Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung. Volume 57 (1), 93–104 (2004)

ON THE TURKIC ORIGIN OF HUNGARIAN *IGEN* 'YES'

LARS JOHANSON*
(Mainz)

The present paper discusses the origin of the Hungarian particle *igen* 'yes', for which no convincing etymology has been presented so far. It is suggested that it is a selective copy of Turkic *egen ~ igen* (< *erken*), an indirective and/or emphatic rhetorical particle ('evidently', 'obviously', 'apparently', 'as it appears', 'it turns out that', 'indeed'), derived from *er-* 'to be' and used as part of the predicate core and/or as a postpredicate element to convey consenting or admitting answers.

Key words: affirmative, evidential, rhetorical particles, Kipchak Turkic.

A particle of unknown origin

In their etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language, Benkő et al. (1970, p. 192) indicate that the particle *igen* is of unknown origin. The old documents cited, written from 1275 on, display several variants of it. The first consonant is mostly represented by *g* or *gy* but also by *k*, namely *iken* (1525). The first vowel is written *e*, *y*, *i*, etc.: e.g. *egen*, *ygen*, *igén*, *iken*.

The meanings of the word include 'yes', 'it is so' (*úgy van*), 'very' (*nagyon*), 'indeed' (*valóban*), German *etwa* (*körülbelül*), etc. The earliest occurrence (1298, copied in 1323) is the placename *Egenszáraz* ('very dry'), where the word seems to be an emphatic qualifier. Interestingly enough, the explanatory dictionary of Hungarian, *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára* deals with *igen* as two distinct entries under different headings, one with augmentative and intensive meanings in the sense of 'very' (1965, pp. 447–448) and one in the affirmative sense of 'yes' (1965, pp. 448–450). The same distinction between two lemmata is found in Juhász et al. (1985, pp. 583–584). The question whether modern Hungarian *igen* has one or two origins is, however, not dealt with in either of the dictionaries.

* Lars Johanson, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Seminar für Orientkunde, Fachbereich 15, DE-55099 Mainz, e-mail: johanson@mail.uni-mainz.de

0001-6446 /2004/ $ 20.00 © 2004 *Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest*

The etymological literature is remarkably vague with respect to *igen*. It has been thought to be a declined form, though neither the stem nor the ending has been determined. Klemm (1928, p. 23) simply stated that *igen* is a declined form of a stem *igë-*. According to Bárczi et al. (1967, p. 391), it is a non-transparent declined form of a Finno-Ugric adjectival stem. It has been suggested that the final *-n* is a modal suffix, though it has not been possible to determine the stem. The hypothesis that *igen* has developed from *ígyen*, i.e. the adverb *így* 'so, this way' plus an adverbial suffix, has been judged as untenable for phonetic and semantic reasons. In general, the proposed Finno-Ugric cognates of the hypothetical stem have been met with skepticism in the specialist literature (Benkő et al. 1970).

The use of *igen* in affirmative answers to polar questions seems to have developed from *igenis* (*igen* + *is* 'also'), which was originally an emphatic adverb attached to a clause constituent. According to Klemm's (1928, p. 23) historical syntax, *igenis* served to give emphasis to a clause constituent that was to be affirmed. Later on the emphasised constituent was dropped, and *igenis* was recategorised as the affirmative counterpart of the negative answer particle *nem* 'no' (Benkő et al. 1970, p. 192). Klemm compared *igenis* to particles of similar adverbial origin, Finnish *kyllä*, French *oui – o* 'that', reinforced by the personal pronoun *il* (cf. Rey 1998, p. 2505) – and German *ja*, originally an adverb ('indeed', certainly') modifying the verb (Klemm 1928, p. 23). In present-day Hungarian, *igenis* is used in the sense of 'yes!', 'yes indeed!', 'certainly!', 'sure!', etc.

Possible origin in Turkic *iŋen*

The fact that *igen* also means 'very' may direct attention to the Turkic intensifying particle *iŋen* 'very', used in 14th century Khorezmian and Kipchak Turkic, in Ottoman Turkish of the same period onwards, etc. (Clauson 1972, pp. 41–42). The form of this particle in the Codex Cumanicus (Kipchak Turkic, early 14th century) is *iŋen* 'valde, herrlich' (Grønbech 1936, p. 147; 1942, p. 107). It is tempting to connect this word with Turkmen *iŋŋēn* 'very', but the latter may be derived from the superlative particle *iŋ* 'most', which has the form *eŋ* in other Turkic languages; compare *eŋ* vs. *iŋen* in the Codex Cumanicus (Grønbech 1942, pp. 89, 107).

