

Dative Case Affixes of Oghuz Group Turkish Languages

Kamil Bashirov Kamal

Abstract—In the article the past tense verbs suffixes of in the oguz group of the Turkish languages are considered. The comparative analysis of the verbs suffixes in different languages belonging to the Turkic group on the base of the examples is presented. The comparison of the verbs suffixes in the singular and plural forms in the Middle Ages and in modern times is demonstrated.

Keywords: dative case affixes of Oghuz group Turkish languages, sound assimilation, and classification.

I. INTRODUCTION

The issue about formation dative case and affixes of dative case is unknown for Turkology. F. Calilov has some ideas about dative case and affixes of dative case and he nominates 3 theories. But he also considers that no one of these are significant enough. (Calilov F.A., 1988, 216 – 217).

On the modern level of Oghuz group languages dative case affixes are $-na^2$, $-ya^2$ after vowels, and $-a$, $-ə$ after consonants. Expression of different morphemes come across when we look throw to first ancient written monuments of Oghuz population, writings of classics and existing other Turkish languages. With taking into account the sayings there are following invariants of dative case in Turkish languages.

- 1) $-qa$, $-ka$, $-kə$, $-gə$, $-ğə$, $-k$, $-ik^4$
- 2) $-ra$, $-rə$, $-ri$, $-ri$, $-rü$
- 3) $-na$, $-nə$
- 4) $-ça$, $-çə$
- 5) $-ya$, $-yə$
- 6) $-ba$, $-bə$
- 7) $-a$, $-ə$

The common element for all groups are “ $-a$,” as can be seen from the dative case affixes. F. Calilov names “ y ” sound addition of the $-ya$ allomorpheme, “ n ” trail of possession affix in the $-na$ and considers that its an infix. The author considers the relation of “ a ” and “ qa ” archetypes unknown and he also emphasizes future etymological investigation of these morphemes. (Calilov F.A., 1988, 216 – 217)

A.N. Kononov who investigated dative case affixes from the language of ancient written monuments and modern Turkish came to conclusion that, k - q - y interchange (ka - qa - ya) is possible phonetic event. (Kononov A.N., 1941, p.97)

In modern Turkman litrary language main exponent of dative case is $-a$ and $-ə$ ($qecə$, $yarma$, $durna$, $serçə$ and etc.), but in Alili and Nohur dialects dative case affixes are same in Azerbaijan and Turkish language.

According to Turkman language dialects B. Serebrennikov and N.Hajiyeva notice that element “ k ” is an active form of dative case in this language.

Owing to this formant there arise adverbs like *bərik*, *arık*, *yokarık* and etc. According to the authors “ k ” formant in this language not only free, but also expresses dative case in “*arık*” and “*k*” complex form. (Serebrennikov B.A. Hacıyeva N.Z., 1979, 80)

We can come across to this case appearing in some dialects, especially in Emud: *Eserde meniñ etmişlerimin barını bir erik jelleseler atuv jezasi maña az bolardı. Çaqalarını baqrına basıp yüzi günbatarık duran front otlularına miñüp qidenleren den. Şu saqadına deñlepдилер.* (Essay of Dialects Turkman Language. 2006, p.127)

II. STATEMENT

After looking throw Turkman language’s dative case system we see that changing of words in this language is more multifarious than other turkish languages. As in this language there are changing vehicles which belong to Oghuz group languages, specific affixes, also elements which gipchaq group languages include. For example when infinitives are declined in Turkman language q - k sounds at the end of the word in dative case change to n and q sounds: *barmaq* – *barmana*, *almaq* – *almana*, *yaşamak* – *yaşama:qa*, *okamak* – *okama:qa* and etc. In Emud dialect the sound “ k ” adds to the end of the word: *ova:k qitdi* (*oba: qitdi*), *Bikə:k berdi* (*Bikə: berdi*).

Unlike Azerbaijan language in turkish, turkman and gagauz language dative case affixes are not added to the end of the word if the word finishes with the vowel “ o ”. For example: *Mən kinoya getdim* (Azer.) – *Men kino: qitdim* (turkish, turkman, gagauz).

