

## Werk

**Titel:** A retrospective view of the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, eausative and decausa...

**Autor:** Sultanzade , Vügar

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2001

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0005](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0005) | LOG\_0011

## Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ [info@digizeitschriften.de](mailto:info@digizeitschriften.de)

# **A retrospective view of the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, causative and decausative in Azerbaijani**

**Vügar Sultanzade**

Sultanzade, Vügar 2001. A retrospective view of the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, causative and decausative in Azerbaijani. *Turkic Languages* 5, 29-67.

The paper investigates the semantico-syntactical and morphological aspects of the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, causative and decausative in Modern Azerbaijani and compares them with the corresponding categories in the oldest texts of this language.

*Vügar Sultanzade, Eastern Mediterranean University, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, via Mersin 10, Turkey.*

## **0. Introduction**

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, causative and decausative in Modern Standard Azerbaijani and to compare them with the corresponding categories in the oldest texts of this language. The categories in question are important means of conveying subject-object relations, which hold a cardinal place in practical and perceptual activities of language-speakers. Many problems of the mentioned categories, especially the syntactical aspect, have not been considered in Azerbaijani linguistics up to now, nor have they been studied in Old Azerbaijani (henceforth OA) material.

We will not discuss the question whether the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, causative and decausative are the elements of one and the same category or whether they are different independent categories. Their common feature is that their functioning changes the verb valency, and consequently, the syntactic structure. We call this their diathetical aspect. Nevertheless, the corresponding meanings, e.g. reflexive or reciprocal, can be expressed by non-diathetical means too.

The changes in the verb valency mostly involve the morphological modification of the verb form, i.e. the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, causative and decausative affixes are markers of the corresponding syntactical transformations. This paper investigates both the syntactical constructions and morphological affixes, but not similar lexical forms such as, e.g. *yayın-* 'to evade' < *yay-* 'to spread', because they do not denote regular transformations.

The data of OA are taken from the texts of the XIII-XIV centuries, namely, the verses of İzzeddin Hasan-ogly, the poem *Dastan'ı Ahmed Herami* (The Story of

Robber Ahmed) by an unknown author, Qazi Burhaneddin's *Divan*, the works of Imadeddin Nesimi, Yusif Meddah's *Varqa and Gulshah*, Ibn Muhanna's dictionary *Kitab'i Hilyat'ul Insan ve Hilbat'ul Lisan*, three different *Yusif and Zuleykha* poems by Khatayi,<sup>1</sup> Mustafa Zarir and Suli Feqih, and also the epic *Kitab'i Dede Qorqud* (The Book of Dede Qorqud), both existing manuscripts of which are probably from the sixteenth century; however, "as to the language of the text, it is consistent with the books belonging to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century" (Lewis 1974: 22).

Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary and the poems of Mustafa Zarir and Suli Feqih are used only as additional sources and quoted sparingly in this paper, because they can equally be considered Turkish sources in their own right.<sup>2</sup> The point is that in the XIII-XIV centuries Azerbaijanian and Turkish had not yet emerged as separate distinct branches of Oghuz Turkic. Yet in the rest of the mentioned texts Azerbaijanian elements are dominant, and these texts are mostly regarded as Azerbaijanian sources rather than Ottoman ones. The following remarks by Muharrem Ergin regarding Qazi Burhaneddin's *Divan* could be applied equally well to all of them:

"It is true that in the fourteenth century the Azeri Turkic and Anatolian dialects had not developed yet along their separate lines, and two or three centuries more were needed for this. However, Kadi Bürhaneddin's language does differ slightly from other Anatolian texts and bears certain of the distinguishing features of Azeri Turkic, which gave promise of its becoming a separate dialect. In view of this, although it is not possible to consider the work entirely a product of Azeri Turkic, yet it is not far off the mark to consider it the product of the period when the Azeri Turkic dialect was heading straight towards separation." (Ergin 1952: 287)<sup>3</sup>

We have also used the poem *Qisse'i Yusif* (The Story of Joseph) written in 1213 by Ali, about whose life there is practically no information. Unknown also is the place where he lived. The prevalent point of view in this matter is the opinion of Tatar philologists, according to whom the poem was created in Tatarstan. However, this opinion does not correspond to the facts. Analysis of the oldest manuscripts of the poem shows that they were written in an Oghuz language rather than in a Kipchak one. The Kipchak-Tatar elements are only predominant in the manuscripts dated XVI century and later, i.e. they are a consequence of later alterations. Nevertheless, since the poem's belonging to Azerbaijanian is questionable, this paper contains only few examples from it.