Rásonyi (1972, p. 414) suggested that the Hungarian particle *igen* goes back to a Turkic word **igen*, an adverb allegedly derived from "*ig*, *yeg* 'bon'". The author even compared the word with Chuvash *avan* 'bon, bien'. He realised that *igen*, due to its early appearance in Hungarian, cannot be a loan from Ottoman Turkish. Nevertheless, he cited the Turkish dictionary *Tarama sözlüğü*, where, according to his opinion, numerous occurrences of a form **igen* from Old Ottoman onwards are listed. The dictionary actually lists many occurrences of what is claimed to be "*iğen* (*igen*, *igende*, *iğende*, *iğin*)" (2014–2019), but the intervocalic consonant, written with Arabic *kaf*, is not likely to stand for *g*. The original consonant was the velar nasal *ŋ*, and the older Ottoman form was certainly *iŋen*. Tezcan (1978, p. 420) stresses that there is no reason to read *iŋen* in Old Anatolian Turkish texts. When the velar nasal

disappeared, it was mostly replaced by *n*. There are exceptions such as *öŋ* > *ög* 'front' in spoken Ottoman Turkish of the 17th century (Hazai 1973, p. 358), but in his 17th century dictionary, Franciscus à Mesgnien Meninski (1680, p. 601) renders the word exclusively as *in-en* 'valde [etc.]'. A Turkic form **igen* does not seem to be attested. If the original form is *iŋen*, Rásonyi's etymology presupposes a shift *ŋ* > *g* in Hungarian.

Possible origin in Turkic *igen* < *e(r)ken*

Another possibility is that Hungarian *igen* ~ *egen* 'yes' goes back to a Turkic form *egen* < *e(r)ken*. In Codex Cumanicus, this form is represented by the modal particle *egen* (Grønbech 1936, p. 161; 1942, p. 90), a word clearly distinct from *iŋen*.

The Kuman particle *egen* must go back to *e(r)ken*, derived from *er*- 'to be' and found in various Turkic languages as *eken*, *ėken*, *iken*, *-(y)ken*, etc. Grønbech (1942, p. 90) derives Kuman *egen* from *er*- without regarding it as normal participial form in *-gEn*. Gabain (1959, p. 68) explicitly states that it is not a participial form derived from *e*- 'to be'. According to Drimba (2000, p. 289), however, it is "la forme de la 3e pers. du passé indéterminé de *e(r)-*". Gabain (1945, p. 150) claims that the corresponding Uzbek "dubitative" form is only homonymous, but not identical with the participle of 'to be'.

As a matter of fact, both the particle and the participle are anomalous forms. Whereas items such as *e(r)di* ~ *idi* 'was' are regular paradigmatic participial forms of *er*- 'to be', *erken* is not a regular participle in *-gEn* (Johanson 1994, p. 137). It might rather be an archaic deverbal form from *er*-, petrified before the participle assumed the shape *-gEn* in East Old Turkic (Clauson 1972, pp. 223a, 224b).

Tekin (1968, p. 180) considers East Old Turkic *erkli* 'while, being' to be another petrified participial form developed from **erigli*. Erdal (1991, p. 383) regards East Old Turkic *erken* as "an original *-gAn* nominal" from *er*-, formed according to an alleged rule "K replaces G after /r/". This explanation is improbable, since *-gEn* participles normally display /g/ after /r/. See my criticism of the 'dissimilation hypothesis' (Johanson 1979; 1994).

The hypothesis that Hungarian may have copied this form from some Kipchak Turkic variety it encountered does not face any special phonetic problems.

(i) The liquid *r* may have been missing in the Turkic model language; it is dropped in many Turkic forms derived from *er*- 'to be'.

(ii) The variation *e* ~ *i* found in the first syllable of the Hungarian forms is also observed in Turkic. On **e* > *i* in Hungarian, see Collinder (1960, pp. 176–177). Róna-Tas (personal communication) suggests that the first vowel of the Hungarian word was *i* or closed *e*, whereas the other variants are due to emphatic use and dialectal variation.

(iii) The voicing *k* > *g* had most probably already occurred in the Turkic model language. Hungarian *-k-* is not likely to have changed to *-g-*; compare, however, examples of denasalisation and voicing of final stops in combinations such as **ŋk* >

ŋg > *g*, e.g. *vág* ‘sickle’ and *bog* ‘knot’ (Hajdú 1988, p. 109). The change *-*k*- > *-*g*- is suggested by the Codex Cumanicus text (“*kaydæ egęn*”), as it has been read by Grønbech and others: *qayda egen*. Drimba (2000, p. 289), however, remarks that *g* has been substituted for *k* in the manuscript “par superposition d’une lettre à une autre”.