In Gagauz language if the word is multisyllable and it ends with the sound “ k ”, the last sound (k) falls when it takes dative case affix and the vowel before last sound pronounces longer. For example: *sokak* (street) – *soka:*, *yanak* – *yana:*, *uzak* – *uza:*, *konak* – *kona:*, *görmek* – *görme:* and etc. This case is on literary level in Gagauz language but it is accepted as dialect in Azerbaijan and Turkish languages. *Enə sonunda yata: düşmüşdü. Ben de onnarı arama: çıkdım. Onu bir kere yime: çavursaya.*

Researches show that this case is more specific for Gaziantep, Kastamoni and Bartın dialects in Turkish language. We can see it in most of Azerbaijani dialects, especially in Mughan and West group dialects. For example: *sə:* (*sənə*), *mə:* (*mənə*), *sa:*, *ma:*, *qona:*, *uşa:* and etc. *Adam uşa: elə söz deməz. Bu kitabı sa: (sə:) bağışlayıram. Üç gündür yorğan-döşə: düşüb.*

As we see from examples after falling of the last consonant (k , q , n) dative case affix joins to last vowel and pronounces long.

In the Vulkanest dialect of Gagauz language dative case is the same with Azerbaijani: *torpağa*, *kaçmağa*, *çıkmağa* and etc. But there are exceptions: *durma:*, *görme:*, *düşme:*.

Manuscript Received on March 2015.

Kamil Bashirov Kamal, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Teaching Methods of Azerbaijan Language of Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University.

“Oraya, buraya” (here, there) place adverbs (demonstrative pronouns) pronounced as “orey, burey” in Komrat and Chadurlunq dialects of Gagauz language. In Azerbaijan language’s Borcali and Amasiya dialects these are pronounced as “orya, burya”. The affix “ey” at the end of the words “guney, quzey” (south, north) we can say is dative case function. In west group of dialects demonstrative pronouns “odur, budur” are pronounced as “odey, budey”.

As it is known from sources in ancient times of Turkish language dative case elements “n” and “q” sounds were used together for a long time as in words: sanqa, manqa, onqa, atanqa and etc. This meant the sound – sağır nun (η). H. Mirzazade mentioned that the sound “n (n+q)” is more older than the sound “n”. M.Kaşqari writes that it was too difficult to pronounce the sound “n” for people who are not Turkish. (5, 115) When M. Ergin talks about dative case in Turkish languages he notices that in ancient Turkish languages dative case affixes were –ğa, –ğe. After western Turkish language started from the sounds –ğ, –g were assimilated and dative case was started to use as –a, –e. (Muharrem Ergin, 1967, p.222)

A. Alizade considers that assimilating the sounds “ğ” and “q” by ages is natural process for Azerbaijan language. Some words are used in Qipchaq and Karluq languages including these consonants are existing in Azerbaijan and other Oghuz group languages without these sounds. For example: sıçğan – sıçan, qağaz – qaz, kağatır – qatır and etc. (Alizade A.C., 1986, 113 – 116)

Now in most of Turkish languages the sound “n” has changed to the sounds “n” and “q”. But in some Turkish languages and western group dialects of Azerbaijan language this sound (sağır nun) is still exists. However now in Azerbaijan language and in its dialects there are not words with pure “ğa” and “ka” (kə) dative case affixes. R.Askar resting to E.Azizov wants to prove opposite of this. “It’s interesting that, dative case affixes –ğa, –gə is also used like this in some our dialects.” E. Azizov writes about this: “–ğ appears when nouns change for possessive,accusative and dative case which include second person in singular possessive affixes in Cabrail and Zangilan’s some village dialects. In ayrım dialects (Dashkesen, Gedebey) sound –ğ appears in accusative case : xalağın, xalağa, xalağı (Cabrail- Qaracallı), gözüğün, gözüğa, gözüğu (Zangilan- Bartaz, Ordaklı, Birinci Alibaylı), atağı (Dashkasan), bavağı (Gadabay) and etc. (Asker Ramiz, 2008, 181-182; 38,185)

We’ll speak about second person’s possessive indicators. But now in brief there are no any concern the sound –ğ in given examples. It is a changing ancient sound –n (n+q) to –ğ. Velyar n- is a sound interchange like in these words: **atanı, xalanı**