The texts in question have been published, except Khatayi's poem. Beside the manuscripts, we have used the Baku editions of the mentioned sources and the St.

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confused with Shah Ismail Khatayi (XV century).

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Muhanna's dictionary also contains many Kipchak elements.

<sup>3</sup> The translation by Buril (1972: 46).

Petersburg edition of Ibn Muhanna's Dictionary. Their list is given at the end of the paper with the corresponding abbreviations.

The investigated data of Modern Azerbaijani (henceforth MA) are taken from the standard language.

The modern Latin-based script of Azerbaijani is used both for the presentation of the MA material and the transliteration of the examples from the OA texts. All examples are translated by the author of the paper, except the data from KDQ, for which the translations in Lewis 1974 and Sümer et al. 1972 are used.

## 1. Passive

### 1.1. Semantics and syntax

Passive constructions are derived ones and they are in opposition with their basic forms—active constructions. Within passive constructions the hierarchy of the semantic actants does not correspond to that of the syntactic ones. The semantic actants are such elements as agent, patient, recipient, instrument, etc. The given order of semantic actants reflects their hierarchy, established psycho-linguistically (Axutina 1989), typologically (Givón 1984) and lexicographically (Xrakovskij 1974). The syntactic actants occupy the syntactic valency-slots of verbs. They are also hierarchically ordered. The first position belongs to the surface, i.e. syntactic subject (henceforth  $S_{syn}$ ), and the second one is the position of surface objects, i.e. complements. There are micro-hierarchy relations among complements too: direct object > indirect object, expressed with case endings > indirect object, expressed with postpositions.

In active constructions the semantic actants of a given verb correspond to the syntactic actants hierarchically, i.e. the  $S_{syn}$  realizes the agent, and complements express non-agentive roles according to their ranks; e.g.:

- (1) a. *Gənc ustalar bir ev tikdilər.*  
           young master:PL a house build:PAST/3PL  
           'The young masters built a house.'

Passive constructions appear when the Agent- $S_{syn}$  correspondence is obliterated, i.e. when the agent is realized by a different syntactic actant than  $S_{syn}$  or not at all (see Xrakovskij 1974). This transformation does not change the given situation (state of affairs) or the propositional meaning of the main verb (cf. Xolodovič 1979).

There are different types of passive constructions in Azerbaijani.

#### 1.1.1. Canonical passive constructions

The canonical passive is the exact opposite of the active diathesis. Here the syntactic positions of the  $S_{syn}$  and a complement are occupied by a non-agentive role and the agent, respectively; cf.:



- (1) b. *Ev gənc ustalar tərəfindən tikildi.*  
 house young master:PL POSP build:PASS:PAST  
 'The house was built by the young masters.'

Since within the canonical passive constructions the agent is realized by a complement, the latter is traditionally called "agentive complement". In MA this complement is expressed by a noun phrase plus the postposition *tərəfindən* 'by', which literally means 'from the side of' (side:POSS:ABL). In OA the morpheme *-dən* (*-dan*) was added directly to the noun phrase avoiding the word *tərəf* 'side', i.e. the complement was formed with the ablative affix. Cf. in Nesimi:

- (2) *Ey evin Həqdən yapılmış ...* (N 191)  
 o house:POSS Truth:ABL build:PASS:PART  
 'O you, whose house has been created by God...'
- (3) *Həm yenə səndən düzülmüş*  
 CONJ again you:ABL put right:PASS:PF  
  
*uşbu bazarım mənim.* (N 148)  
 this bazaar:POSS/1SG I:GEN  
 'And this my bazaar has been put right again by you.'
- (4) *Çox könüllər yağmalandı sən üzü mehparədən.* (N 154)  
 many heart:PL pillage:PASS:PAST you face:POSS piece of moon:ABL  
 'Many hearts were pillaged by you, moon-faced.'
- (5) *Vəzribu<sup>4</sup> buyruldu Həqdən, həm buyurdu Mustafa.* (N 527)  
 wadribu order:PASS:PAST Truth:ABL CONJ order:PAST Mustafa  
 "'Wadribu" was ordered by God, and Mustafa (i.e. Prophet Muhammed) ordered (the same).'