The type *e(r)ken* as a converb

The Turkic form *e(r)ken* has a very complex functional history. The East Old Turkic type *erkli* ‘while, being’ was used as a temporal converb marker, e.g. forming converb phrases based on the present stem: *-(Vr) erkli* ‘while -ing’. In certain Turkic languages, the type *e(r)ken* is used in a similar way, namely as a temporal (and adversative) converb in the sense of ‘while (being)’, e.g. Turkish *evde iken, evdeyken* ‘while (being) at home’. Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī (11th century) presents *erken* as a particle meaning ‘at the time of *(ḥālata)* such-and-such’, i.e. ‘while’. In the sentence *Ol kelür erken kördüm* ‘I saw him at the time of his coming’ (Dankoff–Kelly 1982, p. 137), it occurs with the present stem in *-(V)r*. In Chaghatay we find the locative-marked adverbial form *ėkende* ‘while being’ (Eckmann 1966, p. 289).

The converbial use is of course not the one we would expect from *-gEn* participles. Erdal’s (1991, p. 383) idea that *erken* was used like a *participium coniunctum*, e.g. as in English *you being*, seems less convincing.

The type *erken* as an indirective copula particle

Almost all known older and recent stages of Turkic display indirective copula particles of the types *erken* and *ermiš*, both derived from the verb *er-* ‘to be’ and meaning ‘it turns / turned out’, ‘it evidently is / was’, ‘it is / was found out’, etc. East Old Turkic possesses the indirective copula particle *ermiš*, which corresponds formally to Turkish *imiş* and Yakut *ebit* (Buder 1989, pp. 89–109).

The evidential category of indirectivity, traditionally referred to as ‘hearsay’, ‘inference’, etc., conveys awareness of revealed facts, indicating that an event is apprehended, perceived, noticed, or recognised by somebody. The narrated event is not stated directly, but in an indirect way, by reference to its reception by a conscious subject. This core meaning may be paraphrased ‘as the recipient becomes (became) or is (was) aware of’. Indirectivity is the typically Turkic type of evidentiality, but is not unique to the Turkic family. It seems to be basic to a number of other evidentiality systems, and may even qualify as a crosslinguistic definition of evidentiality (Comrie 2000, p. 1).

The reception may be realised through (i) hearsay, (ii) inference, or (iii) perception (appearance); see Johanson (2000b; 2003). Translation equivalents include English *obviously, evidently*, German *offenbar, offensichtlich, wie sich herausstellt(e),*

French *apparemment, selon toute apparence*, Russian *vyjasnaetsja, vyjasnilos', okazyvaetsja* / *okazalos'*, etc.

It is important to note the perceptive uses, expressing that the event itself or its effect turns out to be the case, becomes manifest and thus open to the recipient's mind, e.g. Kazakh *Kelgen ekensiz* 'You have, as I see, arrived'. These uses cannot be derived from 'hearsay' or 'inferential' meanings or be subsumed under 'non-first-hand knowledge'.

Copula particles of this kind are limited to main clauses with an asserted, contradictable content, and they do not co-occur with the simple past in *-di*. For Turkish *imiş*, see, e.g., Johanson (1971) and Csató (2000). For Uzbek *ekȧn* as an indirective copula particle, see Ivanov (1958) and Kononov (1960, pp. 272–275).

Turkic indirective copulas are tense-neutral. For example, Yakut *ebit* does not designate 'present' nor 'past' explicitly (Korkina 1958, p. 145; 1970, pp. 88–89; Buder 1989, p. 92). It seems that the verb *er-* was originally an initiotransformative verb, expressing (i) an initial dynamic phase 'to become', and (ii) a subsequent stative phase 'to be' (Johanson 2000a, pp. 58–59, 62–63). This is the case with the verb *(b)ol-* in many modern Turkic languages. The copulas may originally have been post-terminal forms, signalling a perspective that envisages the event after its crucial (in this case initial) limit, e.g. *er-miš* 'has become evident', 'has appeared' = 'is evident', 'appears' (Johanson 2000b, pp. 62–63; 2003, p. 288).

Certain modern Turkic languages, e.g. Turkmen, Kumyk, Tatar, Chuvash, Bashkir, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Uzbek and Uyghur, display both *erken* and *ermiš*, though with different functions. The type *erken* tends towards perceptive readings, whereas *ermiš* tends towards 'hearsay' readings, e.g. Chuvash *kilnĕ ikken* 'has evidently arrived' vs. *kilnĕ imĕš* 'has reportedly arrived'. A similar relation obtained between Chaghatay *ėkendur* and *ėmiš*.

