

Werk

Label: Zeitschriftenheft

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2000

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0004 | LOG_0007

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Turkic Languages

Edited by Lars Johanson

Volume 4, 2000

Number 1

Braun: Gender in Turkish • Taube: Eine mythisch-sagenhafte Überlieferung der Altaituwiner • Steenwijk: Turkish adjectives in *-vari* • Cheremisina & Nevskaja: Infinitive constructions of intention in South Siberian Turkic • Erden & Özyıldırım: Apology in Turkish • Erdal: Turkish resultative deverbal adjectives • Shibliyev & Boztaş: Acquisition of English collocations • Reviews

Niedersächsische Staats- u. Universitätsbibliothek

Verlag

ALS' 2
ZA 85958

Turkic Languages

Edited by
Lars Johanson

in cooperation with
Árpád Berta, Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen,
Larry V. Clark, Éva Á. Csató, Tooru Hayasi,
Dmitrij M. Nasilov, Sumru A. Özsoy,
with the editorial assistance of
Vanessa Locke and Sevgi Ağcagül

4 (2000) 1

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

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

Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and all correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Lars Johanson, Turkic Languages, Institute of Oriental Studies, University of Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany. The e-mail address johanson@mail.uni-mainz.de may also be used for communication.

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

Subscription orders can be placed with booksellers and agencies. For further information, please contact: Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Germany; Fax: 49-611-530570; e-mail: verlag@harrassowitz.de.

© Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2000

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

Printing and binding by MZ-Verlagsdruckerei GmbH, Memmingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

ISSN 1431-4983

Contents

Turkic Languages, Volume 4, 2000, Number 1

Editorial note by Lars Johanson.....	1
--------------------------------------	---

Articles

Friederike Braun: Gender in the Turkish language system.....	3
Marcel Erdal: <i>Açık</i> and <i>kapalı</i> : The Turkish resultative deverbal adjective.....	22
Aysu Erden & Işıl Özyıldırım: Apology in Turkish: A functional approach.....	31
Javanshir Shibliyev & İsmail Boztaş: Acquisition of English collocations by speakers of Turkish and Azerbaijanian.....	45
Han Steenwijk: Denominal adjectives containing the suffix <i>-vari</i> in contemporary Turkish	54
Maja I. Cheremisina & Irina A. Nevskaja: 'I stood to lie down' and 'I sat to leave': Infinitive constructions of intention in South Siberian Turkic languages.....	77
Erika Taube: Eine mythisch-sagenhafte Überlieferung der Altaituwiner und ihre fuyü-kirgisische Parallele.....	114

Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of Cholpan Khousaïnova & Rémy Dor, <i>Manuel de qazaq. Langue et civilisation</i>	129
Claus Schönig: Review of Larry Clark, <i>Turkmen reference grammar</i>	132
Christoph Schroeder: Review of Lars Johanson (ed.), <i>The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3-6, 1994</i>	137

Editorial note

Turkic Languages, Volume 4, 2000, Number 1

The present issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES introduces a new period in the short history of the journal. According to our principles of rotation, it has a partly new editorial board. The journal was originally defined as "Europe-based in the sense of being edited by a group of European scholars" (TURKIC LANGUAGES 1/1997: 5). We now think it is time to go a step further, i.e. to "go global". We are thus proud to announce that Larry V. Clark (USA) and Tooru Hayasi (Japan) have accepted to join the board for the period ahead.

Our sincere thanks are due to the colleagues who are now leaving the editorial board. Their strong efforts to develop the journal are highly appreciated, and we are counting on their continued support.

TURKIC LANGUAGES has known no shortages in the supply of good contributions. On the contrary, the journal has always been short of space, which has sometimes caused unnecessarily long "waiting lists". We have now decided to solve part of this problem by reducing the font size of the text, thus probably gaining some 20 per cent of space.

As will be evident from the contents of the present issue, the adjustments certainly do not involve any change of direction in the editorial policy. Several articles are devoted to Turkish issues. Friederike Braun, author of the recently published monograph *Geschlecht im Türkischen?* (Wiesbaden, 2000), deals with the problem of gender in the Turkish language system. Marcel Erdal treats resultative deverbal adjectives of the Turkish types *açık* 'open' and *kapalı* 'closed'. Aysu Erden and Işıl Özyıldırım present a functional analysis of the Turkish system of apology. Javanshir Shibliyev and İsmail Boztaş examine the acquisition of English collocations by native speakers of Turkish and Azerbaijani. Han Steenwijk presents a comprehensive study on modern Turkish adjectives in *-vari*.

Two contributions concern Turkic languages of the Northeast. Maja I. Cheremina and Irina A. Nevskaja scrutinize an intentional construction found in South Siberian Turkic. Erika Taube compares a mythical tradition of the Tuvans of the Altay region with a parallel version familiar to the Fuyü Turks of Manchuria.

In the review section, Mark Kirchner deals with a handbook of Kazakh published by Cholpan Khoussainova and Rémy Dor. Claus Schönig comments on Larry Clark's *Turkmen reference grammar*. Finally, Christoph Schroeder reviews the proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics convened at Mainz in 1994 (*The Mainz Meeting*).

The editors are looking forward to receiving further interesting contributions. Please keep in mind that submissions should conform to the citation and stylistic requirements as indicated in *TURKIC LANGUAGES* 1/1997: 151-156 and on the journal's webpage (at www.uni-mainz.de/FB/Philologie-III/Orientkunde/joh.html).

Lars Johanson

Gender in the Turkish language system

Friederike Braun

Braun, Friederike 2000. Gender in the Turkish language system. *Turkic Languages* 4, 3-21.

This article examines how gender distinctions are coded in Turkish, a grammatically genderless language. Linguistic means of expressing gender are described on three levels: (a) lexical (lexemes such as *kadın*, *erkek*), (b) morphological (suffixes such as *-e* in *memur-e*), (c) syntactic (combinations of a gender lexeme with another nominal form, e.g. *kadın polis*). Factors determining the occurrence of such gender expressions are discussed. The article also deals with inherent gender biases of terms without overt gender markers and the tendency to equate humanness with maleness (as in *adam* or *bir genç*).

Friederike Braun, Seminar für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Kiel, Ols-hausenstr. 40, 24098 Kiel, Germany.

1. Introduction

It is well known that Turkish is spared the “curse of grammatical gender” (Lewis 1967 [1991]: 51). Descriptions of Turkish therefore tend to assume that gender plays a negligible role in the language system. The only thing Underhill (1976: 32) has to say is, for example, that: “Turkish has no grammatical gender, that is, no distinction between ‘he’, ‘she’, and ‘it’, and the pronoun *o* serves for all three”. Other descriptions of Turkish briefly point to the existence of gender-specific lexemes, of gender-marking attributes or suffixes (cf. for example Kissling 1960: 117; Lewis 1967 [1991]: 25 or Kornfilt 1997: 270), but in general, the question of gender and its linguistic expression receives little attention in Turkish linguistics.

It is the aim of the present article to give a more extensive and systematic account of gender expressions and their linguistic status in Turkish.¹ It will be argued that

¹ The observations made in the present article are based on data from the following sources: Literary texts, newspaper articles, the text corpus of the project “Turkish Natural Language Processing” (which is conducted at the universities of Bilkent and Orta Doğu and accessible on the internet), empirical studies conducted by the author, as well as interviews with native speakers of Turkish. In order to distinguish literary texts from linguistic sources, literary texts will be cited in a different format using keywords from the title rather than the year of publication, e.g. “Pamuk, *Sessiz ev*, p. 31”. The full references are given in the list of literary sources at the end of the article.

the linguistic forms concerned are neither few nor simple and that a number of questions regarding the grammar of these forms still need to be answered. The observations and findings presented are the result of six years of research on the linguistic treatment of gender in Turkish and on the gender semantics of Turkish terms for person reference. This research comprises among other things a series of empirical investigations in which over 1,000 native speakers participated. On the basis of these data, it will also be argued that overt expressions of gender are more frequent than is usually assumed and that they occur even where they are neither necessary nor central to the point made in an utterance.

In particular, the following aspects will be dealt with: The linguistic means for expressing gender in Turkish (lexical gender, suffixes, and syntactic gender marking) are presented in sections 2 and 3. The conditions under which gender expressions are used are discussed under 4; this section also summarises results of an empirical study on overt gender marking. Section 5 is concerned with the tendency to equate humanness with maleness, which has various manifestations in Turkish. Reference will also be made to the covert gender of terms without overt gender markers. The conclusion in section 6 will recapitulate the main aspects of the preceding sections and briefly compare them to findings on Finnish.

2. Means of expressing gender in Turkish

There are basically three ways of expressing gender in Turkish: the use of (a) lexemes with gender as an inherent lexical feature, (b) gender-marking suffixes, and (c) syntactic gender marking.

2.1. Gender as an inherent lexical feature

Lexemes with inherent gender are, among others, expressions such as *kadın* 'woman', *erkek* 'man', *kız* 'girl', or *oğlan* 'boy', in which gender is the core of the designation. But lexical gender distinctions are also common in kinship terms and terms of address.² Note that these lexical fields overlap so that the same differentiations recur (cf. Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1: Kinship terms

Female	Male	
<i>anne</i> 'mother'	<i>baba</i>	'father'
<i>abla</i> 'older sister'	<i>abi</i> (<i>ağabey</i>)	'older brother'
<i>nine</i> 'grandmother'	<i>dede</i>	'grandfather'

Newspaper articles will be identified with the date of publication and the page number, e.g. "*Hürriyet*, 22 August 1995, p. 3".

² The following description disregards terms for animals, where lexical gender distinctions are found as well, cf. *kısrak* 'mare' vs. *aygır* 'stallion', *inek* 'cow' vs. *boğa* 'bull'. As for kinship terms, cf. also Kornfilt (1997: 519-520).

<i>teyze</i> 'aunt' (mother's sister)	<i>dayı</i>	'uncle' (mother's brother)
--	-------------	-------------------------------

Table 2: Terms of address

Female		Male	
<i>hanım</i>	'Mrs, lady'	<i>bey</i>	'Mr, sir'
<i>hanımefendi</i>	'lady'	<i>beyefendi</i>	'sir'
<i>bayan</i>	'lady'	<i>bay</i>	'sir'
<i>abla</i>	'older sister'	<i>abi</i>	'older brother'
<i>teyze</i>	'aunt'	<i>amca</i>	'uncle'

Within the whole field of person reference, however, lexical gender words constitute only a minor subgroup, since the majority of lexemes are not gender-specific (e.g. *işçi* 'worker', *öğretmen* 'teacher' or *komşu* 'neighbour').

2.2. Gender-indicating suffixes

There are a few gender-marking (mostly female-marking)³ suffixes in Turkish. Almost all of them were borrowed from gender languages in combination with lexemes to which they were attached (Kornfilt 1997: 270). They are not productive and cannot freely derive feminine terms from Turkish stems.

The ending *-e* is the most frequent of these suffixes. It was borrowed from Arabic and occurs in Arabic loanwords such as *sahib-e* 'owner-fem', *müdür-e* 'director-fem', *rakib-e* 'rival-fem' or *memur-e* 'employee-fem' (Kissling 1960: 244). In Modern Turkish, the suffix is not mandatory, so that the bare lexemes *sahip*, *müdür*, *rakip*, and *memur* can refer to females as well. In spite of the purist efforts of the Turkish Language Reform, however, even modern Turkish texts contain *-e* forms like the ones mentioned above, cf. example (1).

- (1) *Ertesi yıl laboratuvarının karşısında, yıllardır para işlerini yürüttüğü banka şubesinin müdir-e-si Şule Hanım'la evlendi.*
'In the following year he married Ms. Şule, the **director-fem** of the bank opposite his laboratory, where he had conducted his financial affairs for years.' (Uzuner, *Susamuru*, p. 171)

Similarly, the form *memur-e* 'official-fem' was used by several speakers around the age of twenty in the empirical study described in 4.2. below.⁴

³ Exceptions are borrowed word pairs such as *aktör / aktris*, where both endings may be perceived by Turkish speakers as gender-marking.

⁴ The existence of the secondary derivation *sahib-e-lik* 'owner-(fem)-ship' from *sahib-e* 'owner-fem' is a further indicator that *-e* suffixation is rather established with certain lexemes.

The suffix *-içe* is a loan from Slavic (Banguoğlu 1986: 178) and is found in the originally Slavic words *kral-içe* 'queen' (cf. *kral* 'king'), and *çar-içe* 'tsarina' (cf. *çar* 'tsar').⁵ *İmparator-içe* 'empress' may have come into Turkish via Slavic as well (Lewis 1967 [1991]: 25), even though Italian is the donor language of the base *imparator* 'emperor' (*Türkçe sözlük*, 702). In addition to these "three old borrowings" (Lewis 1967 [1991]: 25) we find the more recent coinage *patron-içe* 'boss-fem', which is derived from the originally French stem *patron* 'boss' (*Türkçe sözlük*, 1169). For female heads of state, *kraliçe*, *çariçe* and *imparatoriçe* have to be used with the suffix, for the unsuffixed bases are understood as exclusively male. *Patron*, however, can refer to females even without the suffix.⁶ According to Banguoğlu (1986: 178) and Lewis (1967 [1991]: 25), the ending *-ça* in *tanrı-ça* 'godd-ess' is related to *-içe* in that *tanrıça*, a neologism, was coined in analogy to *-içe* forms.

Some gender-differentiated word pairs borrowed from French brought along further gender suffixes, e.g. *aktör / aktris* 'actor / actress', *dansör / dansöz* 'male / female dancer', *prens / prenses* 'prince / princess'. These suffixes are not used consistently in Turkish, however: Although *kuaför* 'hairdresser', for example, was borrowed into Turkish, a word **kuaföz* 'female hairdresser' is not used. It is also worth noting that the gender distinction in such pairs is not always adhered to. *Dansöz* 'female dancer', for example, changed its meaning to 'belly dancer', with the consequence that males as well can be referred to as (*erkek*) *dansöz* '(male) belly dancer (fem)'. Similar tendencies are reported for words with the French feminine suffix *-es*: According to Steuerwald (1963: 129, note 328), *metres* 'mistress' can be used to designate male "mistresses", and Brendemoen & Hovdhaugen (1992: 38, note 12) observe that *hostes* 'female flight attendant' can be used to refer to the male service personnel in long distance buses.⁷

The only native candidate for a gender "suffix" is the ending *-(a)num* as in *hoca-num* 'teacher-fem' (from *hoca* 'teacher'). This ending is an enclitic version of the lexeme *hanım* 'lady', which, due to frequent use in address and reference (e.g. *hoca hanım*), has fused with the stem and acquired a suffix-like quality. Occurrences of *-(a)num* are not very frequent today and are basically restricted to forms such as *hoca-num* 'teacher-fem', *müdür-anım* 'director-fem', and *hemşire-anım* 'nurse'.⁸

The above overview has shown that gender-marking suffixes do exist in Turkish. But their limited distribution and frequency assigns them a secondary role in the language system. Even though a systematic gender differentiation could have origin-

⁵ According to Lewis (1967 [1991]: 25) and Kornfilt (1997: 270), the source language is Serbo-Croatian.

⁶ The suffixed form *patroniçe* 'boss-fem' also has the more specialised meaning 'manager of a brothel'. This usage may prevent *patroniçe* from becoming the regular reference to female bosses.

⁷ Informants, however, preferred the term *muavin* 'assistant'.

⁸ The stem *hemşire* is a gender lexeme, so that the suffix is a redundant gender marker in this case.

ated from suffixes, such a development has not taken place. It can be assumed that the language reform, with its efforts to abolish foreign grammatical elements, contributed to a decline of suffixation.⁹ Ergin's (1958 [1993]: 120) observation, however, that there are no gender suffixes in Turkish can only be confirmed in so far as the suffixes described above do not form part of a grammatical gender system.

2.3. Syntactic gender marking

Expressions of the type *kadın doktor* 'woman doctor (= female doctor)', *erkek arkadaş* 'male friend (= boyfriend)' or *kadın bir polis* 'woman a police (= a female police officer)' are instances of syntactic gender marking: They constitute complex noun phrases in which a gender lexeme is combined with another nominal. Since this kind of gender expression exceeds the word boundary, it is regarded here as a syntactic phenomenon. In what follows, the gender lexeme in such an expression will be called "gender marker" or "marker", while the other term will be referred to as "unspecified" (with regard to gender). The present section will give an overview of "female" and "male" markers, while the structural aspects of syntactic gender marking will be dealt with under 3.

The most frequent and most general "female" marker is the word *kadın* 'woman'. The use of *kadın* presupposes that the female in question is an adult and / or is married.¹⁰ *Kadın* is widely used in syntactic gender marking, cf. combinations such as *kadın başbakan* 'woman prime minister', *dilenci kadın* 'beggar woman', *kadın dedektif* 'woman detective', *kadın yazar* 'woman author'.¹¹

Another gender marker for adult women is *bayan* 'lady', which was introduced during the language reform as an equivalent to European titles of the type *Mrs* or *Madame*. *Bayan* is a little more formal than *kadın* (hence classified as "unvan" 'title' in *Türkçe sözlük*, 158), but has gained wide currency and can be used with terms that do not express very dignified or "lady-like" roles, e.g. *bayan futbolcu* 'lady football player', *bayan mahkûm* 'lady convict'. However, a certain formal flavour still prevents combinations such as **dilenci bayan* 'beggar lady', **köylü bayan* 'villager lady', or **bayan katil* 'lady murderer'. In syntactic gender marking, *bayan* is much more frequent than *hanım* 'lady', which otherwise has a similar distribution and status.

Kız 'girl' is the gender marker for young and / or unmarried females. It occurs in many combinations, of which *kız çocuğu* 'girl child', *kız arkadaş* 'girl friend', *kız*

⁹ The literature on the language reform (e.g. Steuerwald 1963, 1966; Brendemoen 1990) contains surprisingly little information on these suffixes, although Arabic *-e*, for example, should have been a typical target of the kind of purism pursued in the reform.

¹⁰ The aspect of marriage referred to here is 'loss of virginity'. This aspect is also manifest in a news text (Turkish Natural Language Processing Project, file "trtnews1") where 12 and 13-year-old girls are referred to as *genç kadınlar* 'young women', because they are prostitutes—and hence not virgins.

¹¹ The order of the respective elements will be dealt with under 3.1. below.

öğrenciler ‘girl students’ are typical examples. With *kardeş* ‘(younger) sibling’ *kız* does not express the actual age of the referent, but her age relative to the person who is the point of reference. A *kız kardeş* ‘girl sibling (= sister)’ can thus be 50 years of age provided that the other one is older.

Apart from these common markers of female gender, there are a few others with more specialised uses: *Karı* ‘woman, broad’ is distinctly pejorative and can be found in expressions such as *köylü karıları* ‘village women (broad)’. *Teyze* ‘aunt’ appears in combinations of the type *komşu teyzeler* ‘neighbour aunts’, where it signals familiarity (and thus parallels the use of *teyze* as a term of address). The markers *madam* ‘madam’ and *matmazel* refer to non-Muslim or non-Turkish women, cf. *terzi matmazel* ‘dressmaker Miss’ for a European referent.

For male gender there are only two markers which are commonly used: *erkek* ‘male, man’ and *adam* ‘man, human’. With *erkek*, there are restrictions concerning age, but they depend on its position in the complex expression: When *erkek* is the modifier, as in *erkek çocuk* ‘male child’ or *erkek okuyucu* ‘male reader’, it expresses only gender and says nothing about age. Where it serves as the head noun (cf. *komşu erkekler* ‘neighbour men’), it refers to adult men.¹²

That *adam* serves as a ‘male’ marker might seem surprising considering its second, gender-neutral reading ‘human’. The context, however, usually disambiguates the two meanings: *Adam* means ‘man (male)’ when it is used in the singular in reference to a specific person. As a ‘male’ marker, *adam* implies adulthood of the referent, but is otherwise widely combinable, cf. *makinist adam* ‘engine driver man’, *dilenci adam* ‘beggar man’, *cüce adam* ‘dwarf man’. The subjects participating in the empirical study mentioned under 4.2. showed a preference of *adam* over *erkek* as marker of male gender.

In contrast to its ‘female’ equivalent *bayan*, the marker *bay* ‘Mr, sir’ rarely appears in syntactic gender marking. It seems to be more or less restricted to job offers and wanted ads, where *bay eleman* ‘sir personnel / staff member (= male employee)’ is an established expression. *Bey* ‘Mr, sir’, the equivalent to *hanım*, is hardly ever used as a gender marker.

Oğlan ‘boy’ serves as a ‘male’ marker for non-adults. It is found in combinations such as *oğlan çocuğu* ‘boy child’ and *oğlan kardeş* ‘boy sibling (= younger brother)’ where *erkek* ‘male, man’ can be used as well.¹³ In contrast to attributive *erkek*, *oğlan* gives definite information about the age of the referent.

¹² Some of the informants regarded the use of *erkek* in head noun position as somewhat unusual. For them, *erkek* has slightly sexual connotations when it appears in a “noun” position, since *erkek* then refers to biological sex (cf. *Türkçe Sözlük*, 463). As to the word class of nominals in syntactic gender marking, cf. 3.1. below.

¹³ In general, the word *oğlan* refers to persons that are not regarded as fully male, either because they are too young and sexually inexperienced or because they are homosexuals. Due to the association with homosexuality, some informants were hesitant about using *oğlan* as a gender marker and expressed a preference for *erkek*.

The lexeme *herif* ‘guy’ can be regarded as the male counterpart of *karı* ‘woman, broad’ as it is similarly pejorative. Its use in syntactic gender marking is rather rare; it was found for example in the combination *hademe herif* ‘servant guy’ where it was clearly negative.

To conclude, there are a number of gender lexemes in Turkish which serve as gender markers when they are combined with unspecified nominals. They have additional semantic components of evaluation, formality and reference to age. These aspects rather than the expression of gender can be the primary motivation for speakers to use a given marker. A speaker may choose to add *karı*, for example, to the unspecified term *satıcı* ‘salesperson’ in order to convey a negative evaluation (rather than marking gender). Similarly, a speaker may use *oğlan* ‘boy’ in combination with *kardeş* ‘(younger) sibling’ to signal that the younger brother is still a child. But no matter what is foremost in the speaker’s mind, these markers always convey gender information. Since gender is the main component in their lexical meaning, they are treated as gender markers.

3. Structural aspects of syntactic gender marking

There are two ways in which the combination of a gender marker and an unspecified nominal may vary: First, in the respective order of the two elements. Both gender marker – unspecified nominal and unspecified nominal – gender marker are attested, as in *kadın polis* ‘woman police (= female police officer)’ and *polis kadın* ‘police woman’. The second area of variation concerns the type of construction that the two elements form. Here again there are two possibilities. One is that the two are simply juxtaposed, as in *bayan sürücü* ‘lady driver’, with no further formal indication of their relationship. The second possibility is that the two combine in a compound with a third person singular possessive marker on the head noun, as in *kız çocuğu* ‘girl child-poss (= girl)’.

3.1. The order of elements in syntactic gender marking

Combinations of the type *kadın öğretmen* ‘woman teacher’ constitute complex nominal expressions in which the last element is the syntactically dominant head noun, and the initial element the modifier.¹⁴ The examples in the preceding section have already shown that markers and unspecified nominals can occur in either position so that there are expressions of the type *kız öğrenci* ‘girl student’ (marker-un-

¹⁴ It is obvious that a modifier such as *kadın* ‘woman’ (in *kadın öğretmen* ‘woman teacher’) is grammatically rather different from a modifier such as *iyi* ‘good’ (as in *iyi öğretmen* ‘good teacher’). *Kadın* and *iyi* are therefore usually not coordinated in a phrase such as **iyi ve kadın bir öğretmen* ‘a good and woman teacher’. This is at least partly due to the different degree of nouniness of *kadın* and *iyi*, cf. below. This question is not central to the present considerations, though, and will not be discussed any further here.

specified nominal) as well as *köylü kadın* 'villager woman' (unspecified nominal-marker). It is not unusual for the same two lexemes to occur in both orders and even to alternate within the same text. For example, both *hastabakıcı kadın* 'hospital attendant woman' and *kadın hastabakıcı* 'woman hospital attendant' were found in the same text, as were *trafik polisi bayan* 'traffic police lady' and *bayan trafik polisi* 'lady traffic police'. In a series of standardised interviews conducted in Ankara, informants mentioned *futbolcu bayan* 'football player lady' and *bayan futbolcu* 'lady football player' as possible expressions which were to be inserted in the same sentence frame. There are, however, semantic nuances between the different orderings and a few restrictions with certain types of forms.

Where both orders are possible, the nominal in head noun position gives the primary classification of the referent, with the modifier adding further information (cf. Haig 1998: 74 on the relationship of modifier and head in general). A person referred to as *kadın polis* 'woman police', for example, is first and foremost a police officer, but one who is female. A person designated as *polis kadın* 'police woman', on the other hand, is seen primarily as a woman, but one who is a police officer. As Kissling (1960: 118) and similarly Lewis (1967 [1991]: 252) rightly note, the modifier is often the focus of attention, since it names the feature which distinguishes persons from the same basic category. Thus, *öğrenci kız* 'student girl' and *dilenci kız* 'beggar girl' both refer to the category 'girl', but the modifiers highlight the difference between the two girls. On the other hand, *kız öğrenci* 'girl student' refers to the basic category 'student', as does *erkek öğrenci* 'male student', but the modifier contrasts the two on the basis of gender. The head noun may thus be seen as the theme of the construction and the modifier as the rheme. A corresponding view is proposed by Dede (1982: 88), who postulates underlying sentences following the pattern "HEAD NOUN is MODIFIER". According to this view, *kız öğrenci* 'girl student' expresses the underlying sentence 'the student is a girl', with 'student' the theme and 'girl' the rheme. The underlying sentence for *öğrenci kız* 'student girl' would be 'the girl is a student', with 'girl' as the theme and 'student' as the rheme. These semantic distinctions are very subtle, however. In many contexts they are so small that native speakers do not perceive a tangible difference between the two orders.

In addition, there are a few restrictions in the order of elements which concern certain lexemes: Expressions of origin, such as *Alman* 'German' or *Ankaralı* 'Ankaranian', usually occur in the modifier position,¹⁵ with the marker as the head noun (cf. *Alman kadın* 'German woman', but not **kadın Alman* 'woman German'). The markers *adam* 'man' and *karı* 'woman, broad' are always in head noun position, hence *dilenci adam* 'beggar man' or *komşu karı* 'neighbour woman' and not **adam dilenci* 'man beggar' or **karı komşu* 'woman neighbour'. With *çocuk* 'child' and *kardeş* 'sibling' the gender marker has to be in the modifier position, as in *erkek çocuk* 'male child' and *kız kardeş* 'girl sibling'.

¹⁵ Cf. Braun & Haig (1998) on the relatively low degree of "nouniness" of these terms.

The order of elements in forms like *Alman bayan* 'German lady' is of course not merely a question of semantics, but is related to the question of word class membership: Across languages, it is a prototypical function of adjectives to act as modifiers within noun phrases, hence as attribute to the head noun (cf. Croft 1991: 52; Bhat 1994: 49-50, 167; Wierzbicka 1986: 373; on Turkish cf. Kornfilt 1997: 105). The word class membership of lexemes should thus predict the preferred order in syntactic gender marking. In Turkish, however, the distinction of adjectives and nouns is far from clear and is the subject of considerable controversy (cf. Johanson 1990: 187-191). As the overview in Johanson (1990) shows, it is difficult, if not impossible, to draw a strict line between the two word classes. This position is supported by the results and the discussion in Braun & Haig (2000), where it is argued that no individual linguistic criterion is capable of separating an adjective class from a noun class. The empirical study on Turkish terms for person reference reported in Braun & Haig (2000) shows that these terms can be positioned on a scale of "nouniness" stretching from adjective-like to noun-like nominals: Adjective-like terms are for instance *zengin* 'rich' and *Ankaralı* 'Ankaranian', whereas *polis* 'police officer' and *kadın* 'woman' are noun-like terms; nominals such as *hasta* 'ill, patient' and *genç* 'young, young man' occupy an intermediate position. Speakers tend to prefer more adjective-like terms in modifier function and more noun-like ones in head noun position, but these rules are gradual rather than categorical. There is thus no definite word class distinction between adjectives and nouns and therefore only a very small number of rules for the ordering of elements in syntactic gender marking. As was argued above, it depends on the demands and contents of the text which position is the suitable one for a given element.

3.2. Juxtaposition vs. suffixation in compounding

It is conspicuous that some combinations of gender marker and unspecified term have a possessive suffix on the second element, while most of them do not, cf. for example *kız çocuğ-u* 'girl child-poss (= girl)' vs. *kadın polis* 'woman police (= female police officer)'. This is not simply a matter of word classes (with unsuffixed forms consisting of adjective-like element + nouny element and suffixed forms of two nouny ones), for the same two lexemes can occur both with and without suffixation, e.g. *köylü kadın* 'villager woman' and *köylü kadın-ı* 'villager woman-poss'. It is therefore necessary to take a look at juxtaposition and suffixation in compounding in general.

In Turkish, compounding is achieved by means of (a) juxtaposition of two nominals (e.g. *altın yüzük* 'gold ring'), and (b) suffixation of the 3sg possessive to the head noun (e.g. *doğum gün-ü* 'birth day-poss = birthday'). Suffixation is the more frequent mechanism and is regarded as the standard pattern of compounding, so much so, that Ergin (1958 [1993]: 362) speaks of juxtaposition as "feci bir yanlışlık" 'a terrible mistake'. Nevertheless, juxtaposition is the rule under certain conditions, e.g. when one of the elements refers to material as in *altın yüzük* 'gold ring' or *demir kapı* 'iron door' (for an overview of the respective rules cf. König 1987; Kornfilt

1997: 473-475; Dede 1982 or Lewis 1967 [1991]: 41-44). In combinations of gender markers with unspecified terms, juxtaposition is clearly the dominant type, cf. *bayan sürücü* 'lady driver' or *komşu erkekler* 'neighbour men (= male neighbours)'. Use of the possessive suffix would in many cases introduce considerable changes in meaning, as described in the literature (e.g. Lewis 1967 [1991]: 252; König 1987: 166-167): While *kadın terzi* 'woman tailor' refers to a female tailor, *kadın terzi-si* 'woman tailor-poss' is a tailor for women's clothes, but not necessarily a woman.

In his analysis of suffixation vs. juxtaposition in Turkish compounds, König (1987) arrives at a rule which should predict the occurrence of the possessive suffix in syntactic gender marking. According to König, juxtaposition is used when the nominals concerned form a conjunction of predicates, i.e. parallel statements about the referent. *Kadın doktor* 'woman doctor', for example, conjoins two predicates in stating that the referent is a woman and also a doctor. The suffixed form *kadın doktor-u* 'woman doctor-poss (= gynaecologist)' contains no such parallel claims, but gives a specification of the head noun. Viewing combinations of gender marker and unspecified term from this angle, it becomes apparent that practically all of them consist of conjoined predicates: A *kız çocuk* 'girl child' is both a girl and a child, a *köylü kadın* 'villager woman' is both a villager and a woman, and a *dilenci adam* 'beggar man' is both a beggar and a man. It is thus not surprising, following the rule proposed by König, that juxtaposition is the dominant type of compounding in such combinations. What is surprising, however, is that suffixation does occur as well.¹⁶ There are instances such as *kız çocuğ-u* 'girl child-poss', *oğlan çocuğ-u* 'boy child-poss', *erkek çocuğ-u* 'male child-poss', *çingene kadın-ı* 'gypsy woman-poss', and *köylü kadınlar-ı* 'villager women-poss'. Especially *kız çocuğ-u* is so frequent that the juxtaposed form *kız çocuk* has to be regarded as a minor variant, although the suffixed form clearly violates the rule formulated by König.¹⁷

The occurrence of suffixed forms cannot be explained at this point, but it may be understandable at least from a semantic point of view why, for quite a number of combinations, the coexistence of juxtaposed and suffixed variants is tolerable (cf. Haig 1998: 81): For in many of these cases, suffixation does not lead to ambiguity or misinterpretation. While *kadın doktor-u* 'woman doctor-poss (gynaecologist)' is a doctor *for* women and *erkek kuaför-ü* 'man hairdresser-poss' is a hairdresser *for* men, there is no corresponding concept that could be referred to by *kız çocuğ-u* 'girl child-poss' or *köylü kadın-ı* 'villager woman-poss', for there is no such thing as a child *for* girls or a child *concerned with* girls, nor is there a woman *for* or *concerned with* villagers.

¹⁶ Several authors note fluctuation and language change in the two patterns of compounding in Turkish (König 1987, Lewis 1967 [1991]: 47; Brendemoen & Hovdhaugen 1992: 62), but what they observe is an increase of juxtaposition and not of suffixation.

¹⁷ In the study described under 4.2., *kız çocuğ-u* occurred 18 times, compared to only one instance of *kız çocuk*.

4. When is gender made explicit?

The grammar of Turkish does not demand gender distinctions when persons are mentioned. But, as in any language, discourse conditions can necessitate explicit reference to gender, examples of which will be given in 4.1. below. Even more interesting are the many cases where gender is not a central piece of information and is not essential for the understanding of an utterance, but is overtly expressed nevertheless. Empirical data on the frequency and distribution of such markings are presented in 4.2.

4.1. Discourse conditions for gender marking

Gender has to be expressed when an utterance aims at comparing or contrasting female and male representatives of a category (example 2), when the validity of a statement is limited to only one gender (example 3), or when gender is the central topic of an utterance or stretch of discourse, as in (4).

- (2) **Kız çocuklarındaki beslenme bozuklukları ve buna bağlı ölümler, erkek çocuklardan çok fazla.**
'Problems of nutrition and deaths resulting from them are much more frequent with **girl children** (= girls) than with **male children** (= boys).'
- (3) *Ekvador'un ilk kadın devlet başkanı olma şansını yakalayan 41 yaşındaki Arteaga'nın da Bucaram gibi bir lakabı var.*
'41-year-old Arteaga, who grasped the chance to become Ecuador's first **woman state president** (= female president of state) also has a nickname just like Bucaram.' (Milliyet, 10 February 1997, p. 13)
- (4) *... İSEDAK toplantılarına bu yıl 53 ülkeden uzmanlar katılıyor. Bu uzmanlar arasında birkaç kadın da yer alıyor. Kadın uzmanlar, genellikle tesettürlü.*
'... This year, specialists from 53 countries attend the İSEDAK conferences. There are also a number of women among these specialists. The **women specialists** are generally veiled.' (Milliyet, 13 November 1996, p. 4)

The term *arkadaş* 'friend' constitutes a special case when it comes to gender marking: The bare lexeme does not primarily point to an intimate kind of relationship, but explicit reference to the opposite gender frequently changes the meaning to that of 'lover' or 'partner'. In example (5), *arkadaş* 'friend' is directly contrasted with *erkek arkadaş* 'boyfriend', marking a decisive change in relationship:

- (5) **Arkadaş olalı altı ay ama, erkek arkadaşım olalı üç ay falan oldu.**
'It has been six months since we became **friends**, but three months or so since he became my **male friend** (= boyfriend).'
- (Çerezcioglu, Mavi saçlı, p. 189)

When *arkadaş* is used to refer to a person the speaker has an intimate relationship with, gender marking is almost obligatory. Use of a gender marker with *arkadaş* is thus often a pointer to this kind of relationship.

Without being strictly necessary, gender marking can be used to conjure up the image of a multitude and diversity of people, as in (6):

- (6) *Girenler, çıkanlar, beyazlı kadın hastabakıcılar, beyazlı erkek hasta-bakıcılar, sedyede taşınan bir ihtiyar, kollarına girilmiş adım adım götürülen bir kadın ...*
 '[People] coming in and going out, **woman hospital attendants** (= female hospital attendants) in white, **male hospital attendants** in white, an old person carried on a stretcher, a woman, led by the arms step by step ...'
 (Altan, *Gökyüzü*, p. 182)

Overt gender marking is also frequent when an unspecified term alone would lead readers or hearers to expect a different gender, i.e. when the gender of the referent deviates from the norm. In (7) for example, which is the headline of a newspaper article, the marker *bayan* 'lady' signals from the outset that the *futbolcu* 'football player' whom the text is about is not a man, as readers would otherwise assume:

- (7) **Bayan futbolcudan kaza kurşunu**
 'Accidental bullet from **lady football player** (= female football player)'
 (*Milliyet*, 25 January 1996, p. 3)

In cases as the ones described, gender marking is either necessary to convey the intended message or is a means for conveying useful background information.

4.2. "Unnecessary" gender marking

Many linguists claim that in Turkish an explicit expression of gender occurs only where it is inevitable (Kissling 1960: 117) or "where it is important for understanding" (Brendemoen & Hovdhaugen 1992: 38, my translation), in other words, in cases like the ones mentioned above. Closer inspection of Turkish texts, however, reveals an astonishing number of instances where gender marking cannot be explained in this way and, in fact, appears unnecessary. In (8), for example, marking seems rather redundant since the context contains several clues to the gender of the (female) referent, a model depicted in an advertisement for motor oil and compared to another woman, Ceylan:

- (8) *Şaşkınlıkla duvardaki Mobil-Oil afişine baktım: Elinde yağ tenekesi tutan **manken kadın** inanılmayacak kadar Ceylan'a benziyordu.*
 'In confusion I looked at the advertisement for Mobil Oil on the wall: The **model woman** (= model), who held an oil can in her hand, resembled Ceylan to an unbelievable degree.' (Pamuk, *Sessiz ev*, p. 244)

In another novel by Orhan Pamuk, *Cevdet Bey ve oğulları*, there is a conspicuous and similarly unexplainable frequency of 'female' markers with the lexeme *kardeş* '(younger) sibling': (Younger) sisters are almost always referred to as *kız kardeş* 'girl sibling (= sister)', even where none of the motivating conditions hold. (Younger) brothers, on the other hand, are simply referred to as *kardeş* '(younger) sibling'.

To investigate the occurrence and distribution of such overt markers systematically, an empirical study was conducted which focussed on gender marking not strictly necessary for understanding.¹⁸ In the study, 404 subjects were asked to translate an English text about a traffic accident in which one person was injured. The gender of that person was irrelevant for the reported events, but was identifiable through the English pronouns used in the text (*she* vs. *he*). The text was presented in a number of different versions, created by varying the gender and occupation of the central character. In this manner, provision was made for occurrences of unexpected gender: Where the main character was referred to as *secretary ... he* or as *basketball player ... she*, gender was a noteworthy (though not strictly necessary) piece of information.

It would have been possible to formulate an understandable, coherent and correct Turkish text for all versions of the story without using any overt gender marker. This is what happened in 72% of the translations. But the remaining proportion of 28% gender-marked texts is surprisingly high, considering the lack of grammatical or textual necessity of gender marking. The expression of unexpected gender was of course a potential motivation for gender marking in certain text versions. But it soon became obvious that this was not the decisive factor: There was a tendency to mark unexpected female gender with the stimuli 'basketball player' and 'police', but no corresponding tendency to mark unexpected male gender with 'secretary' and 'housekeeper'. Instead, marking was always more frequent for female than for male gender, even where both were equally expectable (as with 'American' and 'child') or where female gender was more expectable.¹⁹ In the latter case, however, the frequency of 'female' markers was only marginally higher than the frequency of 'male' ones, and the difference did not attain statistical significance.

The data thus suggests that there is a tendency to mark female gender in Turkish, even in cases where gender is irrelevant and / or where female gender is expectable.

¹⁸ This study was one of the series of empirical investigations on gender in Turkish mentioned in 1. It is described in more detail in Braun (1997) and (1998b). Inevitable expressions of gender were not taken into account because it is self-evident that inevitable expressions of gender occur in Turkish, as they do in any language. They do not contain information about the specifically Turkish distribution of gender markers.

¹⁹ Female gender was marked in 50% of all cases, and male gender in only 5%. This is a highly significant statistical difference.

Male gender, on the other hand, is rarely marked, even where it is unexpected.²⁰ This finding was backed by statements made by interviewees in a later study (cf. Braun 1998b, study 4C). When pondering the use of gender markers, they frequently took marked forms for male referents into consideration (e.g. *erkek sekreter* ‘male secretary’, *çocuk bakıcısı adam* ‘nursery school teacher man’), but dismissed them as ‘impossible’ or ‘strange-sounding’. Apparently ‘male’ marking is much less conventionalised in Turkish than the marking of female gender.

On the whole, then, overt expressions of gender are not as rare in Turkish as is often assumed, and they are certainly not restricted to contexts where the expression of gender is a textual necessity. Kornfilt’s (1997: 270) statement that only a small number of nouns are gender-marked—namely the ones with gender suffixes—is thus rather misleading.

5. Human = male?

The empirical data on gender marking document a fundamental asymmetry in Turkish person reference: While female gender tends to be highlighted by overt expressions, male gender is often treated as the normal case that does not need to be specified. This tendency exemplifies what Silveira (1980) calls the “male = people-bias”: Males are referred to with general terms (e.g. ‘person’, ‘people’), while gender-specific expressions (e.g. ‘woman’, ‘girl student’) are used for females. A semantic corollary of this phenomenon exists in the “covert gender” of Turkish nouns, i.e. the gender biases inherent in the semantics of Turkish terms without gender marking. In two empirical investigations on covert gender, the following regularities were found:²¹ Terms from typically male occupations such as *polis* ‘police officer’ or *işportacı* ‘street vendor’ have a male bias and evoke ‘male’ associations in native speakers, their covert gender is male. Similarly, the covert gender of terms from female domains such as *sekreter* ‘secretary’ or *temizlikçi* ‘cleaning person’ is female, as they are associated with female persons. Words from gender-neutral domains, however, have a bias that does not correspond to the statistical distribution of women and men—the covert gender of words like *kişi* ‘person’ or *birisi* ‘someone’ is male. Terms whose lexical meaning refers to people in general are thus more readily understood as ‘male’ than as ‘female’. This is what Silveira (1980) calls the “people = male-bias”, i.e. the tendency to give general terms a preferred ‘male’ reading. There

²⁰ It might be argued that translations do not give a realistic picture of Turkish language usage. But even if gender distinctions in the source text should have pushed the subjects towards gender marking, the asymmetrical tendency in the Turkish data cannot have resulted from English influence, for gender expressions were always symmetrical in the English originals (e.g. *child-she* : *child-he*). Comparatively infrequent marking with the stimuli *basketball player* and *secretary*, moreover, shows that subjects did not automatically imitate gender markings present in the source text.

²¹ These studies are described in Braun (1997, 1998a) and in more detail in Braun (1998b).

is empirical evidence that the male bias in *kişi* 'person' and similar words is not an artefact caused by gender biases in the context. In another investigation, where context was experimentally controlled, *kişi* 'person' was interpreted as 'male' by 64% of 386 subjects and as 'female' by only 14% in the gender-neutral context (the rest being inclusive interpretations). The distribution of overt gender markers as well as the gender semantics of terms for person reference thus attest to the existence of a male-as-norm principle in Turkish, a principle that was found to exist in many languages. The following paragraphs will give some additional examples of Turkish words with a blending of the meaning 'male' and 'human'.

Modern Turkish *oğul* 'son' originally meant 'child'; in the course of time this was overridden by the preferred reading 'son'. Pre-thirteenth century Turkish, as described in Clauson's (1972: 82) etymological dictionary, shows a strong preference for the 'male' reading:

"*oğul* 'offspring, child' originally of either sex, but with a strong implication of 'male child'; by itself it can mean 'son', but not 'daughter'; in the Plur. it might mean 'sons and daughters', but *oğul kız* would be the more normal expression."

Apparently *oğul* went through a stage where its male bias required gender-marking for female referents, cf. the historical form *qız oğul* 'girl child (= girl)' mentioned by Grönbech (1936: 24), and later acquired the entirely gender-specific meaning that it has today. A parallel tendency can be observed with the word *çocuk* 'child' in Modern Turkish. In the study summarised under 4.2. above, it was found that the gender-marked combination *kız çocuğu* 'girl child (= girl)' is preferred for girls, whereas *çocuk* alone is the normal expression for boys. It is also worth noting that *çocuk* has a second reading which is even exclusively 'male'. On that reading, *çocuk* means "genç erkek" 'young man' (*Türkçe sözlük*, 317) and is used for male persons up to an age of about 25 years. Sentence (9) exemplifies the use of *çocuk* in its second meaning:

- (9) *Partide Semra'nın yanında çok yakışıklı bir çocuk gördüm.*
'At the party I saw Semra with a very handsome **child** (= young man).'

Semantic narrowing of a similar kind can be observed in *genç* 'young, young person, young man'. Used as a modifier, *genç* is gender-neutral and therefore freely combinable, cf. *genç sporcular* 'young athletes', *genç kız* 'young girl' or *genç adam* 'young man'. Used as a head noun, however, *genç* has a perceptible male bias and is usually interpreted as 'young man'. In a series of interviews conducted with 42 Turkish speakers in Ankara in 1997, a majority of 30 interviewees stated that *genç* in head

noun function was exclusively ‘male’.²² Example (10) illustrates the use of *genç* as a modifier vs. head noun: In this sentence, *genç* ‘young (man)’ (*genç* as head noun, hence ‘male’) contrasts with *genç kız* ‘young girl’ (*genç* as modifier, hence ‘unspecific’):

- (10) *Ailesinin evlenmelerine karşı çıkması üzerine sevdiği gençle birlikte kaçan genç kız, onları yakalayıp öldürmek için ant içen ağabeyinin tabancasının namlusunu ensesinde hissediyordu.*
 ‘The young girl who had eloped with the young (man) she loved because her family was opposed to their marriage felt the barrel of her elder brother’s pistol in her neck, who had sworn to catch and to kill them.’
 (*Hürriyet*, 30 August 1995, p. 2)

In (11), a young girl describes her mother’s reactions to attention paid to her by young men. Again, *genç* is clearly gender-specific and is treated as almost synonymous with *erkek* ‘man’, which occurs later in the sentence:

- (11) *Bir yerde tesadüfen bir genç olsa, biraz bana baksa ... [annem] sanıyor ki; erkekler benimle ilgilendikleri zaman çok seviniyorum.*
 ‘If there happens to be a young (man), if he happens to look at me ... [my mother] assumes that I am happy when men are interested in me.’ (Özgül, *Lise defterleri*, p. 47)

Turkish *genç* thus resembles English *youth*, which is also gender-specific (‘young man’) when used as a term for person reference. It is worth noting, however, that the plural form *gençler* ‘the young, young people’ can refer to both females and males, cf. (12):

- (12) *Gerlingen Diesel caddesi üzerindeki Flic-Flac diskoda Türk Pop Gece-leri’nin ilkinde gelen Türk gençlerinin yüzde 65’ni [sic] genç kızlar oluşturdu.*
 ‘65% of the Turkish youths that came to the first of the Turkish Pop Nights in the Flic-Flac disco at Diesel Street in Gerlingen were young girls.’
 (*Sabah*, 4 November 1996, p. 11)

On the whole, *genç* seems to be undergoing a similar development as *çocuk* and *oğul*: A term whose lexical meaning should be applicable to humans in general is semantically narrowed so that it receives a preferred ‘male’ reading.

²² The ‘male’ covert gender of *genç* has repercussions in the perceived compatibility with gender-specific predications. In an empirical study it was found that a sentence combining the subject *genç* with the predication *çeyizini düzmek* ‘to prepare one’s trousseau’ was rated as significantly less acceptable than a sentence combining *genç* with *askerliğini bitirmek* ‘to finish one’s military service’ (cf. Braun forthcoming, 1998b).

6. Conclusions

Gender plays a more important role in the Turkish language system than the absence of grammatical gender distinctions might suggest. Expressions of gender are rather varied and are used more frequently than textual necessity in a strict sense would demand. But the distribution of gender is conspicuously asymmetrical, for it is first and foremost female gender that is marked by overt expressions.

The most frequent and productive means to make gender explicit is syntactic gender marking: Any unspecified term can be combined with a gender lexeme to express gender; at the same time, additional aspects of evaluation, formality or age can also be conveyed by the individual gender markers. The structure of expressions formed by syntactic gender marking is not unproblematic for linguistic description: The distribution of juxtaposition vs. possessive marking needs further clarification and the word class membership of elements in syntactic gender marking is not readily statable in terms of “adjective” or “noun” but will have to be determined on a scale of nouniness.

The majority of terms for person reference are unmarked for gender in Turkish. But, semantically at least, gender is an important element even here. Unspecified terms such as *yolcu* ‘passenger’, *şoför* ‘driver’ or *temizlikçi* ‘cleaning person’ have a “covert gender” which makes speakers and hearers associate them primarily with either male or female gender and which affects the way these terms are used (cf. Braun 1998b, forthcoming).

