Observe: oylī 'his son', but in all other cases oylīda (with high i), etc.

(7) After words designating parts of the body or relatives we often find a double possessive suffix: állisi 'his hand' (Mūsī-ābād, Hizār-ābād). Cf. OLZ 66 (1971). 339.

3.1.4. The comparative suffix is -tar / -tār (← Iranian), e.g., bīdiktār 'bigger'; the superlative uses a circumlocation: 'the biggest village' = hāmā baluqlar bīdiktār baluqi, literally "of all villages the bigger village", and similar constructions.

3.1.5. The numerals have the forms: bī, ākkī (Talx-āb ākkū), tē (Northern dialects ṣūṣ), tīrst (~ tōrīst), bīnš, altu, yātti, sākkiz, toqquz, ān; yigirmi, hottuz, girq, állig (~ álliy, állī, etc.), altmiš (~ altmuš), yātmiš, sūysān, toxsan, yīz (~ yūz), miyk (Talx-āb mīn. We find the following special features in the dialects:

(1) The higher numerals 70, 80, 90 are very often Persian: hásta'd, hásta'd, nāvād (this is just as in many Khorasan Turkic dialects which have been influenced by Persian in the same extreme manner as Khalaj; by the way, some Khorasan dialects also have the comparative in -tar, cf. 314.). Often we find variants like nāvād ~ toxsan (e.g., Talx-āb).

(2) In Kārdiyān we find '80' hásta'd ~ ākkī girq (= "2 x 40")

(3) In the speech of many villages we find numerals compounded with hottuz '30' (the h- of which disappears in presto speech): '60' ākki-ottuz, '70' ākki-ottuz-(u-)ān (= 2 x 30 + 10), '80' ākki-ottuz-yigirmi, '90' īcŏttuz, even '150' bīnš-ottuz. Cf. (7). 166 (e.g., Xalt-ābād).

(4) In some villages (e.g., Xarrāb, Sift) an ordinal suffix -minci exists (as in Turkmen and Azerbaijani dialects).

3.1.6. Some special postpositions are these: saru 'because of' (with ablative) = Ancient Turkic sari, arsa 'beneath' = ATu. asra, hōya 'be-
hind’ <ATu. *āγa (converb of ἀγ—‘to come back’, cf. 323.), bārā ‘since, on this side of’ = ATu. bārō, ārā ‘on that side of’.

3.1.7. The personal and demonstrative pronouns (of Xarrāb) are these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom.</th>
<th>‘I’</th>
<th>‘we’</th>
<th>‘thou’</th>
<th>‘you’</th>
<th>‘this’</th>
<th>‘that’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mān</td>
<td>biz</td>
<td>sān</td>
<td>sīz</td>
<td>bō’</td>
<td>ō’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bizlār</td>
<td>sīzlār</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>mānūm</td>
<td>bizūm</td>
<td>sānūy</td>
<td>sīzūy</td>
<td>mu’nuy’</td>
<td>u’nuy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>māyā</td>
<td>bizkā</td>
<td>sāyā</td>
<td>sīkā</td>
<td>mu’ya’</td>
<td>u’ya’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>mānū</td>
<td>bizū</td>
<td>sānū</td>
<td>sīzū</td>
<td>mu’nū</td>
<td>u’nū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>māndičā</td>
<td>bizdičā</td>
<td>sāndičā</td>
<td>sīzdičā</td>
<td>mu’ndiča</td>
<td>u’ndiča</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbL.</td>
<td>māndā</td>
<td>bizdā</td>
<td>sāndā</td>
<td>sīzdā</td>
<td>mu’n’dā</td>
<td>u’n’dā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins.</td>
<td>māndilā</td>
<td>bizdilā</td>
<td>sāndilā</td>
<td>sīzdilā</td>
<td>mu’n’dilā</td>
<td>u’n’dilā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equ.</td>
<td>māndivara</td>
<td>bizdivara</td>
<td>sāndivara</td>
<td>sīzdivara</td>
<td>mu’n’divara</td>
<td>u’n’divara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plural forms of the demonstrative pronouns are regular: bōllar, òllar (loo. bōllarēca, etc., only in the instrumental bōllarlā ~ bōllardīla). We find the following striking features:

1. In some case forms we find an infix -di- (originally = adverbialis, e.g., in ATu. qāṭiydī ‘firmly’), which is found in ATu. pronouns as well: A.v. Gabain: Alttürkische Grammatik, Leipzig, 1950. 91: māndiðā = Khalaj māndičā, sintīdā = sāndičā. The form u’nča of the Talx-āb dialect may be shortened from u’n’diča; but it may correspond to onda of other Turkic languages, as well.