Features of Turkic evidential systems have proven highly attractive in language contacts (Johanson 1992, pp. 244–245; 2002, p. 99). Some non-Turkic languages of Southwestern and Central Asia, Southeastern and Northeastern Europe, etc., with which Turkic languages have been in close contact display conspicuously similar traits in their evidentiality systems. Indirective categories similar to the Turkic ones typically appear in contact areas such as the Balkans, Anatolia, Caucasus, the Volga region, and Central Asia, e.g. in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, Kurdish, Armenian, Georgian, Tajik, and Eastern Finno-Ugric. The indirective copula particles of the types *erken* and *ermiš* have close equivalents in various contact languages. Indirective functions seem to have been copied onto participles and other forms of the verbs 'to be', e.g. Armenian *eγel*, Tajik *-a ast*, Bulgarian *bil* (Johanson 1996; 1998; cf. Levin-Steinmann 2002). Evidential particles of a similar kind are found in some Finno-Ugric languages, e.g. Mari *ulmaš*, Komi-Zyryan *völöm*, Udmurt *vyläm*, all formed from a verb 'to be' (Serebrennikov 1960).

Our first question thus must be: Could Hungarian *igen* be a copy of a Turkic evidential particle *egen* ~ *igen* < *e(r)ken* 'obviously, evidently'?

The type *erken* as a rhetorical modal particle

The situation is, however, somewhat more complicated. In certain Turkic languages, *e(r)ken* may be used as a rhetorical particle of a distinct type. Despite the superficial correspondence, this is not a copula particle, but an utterance-final modal particle added to complete main clauses, without carrying personal suffixes. It displays rhetorical, meditative, exclamatory, emphatic, corroborative uses, often expressing astonishment, Kazakh *Aydarbek žaman emes eken* 'Aidarbek is indeed not bad'. In this function, *erken* may also co-occur with the simple past item *-di*, e.g. Kazakh *Aydarbek keldi eken!* 'Aidarbek has indeed arrived!'. The particle can also be used together with conditionals for emphatic expression of wishes, e.g. Uzbek *U yåzsa ėkȧn* 'If he only would write!' (Kononov 1960, pp. 234, 276).

The Dukha dialect of Tuvan, spoken in Northern Mongolia, possesses the indirective copula particle *ergen*. The materials recorded by Elisabetta Ragagnin, Mainz, who is preparing a description of this dialect on the basis of intensive field work, contains examples such *as Duχa ulustar göčüp gelgen ergen* 'The Dukha people have reportedly migrated [to this place]'. The particle *iyen*, however, is rather of the rhetorical, exclamatory type, e.g. *Gelgen iyen* '(S)he has [obviously, indeed] arrived', *On šaq boldï iyen* 'It's ten o'clock [as I have suddenly become aware of]!', *Müŋ dïqqa amtannïγ iyen* 'The soup is [as I taste] very fine'. The phrase *indig iyen* is used in the sense of 'yes, it is so'. Here *iyen* seems to combine indirective and emphatic functions (personal communication). The form *iyen* has developed from **e(r)ken*; cf. Tuvan *iyi* 'two' < **iki*.

With interrogative elements, these variants of *erken* form rhetorical questions, with readings of wondering and hesitation ('I wonder'). This is an attenuating use to tone down questions, to give them rhetorical (meditative, skeptical, timid) connotations (Johanson 2000b, p. 79). Examples: Uzbek *Nimȧ qïlȧmiz ekȧn?* 'What will we do [I wonder]?', Kazakh *Keldi me eken?* 'I wonder if (s)he has come', *Ne ettim eken?* 'I wonder what I have done', Noghay *Nege bolmaydï eken?*, Uyghur *Nemišqa bolmaydiken?* 'I wonder why it does not come about'. For the situation in modern Uzbek, see Kleinmichel (1997). The use in questions is documented in the Cuman sentence *Qayda egen* 'Where may he be? ("wo mak he zin") (Grønbech 1936, p. 161). According to Drimba, *egen* here has "un sens hypothétique ou suppositif", but since the author regards it as a past tense form, he claims that the phrase should be translated 'où a-t-il bien été?', 'où faut-il croire qu'il a été?' (2000, p. 289); cf. 'où a-t-il éte donc?' (1973, p. 43). Compare the use of the Hungarian particle *ugyan*, e.g. *Ugyan ki jön?* Who is coming [I wonder]?, or the Swedish particle *månntro*, e.g. *Kommer han månntro?* 'I wonder whether he will come'.

Karakoç (2001) cites Noghay interrogative sentences in which the element *eken* is a indirective copula suffix carrying the personal suffix, e.g. *Nege kelgen ekenler?* 'Why do they seem to have come?' ('Why have they, as it seems, come?'), *Sen nege urlaqay ekensiŋ?* 'Why are you said to be a thief?', *Nege sen aŋqïldaq ekensiŋ?* 'Why are you said to be so stupid?'. By contrast, the author cites sentences in which the element *eken* is a modal particle added to the complete sentence. Thus,

Nege kelgenler eken? is a rhetorical question meaning 'I wonder why they have come'. Further examples: *Sen nege urlaqaysïŋ eken?* 'I wonder why you are a thief'; *Nege sen sonday anqïldaqsïŋ eken?* 'I wonder why you are so stupid'.