Though, in general, little research has been done on the role of gender in grammatically genderless languages, it can be assumed that the findings presented above are not unique for Turkish. As is known from research on Finnish, conducted above all by Engelberg (1993, 1998, 1999), there are considerable parallels in this language, which is not only grammatically genderless but shares many other structural features with Turkish. In Finnish as well there is rudimentary gender suffixation: There is the “feminine” ending *-tAr* (an originally Baltic loan) as in *myyjä-tär* ‘salesperson-fem’, which is however heavily on the decline, and the ending *-kkO* as in *sisä-kkö* ‘interior-fem (= female househelper)’, which is not always gender-specific (cf. Engelberg 1998). As in Turkish, there is a tendency towards asymmetrical gender marking, whereby female rather than male gender is overtly expressed, e.g. with the stem *nais-* (< *nainen* ‘woman’) as in *nais-arkkitehti* ‘woman architect’. Such markings can occur even where they are redundant, for example, where gender is evident from the context (Engelberg 1999). In addition, unmarked terms for person reference seem to have a covert gender, with terms from gender-neutral domains frequently displaying a male bias (Engelberg 1993, 1999).²³

In conclusion, gender has to be reckoned with as a factor for language structure and language use as long as gender is an important social category in a language community. The impact of gender takes on a different and more veiled form in lan-

²³ The male bias seems to be less pronounced than in Turkish, though.

guages where it is not grammaticalised, but linguistic descriptions should nevertheless account for the linguistic forms concerned.

Literary Sources

- Altan, Çetin 1984⁶. *Bir avuç gökyüzü*. İstanbul: Özgür yayın.²⁴
 Çerezcioğlu, Burçak 1997. *Mavi sağlıklı kız*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi.
 Özgül, Gönül 1996³. *Lise defterleri*. İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar.
 Pamuk, Orhan 1995⁹. *Cevdet Bey ve oğulları*. İstanbul: İletişim.
 Pamuk, Orhan 1996¹⁶. *Sessiz ev*. İstanbul: İletişim.
 Uzuner, Buket 1991. *İki yeşil susamuru. Anneleri, babaları, sevgilileri ve diğerleri*. İstanbul: Gür.

References

- Banguoğlu, Tahsin 1986. *Türkçenin grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
 Bhat, D. N. S. 1994. *The adjectival category. Criteria for differentiation and identification*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
 Braun, Friederike 1997. Covert gender in Turkish. In: İmer, Kâmile & Uzun, N. Engin (eds.) *VIII. Uluslararası Türk Dilbilimi Konferansı Bildirileri 7-9 Ağustos, 1996. Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics August 7-9, 1996, Ankara*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi. 267-274.
 Braun, Friederike 1998a. Prototype theory and covert gender in Turkish. In: Koenig, Jean-Pierre (ed.) *Discourse and cognition. Bridging the gap*. Stanford, Cal.: Center for the Study of Language and Information. 113-122.
 Braun, Friederike 1998b. *Geschlecht im Türkischen? Untersuchungen zum sprachlichen Umgang mit einer sozialen Kategorie*. [Habilitation thesis, Kiel University.]
 Braun, Friederike 2000. *Geschlecht im Türkischen?* (Turcologica 42.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Braun, Friederike (forthcoming). Gender in a genderless language: The case of Turkish. In: Suleiman, Yasir (ed.) *Language and society in the Middle East and North Africa*. Richmond: Curzon.
 Braun, Friederike & Haig, Geoffrey 2000. The noun / adjective distinction in Turkish: An empirical approach. To appear in: Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia (eds.) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. Lincoln College, Oxford, August 12-14, 1998*. (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 Brendemoen, Bernt 1990. The Turkish language reform and language policy in Turkey. In: Hazai, György (ed.) *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft 1*. Budapest: Akadémiai. 454-493.
 Brendemoen, Bernt & Hovdhaugen, Even 1992. *Tyrkisk grammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
 Clauson, Gerald 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkic*. Oxford: Clarendon.

²⁴ This novel first appeared in the seventies, but I was unable to determine the exact date.

- Croft, William 1991. *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations. The cognitive organization of information*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Dede, Müşerref 1982. A semantic analysis of Turkish nominal compounds. *Journal of Human Sciences* (ODTÜ) 1 (1), 87-102.
- Engelberg, Mila 1993. Maskuliini, feminiini, virkamies? [Masculine, feminine, civil servant?] *Naistutkimus – Kvinnoforskning* 4, 39-50.
- Engelberg, Mila 1998. Sukupuolistuneet ammattinimikkeet [Gendered occupational terms]. *Virittäjä* 1, 74-92.
- Engelberg, Mila 1999. *Androcentricity in Finnish: Empirical findings*. [Unpublished manuscript.]
- Ergin, Muharrem 1958 [1993²⁰]. *Türk dil bilgisi*. İstanbul: Bayrak.
- Grönbech, Kaare 1936. *Der türkische Sprachbau*. Kopenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.
- Haig, Geoffrey 1998. *Relative constructions in Turkish*. (Turcologica 33.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Johanson, Lars 1990. Studien zur türkeitürkischen Grammatik. In: Hazai, György (ed.) *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft* 1. Budapest: Akadémiai. 146-301.
- Kissling, Hans Joachim 1960. *Osmanisch-türkische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- König, Wolf Dietrich 1987. Nominalkomposita im Türkischen. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 6 (2), 165-185.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin 1997. *Turkish*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, G. L. 1967 [1991]. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Silveira, Jeanette 1980. Generic masculine words and thinking. In: Kramarae, Cheris (ed.) *The voices and words of women and men*. Oxford et al.: Pergamon. 165-178.
- Steuerwald, Karl 1963. *Untersuchungen zur türkischen Sprache der Gegenwart 1: Die türkische Sprachpolitik seit 1928*. Berlin-Schöneberg: Langenscheidt.
- Steuerwald, Karl 1966. *Untersuchungen zur türkischen Sprache der Gegenwart 3: Zur Ablösung des arabischen und persischen Grammatikgutes*. Berlin et al.: Langenscheidt.
- Türkçe sözlük*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. 1988.
- Underhill, Robert 1976. *Turkish grammar*. Cambridge, Mass., London: MIT Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna 1986. What's in a noun? (Or: How do nouns differ in meaning from adjectives?). *Studies in Language* 10 (2), 353-389.

Açık and kapalı: The Turkish resultative deverbal adjective

Marcel Erdal

Erdal, Marcel 2000. *Açık and kapalı: The Turkish resultative deverbal adjective. Turkic Languages* 4, 22-30.

The Turkish formation in *-(I)lI* is shown to be derived from simple transitive verbs and to form adjectives qualifying direct or indirect objects of the base. It is compared to the ones ending in *-mA*, *-Ik* and *-gIn* which, we find, can be added also to denominal or deverbal verbal stems, to both transitive and intransitive ones and can also form nouns. We find, finally, that *-(I)lI* adjectives are resultative, describing ascertainable changes of state; this links up with a universal connection between perfect and passive. The suffix comes from *-(X)glXg*, attested in Old Turkic with the same function as in Turkish.*

Marcel Erdal, J. W. Goethe University, Turcology Department, P.O.B. 11 19 32, D-60054 Frankfurt a.M., Germany.

On the first page of Halide Edib's novel *Sinekli Bakkal* we read the following passage: *Sürürlü kafeslerin arkasında kocakarı başları dizili. ... Sokakta ayağı takunyalı, başı yazma örtülü, eli bakraçlı kadınlar çeşmeye gider gelirler* 'Old women's heads are lined up behind the locked lattices of the windows. ... On the street, women in clogs and hand printed headscarves are carrying copper buckets back and forth to the fountain.' You will notice that five of the words in this passage end in /lü/, /li/ or /lı/; only three among these, *takunyalı*, *dizili* and *örtülü*, are listed in the *Türkçe sözlük*; *takunyalı* is glossed with 'takunyası olan' while *dizili* gets the glossings 'dizilmiş olan, sıralanmış' and 'mürettep'. *Örtülü* is supplied in that dictionary with several paraphrases, among them on the one hand 'örtüsü olan', on the other 'örtülmüş, bir şeyle kaplanmış'.¹ The nominal relative clause *başı yazma örtülü* has *örtülü* in the first mentioned meaning, i.e. 'örtüsü olan'; actually the suffix *+lü* is not added here to the noun *örtü* but to the noun phrase *yazma örtü*. This first meaning, corresponding to the use of *+lI*² signifying 'having X', is also found in *takun-*

* A previous version of this paper was presented in March 1999 at the 4th German Turcologists' Conference in Hamburg.

¹ A further, metaphorical meaning listed there is of no interest to us.

² Capital letters refer to archiphonemes. In Turkish words, *I* = *i / ı / ü / u*, in Old Turkic *i*

yalı. The second meaning given in the *Türkçe sözlük* for *örtülü* appears to come directly from the verb *örtmek*, as *dizili* 'lined up in a row' must have the verb *dizmek* 'to line up, arrange in a row' as its direct source. Denominal *dizi+li* should, in principle, also be possible, as there is a noun *dizi*; however, that derivative was not given any entry in the *Türkçe sözlük*. *Bakraçlı* and *sürülü*, the two other adjectives ending in /l/, do not appear in this dictionary: *sür-ülü* 'closed' is obsolete, as *sür-* was used in this meaning only in connection with the *kafes* windows, which have now practically disappeared. *Bakraçlı* is, of course, formed like *takunyalı* and like the instance of *örtülü* appearing in this passage, while *sürülü* is formed like *dizili* and like the use of *örtülü* which was not employed here. So much for *Sinekli Bakkal*, so much for the *Türkçe sözlük*.

Turkish word formation has been largely neglected in the grammars. In the previous decades, a lot of attention was devoted to neologistic lexeme creation, which concerns only a very limited area (though one enjoying the attention both of the Turkish media and of students of cultural processes in Turkey): The replacement of lexemes copied from other languages by lexemes derived from Turkic bases. Only very recently do we find a few papers dealing with 'normal' word formation, which concerns the regular, productive formation of lexemes. We will here focus on one of the most active deverbal adjective formations of Turkish.

It is in the nature of word formation that it bridges the gap between the lexicon, which is the domain of irregularity in all languages, and between morphology, which happens to be exceedingly regular in Turkish. Word formation belongs to the lexicon insofar as its products compete in use with opaque lexemes, as entries which the child or a learner of the language has to memorize in order to understand and use them. On the other hand it also is part of the grammar, since the creative speaker or writer producing new lexemes does this according to certain rules; these rules are recognised by the listener or the reader if he is to understand an unknown derivative in its context. The transparent lexemes *açık* and *kapalı*, which appear in the title of this paper, are both deverbal; they come from *açmak* 'to open' and *kapamak* 'to close'. 'closed', the English counterpart of *kapalı*, is like *kapalı* in that it is a perfect participle of 'to close'; 'open', on the other hand, is unlike *açık* in that it is a simplex, homophonous with the verb. 'Opening' and 'closing' are, in essence, symmetrical acts; this symmetry has not, however, carried over either to the Turkish or to the English language: Morphologically speaking, both English 'open' and 'closed' and Turkish *açık* and *kapalı* are distinct forms. English has a simplex for 'open' but none for 'closed'; to express the notion of 'closed', morphology had to be called upon in order to complement the lexicon. In Turkish, however, both *kapa-lı* and *aç-ık* are transparent; in this case it is our task to try to explain the competition between the two formations. *Kapa-k*, which has the rather narrow meaning 'lid', actually belongs

/ ɪ. Turkish A is a / e while Old Turkic X is i / ɪ / ü / u. + marks nominal, - verbal juncture.

to the instrument formation with *-(A)k*,³ as *dayan-ak* ‘support’, *sığın-ak* ‘shelter’, *sun-ak* ‘altar’ etc.; the *-Ik* derivate from *kapa-* would, however, have had the same shape. To form another lexeme *kapa-k* with the meaning ‘closed’ would be against the principle that homophony should be avoided where possible; this is one of the reasons why languages have competing formations.

Aç-ık and *kapa-lı* describe the state of objects resulting from the actions of ‘opening’ and ‘closing’; *açık kapı* is an open door, *kapalı kapı* a closed one. Similarly with practically all of the products of these two formations; their English translations are mostly passive past participles. The suffix appearing in *kapalı* has the form *-lı, -li, -lu, -lū* after stems ending in vowels, e.g. in *döşe-li* ‘paved; furnished’ from *döşemek* ‘to pave, spread, lay down (floor, carpet etc.)’, *tıka-lı* ‘stopped up, obstructed’ from *tıkmak* ‘to stuff up, plug’, *daya-lı* ‘leaning against, propped up’ from *dayamak* ‘to lean (against, tr.), to prop up’ or *tara-lı* ‘combed’ from *taramak* ‘to comb’.

As will be clear from the explanations to the Halide Edib passage, this suffix, which is added only to verb stems, should not be confused with the denominal suffix *+lı, +li, +lu, +lū*: Deverbal *-lı* is the variant of the suffix *-ılı, -ili, -ulu, -ülū*, previously presented in *diz-ili* and *sür-ülū*, which drops its initial vowel when it is added to a stem ending in a vowel; the products of this formation are distinct from denominal *+lı*, which remains *+lı* after consonants, both by shape and by meaning.⁴ Further examples for the deverbal formation are *ek-ili* ‘sown’, e.g. in the phrase *buğday ekili tarla* ‘a field sown with wheat’; also *dik-ili* ‘planted, set up, erected, sewn’, *bük-ülū* ‘crooked, twisted, spun’ and *tut-ulu*, e.g. in the sentence *Bütün yerler evvelden tutuluydu* ‘All seats were taken up beforehand’. In *kâğıda sar-ılı ekmek* ‘bread wrapped in paper’ and *ipe as-ılı çamaşırlar* ‘laundry hanging on a line’ the dative is, of course, governed by the verb; otherwise the locative would have been used. *Kur-ulu düzen*, from *kurmak* ‘to set (up), establish’, denotes the ‘established order’. *Yazılı* means ‘written’ when it is derived directly from the verb; when it comes from the deverbal noun *yazı* ‘writing’, on the other hand, it signifies ‘bearing some writing’. *Yazılı hukuk* is ‘statute law’ (jurisprudence based on written law) and not ‘jurisprudence bearing writing’. In the phrase *peynir bas-ılı küp* ‘a jar stuffed with cheese’ the verbal adjective is accompanied by the verb’s object and qualifies its indirect object. In the sentence *Başını, masanın üzerine serili bir plâna eğdi* ‘He bowed his head over a plan spread out on the table’,⁵ finally, *sermek* ‘to spread out’ governs the dative.

³ Linguistic elements are put into brackets if they are dropped under certain definite circumstances; vowels are generally dropped if the suffix which they start is added to a stem ending in a vowel.

⁴ *Bakraçlı* ‘having a copper bucket’ is rightfully not mentioned in the *Türkçe Sözlük*: The creation of *+lı* derivatives is fully productive and they do not have to be entered in the mental lexicon to be understood.

⁵ From a novel by Refik Halid Karay.

When there is a homophonous noun stem beside a verb stem ending in a vowel, e.g. *boyamak* ‘to paint, to colour’ and *boya* ‘paint, dye’, there results homophony between the denominal *+ll* form and the deverbal derivate. One could be tempted to derive *boyalı* from the noun *boya* also when it signifies ‘painted’, e.g. in the phrase *türlü renklere boyalı oyma tahtalar* ‘carved boards painted in various colours’. The dative *renkler+e* from *renk+ler* ‘colours’ is, however, governed by the verb *boyamak*, which underlies the adjective *boyalı*.

Now note that *derli toplu* ‘tidy’, *saklı* ‘hidden’, *kaplı* ‘covered, coated’ or *saplı* ‘sticking into’ are semantically linked to the verbs *derlemek toplamak* ‘to gather together, tidy up’, *saklamak* ‘to keep, store, hide’, *kaplamak* ‘to wrap up, to coat’ and *saplamak* ‘to thrust into, skewer’ in exactly the same relationship as with the formation we have been looking at; *toplu* is certainly not derived from *top* ‘ball’, nor does *saplı* come from *sap* ‘handle, stalk’. These last-mentioned adjectives can also be assigned to the formation *-(I)ll*, if we assume haplology: **derle-li > derli*, **sapla-lı > saplı* etc. Such haplology is in accord with Turkish phonotactics, which avoids sequences of */l/* also in other cases within the domain of word formation: */l/* verbs such as *al-* ‘to take’, *del-* ‘to pierce, bore’ or *bul-* ‘to find’ do not form passives with */l/*, and the passives of *saklamak* and *saplamak*, for instance, are *sakla-n-mak* and *sapla-n-mak*. Nor does the denominal formative *+(A)l-*⁶ ever get added to stems in */l/*. Like *derli toplu* etc., *ütülü* ‘ironed’ is likelier to come from *ütülemek* ‘to iron’ than from *ütü* ‘hot iron’: cf. the meaning of *ütülü pantolonlar* ‘ironed trousers’.

‘To patch’ is in Turkish *yama-mak* or *yamala-mak*. The latter is a denominal verb derived from *yama* ‘patch’. *Yama* and *yama-* are homophonous, then, like *boya* ‘paint’ and *boya-* ‘to paint’. Similar to *boyalı*, *yamalı* can signify ‘having one or more patches’ or ‘patched’. In the latter meaning it is derived either from *yama-* (like *boyalı*), or from *yamala-* (with haplology like *saplı* or *derli toplu*).

Instead of *kâğıda sar-ılı* (see above) one could also have *kâğıda sar-ılmış*, instead of *yerler evvelden tutuluydu* (see above) also *yerler önceden tutulmuştu*. I don’t mean the aspectual values of these forms which, as we shall see, are different; I mean the fact that *sarılmış* and *tutulmuş* are passive forms. This is probably why Kornfilt (1997: 459) proposed that *asılı* ‘suspended, hanging’ or *takılı* ‘affixed, attached’ must be *-I* derivatives from the passive stems *as-ıl-* ‘to get hung’ and *tak-ıl-* ‘to get affixed, attached’, but had no explanation for *kapalı*. She even denied the need for postulating a suffix *-(I)ll*, as she assigned the *-Ill* forms discussed in the present paper to the formation in *-I*. One argument against her analysis is in fact the absence of passive derivatives in *-l-* from stems ending in vowels: These stems only have *-n-* derivatives covering passive meaning as well, and passive derivatives in *-tll-*; beside

⁶ E.g. *dar+al-* ‘to get narrow’, *az+al-* ‘to get less’, *çoğ+al-* ‘to get more’, *boş+al-* ‘to get empty’, *kısa+l-* ‘to become shorter’, *ince+l-* ‘to get thinner’, *yön+el-* ‘to turn or be directed towards’, *dik+el-* ‘to get upright’ or *düz+el-* ‘to improve, reach a right and proper condition’.

tıkalı, *kapalı* or *döşeli* we only get *tıka-n-dı*, *döşe-n-di* or *döşe-til-di* and *kapa-n-dı* or *kapa-til-di*. Another argument against the hypothesis of Kornfilt is the fact that *-I* only forms nouns, like *yaz-ı* ‘writing’, *kaz-ı* ‘excavation’, *gez-i* ‘excursion’, *ölç-ü* ‘measure’, *ört-ü* ‘cover’, *doğ-u* ‘east’, *bat-ı* ‘west’, *say-ı* ‘number’, *koş-u* ‘running contest, race’, *sor-u* ‘question’ or *yap-ı* ‘construction’, but no adjectives.

Synchronically speaking, this *-(I)ll* cannot consist of the suffix *-I* forming verbal nouns plus the adjective suffix *+ll*: Verbal nouns like **ek-i*, **dik-i* or **tut-u* do not exist and may never have existed. With those verbs which have both the *-I* form and the *-(I)ll* form, the *+ll* expansion of the verbal noun can very well be distinguished from the form in *-(I)ll*. We had noted this in connection with *örtülü*, which either comes from the verb *örtmek* ‘to cover’ or from the noun *örtü* ‘cover’. Without context, *örtülü* signifies both ‘having a cover’ and ‘covered’. There is no context-free language, however, and context disambiguates. In context, the *-(I)ll* form has verbal government when it appears in the second meaning: The sentence *Yerler karla örtülü*, for instance, signifies ‘The ground is covered with snow’; the verb *ört-* here governs the noun which refers to the ‘cover’, i.e. the snow, through the postposition *-(y)lA*. The denominal *+ll* adjective, on the other hand, would have had no verbal government.

From the historical point of view, *-(I)ll* appears to come from Old Turkic *-(X)glXg*, a form which is attested already in the *Irq bitig*;⁷ the diachronical sound relationship between the suffixes is perfectly regular.⁸ Erdal (1991: 344-349) deals with quite a number of Old Turkic *-(X)glXg* forms, all of which are derived from transitive verbs. Old Turkic *töşä-glig töşäk* ‘a spread out bed’ is directly comparable and synonymous with Turkish *döşeli döşek*, *yama-glıg ton* ‘a patched garment’ from the *Maitrisimit* is like Turkish *yamalı elbise*, *yığıglıg* ‘concentrated’ like Turkish *yığılı* ‘heaped up’, *biti-glig* ‘written’ like Turkish *yaz-ıl*, *örtüglüg kızlāglıg ... ayıg kılınçımız* ‘our secret sins’ like *örtülü gizli günahımız* etc. *Kızlāglıg*, e.g., is especially common in Old Turkic; it may have been one source of Turkish *gizli*. Kāšğarī (Dankoff & Kelly 1982-1985, fol. 255) correctly calls the *-(X)glXg* form *al-mafūl*, i.e. a passive participle: The passive content does not get conveyed here by a passive suffix like *-Xl-* but, like in English, by the adjective-forming suffix itself. Erdal (1991: 169, 172-356) has observed that the majority of deverbal nouns and adjectives denote the object and not the subject of transitive verbs in Old Turkic, though they denote the subject of intransitive verbs; the formations which do this are there called ergative formations since, broadly, ergative languages use the same case form to refer to the object of transitive verbs as they do to the subject of intransitive ones. This is, by the way, a feature typologically linking Old Turkic to early Indo-European, where

⁷ A 10th century booklet written in Old Turkic runiform script.

⁸ The Old Turkic *-(X)gl* participle, on the other hand, is unlikely to be the source of the Turkish *-(X)ll* form: *-(X)gl* was agentive, whereas Turkish *-(I)ll* belongs to the formations called “ergative” in Erdal (1991). Besides, *-(X)gl* was quite obsolete already in late Old Turkic and is unlikely to have survived the Old Turkic stage.

the resultative verbal noun in *-tos* (and others) behave in the same way. Kornfilt & Greenberg (2000) have similar things to say on (equally resultative) Turkish *-mA*, a formation⁹ which has the same “ergative” features as those found in the Old Turkic ones referred to: It denotes the subjects of intransitive base verbs but the objects of transitive ones.¹⁰ They write: “Positing a passive here is unnecessary, since one of the main syntactic effects of passive, namely to change the internal argument of the verb, i.e. its object, into an external argument, is achieved here by the resultative nominalization marker itself”.

I have come across 31 examples for the formation *-(I)lI* (*sür-ülü, diz-ili, ört-ülü, kapa-lı, döse-li, tıka-lı, daya-lı, tara-lı, ek-ili, dik-ili, tut-ulu, bük-ülü, yaz-ılı, boyalı, derli toplu, saklı, kaplı, saplı, sar-ılı, kur-ulu, ser-ili, tak-ılı, as-ılı, yığ-ılı, yama-lı, ütülü, düz-ülü, çiz-ili, and sat-ılı*), which are all derived from transitive verbs. Beside these 31 *-(I)lI* derivatives I have met only a single one which comes from an intransitive base: *küsülü* ‘sulky, offended, on bad terms’, from *küs-mek* ‘to be offended, sulk and pout’. This form clearly does not (since the 14th century, according to the *Tarama sözlüğü*) qualify the person towards whom one feels offended, not, that is, the dative object of this attitude, but the person who is the subject of this behaviour. We find a few exceptions of this sort also with Old Turkic *-(X)gIXg*, which had caused me to include this formation among the ergative (and not the purely passive) ones in Erdal (1991: 348-349). Since a proportion of 31 to 1 is unlikely to be a coincidence, *küsülü* can be called an exception. The exception is not one on the semantic level, though: *küsülü* has, in fact, the same passive content as the English participle ‘offended’. The assignment of passive meaning to the *-(I)lI* derivative from this verb is not really exceptional: Semantically, the subject of *küs-* is an object. With *-mA*, intransitive bases are even more common; Kornfilt & Greenberg mention *dolma* from *dol-* ‘to fill (intr.)’, *doğma büyüme* from *doğ-* ‘to be born’ and *büyü-* ‘to grow (up)’ and *kalma* e.g. in *babadan kalma*, from *kal-* ‘to remain’. They state, however, that all the intransitive verbs that appear with the resultative *-mA* are unaccusative verbs, i.e. verbs whose surface subject is, at the level of lexical argument structure, an internal (and not external) argument. Old Turkic intransitive verbs with ergative derivatives should also be looked at in view of such a classification.

Note, further, that *-(I)lI* adjectives do not necessarily qualify the direct objects of the transitive verbs they are derived from: The example for *ek-ili*, for instance, has this form qualify the ‘field’ (the dative object) and not the ‘seeds’ sown on it (the direct object); the same could have been done with *dik-ili*. The ‘jar’ qualified by *bas-*

⁹ Distinct from the action noun in *-mA*, which is completely outside the lexicon, refers not to subjects or objects but to non-factive events, and allows reference to the subject by possessive suffixes. As Kornfilt & Greenberg also point out, that form “does depend on voice morphology to change argument structure”.

¹⁰ In Old Turkic deverbal nominals this behaviour is not limited to resultative formations, though.

ılı in the example quoted above is not the direct object either, the direct object being the ‘cheese’. Reference to indirect objects is possible with *-Il-* forms as well, e.g. *ekilmeyen arazi* ‘uncultivated land’; whether the degree to which this can be done with the two processes is the same should be looked at in further research.

-(I)Il adjectives differ from perfect participles in *-miş* coming from the corresponding passive stems in that the *-miş* participles also imply the action which preceded the state reached through it, whereas the *-(I)Il* forms only refer to the attained state. *Kapalı kapı* is ‘a door which is in a closed state’; *kapanmış kapı*, on the other hand, is ‘one which at some stage got closed through somebody’s action or by itself’, while *kapatılmış kapı* is ‘a door closed by somebody’. One can say *kâğıda sarılmış ekmek* instead of *kâğıda sarılı ekmek* ‘bread wrapped in paper’, in so far as the bread would in any case have been wrapped up by somebody; it would hardly be acceptable to have *yazılmış hukuk* instead of *yazılı hukuk*, however, as the act of writing down no longer belongs to the conceptualisation of this term.

Another two Turkish deverbal adjective formations also describe states resulting from activities denoted by the base verbs: *-(I)k* as in the adjective *aç-ık* ‘open’ mentioned above, and *-GIn* as in *küs-kün*, more or less synonymous¹¹ with *küs-ülü*, also already discussed. However, *-GIn* and *-Ik* derivatives are often nouns, whereas the related *-(I)Il* forms are always adjectives; e.g. *baskın* ‘raid’ beside *bas-ılı* which, among other things, means ‘printed’, or *çiz-ik* ‘a scratch’ beside the pure adjective *çiz-ili* ‘ruled, lined, marked, scratched, drawn, crossed out’. When the different formations compete, it often happens that *-GIn* has a metaphorical meaning; thus *ez-ik* ‘squashed, bruised’ but *ez-gin* ‘run down, trampled under foot’, *kır-ık* ‘broken’ but *kır-gın* ‘dejected, disappointed’, *düş-ük fiyat* ‘a low price’ but *düş-kün kadın* ‘a woman fallen on hard times’,¹² *tut-ulu* ‘taken up’ but *tutkun* ‘given to, duped, in love’. A further difference between those two formations and *-(I)Il* is the fact that *-(I)Il* can be added only to monosyllabic stems or to stems whose second syllable consists of a vowel, and only to simple, neither deverbal nor denominal bases. In other formations, on the other hand, we find e.g. *don-dur-ma* ‘ice cream’, *belir-gin* ‘evident’ or *yetiş-kin* ‘grown up’; *kabar-ık* ‘swollen’, *değiş-ik* ‘different’, *tıka-n-ık* ‘blocked, stopped up’ or *gücen-ik* ‘offended’. When *-Ik* and *-GIn* forms are derived from intransitive verbs, which happens very often, they describe the subject of their bases, like *-mA*: This can be seen in the instances mentioned; cf. further *dol-gun* ‘plump, stuffed, full’, *şaş-kın* ‘bewildered’, *ol-gun* ‘ripe’, *dur-gun* ‘static’, *az-gın* ‘wild’ etc. Sometimes, derivatives formed with *-GIn* even denote subjects of transitive verbs, e.g. in *yetmiş yaşını geç-kin* or *aş-kın* ‘over 70 (years old)’ or *bil-gin* ‘learned, scholar’; this never happens with *-(I)Il*. The aspectual difference between *küskün* and

¹¹ See below, however.

¹² *Düşkün* can also mean ‘addict’, e.g. in *içkiye düşkün kadın* ‘a woman addicted to alcohol’. This instance, suggested to me by Jaklin Kornfilt, shows that *-gIn* can also retain the government pattern of its source verb.

küsülü (both ‘cross, sulking’) seems to be important: It seems that *küskün* denotes a post-terminal fact and corresponds to the participle *küsmüş*, while *küsülü* is to be interpreted as resultative imperfective or intra-terminal.

From the stems of *kes-ik*, *ez-ik*, *kıs-ık*, *çöz-ük*, *dök-ük*, *sil-ik*, *kır-ık*, *çürü-k* or *boz-uk* no *-(I)lI* derivatives can apparently be formed. It is relatively rare but not impossible for the bases of *-(I)lI* derivatives to show parallel formations in *-Ik* and *-GIn*; the absence of *-(I)lI* derivatives from these bases may, therefore, also be related to the fact that all of them express something negative. Subjectively speaking, of course: Does this mean, then, that Turks conceive of *kapalı* ‘closed’ as being more positive than *açık* ‘open’?

We note, on the other hand, that there is no **al-ılı* ‘taken, bought’, **ver-ili* ‘given’, **at-ılı* ‘thrown, shot’, **gör-ülü* ‘seen’, **geç-ili* ‘passed, overtaken’ or **sev-ili* ‘loved’ either: This is probably because the transitive verbs mentioned denote activities which do not influence their object in any noticeable way. This would also be related to what has already been pinpointed as constituting the central meaning of the *-(I)lI* formation, i.e. that it describes attained *states*; being ‘seen’, ‘passed’, ‘taken’, ‘given’ or even ‘loved’ does not, by itself, transpose entities or creatures into physically ascertainable and describable states. This links up with the pragmatic connection discovered by Comrie (1981) between perfect and passive: The connection between resultative perfect and passive is universally strongest where the result can be ascertained on the object. This is apparently why Turkish resultative verbal nouns and adjectives denote the object and not the subject of transitive verbs.

Inflectional morphology maintains clear oppositions between the functions of forms in a paradigm. Typical for Turkish word formation as for that of other languages is, however, the competition between formations partially overlapping in meaning and function. It is the task of grammarians to get out as much grammar as possible from such *partially* haphazard distributions. I hope to have shown in this paper the importance of word formation for the understanding of a language’s grammar and semantics. This paper is not, however, the result of any systematic research; several questions concerning the formations dealt with could therefore only be given tentative answers. Hopefully, such tentative answers will encourage more extensive research into the problems raised.

References

- Comrie, Bernard 1981. Aspect and voice: Some reflections on perfect and passive. In: Tedeschi, Philip J. & Zaenen, Annie (eds.) *Tense and aspect*. (Syntax and Semantics 14.) New York: Academic Press.
- Dankoff, Robert & Kelly, William (eds.) 1982-1985. *Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī. Compendium of the Turkic dialects. (Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk) 1-3*. (Sources of Oriental languages and literatures. Turkish sources 7.) Harvard: The Harvard University Printing Office.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon*. (Turcologica 9.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin & Greenberg, Gerald 2000. Changing argument structure without voice morphology: A concrete view. To appear in: Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia (eds.)

- Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. Lincoln College, Oxford, August 12-14, 1998.* (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin 1997. *Turkish grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Tarama sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. 1963-1974.
- Türkçe sözlük*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. 1988.

Apology in Turkish: A functional approach

Aysu Erden & Işıl Özyıldırım

Erden, Aysu & Özyıldırım, Işıl 2000. Apology in Turkish: A functional approach. *Turkic Languages* 4, 31-44.

Apology forms which can be defined as “regretful acknowledgement of fault or failure; assurance that no offence was intended” have complex functional properties.

The functional approach carried out in the study of Turkish apology forms covers two main aspects of the communicative effects of the sentences and texts denoting indirect apology: (1) The *formation* in which the importance of the implications and conversational implicatures is undeniable and (2) the *interpretation* of communicative effects of sentences and texts in which two related phases become important: *Decoding* and *inferential* phases.

In this study, functions of the forms of apology having non-directive force are also explained through examples taken from various Turkish literary texts.

Aysu Erden & Işıl Özyıldırım, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Linguistics, Beytepe – Ankara, Turkey.

I. Introduction

Language is a complex and multidimensional concept. How language is organized in the human mind is still a matter of debate among many linguists. As Finegan & Besnier state “Language has been a focus of people’s curiosity and intellectual probing for millennia. Like other inquiries that are central to human experience, questions about language and how it functions are not new to the twentieth century” (1989:1).

However, it is clear that language is not only a grammatical or abstract system consisting of rules but also a tool for communication. People exchange their ideas, feelings, wishes, desires by using language. They communicate with others in society. Thus, it is possible to analyze language in different ways. Studies that are concerned with structural or formal properties of languages are generally known as formal or structural studies. On the other hand, those that are based on how language is used in a certain context are regarded as functional studies.

“Apology” can be defined as “regretful acknowledgement of fault or failure; assurance that no offence was intended.” (*The concise Oxford dictionary*, 1980: 43-44) Therefore, apology always carries with it the will to be forgiven and is expressed by different but limited linguistic forms. These are namely: *affet* ‘forgive me’; *kusura bakma* ‘forgive me / I’m sorry’; *bağışla* ‘forgive me’; *affedersin* ‘I’m sorry / excuse me / I beg your pardon / sorry’; *kusura kalma* ‘forgive me / I’m sorry’; *hoşgör* ‘be tolerant’; *pardon* ‘pardon me / excuse me’; *özür dilerim* ‘I apologize / I’m sorry’; *af*

dilerim 'I ask your pardon'; *affeyle* 'forgive me'; *affınızı istiyorum* 'I ask your pardon'; *affınıza sığınıyorum* 'I beg to be excused'; *af buyur* 'excuse me'. This study deals with the forms of "apology" used in Turkish. In other words the aim will be to state the forms of apology in terms of their use.

The data have been collected from the different works of contemporary Turkish writers and are sometimes formed by our intuition as native speakers. In this way, the collected sentences are examined and evaluated in terms of their functional properties. The selected sentences are translated literally throughout the study.

II. A functional approach to the study of apology

1. Functionalism

Language is a social, more than an individual entity. Thus, it is not sufficient to study linguistic units structurally, as ends in themselves. It is necessary to consider linguistic as well as non-linguistic context to appreciate their communicative function. It is a fact that formal approaches did not attach importance to the meaning and functions of utterance. They were basically concerned with abstract grammatical items. Since language is used for communication, it is necessary to go beyond forms. It is not possible to understand what any speaker means without doing a functional study. Thus, a functional study of a language aims to find out the purpose for which an utterance or unit of language is used. Leech (1983: 48) expresses what is meant by a functional explanation as follows:

"It means explaining why a given phenomenon occurs by showing what its contribution is to a larger system of which it is itself a sub-system. As far as language is concerned, a functional theory is one which defines language as a form of communication, and therefore is concerned with showing how language works within the larger system of human society. Talk of purposes, ends, goals, plans also presupposes functionalism. When we discuss illocutions or meanings in terms of intentions or in terms of goals, we are indulging in a functional explanation."

The interpretation of sentences cannot be restricted to the linguistic forms alone but should also be considered in terms of psychological and social functions outside the ongoing discourse. In other words, the fact that sentences have speech act values could best be understood within a universe of discourse.

Austin stated that in issuing an utterance a speaker can perform three acts simultaneously: (1) The *locutionary act* is the act of saying something: Producing a series of sounds which mean something. This is the aspect of language which has been the traditional concern of linguistics. (2) The *illocutionary act*, which is an act performed in saying something and is identified by the explicit performative (e.g.: "I bid", "I apologize", etc.), includes acts such as promising, apologizing, criticizing or denying. (3) The *perlocutionary act*, on the other hand, is performed by or as a result of saying something. The perlocutionary act produces some effects on the hearers. Persuasion, for example, is a perlocutionary act: One cannot persuade someone to do

something just by saying “I persuade you”. Comparable examples are the acts of convincing, annoying, frightening and amusing. It can be summarized that all utterances perform specific actions since they have specific forces and specific meanings occurring side by side. This fact is best explained by the above-mentioned distinction between three basic senses in which one does something by saying something, namely locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The following examples can be given to illustrate these three types of acts (Coulthard 1977: 17-18):

Act A or locution

He said to me: “Shoot her”.

Act B or illocution

He urged me to shoot her.

Act C or perlocution

He persuaded me to shoot her.

As Searle puts forward, the locutionary act being achieved through the uttering of certain words is potentially under the control of the speaker, provided he uses the correct explicit performative in the appropriate circumstances. No one, for example, can prevent someone from warning or advising the other except by refusing to listen (1980: VIII).

Searle (1975) introduced a distinction between direct and indirect speech acts which depends on a recognition of the intended effect of an utterance on a particular occasion. Indirect speech acts are cases in which one act is performed indirectly by way of performing another. Thus, the example “Can you speak a little louder?” can be seen as, at one level, a question about the hearer’s ability, but at another level, a request for action (Brown & Yule 1983: 232). This fact leads to another distinction: The distinction between direct and indirect apology. Such a distinction between these two main types of apology requires a further distinction. Thus, it is possible to distinguish three main groups of linguistic units denoting apology:

1. Sentences denoting direct apology
2. Sentences and texts denoting indirect apology
3. Functions of the forms of apology having non-directive force

This study deals with three main topics: Direct apology and sentences denoting direct apology, indirect apology and sentences as well as texts denoting indirect apology, and the functions of indirect apology, which further deals with the forms of apologizing having non-directive force. The method of analysis used in this study is developed in the light of the approaches put forward by Austin (1962), Grice (1975), Coulthard (1977), Searle (1975, 1980), Brown & Yule (1983), Levinson (1992), Pilkington (1996), Clark (1996), and Langacker (1996).

2. Direct and indirect apology and functions

2.1. Sentences denoting direct apology

In the light of the “Speech Act Theory” discussed so far, it can be said that to apologize is an illocutionary act, which is achieved through the uttering of performative verbs such as *özür dilerim*, *bağışla*, *hoşgör* and *affet*, carrying the act of apologizing in themselves. Such utterances are used to perform actions rather than to say something is or is not the case. Such verbs carry an action in themselves, in our case, the act of apologizing. Whenever the verb *özür dilerim* or *bağışla* is used, the speaker automatically performs the act of apologizing. No one can prevent someone from apologizing except by refusing to listen. These are in fact forms of apology having directive force. As Levinson defines them, directives are “attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something” (1992: 240). In the case of apologizing, the attempt by the speaker to get the addressee to do something is the addressee’s asking for forgiveness and his expectancy of being forgiven by the addressee.

2.2. Sentences and texts denoting indirect apology

Sentences of indirect apology consist of linguistic forms which include verbs other than the performative ones and which suggest indirect apology. It is not the order and the inner structure of such sentences but the verbs in their verb phrases that contribute to the indirect apology. Such forms of apology have non-directive force.

However, there are also cases where the speech act of apologizing is achieved indirectly. As Searle (1980) also expresses, “in a theory of speech acts there is a customary distinction between direct speech acts where the speaker says what he means, and indirect speech acts where he means something more than what he says”. He further states that:

“In indirect speech acts, the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer.” (1980: 226)

It is clear from the extract above that the hearers can understand indirect speech acts by relying upon their knowledge of speech acts, along with the general principles of cooperative conversation, mutually shared factual information and a general ability to draw inferences.

2.2.1. Sentences denoting indirect apology

At this stage it is necessary to mention J. L. Austin and his functional view of language as action in social contexts once again. As already discussed under the heading “functionalism”, there are many different things which speakers can do with words. Austin’s most basic insight was that some utterances are not statements or questions about some piece of information, but are actions. Thus, according to his “Speech Act

Theory” language as action serves a range of different functions such as promising, asserting, describing, impressing, complaining, persuading and apologizing (Coulthard 1977: 17).

But in the case of apologizing, both the performative verbs such as *bağışla* and *affet* ‘forgive me / us’, *özür dilerim* ‘I apologize’ and other verbs which carry an indirect meaning of apologizing and which produce some effect on the addressee can optionally and interchangeably be used due to the situational context, the style and varying degrees of emphatic usage employed by the speaker.

The following extracts can be taken as cases of when and how direct and indirect forms of apology can be used interchangeably and optionally due to stylistic and possibly emphatic reasons. In the following cases, both the direct and indirect forms are used to perform illocutionary acts and can be used in one another’s place.

- (1) *Kızma bey, kızma bey kurban olayım ... dedi, kızma sen haklısın ...*
(Nesin 1975: 82)
“‘Don’t get angry dear, don’t get angry dear ...’ said she. “Let me sacrifice myself for your sake. Don’t get angry, you are right ...”
- (2) *Kuzum dadıcığım, canım dadıcığım, etme eyleme!*
(Karaosmanoğlu 1980: 99)
‘Dear nanny, dearest nanny, please don’t do it, don’t get angry!’
- (3) “*Babacığım*” diyor, “beni affet”. (Faik 1970: 25)
“‘Dearest father’ says he ... “do forgive me!”

The imperative verbs *kızma* ‘don’t get angry’ and *etme eyleme* ‘don’t do it’ can easily be replaced by *affet* or *bağışla*, although they produce an indirect effect of apology on the addressee. Similarly, *beni affet* ‘do forgive me’ in the third example can also be replaced by one of the imperative verbs *kızma*, *etme* and *eyleme* that produce indirect effects. Hence it is possible to rewrite and translate the three examples above as follows:

- (4) *Affet / bağışla bey, Affet / bağışla bey, kurban olayım ... dedi,*
Affet / bağışla sen haklısın ...
“‘Forgive me dear, forgive me dear ...’ said she. “Let me sacrifice myself for your sake. Forgive me, you are right ...”
- (5) *Kuzum dadıcığım, canım dadıcığım, affet / bağışla.*
‘Dear nanny, dearest nanny, please do forgive me!’
- (6) “*Babacığım*” diyor, “kızma / etme eyleme!”.
“‘Dearest father’ says he ... “don’t get angry / Please don’t do it.”

Thus, as Searle puts forward, “the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such

as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologizing, thanking, congratulating" (1980: VII).

2.2.2. Texts denoting indirect apology

Speakers and listeners have the ability to assign interpretations to certain sentences or groups of sentences in certain contexts and draw inferences from them because what is conveyed by a certain message may be richer than what is written. In such cases the listeners have to search extensively for hints within the context in order to assign appropriate interpretations to certain utterances. In fact, "the relative accessibility of assumptions" is an important factor which guides the interpretation not only of individual sentences but of texts as well. Pilkington (1996: 158) explains this fact as follows:

"The addresser in fashioning his or her utterance takes into account what he or she considers to be the concepts and assumptions that are most accessible to the addressee. The addressee follows a route of least effort in using the most accessible concepts and assumptions until a range of contextual effects that the addresser could rationally have intended is derived. Context is extended until such effects are achieved. These effects then constitute the interpretation."

Thus, it is necessary to distinguish what is implied, suggested or meant by a sentence or group of sentences and what is actually said. As sentences and texts are means of communication, the participants in this communicative exchange are either the writer and the reader or the characters created in a literary text. The reader has to distinguish what the writer tries to imply, and the characters in a narrative text have to assign interpretations to what one says to the other throughout the text.

Whether the participants are the writer and the reader or the characters created by the writer himself in the text, they are expected to observe the cooperative principle formulated by Grice (1967, 1975). He explains this principle in the following way: The participants should make their conversational contribution "such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which they are exchanged. If the speaker's words convey other ... than their literal meaning, and the situation characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature" (*Encyclopedic dictionary of semiotics*, 1986: 338-339).

There are two main types of implicature (implicit content): (1) Conventional implicatures are "determined by particular lexical items or linguistic constructions" in the sentence. They are "arbitrarily stipulated". (2) Conversational implicatures "follow from general maxims of truthfulness, informativeness, relativeness and clarity" and should be recoverable by an argument. Otherwise they cannot be considered conversational implicature (Grice 1975: 42-43).

Grice makes a distinction between two types of conversational implicatures (*Encyclopedic dictionary of semiotics*, 1986: 339-340):

(a) Particularized conversational implicatures: Grice explains certain rhetorical effects such as irony, metaphor and hyperbole via implicature because they occur in

particular occasions due to the special features of the situational context of the text. These can be taken as a “set of non-logical and context dependent inferences that comprise conveyed meaning: that which is meant without being said”.

(b) Generalized conversational implicatures: They are independent of context and are always associated with a particular linguistic form.

Searle (1975), on the other hand, makes a distinction between two cases of meaning: (a) The case when “the speaker utters a sentence and means exactly and literally what he says”. In this case what the speaker intends is to produce an illocutionary effect in the hearer. This effect is produced when the hearer recognizes (with the help of his own “knowledge of the rules that govern the utterance of the sentence”) the intention of the speaker. (b) The case when “the speaker’s utterance meaning and the sentence meaning” diverge “in hints such as insinuations, irony and metaphor”. In such cases, “the speaker utters a sentence, means what he says, but also means something more”. Thus, two different types of illocutionary acts are intended to be performed by one sentence: One sentence which contains an illocutionary force indicator and is uttered to perform one kind of illocutionary act may additionally perform another type of illocutionary act (Searle 1975: 59).

On the other hand, Clark (1996: 164) mentions two phases in the interpretations of sentences and texts: The *decoding* and *inferential* phases. In the decoding phase, linguistic expressions (words and syntactic structures) “automatically cause readers” to access particular conceptual representations. The readers manipulate those representations in particular ways. The inferential phase “builds more complex representations on the basis of what is decoded and derives implications and implicatures through their interaction with contextual assumptions”. That is, the reader works out the implications of the sentence or the text and decides which of these implications are the *intentionally conveyed implications* (implicatures). He does this with his knowledge of how particular linguistic forms are typically used in certain contexts. The particular communicative effects that texts give rise to result from the interaction of the reader’s knowledge of the meanings of particular linguistic forms with his knowledge of how these forms are typically used in certain contexts. In short, texts have communicative effects which result both from implicatures and implications.

The method of analysis used in the study of texts denoting indirect apology in Turkish is developed in the light of the approaches formulated by three linguists: Grice, who distinguished particularized conversational implicatures from generalized ones and who emphasized their role in the formation of the communicative effects of the texts, Searle, who distinguished sentences and texts performing more than one illocutionary act from those having one literal meaning only, and finally Clark, who emphasized the role of the decoding and inferential phases in the interpretation of sentences and texts as well as the importance of implications and implicatures in the formation of the communicative effects that texts give rise to.

In this framework, it is possible to give the following examples for indirect apologizing acts:

- (7) *Ooo, bana darılmayınız, dedim. Siz benim herşeyimsiniz. Gelin barışalım dedim.* (Karaosmanoğlu 1980: 94)
 “‘Oh, don’t get angry,” said I. “You are my everything. Come on, let’s be friends again,” said I.’
- (8) *... Döneceğime inanmış olduğumu söyledin ama evde bana ait tek şey bırakmamışsın. Görmeye dayanamıyordum, dedi Ayfer. Anlamalısın. Hem moda değişiyor durmadan. Saklasaydım bile beğenmezdin onları. Çok titizdin giyimine.* (Aral 1986b: 95)
 ‘... You told me that you had believed I would return, but you haven’t left anything in the house that belongs to me.” “I couldn’t bear to see,” said Ayfer. “You have to understand. Besides, the fashion is continuously changing. Even if I had kept them, I bet, you wouldn’t like them now. You were too difficult to please with the way you dressed.’
- (9) *... Sokağın başında indik. İkinci apartmanın önüne gelince: “Çok geç olmasaydı size birer kahve içelim diyecektim. Başka zaman beklerim. Ben üst katta oturuyorum ...”* (Toprak 1975: 83)
 ‘... We got off at the corner of the street. When we arrived in front of the second building: “If it weren’t late, I would offer you a cup of coffee. I expect you to come some other time. I live on the top floor ...”
- (10) *... Valla olmaz. Darılmayın çocuklar. Başka şey olsa vereyim.* (Nesin, 1995: 55)
 ‘... By God, no. Don’t get angry guys. If it were something else, I would give it to you.’