2. The dative is not *baγa, *maγa, but analogous to the other case forms, varying only according to the phonetic laws (−η− > −n−, −ń−, −y− in the dialects, cf. 22., point 5). It resembles Azerbaijani forms (which fact may be a mere coincidence: the same tendency of analogy in both languages).

3. The original ATu. forms were bo : ol. The form in -l has been preserved in the plural: òllar, and, for its part, influenced bolar ‘these’ > bōllar; on the other hand, the singular form bō’ has influenced ol ‘that’ > ō’.

4. We find a kind of ablaut o’ (nominative): u (other case forms) in the demonstrative pronouns (just as in Ancient Turkic and many modern Turkic languages), in all Khalaj dialects (Talx-āb ū’o ‘that’ ~ presto ō’ : u’nča; Winārē o’, bo : u’nuy, ūna, mu’nuy, mu’nā, etc.).
However, we find no ablaut of the type ATu. mān ‘I’: mini (meni?) ‘me’. (In some Khalaj dialects, among them Xarrāb, Bunčinār, there seems to be an opposition mān ‘I’: māni ‘me’).

Some adverbs have been derived from these stems, e.g., buṭra ‘here’, ura ‘there’ (also niṭrā ‘where’). Here we find some exceptions from the normal declension; the dative is = the nominative, the locative is buṭda, etc. (ablative buṭrdā, etc.).

The interrogative pronouns are: nā ‘what’ (accusative nāy), kim ‘who’ (Xarrāb, ~ Manšūr-ābād kīm, which may be, connected with ATu. kām = Oirat and some other Turkic languages, even Chuvash kam < kām); qāa ‘where, which’ (ō qīz qāa ‘where is this girl?, qāa yānda kāliyoruy ‘on which side do you come?’); qāni, qāni, qānu ‘where, which’. Kim shows forms with –dī, cf. point (1), above.

3.1.8. The copula shows two series, after vowels, and after consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘I am’</th>
<th>after vowels</th>
<th>after consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘thou art’</td>
<td>–rsām</td>
<td>–ām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘he, she, it is’</td>
<td>–rī</td>
<td>–ār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘we are’</td>
<td>–rsāk</td>
<td>–āk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(all of) you are’</td>
<td>–rśāyiz</td>
<td>–āyiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘they are’</td>
<td>–rī, –lār</td>
<td>–āllār</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These forms are derived from ATu. ār- ‘to be’ (cf. also Khalaj ārti ‘he was’ = ATu. ārti), the suffixes are influenced by the perfect forms (cf. chapter 325.). Instead of –ār (or –rī?) we often find the fuller (more archaic) form āri (e.g., Talx-āb härin bācusi, balduz āri ‘the husband’s sister is called “balduz”’ ~ hāy-vāra-ru ‘it’s like the moon’). The forms –rsām etc. may be derived as follows: mān Ali-ṣām ‘I am Ali’ < ‘if I am Ali’ (Ali ārsām, cf. Ali’rti < Ali ārti ‘this was Ali’); this may have been a modest kind of expression. In some dialects, e.g. Sift, we find simplified forms like hāvčāsām instead of hāvčārsām ‘I am at home’ (cf. 22., point 5).

3.2. The verb

3.2.1. We find two kinds of predicative suffixes, cf. (9). 297. The normal forms are:
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sg.</td>
<td>-(U)m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-(U)y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. pl.</td>
<td>-(U)K(In)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-iz ~ -yiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-Ar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These forms are well-known in other Turkic languages as the forms of the perfect (and, mostly, conditional). In Khalaj, they are almost universal, e.g., also in the present tense in -yor-, in the future tense in -GA-, etc. The only exception is found in the aorist, and this only in the I. plural: -miz, e.g., kāl-i̱miz ‘we come’ (: kāl-iyoruq ‘we are coming’). Interesting are the I. pl. forms in -KIn, e.g., aliyaqin ‘we shall take’ (Manṣūr-ābād). Some tenses are combined with the copula, e.g., kālmiś ām ‘I have come’ (< kālmiś ārīr mān), not *kālmiśim.