In MA the "agentive" complement of the passive constructions derived from some transitive verbs denoting unintentional action has the dative form; e.g.:

<sup>4</sup> The transliteration *fəzrəbu* in the Baku edition is not correct. The word is a quotation from the Qur'an: *wadribu* (Al-Nisa: 35), which has (at least) two interpretations. Ahmed Ali (1988: 78) has translated it 'and go to bed with them', based on Raghīb's *Lisan al-'Arab*, where the author points out that *daraba* metaphorically means 'to have intercourse'. Another interpretation of *wadribu*, and one which is widespread, is 'and punish them', e.g. "and scourge them" (Pickthall 1952: 97); "and beat them" (Palmer 1949: 70). Nesimi surely meant the 'punish' meaning, as the first line of his distich indicates: *Türabiler elinde Zülfiqar şəmşirü-tiğ* (N 527) 'At the hands of the people of Turab (the nickname of Imam Ali) the Zulfıqar (Ali's sword) is a saber and sword'.

- (6) *Uzaqda bizə Savalan*  
 far:LOC we:DAT Savalan

*dağının zirvəsi görünürdü.*  
 mountain:POSS:GEN top:POSS see:PASS:PRES:PAST  
 'The top of the mountain Savalan was seen by us in the distance.'

We set the word "agentive" in inverted commas because from the semantic point of view the subjects of verbs denoting unintentional action, like *gör-* 'to see', *eşit-* 'to hear', are not real agents, i.e. they are neither active nor volitional substances. Constructions of type (6) are to some extent similar to ergative structures. Such ergative-like constructions exist in the OA texts too; cf.:

- (7) *Ol öylə adam degildir kim, sana görinə.* (KDQ 54)  
 she such man not:COP CONJ you:DAT see:PASS:SUBJ  
 'She is not the sort of person who would show herself (lit. be seen, V. S.) to you.' (Sümer et al. 1972: 46)

- (8) ... *Maliknin qulağına eşitüldi.* (A 6)  
 lord:GEN ear:POSS:DAT hear:PASS:PAST  
 '... was heard by the lord's ear.'

As passive constructions are used with the purpose of "focusing", i.e. putting in the forefront the object of the action, the expression of the agentive complement is optional, and in speech these constructions usually occur without it. It is the same in the OA texts, where one finds few examples with the agentive complement.

In the case of canonical passives the omission of an agentive complement is not a fact of deletion, but only a grammatical ellipsis<sup>5</sup>, i.e. one can reconstruct this position. It means that in the canonical passive transformation the syntactic valency of the main verb does not change quantitatively. However, it changes qualitatively, because the agentive complement is lower than the direct object of the related basic diathesis in rank.

### 1.1.2. Adversative constructions

In Azerbaijanian the adversative constructions fall into two groups. The first group is formed in MA on the basis of four verbs: *basıl-* 'to be defeated' (< *bas-* 'to defeat'), *döyül-* 'to be beaten' (< *döy-* 'to beat'), *yenil-* 'to be conquered' (< *yen-* 'to conquer') and *uduz-* 'to lose' (< *ud-* 'to win'). In these constructions the agentive complement is formed with the dative affix; e.g.:

<sup>5</sup> This kind of ellipsis is different from contextual ellipsis (cf. Lyons 1968: 174).

- (9) *Osmanlılar italyanlara basıldılar.* (C. Məmmədquluzadə)  
 Ottoman:PL Italian:PL:DAT defeat:PASS:PAST/3PL  
 'The Ottomans were defeated by the Italians.'

The adversative constructions have the same characteristics in OA. Cf.:

- (10) *Bu qıza basılacaq olursam...*  
 this girl:DAT defeat:PASS:PART be:COND/1SG  
 'If I am beaten by this girl...' (Lewis 1974: 64)

The adversative construction focuses the object of the related basic verb and denotes an action / event unfavorable to the animate (mostly human) referent of this object. Thus, the adversative combines semantic features of the canonical passive, on the one hand, and the non-volitional permissive-causative, on the other hand (cf. Malchukov 1993). It is not by mere chance that the above-mentioned verbs take the passive *-(ı)l* and the causative *-uz* (see section 4.2.4) affixes. However, unlike both canonical passive and permissive, within the first group of the adversative constructions the focused participant of the situation is not a non-active, but an active referent, which shows a certain resistance to the action of the agent.