In the above extracts, although there are no apology forms, the global speech act is apologizing. They are not as strong as direct apologies, however, the hearers can understand the indirect apologies by relying upon their knowledge of speech acts, along with the general principles of cooperative conversation, mutually shared factual information and the ability on the part of the hearer to make inferences.

In example 7 the indirect apology starts with the speaker’s trying to calm down the addressee and then his making use of the art of flattery when he says *siz benim herşeyimsiniz* ‘you are my everything’. Finally he offers the addressee friendship. Thus, the process of apologizing appears in the sentences as follows:

[S1 calming down] + [S2 flattery] + [S3 offering friendship]

In example 8, Ayfer apologizes by offering three logical and valid reasons to make her husband understand why she threw his clothes away as soon as they were divorced: (1) The fact that she couldn’t bear to see his clothes, as they reminded her of her ex-husband, (2) he must accept the fact that the fashion has changed since then, (3) it is an obvious fact that his likes are changeable and that it is very difficult to please him. Thus, these three psychological and social facts constitute the whole process of apology and this process in the sentences is seen as follows:

[S1 [S2 Positive reasoning] but [S3 Disappointment]] + [S4 Progressive disability in the past] + [S5 Necessity/obligation at the moment of speaking] + [S6 Giving information] + [S7 [S8 Conditional] even if [S9 Conditional]] + [S10 Giving information about the apologized person]

In example 9 the speaker starts her apology with a conditional sentence. But in this case, it is not very clear whether the speaker really seeks the addressee's company or not. Had the speaker really wanted the addressee's company, then the reason why she made use of such a conditional introduction would be the hidden fact that she was afraid of being refused by the addressee if she had directly invited him to her apartment. On the other hand, if the speaker had not desired the addressee's company, the reason for using the conditional sentence would be that what she really wanted was to refuse him kindly, in an indirect way.

In example 10, the speaker apologizes for not giving something that he really wants to keep for himself, but stating another reason. He doesn't directly refuse to give it to the addressees, and the process of apology indicated by the text itself appears in the sentences as follows:

[S1Negation] + [S2 Negative Imperative] + [S3 Conditional]

In this case, the conditional sentence does not constitute the introductory part of the process of apology but its concluding part.

- (11) *Hamal tutmuyorum. Ardımca gezen bu çocuklar adına onur kırıklığı duydum hep. Çocuklarım karnımdayken gereksindim onlara ama gereğinden çok verdim. Kazak, gömlek, pabuç verdim. Islandıklarında soba başında kuruttum giysilerini. Kaynanam söylendi.* (Aral, 1986a: 7)

'I don't ask for a porter. I've always felt my pride hurt on behalf of these children who were walking right behind me. I needed them when I was pregnant but I paid them more than they needed. I gave them pullovers, shirts and shoes. When they were wet all over, I let their clothes get dried before the stove. My mother-in-law grumbled.'

As can be seen in the above example, the sentences seem to be uttered by the speaker in order to perform only one kind of illocutionary act, which is the act of refusing to hire or use children who try to earn their livelihoods working as porters at the bazaar. The speaker feels extremely guilty, especially when she is pregnant. That is the reason why she gives these children some clothes together with the payment and lets their wet garments dry in her house in spite of her mother-in-law's objections. In the sentences indicating the above-mentioned actions there is another, additional type of illocutionary act, which is the speaker's act of apologizing to those children for making them work. She makes an apology to the children both for making them work for the sake of her own unborn baby and for society's way of forcing these children to work hard in bad conditions at the bazaar. In this case, it is the order and the inner

structure of each sentence that contribute to the overall effect produced by the text as a whole: The indirect apology.

This fact can also be illustrated by the following example:

- (12) (1) *Evladım, aslan evladım!* (2) *Ne kötülüğümü gördünüz?* (3) *Elimden geldikçe iyilik ettim.* (4) *Söyle güzel evladım!* (5) *Ne kötülük ettim?* (6) *Cemile Kariyi bilmez misin?* (7) *İftira ediyor ...* (Kemal, 1981: 75)
 ‘(1) Son, oh brave son! (2) Have you ever seen me doing a dirty deed? (3) I have done good with all my might. (4) Tell me dear child! (5) Have I done anything bad? (6) Don’t you know that bitch Cemile? (7) She’s telling lies...’

As shown in the above example, sentences 2 and 5 can be seen as questions about the speaker’s ability and 6 as a question about the addressee’s ability at one level, but at another level an apology for something wrong that the speaker has done. On the other hand, sentence 4 can be seen as an imperative, but in this context of situation it is used to support and emphasize the speaker’s style when he apologizes for what he has done. Sentence 1 is vocative and functions as an introduction to the speaker’s apology. Thus, the sentence types successively used in the apology are: vocative + question + statement + imperative + question + negative question + statement.

2.3. Functions of the forms of apology having nondirective force

Forms of apology may reflect a number of functions. Sentences containing forms of apology may bring about different kinds of meanings which cannot be explained by merely looking at the grammatical form or structure. Such sentences can be understood fully only when such concepts as discourse and context of situation are taken into account. Although sentences having apology forms are normally used with a directive force, there are a number of cases where forms of apologizing are not regarded as an attempt by the speaker to get the addressee to forgive him. In what follows, forms of apology having nondirective force will be explained by means of examples taken from various literary texts.

- (a) As God’s blessing
Allah başışlasın Ceylan yavrusu ... Kimin kızı a canım! (Taner 1983: 83)
 ‘God bless her. A baby deer ... Whose daughter is she, dear?’
Çok şirin şey, Allah başışlasın.
 ‘What a pretty thing. God bless her.’
- (b) As a parenthetical expression of kindness
Aptalca yaşamamış olduğunuz belli dedim. Üstelik de hala – başışlayın – çekici bir kadınsınız. (Aral 1986 b: 77)
 ‘It is evident that you haven’t lived like a fool. Besides, you are still—forgive me—an attractive woman.’

Çok zayıf, affedersiniz, biraz kambur bir ihtiyar. (Güntekin 1983: 249)
 ‘A very lean, *excuse me*, and a little, old hunchback.’

“Bir de Niçe’nin sözü olacak” dedi. “Aklım evet der, gururum hayır, yo pardon, aklım hayır der, gururum evet”. (Taner, 1983: 60)
 ‘Besides there should be the quotation taken from Nietzsche. My mind says yes, my pride no, oh no, *pardon me*, my mind says no, but my pride yes.’

(c) As an introduction to an unpleasant subject

“Affedersiniz” dedi. “Dertlerinizin tazelenmesine sebep oldum.”
 (Karaosmanoğlu 1980: 96)

“I’m sorry” said he. *“I made you remember your troubles”.*

Affedersiniz tuhaf bir teşbih ama ... Kayakların buzdan aldığı o hızlı lezzeti alır. Korkmayın! ... (Faik 1977: 26)
 ‘... *Excuse me*, this may be a strange metaphor but ... It’s like the speedy taste which the skates develop on ice. Don’t be afraid.’

(d) As a protest

Hah hah haay ... Güleyim bari ... Ya senin zenaatin ne? Muhabbet tellallığı daha mı şerefli bir iş? Affetmişsin sen onu. Ben sekreter ve daktilo kursu işletiyorum! (Verel 1982: 174)

‘Ha ha ha ... Let me laugh at it. Well, what is your job? Is prostitution a more honorable job? You don’t have the right to say such a thing. I have a private school for training people to become secretaries and typists.’

Affetmişsin sen onu. Şu bir damlacık yerde yatıyorum, utanmadan kalkıp dil uzatıyorsun. Seninki hem kellik hem fodulluk. (Oran 1982: 138)

‘You don’t have the right to say such a thing. It’s me who is sleeping at such a small place as this one. And now what you are doing is just objecting without feeling any shame at all. What you are doing is rudeness but nothing else.’

(e) As an objection

Affedersin ama benim senin dualarına hiç de itimadım yok. (Verel, 1982: 173)

‘Excuse me, but I don’t trust in your prayers, never at all.’

Yoo Hacı Bey ... Affedersin ama biz medrese açmadık. (Güntekin 1983: 147)

‘Oh no, Mr. Hadji. Excuse me, but we didn’t build a religious school.’

Beyefendi, Affedersiniz. Ben denizi tanırım. İstanbul’da doğup büyüdüm ... (Nesin 1995: 44)

‘Sir, excuse me. I know the sea. I was born in Istanbul and lived in Istanbul ...’

(f) As a device to draw attention, to start a conversation with a stranger or to ask a stranger a question

Affedersiniz sizi birisine benzetmiştim de diyerek kazasız belasız sıyrılabilir misiniz? (Tığlı 1982: 256)

'Is it possible to get rid of the burden of such behaviour by saying "*Excuse me*, I thought you were somebody that I knew so well" to somebody that you don't know at all.'

"*Evet*" dedi "affedersiniz, rahatsız ettim. Lakin vazife icabı ..." (Talu 1982: 42)

"Yes" said he, "excuse me, I disturbed you. But it's my duty."

Bir kadın yanıma sokuldu, "affedersiniz, şuraya nereden gidilir" diye bir yer sordu. (Nesin 1975: 150)

'A woman, coming close to me, asked me a question. "*Excuse me*, how can I get to this address?"'

- (g) As a device in prayers or in religious communication
... *Tövbe Yarabbi ... sen bizi affet Yarabbi.* (Kanık 1982: 198)
'We won't do it again! oh God. Please, *do forgive us.*'

Dilediğini bağışlar ... Bizi bağışla, bize acı. (Kur'an-ı Kerim 1986: 48)
'He *forgives* whoever he wants ... *Forgive us*, pity us.'

Ya Rab, bağışla suçlarımızı. (Kur'an-ı Kerim 1986: 66)
'Oh God, do forgive our sins.'

- (h) As a device to express a pessimistic approach towards life
Sürekli bir güceniklik içindeydi insanlar, güceniklikleri daim kılındı.
Bağışlamayıcıydılar ... (Hepçilingirler 1990: 101)
'They were in a state of continuous vexation. Their resentment was lifelong. They were those who were *unforgiving.*'
Gücenmelerin ve bağışlamamaların perçinlediği hüznün: Tanıdık ve olgun.
(Hepçilingirler 1990: 103)
'A sorrow which became riveted as a result of a state of being offended, and a state of not *forgiving*: A well known and mature state.'

- (i) As a device to indicate a so-called politeness or formal kindness.
Madam ... Pardon ... Yani sen arıyor burda hela. (Nesin 1995: 71)
'Madam ... *Pardon me ...* You mean, you are looking for a WC.'
Hikmet Bey, dikkatle bakıyordu adamın yüzüne. Ağzındaki lokmayı gürk diye yuttu. "Çok özür dilerim ... Tanıyamadım pek ..." (Korkmazgil 1982: 164)
'Hikmet Bey was looking at the man's face carefully. He gulped the piece of food in his mouth. "*I'm really very sorry ... I couldn't remember you.*"'
... Ama gözlerindeki acı geçmemişti. Evde arama yapanları konuk sayıyordu bir bakıma. "Sen insan ol, karşındakiler kaba davransalar da, insandılar onlar da ..." düşüncesi geçti aklından. Yüzbaşıya döndü: "Özür dilerim, birşey ikram edemedim. Bu gecenin anısı olarak, sizlere birer kitap imzalayayım."
(Toprak 1975: 157)
'... But a look of sorrow still rested in his eyes. He accepted those who were making a search in his house as his guests. "You have to behave kindly even if they don't, because they are also human beings" thought he. He turned to

the lieutenant and said "I'm sorry, I could not offer you anything. But let me sign a book of mine for you as a souvenir".'

III. Conclusion

As a result, it can be said that Turkish apology forms are worth studying in the sense that they have more complex functional properties than meets the eye.

In this study, a functional approach has been carried out. As is known, texts give rise to communicative effects in the functional approach. The study of both the formation and interpretation of the communicative effects of sentences and texts becomes important in terms of their psychological and social functions in certain situational contexts.

In the formation of the communicative effects of sentences and texts which denote indirect apology, the importance of the implications and conversational implicatures is undeniable as any sentence or text can be considered as a medium of communication between the writer and his reader. Conversational implicatures are of two types: Generalized and particularized. It is possible to analyze sentences and texts denoting indirect apology mostly from the point of view of particularized conversational implicatures because such sentences and texts perform different functions when they occur in particular occasions. In this case, their apology function can only be drawn from the special features of the situational context in which they take place.

In the interpretation of the communicative effects of sentences and texts denoting indirect apology, two different but closely related phases become important: Decoding and inferential phases. First comes the decoding phase, which requires the reader to manipulate the linguistic representations (morphological and syntactic) in particular ways. Then comes the inferential phase, which makes it possible for the readers to derive implications and implicatures on the basis of what they have decoded previously. In the inferential phase, when the implications and implicatures interact with the contextual assumptions, the reader is able to work out the implications in the sentence or the text and to decide which of these implications the writer is intentionally conveying. That is possible because the reader already has the knowledge of how particular linguistic expressions are typically used in certain contexts.

And finally, sentences with forms of apology may have different kinds of meaning which cannot be explained by looking at their grammatical forms or structures only. This is because such sentences reflect a number of different functions.

References

- Austin, I. L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Clark, B. 1996. Stylistic analysis and relevance theory. *Language and Literature* 5/3, 163-178.
The concise Oxford dictionary of current English. London: Book Club Associates. 1980.
 Coulthard, M. 1977. *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
Encyclopedic dictionary of semiotics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1986.

- Finegan, E. & Besnier, N. 1989. *Language: Its structure and use*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovic Publishers.
- Grice, H. P. 1967. Logic and conversation. [Unpublished manuscript of the William James lectures.]
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In: Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic Press. 41-58.
- Kuran-ı Kerim ve Türkçe anlamı*. İstanbul: Güneş Halkalı Tesisleri. 1986.
- Langacker, R. W. 1996. Conceptual grouping and pronominal anaphora. In: Fox, B. (ed.) *Studies in anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, C. S. 1992. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pilkington, A. 1986. Introduction: Relevance theory and literary style. *Language and Literature* 5/3, 157-162.
- Searle, J. R. 1975. Indirect speech acts. In: Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic Press. 59-77.
- Searle, J. R. & Kiefer, F. & Bierwisch, M. 1980. *Speech act theory and pragmatics*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Bibliography for literary texts

- Aral, İnci 1986a. *Ağda zamanı*. İstanbul: Kaynak yayınları.
- Aral, İnci 1986b. *Sevginin eşsiz kısı*. İstanbul: Özgür yayın dağıtım.
- Faik, Sait 1970. *Bütün eserleri 6: Havuz başı, Son kuşlar*. Ankara: Bilgi basımevi.
- Faik, Sait 1977. *Bütün eserleri 4: Mahalle kahvesi, Havada bulut*. Ankara: Bilgi basımevi.
- Güntekin, Reşat Nuri 1983. *Kavak yelleri*. İstanbul: İnkılâp ve Aka kitabeveleri.
- Hepçilingirler, Feyza 1990. *Kırlangıçsız geçti yaz*. İstanbul: Cem yayınevi.
- Kanık, Adnan Veli 1982. İyi bir kısmet için. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 125-132.
- Karaosmanoğlu, Yakup Kadri 1980. *Hep o şarkı*. İstanbul: Birikim yayınları.
- Kemal, Yaşar 1981. *Sarı sıcak*. İstanbul: Karacan yayınları.
- Korkmazgil, Hasan Hüseyin 1982. Neyiniz var Süleyman Bey. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 241-248.
- Nesin, Aziz 1995. *Sizin memlekette eşek yok mu?* İstanbul: Doğan yayın holding, A. Ş.
- Nesin, Aziz 1975. *Vatan sağolsun*. İstanbul: Doğan yayın holding, A. Ş.
- Oran, Bülent. 1982. Sınır. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 138-143.
- Talu, Ercüment Ekrem 1982. Yine parasızlık. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 38-44.
- Taner, Haldun 1983. *Onikiye bir var*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınevi.
- Tıgılı, Erhan 1982. Benzetmek. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 256-262.
- Toprak, Ömer Faruk 1975. *Karşı pencere*. İstanbul: Cem yayınevi.
- Verel, Oktay 1982. Esnekbil ile alkışlar. In: Semih, Mehmet (ed.) *Türk mizah hikayeleri antolojisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi yayınları. 171-177.

Acquisition of English collocations by speakers of Turkish and Azerbaijani

Javanshir Shibliyev & İsmail Boztaş

Shibliyev, Javanshir & Boztaş, İsmail 2000. Acquisition of English collocations by speakers of Turkish and Azerbaijani. *Turkic Languages* 4, 45-53.

The study focuses on difficulties that students from a Turkic language background (Azerbaijani and Turkish) encounter in comprehending and producing English collocations. The research work limits itself to investigating *make* and *do* collocations. The reason for selecting them were (1) their relatively high level of frequency of occurrence (Renouf 1987), (2) the heavy duty that they perform in the formation of collocations due to their delexicalization. We aimed to find out (1) which of the related collocations our students are familiar with, (2) which of the collocations are most frequently comprehended, and (3) the errors that could be explained by native language transfer. The research work enabled us to conclude that (1) collocations used with prepositions, (2) collocations used in colloquial speech, and (3) collocations exemplified by high level of restrictedness were comprehended erroneously. It also revealed that the interference errors were mainly the result of the semantic structure of the collocations.

Javanshir Shibliyev & İsmail Boztaş, Eastern Mediterranean University, Gazimağusa, KKTC, via Mersin 10, Turkey.

Introduction

Collocations are useful for teaching both text comprehension and production because by memorizing groups of collocations, students become aware of lexical restrictions. Moreover, collocations teach students expectations about what sort of language can follow from what has preceded. This acquires more significance when one bears in mind such an obvious assumption that knowing a word means being aware of the degree of probability of encountering it and the sorts of words that the given word is likely to associate with. It should also be mentioned that the main problem that the non-native speaker of English encounters is that s/he finds it very difficult to predict the occurrence of lexical features. In addition, when encountering a new collocation, a learner never makes a conscious effort to understand or memorize it. As a result, the collocation very often passes unnoticed because it does not require the learner to apply different mental operations consciously. Taking all these factors into account, we can conclude that it is very important to study the role of the transfer that the learners face in learning English collocations.

Brief literature review

A review of the relevant literature indicates that English collocations have been a research subject for nearly half a century. In fact, Firth (1957) was the first to mention collocations; he considered collocation to be an abstract of the syntagmatic level not directly concerned with the conceptual or ideational approach to the meaning of words. Since Firth, studies of collocations in English have been mainly in two directions: (1) Defining their linguistic status, and (2) comparative / contrastive analysis of collocations. When dealing with the former, researchers approach the collocations from different viewpoints, such as lexical (Halliday 1966; Mitchell 1972; Halliday & Hasan 1976; Robinett 1978; Benson 1985; Jackson 1988; White 1988), lexicogrammatical (Carter 1987; Sajavaara & Lehtonen 1989) and stylistic (McIntosh 1966). Another direction in the study of collocations is their comparability / contrastivity between languages (Mitchell 1975; Tritch 1981; Linnarud 1986; Biskup 1992).

Need for further research

The above survey of the relevant literature shows that no consensus exists among researchers on the linguistic status of collocations. The analysis of these discrepancies is beyond the scope of this paper, and the languages involved come from the Germanic, Romance and Slavic language families. Focusing on Turkic languages with respect to collocations alongside other languages typologically and genealogically similar or distant will enable us to determine those areas of linguistics that have universal characteristic features for all languages or at least for many languages. Our decision to concentrate on two Turkic languages, Azerbaijanian and Turkish, was prompted by our belief that the research findings could increase the reliability of our assumptions. For feasibility purposes we decided not to concentrate on the correlational analysis between Azerbaijanian and Turkish in respect to transferability of English collocations. The transfer of delexicalized units on the materials of the given languages will be considered separately.

Conceptual definition

The main term to be used in this study is *collocation*. By collocation we mean habitual co-occurrence of individual linguistic items. They are a type of syntagmatic relation, being linguistically predictable to a greater or lesser extent. Relative fixedness is characteristic of collocations. Another characteristic is non-idiomaticity, i.e., their meaning can be decoded from the meanings of their constituents. The term *lexeme* is also frequently used here. By *lexeme*, we mean the least meaningful unit of the word level.

Methodology

For this study, we decided to apply a qualitative method, and the data have been elicited by asking the subjects to perform some linguistic tasks in written form. The

elicited data underwent percentage analyses, and the errors were grouped in the order of decreasing importance: From more frequent to less.

A total of 14 pre-intermediate proficiency level students from Middle East Technical University (Ankara, Turkey) participated in the study. As required by the research question, the students selected came from two Turkic-language backgrounds (Azerbaijani and Turkish).

In order to give the material systematicity, we classified the collocations with the verbs *make* and *do*. The choice of the given words was dictated by the fact that (a) they are included in the first two hundred word forms in the Birmingham Corpus ranked in the order of frequency of occurrence (Renouf 1987), (b) they play a major role in the formation of collocations, and (c) their Turkic equivalents *yapmak / etmek* possess similar features. The patterns to be described here are based on Mednikova's (1986) models. For this piece of research, we modified them however, focusing on those patterns that would be characteristic for only *make* and *do* collocations. The main criterion to describe collocability was the principle of patterning collocations by taking the semantic structure of the word into account. The patterns are distinguished at the level of word classes (parts of speech). The patterns were classified on the basis of the following criteria:

1. All the constituents of the patterns must be obligatory, i.e. omitting any of the constituents would lead to the splitting of the phrase (e.g. *to make friends with somebody*).
2. The meaning of the word is conditioned by the structure of the collocational pattern (e.g. *to do sums*).
3. A given meaning of the verb is regularly realized within the given pattern. Here we mean the habitual co-occurrence of the units as one of the distinguishing features of the collocations. The occurrence of *mistake* with *make* is easily predictable, and this given meaning is regularly expressed by this collocation.

The test materials were derived from (1) the novel *The spider's house* (Bowles 1985) and *Dictionary of verbal collocations* (Mednikova 1986). All the materials could be divided into two parts: (a) Translation task, i.e. sentences with *make* and *do* elicited for translation, and (b) acceptability tasks, i.e. collocational patterns with *make* and *do* for checklists consisting of thirty items.

Data analysis

Make

The data analysis showed that the most frequent errors are made with collocations whose general meaning is hard to derive from their constituents. In other words, the more restricted the collocation, the lower the comprehension level appears to be. For example, the participants were given the collocation *to make up something / something up: They made up their quarrel at last*. (Correct Azerbaijani: *Onlar sonunda barışdılar* and correct Turkish: *Sonunda uzlaştılar*.) None of the 14 respondents could translate it into their native languages. The collocation *to make both ends meet* in the sentence *They tried to make both ends meet* (correct Azerbaijani: *Maaşları*

onlara güc-bəla ile çatırdı; correct Turkish: *Gelir ve giderlerini denk getirmeye çalıştılar*) was translated correctly by 13.63% of the subjects only. Most of them translated it erroneously: *O hər iki tərəfi görüşdürməyə çalışdı* which means 'He tried to make the sides meet' in Azerbaijan and *O qarşılaşmanın sona ermesini denedi*, i.e. 'He tried to finish the meeting' in Turkish.

The second group of errors was made with collocations which are generally used with adverbs and verbal particles. For example, the collocation *to make away with something or somebody* was comprehended by only 4.16% of the participants. The main factor that misled the subjects seemed to be the adverb *away*. This expression is usually understood as *something or somebody that is far away from something or somewhere*. That was why some participants rendered one sentence as *Düşmənlərimizdən uzaq durmalıyıq* in Azerbaijanian; and as *Düşmanlarımızdan uzak olmalıyız* in Turkish, which means 'We must keep away from our enemies'. (Correct Azerbaijanian: *Düşmənlərimizi məhv etməliyik*; correct Turkish: *Düşmanlarımızı yok etməliyiz*.) Some participants associated the expression with the meaning *to run away with something*. Consequently, the sentence *All the money has been made away with in a week* was translated as *Bir həftə içinde pulları alıb gəcdi* in Azerbaijanian, and *Parasıyla birlikte bir hafta içinde kaçtı* in Turkish. (Correct Azerbaijanian: *Bir həftə içərisində pullar xərcləndi*; correct Turkish: *Bir hafta içinde bütün para harcandı*.)

The third group of errors was committed due to the ambiguity of the collocations. In other words, the sentence-context could not serve as a clue to the meaning. For example, the participants were asked to translate the sentence *But they will kill any person who makes a sacrifice* (correct Azerbaijanian: *Onlar gurban kəsən hər kəsi öldürəcəklər*; correct Turkish translation: *Ama onlar kurban kesen herhangi bir kimseyi öldürecekler*). As the context was neutral, this sentence could be interpreted in different ways. Only 13.63% of the participants translated the sentence correctly. Most of them translated it as *Onlar gurban verileni öldürəcəklər* (Azerbaijanian) and *Ama onlar kurban etmek için birini öldürecekler* (Turkish) which means 'They will kill anyone who is chosen as a victim'.

The fourth group of errors was due to the fact that the Turkic students found it difficult to comprehend left-branched collocations. We mean that, at their current stage of proficiency, they could only understand those phrases where the collocated word stands to the *right* of the related verbs. For example, only 13.63% of the answers were correct when they translated *I have a confession to make* (correct Azerbaijanian: *E'tiraf etməliyəm*; correct Turkish: *İtiraf etmem / doğrulamam gerekir*). The most frequent erroneous translations were *Mənim boynuma almağa e'tirafım var* (Azerbaijanian) and *Yeterince gücüm yok o işi yapmak için* (Turkish).

The fifth group of errors arose from the fact that the students failed to comprehend relatively complex constructions using related collocations. For example, the sentence *Can you make yourself understood in English?* (correct Azerbaijanian: *Fikrini ingiliscə ifadə edə bilərsənmi?*; correct Turkish: *İngilizce meramını anlatabilir misin?*) was comprehended correctly by 13.79% of the participants. The great major-

ity of Azerbaijani respondents confused this collocation with *to make somebody do something*, and subsequently they translated it as *Sən özünü İngilis dilini başa düşməyə məcbur edə bilərsənmi?* But Turkish respondents relied on *yourself* in trying to guess the meaning, which was probably the reason why the sentence was erroneously translated *Kendi kendine İngilizceyi anlayabilir misin?* The same is true in respect of *Effective use was made of his money* (correct Azerbaijani: *Onun pulundan effektiv istifadə edildi*; correct Turkish: *Parası etkili bir şekilde kullanıldı*). (Cf. erroneous Azerbaijani: *Effektiv istifadə onun pullarında olmuşdur*; erroneous Turkish: *Etkili işler onun parasıyla yapılır*.)

The sixth group of errors was explicable in terms of the unfamiliarity of certain collocations. For this reason, the collocation *to make something do something* in the sentence *It makes me think you right* (correct Azerbaijani: *Bu mənə sənə haqlı olduğunu düşünməyə vadar edir*; correct Turkish: *Bu bana senin doğru olduğunu düşündürür*) was comprehended only by 27.27% of the participants. Most of the Azerbaijani students erroneously translated it as *O mənə yaxşı düşüncəli elədi* which means 'This taught me how to think better'. For most of our informants this sentence meant that *Bu sənə doğru olduğunu göstərir* (i.e., 'This indicates that you are right'). Approximately the same is true for another sentence with this pattern: *He could not make the fire burn* (correct Azerbaijani: *O, ocağı galaya bilmədi*; correct Turkish: *Ateşi yakamadı*) (23.33%).

A large number of errors seemed to stem from the influence of the native language. The role of transfer will be analyzed later.

Do

Erroneously comprehended *do* collocations were found to be similar in nature to those involving *make*. There were, however, significant differences, and for this reason we considered *do* collocations separately.

The first group of errors can be attributed to the participants' unfamiliarity with the colloquial usage of the collocation. For instance, only 6.66% of the participants comprehended the collocation *to be done for* in the sentence *These shoes are done for* (correct Azerbaijani: *Bu ayagabaların hay-hayı gedib vay-vayı galıb* = *Bu ayagabalar cox köhnəlib*; correct Turkish: *Bu ayakkabıların işi bitmiş*). What also misled the Turkic speakers was the word *for*: They tried to try to emphasize its literal meaning. For instance, most Azerbaijani students translated the sentence *Bu ayagabalar onun üçün* (i.e., *These shoes are for him*), whereas the majority of Turkish learners translated it *Bu ayakkabılar için yapıldı* ('This is done for the shoes'). The students' treatment of the collocation *to be done in* in the sentence *He is the third person that has been done in within the last two months* (correct Azerbaijani: *O, son iki ay içərisində öldürülən üçüncü adamdır*; correct Turkish: *O, son iki ay içinde öldürülen üçüncü kişidir*) constituted further corroboration of our assumption. In fact, only one respondent was able correctly to derive the meaning from all the constituents of the collocation. The rest ignored it in the collocational pattern.

The second group of errors suggest that the students found items difficult to understand when the related collocation was used with prepositions. For example, the preposition *out* seemed to lead to a misunderstanding of the sentence *We must do out of the desk drawer* (6.66%) (correct Azerbaijani: *Masanın siyirməsini gaydaya salmalıyıq*; correct Turkish: *Masanın çekmecesini düzenlemeliyiz*). Some participants erroneously translated it *Biz stolun siyirmesini çəkməliyik* (Azerbaijani) and *Çekmeceyi dışarı çekmeliyiz* (Turkish) which means 'We must pull the drawer out'. Because of the adverb *away*, the sentence *The horse broke a leg and had to be done away with* (correct Azerbaijani: *At ayağını gırdı və öldürülməli oldu*; correct Turkish: *At ayağını kırdı ve öldürülmek zorunda kaldı*) was interpreted wrongly (13.33%). Most Azerbaijani participants understood it as *At ayağını gırdı və yarışdan alındı* ('The horse broke its leg and was taken away from the race') and Turkish respondents understood the sentence as *At yarışdan sonra dinlendirildi*, i.e., 'The horse was given a rest after the race'.

The third group of errors was apparently due to the complexity of some collocational patterns. In fact, learners proved unable to comprehend them at their current stage of proficiency. The sentence *Will it do if we let you have our answer by Friday?* (correct Azerbaijani: *Cümə günündek cavabımızı bildirsək olarmı?*; correct Turkish: *Cumaya kadar cevabımızı bildirsek olur mu?*) posed a serious comprehension difficulty (16.66%).

The fourth group of errors was a result of the high degree of fixedness of some collocations (i.e., the meaning of the collocational pattern cannot be easily derived from the sum of components in the neutral context). In such cases the given context seems inaccessible, though objectively it can give some clues. For instance, only 13.33% of the participants were able to guess the meaning of the collocation *to be done down* in the sentence *I don't want any dealings with him, I have been done down once* (correct Azerbaijani: *Mən onunla heç bir əlaqəyə girmək istəmirəm, bir dəfə pis vəziyyətə düşmüşəm*; correct Turkish: *Bir kez güvenimi sarstığı için onunla her hangi bir şekilde muhatap olmak istemem*). Most of the Azerbaijani students associated its meaning with *to do* or *to expel*, whereas for many Turkish students it meant 'failure'.

The participants' views on acceptability of collocations

The source of student errors and the role of transfer can be more objectively defined if we try to find out their idea of acceptability of certain collocations. With this in mind, the researchers provided the participants with checklists in the form of grids. The evidence suggested that it was impossible to speak of absolute acceptability, though some items' acceptability rate was very high. For instance, ninety-six percent of the participants accepted that *noise* could collocate with *make*, and ninety-two percent believed in the collocability of *housework* and *shopping* with *do*. The acceptability rate of such items as *decision*, *money*, *friends*, *mistake*, *errors* with *make* appeared to be rather high (ranging between 81% and 89%). Much the same could be

reported about the students' notion acceptability of *do* collocations with *effort*, *harm*, *favor*, *jobs*, *well*, *gardening* (from 67% to 92%).

Lexical meanings attached to the verbs *make* and *do* appeared to cause serious problems. This was prompted by the wide range of meaning of their equivalents in their native languages. As a matter of fact, Turkic learners seem to associate *make* with the meaning *to create something, to bring into being*, and *do* is usually associated with *fulfilling a certain action*. That is why, under the influence of their native language, the subjects believe that *effort* should collocate with *do* (cf. *cəhd etmək* in Azerbaijani; *çaba göstermek* in Turkish). In some cases, the participants' idea of acceptability of collocations was very vague. For example, 52% of the participants accepted that *good* would collocate with *make*, while 48% denied it. The same was true of *fortune* and *phone call*.

Transfer of collocations with *make* and *do*

In this section, we will determine whether English learners with a Turkic language background use the knowledge of their first language to comprehend collocations with related verbs. When students were required to provide translation equivalents of L2 collocations, they were faced with a major problem. The interference errors made by the students were mainly the result of the semantic structures of the items. For example, the students were given a sentence like *He did three years for robbery*. Only 5.88% of the participants could provide a correct native language equivalent. The meaning of the verb *do* misled them. A great majority of participants (82,35%) translated it *Üç yıl hırsızlık yaptı* (Turkish) or *O üç il oğurlug etmişdir* (Azerbaijani) which means 'He spent three years in robbing'. Another example is the sentence *He did the host nicely*. This caused a similar problem. The fact is that Turkic language speakers are never prepared to collocate *yapmak / etmek* with *ev sahibi* ('hostess') as the semantic structure of the verbs *yapmak / etmek* is quite different from *make / do* in English. Instead they use *Çok iyi ağırladı / iyi ev sahipliği yaptı*. In the English language the verb *do* can in some cases be used as *to act as somebody*, but in Turkic languages such a collocation would mean 'to perform an action on somebody', which is not acceptable for a Turkic speaker. That is why 52.94% of the participants did not translate it correctly.

Due to interference from the Turkic equivalent of the verb *do*, the participants gave different translations for the sentence *He is the third person that has been done within the last two months* (correct Azerbaijani: *Keçmiş iki ay içinde üçüncü kişidir*. Correct Turkish: *Bu son iki ay içinde öldürülen üçüncü kişidir*. Having taken the literal meaning of the verb, Azerbaijani students erroneously translated the sentence *Keçmiş iki ay içinde bu üçüncü adamdır ki, bu işi etmişdir* (i.e., 'He is the third person to do it in the last two months'). This is presumably why the Turkish respondents translated the sentence *Bu, son iki ay içinde yapılan üçüncü adamdır* (i.e., 'He is the third person that was made within the last two months').

The meaning of the preposition *out of* is associated with *besides*, and *except by* Turkic speakers. Due to this, some participants translated the sentence *They want to*

make slaves out of all Moslems as *Onlar müsəlmanlardan savayı bütün insanları kölə halına gətirmək istəyirlər* (Azerbaijani) and *Müslümanların dışında herkesi köle yapmak isterlerdi* (Turkish) which means ‘They wanted to make slaves of all people except Moslems’.

As English and the Turkic languages under consideration are genetically not related, we did not encounter any interference errors due to formal similarities. All the errors reflected assumed semantic similarities.

Research findings

The data analysis indicated that the factors preventing the students from translating correctly were:

1. The students’ unfamiliarity with the colloquial usage of certain collocational patterns.
2. The high degree of fixedness. Learners at the pre-intermediate level of proficiency seemed to comprehend only those collocations whose constituents covered the core of the vocabulary.
3. The students found it difficult to comprehend collocational patterns with adverbs and verbal particles. The data suggested that the main reason here was the ambiguity of the expressions.
4. Lexical meanings attached to the verbs *make* and *do* by Turkic learners under the influence of their native language caused a problem.
5. Evidence suggests that the participants’ vocabulary store (lexicon) plays a great part in the acquisition of collocations. Certain factors lying beyond immediate constituents of the collocations cannot be ignored, as they play a considerable role in comprehending and producing them.
6. Relying on the data reported in this research study, it is possible to characterize the factors giving rise to native language transfer. There were certain tendencies that could be interpreted as cross-cultural influence. As has been indicated, L2 learners tended to transfer meanings of L1 units in a systematic way and most often this systematicness was due to the core nature of a word and the distance between L1 and L2 as perceived by the learners.

Implications for further research

There remains considerable uncertainty about how much influence semantic structures in one language can have on comprehension and production in another language. Further investigations would help to define linguistic universals in cross-linguistic research on cognition.

Our attempt to treat a certain group of collocations (*make* and *do*) on the principle of collocational patterns should be helpful to those who intend to investigate collocations in relation to other items.

One of the questions this study has considered is comprehension errors. The comparative study of comprehension and production errors is a neglected area of linguistics. It would also be interesting to discover the relationship between the degree

of fixedness and comprehension / production errors. A deeper knowledge of this field would benefit EFL / ESL practitioners.

This study has theoretical implications for the investigation of transfer in the acquisition of a foreign language. The results suggest that collocations are not always transferable. Further research is needed with subjects from different languages and cultural backgrounds in order to test this hypothesis.

References

- Benson, M. 1985. A combinatory dictionary of English. *Dictionaries* 7, 189-200.
- Biskup, D. 1992. L1 influence on learners' renderings of English collocations: A Polish / German empirical study. In: Arnaud, P. T. L. & Bojoint, H. (eds.) *Vocabulary and applied linguistics*. London: Macmillan. 85-94.
- Bowles, P. 1985. *The spider's house*. London: Abakus.
- Carter, R. 1987. *Vocabulary: Applied linguistic perspectives*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Firth, J. R. 1957. The technique of semantics. In: Firth, J. R. (ed.) *Papers in linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 7-33.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1966. Lexis at a linguistic level. In: Bazell, C. E. & Catford, J. C. & Halliday, M. A. K. & Robins, K. H. (eds.) *In memory of J. R. Firth*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Jackson, H. 1988. *Words and their meanings*. London: Longman.
- Linnarud, M. 1986. *Lexis in comparison: A performance analysis of Swedish learners' written English*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Lund University, Sweden.]
- McIntosh, A. 1966. Patterns and ranges. In: McIntosh, A. & Halliday, M. A. K. (eds.) *Patterns of language. Papers in general descriptive and applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Mednikova, E. M. 1986. *English-Russian dictionary of verbal collocations*. Moscow: Russkij Jazyk.
- Mitchell, T. F. 1971. Linguistic 'goings-on', collocations and other lexical matters arising on linguistic record. *Archivum Linguisticum* 2, 35-69.
- Mitchell, T. F. 1975. *Principles of Firthian linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Renouf, A. 1987. Lexical resolution. In: Meijs, W. (ed.) *Corpus linguistics and beyond: The proceedings of the 7th International Conference of English Language Research Computerised Corpora*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 121-131.
- Robinet, B. W. 1978. *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: Substance and technique*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sajavaara, K. & Lehtonen, J. 1989. Aspects of transfer in foreign language speakers' reactions of acceptability. In: Dechert, H. W. & Raupach, H. (eds.) *Transfer in language production*. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.
- Shibliyev, J. 1993. *Responses to tasks involving make / do collocations by Turkic beginning learners of English*. [Unpublished MA thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.]
- Tritch, M. 1981. Improving vocabulary: Problems in co-occurrence and grammatical marking. *English Teaching Forum* 19 (2), 22-27.
- White, C. 1988. The role of associational patterns and semantic networks in vocabulary development. *English Teaching Forum* 26 (4), 9-11.

Denominal adjectives containing the suffix *-vari* in contemporary Turkish

Han Steenwijk

Steenwijk, Han 2000. Denominal adjectives containing the suffix *-vari* in contemporary Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 4, 54-76.

The originally Persian suffix *-vari* is reported to be one of the few “Ottoman” derivational morphemes to have survived the Turkish language reform. On the basis of attestations found in recent newspapers and magazines, a morphological and semantic analysis is made of adjectival formations containing this suffix, and of the contexts in which they occur. It appears that the derivation rule for the formations contains restrictions of a semantic nature and that the derivatives mainly occur in stylistically marked environments. A comparison with Late Ottoman attestations shows that the derivation rule for contemporary Turkish differs from that of Late Ottoman grammar.

Han Steenwijk, Böhmsche Straße 48 II, 12055 Berlin, Germany.

1. Introduction

This paper aims at a description of the morphological and semantic characteristics of modern Turkish denominal adjectives derived by means of the suffix *-vari* (in the following: A_{vari}). In the process, special attention will be paid to A_{vari} appearing within a context, ideally a (set of) complete sentence(s) or at least a noun phrase. Isolated attestations of A_{vari} may be useful in order to establish the domain the derivational rule draws upon, but yield insufficient information for a semantic analysis of the derivatives.

Almost all attestations to be discussed were drawn from recent press publications: newspapers and weekly and monthly periodicals. For this reason, strictly speaking, the results of the analysis pertain to the language use of these media only. A_{vari} can also be found in other texts, but in order to obtain a coherent sample of data, the search for attestations was deliberately restricted to the aforesaid press publications.

After this synchronic description a comparison will be made with some incidental Late Ottoman attestations. Unfortunately, as these Ottoman attestations partly originate from dictionaries, they cannot always be precisely fixed in time. A cursory description of the A_{vari} found there will show that the contemporary derivation rule is not identical with the one that applies to the older language stage. Therefore some hypotheses are put forward which could explain the changes that must have occurred in the derivation rule. The synchronic and diachronic sections are preceded by a short

overview of pre-existing descriptions of the morpheme *-vari* and of its sociolinguistic status.

Because in Turkish it is notoriously difficult to distinguish between the class of substantives and the class of adjectives on morphological grounds alone, the notion “class” is to be interpreted rather as a syntactically defined “function-class” (Johanson 1991: 15-17) or a syntactically-semantically defined “expression-class” (Lyons 1990: 438-450). The traditional notions “substantive” and “adjective” are then labels for thus defined classes. Without showing any formal distinction, certain members of the class of adjectives may in Turkish also enjoy the status of members of the class of adverbs. For this reason it should be noted once more that the present study only takes such A_{adv} into account that are used as adjectives.¹

1.1. Sociolinguistic background

In Late Ottoman dictionaries the morpheme *-vari*, a Persian loan,² can be found in several derivatives whose bases also occurred as independent lexemes, e.g. *haçvari* “cross-shaped, crossed”, analysable as *haç* “a cross, a crucifix, a sign of the cross” and *-vari* “like (so and so)” (Redhouse 1890). The Persian origin of the suffix makes it part of a group of morphemes that received special attention during the language reform movement of the 20th century. One of the main objectives of the reform was the elimination of derivational prefixes and suffixes of Arabic and Persian origin.³ As a consequence it became a major task for the language reform movement, especially after it gained momentum from the 1930s on, to elaborate the derivation rules of etymologically Turkish suffixes, which were used to form deliberate neologisms.

This was done so successfully that the great majority of the derivational morphemes of foreign origin quickly lost their productivity. The media and schools passed on the aims and parameters of the Language Reform to the language community at large. Therefore the educated speakers of contemporary Turkish are, to a certain extent and in a schematic way, acquainted with the etymological dimension of their active and passive vocabulary.⁴

As a consequence of concentrating so much effort on the study and application of etymologically Turkish material, the descriptive publications appearing in Turkey ignored⁵ and continue to ignore⁶ derivational morphemes originating from Arabic or

¹ Indeed, in the newspapers and magazines I have checked, I encountered no derivatives used as a syntactic adverb.

² See Tietze (1964: 197).

³ The manifesto of the *Yeni Lisan* movement (1911) advised no longer to apply such morphemes in derivation and to restrict the use of existing derivatives containing them to the most frequent ones (Seyfettin 1989: 27).

⁴ E.g., deliberate neologisms mark the language use of certain social groups, cf. Cüceloğlu & Slobin (1980).

⁵ Gencan (1966: 363) is no exception, because the introduction to the chapter on Arabic and Persian grammatical elements expressly states that acquaintance with them is use-

Persian. Only in works of a prescriptive nature are incidentally occurring, spontaneously coined neologisms that are derived by means of such morphemes identified and criticised.⁷

Thus the study of derivation has been subject to a kind of division of labour, in which it is left to specialists from outside Turkey to deal with the loan morphemes from Arabic and Persian. For instance, Kononov (1956: 112, 147) lists one originally Arabic (*-î / -vî*, adjectival) and two originally Persian (*-hane* substantival, *-i / -yi* adjectival) morphemes; Swift (1963: 74) also mentions *-î / -vî* and furthermore *-en / -an*, adverbial and likewise of Arabic origin. Kononov takes special care to point out that the loan morphemes served to coin new formations within the framework of Turkish.

A_{ari} in contemporary Turkish are defined by Tietze (1964: 197, 200) as “adjectives of comparison”, a semantic description that seems to be supported by Kissling (1960: 240-241) and Lewis (1988: 66). The former translates them as “-artig” and “-haft”, the latter as “-like” and “-ish”. Examples of nominal phrases are *aktörvari bir eda ile* “mit schauspielerhaftem Pathos” (Tietze) and *James Bondvari bir casusluk* “a James Bond-ish case of espionage” (Lewis). As to the selection of the base, Kissling implicitly states that, in addition to Persian bases, *-vari* sometimes combines with Arabic and rarely with Turkish bases. This statement is corroborated neither by the examples just given nor by his own examples *amerikanvari*, *gangstervari*. On the other hand, Tietze writes that A_{vari} allows for formations from Turkish bases or from any base whatsoever. Both authors, then, operate with etymological criteria. Lewis does not give any etymological specification and says only that the suffix “is still productive to a limited extent”. These short descriptions leave room for, among others, the following questions:

1. What kind of lexemes can serve as a base for A_{ari} ? Which phonologically, semantically or etymologically determined selection restrictions are relevant for derivation by means of *-vari*?
2. What kind of lexemes can serve as the head of nominal phrases containing an A_{ari} ? Which collocational restrictions hold for A_{ari} ?
3. Based on the answers to these first two questions, what is the exact semantic value of the suffix? What kind of relationship is established between the head of the nominal phrase and the base of the derivate?

ful when reading (Late) Ottoman texts. The same holds for Bilgegil (1982), whose grammar, despite its title, in parts reads like a grammar of (Late) Ottoman.

⁶ Only derivational morphemes originating from European languages are sometimes touched upon, e.g. by İmer (1991), who discusses the morphemes *tele-* (*telekiz*, p. 24) and *-matik* (*dokunmatik*, p. 24, 27).

⁷ For instance, *önemiyyetle* “attentively” (Aksoy 1980: 20), consisting of the deliberate neologism *önem*, the originally Arabic substantival suffix *-iyyet / -iyet* and the postposition *ile*: *önem-iyyet-le*. The coining was probably triggered by analogy to *ehemmiyyetle* ‘attentively’.

4. What is the distribution of A_{var} in relation to other semantically comparable adjectives and adjectival expressions?
5. In terms of its productivity and semantic value, what is the status of the suffix within a description of contemporary Turkish?

Not until these questions have been answered, can the description of the suffix be regarded as more or less sufficient. True, the present description is based on a restricted sample of data, but I feel that this sample is representative enough to arrive at some generalisations about the derivation and distribution of A_{var} . Thus production rules might be formulated that comply with the criterion that Aronoff (1976: 17-18) regards as paramount for morphological descriptions: "The simplest task of a morphology, the least we demand of it, is the enumeration of the class of possible words of a language". In other words, just as syntactic rules describe the set of possible sentences of a given language, the morphological rules should encompass the set of its possible words.

1.2. Specifics of the data collected

The A_{var} to be discussed were culled from newspapers and magazines published between 1985 and 1998, preponderantly in the years 1995, 1996 and 1997. These are the European editions of the dailies *Hürriyet* and *Milliyet*, the weekly *Cumhuriyet Hafta* and the magazines *Aktüel*, *Erkekçe*, *Haber Extra*, *Nokta*, *Tempo* and *Tombak*. The distribution of the sample over several years and various sources implies that derivation by means of *-vari* forms an integral part of the contemporary Turkish language system. The derivatives, 21 in number, are listed in appendix A together with their context and source.