As I have shown in (9). 331–40, there is a certain chance that the conjugation with possessive suffixes is the original one in Turkic (i.e., originally not only kāl-t-im ‘I came’ but also in the aorist tut-a-m ‘I hold’), whereas the forms with personal pronouns originally were used only after nouns and adjectives (alp mān ‘I am courageous’, bōg mān ‘I am a prince’), only secondarily influencing verbal forms (tutar mān ‘I hold’). Furthermore, there is a certain chance that the different vowels of the aorist (−A−, −U−, −I−) originally were aspects (markers of directions). However, up to now these are unconfirmed speculations.

3.2.2. The verbal nouns are of two kinds: infinitives and participles.

We find infinitives in −mA, −MAK, −GU (e.g., kālgūsi u̱lmāta ‘he may not come, let him not come’, lit. ‘his coming may not be’, kālgūcā tā ‘until one comes’), −DUK (use very similar to Osmanli, e.g., kāldū-kūm kīn ‘the day when I came’, kāldūkīmū ‘when I came’).

The participles are in: −mīš (negative −mādūk / −maduq), mostly predicative (but, e.g., Xarrāb pusilmīš ‘destroyed’, Mūsī-ābād bišmiś ‘cooked’); −GUr (only in curses, such as bīsrī yiğgūr ‘may the wolf eat [him]’); −GULUK (e.g., Xalt-ābād kālgūluğ ām ‘I must come’, cf. ATu. −GULUK); −GILi (normally marking perfect, or past tense: Xalt-ābād kāšgūli i̱l ‘last year’, lit. “the year which has passed” = Winārč kāşgūli i̱l, Kārdiyan bō kāşgūli hûlûr ‘these arrived men’; as a noun marke-
ing a usual actor, i.e., somebody who has always done something and continues to do it even now, e.g., Xarrāb hikmāk yaprīli ‘the baker’, lit. “the bread-maker”; this form is derived, by metathesis, from ATu. -Gli; -An marks an action performed continuously (Bunčīnār hīnān tēvā ‘riding camel = camel for riding’, Xalt-ābād kalān yīl ‘coming year = next year’), it very often is in competition with -Gīlī (cf. hikmāk yapan ‘baker’ in Nadr-ābād, Māsī-ābād, Hizār-ābād, Kārdīyān); rather seldom we find -AGAn (cf. Middle Turkic, al-Kāšgāri, e.g., Talx-āb kūlāgān oyyul ‘the [always] laughing son’ [∼ kūlān hār ‘the laughing man’], a marshy valley near by Talx-āb is called yīdāgān dārā ‘Stinking Valley’); the participle in -r has been preserved only in some fixed terms, such as (Talx-āb) kūn batar ‘evening, West’ (“sun going down”), kūn ēlār ‘East’.

All participles may be used as predicative forms when combined with the copula, e.g., Talx-āb mān kūlgīlī-sām ‘I have come’.

I can not decide whether -An is a loan suffix from Azeri or whether Middle Turkic -GAn is a contamination of older -An (preserved in Khalaj) and -AGAn (preserved in Khalaj and in Middle Turkic; neither -AGAn nor -GAn are found in the oldest Turkic documents: the Orkhon inscriptions). I have the impression (corroborated by some facts of Khorasan Turkic) that -GAn is not the original form of Proto-Turkic but rather a contamination of -An and -AGAn (cf., e.g., Khorasan Turkic of Gürgi: išlāgān ‘working’, with presumably the same contamination although Khorasan Turkic, as an Oghuz language, ought to lose -g-).

3.2.3. Converbs are rare in Khalaj. They continue to exist in some imperative forms (cf. 324.), in some fixed terms such as īnā ‘below’ (< ‘going down’), hāya ‘back, behind’ (< ‘going back, turning’), (Bunčīnār) argūyēh hīnā kāčām ‘I mount onto your back’, (Maucān) varibilidim ‘I was able to go’, hay-yali ‘in order to say’, bošladiq varyali ‘we began to go’ (also Xarrāb, Bunčīnār, etc.), (Xarrāb) kīlā kīlā vardūm ‘I went off, continuously laughing’ (even here kilma’la is preferred). Cf. (9), 318-9: the converb in -“p is preserved only in the imperative. Only two converb forms are productive and frequently used in Khalaj: -GAli and (to lesser degree) -A (doubled).