E. Tenishev’s researches and findings from ancient writing monuments in Turfan and Qansi states provides that **ka, qa, ge** formants are active as indicator in dative case: *axısa (ağzına), sıqke (qapıya), kuşge (quşa), misqe (bizə), kişigə (kişiyə)* and etc. (Tenishev E.R., 1976, p.18-46)

When Kashgari compared Turkish languages with Oghuz, he emphasized that in this language **qa, kə** was also used as dative case affix: *Olar tağka ağduk. Ol evgə barmış.* and etc. (Mahmud Kashgari, 2006, p.251)

Observations show that while dative case affixes developed in Turkish languages, this affix stabilized for Qipchaq language. H. Mirzazade said: “Common affix for Oghuz and Azerbaijan language left their ancient forms and

developed for its specific peculiarities. (Mirzazadeh H., 1990, p.43-44)

H. Mirzazadeh explains relations between Azerbaijan and other Turkish languages with literary-cultural exchange according to classical poets – Kishvari, S. Tabrizi who used the affix of dative case in their poems.

Now “n” and “k” elements goes on using in some our words, in parallel use of our dialects: *görüük, bezik, ərik, sürük* and etc. In west group dialects we can come across changing –q to x: *umsum-umsux, darıx,qorux (qorx), yolux, acıx (acmağ) and etc.*

“k” and “q” dative case affixes had an important role for improving and making new grammatical forms to new words in our languages. First this element denoted direct, second convertibility, repetition and terminal point, and third expressed statical character and finally expressed function of derivative nouns from verbs.

Element “k” denotes collectiveness of first person plural (*gölerik, gedirik* and etc), after ablative, nominative and possessive cases joins to words which denotes place and possession and makes adjectives: *irəlidəki, arxadaki, mənimki, səninki, dününki, çoxdankı,həminki and etc.*

Like “k” so “n” element left its case denoting function to “a-ə” morphemes in other development steps of our language and now these morphemes are using to denote sign, possession, impersonal, passive and reflexive formant. Reflexive also expresses back action, i.e direction. It’s interesting that, in that dialect **na,ne** dative case forms like **an,en: Oğlannara:n yazığım gelmedi, şimdi qızı da öldüreceəm... Bu asbablarını *sehen* verim, sen behen qoyun kes, qarnını *behen* ver, eti-meti *sehen*.** (Vekilov A.P., 1973, p.64).

As seen as **oğlannara:n (oğlanlarınla), *sehen* (sənə),*behen* (bene-mənə)** in these words there are sound interchange event. To this analogical event we can come across in Azerbaijan language’s Salmas dialect: *ba:şan (başına), cana:n (canına),qulağa:n (qulağına), güzen (güzünə)* and etc. (Bilgehan A., 2007, p.106)

The ancient types of dative case were – qarü, -aru², -ra²,-r¹⁴. They were in active position, then these archetypes combined to the roots of words and lost their dative case peculiarities and in modern Oghuz languages they already are not used. We can see these affixes only in dialects and classical poems. They formed as a component of adverb and postposition, demonstrative and question pronouns and they are just directional morphemes. According to Z. Qorkhmaz this affix still maintains its activity and has a function of denoting dative case in some words: *daşra, yolıra, depere, köksure,arkaru,anaru, kancaru and etc.* (Korkmaz Zeynep, 2005, p.551)

About source of these affixes A. Damirchizadeh writes: “In previous times “qa-rı” used equipose, for some time later instead of “ra” formed “a”, and at least “arı” morpheme stabilized and combined to the word. That’s why in modern speech we use not only “dışarı” but also “dışarıya”. (Damirchizadeh A.M., 1967, p.76)

In Azerbaijan language dative case affixes –ra², -r¹⁴ lost their independence and they combine root of the words and here are following examples: *yuxarı, bəri, geri, irəli, dışarı, ora, bura, hara,sonra* and etc. Paying attention to it: *yuxarı-ya, dışarıya,içəriyə* can be seen there are three-fold dative case in adverbs: *yux (yoxuş)+a+rı+ya, iç+ə-ri+ya, dış+a-rı+ya.* In others indicator of dative case is two:

o+ra, bu+ra, son+ra, bə+ri (infact bura) and etc.