Not analysed are the attestations of *Amerikanvari*, because among the A_{var} this lexeme enjoys a special status. It is the only one of the attested derivatives that appears in the dictionaries (e.g. Steuerwald, *Yeni Redhouse*) and it is encountered in the texts markedly more frequently than the other formations. This lexeme is not a new formation, but an established lexeme that possibly has a lexicalised meaning. Morphologically it distinguishes itself from the remaining derivatives in that it can alternatively be interpreted as de-adjectival. These special characteristics calling for caution, I decided to separate the lexeme *Amerikanvari* from the remaining attestations for the moment.

The semantic interpretations and paraphrases are based on the definitions given in *Türkçe sözlük*. As regards notation, the following should be kept in mind: Concepts are indicated by single quotation marks, and meanings and translations by double quotation marks, e.g. 'gecekondu' "unauthorised construction set up in one night". Concrete words as language material are quoted in italics, e.g. *gecekondu*.

2. Analysis of the contemporary derivatives

2.1. Selection restrictions on the base of A_{vari}

Because of the special status that proper names enjoy within the lexicon,⁸ they are to be kept distinct from other lexemes in a classification based on etymological criteria. Turkish proper names occur five times (*Baykal*, *Çiller*, *Demirel*, *Metin Vertan*, *Özal*) and English (*Barbara Cartland*, *Dallas*, *Texas*, *Walt Disney*), German (*Nietzsche*) and Spanish (*Peron*) proper names together make up six occurrences. The etymology of the base does not seem to be a relevant factor here.

The remaining bases display a different picture. Only one base each was found with an Arabic (*intihar*), Greek (*kukla*) or Turkish (*gecekondu*) etymology, while all other attestations contain bases that are loans from widely spoken modern European languages.

They are of English (*Süpermen*), French (*labirent*, *şezlong*, *şömine*), German (*Nazi*) or Italian origin (*paparazzi*, *tiyatro*). Among them, *Nazi*, *Süpermen* and *paparazzi* are clearly more recent loans than *labirent*, *şezlong*, *şömine*⁹ and *tiyatro*, which entered the language at an earlier stage.

The established distribution shows that, proper names excepted, the derivation draws mainly on non-Turkish, “western” lexical material. With this finding, Tietze’s basically correct etymological statement (see section 1.1.) is further refined.

A phonological analysis shows that monosyllabic bases do not occur. Slightly more than half of the bases contain three or more syllables, with an average of 2.76 syllables per base. Likewise, slightly more than half of the bases contain vowel sequences that are at odds with the laws of Turkish vowel harmony.

Taking semantic criteria as the parameter of analysis, the bases can be divided among the following groups of concepts:

1. Concrete products of human activity (artefacts): ‘gecekondu’, ‘kukla’, ‘labirent’, ‘şezlong’, ‘şömine’.
2. Abstract products of human activity: ‘Dallas’, ‘tiyatro’.
3. Categories of human beings: ‘Nazi’, ‘paparazzi’, ‘Süpermen’.
4. An action: ‘intihar’.

The remaining bases are proper names that refer to:

⁸ Cf. the following statement by Kleiber (1992: 77): “S’il est des mots qui occupent une place à part dans le langage, ce sont bien les noms propres. Quasiment insaisissables, en ce qu’ils déjouent au moment où on y s’attend le moins les critères de définitions les plus subtils: philosophiques, logiques, psycho- / socio-linguistiques et linguistiques.”

⁹ The Ottoman transcription that is added in *Yeni Redhouse* for these three French loans implies that they were already in use before 1929.

5. A location: *Texas*.
6. Individuals: *Barbara Cartland, Baykal, Çiller, Demirel, Metin Vertan, Nietzsche, Özal, Peron, Walt Disney*.

Groups 1 and 2 can be subsumed under the notion of cultural kinds as opposed to natural kinds.

The proper names not only refer to the location and individuals, but also possess as their semantic value the characteristics that are logically associated with these entities.¹⁰ This means that extra-linguistic knowledge is not necessary to ensure successful communication; knowing about characteristics associated with individuals and locations is part of the language competence of the native speakers.

Although the base *Dallas* (the television series) could also be interpreted as a proper name, I prefer to assign it to the group of abstract products. *Süpermen* is known as a fictional hero in comics and motion pictures and could therefore be taken as an abstract product, but precisely because it denotes a fictional hero, the concept is better seen as belonging to a category of (exceptional) human beings. In the case of *Walt Disney* the person as well as the firm could be meant, but in a common view of the world the person is more likely to have been the referent.

While groups 1, 2 and 4 share the semantic feature “+human activity” groups 3, 5 and 6 all contain the feature “+human”. Group 4 contains an action that is commonly associated with human activity only. The location referred to in group 5 is to be understood as a geographical notion that designates an area inhabited and culturally shaped by human beings. As groups 4 and 5 contain one element each, it is too early to decide whether they really are included in the selection restrictions. Especially attestation (A7) *intiharvari eylem* turns out to be rather exceptional, not only because of the etymology and semantics of the base, but in other respects as well (see sections 2.3., 2.4.).

All groups have in common that their members occupy a subordinate position in the taxonomy of semantic categories. They all have to be located well beneath the basic level.¹¹ Most clearly this can be seen in group 6, whose members are “absolute hyponyms”: The classes of possible referents contain one element each. In group 3 very specific categories of human beings are represented. Similarly group 1 contains very specific artefacts.

Although the search for selection restrictions applying to the base of the *A_{vari}* revealed that the etymological parameter bears some relevance—as far as lexemes other than proper names are concerned—this did not result in a solid rule, but only in a tendency. The same can be said about the phonological parameter. The semantic parameter, however, appeared to be decisive as it yielded two clear-cut rules: 1) +human (activity); 2) subordinate position in the taxonomy of semantic categories.

¹⁰ “Proper names are [, in a loose sort of way,] logically connected with characteristics of the object to which they refer” (Searle 1958: 173).

¹¹ For this notion see Rosch (1977: 30).

The attested A_{vari} are probably all neologisms. This can already be deduced from the quotation marks that are sometimes used in the texts (A13, A14, A16, A18) and from the fact that they are nonces. Only two derivatives (*gecekonduvari*, *Özalvari*) were encountered more than once in independent sources. Considering the different interpretations to be assigned to the attestations of *Özalvari* (see section 2.3.), it is likely that a new formation was independently coined in each of these cases.

2.2. Selection restrictions on the head of the nominal phrase

The denotata of the heads of nominal phrases containing an A_{vari} can be subsumed as manifestations of human activity or human life. In order to get a better grip on this admittedly abstract definition the following subdivision is made.

Firstly, products of human activity are encountered that can again be divided into material products (artefacts) and abstract products. Artefacts are ‘banliyö treni’, ‘cami’, ‘dehliz’, ‘ev’, ‘heykel’, ‘kıyafet’, ‘koltuk’ and ‘ocak’; immaterial products are ‘dedikodu haberi’, ‘dizi’, ‘kitap’ (the contents, not the object), ‘kültür eleştirisi’, ‘senaryo’, ‘tarih’, ‘yazı’ and ‘yöntem’.

Secondly, there are the concepts ‘dünyaya bakış’ “world view”, ‘fikir’ “idea” and ‘temenni’, whose ontological counterparts do not necessarily originate from the conscious creative activity of man but are nonetheless controlled and developed by it. As opposed to this, animals are not imbued with ideas, world views and wishes; these concepts belong to the referential field of human life. In a world without humans, these concepts could not exist.

We shall refer to the concepts mentioned so far as objects, because no concepts with the feature “+alive” are included here.

Thirdly come the typical human activities ‘eylem’ “terror act” and ‘seyahat’, and fourthly a single concept, ‘popülist’, that contains the features “+alive” and “+human”. Last comes a time indication, ‘fasıl’, that has to be construed as a time segment of a human activity (politics in this case).

Thus the selection criterion for the head of the noun phrase turns out to be a semantic feature already encountered in the selection restrictions on the A_{vari} base: “+human (activity)”.

2.3. The semantics of the suffix

Depending on the semantics of the substantives that are made to relate to each other by means of the suffix, one out of the three following paraphrases of the semantics of *-vari* is actuated in the collocation:

- (1) “B-ye benzer”
- (2) “B-ye özgü, B-ye ait olabilecek”
- (3) “B şeklinde”

Paraphrase (1) fits in collocations in which the base belongs to group (1) or (2). These all denote concrete or abstract products that, because of certain properties in common, are compared to the denotatum of the head of the phrase, e.g.:

group (1): <i>şöminevari ocak</i>	“şömineye benzer ocak”
group (2): <i>Dallasvari diziler</i>	“Dallas’a benzer diziler”

The properties of the base that are relevant for the interpretation of the noun phrase inevitably form part of the primary features in the prototype definition, as otherwise a comparison would not make any communicative sense. For the head of the phrase, however, these properties are secondary features, they do not belong to its prototypical definition. Thus, in the examples adduced above, not every television series is like ‘Dallas’ and certainly not all fireplaces of the dwellings in rural Turkey are constructed like a ‘şömine’.

Paraphrase (2) is valid when the base is to be assigned to one of the groups 3, 5 and 6. The head of the phrase refers to objects and other entities, certain properties of which are stereotypically associated with a certain category of human beings or with a single place or person, e.g.:

group (3): <i>Nazivari yöntemler</i>	“Naziye özgü yöntemler”
group (5): <i>Texasvari banliyö trenleri</i>	“Texas’a özgü banliyö trenleri”
group (6): <i>Nietzschevari bir kültür eleştirisi</i>	“Nietzsche’ye ait olabilecek bir kültür eleştirisi”

Paraphrase (3) fits one collocation only, namely attestation (A7) *intiharvari eylem*. Such a terror act is not just similar to suicide, but combines suicide and an act of terrorism in one single action. In other words, although syntactically an adjective, in a semantic analysis *intiharvari* functions as an adverbial expression. I regard these semantics, which deviate from the interpretations given for the other collocations, as an isolated case and will not take them into account in the remainder of this section (however cf. section 2.4.).

The paraphrases (1) and (2) have in common that the exact nature of the relevant properties of the base eludes definition. When the base is a proper name, the fact that the descriptive statements connected with these names are never made explicit (Searle 1958: 171) already causes vagueness about the nature of the properties. In the collocation *Nazivari yöntemler* several properties can be involved, such as “systematically”, “cruelly”, “concentrated on a certain people” and “in huge numbers”. The relevant properties may even vary between one case and another. Thus in (A14) “*Özalvari, Demirelvari*” *temenniler* mainly unjustified optimism seems to be meant, while in (A15) *Özalvari seyahat* the composition and size of the accompanying group of persons is the relevant property. Such variation in the interpretation exceeds by far the usual semantic variation conditioned by actual collocations. The A_{vari} are thus

seen to display relatively vague and polydimensional semantics. They certainly do not predicate such primary features of the head as overall shape and contour.¹²

The two paraphrases stand in close relation to each other, as in both cases the properties that are typically associated with an object, place or person are involved. In order to express the similarity between paraphrases (1) and (2), they can both be rephrased thus:

- (4) “Birkaç niteliği B-ye özgü, ait olabilecek”
şöminevari ocak “birkaç niteliği şömineye özgü ocak”
Nazivari yöntemler “birkaç niteliği Naziye özgü yöntemler”

This new paraphrase is to be understood as the underlying, invariant meaning of the suffix in the structuralistic sense.

A further similarity may be noted between the bases in groups 1 and 2 on the one hand and those in groups 3, 5 and 6 on the other. The concepts in groups 1 and 2 are the products of human activity. As a consequence, the properties relevant in the collocation (= “birkaç niteliği”) likewise are a result of human intervention.

The feature “+human”, the only one shared by all bases, can be taken as the starting point in an attempt to explain the synchronic link between the surface polysemy as expressed in paraphrases (1) and (2). As the feature “+human” is more central to the concepts in groups 3, 5 and 6 than to those in groups 1 and 2, I suppose that the semantic derivation responsible for the polysemy originated in those cases where the base denotes a human being, a region inhabited by human beings or a category of human beings. Thus, paraphrase (2) is to be considered as primary and paraphrase (1) as secondary, as it can be derived from paraphrase (2). This semantic derivation was very probably made possible by the metaphor “typifying human behaviour = style”. The concept ‘stil’ contains a set of typical properties that are, however, secondary to the object in which they become manifest. These properties originate from the creative activity of a certain person or a certain group of persons. This concept ‘stil’ was metaphorically extended to anything in which human activity can play a typifying role: ‘üslûp’. As a matter of fact, both concepts, ‘stil’ and ‘üslûp’, can be represented by the lexeme *üslûp*.

This style is not a generally known and applied style, but, on the contrary, a very individual one. This is already implied by the low position of the bases in the taxonomy of semantic categories (see section 2.1.).

This having been said, the underlying paraphrase (4) can be rephrased in a more natural way. For this purpose, a quasi-synonym of *üslûp* that is more frequent in the press, *tarz*, will be used:

- (5) “B tarzını andıran”
şöminevari ocak “şömine tarzını andıran ocak”

¹² Cf. Rosch (1977: 34) on contour as a powerful factor in the human classification of natural objects.

<i>Dallasvari diziler</i>	“Dallas tarzını andıran diziler”
<i>Nazivari yöntemler</i>	“Nazi tarzını andıran yöntemler”
<i>Texasvari banliyö trenleri</i>	“Texas tarzını andıran banliyö trenleri”
<i>Nietzschevari bir kültür eleştirisi</i>	“Nietzsche tarzını andıran bir kültür eleştirisi”

I regard this paraphrase to be the final one because it includes the following semantic elements: 1) Comparison; 2) set of properties primary to the base but secondary to the head; 3) human intervention; 4) relative vagueness of definition (*andıran*). It is not the case that a semantic feature of the base has hereby been projected onto the semantics of the suffix. The feature “+human activity” is only implicitly present in groups 3, 5 and 6. In groups 3 and 6 two separate features occur, “+human” and “+activity”, that are only combined in the semantics of the suffix. Group 5 is somewhat problematic when one attempts to decide whether the feature “+human” or “+human activity” is present. Leaving aside the semantics of the suffix, this can only be solved by taking into account the semantics of the head. The appropriateness of paraphrase (5) is further supported by the fact that several of the concepts occurring in the attestations belong to referential fields in which the concept ‘stil’ occupies a prominent position: literature, arts and architecture, etc.

The selection restrictions identified in the previous two sections have thus turned out to be directly conditioned by the semantics of the suffix.

2.4. Characteristics of the nominal phrase (semantics, stylistics, quasi-synonyms)

In order to identify differences with quasi-synonymous expressions as regards semantics and selection restrictions, it may be useful first to elaborate on the semantics and stylistics of the nominal phrase in which an *A_{vari}* occurs.

An *A_{vari}* nominal phrase is not a metaphorical expression, as only a shift within the taxonomic tree to which the head belongs takes place and not a horizontal transposition from one taxonomic tree to another. If the base constitutes an artefact, it often is a hyponym of the head (‘gecekondu’ → ‘ev’, ‘şömine’ → ‘ocak’, ‘Dallas’ → ‘dizi’). In cases where a hyponym-hyperonym relation between base and head does not exist, as in *gecekonduvari camiler*, both concepts relate as hyponyms to the same superordinate concept (‘bina’). The *A_{vari}* are qualifying and add new properties to the concept of the head of the phrase, thus establishing a new subcategory.

This newly established subcategory is temporary, as it functions only within the linguistic context in which it is introduced. Cf., for instance, (A10) *Metin Vertanvari (bir yazı)*, a nominal phrase that outside its context does not make sense. Many of the other *A_{vari}* nominal phrases as well cannot be completely understood without a context. This is probably the reason why sometimes further information is given that relates to the nominal phrase and thus helps to establish the new category. In (A3) the heading *Çillervari tarih* is explained in the text, just as the heading *Chirac’tan Özalvari seyahat* in (A15). In (A11) *Nazivari yöntemler* several further indications

(*yüzlerce masum insan, gaz odaları*) point to the meaning of the nominal phrase, and in the case of (A23) *dünyaya Walt Disneyvari bakışı* this is done by the following sentence *Düşünceleri olağanüstü saf ve temiz*.

Although (A7) *intiharvari eylem* is in fact a rather sharply defined concept, this nominal phrase is also to be interpreted as a temporary category. The text containing the attestation was pronounced before the suicide attacks were actually carried out. I suppose that for tactical reasons the speaker consciously chose a vague expression instead of one of the more usual ones (*intihar eylemi, intihar saldırısı, intihar saldırısı eylemi*). This example is furthermore exceptional because the neologism occurs twice within the same text within only a small interval. This runs contrary to the nonce status of A_{vari} .

Among the text types in which the attestations of A_{vari} were found, the objective-informative style seldom occurred. The attestations originate mainly from comments by the *köşe yazarları* (A2, A3, A13, A14), from interviews and discussions (A1, A12, A16, A22, A23) and from travel accounts (A8, A20, A21). In the reporting section of the newspapers it was only in reports on foreign affairs, which are mostly cast in an expressive-informative style, that some attestations could be found (A11, A15, A17, A18). Expressive-informative reporting on home affairs is the context for (A9) and (A19). The contexts of the occurrences just mentioned and of (A4, A5) and (A10) often contain an evaluating judgement. This evaluation is sometimes positive, mostly, however, negative. As the evaluation can be deduced from the context only, I hesitate to ascribe an ameliorative or pejorative value to the A_{vari} or to the suffix itself.

In two cases the information is given in an objective-informative style. Apart from the exceptional case (A7) already mentioned, this applies to example (A6) *gecekonduvari bir ev*. For the moment this has to be regarded as an exception for which no logical explanation presents itself. One could presume that ‘gecekonduvari’ is developing into a sharply defined concept. This is also suggested by repeated attestations in independent sources.

As A_{vari} markedly often occur in expressive, evaluative contexts, one could justifiably think that they function as stylistic markers of such texts. Taking the etymology of the suffix into account, this assumption is in accordance with the findings of Hřebíček (1975: 225, 230), who likewise stresses the stylistically marked role of Arabic and Persian elements in contemporary Turkish texts.¹³ As regards the base, the use of proper names as full-fledged concepts is a constructive element of texts cast in an expressive mode. Likewise the low position of the other concepts in their respective taxonomy trees aids to achieve an expressive effect.

A further contribution to the expressive value of A_{vari} can possibly be found in their phonological structure. The 21 bases are relatively long, and in 13 cases they show non-harmonic vowel sequences, partly because they are often loans. The same

¹³ Derivates containing a loan suffix were classified as a loan for the purposes of his study (Hřebíček 1975: 225).

qualification holds for the suffix itself. The derivatives have an average syllable number of 4.76, which is well above the average 2.6 for Turkish words (Bazin 1962: 64; Tretiakoff 1970: 32). The derivatives thus appear to be phoneme sequences marked by length and non-harmonic structure.¹⁴

Turning now to quasi-synonymous expressions, their description must remain restricted to some salient properties, as no exhaustive analysis was carried out for them.

(a) *B tarzı*.

As can be seen from paraphrase (5), the *A_{vari}* stand in close relation to this expression. The difference from *A_{vari}* lies in the fact that the “style” in question is not presented as a new, individual and vaguely defined concept, but as a generally known and sharply defined one, e.g. *Nü tarzı çalışmalar*, *Batı tarzı kahveler*. However, the attitude of the speaker is decisive, and therefore new concepts also may be presented as if they were generally known, e.g. *Toto tarzı gruplar*, “*görüntü var ses yok*” *tarzı bir gitar*. Furthermore the expression *B tarzı* lends itself better to use in objective-informative text types without causing stylistic dissonance.

(b) *B usulü*.

In one of its uses, this expression, too, serves to render a generally known and sharply defined concept. In addition, it more clearly stresses that the relevant features of the head originate from human activity, e.g. *Japon usulü erotizm*, *Madonna usulü müzikal*, *Türk usulü bir “Watergate”*. The base often denotes human collectives, and sometimes human individuals. The denotation of artefacts is precluded because of the stress on human activity. Another difference to *A_{vari}* nominal phrases is that in *B usulü* phrases the relevant features of the head came about thanks to the specific activity of the individual or individuals referred to by the base, as in the examples just given. In *A_{vari}* nominal phrases this is left unspecified and may (*Çillervari tarih*) or may not (*Chirac’tan Özalvari seyahat*) be the case.

(c) *B-msi*.¹⁵

According to the description given by Banguoğlu (1957: 16-17) these adjectives have a vague reference (“takribî benzerlik ifade eder”), a quality which they share with *A_{vari}*. They distinguish themselves from the latter by the pejorative evaluation they may convey: “*raporumsu bir yazı* = kötü bir rapor, sözde rapor demek olur”. As the semantics of the suffix do not specify exactly how the features shared by the base and the head came into existence, natural objects can also occur as a base, e.g. *meyvemsi bir koku*. The same attestation shows that the denotatum of the base does not necessarily belong to a very specific subcategory, but can easily be picked from a higher level in the taxonomy of natural categories.

¹⁴ Cf. Mathesius (1964) for the associative phonological analysis.

¹⁵ The suffix *-si*, which basically has the same semantics, is less productive and, apart from that, is used in the conscious coining of neologistic technical terms (Banguoğlu 1957: 20-21). For these reasons it will not be considered here.

(d) *B benzeri*.

This expression is likewise rather vague in its reference and does not seem to display any specific selection restrictions, e.g. *AİDS benzeri virüs*, *omurgasız mahlukat benzeri kıvrılma*, *12 Eylül benzeri uygulamalar*. Therefore, with the loss of some semantic specificity, it can function as an alternative to an *A_{vari}*, as in *gecekondu benzeri evler*. *B benzeri* is especially apt to be used in objective-informative text types, e.g. *borç benzeri kalemler*, *sünger benzeri tüpler*.

2.5. Status of *-vari* within a description of modern Turkish

According to Lyons (1990: 526-534) only derivatives that display morphological, syntactic and / or semantic idiosyncrasies, i.e. whose derivation and meaning cannot be captured by a set of rules, should be incorporated into the lexical component of a linguistic description. Such a set of rules, on the other hand, is part of the grammatical component. In view of the considerable amount of neologisms, their transparent and regular semantics, and their unequivocal selection restrictions, the description of *A_{vari}* clearly belongs to the derivational part of the grammatical component. This positioning, however, raises the question of the productivity of this derivational rule.

This question cannot be answered satisfactorily on the basis of the data collected so far. Apart from the press texts of a mainly expressive nature, some attestations of *A_{vari}* were found in non-fiction and in the speech of intellectuals; they are listed in appendix B. In the everyday speech of the lesser educated these derivations do not seem to occur.¹⁶ Within the written and spoken speech production of intellectuals, two distinct thematic fields can be made out. If the topic is somehow related to literature, art and architecture or fashion, an *A_{vari}* can be coined without any apparent stylistic connotation (cf. also *O'Henryvari*, *romanvari*, *Şarkvari*, *ketenvari*). In other thematic fields the coining is marked and aims at a stylistic effect, cf. also *ortak pazarıvari*¹⁷ and especially *Sokratvari*, the exceptional use of which is prepared in context by the introductory remark *Donaldson'un tâbiriyle*. However, such deliberate neologisms pertain to morphological creativity, not to morphological productivity (Van Marle 1985: 45-47). If the attestations listed in appendixes A and B are indicative of the language use in general, then the derivation rule cannot be said to be unrestrictedly productive, as under certain conditions coining is deliberate and stylistically marked. With this in mind, Lewis' statement on the productivity of *-vari* (see section 1.1.) can be confirmed and qualified.

¹⁶ In fact Pierce (1961, 1962) attested his single *A_{vari}* (*külhanbeyvari*) in written texts and not in the speech of the lesser educated.

¹⁷ This example, that contains an inflectional morpheme positioned between the base and the derivational morpheme, is similar to some attestations cited by Tietze (1964: 197-198), like *Denizli horozuvari*, *Montmartredakilervari*. This order deviates from the general rules of Turkish morphology and might be a manifestation of the phenomenon that Zwicky & Pullum (1987: 336) subsume under the notion "expressive morphology". Tietze calls the style of the context in which the attestations occur "etwas überspitzt". These attestations all stem from one and the same author.

The etymological factor does not provide a restriction on the productivity of the derivation rule. It is true that many bases are loans just like the suffix itself, but for a well-formed derivate no knowledge of any *specific* foreign language is needed.¹⁸ Apart from that, etymologically Turkish bases are also possible, albeit not very frequent if one disregards the proper names.

3. Diachronic observations

As the suffix *-vari* already was an element of the Late Ottoman language system and is a loan from Persian, one might be tempted to regard its use simply as an “Ottomanism”, anachronistically continuing the usage of days gone by.¹⁹ Guided by some attestations, listed in appendix C, an attempt will be made to ascertain to which extent the contemporary Turkish derivation rule for *A_{-vari}* is a mere copy of rules belonging to the grammar of Late Ottoman proper.

3.1. cursory description of the Late Ottoman material

As regards the selection restrictions on the base, natural categories also may be the denotatum of the base, e.g. (C4) *gagavari*. Likewise, the selection of the head of the phrase is not restricted to cultural categories, e.g. (C4) *burun*, (C5) *nebat*, (C10) *tepeler*. The semantics of the suffix can, in certain attestations, be captured by the paraphrase given above (“B tarzını andıran”), as in (C1) *Arsen Lüpenvari bir intrika*, (C2) *Bekir Mustafavari mestane bir nara*, (C3) *Frenkvari hayat*. If a base or a head is selected that is not a cultural category, the paraphrase “B biçimi” suggests itself, as in (C10) *şemsiyevvari tepeler*. Both these paraphrases can be included in the basic paraphrase “B-ye benzer”, where the use of proper names as a base is metonymic.²⁰ The derivate *sıravari* in, for instance, (C9) *sıravari yalılar* has a deviant interpretation: “bir sıra teşkil eden” (Şemseddin Sami p. 826). It can only occur in noun phrases in which the head refers to more than one object.

As far as objects are concerned, reference does not seem to be particularly vague. In the expression *şemsiyevvari tepeler* it is clear which feature of the concept ‘şemsiye’ is predicated for the concept ‘tepe’. In the case of geometric forms, reference is necessarily unequivocal, as the definition of such concepts is unidimensional: (C5) *haçvari yol*, (C6) *halkavari şekiller*. Here, primary features of the head are referred to. Since

¹⁸ Indeed, as the derivatives serve to establish new and very specific categories, it cannot be excluded that the predilection for “western” bases is determined by extra-linguistic rather than linguistic factors. The modern orientation of Turkish society toward European and American culture may involve a tendency for establishing such new categories by means of familiar western ones.

¹⁹ “The relationship between the modern language and the Ottoman written language, for instance, has been reduced to little more than a myth by those who criticize the use [of] ‘old-fashioned’ vocabulary by labelling it as ‘Ottoman’” (Boeschoten 1991: 176).

²⁰ In concordance with this analysis, the definition given for the suffix in *Kamus-u Türkî* is: “benzer, müşabih, tarz ve biçiminde”.

the possibility of unequivocal reference is given, certain A_{vari} can be lexicalised, like *gagavari* “aquiline”, (C8) *mahallevari* “vulgar”, and even be used as technical terms, like *pıhtıvari* “jelly-like; clotted, coagulated” (Redhouse 1890) and the derivatives *haçvari*, *halkavari* mentioned above. Base and head do not necessarily belong to the same taxonomic tree, see *haçvari yol*, *şemsiyevari tepeler*.

3.2. Some explanatory hypotheses

A comparison between the Late Ottoman and contemporary descriptions shows that the suffix must have been limited to the metonymical use of proper names, thus leaving room for the paraphrase “B tarzını andıran”. It is only after this reinterpretation was made that cultural categories could become included in the selection restrictions. A direct limitation from objects in general to cultural ones only is not well conceivable without this intermediate analytic step.

As a consequence, the synchronic semantic relation between the derivatives is different. Whereas in the Late Ottoman derivation rule, the metonymical use of proper names is secondary, in the rule for contemporary Turkish the general paraphrase starts from exactly these bases, while the derivation from bases denoting cultural categories is made possible by a secondary extension.

In the course of the Language Reform, the suffix *-vari* became a candidate for replacement by etymologically Turkish morphemes. This must have limited its productivity, and some of its semantic functions were taken over by other morphological models. To the functions that were taken over belong the (unequivocal) comparison with natural categories and the coining of technical terms. The semantics and use of the suffix have thus been subject to specialisation and, as was shown in section 2.4., contemporary Turkish has no directly competing candidate for the functions. The semantic specialisation has increased the remaining transparency of the derivation rule.

Some possible explanations for the present situation suggest themselves. I will list them here as hypotheses that might serve as lines of further investigation.

(a) $-(İ)msİ$.

One of the derivational morphemes used to replace *-vari* in the coining of technical terms is $-(İ)msİ$, as in *haçımsı* (Steuerwald) and *halkamsı* (*Türkçe sözlük*). Although in the reformed language system $-(İ)msİ$ could have been a morphological alternative for all aspects of the Late Ottoman derivation by means of *-vari*, the Turkish morpheme apparently did not succeed in taking over all the functions of the morpheme inherited from Ottoman. One reason for this must be the pejorative connotation that may be associated with $-(İ)msİ$. According to an informant, when complimenting a woman, the use of ***pensesimsi* instead of **pensesvari* would be out of place. The examples that Banguoğlu (1957: 16) cites for the pejorative connotation, *odamsı bir yer* and *raporumsu bir yazı*, both contain an artefact as the base and a hyperonym to this base as the head. This may be pure coincidence, but nevertheless it would be worth investigating under which conditions the pejorative connotation arises.

Phonological and etymological selection restrictions should also be considered. For instance, Kononov (1956: 146) points out that monosyllabic bases ending in a consonant are a relevant criterion for the distribution of the suffixes *-sî* and *-(î)msî*. As already stated, in the attestations of *A_{vari}* the base often contains three or more syllables and is a loan.²¹

If such selection restrictions are actually present in the derivation rule of *-(î)msî*, one could look into the chain of cause and effect. The suffix *-vari* seems to fit precisely into the slot left empty by *-(î)msî*. Or was the expansion of *-(î)msî* into this domain blocked because it was already covered by *-vari*?

(b) *Amerikanvari*.

Probably for several decades already, this lexeme has had a high frequency compared to the remaining *A_{vari}*. It cannot be ruled out that analogy to this lexeme supported the derivation of modern *A_{vari}* in their specialised meanings. However, I do not think that the presence of this lexeme was the sole decisive factor in the development of the new derivational model, as already Late Ottoman contained the elements from which the modern model has emerged.

(c) *-kârî*.

The modern use of the suffix *-vari* is very similar to a certain use of the originally Persian suffix *-kârî* encountered in Late Ottoman and in the first decades of Republican Turkish. For instance, Steuerwald (1993: 494) gives as its second meaning “ähnlich wie..., nach der Art von ..., gemahnend an ...”. The derivatives that contain this suffix likewise invoke the concept of an individual and relatively vaguely defined style. My incidental attestations of *-kârî*, just like many of the modern attestations of *-vari*, come from thematic fields such as literature, arts and architecture and politics (see appendix D). It is conceivable that the suffix *-kârî*, which is no longer used, left a vacuum that was filled by *-vari*.

(d) French *-esque*

The French suffix *-esque* shows in one of its uses a strong resemblance to contemporary Turkish *-vari*.²² This resemblance concerns derivatives with proper names or loans as their base in order to create adjectives with the general meaning “présentant le caractère spécifique de”, e.g. *chaplinsque*, *lupinesque*, *molièresque*. In French, this kind of derivation notably from the 19th century onward yielded a certain number of neologisms (Zwanenburg 1975: 227-230). In Ottoman official and intellectual circles the knowledge of French started to spread in the first half of the 19th century and by the middle of that century this process had reached a point where one could justifiably speak of a kind of Ottoman / French bilingualism in the social upper classes.²³ Also after this almost exclusive concentration on French had given way,

²¹ Taking into account actual language use, i.e. the texts screened for attestations, rather than the paradigmatic relations within the language system, derivatives with *-(î)msî* were found to be conspicuously less frequent than derivatives with *-vari*.

²² I am indebted to one of my anonymous reviewers for this valuable suggestion.

²³ Indications for such a state of affairs can be gleaned from Levend (1972: 142-143, 178, 241).

during a large part of the 20th century proficiency in French remained the hallmark of the westward looking Turkish intellectual. As A_{vari} with proper names as their base are also attested for the Late Ottoman period, it is possible that the French derivatives with *-esque* exerted a certain pressure already on the Late Ottoman derivation with *-vari*. When this hypothesis turns out to be true, further research may show whether the influence of the French derivatives remained largely restricted to Late Ottoman times or was also of some relevance for the change between the derivation rules of Late Ottoman and those of contemporary Turkish.

4. Conclusion

Derivation by means of the loan suffix *-vari* has proven to be an integral part of the grammar of contemporary Turkish. Its description cannot simply be delegated to a grammar of Late Ottoman. The clear delimitation of the data set in terms of period and language variety helped to identify the relevant characteristics of the derivation rule. These two criteria could be added to the reasonable prerequisites for a Turkish morphology as listed by Berta (1991). Keeping in mind the high rate of change which Late Ottoman and Republican Turkish have been subject to in the 20th century, I believe it advisable to scrutinise every attestation older than 40-50 years as to its relevance for a description of the grammar of contemporary Turkish.

References

- Aksoy, Ömer Asım 1980. *Dil yanlışları: 900 sözün eleştirisi* (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 470.) Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi basımevi.
- Aronoff, Mark 1976. *Word formation in general grammar* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 1.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Banguoğlu, Tahsin 1957. Türkçede benzerlik sıfatları. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten* 1957, 13-27.
- Bazin, Louis 1962. Note sur la fréquence des voyelles turques. In: Eckmann, János et al. (eds.) *Németh armagani*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. 61-68.
- Berta, Árpád 1991. Gedanken zur Erforschung der Wortbildungselemente im Türkischen. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 45/2-3, 205-217.
- Bilgegil, M. Kaya 1982². *Türkçe dilbilgisi*. İstanbul: Dergâh yayınları.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik 1991. Aspects of language variation. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Turkish linguistics today*. Leiden: Brill. 150-176.
- Cüceloğlu, Doğan & Slobin, Dan I. 1980. Effects of Turkish Language Reform on person perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 11/3, 297-326.
- Devellioğlu, Ferit 1995¹². *Osmanlıca-Türkçe ansiklopedik lûgat*. Ankara: Aydın kitabevi yayınları.
- Gencan, Tahir Nejat 1966. *Dilbilgisi* (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 243.) İstanbul: Ahmet Sait basımevi.
- Hřebíček, Luděk 1975. The Turkish Language Reform and contemporary texts: A contribution to the stylistic evaluation of borrowings. *Archív Orientální* 43, 223-231.
- İmer, Kâmile 1991. Türkçenin sözvarlığındaki yeni öğeler. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* 1991, 18-28.

Bildfehler

Die Konvertierung der Seite ist fehlgeschlagen, bitte melden Sie den Fehler an die DigiZeitschriften Geschäftsstelle.

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Zwicky, Arnold M. & Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1987. Plain morphology and expressive morphology. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 13, 330-340.

Appendix

A. Contemporary Turkish attestations of A_{vari} in the press

(A1) *Barbara Cartland'vari* (kitap)

“– Kitabı okudum ve müthiş bir aldatılma duygusu beni sardı.
– Anlamadım niye böyle hissettiğinizi, okudunuz mu hepsini?
– Atlaya zıplaya okudum, bana Barbara Cartland'vari geldi. Aşk üzerine böyle yoğunlaşan bir yazarın belki de erkek olmasıydı bana inandırıcı gelmeyen.” (Zeynep Tunusu, *Haber Extra* 1/5, 23/10/1997, p. 100)

(A2) *Baykal'vari* (fasıl)

“Baykal koşullarla mı geliyor, karşı koşullar sıralamaya başladı ... Daha sonraki fasıl elbette Baykal'vari olacak, kimi isteklerine “geçmişe dönme olasılığını” da ekleyecek.” (Cüneyt Arcayürek, *Cumhuriyet Hafta*, 03/04/1998, p. 19)

(A3) *Çillervari tarih* [heading]

“Çünkü, “tarih”, altın yaldızlı boyaya batırılmış sahte harflerle değil, beyaz üzerine düşen siyah mürekkeple yazılıyor.” (Hadi Uluengin, *Hürriyet*, 07/12/1995)

(A4) *Dallasvari diziler*

“Üstelik, toplumumuzun adetlerine alışkanlıklarına ters düştüğüne büyük kitlenin inandığı Dallasvari dizilerin getirilmesi büyük bir yayıncılık olayı imiş gibi sunulmuş.” (Lale Karaca, İzmit, in a letter to the editor, *Erkekçe* 5/8, October 1985)

(A5) *gecekonduvari camiler*

“Mazi ve istikbalî düşünmeden, ancak günün ihtiyacını giderecek vasıfsız, sanat değerinden yoksun, zevksiz ve gecekonduvari camiler yapılıyor.” (Diyanet İşleri Başkanı Mehmet Nuri Yılmaz, quoted in *Cumhuriyet Hafta*, Oct./Nov. 1995)

(A6) *gecekonduvari bir ev*

“Evimiz kiraydı. Dört yıl önce gecekonduvari bir ev yapıp buraya, Beykoz'a taşındık.” (Lise öğrenci Yılmaz Polat, quoted in *Cumhuriyet Hafta*, 11/10/1996, p. 14)

(A7) *intiharvari eylem*

“Yapımızdaki hazırlık böyle intiharvari eylem dönemini geliştirecek seviyededir. Halkımız artık tahammül sınırlarını zorlama noktasındadır. Her PKK militanının intiharvari eylem özelliği olduğunu biliyoruz.” (Abdullah Öcalan (translated), quoted in *Hürriyet*, 30/10/1996, p. 6)

(A8) *kuklavari heykel*

“Bence daha önemlisi hemen altında harekete geçen dört kuklavari heykel.” (Hakan Akçaoğlu, *Tombak* 16, October 1997, p. 78)

(A9) *labirentvari dehlizler*

“Bu arada 1930'larda yapılan bir arkeolojik kazı Çemberlitaş civarında bir takım labirentvari dehlizlerin doğruluğunu kanıtladı.” (Şafak Altun, *Nokta* 13/18, 30/04-06/07/1995, p. 46)

(A10) *Metin Vertanvari (bir yazı)*

“Başka bir okur, gazete yönetimini 15 yıl önce ölen yazar Metin Vertan’ın stilini kopya etmekle kınıyordu. Bu okura göre, özellikle yazının içindeki şu kısım Metin Vertanvari-ydi.” (Güney Menteş, *Erkekçe* 8/2, April 1988, p. 87)

(A11) *Nazivari yöntemler*

“Sırların, Bosanska Krupa bölgesinde yüzlerce masum insanı öldürdükleri gaz odaları ortaya çıkarıldı. Tanıklar esir kampında Nazivari yöntemlerle öldürülen sivillerin, yöre yakınlarındaki bir köyde bulunan toplu mezara gömüldüğünü söylüyorlar.” (*Hürriyet*, 15/06/1996, p. 17)

(A12) *Nietzsche’vâri bir ‘kültür eleştirisi’*

“‘Dullara Yas Yakışır’da ise, bir önceki gelişmeye ve toplum eleştirisine Nietzsche’vâri bir ‘kültür eleştirisi’ eklenmiş, doğaya ‘kozmik’ bir yaklaşım gözlemleniyor, biçim denemeleri daha faz[la].” (*Cumhuriyet Kitap* (supplement to *Cumhuriyet Hafta*), 21/12/1995, p. 5)

(A13) *“Özalvari” (fikirler)*

“Yılmaz’ın Kürtler hakkında biraz da “Özalvari” bulunan bu fikirlerini, görüşeceği Alman devlet adamlarına da açıklaması bekleniyordu.” (İzzet Sedes, *Akşam*, quoted in *Hürriyet*, 18/05/1996, p. 12)

(A14) *“Özalvari, Demirelvari” temenniler*

“Ekonomi, lirik bir iş değildir. Hesaba kitaba uymalısınız. Temennilerle tahminleri ayrılmalısınız. Erbakan’ın “Yeniden Büyük Türkiye Projesi”, bu anlamda, ‘Özalvari, Demirelvari’ temenniler bütünüdür.” (Şeref Oğuz, *Milliyet*, 27/01/1997, p. 4)

(A15) *Özalvari seyahat*

“Chirac’tan Özalvari seyahat” [heading]

“Bir zamanlar Turgut Özal’ın yaptığı gibi Latin Amerika gezisine beraberinde kalabalık bir heyet getiren Chirac, gezinin ilk ayağı olan Brezilya’da bugün ve yarın temaslarını sürdürecektir.” (*Hürriyet*, 11/03/1997, p. 17)

(A16) *“paparazzivari” dedikodu haberleri*

“Ben Avrupa’da yaşayan ve Üniversite eğitimi alan gençler ile ilgili bir röportajı ‘paparazzivari’ dedikodu haberlerine tercih ederim. O tür bir programda asla yer almak istemezdim zaten ...” (Lale Barçın İmer, quoted in *Hürriyet TV7 Magazin*, 04/05/1996, p. 7)

(A17) *Peronvari bir popülist*

“Hakkında açılan ‘soruşturmanın’ doğruluğu ya da haksızlığı bir yana, Di Pietro’yu ‘Peronvari bir popülist’ etiketiyle nitelendirenler ve üslubunu eleştirenler – ki aydınların büyük kısmı bu grup içinde – bulunuyor.” (Nilgün Cerrahoğlu, *Milliyet*, 19/11/1996, p. 8)

(A18) *“Süpermenvari” kıyafet*

“Meksika’da, ‘Süpermenvari’ kıyafetiyle varoşlardaki yoksulların yardımına koşarak adını duyuran, ‘Süper Barrio’ şimdi Chiapas Eyaleti’nin bağımsızlığını isteyen yerli gerillalara destek veriyor.” (Dario Lopez Mills (translated), *Hürriyet*, 11/05/1996, p. 8)

(A19) *şezlongvari beyaz koltuklar*

"İzleyicinin rahat etmesi için hiçbir fedakârlıktan kaçınmayan Conrad Açık Hava Sine-ması'nda; yeşil kaplı zeminde, şezlongvari beyaz koltuklar geniş aralıklarla sıralanmış ..." (Pervin Karadağ, *Kaçamak mekanları* (supplement to *Tempo*), 18-23/07/1996, p. 24)

(A20) *şöminevari ocak*

"şöminevari ocak, oturduğumuz divanın yanbaşındaydı, ama teyzenin yemekleri ne zaman hazırladığını farkedememiştik." (*Cumhuriyet Hafta – Dergi*, 26/01-01/02/1996, p. 19)

(A21) *Texasvari banliyö trenleri*

"Teksasvari banliyö trenleriyle en fazla bir saat uzaklıkta bir istasyon." (*Cumhuriyet Hafta*, 22-28/12/1995, p. 17)

(A22) *tiyatrovvari (senaryolar)*

"Türkiye'de senaryolar Almanya'daki film senaryolarına kıyasla çok daha tiyatrovvari." (Rebecca Winter (translated), quoted in *Erkekçe* 6/4, June 1986, p. 125)

(A23) *dünyaya Walt Disneyvari bakışı*

"– Nicoletta'nın hangi özelliği çekici geldi?

– Zekâsı, yumuşak huyu ve dünyaya Walt Disneyvari bakışı. Düşünceleri olağanüstü saf ve temiz." (Luciano Pavarotti (translated), quoted in *Aktüel* 263, 18-24/07/1996, p. 14)

B. Further modern attestations of A_{vari}

(B1) *ketenvari ayakkabı* (sales talk in a shoe shop, April 1998)

(B2) *O'Henry vari, Maupassant vari, Çehov vari, Virginia Wolf vari öykü*

"O'Henry vari, Maupassant vari, başı, ortası, sonu, gerilimi, aksyonu, vurucu bitişi olan klasik öykünün olsun; modern öykü adı altında topladığımız Çehov vari, Virginia Wolf vari öykünün olsun, elbet ayrı ayrı işlenişleri var." (Haldun Taner, quoted in F. Bozkurt, *Türkiye Türkçesi*, İstanbul: Cem yayınevi, 1995, p. 435)

(B3) *ortak pazarıvari bir şey* (manager in the tourist industry in a discussion on politics, July 1996)

(B4) *romanvari kurmaca*

"1797'de, oradan oraya dolaşan bir boyacı, şapkacı, ayyakkabıcı [sic!] ve demir işçisi olarak yaşadığı maceralarla ilgili, ilk bakışta romanvari kurmaca olarak algılanıp okunabilecek bir anlatı ortaya çıkmıştır." (Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı kültürü ve gündelik yaşam*, translated by Elif Kılıç, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997, p. 262)

(B5) *"Sokratvârî" bir okul*

"Mevcut rivâyetlerden İmam Câfer es-Sâdık'ın Medîne'deki bahçeli evine her taraftan ziyaretçilerin geldiği ve onun, burada, Donaldson'un tâbiriyle 'Sokratvârî' bir okul teşkil ettiği anlaşılmaktadır." (Dwight M. Donaldson, translated and quoted by Ethem Ruhi Fiğlalı, *Türkiye'de Alevilik ve Bektâşilik*, Ankara: Selçuk Yayınları, 1994³, p. 265)

(B6) *şarkvari hanlar*

"Camileri ve türbeleriyle, medreseleriyle (cami okullarıyla), öylesine çeşitli ve güzel sokak çeşmeleriyle, köşkleri ve saraylarıyla, büyük şarkvari hanları ve kapalıçarşılarıyla, İstanbul bir Doğu başkenti olarak adlandırılmayı hak etmektedir." (Fred Field Goodsell,

in *İstanbul 1920*, C. R. Johnson (ed.), translated by Sönmez Taner, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995, p. 75)

C. Late Ottoman attestations of *A_{vari}*

(C1) *Arsen Lüpenvari bir intrika*

“Yirmi beş sene içinde bin türlü sıkıntı ile, istikballeri için biriktirdikleri serveti bankadaki kasadan Arsen Lüpenvari bir intrika ile aşırıp Amerika'ya kaçtığından beri karı koca ismini bile ağızlarına almıyorlardı.” (Ömer Seyfettin, *Bahar ve kelebekler*, İstanbul: İkbal Kütüphanesi sahibi Hüseyin, 1927, p. 46)

(C2) *Bekir Mustafavari mestane bir nara*

“Mesut Beyin hanesinde bir gece döşeklere girildiği esnada kapı önünde Bekir Mustafavari mestane bir nara işitildi.” (Hüseyin Rahmi [Gürpınar], *Tebessüm-ü elem*, İstanbul: Tüccarzade İbrahim Hilmi, 1339, p. 520)

(C3) *Frenkvari hayat*

“Bütün vükelâ, vüzera, erkân rical ile yüz göz olmuş; kapılarını vurmada, kartını göndermeden, hademeye aldırma odalarına giriyor, vakitli vakitsiz evlerine gidiyor, uykudan uyandırıyor, yataklarının üzerine oturup konuşuyor, Frenkvari hayata düşkün, yanında daima birkaç mühendis bozuntusu, bayağı yüzlü, fakat şapkalı herif, otomobil ile İstanbul'u vızıl vızıl dolaşıyor, Alman sosyetelerine girip çıkıyor, ceneral bilmem kimin kızı yanında çarşığı geziyor, müdür-ü umumî bilmem nenin madamasiyle Eyüp'e gidiyor, yalnız onlarla düşüp kalkıyor.” (Refik Halit [Karay], *İstanbul'un iç yüzü*, İstanbul: Kitaphane-i Hilmi, 1336, pp. 124-125)

(C4) *gagavari (burun)*

“Burun Fransızların ‘akilin’ tabir ettikleri şeklinde yani gagavari ufacık siyah gözler gayet çukurda!” (Hüseyin Rahmi [Gürpınar], *Şık*, Dersaadet: İbrahim Hilmi, 1336², pp. 16-17)

(C5) *haçvari (nebat)*

“[salibî] haç şeklinde olan, haçvari, haç şeklini ibraz edecek surette dört yaprağı olan (nebat).” (Şemseddin Sami, p. 832)

(C6) *haçvari yol* (Şemseddin Sami, p. 566)

(C7) *halkavari şekiller*

“[daire] fiçinin çemberi gibi. Yahut def ve kalbur misillü şeylerin tahtadan olan halkavari şekiller gibi.” (Muallim Naci, *Talim-i Kiraat* 1. kısım, İstanbul: 1325³³, p. 54)

(C8) *mahallevari su-i zanlar*

“Gayet fassal, dedikoducuydu da ... Her gelen misafir hanımın namusundan şüphe getirir: – Kaltağın biri, yürüyüşünden belli ... yahut:

– Halis aşüfte, üstünden akıyor ...

gibi mahallevari su-i zanlarla dünyayı lekeler, kirletirdi.” (Refik Halit [Karay], *İstanbul'un iç yüzü*, İstanbul: Kitaphane-i Hilmi, 1336, pp. 68-69)

(C9) *sıravari yalılar, ağaçlar* (Şemseddin Sami, p. 826)

(C10) *şemsiyevari tepeler*

“Şu karşiki yamaçta, koyun rakid ayinesinde, meftûnâne akislerini seyreder gibi birer halâvetle eğilmiş, şemsiyevari tepeleri, güneşle yaldızlanmış üç büyük fıstık ağacı var.” (Hüseyin Rahmi [Gürpınar], *Tebessüm-ü elem*, İstanbul: Tüccarzade İbrahim Hilmi, 1339, p. 16)

D. Attestations for other derivational models(D1) *dehlizkârî çerçeveli melceler*

“Sığınak: (Sahra tahkimatı)nda vakte ve cuz’î veya oldukça kâfi inşaat malzemesine göre muhtelif şekillerde yapılabilen ve hava, parça... tesirlerine karşı tahaffuz temin eden basit, dehlizkârî, çerçeveli, melcelerle (Daime tahkimatı)nda (Gaz, Bomba ve Mermi emniyetli) olarak vücade getirilen kuvvetli ve büyük melcelerin umumuna şâmil bir tâbirdir.” (Selahaddin A. Kip, *Askerî Kamus*, İstanbul: Vakıf, 1939, pp. 221-222)

(D2) *Fecr-i Âtîkârî (mecmua)*

“Bu mecmuayı pek lenfatik ve çok Fecr-i Âtîkârî bulduğumuz için, Akil Koyuncu ile konuştuk, adını Genç Kalemler’e çevirdik.” (Ali Canip Yöntem, quoted in Hasan Ali Yücel, *Edebiyat Tarihimizden 1*, Ankara: 1957, p. 197)

(D3) *garpkârî bir edebiyat* (Steuerwald 1993, p. 494)(D4) *Macarkârî bir müsaadekârlık* (Steuerwald 1993, p. 494)(D5) *Molière’kârî icatlar*

“Meselâ, *Cehennemlik*’in başındaki, Hasan Ferah Efendi ile üç ayrı devrin zihniyetinin mümessili üç doktorun konuşmaları, yine aynı romanda, ihtiyar Merakî’nin nesliyle genç neslin görüşlerini karşılaştıran, şiir ve edebiyat hakkındaki konuşma sahneleri Molière’kârî icatlar diye vasıflanabilir.” (Pertev Naili Boratav, “Hüseyin Rahmi’nin romancılığı”, in: *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 3/2, 1945, reprinted in id., *Folklor ve Edebiyat* (1982) 1, Adam Yayıncılık, 1982, p. 326)

(D6) *şarkkârî köşeler*

“İç içe üç oda lebaleb doluyor. Birçok şarkkârî köşeler yapmışlar, bunlar üstünde bağdaş kurup oturmuş Alman zabitleri, ellerinde bir tambur veya bir kitara ile yan yatmış Viyanalı kadınlar; duvardan indirilmiş bir uzun çubuğu tüttürmeğe uğraşan Beyoğlulu gençler var.” (Yakup Kadri [Karaosmanoğlu], *Kiralık Konak*, Dergâh Mecmuası, 1338, p. 230)

‘I stood to lie down’ and ‘I sat to leave’: Infinitive constructions of intention in South Siberian Turkic languages

Maja I. Cheremisina & Irina A. Nevskaja

Cheremisina, Maja I. & Nevskaja, Irina A. 2000. ‘I stood to lie down’ and ‘I sat to leave’: Infinitive constructions of intention in South Siberian Turkic languages. *Turkic Languages* 4, 77-113.