Gabain (1945, p. 149; 1959, p. 68) claims that Cuman *egen*, Uzbek *eken*, etc., are corrupt ("verderbte") forms of the East Old Turkic dubitative particle *erki*. This goes back to Bang's (1930, § 7) claim that *erki* developed into *ikin* and later to *iken*, interpreted as the participle of *i-* 'to be'. This development is highly improbable. The particle in question is certainly a form of *e(r)ken*. On the other hand, its rhetorical meaning is due to contamination with that of the old Turkic particle *e(r)ki(n)*.

The latter is an epistemic marker, though not of the evidential kind, as several grammarians have mistaken it for. The old Turkic languages Old Uyghur and Karakhanid possessed the modal particle *erki*, which is also derived from *er-* 'to be'. It may express speculation, skepticism, likelihood, etc., and is usually added to complete sentences, as a postpredicate element not carrying personal markers, e.g. Old Uyghur *Men kergek erdim erki* 'I was perhaps useful' or 'I must have been useful' (Müller 1920, pp. 69–70: "Mich hatte er wohl nötig gehabt"). According to Çağatay (1964, 246–247), its equivalents in Turkish are *ki*, *galiba*, *acaba*, in German *wohl*, e.g. *Yana kelgey erki* (Müller 1920, p. 67: "/…/ wird er wohl zurückkommen"; Çağatay 1964, p. 247: "Yine gelecek ki [galiba]").

This particle is mostly used in interrogative sentences (Clauson 1972, p. 223a), though it is not an interrogative marker itself, e.g. *Qanda erki ol* 'Where may he be?'. Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī refers to *erki* as a particle of doubt (*šakk*). In a sentence such as *Ol kelir mü erki* 'Is he coming or not (*am lā*)?' (Dankoff – Kelly 1982, p. 152), *mü* is the interrogative marker. The task of *erki* is to express scepticism or attenuation, i.e. to tone down the question. The reason for toning down the question may be politeness or the wish to make it rhetorical, a question that does not invite any reply. The question thus gets meditative or timid connotations. In a similar way, the modern Tuvan particle *irgi* renders questions more polite (Ishakov – Pal'mbah 1961, p. 433). Compare English questions introduced by *I wonder*, Latin questions with *num* or Turkish questions with *acaba*, German questions with *wohl*, *etwa*, *ich überlege*, *ob*, etc.

The type *erki* seems to be the origin of one of at least two different homophonous Turkish particles *ki* (Çağatay 1964). As Deny (1921, p. 687) suggested, "on peut considérer la particule *ki* comme équivalant á un point d'exclamation". Lewis (1967, p. 214) cites, among several colloquial uses, the indication of anxiety at the end of a question, e.g. *Bu borcun altından kalkabilir mi ki?* 'Can he ever rise from-under this debt?', and adds that *bilmem ki* means 'I wonder' (not 'I don't know that …'). Compare Çağatay's (1964, pp. 246–247) equation *Bilmem ki olur mu? = Bilmem olur mu acaba*. Çağatay (1969, p. 173) translates Tuvan *Bar irgi be?* 'I wonder if it is there', as 'Var mı ki?' (Ishakov – Pal'mbah 1961, p. 433: 'est' li? [skažite požalujsta]'), *Xarïn qaš šaq irgi am* 'I wonder what time it is now' as 'Bilmem, saat kaç (kaç zaman) ki şimdi', and *Meŋē čaγā bar irgi be?* 'I wonder whether there is a letter for me' as 'Bana mektup var mı ki?'. The author remarks that these types of inter-

rogative sentences represent a polite and soft kind of address ("bir nevi nazik ve yumuşak hitaptır").

The particle *erkin*, a secondary form of *erki*, may well have emerged under the influence of *erken* (Gabain 1945, p. 149). Its function is close to that of *erki*. Clauson (1972, p. 224) characterises it as a 'particle used to give a flavour of indefiniteness to a statement'. Its further formal development is represented by Chaghatay *ėkin* ~ *ikin* (Eckmann 1959, p. 158; 1966, pp. 183–184), modern Uyghur *ikin*, etc. It is represented in Tuvan by *iyin*, which functions as a 'softening particle' ("častica smjagčenija"; Ishakov – Pal'mbah 1961, p. 433). The formally more conservative form *irgin* has similar functions but is also often used in fairy-tales. It is thus more similar to the Dukhan indirective particle *ergen* ('reportedly'), whereas *iyin* is more similar to Dukhan *iyen*.