From my point of view it's not wright to present element "r" as an independent dative case affix and the morpheme "qaru" was given as complex dative case affix and "q" and "a" pieces was shown as dative case indicators (although this situation didn't make any debate) by B. Serebrennikov. We have to absolutely refuse that, dative case affix "qaru" derived from independent word "qaru" meaning direction.

Turkologists I.Direnkova, A. Abdullayev, A.Sherbak and others consider that dative case's allmorphemes derived from "qaru" which means "qol" its also notacceptable fact. Instead of this "keri, kere" morphem which means "sonra" is convenient for comparing: *Ondan kerı (qeri) bi alma alam gelü. Ondan kere o:lan ehdiyardan ayrılıya.* (Vekilov A.P., 1973, p.81)

Here "ge+ri" morphemes are stem and affix functions: **ge (ke) qayıtmaq (qayetmək), dönmək, getmək** is archaic form of verb, **ri** is dative case affix.

Generally we can say that the word "qaru" is used in the meaning of volume, dimensions content in many Turkish languages. Not in the meaning of direction. As: qarmaq (to catch), qarın (capacity), qarsımaq (influence), gərmək (tilt, curve, tow), qarış (unit of measurement) and etc.

F.Calilov's following idea would be enough for having right imagine about "ra²-ri⁴" morpheme's origins if he would not accept the word "qaru" as a independent dative case affix: "If The morpheme "qarı" would be retored according to the words "içkeri, tıxarı" (Karachay – Balkar) "re, ra" – affix variations of the words "yerə, ara" which passed the same analogical transformation way would be restored in the words – bura (bu ara), ora (o ara), sonra (son ara), nere – nire (means "nə yerə" in Turkish and Turkman languages). May be, "-ra" is affix also in the in the word – "kənar". (Calilov F.A., 1988, p.186)

It is interesting fact that in Xakas language's Kacin dialect beside **ka,ğa**, (Ağbanğa parım – abakana gedirik, Mato pıltır Moskvağa vıstavkaa çörgen – mato bildir Moskvağa sərgiyə getmişdir.), ğar/xar, qar/qer, zar/zer, sar/ser varaitions are used: çasxar (toword spring) çayğar (toword summer) küsker (toword autumn) ağassaar (toword tree) turazaar (towords home) költer (toword lake) tağzar (towords mountain) and etc. (Questions of dialectology of Turkish Languages, 1966, p.155 – 161).

D. Patackova rightly considers zar/zer, sar/ser morphemes element of postposition "sarı" which means direction. (Questions of dialectology of Turkish Languages, 1966, p.153) Then analogically we have to add geri, doğru postpositions too.

There is no big differ between B.Serebrennikov and F.Calilov's aspects. The only difference is B.Serebrennikov is committed to containing approach to the morpheme "qaru" but F.Calilov compete approach. Finally i want to add following sentences:

1) The morphemes "qaru" "qeri" which are considered ancient variation of dative case made up two parts: qa+rı (qe+ri). First part came to Oguz group languages from Altay – tatar, Qipchaq languages. Origin of second part – "ra" is Oghuz group languages.

2) As most of turkologists mentioned in "qa (ka)" case indicators q (k) elements hold appending consonant or infix task. Now days in some of Azerbaijan dialects carry out this function when personal pronouns change for cases:

sənə – sağa, ona – oğa, mənə – mağa, maña, saña and etc. (West – Qax dialects)

3) Element "r" in indicator –ra²(rı⁴) of dative case have the same semantic function. This element has a place context. It seems clear from the background of pronouns "o, bu". As we know, these pronouns are used both in third person's singular and as a demonstrative pronoun, they differ from each as other for their context and form using in dative case. When it declines as personal pronoun gains the meaning "thing" and accepts "n" connecting: ona, buna; when it has a function of demonstrative pronoun (adverb) it accepts element "r" and expresses place context: ora, bura (bəri, hara, nere) and etc.