The article is devoted to the category of the infinitive in Turkic languages. It first defines the place of the infinitive among functional verb forms, and then describes the functions of the infinitive in Turkic languages in general and the infinitive forms and infinitive constructions in South Siberian Turkic languages (Altay, Khakas and Shor) in particular. One type of infinitive constructions, namely constructions with the semantics of intention, is dealt with in more detail. Such constructions constitute a separate functional subsystem. They can be of different formal and semantic types, but they all refer to an anticipated, desirable, non-factive action. The article describes these constructions according to several parameters: The place of the construction on the scale denoting stages of preparation for an action (desire – intention – decision – declaration of intentions – planning – preparation – readiness – attempt – terminate point, i.e. being at the brink of doing something); the use of negation; the relative time span to the starting point of an action; the degree of intention (neutral, low, high); unexpected decision versus planning; unrealized intention; feigned intention, etc.

Maja I. Cheremisina & Irina A. Nevskaja, Novokuznetsk State Pedagogical Institute, ul. Belana, 21-60, 654005 Novokuznetsk, Russia.

0. Introductory notes

The infinitive is capable of heading embedded syntactic constructions that function as action nominals and that occupy argument slots of a superordinate predicate—its host, the head of the matrix clause. An infinitive construction may also have adverbial semantics (usually of purpose or result) and be an adjunct of its host predicate. Within an embedded construction, the infinitive dominates over its own arguments and adjuncts. The infinitival construction is a transformation of the sentence pattern associated with a verbal lexeme: Its subject is usually eliminated, but the agent may be expressed by a nominal phrase in the dative case if it differs from the subject of the matrix clause. Otherwise, its structure is predetermined by the valency pattern of the verb in the infinitive form.

The inner structure of infinitive constructions lies outside our present task. Our particular interest concerns combinations of a subordinated infinitive with its host. Such constructions are very numerous and diverse. Although formally similar, they may vary from a free syntactic combination of a predicate and its argument or adjunct to an analytical modal or phasal verb form. We would like to introduce the main types of infinitive constructions in South Siberian Turkic languages (Section 2) and then describe one type in detail, namely infinitive constructions with the semantics of intention, that is infinitive constructions with superordinate verbs of intention proper (Section 3) and idiomatic analytical infinitive constructions formed by superordinate existential verbs; some of these are primarily positional ones or verbs of motion: 'to be', 'to lie', 'to sit', 'to stand', 'to go', etc. (Section 4). The title of the article refers to such constructions, e.g. 'I stood to lie down', 'I sat to leave' (= 'I wanted to lie down', 'I intended to leave'). In Section 1 we discuss the place of the infinitive among other functional verb forms. Our research is based on Altay, Khakas and Shor language data.¹

1. The place of the infinitive among other functional verb forms

Functional verb forms show a privative opposition of finite versus non-finite forms; the latter may comprise participles, converbs, infinitives, gerunds, verbal nouns, etc. A set of functional verb forms is language specific. There may be an element of arbitrary decision when linguists define a form of a particular language as, say, an infinitive or as a verbal noun (see 1.2.). Irrespective of this additional difficulty, when trying to identify similar verb categories in different languages one discovers that language material does not always fit into the above-mentioned framework.

To begin with, functional and formal categories do not always coincide, e.g. the distinction of finite versus non-finite verb forms does not hold good for Turkic languages, since central Turkic verb forms, so-called participles, function both as finite and non-finite predicates. In fact, the only purely finite indicative form in some Turkic languages is that of the preterite *-DI*.² Confusion only grows when we

¹ All language examples are authentic: they were primarily taken from published fine or folklore literature in Altay, Khakas and, partially, Shor and were discussed with native speakers of those languages. Some Khakas language examples were taken from Zinaida Kotožekova's works on related topics (Grigorenko 1995, Kotožekova 1996). Since Shor has not been written until very recently, the majority of Shor examples are from I. Nevskaja's field data.

Language examples are given in a phonemic transcription based on the Fundamenta transcription (Deny et al. 1959: XV). Russian words and citations are transliterated according to the international system used by linguists specializing in Russian and Slavonic studies (Shaw 1967).

² Turkic languages belong to the agglutinative type. Their morphonology is characterized by so-called synharmonism, i. e. progressive assimilation processes affecting both consonants and vowels, mainly in affixes. Consequently, Turkic affixes may have up to sixteen morphonological variants. Therefore, we use an archimorphemic

proceed to analyse non-finite categories. The infinitive belongs to the most complicated of these.

1.1. The category of the infinitive

Infinitive properties and functions may differ among languages distinguishing this category. Therefore, it is not quite clear when and why this or that form of a language can be defined as an infinitive. Nevertheless, linguists appear to have a certain, perhaps partially intuitive, set of criteria which allow them either to speak of infinitive forms in some languages, e.g. Russian, German, English, French, Turkmen, Altay, Khakas, Shor, Kazakh, Bashkir or Tatar, or to state the absence of such forms, e.g. in Tuvan, Tofan, Mongolian, Evenki or Khanty. A most common set of infinitive features seems to be as follows.³

The infinitive is a non-finite verb form; hence, it does not express absolute tense or mood distinctions. It usually denotes an anticipatory or potential action, often seen as the purpose of a head action (therefore it is sometimes grouped with purpose converbs or supines, see 1.3.). It easily combines with phasal, modal (emotive, intentional, desiderative) and propositional attitude (evaluative, commentative) predicates. It does not usually accept personal markers,⁴ although its action can be assigned to an agent in the dative case unless the agent is shared by the host predicate.⁵ With this exception, the infinitive preserves the valency pattern of a verb stem. It can also be modified by adverbs and entities used in adverbial functions (e.g. certain

representation of Turkic formants, which is traditional in Turkology. *A* denotes *a* after stems with back vowels and *e* after stems with front vowels. *I* denotes *ı* in words with back vowels and *i* in words with front vowels. *X* has the same values as *I* in words with unrounded vowels, but it denotes *ü* in words with front rounded vowels and *u* in words with back rounded vowels. *G* denotes *g* after stems with front vowels ending in a vowel or a sonorous consonant, *γ* after stems with back vowels ending in a vowel or a sonorous consonant, *k* after stems with front vowels ending in a voiceless consonant, *q* after stems with back vowels ending in a voiceless consonant. *S* denotes *s* after stems ending in a voiceless consonant and otherwise *z*. *K* denotes *q* in words with back vowels and otherwise *k*. The values of *B* are specified by the morphological rules of the particular Turkic language. Thus, for Shor, *B* denotes *m* after nasals, *p* after unvoiced consonants and otherwise *b*. Vowels in brackets appear only after stems ending in consonants. Consonants in brackets appear only after stems ending in vowels.

³ This characterization is undoubtedly based on the properties and functions of Indo-European infinitives.

⁴ This restriction is not absolute even for Indo-European languages: the Portuguese infinitive does accept a personal marking. Quite a number of Turkic infinitives certainly do (Jusupov 1985: 114; Clark 1998). However, it seems to be a prerequisite that a candidate for the infinitive status can be used without a personal marking, thus representing an action in general.

⁵ In different-subject constructions with the semantics of purpose, the infinitive can have its own subject in the nominative case (Nevskaja 1988).

nominal groups, converbs, dependent adverbial clauses). The infinitive has all the other verb categories: Those of voice, causality, reflexivity, reciprocity, frequentativity, actionality, modality, negation and some other categories (a set of verbal categories is language specific). Consequently, it can be formed from all kinds of derived stems, along with various compound and complex stems. In Turkic languages, it is formed from passive, causative, reciprocal and reflexive stems, from so-called analytical verbs including lexical compounds as well as compounds of a phasal, modal or *Aktionsart* semantics, and from negative stems.

The infinitive names an action. It can represent it in general, without referring it to its agent (*to speak, to go, to smoke*). Thus, it often serves as the dictionary form of verbs (but not in Turkic languages, where the most common dictionary verb form is that of the 2.p.s. of the imperative mood consisting of the bare verb stem).⁶ Several infinitives might be distinguished in a language, but, as a rule, only one form has the nominating function.

In Turkic languages, the category of the infinitive is considered to have developed relatively recently from different sources (Gadžieva 1973), or it has not formed at all, e.g. there is no infinitive in Tuvan (Isxakov & Pal'mbax 1961). In Tofan, the form *-(A)rGA* is used very rarely, and the infinitive functions are divided between future participles and converbs (Rassadin 1978: 198-200). In Yakut, six infinitive forms are distinguished; they share traditional infinitive functions, but do not cover all of them, e.g. some typical infinitive functions are performed by converbs (Ubrjatova 1976: 108-114).

In Altay, Khakas and Shor, the infinitive has undoubtedly developed (Tadykin 1971: 131, Baskakov 1975: 173-175, Dyrenkova 1941: 131, Nevskaja 1988). These languages have analogous infinitive forms (as do Tatar, Bashkir, Karachay, Balkar and Yakut). Historically, the infinitive is the future participle *-(A)r / (neg.) -BA*s in the dative case: *-(A)rGA*, with the negative form *-BA*sKA. Native speakers of these languages perceive these formants as whole entities. Although materially identical, these forms have different functional scopes in Altay, Khakas and Shor. In Khakas and Shor, the infinitive is more active than in Altay: It is expanding its functions in competition with converbs and participles in some positions traditionally occupied by them.

Future participles in dative case forms have given rise to infinitives in many Turkic and non-Turkic languages. Ubrjatova and Tadykin are of the opinion that the infinitive semantics developed from the directional meaning of the dative case, while that of purpose was an intermediate stage: cf. *iš-ke* work-DAT 'for work, to work' and *ište-r-ge* work-PART:fut-DAT 'about to work, in order to work, to work' (Ubrjatova 1976: 108-114, Tadykin 1971: 131). We can add that the infinitive must have obtained its prospective meaning along with the modality of potentiality from the future participle.

⁶ In some Turkic languages the infinitive *-mA*k does serve as the dictionary form of verbs, e.g. in Turkmen and Uzbek.

The South Siberian infinitive accepts no morphology. It can, however, join particles: Shor *tut-pasqoq* < *tut-pasqa oq* 'not even to hold' from *tut-* 'to hold'. In some South Siberian dialectal varieties, the marker of the dative case may be repeated when the infinitive denotes the purpose of a head action: Shor *toγ-basqa-γa* 'in order not to be cold, not to freeze'.⁷

The infinitive has various syntactic functions in Turkic languages (see 1.4.).

1.2. The infinitive and other action nominals

The infinitive belongs to a class of verb forms functioning as event (or action) nominals (Comrie 1976). In Turkic languages, quite a number of forms can represent a nominalized action: Infinitives, verbal nouns, participles and even, in certain positions, converbs.

Verbal nouns are closest to infinitives. These two terms are often used synonymously. Research on the typology of verbal nouns has shown that in both cases a very similar set of properties is meant (Bondarenko 1980). Tradition often takes the upper hand when linguists face the problem of categorizing a functional verb form. However, some differences between these two classes can be found. These are especially relevant for languages having both categories: see the contrastive analysis of infinitive(s) and verbal noun(s) in Bashkir in *Grammatika baškirkogo jazyka* (1981: 318-323), in Tatar by Jusupov (1985: 203), in Turkish by Csátó (1990) and Erdal (1998), in Turkmen by Clark (1998: 327-335), etc.

Verbal nouns share most of the infinitive features listed above, but, contrary to the infinitive, they are capable of referring to their agents by means of possessive affixes added to their markers. They freely combine with case markers and postpositions, may accept the affix of plurality and even be counted. They are readily lexicalized. Still, it is not easy, if at all possible, to draw a borderline between these two categories of verbal forms. Some of their functions overlap, but they often complement each other (see Erdal 1998).

South Siberian Turkic languages have only one infinitive form and lack the category of verbal nouns. Forms analogous to the verbal nouns of other Turkic languages belong to word formation here: E.g. the Shor affixes *-BA+* and *-BAK+* derive deverbal nouns referring to objects involved in an event or to event participants, but not to events themselves: *pur-ba* 'a bore, a drill' from *pur-* 'to bore, drill', *čar-baq* 'a saw' from *čar-* 'to cut' (instruments), cf. the verbal noun *-mA* and the infinitive form *-mAk* in Turkish and Turkmen. Derivates with the affix *-(X)š*, a very productive one in Shor at present, can refer to events: *ačīn-iš* 'sorrow, sympathy' from *ačīn-* 'to be sorry, sympathize', *alyi-š* 'blessing' from *alya-* 'to bless', *čepsen-iš* 'preparation' from *čepsen-* 'to prepare', but show nominal behaviour, which

⁷ This seems to confirm, first, that the infinitive semantics of these forms must have developed from that of purpose. However, the infinitive has gone farther and is not only associated with the meaning of purpose. If a speaker of the dialectal varieties in question wants to stress the purpose semantics, s/he adds another dative marker.

is best demonstrated by the way they are negated: *ižen-iš* 'hope' from *ižen-* 'to hope', but *iženiš čoyul / čoy* 'hopelessness', cf. *-(y)lš* in Turkish (Erdal 1998). Thus, only participles and infinitives regularly function as event nominals in Altay, Khakas and Shor.

Participles and infinitives differ in some basic morphological and semantic features and in sets of functions they can perform. To list only some of them:

1. Participles can take case, plurality and possessive markers and combine with postpositions while South Siberian infinitives cannot; in rare cases they combine with postpositions: Shor *pīžirar̄ya čettire* 'until getting ripe', *maya ölerge čettire* 'before I die (lit: before for me to die)'.
2. Participles can be finite predicates while infinitives cannot (except for a rare imperative use).
3. Participles usually have an absolute tense and mood meaning (at least when used as finite predicates); infinitives show at best a relative tense meaning, that of an anticipatory action: Shor *Ūrgenerge keldim* 'I came in order to study'.
4. The attributive function is considered primary for participles: Thanks to it a verbal form can be defined as a participle. Infinitives are mostly used in subject or object positions, filling argument slots of superordinate verbs.
5. Participles can appear in subject or object positions too, but lexical classes of verbs opening positions for participial and infinitival action-nominal constructions differ considerably.⁸
6. Even when infinitives and participles are arguments of one and the same verb, they usually represent different types of action nominalizations, i.e. factive versus non-factive ones.

The infinitive can denote an action without referring it to any situation of reality. It refers not to events, but to their mental projections, actions in general, virtual actions, which are non-assertive, non-indicative, non-factive (Lyons 1977: 793). In this respect, the infinitive differs from factive event nominals, also defined as indicative or assertive, which refer to real actions. The difference between these two kinds of action nominals is illustrated by the Turkish forms *-DIK* (a participle, factive) and *-mA* (an infinitive, non-factive) (Bazin 1968: 114-126). Thus, among factive event nominals one finds in the first place participles.⁹ Some verbal nouns can function as

⁸ For Turkish, lexical classes of verbs accepting participles and / or infinitives and / or verbal nouns as arguments are briefly touched upon in Csató 1990. Non-finite verb forms and the constructions they form in South Siberian Turkic were described from these viewpoints in a series of monographs edited by Čeremisina et al. *Predikativnoe sklonenie pričastij* 1984, *Strukturnye tipy* 1986.

⁹ The class of participles is not homogeneous. Turkic languages may have non-factive participles; e.g. the Shor participle in *-(A)r* expresses a deontic modality (Lyons 1977: 823) (cf. the Turkish participle in *-(y)AcAK*, characterized as deontic by Csató 1990), while another Shor participle, in *-GAdlg*, denotes a probable action: *par̄yadīr̄*

factive event nominals (Erdal 1998). With rare exceptions (converbs of purpose, of a pretended action and the like), converbs are factive; cf. Čeremisina et al. (1986: 63), where infinitives and converbs are contrasted as non-indicative versus indicative forms.

The distinction between factive and non-factive action nominals is not absolute: It holds good when we describe a semantic function of a non-finite form in a statement, but not when we mean a non-finite category as a whole. It would be a simplification to say that the infinitive always refers to a non-factive event: In some positions it may have the opposite meaning. Consider, for example, the Shor infinitive *-(A)rGA* as a part of the phrase *qīrarya toqtadī* 's/he stopped reading', where the meaning is factive.

Infinitives and participles also differ in some other respects. Let us contrast the infinitive and the participle in the same position. The following Shor examples show both the source participial form *-(A)r* in the dative case and the infinitive in the position of a complement of the same verb:

(a) In an *emotive construction* (it may be a same-subject or different-subject construction with the participle, but only a same-subject one with the infinitive); such constructions are formed by superordinate emotive verbs:

Seeŋ kel-er-iŋ-e örün-ča-m.
 you-GEN come-PART:FUT-POSS.2.SG-DAT be glad-PRES-1.SG
 'I am glad that you will come.'

Men kel-erge örün-ča-m.
 I come-INFIN be glad-PRES-1.SG
 'I am glad to come.'

(b) In a *prospective construction* formed by the prospective verbs 'to expect', 'to hope', 'to wait for': *Olaŋ nanarīma iženčam* 'I hope that he will return' and *Meen nanarīma iženčam* 'I hope that I will return' versus *Men nanarya iženčam* 'I hope to return'.

(c) In a *preparatory construction* with verbs of the type 'to get ready for', 'to prepare for', 'to be going to do something' (verbs of intention): *Seeŋ nanariŋa tiqtinčam* 'I am getting ready for your coming back', *Meen nanarīma tiqtinčam* 'I am getting ready for my coming back' versus *Men nanarya tiqtinčam* 'I am getting ready to come back > I am going to come back'.

In these constructions, the participle *-(A)r* denotes an action which is believed with a great degree of certainty to take place in the future. All the participial actions can be characterized as located on the time scale. The participle preserves its modal and temporal characteristics. The head verb is fully lexical, it has its own modal and temporal characteristics.¹⁰ In the prognostic construction, the degree of certainty is

kiži 'a person who might come'.

¹⁰ The same features are displayed in a fourth type of constructions with the Shor parti-

relatively lower, which is due to the semantics of the verb ('to hope', 'to expect', etc.) heading the matrix clause. Still, the semantics of the *-(A)r* participle does not transcend the borders of the deontic modality.

The temporal and modal characteristics of the infinitive seem to depend to a greater degree on those of the superordinate verb. The future orientation, potentiality and non-factivity of the infinitive action are stronger in the prospective and preparatory constructions, due to the semantics of superordinate verbs. In the emotive construction, the infinitive action seems to be factive and simultaneous with that of the matrix verb. Thus, the infinitive itself appears to be modally and temporally neutral. It is devoid of any temporal or modal characteristics of its own and gets them from the dominating verb. The head verb, in turn, undergoes grammaticalization: It acquires a modal meaning denoting an attitude to the infinitive action. The infinitive and the head verb form a semantic and syntactic complex unit which functions as a compound modal predicate. These characteristics are signs of grammaticalization of the combinations 'infinitive + verbs of emotion, prognosis, intention, etc.'¹¹ We will return to this phenomenon in Sections 2-4.

The modal and temporal characteristics of participles are not indifferent to those of the matrix verb either. However, systematic research in this field is still needed for most Turkic languages.

1.3. The infinitive and converbs

1.3.1. The infinitive and converbs of purpose

There are at least two other terms which should be discussed in connection with the infinitive. They are the supine and the converb of purpose. These two categories of verb forms represent a non-factive event, seen as the purpose of one's motion (supine) or as the purpose of any action (converb of purpose). The semantics of purpose presupposes that an action seen as desired should be non-factive, and it is never clear whether it will become factive or not. Factive purpose turns into its opposite: the result.

Infinitives and verbal nouns can function as purpose converbs. However, in some Turkic languages there are specific converbs of purpose. Their sole function is to denote the purpose of a head action; they lack all the other functions of infinitives (or verbal nouns).

ciple in *-(A)r* in the dative case—in a temporal construction (only a different-subject one): *Quzuq pizir-ar-in-a* (ripen-PART.FUT-POS3:SG-DAT) *çettire iygi ay artı* 'In two months the nuts will ripen (lit: There are two months left until the nuts ripen)'.

¹¹ In spite of all these differences, the South Siberian Turkic infinitive competes against the *-(A)r* / *-BAs* participle in combinations with modal predicative nouns: *parar kerek* 'it is necessary to go' versus *pararya kerek*.

1.3.2. The infinitive and the *-(I)p* converb

Along with its other numerous functions, the common Turkic converb in *-(I)p* sometimes fulfills supine functions. In South Siberian Turkic, it has the supine meaning in very restricted surroundings: The head verb should be one of movement, the verb in the converbial form should be one of obtaining an object: *Aḡnap paṛyām* 'I went hunting'. Verbs of obtaining an object are usually derived by the affix +*LA-* from nouns denoting those objects: Shor *aḡ-na* 'to hunt' from *aḡ* 'wild animal', *quš-ta-* 'to hunt birds' from *quš* 'bird', *palıq-ta-* 'to fish' from *palıq* 'fish', *örtekte-* 'to hunt ducks' from *örték* 'duck', *qıs-ta-* 'to court girls' from *qıs* 'girl'. Only a few verbs of differing derivational patterns can be found as converbs of purpose in this position: *tile-* 'to look for', *aala-* 'to stay at some place as a guest' from *aal* 'village', *sura-* 'to ask for'. One might get the impression that these combinations have already been lexicalized. However, they still allow other words to intervene between their two components: Shor *taḡda aḡnap erte pararım* 'I will go hunting early in the morning tomorrow'.

There are several other positions where the infinitive has to compete with converbial forms. In some Turkic languages, in combinations with phasal and modal verbs one finds converbs instead of Indo-European infinitives (*to begin to read*, *to learn to swim*). In Khakas and Shor, the infinitive is at present broadening its functions and can occupy the second actant position of some phasal and modal verbs, whereas in Altay converbs prevail in such combinations (although similar tendencies are reported). In describing infinitive functions, we will try to show infinitive-converb (and infinitive-participle) conflict areas.

1.4. Infinitive functions in South Siberian Turkic languages

Infinitive functions are strikingly diverse. Let us list and briefly characterize the major infinitive functions in South Siberian Turkic languages.

We distinguish between *independent* and *dependent* infinitives.

(a) The *independent* infinitive, i.e. the infinitive without a head word (i) gives a name to an action: What is Shor for 'to speak'? – *Čoqtarya*; (ii) forms imperative constructions of explicit command: Shor *Parčazı turarya!* 'Stand up, all of you!', or invites to joint action: *Čestek alarya!* 'Let's go gather berries!'

(b) The *dependent* infinitive (i) occupies complement or adjunct positions of predicates belonging to different syntactic and semantic types (see Section 2); (ii) occupies an attributive position; the head word is usually a noun with very broad and abstract semantics, e.g. Shor *čer* 'land, earth, place', *kiži* 'person', *tem* 'time'.

The infinitive denotes the destination of a head noun.¹² If the head noun is inani-

¹² The destination of a person or an object can also be expressed by the participles in *-(A)r* and *-čAḡ* in Shor: *ižer / iščeḡ / ižerge suḡ* 'water to drink, for drinking'. The usage of the infinitive in this position is a modern development in Shor. It was perhaps instigated by Shor-Russian language contacts. In Altay, the *-(A)r* participle is preferred in such phrases.

mate, it cannot be the infinitive's agent: *čadarya čer* 'place to live at, place for living, for residing', *učuyarya tem* 'time to fly'. Then, the infinitive agent can be expressed by a nominal phrase in the dative case: *Poyuna čadarya čer tappadi* 'S/he has not found a place to live'. If the head noun is animate, it denotes the agent of the infinitive action: *pallarba odurarya kiži čoq polyan* 'There was no one who could take care of the children'.

Thus, the infinitive forms classical relative clauses. It may also function as a headless relative clause as in: *Shor Čiš par iżerge teze čoq* 'There is food, but there is nothing to drink'.

Some combinations of the infinitive with head nouns may show a strong tendency toward grammaticalization due to the modal semantics of the head noun: *Shor sayış* 'thought, desire', *kögnü* 'one's soul, desire', *tem* 'time', *küş* 'power, strength', etc., e.g.: *Aaŋ ürgenerge sayışi par* 'S/he wants to study', *Perilgen išti püdürege küžibis alar ba?* 'Do we have enough power to do the work that we were given?' (for such phraseological constructions expressing intention see 4.4.)

Among all the infinitive functions, the most important ones are those fulfilled in combinations with head predicates. Such combinations are notorious for their liability to being grammaticalized; this feature can be considered a language universal.

2. Combinations of the infinitive with host predicates

2.1. Parameters of classification

We apply several formal criteria:

- (a) What part of speech the head word belongs to: whether it is a verbal (2.2.) or a nominal (2.3.) lexeme.
- (b) How the infinitive agent is expressed (*subjective* versus *objective* infinitive).
- (c) Which position the infinitive occupies (complement or adjunct position).

Semantic criteria play a subordinate role. They are as follows:

- (a) Whether the head word is fully lexical or partially / fully grammaticalized.
- (b) The semantics of the head word.

2.2. The infinitive with a verbal host predicate. Subjective and objective infinitives

Among combinations of the infinitive with a verbal predicate, one finds so-called *subjective* and *objective* infinitives. The agent of a subjective infinitive is the subject of the matrix clause, whereas that of an objective infinitive is the object: *Altay Kündülerge sanaŋan* 'He wanted to treat (somebody to some food)' versus *Sler adaarya işterge čaptıq edejdeer* 'You are interfering with your father's work (You are preventing your father from working)'. The objective infinitive construction often

represents the raising of the subject of an embedded clause in causative constructions.

2.2.1. Constructions with subjective infinitives

Several types can be distinguished according to the semantics of dominating predicates.

1. Constructions of intention to fulfill an action. Dominating predicates have the semantics of mental perception or intention (see 3). The infinitive is their second actant:

Altay

Meni qol-yo tud-arya sanan-yan e-di-ŋ?
 I-ACC hand-DAT hold-INFIN think-PART:PAST be-PRET-2.SG
 'Did you want to hold me in your arms?'

Existential verbs and verbs with the most abstract semantics of action (e.g. 'to do') also can head constructions of intention: Shor *kelerge etken* 's/he wanted to come'. Since they completely lose their lexical semantics and serve as auxiliaries, such combinations can be evaluated as analytical modal verb forms (see 4).

2. Constructions of adaptation. Dominating predicates are verbs of knowledge and verbs of acquisition of knowledge, e.g. Shor *uŋna-* 'to know, to be able', *ürŋen-* 'to study', *qin-* 'to get used to, come to love', etc. They express the modality of possibility of an action by virtue of the inner abilities of its agent. Such combinations also tend to be grammaticalized. Some of them are very close to analytical modal forms, since the head verb has acquired a modal meaning, e.g. Shor *uŋna-*: *Men nek sayarya uŋnapčam* 'I know how to milk a cow (= I can milk a cow)'; *Men ürŋen paryam erten turarya* 'I have got used to getting up early (= I can get up early)'; *Ol peš čašta qirarya ürŋenip alyan* 'S/he learned to read when s/he was five (= S/he could read)'.

In the combination with the verb *uŋna-*, the Shor infinitive competes with the *-(I)p* converb: *Men nek sayip uŋnapčam*. This is a new development in Shor.

3. Emotive constructions. The infinitive is governed by an emotive or evaluative predicate, the components tend to have a unitary syntactic function—that of a compound modal predicate: Shor *kölen-* 'to love to do something', *qooruq-* 'to be afraid', *uya-* 'to be ashamed', *örün-* 'to be glad', *küčsün-* 'to find it hard to do something, to try', *egeniš-* 'to feel awkward doing something', *arxastan-* 'to be lazy', etc. The head verb expresses an attitude to the infinitive action: *Aydarya uyačir* 'S/he feels ashamed to say (that)'. The infinitive is its second actant: Shor *Arxas toolanarya da argastanča* 'A lazy-bones is too lazy even to think'.

Altay

Bu qožon-dī qožondo-ryo oboyon-ī
 this song-ACC sing-INFIN husband-POSS.3.SG

qorquštu süü-jten bol-yon.
 awfully love-PART:FUT be-PAST
 'Her husband loved to sing this song very much.'

4. Prospective constructions (see 1.2.)

5. Combinations with phasal semantics. These combinations occupy a special place among constructions with a subordinate infinitive: On the one hand, the dominating phasal predicate ('to begin', 'to go on', 'to stop', 'to finish', etc.) preserves its lexical semantics; on the other hand, such constructions refer to a certain stage of an action. The phasal meaning of these verbs is an auxiliary one in itself. Such verbs are always used together with a lexical verb, if the latter is not omitted for pragmatic reasons: Russian *Ja načala koftu* literally: 'I started a pullover' means *Ja načala vjazat' (ili šit') koftu* 'I started to knit (or to sew) a pullover'. In Turkic languages, such combinations are not less grammaticalized than in Russian, to say the least: Here, the lexical component usually has a converbial form *-(I)p*. However, one often encounters the infinitive in this position. Since almost all Turkic speakers in South Siberia are bilingual, one can suppose that the infinitive is penetrating this sphere under Russian influence. Another characteristic feature of such constructions is that the infinitive action is factive here.

(a) Phasal constructions in Siberian Turkic can denote the *starting point* of an action: Shor *pašta-*, *paža-*, *šiğ-*, *kir-* 'to begin, to start'. In Shor, the infinitive competes against the converb *-(I)p* in the combinations with the verbs *šiğ-* and *pašta-*: *Pis on častaj ala išterge pažadibis* 'We began to work when we were ten (literally: since ten years)'. *Kün am ne šiğqanda, pis paliqtarğa / paliqtap šiqtibis*. 'As soon as the sun rose, we started fishing'.

(b) Phasal constructions with the infinitive can denote the *finishing point* of an action. An action can be finished because it has reached its terminal point, or it can be interrupted. In Siberian Turkic languages, the first semantic variant is expressed by analytical constructions with the *-(I)p* converb. Such constructions usually combine the terminative meaning with that of the *Aktionsart* type: in Shor *paylap aldım* 'I have knit', the form *-(I)p al-* expresses an action performed to benefit its agent: 'I have knit something for myself'. The second semantic variant, that of an interrupted action, is expressed by infinitive constructions with the verbs *toqta-* 'to stop, to interrupt', *tašta-* 'to stop, to give up': Shor *Ol kelgen poyubıla, ižerge taštadı* 'He came back and gave up drinking'.

In South Siberian Turkic languages, there are no phasal verbs of resuming or continuing an action, i.e. an action in progress, as found in Indo-European languages: 'to go on', 'to continue', 'to resume', 'to commence', etc. To resume an action means to start it again; therefore the constructions of the first group are used to express this semantics in Turkic. An action in progress is expressed by analytical *Aktionsart* constructions with converbs.

6. Constructions of the purpose of motion. These are free combinations of a subordinate infinitive with a verb of motion. The infinitive occupies an adjunct position.

Shor

Mus par-īs-qan soon-da, pis suγ
ice go-PERF-PART:PAST back-LOC we river

töbere paliqta-rγa en-er-is.
downwards fish-INFIN descend-FUT-1.PL

‘After the ice has flowed away, we will go fishing down the river.’

7. Constructions of the purpose of a voluntary action. The infinitive combines with a wide range of verbs denoting a voluntary action. It occupies an adjunct position in this case, too. Therefore it can also combine with verbs belonging to the above-mentioned classes as their adjunct. The infinitive expresses the purpose of the action of a superordinate verb. Such constructions are mostly same-subject ones: *Amza-arya sad-īp alyan* ‘He bought (it) to taste (it)’.

In a different-subject construction of purpose, the predicate of the subordinated clause is usually not an infinitive, but the imperative form of the third person along with the conjunction *dep / tep* (an *-(I)p* converb of the verb of speech *te-* ‘to say, to speak’): *Amza-zīn de-p sad-īp alyan* ‘S/he¹ bought it for her/him² to taste’.

In exceptional cases, the infinitive can appear in a different-subject construction with the semantics of purpose. In Shor, the agent of the infinitive action can be expressed by a nominal phrase in the dative or, very rarely, in the nominative case: *Pis qışqıda sooqqa toybasqaya, içem ödük tiq pergen* ‘So that we would not get cold in winter, my mother sewed boots’; or *Qışqıda sooqqa toybasqaya, içem piske ödük tiq pergen*.

8. Constructions of the consequences of an involuntary action. Verbs of an involuntary action do not have a component of purpose in their semantics. Therefore, the infinitive can only express consequences of such actions: Shor *Ani çolap pararya, arya moynun tiğiyalaq* ‘You are not strong enough, to follow him (literally: Your spine and your neck have not yet got strong enough, (for you) to follow him)’.

It is only in the last three types of constructions that the infinitive has modal and temporal characteristics of its own: It denotes a prospective potential action.

2.2.2. Objective (causative) infinitive constructions

In them, the subject of the matrix clause causes the subject of the embedded clause to fulfill the infinitive action. In Turkic and Mongolic languages, there are special voice forms expressing causation. The constructions with the objective infinitive represent an analytical way of expressing the causative diathesis. The host predicates are:

- (a) causative verbs of adaptation: Shor *üret-* ‘to teach’ (causative), cf. *üren-* ‘to study’ (non-causative), *sal-* ‘to predetermine’: Shor *Saya uluγ quday salyan*

- iygi qolunañ alıp çayalarğa* 'The great God predestined that you should create strongmen from both hands of yours';
- (b) verbs of positive or negative influence on the infinitive action: *poluř-* 'to help', *aarlıř-* 'to interfere', *pořat-* 'to allow to go', *al-* 'to accept someone for a joint action': *Meni oynarğa alzar!* 'Let me play with you (lit.: take me to play)!';
- (c) causative verbs of speech: *sura-* 'to ask', *ayt-* 'to say, to order', *per-* 'to allow', *qıır-* 'to call, to invite to come (in the direction of the speaker)', *ıs-* 'to send, to cause to go (from the speaker)': *Shor Qıs qarındařım aya pararğa maya ayçır* 'My friend advises me to marry him'.

2.3. Infinitive constructions with nominal predicates

2.3.1. Constructions with the infinitive in the complement position

The infinitive usually occupies the position of the first actant of such predicates. A copula is needed to refer the situation to the past or to the future, to present it as desired or possible, or to negate it. The agent of the infinitive action can be introduced by a nominal phrase in the dative case. The infinitive action is factive in evaluative and commentative constructions, non-factive in expressive ones and either factive or non-factive in modal constructions.

1. *Evaluative constructions.* Infinitives may be headed by propositional attitude predicates, i.e. nominal predicates with evaluative semantics: *Shor çaqřı* 'good, right', *çabal* 'bad', *uyat* 'shame, shameful'. The infinitive denotes a factive situation which is evaluated: *Shor Andıy nebeni aydarğa da uyat* 'It is shameful even to say such a thing'; *Sooq kün kebege çülinarğa çaqřı polar edi* 'It would be good to get warm by the stove on a cold day'; *Altay O-ğo d'añısqan d'ad-arğa qunuqçıl* 'It is boring for her to live alone'.

2. *Commentative constructions* are formed by nominal commentative predicates: *Shor küř* 'difficult', *nıñnaq* 'easy' etc. The infinitive denotes a situation which is commented upon: *Pararğa raq* 'It is far to go', *Qazarğa küř polyan* 'It was difficult to cut (it off)'.

3. *Expressive constructions* are used for rhetorical questions with interrogative pronouns: *Shor qayde* 'how', *qayarğa* 'where', *qaçan* 'when', etc.: *Aydarğa qayde!* 'How to say (that)! (= It is impossible to say that!)', *Pararğa qayarğa!* 'Where to go! (= It is no place to go!)'.

4. *Modal constructions* contain nominal predicates: *Shor kerek* 'it is necessary', *çarabas* 'it is impossible, it is prohibited', *keliřpes* 'it is not suitable': *Eede iřpeske kereksiğ noo!* 'It is impossible for you to drink so much!', *Şıyarğa keliřpes* 'It is not suitable to go out', *Seeñ adiñdi maya adarğa çarabas* 'I am not allowed to call you by name'.

2.3.2. Constructions with the infinitive in the adjunct position

The infinitive expresses consequences of an involuntary action: *Shor Men qara pol pardım qıstap çörerge* 'I have become too old for courting girls'.

3. Intention constructions. Constructions headed by verbs of intention proper

In each of the above-mentioned constructions, the properties of both the infinitive and the head entity should be investigated in detail. They depend on different structural and semantic parameters: The semantics, mood and tense characteristics of the head entity, the semantics of the verb in the infinitive form, the presence of negation, etc. Quite often such combinations are grammaticalized as analytical phasal or modal verb forms.

These constructions can express phasal or modal semantics of different types (of a desired, possible, probable, etc. action).

Particular meanings of a certain type can be described as a semantic field organized around a central meaning which they all share. Various language means expressing this semantics can be perceived as a functional field. Among infinitive constructions, those denoting intention, possibility, the phasal structure of an action, etc. can be distinguished.

Modal semantics of such constructions can be specified by different factors (an animate or inanimate subject, voluntary or involuntary infinitive action, etc.). Therefore, one construction can belong to several functional fields which, thus, overlap. Conversely, a number of constructions of different formal types can belong to the same functional field: They can complement one another or offer the speaker a choice of synonymous means of expression.

We shall now take a closer look at the properties of infinitive constructions constituting the functional field of intention.

Infinitive constructions of intention refer to a stage preceding the starting point of an action, i.e. they refer to a non-actual, anticipated action. Their semantics varies from the desire to do something to the approaching of the terminal point after which the action actually starts.

In South Siberian Turkic, this stage is expressed solely by infinitive constructions with verbal or nominal head entities. In these constructions, the infinitive denotes a non-factive action. Such constructions are opposed to language means denoting an actual action, e.g. phasal and *Aktionsart* constructions with converbs or various aspecto-temporal finite forms referring to a habitual action (non-focal forms), to an action in progress (focal forms) or to its completion, its results and consequences (terminal and postterminal forms) (Johanson 1971).

The term *intention* is used generically to define the whole semantic field of a desired, intended, planned action: The meaning of intention is most central and is shared by all language means of this field. The term *intention* also designates one stage of the preparation for an action.

Intention presupposes an animate agent who is planning a voluntary and controlled action. However, some formally intentional patterns can be used when the infinitive subject is inanimate or the infinitive action is totally or partially uncontrolled. In this case, these constructions denote the approaching of the infinitive action: They predict or forecast it. The speaker has to make a prediction that some action is approaching, judging by certain signs or his or her knowledge of the world.

Thus, these constructions also belong to another functional field, that of prediction or forecasting that an action will take place. They are close in meaning to participial and infinitive prospective constructions (see 1.2.). South Siberian Turkic infinitive constructions allow one not only to predict an action, but also to evaluate the relative time span until its starting point.

The functional fields of intention and forecast have much in common: They both express a potential, non-factive action. They partially overlap: Constructions that primarily express intention may also have a prognostic meaning. Since prediction, forecast and the approaching of an action are secondary semantic variants of some intention constructions, we will mention them along with the principal variants of those constructions.

3.1. Parameters of describing intention constructions

They are as follows:

1. The place of a construction on a scale marking the *stages of preparation for an action*: Desire – intention – decision – declaration of intentions – planning – preparation – readiness – attempt – terminal point (at the brink of doing something) – starting point (it is already excluded from this field). This scale is at the same time a research instrument and a result of research: There has been a continuous back and forth between devising the scale itself and applying it in order to determine which stage of preparation for an action the Turkic languages distinguish.¹³
2. Negation in the constructions of intention.
3. Unexpected decision versus planning.
4. The degree of intention: neutral, low, high.
5. Unrealized intention.
6. Feigned intention.
7. Other individual characteristics of a construction.
8. The relative time distance to the starting point of an action. It cannot be measured in hours or seconds. It can be defined only in relative terms. The speaker's emotions, the context and the speech situation can and do interfere in the evaluation of the time necessary for an action to start.

The first two parameters are relevant for all the constructions. The remaining criteria are individual properties of particular constructions.

3.2. Constructions headed by verbs of intention proper (non-idiomatic intention constructions)

In a given South Siberian Turkic language, about a dozen verbs combining with a subordinated infinitive form constructions with the semantics of intention, willing-

¹³ The phasal structure of an action and stages preceding the moment when the action begins were described in Xrakovskij 1983.

ness or readiness (or, in the negative form, unwillingness, non-readiness) to start an action denoted by the infinitive. Those are mostly modal lexico-semantic variants of polysemantic verbal lexemes. Combining with the infinitive, they preserve their lexical meaning. This distinguishes them from idiomatic analytical constructions of intention formed by existential verbs and allows them to better express one or the other nuance of this semantics.

If we try to order these constructions along the axis desire – intention – decision – planning – preparation – readiness – attempt – action, i.e. according to the increasing readiness for an action and the approaching of the starting point of this action, we obtain approximately four groups of constructions.

The first group denotes the stage when a desire to fulfill an action takes shape, becoming first an idea to do something and then an intention, and the planning begins. It is a totally internal stage, as there are no visible indications of intentions or preparatory actions: Altay *sanan-* ‘think, want, intend, plan’, *šuun-* ‘think over, plan’, *umzan-* ‘hope, intend’, *d’asta-* ‘to be going to do something’, Khakas *sanan-* ‘to want, to think over’, *xīn-* ‘to want to do something, to like to do something (it is the desire for and expectation of something pleasant for an agent in case s/he does it)’, *sagīn-* ‘to plan, to think over’, Shor *sana-* ‘to wish’, *ižen-* ‘to hope’, *sayış par, sayış toolan-* ‘to think over, to plan’.

The second group refers to the stage when the intention is strong. The agent has already decided to fulfill an action, the decision may be announced in public: Altay *tidin-* ‘to decide, to dare to do something’, Khakas *čarat-* ‘to decide’, Shor *sal-* ‘to decide’, *sös per-* ‘to promise’, *tap-* ‘to decide unexpectedly’ and verbs of the first group with markers of a completed action.

The third group denotes the stage of preparation for an action: The agent is not ready to start it; s/he has to fulfill some preparatory actions, but the planned action has not yet started: Altay *beleten-* ‘get ready’, *šiydīn-* ‘get ready’, Khakas *timnen-, tirīn-* ‘to get ready’, Shor *temnen-, pelenen-* ‘to get ready’, *čöpteš-* ‘to plan to do something together’.

The fourth group refers to the stage of readiness to fulfill an action: The agent is internally ready for an action; s/he may be in a hurry to fulfill it or even try to do it without any preparation, skipping the previous two stages. It may be an unsuccessful attempt, but nevertheless constitutes an attempt to carry out an action: Altay *al-badan-* ‘to strive, try’, *kičeen-* ‘to make efforts, try’, *amada-* ‘to strive’, *meñde-* ‘to be in a hurry’, *küyüren-* ‘to try’, *čeneš-, čīramayt-* ‘to try’, Khakas *xaras-* ‘to try, make efforts’, *sīren-* ‘to try hard’, *kūšten-* ‘to do one’s best, try very hard’, *mañzīra-, minde-* ‘to be in a hurry, try to fulfill an action without any preparation’, Shor *mañzīra-, mañna-* ‘to be in a hurry to do something’ *kičen-* ‘to make efforts, try’, *kūšten-* ‘to try hard, do one’s best’, *kör-* ‘to try’.

Idiomatic constructions of intention complement this picture. They either denote a general intention to fulfill an action, or refer to the very last stage of the preparation for an action, approaching the terminal point after which the action starts (see Section 4).

This division into groups is very tentative since many verbs can vary their semantics in different contexts and should be assigned to more than one group. The first and the fourth groups are the largest ones. They are represented by a variety of synonymous constructions.

The more frequently a verb is used, the more semantic nuances it can convey. The most frequent are the verbs *sanan-* in Altay and Khakas and *sana-* in Shor. Their primary meaning is 'to think'. Combining with infinitives, they express the meaning 'to want, intend to do something'. These verbs are the central ones in the first group of intention proper.

The verbs of the fourth group (*albadan-* 'to intend, strive, try' in Altay, Khakas *xaras-* 'to try, make efforts', *kičen-* in Shor) are also very frequent; they hold the second place. They express the stage of readiness to fulfill an action. Both *sanan-* and *albadan-* attract verbs with closely related semantics. The meaning of intention is the leading semantic component of those verbs, although certain nuances can be found. The centre is surrounded by a periphery of other verbs with more 'specific semantics.

All these constructions are opposed to idiomatic ones in that each head verb preserves its individual lexical meaning. However, these verbs themselves are not fully lexical; alone, they cannot form a predicate for both structural and semantic reasons. They express modal semantics, i.e. an attitude to another action. In order to form a predicate, they have to combine with another verb, a fully lexical one, usually in the infinitive form.

In general, in analytical modal constructions of predicates, a lexical verb may be in another non-finite form, converbial or participial, but verbs of intention combine with infinitives. It is very natural for these verbs to combine with infinitives. Their valency oriented to the infinitive is strong, obligatory and invariable: The infinitive does not compete against any non-finite form or nouns in this position. The resulting constructions are neutral in the stylistic or expressive respect; they lack any connotations or evaluations. This allows them to appear in different contexts and to express various additional nuances and meanings. Therefore, they are rendered into English by various equivalents. This, however, does not indicate their polysemy, since all these nuances and meanings are contained in their semantics and are actualized in different contexts.