Nevertheless, one can consider the mentioned constructions to be a kind of passive. First, syntactically, the adversative transformation is similar to passivization. Second, semantically, the initial situation as well as the propositional meaning of the main verb do not change. And finally, the affinity of adversative to the passive can be proved in many cases by substitution testing. For example, the above-illustrated sentence (9) can be used as a canonical passive:

- (9) a. *Osmanlılar italyanlar tərəfindən basıldılar.*  
 Ottoman:PL Italian:PL POSP defeat:PASS:PAST/3PL  
 'The Ottomans were defeated by the Italians.'

The second group of the adversative constructions is formed only on the basis of the verb *tut-* 'to seize' (> *tutul-* 'to catch') ; e.g.:

- (11) a. *Uşaqları xəstəlik tutdu.*  
 child:PL:ACC illness seize:PAST  
 lit. 'An illness seized the children.' (basic)
- (11) b. *Uşaqlar xəstəliyə tutuldular.*  
 child:PL illness:DAT seize:PAST/3PL  
 'The children caught an illness.' (adversative).

This type of adversative construction is semantically closer to the permissive rather than to the passive. Indeed it is distinguished to a considerable extent from the first group mentioned. This adversative construction denotes the situation where there are not two, but one animate participant, and the latter has a quite passive role within

the “unpleasant” event, which does not depend on him / her. However, since the syntactic valency of the main verb does not increase, one cannot consider transformations like (11a)-(11b) to be permissive-causative. On the other hand, the fact that in these transformations the  $S_{syn}$  and the complement exchange their positions and the valency of the verb is decreasing only in rank gives grounds for relating the adversative to the passive constructions.

The second group of adversative constructions exists in OA too; e.g.:

- (12) *Qılıncıma toğranayın!*  
 sword:POSS/1SG:DAT slice:PASS:SUBJ  
*Oxıma sancılayın! ... (KDQ 59)*  
 arrow:POSS/1SG:DAT spit:PASS:SUBJ  
 ‘May I be sliced on my own sword, may I be spitted on my own arrow ...’  
 (Lewis 1974: 73)
- (13) *Yaxıldım eşqinə manəndi-Məcnun. (N 194)*  
 burn:PASS:PAST:1SG love:POSS/2SG:DAT like Majnun  
 ‘I was burned with your love, like Majnun.’
- (14) *Necə tutulmayam bən ol tuzağa. (QB 454)*  
 how catch:PASS:NEG:SUBJ/1SG I that trap:DAT  
 ‘How can I not be caught in that trap?’

In OA the adversative constructions formed on the basis of the verb *tut-* could also be related to the first group. This can be indirectly proved by the following instance, where the *tut-* root of the predicate demands a noun in the dative denoting an animate participant:<sup>6</sup>

- (15) *Yəqin bildi kim, oğlu kafərə tutsaqdır (KDQ 74)*  
 for certain know:PAST CONJ son:POSS infidel:DAT captive:COP  
 ‘He knew then for certain that his son had been captured by the infidels.’  
 (Sümer et al. 1972: 81)

As one can see from the instances above, the spectrum of verbs forming adversative constructions in OA was wider than now. It is interesting to note that the verb *aldan-* ‘to be deceived, tempted, enticed’ also belonged to this domain. Cf.:

- (16) *Ey Xətayi, əmrə aldanma kim ... (X 11b)*  
 o Khatayi order:DAT deceive:PASS:NEG CONJ  
 ‘O Khatayi, don’t be deceived by the order that ...’

<sup>6</sup> It is not by mere chance that Sümer et al. translated this predicate into English as a passive verb.

- (17) *Aldanma anın alına ...* (N 42)  
 entice:PASS:NEG he:GEN lie:POSS:DAT  
 'Don't be enticed by his lie.'