4) In Turkman language declining "k" element used more than Azerbaijan language. According to E.Nacip statute: "In modern Turkman language Qipchaq element has an important role, in Azerbaijan language there are not only importance of Qipchaq language but also uyhur element. (Nagir E.N., 1979, p.88)

5) From my point of view F.Calilov's connecting –ra², -rı⁴ formants context to yer, ara independent words is much more academic. We want notice that, this idea was nominated by V.V. Radlov and this idea was suggested by N.K.Dmitriyev. (Dmitriev N.K., 1962, p.130-131). So, it's approved idea of derivative –ra² dative case affix from **yerə, ara (aralığa- K.B)** words. It proves the elements which are relative with words containing place meaning: **yan-yörə, yeri, yürü** words, **hara** (hancarı), **nereye** dative case questions, postpositions denoting direction **sarı, doğru** (old variants), dative case postposition **görə, -ra²-rı⁴** affixes etc.

6) In our old texts and classical languages *ara* and its variants –ra² –rı⁴ covers semantic class and all of these expresses place:

- 1) ara- emptiness, area, side, towards
- 2) ol araya- oraya, bu araya - buraya
- 3) məktəb ara, ev ara, məscid ara
- 4) aralan-uzaqlaş, aralı-uzaq
- 5) ur-ir-iraq(uzaq), irmək-çatmaq, irəli-qabağa
- 6) urca- opposite side

"Ucrana xeyir çıxsın", "Ağacı ucrasına süzməzlər". (Oğuz atalar sözü)

We think that verb's future tens affix –ar² and dative case –ra have internal relation between them.

In turkological researches –ba,-bə morphemes are also given as an indicator of dative case. In most literary works –ba² morpheme is expressed mutuality-thing(way) and its synonym with –la² both of them are dative case affixes and this fact escape from attention. Halbuki, üzbəüz, dalbadal, günbəgün and etc. these words have mutuality context, beside it has dative case context: üzbəüz - üz-üzə, dalbadal - dal-dala, günbəgün - gündən-günə and etc.

We want speak a little about dative case in panturk and about its morphemes –ça,-çə. These affixes belongs to the ancient Turkish languages (tuvin, xakas, tatar). They have independent meaning and dative case function: kemçe (çaya), xölçə (gölə), ıyaşçe(ağaca) – tuvin; urmanğaça (meşəyə), ülqənçə (ölünçə)- tatar. (Serebrennikov B.A. Hacıyeva N.Z., 1979, p.81-82)

A.M. Sherbak names –ça,-ja joined case "comparison-limitation case", and he emphasize other meanings: ejikçe (to home), xemçe (to river), dövəjə (as camel) sənçə (like you-as you) and etc. (Sherbak A.M., 1977, p.53-54)

There is no any extraordinary sound interchange in k-q, k-y, k-ç, ç-c, c-j, d-t, y-v in turkish languages. It can often come across sound interchanges either in word stems or affixes: döyüş >doğuş >döküş >dövüş >dögüş (fighting); dəg >dək >teq >təğ >tiy >tiv; yer > yər çir >jer >çer (place); yılan >çılan >ılan; dıkta >dikte >dıkda >dikdə (touch); dikca >dikçə >dıqca >dikçə; kən >çən >çan >şən >şan: militant (Azerbaijan); kürəşçən (özbək); söqüşçan; aşuvşan (q-angry) and etc.

Consonant changings usually take place between sound arise or nearby sounds. That's why like connective consonant k-ç-y sounds in lexical and grammatical forms substitutes each other and this event have typological gist.

In modern turkish languages (g) k > ç(c) and ç(c)>(k)g substitution come across very seldom. In East group also in Arzurum and Gaziantep dialects they are nearly in normal level: celdi, cotür, cel, böyüç, çim, ceriyə, cün, çilim, eçerkan, erçenden (gədi, gütgür, gəl, büyğk, kim, geriyə, kilim, ərkərkən, erkəndən) and etc.

... *Toxumunu eçerkan, çiftin peşinə çiderkan, baxdı çı...*
Bir böyüç tuccara costerdı... Bu daşa cücüüm çatmaz.
Bezircan dedi çı: "Cet cetir", cetdi daşı aldı, celdi.
 (Vekilov A.P., 1973, p.59-60)

It's interesting that, k>ç substitution event dominates in Azerbaijan language among Turkish languages. So it is expended enough in Saki, Ismayilli, Naxcivan, Qazakh and etc. dialects: çakic – çəçic, kömək – çömək, kişi – çişı, keçi – çeci, köhnə - çöhnə, çöynək – küynək, çamança – kamanza, kiçik – çičik, keçdi – çecdi, kim – çim and etc.