The forms of the *e(r)kin* type are used in questions with the same rhetorical (meditative, skeptical, timid) and attenuated readings as expressed by the earlier *mu erki*. Uzbek *mikin* is a combination with the interrogative particle, e.g. *Kečä ketdimikin?* 'I wonder whether he left yesterday' ("Ob er wohl gestern abgefahren ist?", Kleinmichel 1997, p. 105). The distinction between the evidential copula and the rhetoric particle may also be useful in understanding Modern Uyghur *-mikin* and *-(i)ken*. Hayasi notes that *-mikin* can follow personal markers, whereas *-(i)ken* cannot (personal communication). The two items may also cooccur, e.g. *kel-gen-ken-mikin* 'I wonder whether (s)he appears to have come'.

The type *erinč*, occurring in older East Turkic varieties, is an epistemic marker that must be distinguished from *erki(n)*, *erken* and *ermiš*. It is not a dubitative or inferential particle, as has been suggested, but rather a presumptive, best translated 'presumably, supposedly', etc. (Clauson 1972, p. 234; cf. Tekin 1968, p. 328, Erdal 1991, p. 321). Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī claims that *erinč* is a particle meaning 'perhaps' (Arabic *la^{c}alla*), e.g. *Ol keldi erinč* 'Perhaps he has come' (Dankoff – Kelly 1982, p. 154), which might be interpreted as 'He must have come'. Compare examples such as *bilge ermiš erinč* 'must have been wise' (Kül Tigin E 3) in the East Old Turkic inscriptions, Old Uyghur *Ol bodisavt erinč* 'This must be the Bodhisattva' (in the history of the princes Kalyāṇaṃkara and Pāpaṃkara) or Karakhanid *Yandi erinč uγraγi* 'Perhaps he has turned back from his intention' (Dankoff – Kelly 1984, p. 182), also interpretable as 'He must have turned back …'.

The semantic profile of a Turkic model for *igen* 'yes'

It is far from easy to distinguish systematically between the evidential copula particle *erken* and the rhetoric particle *erken*. But we must conclude that if Turkic *erken* is the source of Hungarian *igen*, the model must have been a particle with indirective – inferential, perceptive – and/or rhetorical meanings.

First a comment on indirectives. Turkic indirectivity markers do not serve to express the speaker's attitude to the truth of the propositional content, to the degree of reliability of the statement. Indirectives are not dubitatives and do not signal 'sup-

position' or 'probability'. The English expressions *maybe*, *probably* and *possibly* are thus not adequate as translation equivalents. But as a pragmatic extension of the central meaning, indirectives may suggest a certain dissociation from the narrated event, a cognitive or emotional distance to it. If one does not speak directly about the event itself, but rather on the reception of it ('as it appears'), some kind of distance will always be involved. The limitation to an indirective statement may also be motivated by caution, modesty, the need for a summarising view, etc.

The rhetorical particle *erken* belongs to the intensifiers that can be both positive as amplifiers and negative as moderators. This ambivalence known from adverbs such as English *sure(ly)* – ranging from certainty to likelihood – also fits together with the type found in Finnish *kyllä* 'yes', which has both amplifying and moderating uses ('sufficiently', 'fairly', 'rather'), essentially corresponding to Swedish *nog* ('enough', 'certainly', 'probably', 'I presume/suppose/think that') or German *wohl* ('I presume/suppose/think that', 'I wonder whether'): Finnish *Kyllä hän tulee* 'He will certainly come', *Oletteko herra Mäkelä? Olen kyllä*. 'Are you Mr. Mäkelä? I [admittedly, certainly] am'. Compare Estonian *küll* 'enough', 'certainly', 'surely', e.g. *Küll ma tulen* 'I will certainly come'. Estonian *Küll on* 'It is amazing' is an example of the rhetorical, emphatic, exclamatory use conveying astonishment ('indeed').

Particles of this kind may express conviction, assurance, consent, concession ('no doubt', 'to be sure', 'I can assure you', 'certainly') but, at the same time, reduce the degree of presumptuousness and convey modesty ('admittedly', 'I dare say', 'if I may admit it'). The Mari particle *ane* does not only express 'yes' (agreement, confirmation) but may also be used to soften requests, in which case it corresponds to the Russian particle *-ka*. Other Finno-Ugric affirmative answer particles of different origins seem to imply similarly wide ranges of meaning. Many 'yes' phrases are reminiscent of the Dukhan phrase *indig iyen* cited above. Compare the above-mentioned use of Hungarian *igenis* in the sense of 'yes indeed!', etc.

Turkic *egen ~ igen* and Hungarian *igen ~ egen*

The aim of this article has thus been to suggest that the origin of Hungarian *igen ~ egen* is Turkic *egen ~ igen* (< *erken*), an indirective and/or emphatic particle ('evidently', 'indeed', 'certainly') used as part of the predicate core and/or as a postpredicate element.