3.3. Intention constructions of the first group (the desire stage)

The construction *-(A)rGA sanan- / sana-* has a very broad and "pure" semantics of wish, desire, intention to fulfill an action that has not begun to be realized. In different contexts it expresses the meanings 'to think, want, intend to do something', sometimes it can be translated as 'to be going to do something', but no preparatory steps are taken for the action to be realized.

This construction often expresses different nuances of the desire to fulfill an action, an inner orientation of a person to an action:

Altay

Kör-örgö sana-yan d'e iyla-p
 see-*INFIN* think-*PAST* but cry-*CONV*

tur-up ne-ni kör-zin!
 stand:*aux.*-*CONV* what-*ACC* see-*IMP.3SG*
 'He wanted to have a look, but what can one see while crying!'

Pavlov uyal-a ber-gen-diy kenetiyin
 Pavlov be ashamed-*CONV* give:*aux.*-*PART-PAST-COMPAR* suddenly

oro tur-arya sanan-ala d'e tur-up bol-bo-dī.
PRTCL stand-*INFIN* think-*CONV* but stand-*CONV* be:*aux.*-*NEG-PRET*
 'Pavlov reacted as if he were ashamed. Suddenly, he wanted to stand up, but he could not.'

Shor

Qaryan aŋčī poy-u-niŋ čat-qan
 old hunter self-*POSS.3SG-GEN* live-*PART:past*

čer-i-n kör-üp al-arya sana-yan.
 land-*POSS.3SG.ACC* see-*CONV* take:*aux.*-*INFIN* think-*PAST*
 'The old hunter wanted to see the place where he had lived.'

The construction can be negated in two ways: The negation affix may be added to the modal verb or to the infinitive. In the first case, it is the modal component that is negated: Shor *Pararya sanabaan* 'S/he did not want to go'. The construction with the negative form of the infinitive expresses the opposite: An intention not to fulfill an action. Quite often the intention remains unrealized: Khakas *Parbasqa sayiňyan...* 'S/he didn't want to go, but...':

Altay

Arina tura-zin ber-beske sana-yan.
 Arina house-*POSS.3SG.ACC* give-*INFIN:neg* think-*PAST*

'Arina did not want to give her house (for the school: she wanted to live in it, but then she agreed to give it for the school).'

Even the positive form can denote an unrealized intention, if the intention refers to the past tense. (In general, intention expressed by the head verb in the past tense often remains unrealized.) Then the sentence contains certain signals indicating that the action was not carried out: Altay *Ol turyuza la Abaydi aldirarya sananyan, d'e ...* 'He wanted to invite Abay, but ...'.

The Altay verbs *šuun-* 'to think, decide', *umzan-* 'to intend, hope', *tidin-* 'to decide', *d'asta-* 'to intend, be going to do something', Khakas *xin-* 'to want to do something, like to do something', *sayin-* 'to plan, think over', Shor *ižen-* 'to hope', *sayış par, sayış toolan-* 'to think over, plan' are close to *sanan-* in meaning: Shor *Sen*

toolančadiŋ ma aarŋma erbekterge? 'Are you going to speak to him?'; Khakas *Pīdi toŋazip aŋaa čooxtap pirerge sayiŋam* 'This way I wanted to meet him and tell him all'; *Pistīŋ mallarni aylandir pirgenineger čooxtap pirerge sayiŋčam* 'I want to tell how our cattle was given back to us'.

The Altay verb *amada-* 'to aim at, intend, seek' expresses a firm intention:

Bis öskö albatī-lar-dīŋ biyik le byalıq
 we other people-PL-GEN high PRTCL rich
kul'tura-zī-la baza taniž-arya amada-y-dī-s.
 culture-POSS.3SG-COMIT also make.acquaintance-INFIN aim-PRES-1PL
 'We also want to get acquainted with the high and rich cultures of other peoples.'

In these constructions, either the intention itself or the infinitive action may be negated, but some head verbs do not allow for the infinitive to be negated, e.g. Khakas *-(A)rGA xīn-: Irīstīg sīxzčalar gazetalar. Annar pu gazetaa pazīnarŋa xīnminča* 'Boring newspapers are published; therefore people do not want to subscribe to those newspapers'. It would be impossible to say **gazetaa pazīnmasxa xīnča*.

In Khakas and Shor, the verbs *sanan-* and *sana-* are grammaticalized to a greater degree than in Altay. They may combine with an animate subject. In this case, they denote the approaching of the starting point of the infinitive action: Shor *Čol qararŋa sanapča* 'The road is going to get black (before the snow has completely melted)'.

3.4. Intention constructions of the second group (the decision stage)

The moment of making a decision, logically following the stage of desire, is not often expressed by a specialized construction in South Siberian Turkic languages. Here, the verbs of intention proper with a marker of a completed action may denote the moment of decision; with the Shor and Khakas marker *-(I)bls*¹⁴ they may also have the meaning of an unexpected decision. The following Altay and Khakas examples illustrate the meaning 'to decide' expressed by the verbs of intention proper: Altay *sanan-* and *šuun-* in the analytical form of an action directed to the agent himself *-(I)p al-* and Khakas *sayiŋ-* with the perfective marker *-(I)bls*:

Aq Boro-ni o-noŋ umčila-rya tīn sanan-īp al-dī-m.
 Aq Boro-ACC that-ABL feed-INFIN firm think-CONV take:aux.-PRET-1SG
 'After that I firmly decided to feed Ak Boro from a baby bottle.'

Jaš bala-zī-n čida-d-īp al-arya
 small child-POSS.3SG-ACC bear-CAUS-CONV take:aux.-INFIN

¹⁴ The marker goes back to an analytical construction, *-(I)p iŋs-*, where *iŋs-* is the auxiliary verb 'to send'.

bol-up, d'alč'i bol-orɣo bīžu šuun-īp al-dī.
 be-CONV servant be-INFIN PRTCL decide-CONV take:aux.-PRET
 'In order to bring up a small child, he decided to become a servant.'

Naa čil-ɣa ir-ī ipč'i-zīn-e
 new year-DAT husband-POSS.3SG wife-POSS.3SG-DAT
pīree sīyīx it pir-erge sayīn-ībīs-tī.
 one present to give:aux.-INFIN think-PERF-PRET
 'The husband decided to give a present to his wife for New Year's.'

However, there are several more or less specialized decision constructions. The Khakas verb *čarat-* 'to decide, have a firm intention' refers to the moment of arriving at a decision, it denotes the declaration of intentions: *Paza la polbasta, Tais anī inneg turazınzar apararya čaratxan* 'When there was no other way out, Tais decided to take him to the hospital'; *Xisnaŋ ool xon salarya čarat saldılar* 'The boy and the girl decided to get married'.

In Altay, the verb *d'asta-* has the meaning 'to intend, to decide', if its agent is a person. If the subject of this verb is an object or a natural force, the verb expresses the meaning of the approaching of the infinitive action:

Emdi azıra-ɣan bala-m-dī baz-arya d'asta-dī.
 now feed-PART child-POSS.1.SG-ACC kill-INFIN decide-PRET
 'Now he decided to kill my child whom I have brought up.'

Sler-diŋ čer-de ... d'aŋmīrla-rya d'asta-ɣan tur-ba-y.
 you:PL-GEN land-LOC rain-INFIN decide-PART:PAST stand:aux.-NEG-CONV
 'It is going to rain in your place (as I see).'

The Altay verb *tidin-* has the specific meaning 'to pluck up courage to do something, dare to do something'. It is a verb of intention only when it is used with a negation. Otherwise it denotes a completed action. The infinitive cannot be negated. Obviously, one needs to pluck up courage in order to do something and not be passive: *Men bararya tidinip albadīm* 'I did not dare to go'.

In certain contexts, some verbs may acquire the meaning of arriving at a decision, e.g. Shor *tap-* 'to find', which gives a negative evaluation of the decision: *Aqčalīma šabarya qaydaŋ tapqanzīŋ?* 'Why did you unexpectedly decide to beat (a person) without any reason?'

3.5. Intention constructions of the third group (the preparation stage)

The central verbs of the third group, Altay *beleten-*, *šīydin-*, Khakas *timnen-*, *tirīn-* (obsolete), Shor *temnen-*, *pellen-* 'to get ready', presuppose some preparatory measures in order for the action expressed by the infinitive to take place. This corresponds to the preparatory stage. Only the modal component is usually negated (one need not prepare not to do something):

Altay

Emdi de-ze uyuqta-rya beleten-ip otur-dī-s.
 now say-COND sleep-INFIN get ready-CONV sit:aux.-PRET-1.PL
 'And now we are only getting ready to lie down.'

Altay

Qačan Odoy oyto atan-arya šīydīn-a ber-er-de ...
 when Odoy again go-INFIN get ready-CONV give:aux.-PART:fut-LOC
 'When Odoy was again getting ready to go away...'

Khakas

Katarina ülče-zī nīmīrxa-lar xaar-arya timnen-ībīs-ken.
 Katarina grandmother-POSS.3SG egg-PL fry-INFIN get ready-PERF-PAST
 'Grandmother Katarina was going (was getting ready) to fry eggs.'

It is possible to say: *xaararya timnenmeen* 'was not getting ready to fry', but not **xaarbasxa timnenībīsken*, 'was getting ready not to fry', unless there is an alternative, e.g. 'not to fry, but to boil'.

The Shor verb *čöpteš-* presupposes agreement with other people in order to achieve the aim, while *suran-* 'to ask for permission' aims at getting the consent of an authority to fulfill an action: *Qadıy künde körüžerge čöpteštiler* 'They agreed to struggle together in a difficult time'; *Qizim pispile paraşa surančir* 'My daughter is asking to be allowed to go with us'.

The construction with the adjective *belen* 'ready' is semantically close to the above-mentioned ones, although it belongs to another formal type:

Altay

Barıntı-ya atan-arya olor qaži la oydo belen.
 Baratin-DAT go-INFIN they always PRTCL again ready
 'They are always ready to go to Baratin again.'

3.6. Intention constructions of the fourth group (the attempt stage)

The central Altay verb of the fourth group *albadan-* has two main lexico-semantic variants: 'to intend and try to do something' (i.e. to make efforts to achieve something), and 'to strive for, to strongly wish to do something'. The Khakas verb *xaras-* and Shor *kičen-* have similar semantics. They correspond to the stage when the speaker has already firmly decided to carry out an action. The infinitive construction they head, usually in the positive aspect, is semantically quite definite (cf. the construction with the verb *sanan-*). It often has the meaning 'to make efforts to do something'. Here, the speaker conveys not only his or her wish or intention, but also a certain progress in the desired direction; s/he is active, has already started some preparatory actions, s/he is undertaking certain measures to make the desired action happen, s/he is making an attempt to do it:

Altay

O-niŋ učun o-lor Arina-ni d'ol-i-naŋ tuur-a
 that-GEN for:POST that-PL Arina-ACC way-POSS.3.SG-ABL stand-CONV
d'ayla-d-iŋ sal-arya albadan-iŋ, qarındaŋ-ın-a
 make mistake-CAUS-CONV put:aux.-INFIN try-CONV brother-POSS.3.SG-DAT
gorod d'aar d'uzun-d'uur pis'mo-lor sal-iŋ tur-yan-dar.
 city towards:POST various letter-PL put-CONV stand:aux.-PAST-PL
 'Therefore, they strived to make Arina go the wrong way (i.e. make her divorce her husband) and were constantly sending various letters to her brother in town.'

Je an-diy da bol-zo, ulus-tiŋ bičik-ke
 PRTCL that-COMP PRTCL be-COND people-GEN writing-DAT
üren-erge albadan-iŋ tur-yan-ın
 study-INFIN try-CONV stand:aux.-PART:PAST-POSS:3SG-ACC
kezik-te kör-örgö qorquštu bol-yon.
 piece-LOC see-INFIN terrible be-PAST
 'And even if it were so, it was still sometimes terrible to see how hard the people were trying to learn to write.'

The negative infinitive form, although quite rare, is found in this construction more frequently than in the previous ones, since it takes more effort to give up one's intention of doing something after having decided to do it, than to give up the mere idea of doing something. It also demands an effort to persevere and to overcome external circumstances, especially if the infinitive denotes an involuntary spontaneous action: Altay *Odoy yïlbasqa albadanip* 'Odoy tried not to fall down'; *baza Borboq-Qara ... köstörineŋ d'aş içqinbasqa albadanat* '... Borbok-Kara also tried not to cry'. These infinitive actions can be controlled by agents, at least partially, otherwise the construction would denote their starting point.

The following verbs also refer to the stage of an attempt to fulfill an action.

(a) Altay *kičeen-* 'to try, endeavour, do one's best'. Khakas *xaras-* *siren-*, *küsten-*, Shor *kičen-*, *küşten-*: Altay *Biyil d'aqşı tužum al-arya kičeen-er kerek* 'It is necessary to do our best in order to gather a good crop this year'; Khakas *Kem ne polza xiyix-tabızarya xarasça amir kizini* 'Whoever it is, everyone tries to offend a quiet person'.

The Khakas verbs *xaras-*, *küsten-* and *siren-* (similarly to the Shor verbs *kičen-* and *küşten-*) differ in the degree of presupposed efforts a person makes in order to achieve the desired result: *xaras-* is 'to try', *siren-* 'to try hard', *küsten-* 'to do one's best': Čaajı ibire sirgek körergerge *xaraxan* 'The warrior tried to look around alertly'; *Küsküzin Poris pazox toy iderge sirengen* 'In the autumn, Boris tried to make a wedding party again'; *Oyqa pu xiranı püün toozibızarya küstenče* 'Ojka did her best to finish this field today'; *Prayzi prayzin alaaxtırarar küstenče* 'Everyone tries hard to deceive one another'; *Zoya naa školada čaxsi ürgenerge sirengen* 'Zoja tried to study well in another school'.

The last example is interesting in that the scope of intention is limited only to the manner of performing the infinitive action: Zoja went to school and studied in any case, but she tried to study *well*. The presence of an adverb of manner switches the coordinates of intention and changes the modality of the infinitive: The infinitive action takes place, it is actual, factive, indicative, unlike that of infinitives without adverbial modifiers of manner in intention constructions. This switch is possible only if the intention refers to the past.

Negation usually appears on the modal verb in these constructions: Khakas *Ol annaŋar pilerge dee küstenmeen* 'He did not even try to learn about it'; *Oyqa paza til alızaryä küstenminibışken* 'Ojka also did not try to speak'.

(b) *meŋdele-* in the meaning 'to be in a hurry to do something'. One notes that the agent is at the brink of starting an action. Analogous Khakas constructions are headed by *maŋzıra-* / *minde-*, in Shor by *maŋzıra-* / *maŋna-* 'be in a hurry to do something'. They usually require verbs of motion as their second component: Altay *d' erine d' edip alaryä meŋdegender* 'They were in a hurry to return home'; Shor *Men paraŋa maŋzirapčam* 'I am in a hurry to leave'.

If these modal verbs combine with infinitives of other semantic classes, they mean 'to do something quickly': Altay *Bu d' aŋıttı bilerge kiži meŋdebey!* 'I want to learn this secret as soon as possible!'; Khakas *Ol tabırax ot odınaryä maŋzirapčatxan* 'He was in a hurry to make a fire'; "*Kiltır!*" *arıŋ čüregineŋ čooxtıryä maŋzıraan Payusa* "He has arrived!" Pajusa was in a hurry to tell (that) from the bottom of her heart'; Shor *Apşaq pal alaryä maŋziradi* 'The bear was in a hurry to get some honey'.

(c) The stage of an attempt to fulfill an action is expressed by the Altay verbs *čeneş-*, *čirmay-*, *küyüren-* 'to try to fulfill an action'. These verbs denote desire and efforts made to fulfill an action, but they also contain an element of failure. These attempts prove unsuccessful: *Inga ol ulustı ötkönörgö čenežet* 'Inga tries to copy those people (but he cannot do that)'; *boyın bo aysa olordı ba toqunadaryä čirmayıp...* 'trying to soothe either himself or them ... (but he failed)'.

(d) The Altay verb *mekele-* occupies a specific position on this scale of intention. Its primary lexical meaning is 'to deceive', but it does not have the valency to join an infinitive in this case. When used with an infinitive, it expresses a pretended action—an intention to fulfill or, with negation, not to fulfill an action on purpose: *kör-böskö mekele-* 'to make an appearance as if not to notice, pretend not to notice' (the agent pretends that s/he is not fulfilling an action expressed by the infinitive).

The semantics of the constructions of this group do not allow for the infinitive to have an inanimate subject, since efforts and attempts to fulfill an action demand free will and conscience; they also presuppose a voluntary action.

4. Infinitive analytical constructions with existential verbs

This group consists of more or less idiomatic constructions; their auxiliary component is represented by the existential proper verb *pol-* 'to be' and by positional verbs and verbs of motion also used as existential ones in South Siberian Turkic, e.g. *tur-* 'to stand', *d'at-* / *čat-* 'to lie, live', *d'ür-* / *čör-* 'to go', *otur-* / *odur-* 'to sit'. Along

with existential verbs, some other verbs are used in similar constructions: *et-* / *it-* ‘to do’ in Khakas and Shor, *d’et-* / *čet-* ‘to reach’ in Altay, Khakas and Shor. The constructions discussed here are termed “idiomatic” because their meanings are not the sum of their components and cannot be extracted from them, e.g. ‘to stand to lie down’ means ‘to intend to lie down’, etc. All these constructions express intention and readiness for some action or the meaning ‘to be at the brink of doing something, to be about to do something’ with animate infinitive agents, and the prognosis and approaching of the infinitive action if its subject is inanimate. In the latter case, different constructions denote a different time distance to the starting point of the action.

As in the constructions with verbs of intention, negation is used very rarely in these constructions, too. In constructions of general intention, both components can be negated. In constructions with the meaning ‘to be about to do something, to be at the brink of doing something’, negation never occurs. These constructions usually refer to the past or present. When such a construction refers to the past, it quite often denotes an unrealized intention, especially when the infinitive action is negated.

Within a language, such constructions constitute a special subsystem; the more forms it contains, the more complex it is.

4.1. Altay idiomatic construction of intention

This system in Altay includes all the above-mentioned forms, except the verb *et-*, which is most active in Khakas and Shor in this role. The centre of this system is occupied by the form *-(A)rGA tur-*. All the constructions express a very general meaning of intention which is realized as the desire, intention or readiness to fulfill the infinitive action in certain contexts, but each construction has its own semantic nuance. These nuances are mostly obvious when different existential verbs appear in the same surrounding, combining with the same lexical verb. However, thanks to the specificity of the semantics of each auxiliary verb, it can and usually does combine with verbs of certain lexical classes, somehow corresponding to it in meaning. Therefore, infinitives in a construction are not always freely interchangeable.

1. The construction *-(A)rGA tur-* expresses readiness for an action:

O-niŋ qarandaš-tar-ın-a la ene-zin-e
 he-GEN brother-PL-POSS.3.SG-DAT PRTCL mother-POSS.3.SG-DAT
apar-arğa tur-ğan sıy-ı uy-dıŋ
 bring-INFIN stand:aux.-PART:PAST present-POSS.3.SG beef-GEN

altı bolčoq qayna-t-qan ed-i.
 six piece cook-CAUS-PART:PAST meat-POSS.3.SG
 ‘The present which he wanted to bring to his brothers and to his mother was these six pieces of cooked beef.’

Qandıy čast’-tar-ın öt-kön-in
 which military unit-PL-POSS.3.SG.ACC pass-PART:PAST-POSS.3.SG.ACC

bil-ip al-arya tur-yan.
 learn-CONV take:aux.-INFIN stand:aux.-PAST
 'He wanted to learn which military units were passing by.'

Teskeple-erge tur-yan nemec-ter-diŋ
 retreat-INFIN stand-PART:PAST German-PL-GEN

pexota-zin iste-p, joq et-sin
 infantry-POSS.3.SG.ACC track-CONV, there is no do-IMP.3.SG
 'Let them track the German infantry, which is about to retreat, and annihilate it!'

The infinitive can be formed from a compound verb:

Or-i-naŋ tüz-ele, ol qayırçaŋ-ı-niŋ
 bed-POSS.3.SG.ABL stand-CONV she chest-POSS.3.SG-GEN

üst-in-e jad-ıp al-arya tur-yan.
 top-POSS.3.SG-DAT lie-CONV take:aux.-INF stand:aux.-PAST
 'Having stood up from the bed, she wanted to lie down on the chest.'

Jay bašta-l-za, kolxozçı-lar ölöŋ iŋ-in-e
 summer begin-PASS-CONV collective farmer-PL grass work-POSS.3.SG-DAT

kir-gelek-te, bar-ıp kel-erge tur-yan.
 enter-PART:UNACCOMPL-LOC go-CONV come-INFIN stand-PAST
 'When summer came, before the collective farmers had started mowing the grass, she wanted to go (to her aunt) and come back.'

If the subject of the infinitive action is inanimate, the analytical construction denotes an action which is about to start, as compared to the intention or readiness to start an action expressed by the same construction with an animate subject: *Qazan emdi de qayn-arya tur-di* 'Qazan is just about to boil'.

This construction may express the meaning 'to be at the brink of doing something':

Şura bar-arya tur-yan kiŋi
 Şura go-INFIN stand:aux.-PART:PAST person
bol-up, eŋik-ke juuqta-p kel-di.
 be-CONV, door-DAT approach-CONV come-PRET
 'Şura pretended that she was going to leave and came to the door.'

It may involve an action which was about to happen but was not carried out:

Küdreş onı yudruqta-p iy-erge tur-ala,
 Küdreş he.ACC beat-CONV beat-INFIN stand:CONV

2. The construction *-(A)rGA d'at-* expresses a similar meaning: readiness for an action, desire and intention to do it, but the meaning is more intense. A second difference is that *-(A)rGA tur-* expresses a general intention, it does not refer it to a certain time, whereas *-(A)rGA d'at-* denotes an intention that refers to the given moment, the action is to start the very next moment—it is an actual intention:

More often than the previous one, this construction denotes that an action is approaching its starting point:

This difference in the semantics of the two constructions becomes more obvious when we compare phrases with identical lexical entities as their first element: *Sen de bala azîrarya d'adî* 'And you want to bring up a child'. Here, the action of giving birth to a child and bringing him / her up is seen as taking place in the nearest future, without any delay. The sentence *Sen de bala azîrarya turîj* is translated into English practically the same way, but its meaning is slightly different: the intention to give birth to a child and bring him / her up is quite firm, but the realization of this intention is planned for some time further off in the future.

However, along with idiomatic constructions of intention, *d'at-* can be used as a lexical verb that dominates over an infinitive form. It preserves its lexical meaning then, while the infinitive denotes the aim of its action. Sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between these two possibilities. In the following sentence, it is clear that a person is really lying and getting ready to stand up:

D'aan kiži uzaq uyuqta-yla,
 old man long sleep-CONV
oyyon-orɣo – oyyon-orɣo d'at-qan-diy.
 wake-INFIN wake-INFIN lie-PART:PAST-COMP
 'When an old man sleeps for a long time, it is as if he has to struggle to wake up.'

3. The construction with the verb *d'et-* / *čet-* 'to reach' occupies a special place. The verb partially preserves its lexical meaning. This construction is on the borderline of intention. In the positive aspect, it means that a desired action has been fulfilled. Thus, it is no longer a construction of intention. In this latter case the construction belongs to another semantic field—that of the phasal structure of an actual action. However, in the negative aspect, it means that the attempt to fulfill an action was interrupted, it was not carried out to the end, although the agent intended to do so. In this case, it can still be considered a construction of intention:

Men ermek ayd-arya d'et-keleg-im-de,
 I word say-INFIN reach-PART:unaccompl.-POSS:1.SG-LOC,
ald-im-da tur-yan tanış emes kiži ayd-at ...
 front-POSS.1.SG-LOC stand-PART:past stranger person say-PRES
 'Before I could say a word, a stranger standing in front of me said ...'

This construction can denote the approaching of an action's starting point: *Baş dep neme boş aylanarya d'etti* 'He felt dizzy (literally: the thing called 'a head' was about to go round)'.

Sometimes, this construction denotes the sufficiency of an action and the desire to stop it. In certain contexts, the previous phrase could mean: 'Enough of my head going round!' In this case, it is also not an intention construction. Thus, the following utterance can be understood in three ways: *Tört lo sarɣara küyerge d'etti* 'He has turned completely yellow' or 'He is about to turn quite yellow' or 'Enough of his turning yellow'.

4. The construction *-(A)rGA otur-* differs from the previous ones in that the verb *otur-* will probably never be completely desemanticized. It also expresses intention or desire, but it always refers to an action which is carried out while sitting: *alančiqta qonoryo oturyan mečirtke* 'an owl that was going to spend the night sitting by the tent'. Another example:

Emeš tīnan-ip al-arya otur-yan-im bu.
 well rest-CONV take-INFIN sit-PART:PAST-POSS.1.SG this
 'Well, here I am going to have a rest.' Or: 'Here I am sitting in order to have a rest.'

The specificity of its semantics is also revealed in the similar lexical distribution:

Qara onı qorquştı çeberle-p uyuqta-arya d'at-qan-da ...
 Qara he-ACC awful care-CONV sleep-INFIN lie:aux.-PART:PAST-LOC
 'When Kara was going to sleep, taking much care of him ...'

Here, *uyuqtaarya d'atqanda* means that he was already lying in his bed and was going to fall asleep; *uyuqtaarya oduryanda* would mean that he was intending to lie down, but hadn't yet done so. The verb *odur-* introduces the meaning of non-intensive action into other analytical constructions where it is found.

5. The construction *-(A)rGA d'ür-* has similar semantics:

Bot ol Ayabas başta-yan neme-ler-diğ
 exactly:PRTCL that Ayabas lead-PART:PAST thing-PL-GEN
baş-ın baz-arya jür-ge-m.
 head-POSS.3.SG.ACC crush-INFIN go:aux.-PAST-1.SG
 'I want to crush such leaders as that Ayabas.'

This construction can express a non-realized intention: *Qızıl potuq moynin uzada çoyip qoʻzondop iyerge d'ürele* 'The red cock, having protruded its neck, was going to sing'.

Since the constructions with *d'ür-* and *odur-* are met very rarely, we can not yet disclose their possibilities in full.

6. The infinitive constructions of intention are synonymous to those with the participle of a probable action *-GAdly* plus existential verbs: *-GAdly tur-* / *otur-* / *d'ür-*. The latter are very rarely used. They can sometimes be mutually interchangeable with the previous ones:

Küçtü bol-zo, tut-qan la boy-ın-ça, d'er
 strong be-COND hold-PART:PAST PRTCL self-POSS.3.SG-TERM ground
d'aar mergede-p iy-gediy tur-γula-yt.
 towards:POST throw-CONV send:aux.-PART:prob. stand:aux.-ITER-PRES
 'If they were strong enough, they were probably ready to take (him) and throw (him) to the ground.'

Note that *mergedep iyerge turγulayt* could be used here as well.

7. The construction *-(A)rGA bolup* occurs only in the non-finite position; the converbial form of the verb *bol-* 'be' is motivated by the dominating verb: *oynop alarya bolup keletender* 'they came with the intention to play, they came to play'. If we take into consideration the whole complex including the finite position, we should evaluate it as a purpose construction in the meaning: 'they came to play, in order to play'. However, the two-member component *-(A)rGA + bolup* functions as a non-finite correlate of constructions with existential verbs, e.g.

Pavlov kün-ge kүй-erge bol-up čamča-zin suur-íp
 Pavlov sun-DAT burn-*INFIN* be-*CONV* shirt-*POSS.3.SG.ACC* take off-*CONV*
al-yan bas-tir-a boy-ĩ ter kel-di.
 take-*PART:PAST* step-*CAUS-CONV* self-*POSS.3.SG* sweat come-*PRET*
 'Pavlov took off his shirt in order to get sunburnt, and his whole body
 was covered with sweat.'

Arina ... sanaa-zin o-γo
 Arina ... thought-*POSS.3.SG.ACC* he-*DAT*
ayd-arya bol-up al-ba-y tur-yan.
 tell-*INFIN* be-*CONV* take-*NEG-CONV* stand:aux.-*PART*
 'Arina was about to tell him her thoughts, but she could not
 do it (for a long time).'

Mašina-nĩ kör-örgö bol-up d'ol-doñ tuura
 car-*ACC* see-*INFIN* be-*CONV* road-*ABL* far
d'at-qan altay-lar onotiyin at tu-u kel-ele.
 live-*PART:PAST* Altay-*PL* there ride-*CONV* come-*CONV*
 'In order to see the car (with the intention to see the car), the
 Altays who lived far from the road came there on horses.'

The *-(I)p* converb is encountered instead of the infinitive in this construction:

Ada-zĩ üren-íp bol-up d'ad-ar-da
 father-*POSS.3.SG* study-*CONV* be-*CONV* lie:aux.-*PART:fut.-LOC*
kolxoz-tiñ jılı qažay an-dar-in
 collective farm-*GEN* warm cattle yard-*PL-POSS:3.SG.ACC*
tur-arya jür-e ber-gen.
 stand-*INFIN* go-*CONV* give-*PAST*
 'When her father was about to start studying, he went to build warm cattle
 yards for the collective farm.'

This example is also remarkable since the construction with *bolup* is subordinated to the verb *d'at-* in the grammatical meaning of intention similar to that in the construction with the infinitive *-(A)rGA d'at-*.

8. The negative counterparts of these constructions with the first component *-BA_sQA* are very rarely used. We have but a few examples with *tur-* and *d'at-*. Therefore, we can only express some preliminary judgements regarding their semantics. Our data show that these constructions express the unwillingness to perform the action denoted by the infinitive:

Qayin ene-zĩ Arina-nĩ kel-gen
 mother-in-law-*POSS.3.SG* Arina-*ACC* come-*PART:PAST*

le ulus-taŋ oyt-o qoč-up kel-zin
 PRTCL people-ABL return-CONV travel-CONV come-IMP.3.SG

de-p ayt-tır-ıp tur-atan, d'e Arina
 say-CONV say-CAUS-CONV stand-PART:PRES but Arina

qayın ene-zi-neg qamaanyıy bol-bosqo tur-yan.
 mother-in-law-POSS.3.SG-ABL dependent be-INFIN:neg. stand:aux.-PAST
 'The mother-in-law demanded through all the people who came (to the village),
 that Arina should come back, but Arina did not want (was not going) to depend
 on her mother-in-law.'

D'üreg-i bu sös-tör-di
 heart-POSS.3.SG this word-PL-ACC

tört oŋdo-bosqo d'at.
 PRTCL know-INFIN:neg lie
 'His heart does not want to accept (lit.: to know, to understand)
 those words (the telegram about the death of his wife and his son).'

Qaçan Pavlov anay-da unčuq-pa-y
 when Pavlov such-LOC speak-NEG-CONV

bar-yan-da, ulus ta tım-ıp, o-niŋ
 go:aux.-PART:PAST-LOC people PRTCL be silent-CONV he-GEN

sanaa-zın-a čaptıq et-peske
 thought-POSS.3.SG-DAT obstacle make-INFIN:neg

tur-yan-dıy, baza unčuγ-uş-pa-y bar-atan.
 stand:aux.-PART:PAST-COMP again speak-RECIPR-NEG-CONV go:aux.-PRES
 'When Pavlov became silent, the people also became silent and did not speak to
 one another, as if they did not want to interfere with his thoughts.'

4.2. Shor idiomatic constructions of intention

In Shor, idiomatic constructions of intention are formed by the existential verbs *čat-* 'to lie, live', *čör-* 'to go' and by the verbs *et-* 'to do', expressing a most abstract meaning of action, and *čet-* 'to reach'. The verbs *tur-* and *odur-*, frequent auxiliaries in Altay, form free syntactic combinations with the infinitive. Perhaps some component of intention can be found in the following phrases headed by these verbs:

Men iş-ke par-arya tur-ča-m.
 I work-DAT go-INFIN stand-PRES-1.SG
 'I stand up in order to go to work.'

Pay-laya odur-ča-m.
 knit-INFIN sit-PRES-1.SG
 'I sit down in order to knit.'

The semantics of the Shor forms *-(A)rGA et-*, *-(A)rGA čat-* and *-(A)rGA čör-* slightly differs.

1. *-(A)rGA et-* expresses the desire to fulfill an action and the intention to fulfill it in the future:

Ol kel-gen kiži naa til-aas čoqta-rğa et-ča.
 that come-PART:past person new message tell-*INFIN* do:aux.-*PRES*
 'That person who came wants to relate some news.'

2. *-(A)rGA čör-* shows the preparatory stage of an action. This verb will probably never be fully grammaticalized. It combines with verbs denoting an action that can be associated with walking around, an action that can be fulfilled while moving: *Men iš-ke par-arya čör-ča-m* 'I am going to go to work (I am walking around, looking for things to take with me, putting on clothes, etc.)'.

3. The construction *-(A)rGA čat-* has the meaning 'to be at the brink of doing something'. Here, the infinitive action is to start the very next moment: *Men čiš pižirğa čam* 'I am going to cook a meal (I will start in a moment)'.

4. The construction *-(A)rGA čet-* denotes the approaching of the infinitive action: *Uzurğa četti* 'S/he has almost fallen asleep'.

The most regular and grammaticalized combinations are those with the verbs *et-* and *čat-*. We can perhaps define these combinations as modal analytical forms in Shor. The auxiliary verbs have been fully grammaticalized and have lost their lexical meaning. Such combinations cannot be penetrated by any word except for the intensifying particle *oq*; they have a unitary function in the sentence.

The form *-(A)rGA čat-* shows a tendency to be synthesized in the present tense. In *par-arya čam* (go-*INF* lie.aux-1.SG) 'I am going to go', the element *ča-* expresses both the modal meaning of intention and the temporal meaning, cf. *par-arya čattim* (go-*INF* lie.aux-*PRET*.1.SG) 'I was going to go', where the two meanings are expressed separately. We can probably speak of an intentional mood form in Shor (Nevskaja 1993). The Altay construction with *čat-* and the Khakas constructions with *tur-* display similar tendencies.

This development corresponds to the others shown by the existential verb *čat-* in Shor. The analytical progressive form *-(I)p čat-*, still found in Radloff's Shor language data, has disappeared by now (Radloff 1866). We only find remnants of it: The converb *-(I)p čadip* / *-(p) čit* (Dyrenkova 1941; Nevskaja 1993) and the participle *-(p)čatqan* / *-(p)čütqan* (Dyrenkova 1941; Esipova 1993). The main reason for its disappearance is that this form has given rise to the present tense form *-(p)ča* (< *-(I)p čadip*) (Kurpeško 1989).

4.3. Khakas idiomatic constructions of intention

Among the Khakas idiomatic forms of intention, are those with the verbs *pol-* 'to be', *it-* 'to do', *tur-* 'to stand', *čit-* 'to reach', *čör-* 'to go'.

1. The construction *-(A)rGA it-* expresses very general semantics of intention. Although the intention seems to be quite firm, it is still possible for the speaker to change his mind. In fact, this often happens, especially when there is a negation: *Če min pasxa nime čooxtirya itkem* 'No, I wanted to say something different'; *Sirer gazetadaŋar čooxtirya itkezer nimes pe?* 'You wanted to talk about the newspaper, didn't you?'; *Men pararya itkem, če parbadim* 'I wanted to go, but I did not go'.

If the agent is inanimate, the form expresses the approaching of the action: *Sooxtar polarya itče* 'The frosts are coming'.

2. The form *-(A)rGA pol-* expresses a firm decision to fulfill an action, if the agent is a person and if the infinitive action is voluntary: *Kamis ibinzer pararya polibisxan* 'Kamis decided to go home'.

The decision may have been declared, but the agent may still change his mind. Sometimes it is done on purpose in order to demonstrate an intention; but, in fact, the agent does not want to realize it, he expects other people to persuade him not to do it (a feigned intention).

In case of an involuntary action, the form expresses its approaching and even gradual beginning; there are already some signs of it: *Ol uzirya polča* 'S/he is going to fall asleep / he is falling asleep'; *Ol iljirya polča* 'S/he is going to cry / s/he is almost crying'.

3. The construction *-(A)rGA tur-* is used very rarely, and only with inanimate subjects. It expresses the approaching of the infinitive action: *Sooxtar polarya tur* 'The frosts are coming'.

4. The construction *-(A)rGA čör-* denotes the approaching of the infinitive action; it is very close to the terminal point: *Suy tazarya čör* 'The river will be very high very soon'; *Ol iljirya čör* 'S/he is about to cry'.

5. The construction *-(A)rGA čit-* denotes that the terminal point has almost been reached. If it has been reached, it is no longer an intention construction: *Sooxtar polarya čitti* 'The frosts are about to begin / have begun'.

When these constructions refer to an action performed by an inanimate subject or to an involuntary action of an animate agent, they may be ordered according to the relative time distance from the starting point of the infinitive action; the verb *čit-* refers to the closest moment to it, *it-* to one farthest from it. If the agent is animate, more nuances can be found, but the following scale of relative time distance to the starting point of an action is still relevant: *it- > pol- > čör- / tur- > čit- START*

4.4. Phraseological constructions of intention

To make our picture of infinitive constructions with an intentional semantics more complete, it is necessary to mention several other formal types of such constructions.

Intention may be expressed by phraseological combinations of a verb with its inner object: *Shor sayiš toolan-* 'to think, to be going to do something', or by phraseological combinations of a semantically almost empty verb, a verbalizer, and a noun expressing intention: *sayišqa sal-* 'to decide (literally: to put into the mind), *sös per-* 'to promise': *Ol kelerge sözün perdi* 'He promised to come'; *Ol čaqşı ür-*

generge saayış toolanyan 'He wanted to study well'. In these combinations, the infinitive either occupies an argument position of the verb (*saayışqa sal-*), or it may be part of the nominal phrase headed by the noun (*sös per-*, *saayış toolan-*). Note that these nouns have a semantic valency on the content of speech or thought ('what promise?' 'what thought?'), which is realized in the sentence structure by their infinitive attributes.

One can find even more obvious examples of modal nouns capable of joining an infinitival attribute. Those are *Shor tem* in the meaning of 'time to do something', *kögnü* 'desire to do something' (from 'soul, heart'), *qüş* 'strength, power' etc. They usually appear with nominal predicates of presence / existence or absence / non-existence *par* and *čoq*, and with verbs that are delexicalized in such combinations, like *çet-* 'to reach', *al-* 'to be enough' from 'to take', *sal-* 'to define, make certain' : *kögnü par / čoq*, *saayış par / čoq* 'there is / is no desire to do something', *tem çet-* 'time to do something', *küş al-* 'have enough power to do something', *tem sal-* 'to determine the time to do something', etc.

The subject of the infinitive action is coreferent with that of the auxiliary verb when the modal noun occupies an object slot of the latter. Then, the subject can be expressed by the personal marker on the verb and by a subject noun-phrase. It may also be marked by a possessive suffix on the modal noun: *Shor Men kelerge sözümni perdim* 'I promised to come'.

If the modal noun occupies the subject position of an auxiliary verb, or of a nominal predicate, the subject of the infinitive action is expressed by a possessive marker on the modal noun and may be additionally denoted by a possessive pronoun or a noun in the genitive case: *Shor Meen püün sarnarya kögnüm čoq* 'I do not have any desire to sing today'.

These constructions are semantically more definite and show less variation than the constructions with verbs of intention proper or idiomatic ones. *Kögnü* and *saayış* correspond to the desire stage, *sös per-* to that of decision. They refer only to a voluntary action performed by an animate agent.

5. Conclusion

The described intention constructions of differing formal types constitute a discrete functional subsystem. They complement each other or give the speaker a choice between synonymous means of expression. All of them refer to an anticipated, desirable, non-factive action.

They represent the period preceding the starting point of an action as a process containing the following stages: desire – intention – decision – planning – preparation – readiness – attempt – action.

The functional system of intention overlaps with that of prediction of an action and its approaching and with that of an action's phasal structure. When the infinitive subject is inanimate or the infinitive action is uncontrolled, the prospective variant of semantics appears. The phasal meaning of the starting point or the completion of an action is the property of particular marginal constructions.

Constructions with verbs of intention proper and phraseological constructions are more semantically definite: they usually do not combine with inanimate subjects (Khakas *sanan-* and Shor *sana-* are rare exceptions) and express the pure intention, willingness or readiness of an animate agent to fulfill a voluntary action.

Although they tend to form a semantic and syntactic unit with the infinitive, the syntactic relations are still alive within such combinations, as opposed to idiomatic intention constructions constituting a morphological unit. The latter can be considered analytical modal verb forms. Some of them are synthesized, giving rise to the intentional mood.

Idiomatic constructions with existential verbs do not have any restrictions on their type of subject or on the action the subject is going to perform. Therefore they often go beyond the limits of intentional semantics and enter other functional fields. They form an elaborate system to denote the approaching of the starting point of an action, differentiating relative time spans until the action starts.

Acknowledgements

The authors express their gratitude to Larry Clark for his valuable remarks on the article, and to Zinaida Kotožekova and Ajana Ozonova for their help in evaluating Khakas and Altay language material.

I. A. Nevskaja expresses her gratitude to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for the opportunity to work on this topic in Germany at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, as a Humboldt research fellow.

References

- [Anonymous] 1884. *Grammatika altajskogo jazyka, sostavlennaja členami altajskoj missii*. Kazan'.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1947. Očerki grammatiki ojrotskogo jazyka. In: Baskakov, N. A. & Toščakova, T. M. (eds.) *Ojrotsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva.
- Baskakov, N. A. (ed.) 1975. *Grammatika xakasskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka. Vostočnaja literatura.
- Bazin, L. 1968. *Introduction à l'étude pratique de la langue turque*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Bondarenko, I. V. 1980. Sintaktičeskie funkcii "infinitivov" v tjurkskix jazykax. In: Akademija Nauk SSSR (ed.) *Polipredikativnye konstrukcii i ix morfoložičeskaja baza*. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo Nauka. 124-144.
- Čeremisina, M. I. & Brodskaja, L. M. & Gorelova, L. M. et al. 1984. *Predikativnoe sklonenie pričastij v altajskix jazykax*. Novosibirsk: Nauka. Sibirskoe otdelenie.
- Čeremisina, M. I. & Brodskaja, L. M. & Skribnik, E. K. et al. 1986. *Strukturnye typy sintetičeskix polipredikativnyx konstrukcij v jazykax raznyx sistem*. Novosibirsk: Nauka. Sibirskoe otdelenie.
- Clark, L. 1998. *Turkmen reference grammar*. (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Comrie, B. 1976. The syntax of action nominals: A cross-language study. *Lingua* 40, 177-201.

- Csató, É. Á. 1990. Non-finite verbal constructions in Turkish. In: Brendemoen, B. (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference. Oslo, 12-16 June 1989*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 75-88.
- Deny, J. & Grønbech, K. & Scheel, H. & Togan, Z. V. (eds.) 1959. *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner.
- Dyrenkova, N. D. 1941. *Grammatika šorskogo jazyka*. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Dyrenkova, N. P. 1948. *Grammatika xakasskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva.
- Erdal, M. 1998. On the verbal noun in -(Y)İş. In: İmer, K. & Subaşı-Uzun, L. (eds.) *Doğan Aksan armağanı*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi. 53-68.
- Esipova, A. V. 1993. *Opređitel'naja funkcija pričastij v šorskom jazyke*. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Novosibirsk.
- Gadžieva, N. Z. 1973. *Osnovnye puti razvitija sintaksičeskoj struktury tjurkskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Grammatika sovremennogo baškirskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. 1981. Moskva.
- Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. AN SSSR, Sibirskoe ot-delenie, Jakutskij filial, Institut jazyka, literatury i istorii. Moskva. 1982.
- Grigorenko, Z. P. [= Kotožekova, Z. P.] 1995. Analitičeskie konstrukcii s glagolami namerenija v xakasskom jazyke. In: *Materialy 33-ej meždunarodnoj naučnoj studenčeskoj konferencii. Filologija*. Novosibirsk. 48-50.
- Isxakov, F. G. & Pal'mbax, A. A. 1961. *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnaja literatura.
- Johanson, L. 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*. (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Juldašev, A. A. 1977. *Sootnošenie dejepričastnyx i ličnyx form glagola v tjurkskix jazykax*. Moskva.
- Jusupov, F. J. 1985. *Neličnye formy glagola v dialektax tatarskogo jazyka*. Kazan': Izdatel'stvo Kazanskogo Universiteta.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. 1988. *A typology of action nominal constructions*. Stockholm: Department of Linguistics.
- Kotožekova, Z. P. 1996. Modal'noe značenie namerenija v infinitivnyx konstrukcijax s glagolami *it-* i *cör-* v xakasskom jazyke. In: *Jazyki korennyx narodov Sibiri* 3. Novosibirsk. 129-133.
- Kurpeško, N. N. 1989. *Biverbal'nye konstrukcii s vspomogatel'nymi glagolami bytija čat-, tur-, odur- i čör- v šorskom jazyke*. [Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoj stepeni kandidata filologičeskix nauk. Alma-Ata.]
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics* 1-2. Cambridge: University Press.
- Nevskaja, I. A. 1988. Upotreblenie formy na *-rga* v šorskom jazıke. In: Ubrjatova, E. I. et al. (eds.) *Grammatičeskie issledovanija po tjurkskim jazykam*. Novosibirsk. 43-67.
- Nevskaja, I. A. 1993. *Formy deepričastnogo tipa v šorskom jazyke*. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo NGU.
- Pritsak, O. 1959. Das Abakan- und Chulymtürkische und das Schorische. In: Deny et al. 598-640.
- Radloff, W. 1866. *Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens*. Sankt-Peterburg.

- Rassadin, V. I. 1978. *Morfologija tofalarskogo jazyka v sravnitel'nom osveščanii*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.
- Sanžejev, G. D. 1963. *Sravnitel'naja grammatika mongol'skix jazykov*. Moskva: Glagol.
- Shaw, J. Thomas 1967. *The transliteration of modern Russian for English-language publications*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Tadykin, V. N. 1971. *Pričastija v altajskom jazyke*. Gorno-Altajsk.
- Ubrjatova, E. I. 1976. *Issledovanija po sintaksisu jakutskogo jazyka. Složnoe predloženie 1*. Novosibirsk: Nauka. Sibirskoe otделение.
- Xrakovskij, V. S. (ed.) 1983. *Kategorii glagola i struktura predloženija*. Leningrad: Nauka.

Eine mythisch-sagenhafte Überlieferung der Altaituwiner und ihre fuyü-kirgisische Parallele

Erika Taube

Taube, Erika 2000. Eine mythisch-sagenhafte Überlieferung der Altaituwiner und ihre fuyü-kirgisische Parallele. *Turkic Languages* 4, 114-128.

Eine altaituwinische Mythe erzählt von Jovγun Mergen, der dem mythischen Vogel Han Gärdi über Peking einen Flügel abschießt und so die Sonne wieder scheinen läßt. Der chinesische Herrscher lohnt es mit Undank. Die Fuyü-Kirgisen haben eine Variante dieser Mythe, die nicht nur wegen des Namens ihres Helden – Yagun Mergen – und der inhaltlichen Nähe beachtenswert ist. Im Gegensatz zur altaituwinischen Version bezieht sie sich deutlich auf historisches Geschehen. Beide Varianten spiegeln ein problematisches Verhältnis zu China. Besonders interessant ist, daß sowohl die Fuyü-Kirgisen als auch die Tuwiner von Cengel den jeweiligen Helden der Überlieferung für einen der Ihren, einen frühen Vorfahren, halten und daß die fuyü-kirgisische Version Xinjiang und Altai (das Überlieferungsgebiet der tuwinischen Version) als ursprüngliche Heimat der Kirgisen von Fuyü nennt.

An Altay-Tuvan myth relates the story of Jovγun Mergen, who shot a wing off the mythical bird Han Gärdi over Beijing, thus allowing the sun to shine once again. The Chinese ruler, however, rewarded him with ingratitude. The Fuyü Kirghiz have a variant of this myth, which is remarkable not only for the name of its hero, Yagun Mergen, or its similar content. Unlike the Altay-Tuvan version, this myth is obviously based on historical events. Both variants reflect a problematic relationship with China. It is particularly interesting that both the Fuyü Kirghiz and the Tuvans of Cengel consider the hero of their respective legend one of their own, an early ancestor, and that the Fuyü Kirghiz version designates Xinjiang and Altai (the setting of the Tuvan version) as the original homeland of the Kirghiz of Fuyü.