Ça² (- ca) give movement (görünçə, alanca(x), səhərəcəx', axşamatan), work (yatanacan, bişənəcən) or object (onlar, yüzlərcə) restriction meaning.

B. Serebrennikov writes about origin of dative case affix –ca²: It seems this format meant something before. But it is too difficult determine this meaning. May be this affix meant restriction meaning. (Serebrennikov B.A. Hacıyeva N.Z., 1979, p.81 – 82) Author disagree with H.M.Serbak's calling of the words including –ca² affix comparison – restriction case. He doesn't accept examples "səncə, dan atınca" were given by H.M.Serbak from Ozbak language. And call dative case affix ca² and ca² affix were given in Serbak's examples homonym words which come from different origin. He puts it on the basis of "uzunca, axca" samples taken from Kirghiz and Azerbaijan languages on to the same phonetic row with restriction of quality instruments. There are enough right and directive elements in the both of theories. For example, it is reasonable enough to call –ca² affixes two different originated homonyms in the examples **səncə** and **dan atınca (dan atkunca)**. As there is comparison meaning in the first example (səncə) and restriction meaning in the second example – **dan atınca**. It can be realized in the sentences like this:

1. *Mən səncə ağıllı deyiləm – Mən sən qədər (sənin kimi) ağıllı deyiləm (Mən səndən ağıllı deyiləm)*
2. *Mən səni dan atınca (dan söküləncə) gözlədim. Mən səni dan atana qədər (atana kimi) gözlədim.*

When we look at sentences attentively we see that morpheme means comparison meaning in the first example and restriction meaning in the second one. It means the affixes B. Serebrennikov considered homonyms are really holding different functions.

If even there is relation between A. Serbak's examples and dative case affix it is not right to call it with

the same name (comparison – restriction). But it is not questionable to call first comparison and second restriction.

Some of turkologists told that there are more than 6 cases of noun in Turkish languages and one of this cases is comparison case. Beginning from J.Deni and V.Radlov A. Potseluyevski, S.Kurenov, B.Cariyarov, K.Sopiyev and many others told about this case which is realized with –ça, –çə (-ja, -je) affixes in Turkish languages and also in Turkman language.

Finally idea is –ça, –çə formant is enclitic – intermediate form developing from postposition function to case affix as mutuality case affixes –la, –le: Öləmdə qoç yigit qörmedim səncə. Xarıñ işi xardır, dostlar, miñ maktasañ atça bolmaz (Aləmdə qoç igid görmədim səncə (sənə bənzər) Eşşək eşşək olaraq qalır, dostlar, min cör tərifləsən də atca (at qədər) olmaz. (20, 125 – 126)

It is interesting fact that the word **boyunça** is used instead of postposition **görə** in Turkman language:

- 1) *Vraçın maxlaxatı boyunça kurorta qıtdım.*
- 2) *Broji boyunça o yelbaşçılıq etmeli (Serebrennikov B.A. Hacıyeva N.Z., 1979, p.73)*

B. Serebrennikov compare examples – yüzçə (yüzə qədər), tağca (dağ qədər) from Turkish language with examples – uzunca (uzuntəhər) axca (ağtəhər) from Azerbaijan and Kirgizh languages and considers that ca² affixes in these words are come from the same origin and means restriction. But we don't agree with it.

The right direction is as both of authors nominate provisions about the element "c" in the affix "ca²" is not coupling consonant, but it is formant including meaning of limited movement.

Observations show that it is impossible to equate the elements "k, r, z, y, n" of dative case affixes' archetypes "ka², ra², za², ya², na²" as sounds realizing the same function. Last two elements do coupling function in dative case affixes but others have more wide meaning. Reminiscently all previous said about element "r" we want to repeat again that this phoneme is related with place meaning and phoneme "k" means regularity.