One of the Turkic types *e(r)ken* implies inferential and perceptive indirectivity ('obviously', 'evidently', 'apparently', 'as it appears', 'it turns out that'). The other one has rhetorical, e.g. emphatic and exclamatory, uses ('indeed'). Both may get readings of astonishment, wondering, hesitation, modesty, meditation, timidity, politeness, caution, softness, distance, summary, etc. Both are appropriate for affirmative – consenting, admitting, agreeing – answers uttered with reduced self-confidence, with 'a flavour of indefiniteness' (Clauson 1972, p. 224). If *e(r)ken* – with all these various implications – was the model for Hungarian *igen* 'yes', we may observe the result of a selective copying process that matches a certain Finno-Ugric pattern.

In Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages, part of the proposition of a given assertion or question may be used as an 'echoing' yes-no answer, e.g. Hungarian *Jön?*, Turkish *Geliyor mu?* 'Is he coming?'; response: *Jön, Geliyor* 'He is coming'. The original pattern of the copying discussed here may have been a combination of an echoing answer and a confirming – emphatic or moderating – particle. The latter could then also be employed alone as a less elaborate answer. Thus the Hungarian combination *igen + is* , which gave affirmative emphasis to sentences and sentence constituents, could also be used without any emphasised element, as a affirmative particle giving minimal yes-no answers to assertions and polar questions.

References

A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára 3. 1965. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Bang, W. (1930): Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut, 5. *Ungarische Jahrbücher* Vol. 10, pp. 16–26.

Bárczi, G.– Benkő, L.– Berrár, J. (1967): *A magyar nyelv története* [The history of the Hungarian language]. Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó.

Benkő, L. et al. (eds) (1970): *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára* 1 [Historical-etymological dictionary of the Hungarian language]. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Benkő, L. et al. (eds) (1993): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Buder, A. (1989): *Aspekto-temporale Kategorien im Jakutischen* (Turcologica 5). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Clauson, Sir G. (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Collinder, B. (1960): *Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages* (A Handbook of the Uralic Languages 3). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell.

Comrie, B. (2000): Evidentials: Semantics and History. In: Johanson, L.– Utas, B. (eds): *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24). Berlin–New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1–12.

Csató, É. Á. (2000): Turkish MIŞ- and IMIŞ-items. Dimensions of a Functional Analysis. In: Johanson, L.– Utas, B. (eds): *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24). Berlin–New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 29–43.

Çağatay, S. (1964): Türkçede *ki* < *erki* [*Ki* < *erki* in Turkic]. In: *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* 1963. (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 234.) Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, pp. 244–250.

Çağatay, S. (1969): Tuba ağzında *iyik* [*Iyik* in Tuvan]. *Türkiyat Mecmuası* Vol. 15, pp. 171–174.

Dankoff, R.– Kelly, J. (1982): *Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects* (*Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk*) 1. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University.

Dankoff, R.– Kelly, J. (1984): *Maḥmūd al-Kāšgarī. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luγāt at-Turk)* 2. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University.

Deny, J. (1921): *Grammaire de la langue turque* (*dialecte osmanli*). Paris, Éditions Ernest Leroux.

Deny, J.– Grønbech, K.– Scheel, H.– Togan Z. V. (eds) (1959): *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis, Steiner.

Drimba, V. (1973): *Syntaxe comane*. Bucureşti, Editura Academiei & Leiden, Brill.

Drimba, V. (2000): *Codex Cumanicus. Édition diplomatique avec fac-similés*. Bucarest, Editura Enciclopedică.

Eckmann, J. (1959): Das Tschaghataische. In: Deny, J. – Grønbech, K. – Scheel, H. – Togan Z. V. (eds): *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis, Steiner, pp. 138 – 160.

Eckmann, J. (1966): *Chagatay Manual* (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic series 60). The Hague, Mouton.

Erdal, M. (1991): *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. 1 – 2 (Turcologica 7). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Gabain, A. von (1945): *Özbekische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis*. Leipzig – Wien, Harrassowitz.

Gabain, A. von (1959): Die Sprache des Codex Cumanicus. In: Deny, J. – Grønbech, K. – Scheel, H. – Togan Z. V. (eds): *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis, Steiner, pp. 46 – 73.

Grønbech, K. (ed.) (1936): *Codex Cumanicus, cod. Marc. Lat. DXLIX, in Faksimile herausgegeben, mit einer Einleitung von K. Grønbech* (Monumenta linguarum Asiæ Maioris 1). Kopenhagen, Einar Munksgaard.

Grønbech, K. (1942): *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus* (Monumenta linguarum Asiæ Maioris, Subsidia 1). Kopenhagen, Einar Munksgaard.