Erika Taube, *Großer Bogen 18, 04416, Markkleeberg, Germany.*

Unter meinen tuwinischen Aufzeichnungen aus Cengel findet sich eine Überlieferung über den halb mythischen, halb sagenhaften Schützen Jovγun Mergen: *Jovγun Mergennij duyajında domaq* "Die Mythe / Sage von Jovγun Mergen".¹ Sie wurde am 10.7.1969 in Būrēlig am westlichen Fuße des Xarlīy xārqaṅ (mongolisch Cəngəl

¹ Deutsch in Taube (1978, Nr. 66); russisch in Taube (1994a, Nr. 69).

chajrchan) von dem damals 74jährigen Lobčā oylu Ĵigžin erzählt. Ĵigžin war ein stattlicher und sehr angesehener konservativer alter Mann, der wegen seines Aussehens den Beinamen Stälin (< Stalin) trug, unter dem er fast bekannter war als unter seinem eigentlichen Namen. Er galt nicht nur als einer der besten Kenner von historischen Überlieferungen, Sagen und Mythen, sondern vor allem der tuwinischen Sitten und Bräuche, auf deren Einhaltung in seiner Jurte noch streng geachtet wurde. Ihm gegenüber beachteten die eingeheirateten Frauen der Sippe die Sitte des *beglēr* '[jemandem] wie einem *beg* begegnen', die ich außer in seiner Jurte und in solchen, in denen er sich vorübergehend aufhielt, nur noch in einer einzigen anderen beobachten konnte – im allgemeinen wurde schon von der Möglichkeit der rituellen Entbindung von der *beglēr*-Pflicht Gebrauch gemacht (Taube 1974).

Lobčā oylu Ĵigžin ließ sich geduldig befragen – beendete dann aber die Sitzung zu einem ihm angemessen erscheinenden Zeitpunkt mit einem sehr bestimmten "Ĵä, amdī bolsun, urūm" 'Na, jetzt ist's genug, meine Tochter / mein Kind'. Außer ethnographischen Informationen verdanke ich ihm solche historischer Art über Amīrsanā, den letzten Oiraten-Fürsten (Taube 1994b: 281-286), und neben der Jovγun-Mergen-Mythe noch eine weitere "Über den Manγīs im Mond" (*Ajda durar manγīstij duγaji*).² Er war der einzige meiner Gewährsleute, der um Erwähnung seines Namens bat: "Ich habe dir das eine und andere erzählt. Wenn du darüber schreibst, nenne meinen Namen und füge meine Fotografie bei!"³

Und zum Abschied sagte er – es war meine dritte und auf lange Zeit letzte Feldforschung (siehe Taube 1996a) –, das nächste Mal solle ich nicht zum Arbeiten kommen, sondern zum Ausruhen. Lobčā oylu Ĵigžin starb 1971, und meine nächste Reise nach Cengel wurde erst 1982 möglich – so habe ich ihn nicht wiedergesehen.

Die altaituwinische Tradition

Im folgenden gebe ich den tuwinischen Text und eine weitgehend wörtliche Übersetzung der Überlieferung:

Jovγun Mergenniγ duγajinda domaq

Bistiγ ju'rtγa Jovγun Mergen dēn bir sürlüy er jorup duru. Ol jerle a'dyanin išγinbas giži irgin.

Bir šayda γidaddij Bēžij γoduzunun bir ijiγge xün degves. Xežē möngüde xaraγγi bop γalıp duru. Eldeb arγa xereglep xereglep jerle bolvasda bistiγ Jovγun Mergenni gēp jalap ap duru. Jovγun Mergen baryaš ājtij duru: "Ĵä, bo jüge xaraγγi boldu dize delegejniγ üstünde dēdistij aldında olurar Xaγ Gārdi γuš bir zalγinin tenitgen irgin. Ol xünnüγ γarān duylān irgin. Men ōγarni a'dip düžürse düžürüp

² Taube (1978, Nr. 65); Taube (1994a, Nr. 59). Leider kehrte mein Begleiter seitens der Universität, Č. Galsan, damals vorzeitig nach Ulaanbaatar zurück, so daß ein längerer Aufenthalt bei L. Ĵigžin, einem älteren Bruder seiner Mutter, nicht möglich war.

³ Sein Foto ist in Taube (1982: 33) publiziert.

berejim. Jaŋγīs – ɣoduɣar biljinar” dērde Ežen xānī “Godu biljinsa biljina bersin. Xünnüŋ ɣarā la dayin bir degse xāmān joq” dēr irgin.

Jovγun Mergen oq sadān ap šīɣāp šīɣāp a’ dīvtarda Xaŋ Gārdiniŋ jaŋγīs ösgüs zalγini düžüp gēp ɣodunuŋ bir iji or joq biljiniŋp duru. Xünnüŋ ɣarā da dayin dēp duru.

Ūn ɣidaddar amdī gižige örgenin ājtīp, xündülep uluɣ jōq dudar. İnjārda “Bo dirig dursa bisti ɣazan dā orüledbes. Uluɣ xortan irgin” dep xoran berip duru. Jovγun Mergen jorup oluryaş barin jük dēs Möngün Döžü dep jerge ölüp xara daş bop jī dīp ap duru.

Ježe ölgen bolsa da ɣidaddar jerle ɣoryup jīl bügde gēp daštīŋ üstünen uluɣ xoran xömüre ɣudar durup duru. Göp jīl injap duru. Bir jīlin amdī daş jidip ɣalip duru. Soŋɣār basyan üs isten ösge bildirer jive jerle joq bop duru. Ol şayman bēr ol Jovγun Mergennen jerle jive diŋnalvajn duru.

Gižiniŋ duzazin görüp ap artinan xoran berip ölürip jīdar – ɣidaddar jerle indīɣ sürlüg jidīɣ xoran sayıştīɣ ulustar ij.

Die Mythe von Jovγun Mergen

In unserem Land lebte ein starker Mann, der Jovγun Mergen hieß. Er war ein Mensch, der niemals verfehlte, worauf er schoß.

Zu einer Zeit schien die Sonne nicht [mehr] auf die eine Seite der Stadt Beijing. Auf immer wurde es dunkel. Man wendete und wendete reichlich Mittel an, und als überhaupt nichts gelang, bat man unseren Jovγun Mergen zu kommen. Nachdem Jovγun Mergen hingegangen war, sprach er: “Nun, fragt [wörtlich: sagt] man, warum es hier dunkel geworden ist, [so] hat der Vogel Xaŋ Gārdi, der über der irdischen Welt [und] unter dem Himmel lebt, einen seiner Flügel ausgebreitet. Er hat das Auge der Sonne verdeckt. Wenn ich diesen Eurigen herunterschiesse[n soll], will ich ihn für euch herunterschießen. Das einzige [ist] – eure Stadt wird kaputtgehen.” Als er [so] redete, sagte deren Herrscher [*ežen xān* < mongolisch *ejen qan*]: “Wenn die Stadt kaputtgeht, mag sie kaputtgehen [*biljina bersin*]! Wenn nur das Auge der Sonne wieder einmal strahlt (wörtl. scheint), macht es nichts!”

Jovγun Mergen nahm seinen Pfeil und Köcher [*oq sādaq*], zielte, zielte, und als er losschoß, fiel ein einziger verwaister Flügel des Xaŋ Gārdi herunter, und die eine Seite der Stadt ging bis auf den letzten Rest [wörtlich: spurlos] kaputt. Das Auge der Sonne aber strahlte wieder. Da nun sprachen die Chinesen jenem Menschen ihren Dank aus, zeigten [ihm] Achtung und hielten ein großes Essen / Gelage [*jōq*] ab. Als sie so taten, sagte [jemand / sagten sie]: “Wenn dieser am Leben bleibt [wörtlich: ist], wird er uns niemals hochkommen lassen. Er ist ein großer Feind!”, und gaben ihm Gift. Nachdem Jovγun Mergen gegangen war und die westliche Richtung eingeschlagen hatte, starb er am Ort Möngün Dözü, und zu einem schwarzen Stein werdend faulte er dahin.

Wie sehr er auch tot war, die Chinesen fürchteten sich dennoch [vor ihm], kamen alle Jahre und schütteten viel Gift oben auf den Stein. Viele Jahre taten sie so. In einem Jahr war [dann] jener Stein verschwunden.

Außer der nach Norden zu eingedrückten Fettspur ist überhaupt kein Zeugnis [davon / von ihm] mehr da. Von jener Zeit an war von Jovγun Mergen überhaupt nichts [mehr] zu hören.

Eines Menschen Hilfe erfahren und [ihn] hinterher mit Gift umbringen – die Chinesen sind doch immer [schon] Leute mit solchen bedrohlich stinkenden giftigen Gedanken.

Der mythische Kontext

Die Geschichte von Jovγun Mergen gehört zu den Solarmythen, unter denen hier vor allem jene archaischen Formen von Interesse sind, die von überzähligen Sonnen oder von der erblindeten (d.h. verdunkelten oder unsichtbaren) Sonne berichten. In beiden geht es darum, daß der Erde und allen auf ihr Lebenden Verderben droht – entweder durch die übergroße Hitze oder aber durch den Mangel oder gar Verlust an Licht und Wärme. Der Verlust von Licht und Wärme kann ähnlich wie hier entstanden sein oder dadurch, daß ein Dämon oder Ungeheuer die Himmelsleuchten entführte; bei den altaischen Völkern war es dann oft der Igel, der sie den Menschen zurückbrachte, und es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, daß es nach einer vielleicht längst vergessenen mongolischen Überlieferung der Fuchs war, der diese Tat ausführte (Taube 1991 und 2000). Wie diese Mythenversion gehört auch die Jovγun Mergen-Mythe der altaischen Tuwiner zur zweiten Art der erwähnten Solarmythen. Die Gestalt des Schützen, der dem Übelstand abhilft, indem er den Schadensverursacher herunterschießt, stellt hier jedoch eine Verbindung zur erstgenannten Art her.

Der Mythos von den überzähligen Sonnen ist unter anderem bei den Völkern am unteren Amur und auf Sachalin bekannt, wo ein Kulturheros mit Pfeil und Bogen die überzähligen Sonnen vernichtet.⁴ Die gleiche Tat verbindet ein mongolischer Mythos mit der Entstehung des Murmeltiers.⁵ Der treffliche Schütze Erchij Mergen ("Daumen-Schütze") holt mit sechs Pfeilen sechs der sieben Sonnen herunter, beim siebenten Schuß fliegt eine Schwalbe dazwischen, der er den Schwanz aufschlitzt (Entstehung des gegabelten Schwanzes der Schwalbe), wodurch er die siebente Sonne verfehlt.⁶

In China ist der Mythos von den überzähligen Sonnen schon in den ältesten literarischen Texten enthalten. Für einen möglichen Zusammenhang mit den chinesischen Überlieferungen spricht die Tatsache, daß in der altaituwinischen Mythe inhaltlich eine unmittelbare Beziehung zum chinesischen Milieu hergestellt ist – die Bedrohung der Stadt Peking und das Hilfeersuchen der Chinesen (vgl. Erkes 1925-1926: 32). In unserem Zusammenhang ist das eigentliche Thema jedoch das Aus-

⁴ Vgl. Mify (1982, 2: 461, Sp. 2) (Vernichtung überzähliger Sonnen).

⁵ Vgl. Gaadamba (1966: 66); siehe auch Taube (1994a: 347-348) (Kommentar zu Nr. 50).

⁶ Ohne den solarmythischen Hintergrund ist diese Überlieferung bei den altaischen Tuwinern wohl bekannt als aitiologisches Märchen von der Entstehung des Murmeltieres und des Gabelschwanzes des Milans, verbunden mit weiteren entstehungsgeschichtlichen Informationen (unter anderem zum Jagdbrauchtum). Siehe dazu Taube (1969: 263-275); (1978, Nr. 18-19), sowie (1994a, Nr. 50-52) und die zugehörigen Kommentare.

bleiben des Sonnenlichts, verursacht durch Xaŋ Gärdi, der mit einem seiner Flügel "das Auge der Sonne"⁷ verdeckt. Dazu ist eine altaische (telengitische) Variante zu vergleichen, wo jener Schuß, nach dessen Mißlingen sich der Schütze in ein Murmeltier verwandelt, eigentlich dem Flügel des Chan Gärdi gegolten hatte (Potanin 1884: 179-180, Nr. 6e; siehe auch Taube 1994a: 347-348, Kommentar zu Nr. 50).

Die fu-yü-kirgisische Tradition

In dem Band "Märchen der Völker Nordost-Chinas" (1994)⁸ veröffentlichte I. Nentwig als Nr. 20 ein aus dem Chinesischen übersetztes Märchen der Kirgisen von Fuyü in Heilongjiang mit dem Titel "Tapfere und verwegene Menschen", dessen zweiter Teil die hier vorgestellte Mythe von Jovyun Mergen beinhaltet – hier trägt der mythische Held den Namen Yagun Mergen. Dieser fuyü-kirgisische Text erzählt davon, daß vor vielen Jahren das ganze Volk der Kirgisen in Xinjiang lebte. Unter ihnen gab es zwei Brüder namens Galazhoo und Yagun Mergen. Galazhoo, der ältere, war ein weithin beliebter Sänger, mit dem es "nicht einmal der Pirol" aufnehmen konnte. Yagun Mergen, der jüngere, war ein vortrefflicher Schütze. Der Kaiser der Qing-Dynastie, zu dem der Ruhm des Sängers Galazhoo gedrungen war, ließ ihn holen und für sich singen – aber jener sang nur "ein Berglied, das die Schönheit seiner Heimat pries" – einen Lobpreis also, den – wie es heißt – sogar die Vögel und Tiere gern hörten. Anderes, den Kaiser Preisendes, weigerte sich Galazhoo zu singen und ward dafür auf kaiserlichen Befehl getötet (siehe Taube 1996b: 115). Wie später deutlich wird, dürfte Galazhoos Lied eine Art Lobpreis auf den Altai oder einen seiner Berge gewesen sein, ein in jener Region bis heute übliches Genre; das Fuyü-Gebiet selbst ist flach (freundliche Auskunft von Mareile Flitsch).

Yagun Mergen machte sich auf nach China, um seinen verschollenen Bruder zu suchen, fand ihn aber nicht. Nun heißt es weiter (Nentwig 1994: 152):

"Zufällig erschien gerade in diesen Tagen hoch über Beijing ein Phönix. Niemand wußte, wie groß der Phönix war, denn ein einziger Flügel bedeckte Beijing schon so, daß man nichts mehr sah. Weil der Kaiser der Qing drei Tage lang die Sonne nicht mehr gesehen hatte, sagte er, daß das kein gutes Omen sei, und wußte sich vor Sorgen keinen Rat. Er erließ ein Dekret, den fähigsten Menschen auf der Welt zu suchen. Wer es schaffe, den Phönix zu vertreiben, der könne verlangen, was er wolle.

⁷ Dieser Begriff "Auge der Sonne" und die damit verbundene Vorstellung vom Erblinden (Unsichtbar-Sein) der Sonne ist von besonderem Interesse. Beides spielt insbesondere bei den Völkern Zentralamerikas eine große Rolle (vgl. Mify 1982,2: 461, Sp. 3). Könnte das ein Hinweis darauf sein, daß der Mythos vom verdunkelten Auge der Sonne in der Alten Welt schon vor der Besiedlung Amerikas existierte und dorthin mitgenommen wurde?

⁸ Der hier auszugsweise zitierte Text (Nentwig 1994: 151-154) wurde von Mareile Flitsch und Ingo Nentwig übersetzt.

Yagun Mergen Baturu war ein berühmter Jäger der Kirgisen. Mit einem einzigen Bogenschuß konnte er eine ganze Reihe Wildgänse schießen, mit einem Bogenschuß konnte er neun Bergschafe erlegen. Als einige Würdenträger hörten, daß Yagun Mergen Baturu nach Beijing gekommen war, um seinen Bruder zu suchen, gingen sie hin und erstatteten dem Kaiser respektvoll Bericht. Sie sagten: 'Der fähigste Mann ist gefunden.'

Der Kaiser fragte: 'Wer ist es?'

Die Würdenträger sagten: 'Wir hörten, daß es der jüngere Bruder des Galazhoo ist, er heißt Yagun Mergen Baturu. Im Bogenschießen soll er der Beste sein.'

Der Kaiser befahl, daß Yagun Mergen Baturu hingehen und auf jenen Phönix schießen solle. Wenn es ihm gelänge, ihn abzuschießen, werde ihm ein Beamtentitel und außerdem ein Adelsrang verliehen. Yagun Mergen Baturu sagte: 'Ich möchte überhaupt nichts haben. Wenn man mir nur hilft, meinen älteren Bruder zu finden, dann ist das genug'.

Yagun Mergen Baturu nahm Pfeil und Bogen, ging hinaus, nahm alle Kraft zusammen, zielte genau auf den Phönix und ließ einen Pfeil losschnellen. Mit diesem Pfeil schoß er eine Feder herab.⁹ Was meinst du, wie groß diese Feder war? Als man sie auflud, bedeckte sie sieben bis acht Pferdewagen. Heruntergefallene Federäste zerschlugen noch viele Gebäude des Kaiserpalastes. Der Phönix flog fort. Yagun Mergen Baturu wurde vom Kaiser herbestellt. Er sagte ihm, daß er sich Verdienste erworben habe, erkannte seine Tapferkeit an und verlieh ihm einen kleinen Beamtentitel. Doch Yagun Mergen Baturu hatte die Suche nach seinem älteren Bruder Galazhoo nicht vergessen. Der Kaiser betrog ihn und sagte: 'Dein älterer Bruder ist von uns bereits, mit einem Beamtenposten belehnt, in ein entlegenes Gebiet geschickt worden. Früher oder später kann ich euch beiden Brüdern ein Treffen ermöglichen'.

Da der Kaiser der Qing seine Tapferkeit erkannt hatte, wollte er ihn mit einem kleinen Beamtenposten dafür gewinnen, der Qing-Dynastie zu dienen. Der Kaiser befahl ihm, 500 Qing-Soldaten auszubilden. Da er [Yagun Mergen; E. T.] nicht wußte, daß er damit betrogen wurde, willigte er ein. Er dachte, daß er seinen Bruder ja doch eines Tages wiedersehen würde."

⁹ Daß dem Gewährsmann der altaituwinischen Version auch eine Variante mit nur einer Feder bekannt gewesen sein kann, darauf deutet vielleicht die Formulierung *jaŋγīs ösgūs zalyīn* hin; zwar bedeutet *zalyīn* (standardtuwinisch *čalgyn*) 'Flügel', aber *jaŋγīs ösgūs* wird wie auch *xara jaŋγīs* im allgemeinen im Kontext einer Vielzahl, seltener einer Zweizahl, verwendet. Die Überlieferung von der über Peking herabgefallenen Feder des mythischen Vogels scheint sich weit nach Westen verbreitet zu haben. Annemarie Schimmel (1998: 175) zitiert die Dichtung "Mantiq at-tair" des persischen Dichters Attar (etwa 1150-1230), in der in einem ganz anderen, mystischen Zusammenhang von dem "Gott-Vogel" Simurgh die Rede ist, der einst über China dahinflog, wobei über dem Land eine Feder herabfiel – trotz des hier ganz anderen Sinngehalts (die Feder des Simurgh als Quelle alles Schönen und Schöpferischen) wohl doch ein Nachklang der chinesischen Mythe.

Zum Entstehungsgebiet dieser spezifischen Überlieferung

Von Zusätzen, die mit dem zweiten Handlungsstrang um den Bruder Galazhoo zusammenhängen, abgesehen, haben wir es hier mit einer der altaituwinischen Mythe sehr nahestehenden Variante zu tun. Den offensichtlichen Zusammenhang unterstreicht zum einen der Satz am Anfang der von I. Nentwig bekanntgemachten Überlieferung, der feststellt: "Vor vielen Jahren wohnte das ganze Volk der Kirgisen in Xinjiang". "Das ganze Volk der Kirgisen" kann zunächst jene heute in Nordost-China im Kreis Fuyü der Provinz Heilongjiang beheimateten meinen; vielleicht aber drückt dieser Begriff auch das Bewußtsein der Zugehörigkeit zu einer größeren "kirgisischen" Gemeinschaft in Zentralasien aus. Der Text der Mythe selbst bietet noch einen weiteren geographischen Hinweis, der das Herkunftsgebiet der diese Mythe überliefernden Fuyü-Kirgisen innerhalb Xinjiangs deutlicher begrenzt: Yagun Mergen erfährt von der Ermordung seines älteren Bruders durch den Qing-Kaiser und fordert von ihm Rechenschaft, ihn mit aufgelegtem Pfeil und gespanntem Bogen bedrohend. Der Kaiser fällt ohnmächtig vor Schreck vom Neun-Drachen-Thron, und es heißt weiter:

"Als Yagun Mergen Baturu sah, daß der Kaiser nichts taugte, verließ er den Thronsaal hoherhobenen Hauptes, sang ein Lied der Empörung und kehrte ins Altai-Gebirge zurück." (Nentwig 1994: 154)

Damit kommt der Altai als jenes Gebiet in Betracht, aus dem die Fuyü-Kirgisen als Träger der Überlieferung von Yagun Mergen stammen oder zumindest sich herleiten,¹⁰ und dort wurde auch die Jovyun Mergen-Überlieferung aufgezeichnet. Ein Teil der altaischen Tuwiner lebt bis heute in Xinjiang (Taube 1996a: 214); dabei ist besonders darauf aufmerksam zu machen, daß die Mehrzahl von ihnen zu den *Kök Mončaq* gehört (Monguš 1995: 38) und daß auch der Gewährsmann der Geschichte von Jovyun Mergen ein *Gök Monjaq* war.

Daß das Gebiet von Cengel, wo die altaituwinische Version des Jovyun Mergen-Stoffes aufgezeichnet wurde, heute auf mongolischem Territorium und nicht auf chinesischem liegt, das heißt nicht in Xinjiang, darf hier vernachlässigt werden. Über den Altaikamm und damit über staatliche Grenzen hinweg bestanden noch bis in die Mitte unseres Jahrhunderts Kontakte zwischen den altaischen Tuwinern beiderseits des Gebirgskammes. Zur fraglichen Zeit, Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts, dürften in diesem Nomadengebiet Grenzen noch unschärfer gewesen sein. So darf auch der geographische Begriff Xinjiang als Herkunftsgebiet der Fuyü-Kirgisen nicht streng im Sinne der heutigen Staatsgrenzen gesehen werden. Immerhin ist noch in einem

¹⁰ Hu & Imart (1987: 3) nennen das Altai-Gebirge als Herkunftsgebiet der Fuyü-Kirgisen unter Berufung auf eine lokale Überlieferung, zu der sie sich leider nicht näher äußern, so daß nicht klar wird, ob es sich dabei um die Vorlage für die Übersetzung von Mareile Flitsch und Ingo Nentwig oder um eine andere Quelle handelt.

1957 publizierten chinesischen Atlas das Gebiet von Cengel in der Westmongolei als zu Xinjiang und damit zu China gehörig ausgewiesen.¹¹

Verquickung der Mythe mit historischem Geschehen

Die beiden Überlieferungen über Jovγun / Yagun Mergen vermitteln uns nicht nur den eigentlichen mythischen Stoff, sondern widerspiegeln zugleich historisches Geschehen – die langwährenden Versuche der Dsungaren und der in ihrem Verband vereinigten Stämme, sich der mandschurischen Qing-Dynastie zu widersetzen und anders als die Ostmongolen – ihre Unabhängigkeit zu bewahren. Ethnisches Selbstbewußtsein klingt in ihnen ebenso unverhohlen an wie das gestörte Verhältnis zu den Chinesen, denen die Dsungaren schließlich 1757 unterlagen. Diese Ereignisse um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts spielen auch eine große Rolle in den historischen Legenden der altaischen Tuwiner über den letzten Dsungaren-Fürsten Amursana (tuwinisch *Amīrsanā*), den Anführer der Qoyid (tuwinisch *Xojt*), den diese heute noch als ihren Fürsten ansehen und der in ihren ehrfurchtsvollen Erinnerungen und in ihren mündlichen Überlieferungen sehr lebhaft gegenwärtig ist (Taube 1994b: 281-286). Offensichtlich spiegelte die Jovγun / Yagun Mergen-Überlieferung gewisse gemeinsame historische Erfahrungen und – damit verbunden – ein ähnlich starkes historisch-ethnisches Selbstwertgefühl, wie es darin zum Ausdruck kommt.

Während die altaituwinische Version, was das Ende des Jovγun Mergen betrifft, weitgehend im mythisch-sagenhaften Bereich bleibt (auf konkrete Erfahrungen aus nicht mehr mythischer Zeit verweist nur der letzte Satz), wird der historische Realitätsbezug in der fuyü-kirgisischen Version am Schluß ganz deutlich, wenn es heißt (S. 154):

“Yagun Mergen Baturu hatte geglaubt, der Kaiser sei wirklich gestorben. Aber er war nicht tot, und es war wieder Leben in ihn gekommen. Er war über Yagun Mergen Baturu erbost, er haßte und fürchtete ihn gleichermaßen. Als die Beamten der Qing sahen, daß die Kirgisen so tapfer waren, machten sie dem Kaiser den Vorschlag, sie alle zu ergreifen, in die Acht Banner einzugliedern und so, als Soldaten zwangsrekrutiert, in die Grenzgebiete zu schicken.

Nachdem der Kaiser das entsprechende Edikt erlassen hatte, wurden die Kirgisen alle in den Kreis Fuyu der Provinz Heilongjiang verschickt.

Es heißt, daß die Kirgisen in dem Kreis Fuyu der Provinz Heilongjiang eben nach dem 22. Jahr des Kaisers Qianlong (1757)¹² dort angekommen sind.”

Die Umsiedlung größerer menschlicher Gemeinschaften durch die Qing-Administration – zum Zwecke der Zersplitterung potentieller Gegner, zur Beseitigung gefährli-

¹¹ *Zhonghua renmin gonghguo ditu ji*, Karte 44-45.

¹² Hu & Imart (1987: 3) nennen unter Berufung auf Tenišev und Pritsak einen wesentlich früheren Zeitpunkt (1293) für die erzwungene Umsiedlung der Vorfahren der Fuyü-Kirgisen.

cher militärischer Bedrohung und zur Sicherung der Grenzen durch im fraglichen Gebiet nicht Heimische –, wie sie sich auch in den sibe-mandschurischen “Liedern von der Umsiedlung” spiegelt,¹³ die gleiche Zeit, denselben historischen Zusammenhang betreffend, hat in der fuyü-kirgisischen Überlieferung “Tapfere und verwegene Menschen” einen weiteren folkloristischen Niederschlag gefunden. Konkret werden die Bemühungen des chinesischen Reiches reflektiert, künftig den Unruheherd im Nordwesten zu eliminieren, an dem auch dieses tapfere “Volk der Kirgisen”, hier repräsentiert durch Yagun Mergen, seinen Anteil hatte.

Während sich in der fuyü-kirgisischen Version der Mythos problemlos mit einem historischen Ereignis, der erzwungenen Umsiedlung, verbindet, bleibt die altaituwinische auf der mythisch-sagenhaften Ebene. Das Ziel, gefürchtete Gegner auszuschalten, wird in der altaituwinischen Überlieferung erreicht durch die physische Beseitigung des Jovyun Mergen, jenes starken und trefflichen Schützen, in dem wir wohl einen Ahnherrn und Anführer jener tuwinischen Gruppe sehen dürfen, die ihn heute noch “unser Jovyun Mergen” (*bistij Jovyun mergenivis*) nennt. Die Version von seiner Vergiftung durch die Chinesen überliefert – allerdings ohne mythologische Elemente – auch Peter Simon Pallas (1776: 31-33):

“Seine anwachsende Macht fieng an bey den benachbarten Reichen Aufsehn zu machen. Nun soll eben damals China (oder, wie andre wollen, Tybet) von innerlichen Unruhen und Empörungen äusserst zerrüttet worden seyn. Der rechtmäßige Regent rief demnach in der äussersten Noth den Joboghon Mergen zu Hülfe, dessen Horden auch die unruhigen Gegenden bald zum Gehorsam brachten. Die listigen Chineser aber sahen in diesem Allirten zugleich einen fürchterlichen Nachbar, und brachten ihm, auf dem Rückzuge, nachdem sie ihn und seine Helden mit Geschenken überhäuft hatten, Gift bey. Nach seinem Tode, zogen die Oeröt wieder in ihr Land, und fünf (man weiß nicht ob Söhne oder) vornehme Heerführer des Joboghon Mergenn [!] theilten sein zahlreiches Volk in fünf Stämme oder Horden, deren eine nachmals die Soongaren [= Dsungaren; E.T.] und Derbeten ausgemacht hat.”

Die Verwandlung des Jovyun Mergen in Stein, von der in der altaituwinischen Überlieferung die Rede ist, findet sich andeutungsweise auch bei Pallas. Er berichtet nämlich von einem aus Felsbrocken zusammengestapelten Bildnis, “gleichsam liegend, mit dem Haupt auf einen Arm gestützt ..., wovon, dem Vorgeben der alten Soongaren nach, noch izt Spuren sind, die von den Kalmücken oft besucht wurden” (S. 32), wobei auch Viehopfer geweiht und freigelassen wurden. Schließlich teilt Pallas mit, daß die Qoyit seit Joboghon Mergen “den ihnen von den Chinesern beygelegten Ehrenahmen Baatut (die tapfern)” behielten, “welcher auch noch den wenigen daraus über gebliebenn gegeben wird” (S. 33).

¹³ Siehe Stary (1988); vgl. den zugehörigen Besprechungsaufsatz Taube (1990).

Genealogische Bezüge

Nach Aussage der beiden Texte aus der jeweiligen mündlichen Tradition betrachten nicht nur die Tuwiner im Altai, sondern auch die Kirgisen von Fuyü den Jovyun bzw. Yagun Mergen genannten Recken als einen aus dem Kreis ihrer Vorfahren. Für eine der gentilen Gruppen der Tuwiner im Altai gibt es dazu weitere Hinweise. Im Zusammenhang mit der Geburt des Čoros, des Ahnherrn dörbetischer und dsungarischer Fürstengeschlechter, erwähnt S. Ju. Nekljudov in seinem Beitrag zu dieser Gestalt der oiratisch-kalmückischen Mythologie (Mify 1982, 2: 633, Sp. 3), gestützt auf Pallas, einen "Greis Trefflicher Schütze Jobogon-Mergen" als drei Generationen vor Činggis Chan lebenden und mit einer Himmelsfee verheirateten Ahnherrn des Geschlechts der Xojt,¹⁴ des ältesten unter den dsungarischen Geschlechtern. Seinen Namen Jobogon erklärt Pallas damit, daß jener wegen seiner gewaltigen Größe und Stärke weder von einem Pferd noch von einem Wagen getragen werden konnte und daher "zu Fuß" gehen mußte (< klassische mongolische Schriftsprache *yabuyan* 'zu Fuß [gehend]', chalcha *javgan*, kalmückisch *jowgan*¹⁵). Dieser Name Yabagan steht am Anfang eines Stammbaums "of the leaders of the Khoit Tribe in the Zengors", den J. Miyawaki in der Handschriften-Abteilung der Universität von Kazan entdeckt und kürzlich publiziert hat (Miyawaki 1997) – Pallas hatte seinerzeit vergeblich nach einem solchen gesucht. Der Name gehört zu jenen, die auch in mongolischen Chroniken Erwähnung fanden. In der "Gelben Geschichte" (*Šira tuγūji*) heißt es (zitiert nach Miyawaki 1994: 200): "The Qoyid were descended from Yabagan Mergen".

J. Miyawaki führt weiter aus, daß die Stärke dieses Stammes, auf die die Überlieferung offenbar anspielt, durch die kriegerischen Auseinandersetzungen innerhalb des Verbandes der Dörben Oirat in den 20er Jahren des 17. Jahrhunderts geschwächt wurde, da sie nach Artikel 3 des mongolisch-oiratischen Codexes von 1640 aufgeteilt wurden: diejenigen "taken in by the Mongols between the years of Fire-Snake (1617) and Earth-Dragon (1628) shall belong to the Mongols; those taken in by the Oyirad shall belong to the Oyirad" (S. 201). Als Teile der Oiraten unter Führung des Stammes der Torgut 1630 an die untere Wolga abwanderten, waren keine Qoyid darunter. Später wurden sie weiter dezimiert wegen ihrer Beteiligung an Amursanas Aufstand gegen die mandschurische Qing-Dynastie in China, dessen Niederschlagung das Ende des Dsungaren-Reiches bedeutete. Auf die Spaltung und Dezimierung der Qoyid verweist auch Pallas' Bemerkung über die wenigen von ihnen übriggebliebenen (s. o.).

¹⁴ Pallas (1776: 31-33). Jovyun Mergens Frau himmlischer Herkunft soll in seiner Abwesenheit während einer militärischen Expedition eine Beziehung zu einem Fürsten niederen Ranges gehabt haben, der die "Zauberkunst *bō*" [das Schamanieren, E. T.] gut verstand (seinen eigentlichen Namen kenne man nicht, er sei aber bekannt als Bö Nojon oder Lusun Chan, "Zauber-" oder "Drachen-Fürst"), aus der Oolinda-budun Taidshi, der Stammvater der Čoros-Linie, hervorging (Pallas 1776: 34).

¹⁵ Ramstedt (1935: 220a) mit dem Zusatz: *jowgan bātr* "Name eines kalmückischen Helden [soll in Turfan begraben sein]".

Unter den Tuwinern von Cengel bilden die zwei *töl* der *Xojod* / *Xojt* (mongolisch *Qoyid*), nach Information von Č. Galsan (tuwinisch Šiniqbaj oyly Ĵuruquvā), den kleinsten *sōk* im Stamm der *Gök Monĵaq*.¹⁶ Wegen ihrer geringen Zahl – gegen Ende der 60er Jahre 50-60 Personen – wurden sie auch spöttisch *Tos Xojt* ‘Neun *Xojt*’, genannt. Sie galten jedoch als gebildete, traditionsbewußte Leute und außerdem als Anhänger des Lamaismus. Mein Gewährsmann Lobčā oyly Ĵigžin war ein typischer Vertreter dieses *sōk*; nach seinem Stammbaum war er in der 6. Generation Nachkomme eines Mannes aus dem dörbetischen Geschlecht der *Xojt* (mong. *Qoyid*), der als *Düp ašĵĵaq* ‘Greis Düp’,¹⁷ bekannt war und den Beinamen *Dege baqšĵi* ‘Ziegenbock-Lehrer’ trug, weil er – zur Zeit des *Ĵazaq Dā* (erster einer Reihe von acht tuwinischen Fürsten, die mit der Revolution endete) als Wandermönch (*badarčĵi lama*) mit einem Ziegenbock umherziehend – die lamaistische Lehre an den Oberlauf des Chovd (tuwinisch *Xomdu*) gebracht haben soll.

Auf die direkte Beziehung der *Xojt*, die unter den Tuwinern Südsibiriens nicht vorkommen (Mannaj-ool 1995a: 59), zu den Dörbeten weist der Name des *töl* der *Dörböđ Xojod* (~ *Xojt*). Nach einer Liste mit *sōk* und *töl* der Tuwiner von Cengel, die Paŷva oyly Ĵivā, ein ehemaliger Lehrer in Cengel, zusammengestellt und mir dankenswerter Weise zugänglich gemacht hat, bildet dieser *töl* der *Dörböđ Xojod* zusammen mit dem *töl* der *Bajlyš Xojod* den *sōk* der *Xojt*. Nach einer anderen Klassifizierung werden diese beiden *töl* dem zahlenmäßig stärkeren *sōk* *Xōĵük* zugeordnet; in jedem Falle gehören sie zum Stamm der *Gök Monĵaq*. Die Traditionslinie des Jovĵun Mergen-Stoffes scheint demnach über besagten *Düp ašĵĵaq* zu den *Xojt* / *Xojod* innerhalb der Tuwiner vom Stamme der *Gök Monĵaq* zu verlaufen.

I. Nentwig weist im Kommentar zu der von ihm publizierten Überlieferung darauf hin, daß die 1757 / 1758 nach Fuyü deportierten Kirgisen (etwa 30 Familien) sich bereits damals sprachlich und kulturell von den islamischen Kirgisen Xinjiangs unterschieden. “Sie galten lange als Oirat-Mongolen, und erst 1960 wurde ihre ethnische Zugehörigkeit offiziell anerkannt” (1994: 300). Zu den Oirat-Mongolen im

¹⁶ Die tuwinischen Wörter *sōk* und *töl* werden sowohl in der Literatur (Monguš 1995, Mannaj-ool 1995a) als auch von den Informanten nicht eindeutig und auch nicht einheitlich verwendet, was für gewisse begriffliche Unklarheiten spricht. Die Informationen, die meine tuwinischen Kollegen in den letzten Jahren sammelten, stammen zum Teil von jüngeren Gewährsleuten, was dies möglicherweise begründet. Bei der Wiedergabe hier behalte ich die von ihnen verwendeten Ausdrücke bei, auch wenn sie nicht mit den von mir erfaßten übereinstimmen. In meinem Material halte ich mich an P. Ĵivās terminologische Klassifizierung. P. Ĵivās Großvater Davāčĵi war seinerzeit als Kenner der Geschichte und der Traditionen der altaischen Tuwiner gerühmt, und später verwies man in diesbezüglich strittigen Fragen auf die Söhne des Davāčĵi. Tuwinisch *sōk* (‘Knochen; Geschlecht’) dürfte dem gleichbedeutenden mongol. *yasun* entsprechen, tuwinisch *töl* (‘Nachkommenschaft; Geschlecht; Generation; patronymische Gruppe [russ. *patronimija*]’) dem mongol. *obog*.

¹⁷ Tuwinisch *düp* bedeutet ‘Wurzel, Anfang, Ursprung’.

allgemeinen Sinne zählte auch der in Xinjiang lebende Teil der altaischen Tuwiner, von denen die Gök Monjaq, Aq Sojan und Xara Sojan bis heute ihre türkische Muttersprache bewahrt haben, während einige kleinere tuwinische Einheiten inzwischen sprachlich mongolisiert sind (Monguš 1995: 39). Da diese Tuwiner auch heute noch keine Anerkennung ihrer ethnischen Zugehörigkeit gefunden haben, werden sie innerhalb der Oiraten den mongolischstämmigen Torguten zugerechnet.

Aber auch in der Mongolei wurden die Tuwiner als eigenständige ethnische Gruppe erst Ende der 80er Jahre anerkannt, im Gefolge des gesamtgesellschaftlichen Umgestaltungsprozesses im Lande. Bis dahin wurden sie zu den mongolischsprachigen Urianchaj gezählt (Taube 1996a: 217-218).

Fragen zur Identität der Fu-yü-Kirgisen

Es bleiben Fragen offen: Sind die Fuyü-Kirgisen wirklich Kirgisen im heute gebräuchlichen Sinne? Gehörten sie zu jenen aus dem Einzugsgebiet des Jenissej nach Xinjiang Zugewanderten und zum Teil in die dsungarische Aristokratie integrierten Kirgisen,¹⁸ von denen I. Nentwig schreibt? Handelt es sich bei ihnen um jene Gruppe, von der S. M. Abramzon (1961: 33) auf Grund seiner Forschungen zur Ethnogenese der in China lebenden Kirgisen feststellte, „daß in ihren Bestand eine kleine Gruppe von Tuwinern einging, die zu den Nachkommen der Jenissej-Kirgisen gehört, [eine Gruppe,] die schon zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts durch die Dsungaren vom Jenissej nach Xinjiang fortgeführt worden war“? Oder haben wir es bei ihnen vielleicht mit Angehörigen eines Clans mit der Bezeichnung *Qıryıs* zu tun, wie er unter den Chakassen und den Tuwinern Südsibiriens, aber auch einmal bei jenen im westmongolischen Altai vorkommt? M. Ch. Mannaj-ool nennt 1995 für die Tuwiner von Cengel und für jene von dort nach Zaamar abgewanderten als eine Untergruppe (*sōk*) unter den Aq Sojan die Qazaq Qıryıs,¹⁹ sowie Qıryıs unter den ursprünglich türkischsprachigen Darchaten im Chövsgöl-Aimak (Mannaj-ool 1995b: 65).

Durch eine erste „vorläufige“ (tentative) Beschreibung des „Fuyü Gırgıs“ von Hu Zhen-hua und Guy Imart (1987) haben wir Kenntnis von der Sprache, die – noch – von den vor allem älteren Fuyü-Kirgisen gesprochen wird. Während die Autoren (1987: 4) konstatieren, daß „the linguistic features of F[u-yü] G[ırgıs] corroborate convincingly enough the close ties with Tien-Shan Khirgiz suggested by a common ethnonym“, hebt Gerhard Doerfer in seiner Besprechung (1997) die beträchtlichen Unterschiede („considerable differences“) zum Kirgisischen in Kirgistan, den Einfluß der angrenzenden Sprachen, insbesondere des Mongolischen und Chinesischen, hervor. Er sieht im Fuyü-Gırgıs eine Art Übergangsglied zu den südsibirischen Türk-

¹⁸ Möglicherweise wurde im 18. Jahrhundert die Bevölkerung am Oberlauf des Jenissej von den Oiraten sehr verallgemeinernd als Kirgisen bezeichnet; die Verwendung des Ethnonyms zum Beispiel bei Pallas, die auf kalmückische Informanten zurückgehen dürfte, scheint dafür zu sprechen.

¹⁹ Mannaj-ool (1995a: 59); zu den Tuwinern in Zaamar siehe Taube (1996a).

sprachen. Einige der von ihm aufgeführten Charakteristika (1, 2, 6 und 7) finden sich auch im Altaituwinischen. G. Doerfers Besprechung ist zu entnehmen, daß Juha Janhun²⁰ das Fuyü-Girgis zum Chakassischen stellt, so daß insgesamt der sprachliche Befund eine Beziehung zum altaisch-südsibirischen Raum zu unterstützen scheint.

Und schließlich: Hu und Imart (1987: 3, Anm. 2) erwähnen eine zweite Tradition, nach der die (oder eine?) erzwungene Migration bereits im Jahre 1293 unter Qubilai Qan stattfand. Sollten vielleicht sich als Tiryis verstehende Gruppen in zwei Schüben nach Nordost-China gekommen sein, womöglich aus verschiedenen Gegenden Zentralasiens?

Noch viele interessante offene Fragen. Doch wie dem auch sei: Daß in der fuyü-kirgisischen Überlieferung so bedeutungsvoll der Altai erwähnt wird, woher ja auch der altaituwinische Text stammt, verbindet den hier behandelten mythisch-sagenhaften Stoff eng mit dieser Gebirgsregion Zentralasiens. Er ist mir von den südsibirischen Tuwinern und auch sonst in dieser konkreten Form nicht begegnet.

Die Vorfahren der heutigen Fuyü-Kirgisen gehörten offensichtlich zu dem Bund der Vier Oiratenstämme. Diese organisatorische Einbindung war vermutlich nicht allein durch ihre damaligen Jagd- und Weideplätze im Gebiet oder Umfeld des Altai begründet, sondern vielleicht auch durch eine frühere Herkunft aus dem Einzugs- und / oder Oberlaufgebiet des Jenissej in Südsibirien. Das würde auch I. Nentwigs bereits erwähnte Mitteilung erklären, daß diese kleine "auf Seiten der Dsungaren kämpfende kirgisische Gruppe sich bereits damals sprachlich und kulturell erheblich von den islamischen Kirgisen Xinjiangs unterschied" (1994: 300).

Bibliographie

- Abramzon, Saul M. 1961. *Kirgizy KNR*. (Izvestija Akademii Nauk Kirgizskoj SSR. Serija obščestvennyx nauk, 3: 2.) Frunze.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1997. Besprechung zu Hu & Imart 1987. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 147, 238.
- Erkes, Eduard 1925-1926. Chinesisch-amerikanische Mythenparallelen. *T'oung Pao* 24, 32-53.
- Gaadamba, Šamž-Mjativyn 1966. Ėrchij mērgēnij domog-ūlgērijn učir. *Šinžlėch uchaan am'dral* 3, 66-69.
- Hu, Zhen-hua & Imart, Guy 1987. *Fu-Yü Girgis: A tentative description of the easternmost Turkic language*. (Papers on Inner Asia 8.) Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Mannaj-ool [Mannaj-ool], Monguš Churgul-ool[ovič] 1995a. Tuvincy Mongolii: tradicii i sovremennost'. In: *Učēnye zapiski*. (Serija istoričeskaja 18.) Kyzyl: Tuvinskij naučno-issledovatel'skij institut jazyka, literatury i istorii. 56-62.
- Mannaj-ool, Monguš Churgul-ool[ovič] 1995b. Darchaty: nekotorye étnografičeskie dannye. In: *Učēnye zapiski*. (Serija istoričeskaja 18.) Kyzyl: Tuvinskij naučno-issledovatel'skij institut jazyka, literatury i istorii. 62-67.

²⁰ G. Doerfer verweist dazu auf *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 82, 178.

- Mify = Tokarev, S. A. (Hrsg.) 1982. *Mify narodov mira 1-2*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija 1982.
- Miyawaki, Junko, 1997. The Khoyid chief Amursana in the fall of the Dzungars: The importance of the Oyirad family trees discovered in Kazan. In: Berta, Árpád (Hrsg.) *Historical and linguistic interaction between Inner-Asia and Europe. Proceedings of the 39th Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC), Szeged, Hungary: June 16-21, 1996*. Szeged: University of Szeged, Department of Altaic Studies. 195-205.
- Monguš [Монгуш], Marina Vasil'evna 1995. Tuvincy v Kitae: Problemy istorii, jazyka i kul'tury. In: *Učenyje zapiski*. (Serija istoričeskaja 18.) Kyzyl: Tuvinskij naučno-issledovatel'skij institut jazyka, literatury i istorii. 30-56.
- Nentwig, Ingo (Hrsg.) 1994. *Märchen der Völker Nordost-Chinas*. [Aus dem Chinesischen übersetzt von Mareile Flitsch, Ingo Nentwig und Jiang Wu.] (Die Märchen der Weltliteratur.) München: Eugen Diederichs.
- Pallas, Peter Simon 1776. *Sammlungen historischer Nachrichten über die Mongolischen Völkerschaften* 1. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften. [Nachdruck: Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1980.]
- Potanin, Grigorij Nikolaevič, 1884. *Očerki severo-zapadnoj Mongolii* 4. St. Peterburg: Imperatorskoe Russkoe Geografičeskoe Obščestvo.
- Ramstedt, Gustav John 1935. *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen seura.
- Schimmel, Annemarie 1998. Der Mondbaum. Zaubermärchengedichte aus dem Orient. In: Heindrichs, Ursula und Heinz-Albert (Hrsg.) 1998. *Zauber Märchen. Forschungsberichte aus der Welt der Märchen*. (Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Märchengesellschaft 23.) München: Eugen Diederichs. 174-187.
- Sary, Giovanni, 1988. *Epengesänge der Sibe-Mandschuren*. (Asiatische Forschungen 106.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Taube, Erika 1969. Drei tuwinische Varianten zur Sage von der Herkunft der Murmeltiere. In: Mode, Heinz u. a. (Hrsg.) *Studia Asiae. Festschrift Johannes Schubert* 1. Halle / Saale: Buddhist Centre. [Supplement zu *Buddhist Yearly* 1968.] 263-275.
- Taube, Erika 1974. Zum Problem der Ersatzwörter im Tuwinischen des Cengel-sum. In: Hazai, Georg & Zieme, Peter (Hrsg.) *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 5.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. 589-607.
- Taube, Erika 1978 *Tuwinische Volksmärchen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Taube, Erika 1982. Goldmädchen und Feuerjunge. Zur Namensgebung bei den Tuwinern. *Kleine Beiträge des Museums für Völkerkunde Dresden* 5, 30-36.
- Taube, Erika 1990. Ein Quell für Fragen zu Folkloretraditionen und Glaubensvorstellungen nicht nur der Sibe-Mandschuren. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 85, 261-271.
- Taube, Erika 1991. Der Igel in der Mythologie altaischer Völker. In: Brendemoen, Bernt (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the PIAC, Oslo, Juni 12-16, 1989*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 339-354.
- Taube, Erika 1994a. *Skazki i predanija altajskix tuvincev*. Moskva: Izdatel'skaja firma "Vostočnaja literatura" Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Taube, Erika 1994b. Überlieferungen zur Geschichte der Tuwiner im Altai. In: Schorkowitz, Dittmar (Hrsg.) *Ethnohistorische Wege und Lehrjahre eines Philosophen. Festschrift für Lawrence Krader zum 75. Geburtstag*. Frankfurt a.M., etc.: Peter Lang. 279-292.