We can see by Azerbaijan language materials that –ca² morpheme including phoneme "c" has many different meanings in this language. The morpheme "–ca²" participate very active in forming of many words of different parts of speech. These are following:

1. Forms general and special nouns from adjective and verbs: unnuca (bitki), gödəkcə, tapmaca, bilməcə, düşüncə, əyləncə, Yenica, Əyricə, Qaraca, Ağca
2. Forms derivative and complex adjectives from verbs and adjectives: zorbaca, körpəcə, yaxşıca, olduqca maraqlı, dedikcə çətin.
3. Specifies or generalize object by joining to numbers: bircə adam, üçcə gün, beşcə il, yüzlərcə. Onlarca adam.
4. Forms compare meaning joining to pronouns: səncə, bunca, onca, məcəncə.
5. Forming different adverbs in the meanings "time, place, quantitative and etc.":
 - a) Association: ailəlikcə, hamılıqca, nəsillicə
 - b) Time: Təzəlikcə, tezlikcə
 - c) Quantitative: dəvəcə, köşəkcə, onca, bunca, (Dəvəcə böyüyüb, köşəkcə ağıl yoxdur)
 - d) Means: Rusca, ərəbcə, özbəkcə
 - e) Compare: Bu işi Əhmədcə (qədər) bilməzsən

6. Forms particles in the meaning restriction and wish: *təkə, bircə*

7. Forms modality: *zənnimcə, fikrimcə* and etc.

We can see from examples that the affix $-ca^2$ realizes two main functions in the words it joined:

1) Postposition function: *yüzlərcə (yüzlərlə), onlarca (onlarla), səncə (sən qədar), mənəcə (mənim kimi), ailəlikcə (ailəliklə), hamılıqca (hamılıqla), nəsillicə (nəsilliklə), təzəlikcə (təzəliklə), tezlikcə (tezliliklə), dəvəcə (dəvəcən), köşəkçə (köşəkçən), rusca (in Russian language), Əhmədcə (Əhməd qədar), zənnimcə (zənnimlə)* and etc.

2) Particle function: *təzəcə, yenicə, beşcə, üzəcə, zorbaca, körpəcə, təkəcə, bircə* and etc.

We can replace $-ca^2$ affixes with $-can^2$ almost in all examples it took part: *yüzlərcən, səncən, ailəlikcən, təzəlikcən, dəvəcən, ruscan, Əhmədcən, zənnimcən*.

Approximately, “n” element is accepted like sound rise here. Due to the logical-linguistics approach it is necessary to speak about sound fall but not about sound appear. In panturk “can²” dative case postposition is changed to $-ca^2$, but it lives in dialects. In former times “can” dative case postposition expressed direction and time in limited, but later its function expanded and began to assume compare, quantity, aim contexts and etc.

Taking into consideration that postpositions were independent words with lexical meanings, we must say that *can/çan* morphemes which have auxiliary meaning in nowadays, was an independent word. It is possible to find it in **haçan** interrogative pronoun: *haçan=havaxt=hansı vaxt (hanzi, hankı)*.

Most of turkish languages so in Azerbaijan language we can come across the variants “*çağ,tağ*” of “can” word. For example in turkish and turkman languages *çağ-* means time and is an efficient word. But in Azerbaijan language there are several words: *axşamçağı, səhərçağı* and etc. In Mughan and Qakh dialects **haçan** question has a **haçağ** variant.

$-tan^2 (dan^2)$ are phonetic variants of the word *can* spreaded wide in Oguz languages: *haratan, səhərətən, axşamatan (Azerb)*

We can come across *cenli* postposition with the same function with can^2 in turkish languages: *Yokarı baş baxadan tə üz tüməne cenli kesqitlekyərdi* (Comparative Grammar of Oghuz Group Languages, 1986, p.118); *Ol dızına cenli batqadadı.* (Comparative Grammar Russian and Turkish Languages, 1964, p.77)

Completing the action for the time verbial affixes – $inca^4 (-ğinca^4), -anca^2 (-ğanca^2), -dıqca^4, -zok, -caq^2, -gəc$. In these morphemes $-ca^2, -cək$ means the time, and we take into account to speak about it in future.