Similar constructions, like *Onun sözünə aldandım* 'I was enticed by his word' cannot be considered in MA as derived ones, because there is no basic verb form *alda-* 'to tempt, entice, deceive', which, on the other hand, we meet in the OA texts; e.g.:

- (18) *Aldayuban ər tutmaq övrət işidir* (KDQ 124)  
 Deceive:GER man take:INF woman work:POSS:COP  
 'To take a man by deceit is woman's work.' (Lewis 1974: 185)

### 1.1.3. Conversive constructions

The conversive constructions are formed on the basis of such verbs as *bürün-*, *dövrələn-*, *örtül-*, and so on, which mean 'to be surrounded', 'to be covered'. Here the initial  $S_{syn}$  is demoted to the complement position, the marker of which is not the postposition *tərəfindən*, but *ilə* 'with'; e.g.:

- (19) a. *Şam ağacları bu dağları örtmüşdü.*  
 pine tree:PL:POSS this mountain:PL:ACC cover:PF:PAST  
 lit. 'Pine trees had covered these mountains.'
- (19) b. *Bu dağlar şam ağacları ilə örtülmüşdü.*  
 this mountain:PL pine tree:PL:POSS POSP cover:PASS:PF:PAST  
 'These mountains had been covered with pine trees.'

The complement of conversive constructions differs from the agentive complement of canonical passives not only formally, but also semantically, since it does not denote an agent, an animate and volitional actor of action. Both participants of the "conversive" situation possess equal rights from the natural activity (or precisely, inactivity) point of view, and the agent / non-agent division of their semantic roles is a conditional division. Therefore, in the semantic respect, both (19a) and (19b) can be viewed as basic (or quite the reverse, derived) constructions.

However, as the verb is marked in (19b), only this construction is considered to be a derived diathesis. The form of the verb marker and the syntactic transformation (demotion of the initial  $S_{syn}$  to an indirect object position) are characteristic for the passive.

The conversive constructions in the OA texts do not differ from the contemporary examples; cf.:

- (20) *Havanın yüzü toz ilə büründü.* (DH 29)  
 weather:GEN surface:POSS dust POSP cover:PASS:PAST  
 'The sky was covered with dust.'

#### 1.1.4. Modal-passive constructions

In these constructions the object of the action is realized with  $S_{syn}$ , but the agent does not have any syntactic expression, as in (21b):

- (21) a. *Dəniz suyunu içməzlər.*  
           sea    water:POSS:ACC drink:NEG:AOR/3PL  
           ‘One cannot drink sea-water.’
- (21) b. *Dəniz suyu içilməz.*  
           sea    water:POSS drink:PASS:NEG:AOR  
           ‘Sea-water cannot be drunk.’

Unlike canonical passive, in (21b) one cannot add an agentive complement, i.e. in this case we have a fact of deletion rather than a grammatical ellipsis. Thus, in the modal-passive transformation the valency of the verb is changed quantitatively, decreasing by one.

In MA the modal-passive constructions convey two kinds of modal meaning: possibility / impossibility and assessment, as illustrated in (22) and (23), respectively.

- (22) *Kəşfiyyatçılar ağ xalatda*  
       scout:PI       white cloak:LOC  
  
       *qardan seçilmirdilər.*  
       snow:ABL     distinguish:PASS:NEG:PRES:PAST/3PL  
       ‘One could not distinguish the scouts in white cloaks from snow.’
- (23) *Mişar iti olanda ağac asan kəsilir.*  
       saw   sharp be:GER tree easy cut:PASS:AOR  
       ‘It is easy to cut a tree when the saw is sharp.’

When the modal-passive constructions have the possibility / impossibility meaning the verb is usually used in negative aorist form. The modal-passive constructions of assessment meaning usually have an adverbial modifier of manner, such as *asan* ‘easy’, *çətin* ‘hard’, *tez* ‘quickly’, etc.

Only transitive verbs have a modal-passive diathesis. Furthermore, the modal-passive transformation occurs only on the basis of non-causative transitive verbs, such as *oxu-* ‘to read’, *ye-* ‘to eat’, *tik-* ‘to build’, whose object undergoes (or appears as a result of) the action of animate creatures but not elemental forces, and where the action cannot be spontaneous. Hence one can claim that despite the deletion of the syntactic actant in the modal-passive transformation the semantic role structure of the verb is not changed, i.e. the agent does not disappear, because the action cannot be conceived without an agent.