Hajdú, P. (1988[4]). *Bevezetés az uráli nyelvtudományba: a magyar nyelv finnugor alapjai*. Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó.

Hazai, G. (1973): *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány* (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 18). Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Ishakov. F. G. – Pal'mbah, A. A. (1961): *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija* [Tuvan grammar. Phonetics and morphology]. Moskva, Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.

Ivanov, S. I. (1958): Modal'naja svjazka *ėkan* i forma *ėkanlik* v uzbekskom jazyke [The modal particle *ekán* and the form *ekánlik* in Uzbek]. In: *Učenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 256. *Serija vostokovedečeskih nauk* 7. Leningrad, pp. 131 – 146.

Johanson, L. (1971): *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems* (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1). Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell.

Johanson, L. (1979): *Alttürkisch als 'dissimilierende Sprache'* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, 1979: 3). Wiesbaden, Steiner.

Johanson, L. (1992): *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten* (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main 29:5). Stuttgart, Steiner.

Johanson, L. (1994): Funktion, Kompetenz und Etymon. Bemerkungen zu einer ost-alttürkischen Wortbildungslehre. *Central Asiatic Journal* Vol. 38, pp. 160 – 178.

Johanson, L. (1996): On Bulgarian and Turkic Indirectives. In: Boretzky, N. – Enninger W. – Stolz, Th. (eds): *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte. Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen* (Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 24). Bochum, Brockmeyer, pp. 84 – 94.

Johanson, L. (1998): Zum Kontakteinfluss türkischer Indirektive. In: Demir, N. – Taube, E. (eds): *Turkologie heute – Tradition und Perspektive.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, pp. 141 – 150.

Johanson, L. (2000a): Viewpoint Operators in European Languages. In: Dahl, Ö. (ed.): *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin – New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 27 – 187.

Johanson, L. (2000b): Turkic Indirectives. In: Johanson, L.– Utas, B. (eds): *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24). Berlin–New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 61–87.

Johanson, L. (2002): *Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contact*s [With an introduction by Bernard Comrie]. London, Curzon.

Johanson, L. (2003): Evidentiality in Turkic. In: Aikhenvald, A. Y.– Dixon, R. M. W. (eds): *Studies in Evidentiality* (Typological Studies in Language 54). Amsterdam–Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 273–290.

Johanson, L.– Utas, B. (2000): *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24). Berlin–New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

Juhász, J.– Szőke, I.– O. Nagy, G.– Kovalovsky, M. (eds) (1985): *Magyar értelmező kéziszótár. A–Ly* [Hungarian explicatory hand dictionary]. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Karakoç, B. (2001): *Studien zum finiten Verbalsystem des Nogaischen*. PhD thesis, University of Mainz.

Kleinmichel, S. (1997): Zu *ėkan* und *-kin* im Usbekischen. In: Kellner-Heinkele, B.– Zieme, P. (eds): *Studia Ottomanica. Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, pp. 103–126.

Klemm, A. (1928): *A magyar történeti mondattan* [The Hungarian historical syntax]. (A magyar nyelvtudomány kézikönyve 2: 6). Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Kononov, A. N. (1960): *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka* [Grammar of the contemporary Uzbek literary language]. Moskva–Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Korkina, E. I. (1958): Formy prošedšego vremeni glagola v jakutskom jazyke. In: *Trudy jakutskogo filiala sibirskogo otdelenija institut jazyka, literatury i istorii Akademii Nauk SSSR 1. Obščestvennye nauki*. Jakutsk, pp. 118–161.

Korkina, E. I. (1970): *Naklonenija glagola v jakutskom jazyke*. Moskva, Nauka.

Levin-Steinmann, A. (2002): *Bedeutung und Funktionen der kopulalosen l-Periphrase im Bulgarischen*. Habilitation thesis, University of Leipzig.

Lewis, G. L. (1967): *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Meninski, F. à Mesgnien (1680): *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium turcicæ, arabicæ, persicæ*. Viennæ Austriæ.

Müller, F. W. K. (1920): *Uigurica III. Uigurische Avadāna-Bruchstücke (I–VIII)* (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1920.2). Berlin.

Rásonyi, L. (1972): L'origine du hongrois *igen* 'oui'. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* Vol. 25, pp. 413–414.

Rey, A. (1998[3]): *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. Paris, Robert.

Serebrennikov, B. A. (1960): *Kategorii vremeni i vida v finno-ugorskih jazykah permskoj i volžskoj grupp* [The categories of tense and aspect in the Finno-Ugric languages of the Permian and Volgaic groups]. Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Tarama sözlüğü 3 (1967): (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 212). Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Tekin, T. (1968): *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic* (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic series 69). The Hague, Mouton.

Tezcan (1978): "Marzubān-nāme tercümesi" üzerine. In: *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* 1977 (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 444). Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, pp. 413–431.