Talking about dative case affixes A.M.Sherbak references to M.A.Mashakova and notices that in Chovdur dialect there is $-qine$ form too: - **yokarqine, aşakqine, ilerqine, anrıqine, bariqine.** (Sherbak A.M., 1977, p.52). We consider that X.A.Mashakov and A.M.Sherbak they make carelessness while they speak about this morpheme’s structure. $-qı (-kı^4)$ makes adjectives from adverb and pronoun, and $-ne (-na, -nə)$ is a dative case affix. This context form comes across not only in turkman dialects, but also in Azerbaijan language dialects and slangs: - *aşağıdakına – aşağıkına, - yuxarıdakına – yuxarkına, irəlīdəkinə - irəlkinə, anrıdakına - anrıkına* and etc.

III. CONCLUSION

Development and historical forming peculiarities of grammatical indicators of dative – direction case in Oghuz group Turkish languages took part in this article. There is given the main attention to the modern forms of affixes. But also variants was analyzed which was existed absolutely and is archaic words today, partly maintained their presence.

Research work is based on materials in 4 languages – Azerbaijan, Turkish, Turkman and Gagauz. But in need it also resorted to other Turkish languages.

REFERENCES

1. Alizade A.C. “About Morphological Characteristics of Dative Case on Written Monuments of Azerbaijan Language” // “News of EA”. “Series of Language, Literature and Art”. 1986, 1, s.113 – 116.
2. Asker Ramiz. M.Kashgari and his “Divanü lüğat – it türk” work. Baku: “MBM”, 2008. – 432 s.
3. Azizov E. “Historical Dialectology of Azerbaijan Language”. “Establishment and development of Dialect System”. Baku, Edition of B.S.U. 1999. – 352 s.
4. Bilgehan A. Goghdag, Salmas agzi, Ankara, Karam edition, 2007. – 261 s.
5. Damirchizadeh A.M. Language of “Dede Korkut” saga. Baku: 1967
6. Dmitriev N.K. “Structure of Turkish Languages”. Moscow: East Literature. 1962. – 607 s.
7. Calilov F.A. “Morphology of Azerbaijan Language”. Baku: Maarif, 1988. – 285 s.
8. “Comparative – Historical Grammar of Turkish Languages. Morphology”. (E.R. Tenishev, V.D. Arakin, Q.F.Blaqova and etc.) Moscow: Science, 1988. – 560 s.
9. “Comparative Grammar of Oghuz Group Languages”. II part. Morphology. Baku: Science, 1986. – 134 s.
10. “Comparative Grammar Russian and Turkish Languages”. (Phonetics and Morphology.) Ashkhabad: “Turkm.nesh-ti”, 1964. –380 s.
11. “Essay of Dialects Turkman Language.” Ashgabat: Ilim, 1970. – 192 p.
12. Korkmaz Zeynep. “Researches About Turkish Language”. II c. Ankara: University of Ankara press. 2005. – 478 s.
13. Canonov A.N. “Grammar of Modern Literary Turkish Language”. M.-L.: Izd – vo AN S.S.U
14. Mahmud Kashgari. “Divanü lüğat-it-türk” (Designer and Translator – R.Askar). I, II, III, IV Tome, Baku: “Ozan” 2006.
15. Mirzazadeh H. “Historical Grammar of Azerbaijan Language”. Baku, A.L.U. edition, 1990, 376 s.
16. Muharrem Ergin. Turkish Language Knowledge. Sofiya: “Narodna prosveta”, 1967. – 388 s.
17. Nagir E.N. “Historical-comparative Dictionary of Turkish Languages”. XIV century. Moscow: Science, 1979. – 479 s.
18. Pocheluevski A.P. “Selected Works”. Ashkhabad. Ilim, 1975. –337 s.Sherbak A.M. “Essay of Comparative Morphology of Turkish Language”. Leningrad: Science. 1977. – 191 s.
19. Serebrennikov B.A. Hacıyeva N.Z. “Comparative – Historical Grammar of Turkish Language”. Baku: Maarif. 1979. – 303 p.
20. Tenishev E.R. “Structure of Sarig-Uygur Languages”. Moscow, Science, 1976, 307 s.
21. Vekilov A.P. “Dialectology of Turkish Language”. Ch.I. University of Leningrad.1973, 102 s.
22. “Questions of dialectology of Turkish Languages”. T. IV. Baku: Science, 1966. – 236 s.

AUTHOR PROFILE



Kamil Bashirov Kamal, Ph.D., assistant professor of teaching methods of Azerbaijan language of Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University.