We have met only the possibility / impossibility meaning of modal-passive constructions in the investigated material of OA. The semantico-syntactical features of these constructions do not differ from the ones in the modern language. Cf.:

- (24) *Seçilməz bir-birindən sözləri qənd.* (DH 41)  
 distinguish:PASS:NEG:AOR each other:ABL word:PL:POSS candy  
 'Their sweet words cannot be distinguished from each other'
- (25) *Bulunmaz dünyadə bir yarı- sadıq.* (DH 44)  
 find:PASS:NEG:AOR world:LOC a friend:EZ devoted  
 'A devoted friend cannot be found in the world.'
- (26) *Qaracığa qıymayınca yol alınmaz.* (KDQ 31)  
 Qaracığ:DAT not sacrifice:NEG:GER way take:PASS:NEG:AOR  
 'Distances cannot be covered without spurring the horse.'  
 (Sümer et al. 1972: 4)
- (27) *Ömrün keçəni keçdivü*  
 life:GEN past:PART:POSS past:PAST:CONJ  
  
*baqisi bilinməz.* (QB 355)  
 remaining:POSS know:PASS:NEG:AOR  
 'What has passed in life is past and it is impossible to know about what remains.'

### 1.1.5. Impersonal constructions

While the canonical passive transformations are possible only on the basis of transitive verbs, the main verb of the related basic structure of the impersonal construction is an intransitive verb. The impersonal construction has no  $S_{syn}$  position. Here the agent occupies the position of indirect (agentive) complement, and as for the initial indirect object, it changes neither its syntactic position nor its morphological form; e.g.:

- (28) a. *Komissiya məsələyə baxdı.*  
 commission problem:DAT consider:PAST  
 'The commission considered the problem.'
- (28) b. *Məsələyə komissiya tərəfindən baxıldı.*  
 problem:DAT commission POSP consider:PASS:PAST  
 'The problem was considered by the commission.'

In other respects impersonal constructions do not differ from the canonical passive, even functionally. Thus they are used mainly for the purpose of focusing on the object of the action.

The impersonal construction is a rare phenomenon in OA but does exist:

- (29) *Nola bir məmləkətdə gər azıla.* (QB 264)  
 what be:SUBJ a country:LOC if lose:PASS:SUBJ  
 ‘No wonder if one gets lost in a country.’

### 1.1.6. Modal-impersonal constructions

The modal-impersonal constructions are also possible only on the basis of intransitive two-valent verbs. This diathesis of a verb occurs as a result of deletion of the initial  $S_{yn}$  position. In this transformation the initial complement does not change its syntactic position nor its grammatical features; e.g.:

- (30) a. *[Tədqiqatçılar] Azərbaycanca*  
 researcher:PL Azerbaijan:LOC  
  
*bu bitkilərə rast gəlirlər.*  
 this plant:PL:DAT meet-with:PRES/3PL  
 ‘Researchers meet these plants in Azerbaijan.’
- (30) b. *Azərbaycanda bu bitkilərə rast gəlinir.*  
 Azerbaijan:LOC this plant:PL:DAT meet-with:PASS:PRES  
 ‘These plants are found in Azerbaijan.’;  
 lit. ‘These plants can be met in Azerbaijan.’

As distinct from the impersonal constructions, it is impossible to add an agentive complement here. In this respect and in their property of expressing modality (possibility), the modal-impersonal constructions are rather similar to the modal-passive ones.

Modal-impersonal constructions are rare both in MA and OA. In the OA texts we have found the following instance, which is a hapax legomenon:

- (31) *Ömür axar suya bənzər*  
 life flowing water:DAT resemble:AOR  
  
*keçənə yetilməz.* (QB 134)  
 past:PART:DAT reach:PASS:NEG:AOR  
 ‘Life is like flowing water: the past cannot be reached (again).’