- Taube, Erika 1996a. Zur gegenwärtigen Situation der Tuwiner im westmongolischen Altai. In: Berta, Á. & Brendemoen, B. & Schöning, C. (Hrsg.) *Symbolae Turcologicae. Studies in honour of Lars Johanson*. (Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions 6.) Stockholm: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul. 213-225.
- Taube, Erika 1996b. Die Musik in den Märchen zentralasiatischer Völker. In: Heindrichs, Ursula, und Heinz-Albert Heindrichs (Hrsg.) *Das Märchen und die Künste*. (Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Märchengesellschaft 21.) Wolfsegg: Erich Röth. 103-120.
- Taube, Erika 2000. Der Fuchs. Von der altaituwinischen Tradition zum zentralasiatisch-sibirischen Kontext. In: Walravens, Hartmut (Hrsg.) *Der Fuchs in Zentral- und Ostasien*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 147-176.
- Zhonghua renmin gonghoguo ditu ji*. Beijing, Shanghai. 1957.

Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of Cholpan Khoussainova & Rémy Dor, *Manuel de qazaq. Langue et civilisation*. Paris: Langues & Mondes 1997. 195 pages + 2 compact discs. 270 FF.

Mark Kirchner, Department of Turcology, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, P.O. Box 111932, D-60054 Frankfurt a.M.; e-mail: M.Kirchner@em.uni-frankfurt.de

One of the new tasks of Turcology is to prepare good textbooks for the state languages of the independent republics of Central Asia. For Kazakh, little was done until recent times, both in the NIS countries and elsewhere in the world. The few introductory books are didactically of debatable merit (e.g. Moldabekov 1992), or have been prepared in haste to meet the demand of travellers and businessmen (e.g. Abouy & Öztopçu 1994).

The book under review, written by a renowned European Turcologist and a Kazakh native speaker, aims at filling this gap without being too academic. Kazakh is introduced on the back of the book as “une langue simple”, a language where “la connaissance de soixante suffixes suffit pour maîtriser la grammaire et parler de tout et de rien.” The manual is intended for students without any knowledge in Turkic languages. Nevertheless even those who have a good command in one or two Turkic languages should take Kazakh seriously and study it lesson by lesson even if there may be some redundancy. Each of the 19 lessons presents grammatical explanations, useful exercises with solutions in an appendix, dialogues and additional information about Kazakhstan and Kazakh culture (unfortunately the transcription in these passages is not coherent). The dialogues, which are related to each other in their contents, give a good impression of spoken Kazakh and are not boring at all. This feature and many other details (writing exercises in Cyrillic handwriting, illustrations, etc.) give the impression of a manual prepared with love and care. The CDs are of good quality, and although one of the speakers has a Russian accent, this is not so bad since it reflects the linguistic reality in Kazakhstan.

The authors of the textbook under review have done pioneering work. Thus it is quite natural to find mistakes or misleading descriptions in the first edition. The following list of selected inaccuracies (page numbers in brackets) is presented here as an additional information for teachers or students who intend to use the textbook:

- (5) *mäshür* not *mäšüwr*.
- (7) It is more than a simplification to say that: "l'accent tonique est toujours à la fin du mot". In Kazakh, as in other Turkic languages, there are a lot of systematic exceptions that should be mastered by beginners.
- (8) The Cyrillic letter <y> is transcribed *uw* resp. *üw* after consonants, but *w* after vowels, <q> is *ya* resp. *yä* according to front vs. back harmony.
- (15) *ä* is not a "variété de *a*" but a separate phoneme.
- (16) *student pe* not *student ped*.
- (17) *iše me* "(s)he drinks" is given as the interrogative form of *išedi me* "he drinks". Later, p. 33, there is an exercise where interrogative sentences have to be modelled according to the pattern *bala özi žüredi* > *bala özi žüredi me*?
- (18) Two classes of voiced consonants ("sonores" = *b, v, g, ğ, d, z, ž* and "sonantes" = *m, n, ñ, l, r, y*) are defined in order to give the rules for the distribution of several suffixes (p. 23). Unfortunately this classification does not fit the distribution in many cases. Thus the plural suffix is not *-dAr* "après les sonores et les sonantes", but after all voiced consonants besides *r* and *y*.
- (24) According to the authors of the manual, the *-DI* past is also used for an action whose completion "est certain dans le futur". If there is such a meaning at all, this is a marginal contextual nuance.
- (25) It should be noted that the infinitive suffix is *-(U)w* and causes the loss of final high vowels of verbal stems.
- (26) As stated above, some sentences in the dialogues exhibit syntactic influence from Russian. In the sentence *Žak mağan ayttı sender Parižde kezdesipsiñder* 'Jacques told me that you have met in Paris' punctuation marks could have been used to stress the construction.
- (38) The verbal negation is only given as *-mA* and *-pA*, with no mention of the allomorph *-bA*.
- (40) The translation of the French sentence "ce livre est à moi (le mien)" should be *bul kitap meniki* not *bul kitabi meniki*.
- (43) *bügin* not *büwgin*.
- (48) *taniysıñ* not *tanısıñ*; *oqıysıñ* not *oqısıñ*.
- (56) The second person imperative plural is *-(I)ñIz* not *-ñIz*.
- (61) The description of the distribution of the genitive allomorphs is a little misleading. It should be *-nIñ* after vowels and nasal consonants and *-dIñ* for the remaining voiced consonants. It is not the genitive suffix which is composed of two elements but the genitive construction.
- (62) *Žaqtiñ kitabi* not *Žaqtiñ kitabi*.
- (68) *kompozitorlarınıñ* not *kompozitorlarını*.
- (69) *keşirüw* not *keşerüw* "pardonner".
- (71) In the section "le futur" the authors show a "présent-futur inactuel" with the suffix *-AtIn*. According to Kazakh grammars, this form is not used in the sense of a future tense but in the apodosis of conditional sentences.
- (73) *kitapşı* not *kitapši*; *qonaqşıl* not *qonaqşil*.
- (79) The translation of *ketkenge* should be "pour ceux qui partent" instead of "pour ceux qui viennent".

- (81) *ešnärse* not *ešnarse*.
- (86) The sentence *qalağa barmaq bolıp, äzirlik žasaldı* “Ayant l’intention d’aller en ville, il fit des préparatifs” does not illustrate the participial use of *-MAK*. A phrase like *aytpaq söz* “a word that has to be said” would be more illustrative. The infinitive *-(U)w* and the verbal noun *-(I)s* are not used as participles.
- (92) *menen žas* not *menden žas*.
- (93) *muñdı* not *mundı*.
- (103-105) The meaning of constructions with auxiliary verbs depends also on the gerund on the main verb. Thus *-(I)p al-* and *-A al-* do not have the same meaning, here given as “la capacité d’effectuer une action”.
- (105) *kelip qaldı* not *kelip šaldı*.
- (114) *esikten beri* not *esiktin beri*; *sabaqtan soñ* not *sabaqtan sol*.
- (115) *tañerteñnen* not *tañerteñen*.
- (116) *almanıñ* not *almanın*.
- (126) *meniñ* not *menin*.
- (130) *üşewimiz* not *üşewmiz*.
- (139) *kitaptı* not *kitaptı*.
- (140) *köñildi* not *könildi*; *änder* not *änder*.
- (147) *äldeqayda* is an indefinite pronoun not a postposition.
- (150) *orışsa* not *orşa*.
- (165) In the “repères bibliographiques” the French student will surely miss the “Dictionnaire Français-Kazakh” by L. Kydyrbayeva and the “Dictionnaire Kazakh-Français” by D. Indjoudjan (both Paris 1983).
- (170) *dušpan* is not “étranger” but “ennemi”.
- (173) *köriskense* is not “bientôt” but “à bientôt”.
- (174) “valise” is *qol žügi* not *qol žügin*.

Despite these mistakes, the *Manuel de qazaq* is a good introduction to Kazakh for student groups as well as autodidacts. I have used Khoussaïnova & Dor’s textbook in my course “Introduction to Kazakh” for undergraduate students, most of whom successfully learned Kazakh (along with some French) with its help.

References:

- Moldabekov, K. 1992. *Govorim po-kazaxski*. Alma-Ata: Ana tili.
- Abouv, Z. & Öztopçu, K. 1994. *Colloquial Kazakh – a mini course*. Guilford: Audio-Forum.

Claus Schöning: Review of Larry Clark, *Turkmen reference grammar*. *Turcologica* 34. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998. xxi + 708 p.

The *Turkmen reference grammar* by Larry Clark is intended “to be an accessible, practical and comprehensive reference work for students, researchers and linguists” (p. xvii) on the written and spoken standard Turkmen language. Consequently the author uses an easily understandable language to explain grammatical forms and their functions and provides a lot of examples. This gives even students inexperienced with Turkic languages access to Turkmen. At the same time it makes this reference grammar an important reservoir of grammatical information and language material not only for Turcologists but also for anyone seeking linguistic (and even historical, demographic etc.) data on Turkmen. The grammatical description depends on the Turkmen standard grammar of 1970-1977 (p. xix). Additionally Clark had the cooperation of three Turkmen members of the Turkmen Language Project (see p. xix). Clark’s descriptions are full of interesting details—many of them already known, but never before presented in a grammar not written in Russian.

The introduction (p. 1-26) contains information about the history, name, language and study of modern Turkmen. There follows a chapter on the sound system (p. 27-86) including the description of the Cyrillic alphabet and orthography. Morphology and parts of the syntax (e.g. subordinated clauses which minimally consist of a participle or a gerund) are treated in the chapter on the *grammatical system* (p. 87-484). The chapter about syntax is relatively short (p. 485-504). The lexicon is treated on p. 505-568. Here, besides remarks on word derivation, we find a sub-chapter about thematic groups of words like time and calendar, human body,¹ kinship, greeting, etc. The book ends with lists of various paradigms (p. 569-660), a rich bibliography (p. 661-678) and a very useful index (p. 679-708).

In most parts of the grammar Clark uses the traditional terminology of the classical Latin-based grammatical system still widely in use in Turcology. But occasionally he gives descriptions and explanations which are at least unusual. Thus, e.g., he calls *-mA-* a negation particle and not a suffix (p. 212). He differentiates between *postpositions* (p. 405-426) and *auxiliary nouns* (p. 427-431), where many Turkic grammars use only the term *postposition*. Clark’s postpositions consist of postponed functional words like *göra* ‘according to’ or *sari* ‘toward’ which take no case ending. The term *auxiliary nouns* designates nouns of time and space which appear in genitive constructions of the type *öy içinde* ‘inside the house’. It makes sense to separate these two groups of function words, even if the designation *auxiliary nouns* should better be replaced by a more specific term. But because of the many material and functional correspondences between the two groups, a total separation into completely different groups is perhaps a little bit too radical. I think it would be more

¹ As we can guess from Clark’s table of Turkmen anatomy (p. 562), the Turkmens, like the other Turks under Chinese and former Soviet rule, seem to get by without (designations for) genitals.

adequate to treat them as sub-groups of a category of expressions bearing case-like function.

The case forms of the third person singular possessive suffixes are explained as follows: “The consonant *n* /n/ also appears before all case suffixes when they are added to a word ending in the third person possessive suffix *+ы/i* /+ı/i/” (p. 70). This rule allows, of course, a very simple description of the case-marking strategies of Turkmen which is fully sufficient for practical purposes. But for students of Turcology the designation “pronominal *n*” should have been added, i.e. it should be said that from a diachronic point of view this *n* seems to be part of the possessive suffix. In the related case of final *n* in “possessive and case stems” of demonstrative pronouns (p. 193) Clark speaks only of “altered stems” and gives no reference to the comparable phenomenon on the possessive suffixes. Even if the grammar is intended to be a practical tool, such elementary knowledge of Turcology should have found some place in it. Moreover, the fact that pronominal *n* is treated together with buffer consonants may additionally cause wrong associations by students and scholars inexperienced in Turcological questions.

Another quite unusual designation made by Clark is *verbal* which “consists of those verb forms that cannot appear as final verbs of a sentence. Non-final verbs include the infinitive, participles and gerunds” (p. 327). In this definition of the *infinite verbal forms* (i.e. deverbal forms which can serve as predicates of non-finite clauses) a fourth category—the verbal nouns—is not mentioned; they appear only a few lines later. Although the verbal nouns in *-mA* and *-(y)IG* “share certain features with the infinitive” in *-mAK*, Clark wants to separate them (p. 333). He writes that both verbal nouns “plus possessive suffix reflect the process of an action”, whereas parallel infinitive constructions “indicate only that the otherwise undefined action is possessed by a definite person” (p. 333). Additionally, the verbal nouns cannot be used in constructions with *gerek*, *mümkin* or *islemek*, as can the infinitive. These arguments do not seem very convincing to me. First of all *verbal noun* is a morphological category. Nouns can be defined by the ability to take possessive and case suffixes—and both are true of the infinitives as well as of Clark’s verbal nouns. Furthermore, both types possess—in contrast to derivational verbal nouns—the ability to carry syntactic complements with them like finite forms do. That infinitives can appear in constructions different from those in which the verbal nouns are used is not a valid argument either. One could also say that the form in *-Ip* is not a gerund, only because it appears in constructions in which the other gerunds can not be found. Additionally, an assumed opposition “*process of an action* (*-mA*, *-(y)IG*) versus *undefined action* (*-mAK*)” can be taken as a direct hint to an underlying aspectual opposition between the forms—and, on the contrary, makes it seem very possible that infinitive and verbal nouns are members of one system of forms which is used to form predicates of non-finite complementary (sub-ordinated) sentences.

Clark includes forms like *bar* ‘exists’, *yoq* ‘does not exist; no’, *däl* ‘is not’ and the element *eken* in the group of *modal words* (p. 377-380). The modal words are

said to “have two basic functions: to express the speaker’s attitude toward what she or he is saying, and to add some shade of emotional or other meaning to a word, phrase or sentence” (p. 377). Most of the elements treated in this paragraph may be described this way. But I doubt that—except for the case when *yoq* means ‘no’—this definition really matches the main functions at least of *bar*, *yoq* and *däl*. These three words—different from other words treated in this paragraph—mainly appear in predicative position.² Whereas the simple positive copula form gives information that an entity “is” (which may mean that the entity exists) or that it can be identified with another entity or by a quality or quantity, the words in question are used to make statements about (non-)existence or non-identification. Therefore, they could be best designated as copulative elements and should be treated together with other forms taking part in the formation of nominal predicates, i.e. mainly forms of the copula corresponding with Old Turkic *är-* and its derivatives and later developed substitutes for the present tense copula (Old Turkic *ärür*). To use Clark’s own words: They are used to construct “what she or he is saying” and—different from real modal words of assertion, uncertainty, assumption etc.—do not express more of a “speaker’s attitude” than any non-modal, indicative deverbal form does. In the sentence *atlar bar* ‘there are horses’ the element *bar* is simply the predicate (or the complement of a virtual present tense copula predicate) of a nominal clause and does not express the speaker’s positive attitude toward the “saying” ‘(they are) horses’. In *bu at däl* ‘this is no horse’ *däl* is simply the negation of the copula and reports the non-identity of the subject referent with the referent of *at* ‘horse’. If *däl* ‘is not’ is a modal word, then verbal negations with *-mA-* should also be treated as modal expressions.

A comparable case is perhaps *eken* (p. 386–387). It always follows the predicate and takes instead the possessive or the pronominal personal endings. Clark’s examples and description are reminiscent of the function of *ekan* in Uzbek and *ekändur* in Chagatay, except for the fact that the Chagatay form additionally signalizes anteriority. Especially the Chagatay form can be called the anterior (“past tense”) copula of the indirect perspective, i.e. a form which bears a functional value comparable to that of the aspectotemporal deverbal forms (see Schönig 1997). As an indirective form *ekändur* can not be combined with *di*, which is the basic deverbal form of the past tense direct perspective in Chagatay. In contrast, the Chagatay form *ekin* can be combined with all finite predicates—because it has lost its copula status, does not take part in the perspective system and has become a modal particle expressing doubt or assumption. The question arises whether Turkmen *eken* can still be treated as such a perspective copula form or whether it proceeded in its development towards a modal particle. The fact that it still takes personal endings may be taken as an argument for its copula character. Unfortunately, Clark gives no detailed information about the distribution of *eken* on different types of finite predications, which would help to clarify this question.

² The elements *bar* and *yoq* additionally function to a limited degree as predicates of relative clauses of the type *su bar yerde* ‘in places where water exists’.

In the field of verbal morphology Clark uses some terms in an at least ambiguous and imprecise way. On page 209 the chapter *Verbs* starts as follows:

“Verbs are words which convey the action of a sentence. They may be described according to the time of the action (tense), the duration of the action (aspect), and the speaker’s attitude toward the action (mood).

The forms of Turkmen verbs may be divided into two basic groups: those verb forms which appear at the end of a sentence to indicate its predicate and those which do not appear at the end of a sentence. The final verbs (also called ‘finite verbs’) bear suffixes of tense, aspect and mood, as well as of person and number.

The non-final verbs (also called ‘non-finite verbs’) lack one or more of these categories and thus cannot appear at the end of a sentence, except in special circumstances.”

The paragraph *Tense and Aspect* starts:

“Verbs which serve as predicates of sentences typically express both tense and aspect.” (p. 217)

In both instances Clark uses *verb* (and in one instance *verb form*) in the sense of “deverbal form which can serve as a finite or a non-finite predicate”, in short “(non-) finite verb(al form).” In other passages the term *verb* is used in the sense of *verb root* or *stem* to designate the class of lexemes which are non-nominals and non-particles. Thus we find remarks like “A Turkmen simple verb typically consists of one syllable, but also may have two syllables if its root and suffix cannot be isolated” (p. 210). Thus different morphological and syntactic forms share the same designation *verb* (sometimes accompanied by more specific terms like *verb stem*, *verb form* or *predicate*), a situation one should try to avoid. In the case of the term *final verb* we know from the lines cited above that it is synonymous with *finite verb*. From the sentence “The group of final verbs includes all those treated under Tense/Aspect (/.../) and Mood (/.../) below, as well as the formations dealt with under Descriptive verbs below” (p. 209) it does not become clear whether Clark additionally wants to include all the verbal combinations treated there or only the forms used to derive the *present continuous tense* (see below) under the designation “final verb”.

We find the same unclear situation for the term *tense*. Under the headline *Tense and Aspect* Clark begins:

“The category of tense concerns the correspondence between the verb form and the concept of time. It refers to the time in which the action takes place, whether it occurs in present, past or future time.

In addition to its tense, the action may be viewed according to its aspect, that is, whether its occurrence is indefinite, continuous or perfect (completed) in duration.” (p. 217)

Whereas here *tense* and *aspect* appear to be different categories, the following lines tell us the opposite:

“Thus, tense may be described according to time (present, past, future) and to aspect (indefinite continuous, perfect), and, in some cases, according to various modalities of action (definite, habitual, subjective, unrealized).” (p. 217)

It seems that Clark wants to describe what Johanson (e.g. 1971) calls *aspecto-temporality*. This means that at least indicative finite verbal forms express a temporal relation between the act of speech and the event designated by the finite predication and its extensions, and at the same time convey an aspectual component, i.e. a special perspective subjectively chosen by the speaker under which an event may occur incompleting, at the point of completion, already completed or simply as an undifferentiated whole. Clark’s intention also becomes clear from his descriptions of the individual finite forms treated in this paragraph. Even if the terminology is different and contextual realizations of functional values of the forms are sometimes taken as their basic functions (e.g. the signalization of habituality by the aorist, see p. 219), the threefold aspectual system described by Clark can in principle be explained by applying Johanson’s model.

In the paragraph *Words and Grammar* (p. 93-96) the author states that “Turkmen indicates the aspect of duration of an action within the tense suffixes added to verbs /.../, but also describes the beginning, process, cessation and other characteristics of action through constructions consisting of two verbs /.../”. Such constructions are treated in detail in the paragraph *Descriptive Verbs* (p. 311-325). The functions of the verbal combinations in question are given accurately. Most of these verbal combinations are used to indicate different ways or phases of performing an action (German *Aktionsarten*) and ultimately belong to the derivational and not the grammatical tools of Turkmen. Thus, in connection with the combination *-p čiq-* Clark speaks of “characteristics of an action” (p. 213). But on pages 95-96 he enumerates aspectotemporal (“tense”) forms together with a verbal combination like *-p bol-* indicating “finished action”. Even if forms like the present tense in *-yAr* or the “subjective past indefinite tense” in *-Ipdlr* go back to verbal combinations, they function in modern Turkmen as aspectotemporal markers and should not be treated together with the biverbal combinations on the same functional level. The same holds true for the combinations *-p du:r*, *-p yatı:r* and *-p otı:r*. They are correctly treated as aspectotemporal indicators of the so-called *present continuous tense* (p. 224-228). According to the information given in this paragraph, the combination *-p yö:r* “is used only for descriptive verb formations” and not as a special “tense” form. But in the paragraph about descriptive verbs *-p yö:r* is then treated together with the three other forms. Here the four combinations are said to “serve as descriptive verbs that depict the process of doing something constantly, continuously or regularly” (p. 321-322). As we can see, the weak point of Clark’s analysis of these biverbal forms is that he does not clearly differentiate between aspectuality and actionality—like his

model, the Soviet Turkmen grammar. This originates in a wrong interpretation of the role of “duration of an action”. Whereas different aspect forms can be used subjectively to present one and the same event within its realization, at its critical points or even after these points have been passed, actional forms are used to derive verbs with specialized different meanings from a basic verb. These new verbs designate objectively different actions. The actions expressed by some of these verbs are non-transformative and are well compatible with the idea of “duration”—like the aspectual forms presenting an event in the course of realization. The actions expressed by transformative verbs are easily compatible with the ideas of “shortness” or “completion” like aspectual forms focussing on the critical points of an event. Thus “duration” and “shortness” turn out to be contextual realizations of functional values belonging to two different levels of grammar.

The definition of *sentence* is given without using one syntactic term, such as subject or predicate (p. 492), and mainly relies on the fact that they express a complete thought (see also p. 484). The definition is very broad and also includes exclamations. The terms subject and predicate appear only in connection with the differentiation between simple and composite sentences.

Despite all the critical remarks, I think that Clark’s work is an important and useful basic work on the grammar of standard Turkmen. It is very useful both for learners of Turkmen and for practical purposes. But because of the ample detailed informations, it also makes for an inspiring read while providing a reference work for scholars of Turcology and linguistics.

References

- Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen*. (Studia Turcica Uppsaliensia 1.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
 Schöning, Claus 1997. *Finite Prädikationen und Textstruktur im Babur-name*. (Turcologica 31.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Christoph Schroeder: Review of Lars Johanson (ed.), in cooperation with Éva Ágnes Csató, Vanessa Locke, Astrid Menz, and Dorothea Winterling. *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3-6, 1994*. Turcologica 32. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998. x+765 pp. Hb. DM 164.--. ISBN 3-447-03864-0.

Christoph Schroeder, Universität – GH Essen, FB 3, Türkisch, D-45117 Essen.

The Mainz Meeting brings together the article versions of the papers presented at the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, which was held August 3-

6, 1994, at the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz. The meeting continued a tradition initiated in 1982 by Dan I. Slobin and Karl Zimmer. Earlier International Conferences on Turkish Linguistics had been held at Berkeley in 1982, Istanbul in 1984, Tilburg in 1986, Ankara in 1988, London in 1990 and Eskişehir in 1992. Since the Mainz Meeting, further conferences have taken place in Ankara in 1996, and in Oxford in 1998. All the meetings so far have resulted in a conference volume (see the list given in the bibliography). Since the International Conference on Turkish Linguistics is the only international conference series which combines modern linguistic thinking with the study of Turkish, the conference volumes provide an insight into current works on Turkish linguistics and the discussion in the field which no linguist interested in the study of this language can do without.

In a certain way, *The Mainz Meeting* is different from the previous volumes. As Lars Johanson, the editor of *The Mainz Meeting*, writes in the introduction: "The novelty of the Mainz meeting was that the range of topics was extended to include other Turkic languages besides Turkish as well as problems of general linguistic Turcology ... It was our hope that the meeting would promote the development of modern linguistic scholarship in the field by bringing together Turcologists and linguists dealing with Turkic / Turkish matters under different aspects and perspectives" (ix).

In this review, Section 1 will present the book and its articles in the order in which they appear in the volume. In Section 2 we will try to formulate some general impressions.

1. *The Mainz Meeting* contains 49 papers plus a two-page editor's introduction. The length of the papers ranges from 4 to 35 pages. The papers are divided into 14 chapters, according to their topics. A helpful alphabetical list of the authors and contributions is provided; there is no index.

In Chapter 1, "Phonology", first Michael Dobrovolsky argues that Chuvash is a language whose phonological processes are not syllable dependent but rather dependent on phonological weight ("Chuvash without syllables", 3-27). Next, Marti Roos describes the phenomenon of preaspiration in Western Yugur, a phenomenon rarely attested in the languages of the world ("Preaspiration in Western Yugur monosyllables", 28-41).

Chapter 2, "Morphology" also consists of only two contributions. First, Armin Bassarak discusses the pros and cons of the assignment of functional categories to Turkish morphological units, such as the tense / aspect suffix *-Iyor*, the verbal noun markers *-DIK-*, *-(y)AcAK* and *-mA-*, the plural suffix *-lEr* and the question marker *-mI* ("Functional categories in Turkish—remarks on the interaction between morphology and syntax", 45-56). In the second contribution in this chapter, Ömer Demircan divides the Turkish voice categories into "subtraction" (passive, reflexive, reciprocal) and "addition" (causative, mediative) processes ("Affixal behaviour in Modern Turkish", 57-72).

Seven papers contribute to Chapter 3, “Communicative Functions and Referentiality”. First, Marcel Erdal takes a fresh new look at Turkish exocentric adjectival compounds of the type *el-i açık* (hand-POSS.3SG open) ‘generous’, lit.: ‘his hand (is) open’, that is, compounds in which, contrary to the canonic Turkish pattern, the qualified element comes first and has the possessive suffix of the third person singular. The author argues that these constructions emerged from Old Turkic constructions with a sentence-initial topic and a possessive-marked, subjectival sub-topic. With regard to the distinct coding of subject and topic, then, Old Turkic has similarities with certain Sino-Tibetan languages as well as with Japanese (“Topic, subject and possessive compounds”, 75-84).

The next two articles in this chapter deal with pragmatic aspects of word order. Aslı Göksel investigates how linear order interacts with the interpretation of quantified expressions such as *Bir hemşire her hastaya bakıyor* (a nurse every patient=DAT she=looks=after) ‘A nurse is seeing every patient’. Special emphasis is given to the pre-verbal focus position and the post-predicate position (“Linearity, focus and the postverbal position in Turkish”, 85-106). Next, Jaklin Kornfilt shows that it is possible to relate syntactic and discourse-based properties of “inverted sentence” constructions (i.e. constructions in which the post-predicate position is employed) by applying an analysis of Right Dislocation (“On rightward movement in Turkish”, 107-123).

Taking a promising Turcological viewpoint in order to look at a much discussed problem of Turkish linguistics, Claudia Römer shows that the required use of the accusative suffix with possessive-marked direct objects, which is prevalent in Turkish, did not exist in 16th century Ottoman Turkish. The use of the accusative suffix in Ottoman, then, was much less bound to parameters of definiteness than in modern Turkish (“Marked and non-marked direct objects in 16th-century Ottoman documents”, 124-134).

The two following contributions again concentrate on discourse-pragmatic aspects of Turkish. Şükriye Ruhi investigates the distribution of the two connectors *ama* and *fakat* (both meaning ‘but’) on syntactic, pragmatic and textual levels. The author shows that *ama*, which may appear in the post-predicate position and never combines with *ve* ‘and’, functions on the pragmatic level, where it marks a turn in the discourse. *Fakat* on the other hand, which may combine with *ve* and never appears in the post-predicate position, is an adversative connector and functions on the textual level of cohesion (“Restrictions on the interchangeability of discourse connectives: A study on *ama* and *fakat*”, 135-153). Next, Ümit Deniz Turan contributes to the discussion of referentiality and object incorporation in Turkish. The author points out that incorporated objects may function as antecedents to zero reference and discusses the theoretical consequences of this finding (“Zero object arguments and referentiality in Turkish”, 154-182).

It is difficult to see how the last article in Chapter 3 relates to the topic of the chapter. Working within a Generative Grammar framework, Joop Veld attempts to

explain why Turkish allows certain clauses to appear in the pre- as well as postverbal position (i.e. nominalized clauses), while certain other embedded clauses (i.e. finite complements to verbs like *sanmak* 'believe') may not leave the preverbal position, and again other subordination types (i.e. clauses introduced by means of *ki*) may only appear in postverbal position ("Postverbal clausal constituents in Turkish", 183-196).

Chapter 4 combines three papers on "Converbs". First, looking at Altaic languages in a much broader perspective than the other authors, Walter Bisang argues that the particular type of clause combining by means of converbs, nominalizations and conjunctive verbs of the type *diye*, which is prevalent in all Altaic languages including Japanese, must not necessarily be seen as the outcome of a genetic relationship between these languages. Rather, the "attractiveness" of this bundle of typological features, which is also found in Tamil, Amharic, Quechua, as well as in Uralic languages such as Lamut / Ewen, may have brought about this parallel between the languages, which was then reinforced in the course of their development by way of "structural similarity" as a secondary force of attraction between languages of the same area ("Structural similarities of clause combining in Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungusic and Japanese—a typological alternative to the hypothesis of a genetic relationship", 199-223).

Two papers on converbs in individual Turkic languages follow. Nurettin Demir investigates the combinations in which the Turkish verb *dur-* 'stay' may be used as a postverb. The author distinguishes between two types of combinations, (i) "complex verbs", which are combinations of a full lexical verb with *dur-* in the function of an auxiliary, and (ii) "complex predicates", which are combinations of two full lexical verbs, one of which is *dur-*. According to the author, the distinguishing feature between the two constructions is stress, i.e. while the first type has the stress on the first syllable of the first verbal element, the second has the stress on the second syllable. Both constructions allow two types of combinations in terms of the syntactic relationship between the two verbal elements, (i) paratactic, and (ii) hypotactic ("On the status of a Turkish postverb", 224-233).

Converb constructions in the Siberian Turkic language Shor are the topic of Irina Nevskaya's contribution. Shor converbs in *-p* are generally regarded as belonging to the type of converbs which do not allow a subject different from that of the matrix clause. Exceptions to this rule show noteworthy patterns, that is, different subjects are allowed when the two subjects stand in a part-whole, possessive or inclusive relationship to each other, or when a causal or temporal relationship is at issue. According to the author, this shows that the difference between same-subject and different-subject converbs should not be regarded as categorical, but that one should rather speak of a continuum between the two types ("Subject valency of Shor gerunds", 234-243).

Chapter 5, "Voice", presents three contributions. Michael Hess investigates the properties of Ottoman diathesis constructions. In the author's approach, the respec-

tive suffixes are called “remodelling suffixes” and arranged into four groups, (i) slot-diminishing constructions, (ii) slot-adding constructions, (iii) reciprocal constructions, and (iv) combinations of the first and second type of constructions. Of particular interest are remarks about the grammaticalization of agent phrases in Ottoman passive constructions and the (possible) function of the postposition *ile* “with” in the establishment of causee-phrases in causatives (“The syntax of Ottoman diathesis and related phenomena”, 247-257). In the next paper, Leonid Kulikov investigates patterns of causee-marking in Tuvinian causative constructions. Through accusative-marking of the causee, Tuvinian allows for double-accusative constructions. Thus, Tuvinian seems to challenge the typological claim that, cross-linguistically, the causee is shifted to the leftmost syntactic position not already occupied (“Causative constructions in Tuvinian: Toward a typology of transitivity”, 258-264). Causativity is also the topic of the paper by Vügar Sultanov, who views it as a semantic category of Turkish verbs (“The category of causality in Turkish”, 265-268).

Chapter 6 combines six contributions dealing with various aspects of “Relative Clauses”. Ayhan Aksu-Koç and Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan investigate the referent-identifying (or re-identifying) and referent-characterizing functions of different types of relative clauses (= attributive participle phrases) in Turkish and their use in narratives produced by adults with different educational backgrounds (“The function of relative clauses in narrative discourse”, 271-284).

The behaviour of genitives in relativization is treated in Fatma Erkman-Akerson’s article. The author shows how different types of genitive constructions (inherent vs. exclusive possessives, states of affairs, subject-nominalized verbs) behave differently with regard to “split genitives” in relativization, that is, in constructions where a genitive attribute becomes the head of a relative construction and thereby loses the genitive marking, while the head of the genitive in turn becomes part of the relative clause, as in *baş-ı ağrı-yan çocuk* (head-POSS.3SG ache-PRT child) “the child whose head aches” (“Genitival subjects in Turkish relative constructions”, 285-298).

In the next paper, Geoffrey Haig inquires into the “preferred interpretation” of those relative clauses in which more than one interpretation is possible with regard to the relativized syntactic position. The author arrives at a typologically relevant “preferred interpretation hierarchy” (“On some strategies for case recovery in Turkish relativization”, 299-320).

Headless, non-endophoric relative clauses formed from subject-participles are the topic of Celia Kerslake’s contribution. The author investigates their preferred readings with regard to the semantic (i.e. [+human] and referential-semantic (i.e. [+definite], [+referential]) properties of the concept to which they refer (“Definiteness, referentiality and animacy in pronominal participial clauses in Turkish”, 321-347).

Next, Şeyda Ozil investigates the factors determining the choice between the use of future participles with and without the participle form of the auxiliary *ol-* “to be”. The author shows that the use of the auxiliary is a textual, not a grammatical option, which adds certain modal meanings to the meaning of the accompanying participle

based on a lexical verb ("The choice of the relative participles *-(y)EcEK* and *-(y)EcEK + ol-*", 348-360).

In a new look at relativized locative phrases and relativizations with incorporated subjects, and working within a transformational framework, Sumru Özsoy arrives at an analysis of subject Determiner Phrases of unergatives ("Locative inversion, VP-adjunction and Turkish relativization", 361-375).

In Chapter 7, "Syntax and Semantics", only Maya Cheremisina's contribution does not deal with Turkish. The author investigates the morphosyntactic properties of the negative particle *emes* in Altai Turkic, showing that *emes* should be classified as a marker of nominal negation ("Negative constructions with the particle *emes*", 379-383).

Turning to Turkish, first Sarah Kenelly shows that with regard to the constituent properties of object NPs with pre-head locative phrases, different analyses may be made, depending on whether the NP is an object of a destruction verb or a creation verb. The analysis is based on properties of scrambling and on adverb positions ("Locality conditions in Turkish", 385-403).

Turkish nominalizations and their case-assigning properties are the topic of the paper by Murat Kural. The author arrives at an analysis in which the *-k* contained in the nominalizing suffixes is seen as the complementizer head. The absence of *-k* in nominalizations, then, corresponds with the deletion of the complementizer ("Subordinate Inflections and Comp in Turkish", 404-421).

Next, Gerjan van Schaaijk investigates in detail the morphosyntactic behaviour and the semantics of phrases headed by the so-called "postposition" *gibi* 'like'. The author shows that phrases headed by *gibi* behave significantly differently from other postpositional phrases. *Gibi*, then, should be analysed as a two-place predicate, expressing a wide range of similarity expressions ("On the usage of *gibi*", 422-457).

In one of the few contrastive papers of the volume, Hitay Yüksekler shows that, in Turkish, unaffixed nouns, that is, nouns without the possessive suffix, cannot have structures which are equivalent to complements of English nouns. Thus the prenominal position, i.e., the position where one expects to find complements, is restricted to modifiers in Turkish, and the function of the possessive suffix is to create an argument position ("Possessive constructions of Turkish", 458-477).

The topic of Karl Zimmer's paper is the position of the Turkish question marker *-mI* in so-called "object-verb incorporations". The author demonstrates how the position of *-mI* between the incorporated noun and the incorporating verb creates focus questions. The type of incorporation, however, makes a difference in the type of question evolving (categorical focus question in ad-hoc incorporations,thetic focus question in lexicalized incorporations). On the other hand, the position of *-mI* after the whole phrase denotes an inquiry as to whether some state of affairs prevails ("The case of the errant question marker", 478-481).

In the sole contribution in Chapter 8, "Stylistics", Ahmet Kocaman takes a critical standpoint against the increasing employment of colloquial speech as a stylistic

device in the Turkish mass media ("Stylistic fluctuations in the use of everyday Turkish", 485-497).

The first three of the four papers in Chapter 9, "Language Acquisition", focus on the bilingual child. First, Jeroen Aarssen investigates the linguistic devices bilingual Turkish children, aged between 4 and 10 and living in the Netherlands, use to introduce a character, maintain reference or switch reference to this character in narratives. The results are compared with the respective linguistic behaviour of monolingual Turkish children living in Turkey ("Acquisition of topic continuity in Turkish children's narratives", 501-516).

Turkish schoolchildren's acquisition of everyday reading skills is investigated in Rian Aarts' paper. The author compares the skills of Turkish children in Turkey with those in the Netherlands and shows that the respective proficiency of Turkish children in the Netherlands is mostly influenced by the amount of native language instruction they have received in the Netherlands ("Functional literacy of Turkish children in Turkey and in the Netherlands", 517-526).

In their paper on Turkish-Dutch bilingual speech, Ad Backus and Hanneke van der Heijden present a detailed comparison of code-mixing patterns employed by Turkish-dominant bilingual children and adults. The authors show that children show significantly less intrasentential code-switching than adults do. The findings lead to a discussion of the type of bilingualism displayed by the different age groups ("Life and birth of a bilingual: The mixed code of bilingual children and adults in the Turkish community in the Netherlands", 527-551).

In the last contribution of Chapter 9, Hülya Özcan investigates the acquisition of discourse principles by three-year-old Turkish children. The results suggest that the children are aware of the difference between pragmatic principles such as [+new] and [+given], but are not yet able to perform this competence linguistically ("Definite and indefinite nouns in the discourse of Turkish-speaking children", 552-567).

In Chapter 10, two papers contribute to "Dialect Studies". First, in his discussion of the methods used in Turcological dialectology, Hendrik Boeschoten compares the Turkish *Derleme sözlüğü* with recent lexicographical works in the field of Uzbek dialectology ("On dialect dictionaries", 571-579).

Next, Tooru Hayasi presents a detailed account of the linguistic features of the dialect of the Bolu province in Turkey. The province is located to the north of the Central Anatolian region. Linguistically, it is an interesting area because of its transitional features in terms of voicing, rounding and harmonization ("Dialect distribution in dialect boundary areas: the case of the Bolu dialect of Turkish", 581-593).

In Chapter 11, seven contributions deal with various "Historical and Comparative Turkic Topics". The paper by Selma Çapan reveals the outcome of a test investigating the intelligibility of spoken utterances in six Turkic languages to Turkish speakers. As can be expected, languages such as Azerbaijani and Turkmen, that is, languages closely related to Turkish, appear to be most easily understood by Turkish speakers ("Mutual intelligibility of some Turkic languages", 597-600).

Using the word *Balqaš*, the name of Lake Balkhash in Kazakhstan, as his main example, Kobej Husainov attempts to show that forms with an initial *p-* or *b-*, and a subsequent vowel plus an *-l-* can be traced back to onomatopoeic roots ("Phono-semantic etymon in Turkic languages", 601-606).

Kâmile İmer points out recent problems of graphization, standardization and modernization with which Turkish is confronted and discusses these problems in the light of the principles of the Turkish language reform ("Language reform in Turkey and its aftermath", 607-618).

Western Old Turkic, which was spoken from the 5th century until the beginning of the 13th century (i.e. the time of the Mongolian invasion) in Eastern Europe and the adjacent regions, is the topic of the paper by András Róna-Tas. The author points out phonetic developments in this language and their reflections in certain Hungarian words ("Western Old Turkic", 619-626).

Steve Seegmiller and Çiğdem Balım present an insightful account of the past and present alphabets used for the Turkic languages of the former Soviet Union ("Alphabets for the Turkic languages", 627-646).

Erika Taube reports on the sociolinguistic situation of the Tuvian language in Mongolia and the former Soviet Union in light of new socio-cultural developments and influences from Russian and Mongolian. In the concluding section, the author points to the need to make Tuvian a language of school education ("Observations of a non-linguist concerning the Tuvian language in Tuva and Western Mongolia", 647-655).

Finally, Talat Tekin proves that Kashgari, the famous lexicographer of the eleventh century, was correct in his statement concerning the etymology of Oghuz *tägül* 'is not' [Turkish *değil*). It developed from the Argu negative copula *da:ğol* 'is not' ("On the etymology of Turkish *değil*", 656-664).

In Chapter 12, "Contact Linguistics", we find two papers dealing with traditional Turcological topics, while the focus of the third paper is on diaspora Turkish. First, Klára Agyagási presents a highly detailed investigation of the role of language contact in the development of the Chuvash sound system ("On the characteristics of Cheremiss linguistic interference on Chuvash", 665-682). Next, Hans Nugteren investigates the origins and ages of Turkic loans in the Southern Mongolian languages Monguor, Bao'an and Dongxiang. He compares the results with those from Eastern Yugur, another member of this group, which has far more Turkic loans than the others ("On some Turkic loanwords in Monguor, Bao'an and Dongxiang", 683-695).

In one of the few papers of the volume dealing with diaspora Turkish, Emel Türker investigates the Turkish spoken in Norway by second-generation immigrant Turks. In her interpretation of the data, the author puts special emphasis on the relationship between the group's language behaviour and the social networks of the speakers ("Turkish as an immigrant language: a descriptive study of second generation immigrant Turkish in Norway", 697-704).

In Chapter 13, "Computational Linguistics", first Albert Stoop discusses the problem that arises with the computational translation of the Dutch possessive verb *hebben* 'to have' into Turkish: In certain main clauses (present tense, past tense), Turkish does not use a copula but an existential nominal predicate *var*; in other clauses (subordinate, future tense), the auxiliary verb *olmak* 'to be' replaces *var* ("Some considerations on the implementation of the possessive verb in TRANSIT", 707-727).

Next, Erkan Tin and Varol Akman develop an approach that uses formalized situation schemes in order to identify anaphoric relations in a computational framework, ("Situational analysis of anaphora in Turkish", 728-750).

In the only contribution in Chapter 14, "Applied Linguistics", Lütfiye Oktar and Semiramis Yağcıoğlu, who investigate the effect of topic interest on reading comprehension and recall, arrive at the somewhat puzzling conclusion that for university students, topic interest does not seem to have a facilitative effect on learning and recall from expository texts ("The effect of topic interest on reading comprehension and recall", 753-761).

2. It is not our aim to discuss one or the other theoretical approach, data, methodology or results presented in the volume's papers. Except for a minority of contributions, the reviewer has the impression that all participants are at the height of the research carried out in their particular field. There are, however, some contributions whose authors one might expect to add just a few more words on the theoretical or methodological tools used, in order to help the general reader to find his or her way through the line of reasoning. Also, it is amazing how few instances of explicit cross-referencing to other papers delivered at the same conference can be found. Rik Boeschoten's reference to Tooru Hayasi's contribution (p. 578) is all I was able to find. Given that there is a considerable overlap of research topics (e.g. the six papers on relative clauses) one should expect more.

All in all, it is impressive and promising to see how much ongoing research is being conducted in the field of Turkish and Turcological linguistics. In the near future, the enthusiastic spirit of *The Mainz Meeting* may also bring forth fruitful results in those areas still badly in need of research. The following areas immediately come to the mind of the reviewer.

First, the growing interest in Turkish as a foreign language, and together with this the growing need for high-quality teaching materials, reveals a lack of research in the area of phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical frequency, an area where, since Pierce's pioneering works (1961, 1962), no substantial research results have been published. Of course, frequency research must be based on comprehensive, well-organized corpora—and these are also urgently needed.

Second, there is a clear lack of research with regard to the development of Turkish in the Northern European diaspora. *The Mainz Meeting* contains four articles related in one way or the other to this subject (cf. Aarssen, Aarts, Backus & van der Heijden, and Türker). However, only Emel Türker takes first steps towards a more

concise description of grammatical developments in diaspora Turkish, i.e., Turkish in Norway, while the other works are more oriented towards language acquisition in a bilingual context. Given that in Germany for example, Turkish is the most widely used language next to German, it is amazing to see, with regard to Turkish in Northern Europe, how remote Turkish linguistics is from being able to draw general conclusions from individual speakers' language use.³

Research on diaspora Turkish clearly suffers from another nearly blank spot, i.e. the lack of research regarding the structure of spoken Turkish. It is encouraging to see that some of the articles in *The Mainz Meeting* in fact refer to spoken discourse (cf. Aksu-Koç & Erguvanlı-Taylan, Ruhi, Kornfilt, and Turan).⁴ Nevertheless, a move towards a more systematic description of the structural characteristics of the spoken language is still badly needed. Thus, Johanson's plea for a stronger focus on this field (cf. Johanson 1975) is still valid. Only after gaining a clearer picture of the structure of spoken Turkish can we actually begin to understand developments in diaspora Turkish, since, obviously, it is the spoken language which is apt to change in the first place, not the written standard.

3. The Turcological linguist Lars Johanson and his co-workers in Mainz belong to the few scholars constantly "bridging the gap" between old and new traditions in the study of Turkish and the other Turkic languages, between the so-called "philological" and the "modern linguistic" methodology. They have to be thanked for their courage, and for making *The Mainz Meeting*, that is, both the conference and the volume, such a success. *The Mainz Meeting* demonstrates that both the "philologists" and the "linguists" have much to gain from each other's methods, perspectives, and research results. Thus, the volume opens the door to a more integrative view on Turkish and Turcological linguistics, and to a discussion free of prejudice and tunnel vision.

References

- Haig, Geoffrey & Braun, Friederike 1999. The state of the Turkish language in Germany. *TASG News. Newsletter of the Turkish Area Study Group* 49, 13-18. (Special edition: Turkish language in diaspora.)
- Johanson, Lars 1975. Gesprochenes Türkisch als Forschungsobjekt. *Materialia Turcica* 1, 1-8.
- Pierce, J. E. 1961. A frequency count of Turkish affixes. *Anthropological Linguistics* 3, 9, 31-42.
- Pierce, J. E. 1962. Frequencies of occurrence for affixes in written Turkish. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4, 6, 30-41.

³ See Haig & Braun (1999) for a recent overview on the (comparatively poor) state-of-the-art with regard to research on the development of Turkish in Germany.

⁴ Not to mention the dialectological works in *The Mainz Meeting* (Nurettin Demir, Tooru Hayasi), as well as Emel Türker's contribution and the contributions to language acquisition, which, certainly, use spoken data.

International Conferences on Turkish Linguistics: Conference volumes

- Slobin, Dan & Zimmer, Karl (eds.) 1986. *Studies in Turkish linguistics. Based on most of the papers presented at the Conference on the Turkish Language and Linguistics in Atatürk's Turkey, held May 15-16, 1982, in Berkeley, Calif.* (Typological Studies in Language 8.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan & Erguvanlı-Taylan, Eser (eds.) 1986. *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference. August 9-10, 1984.* Istanbul: Bosporus University Publications.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik E. & Verhoeven, Ludo T. (eds.) 1987. *Studies on modern Turkish. Proceedings of the Third Conference on Turkish Linguistics.* Tilburg: University Press.
- Koç, Sabri (ed.) 1988. *Studies on Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Ankara, 17-19 August, 1988.* Ankara: Middle East Technical University.
- Rona, Bengisu (ed.) 1996. *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, School of Oriental and African Studies, 15 – 17 August, 1990.* Ankara : Hitit yayınevi.
- Konrot, Ahmet (ed.) 1996. *Modern studies in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 12-14 August 1992. Eskişehir / Turkey.* Eskişehir: Anadolu University, Faculty of Education.
- Johanson, Lars (ed.), in cooperation with Éva Ágnes Csató, Vanessa Locke, Astrid Menz, and Dorothea Winterling 1998. *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3-6, 1994.* (Turcologica 32.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- İmer, Kâmile & Uzun, N. Engin (eds.) 1997. *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Ankara, August 7-9, 1996.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia (eds.) 2000. *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. Lincoln College, Oxford, August 12-14, 1998.* (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