3.2.4. The imperative forms of Khalaj are very numerous and difficult. We find ten types of imperative forms (almost each of them with sub-
It is above all in the imperative that ancient converb forms in –p and –V (vowel, undoubled) have been preserved, e.g., qälüp-arta ‘may he remain’ (= lit. ATu. qālp ārzūn; *qāl-zun does not exist in Khalaj). Even the second person singular normally has a suffix, e.g., ali ‘take’ (not *al). The predicative suffixes are:

1. sg.  
   –(d)Um, –(d)Am
2.  
   –I, etc., –ző (rarely), –GlI (rarely)
3.  
   –tA
1. pl.  
   –(d)UK, –(d)AK, rarely –AlUm
2.  
   –y, –diz
3.  
   –tAlAr

These forms do not coincide with the forms of any other Turkic languages. As to the imperative forms, Khalaj deviates from Common Turkic just in the same degree as Chuvash, cf., e.g., ATu. kūl-zūn ‘may he come’ = Azerbaijani gāl-sīn (and similarly most of the modern Turkic languages), but Chuvash kil-têr, Khalaj yă-kūl-tă, etc.

The ten types of conjugation of the imperative are (only 2. sg.):

(1) –i / –y (ali ‘take’)
(2) –ir (başir ‘press’)
(3) –Uk / –UK (qālūp ‘remain’)
(4) –Al (kūdāl ‘put on clothes’)
(5) –AK (ɪrāk ‘arrive’)
(6) ŷA– (yākū ‘come’, yova ‘go’)
(7) –UV (yāţuv ‘lie down’)
(8) –Ar (tūlār < *tūrār ‘stand’)
(9) yeti– (yetikā ‘bring’, from kūl–)
(10) –pi (yi*pi ‘eat’)

Generally, cf. (9).

3.2.5. For other tenses cf. (9). 295–7. We find: perfect in –dUm etc. (cf. for the predicative forms chapter 321.), conditional in –sAm, present in –(i)yorum (← older Azerbaijani? - but this form is known in Kipchak dialects, as well, cf. Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta, I. Aquis Mattiacis 1959. 809; Xalt-âhâd has –VUrUm, well-known in many Turkic dialects, cf. Fundamenta 808), preterite in –miš ām (cf. 318., negative form: –mA dUK ām, the same opposition positive –mIš: negative –mA dUK as in Ancient Turkic), many compound forms, such as kūldûm
är (= käldüm + copula), –miš wolsam (preterite of conditional). The aorist has the forms (V = vowel, dialect of Xarrāh):

- \( Vm \)
- \( Vy \)
- \( Vr \)
- \( Vmiz \)
- \( Viz \) or contraction –iz
- \( VllAr \)

The vowels are the same as in Ancient Turkic, e.g. yät-ur 'he lies' (not *yat-ar, as in most modern Turkic dialects). After vowels we find forms like bašla-yur 'he begins' (= Ancient Turkic, whereas in Middle Turkic forms like bašla-r are usual; these are valid in all modern Turkic dialects with the exception of Khalaj and Yakut: bastūr < bašlayur). The future in –GA shows very similar to those of the imperative (e.g., al-i-γa 'he will take', yi-s-pi-gą 'he will eat' instead of *al-γa, –yi-sagą, cf. (9). 298–9.

4. Lexicology

Khalaj syntax cannot be dealt with here. The Khalaj lexicon is characterized by five striking features:

(1) Khalaj has preserved a very large number of Ancient Turkic words which are extinct in other modern Turkic dialects, some of them hapax legomena in Ancient Turkic vocabularies. For further information cf. my article Alteredmische türkische Wörter im Chaladsch (bibliography nr. (16). Here are some examples: i’m 'trousers', kisi 'wife' (kiši 'woman'), hirin 'white'. (< ürüŋ), harq 'excrement', baluq 'village', vəa- 'to bind', sɛi- 'to break', kidān 'wedding', ü 'sleep', qudōu 'fly'; we also find (Winārē) ěrdān 'bride' (= Codex Comanicus, and only there, er-değ 'virgin').

(2) Khalaj has many (about 150) words of unknown origin, some of which are spread all over the Khalaj area (e.g., havul 'good'), whereas other terms are characteristic only of certain dialects.

(3) In cases of opposition between Oghuz and Non-Oghuz vocabulary, Khalaj is Non-Oghuz, e.g., ěrin 'lip' (not *tōtaq), bĕri 'wolf' (not *qūrt). Some Khalaj words are typically Arghu, above all dąγ (≈ dąyıl) 'is not' (= Arghu dąγ, dąγ ol); for the fact that Khalaj is ≈