### 1.2. Morphology and morphonology

The passive transformations in Modern Standard Azerbaijanian are marked in the morphological structure of the verb by the  $-(ı)l$  morpheme, which has the phonetic variants  $-ıl$ ,  $-il$ ,  $-ul$  and  $-ül$  due to vowel harmony; e.g.: *açıl-* ‘to be opened’; *seçil-* ‘to be elected / selected’; *duyul-* ‘to be felt’; *süzül-* ‘to be filtered / strained’, etc. In two cases this morpheme is replaced by its allomorph  $-n$  (with the phonetic variants:  $-in$ ,  $-in$ ,  $-un$ ,  $-ün$ ): (a) when the verb base has a consonant ending in  $l$ ; e.g.: *alın-* ‘to be bought’; *bilin-* ‘to be known’, etc.; (b) when the verb base has a vowel ending



(except monosyllabic roots); e.g.: *doğran-* ‘to be sliced; be chopped’; *yaralan-* ‘to be wounded’, etc.

The verb *gör-* ‘to see’ is the only exception to the mentioned distribution rule. It is used with the affix *-ün*. However, when the verb has a figurative meaning, it takes the normal *-ül*; e.g.:

- (32) *Bu işlər də bələdiyyə tərəfindən görülür.*  
 This work:PL CONJ municipality POSP see:PASS:PRES  
 ‘And these works are done (lit. seen) by the municipality.’

In the OA texts, beside *gör-*, there are two verbs which have double passive markers, yet the use of the affix *-in* in these cases is occasional. Cf.: *satın-* (QB 96) vs. *satul-* (A 8, 9) ‘to be sold’; *yaxın-* (QB 526) vs. *yaxıl-* (N 194; YM 174; QB 117, 130, 189, 314 ...) ‘to be burned’. The occasional passive marker of the verb *gör-* is *-ül* (as in MA); cf.: *görül-* (DH 14) vs. *görün-* (DH 26, 29; KDQ 38, 72, 73, 79; N 262, 266 ...) ‘to be seen’.

The passive diathesis of the verb *gör-* was marked also by a unique morpheme *-ük (-ik)*; e.g.:

- (33) *Görükməz gözümə*  
 see:PASS:NEG:AOR eye:POSS/1SG:DAT  
*zərrəcə ağyar, nə yar.* (N 531)  
 very small rivals CONJ lover  
 ‘Neither rivals nor the lover are visible to my eyes at all.’
- (34) *Bən yaxılurəm tütün görükməz.* (QB 101)  
 I burn:PASS:PRES/1SG smoke see:PASS:NEG:AOR  
 ‘I am burned (but) the smoke cannot be seen.’

The verb *görük-* is still used in Azerbaijanian dialects. The affix *-(ü)k* seems to originally have been a denominal verb form and not just a passive marker. There are more than 30 verbs in this denominal formation in Old Turkic texts (see Erdal 1991: 492). The affix *-(ü)k* was added to the noun *göz* ‘eye’ to form the verb *gözük-* ‘to be seen’, which was then changed to *görük-*.

The verb *gözik-* is attested in QB (117, 133, 160, 163 ...). It disappeared in MA but remains in Turkish.

Another difference between MA and OA is in the passive forms of the monosyllabic verb stems ending in a vowel. There are three such verbs in MA: *de-* ‘to say, tell’, *ye-* ‘to eat’ and *yu-* ‘to wash’. They take the affixes *-il* / *-ul* with a buffer consonant *y*: *deyil-* ‘to be said, be told’, *yeyil-* ‘to be eaten’ and *yuyul-* ‘to be washed’.

Beside the mentioned monosyllabic verbs, we also encounter in OA the verbs *qo-* (KDQ 43, 50; N 275, 381, 417 ...) ‘to put, place’ and *sı-* (KDQ 40, 47; QB 339, 585) ‘to break’. The passive forms of the verbs *de-* and *qo-* were used with different

buffer consonants, namely *n* and *y*; cf.: *denildi* (N 564) ‘was said’, *denilməşəydi* (KDQ 564) ‘if it was not said’ vs. *deyilür* (QB 165) ‘is told’, *deyilə* (QB 208) ‘if it be said’; and *qonuldu* (DH 64) ‘was put’ vs. *qoyulubdır* (KDQ 61) ‘has been put’.

In the OA texts the passive marker of the verb *ye-* is the affix *-n*; cf.:

- (35) *Içildi şərbət anda, yendi çün xon.* (DH 31)  
 drink:PASS:PAST şərbət there:LOC eat:PASS:PAST CONJ food  
 ‘As şərbət (a kind of syrup) was drunk and food was eaten there.’

As for the verbs *yu-* and *sı-*, they are not used in the passive in the OA texts.

In the majority of the investigated sources the passive markers are used in conformity with vowel harmony; e.g.: *yazıldı* (H 25) ‘was written’; *verilibdi* (YM 137) ‘has been given’; *bulunmaz* (MZ 240) ‘cannot be found’; *zıkr olundu* (SF 40) ‘was mentioned’; *asıldı* (N 104) ‘was hanged’; *qurulmuş* (N 197) ‘has been established’; *çalınır* (N 197) ‘is played’.

In QB the passive morphemes do not obey the labial harmony; cf.: *dökilür* (QB 18) ‘is poured (out)’, *tutulur* (QB 64) ‘is caught’, *düzildi* (QB 139) ‘was arranged’, *urıldı* (QB 347) ‘was beaten’, *bulınur* (QB 357) ‘can be found’, *yolındı* (QB 467) ‘was plucked’, etc. Ibn Muhanna also wrote the *-l* with kesre in passive forms; e.g.: *sındurıldı* ‘was broken’, *açıldı* ‘was opened’, *vurıldı* ‘was beaten’ (IM LIV). This might be an influence of the Ottoman language (more precisely, orthography), where not only the passive but also reflexive and reciprocal morphemes were used only with non-labialized vowels, i.e. in two phonetic variants (see Ergin 1962: 192-198).

We see this practice in Dede Qorqud too, although in few instances and furthermore, with the normal parallel forms; cf.: *dögil-* (KDQ 126) yet *dögül-* (KDQ 66, 75) ‘to be beaten’; *qurıl-* (KDQ 68) yet *qurul-* (KDQ 42, 95) ‘to be built’; *tökil-* (KDQ 45) yet *dökül-* (KDQ 90) ‘to be poured’; *tutıl-* (KDQ 53, 82) yet *tutul-* (KDQ 77) ‘to be caught’.

In Ali’s poem, quite to the contrary, the passive markers are used with labialized vowels; e.g.: *eşitül-* (A 6) ‘to be heard’, *satul-* (A 8) ‘to be sold’, *ayrul-* (A11) ‘to be separated’, etc. The fact that the affixes *-ul*, *-ül* do not obey the labial harmony of verb bases also obtains in Old Turkic texts (see Ercilasun 1984:28). This “anomaly” might be a trace of the verb *ol-*, which, according to Ščerbak (1981:107-108), is at the origin of the passive morpheme.

It should be noted that the verb *ol-* ‘to be’ itself can take the passive morpheme, even though it is an intransitive verb. In all such cases *ol-* appears as an auxiliary verb. Here are instances both from MA and OA:

- (36) *Uca dağlar şam və ardıc ağacları*  
 high mountain:PL pine CONJ juniper tree:PL:POSS  
  
*ilə əhatə olunmuşdu.* (I. Vəlizadə)  
 POSP surrounding be:PASS:PF:PAST

‘The high mountains had been surrounded  
by pine and juniper trees.’

- (37) *Hərgiz həll olunmadı bu müşkil.* (DH 27)  
never solution be:PASS:NEG:PAST this problem  
‘This problem was by no means solved.’

- (38) *Niyyətin təsdiq olunmaz ...* (N 502)  
resolve:POSS/2SG affirmation be:PASS:NEG:AOR  
‘Your resolve cannot be affirmed.’

The given sentences can be considered to be passive constructions, yet their related basic syntactic structures are formed by another auxiliary verb: *et-* ‘to do’. For instance, the active structure of (36) is (36a) and not (36b):

- (36) a. *Şam və ardıc ağacları*  
pine CONJ juniper tree:PL:POSS  
  
*uca dağları əhatə etmişdi.*  
high mountain:PL:ACC surrounding do:PF:PAST  
‘Pine and juniper trees had surrounded the high mountains.’
- (36) b. \**Şam və ardıc ağacları*  
pine CONJ juniper tree:PL:POSS  
  
*uca dağları əhatə olmuşdu.*  
high mountain:PL:ACC surrounding be:PF:PAST  
\*‘Pine and juniper trees had surrounded the high mountains’

On the other hand, the verb *et-* itself has the passive form: *edil-* ‘to be done’. Within complex verbs *edil-* and *olun-* have one and the same meaning. In MA *olun-* can always be substituted with *edil-* but not vice versa, i.e. the spectrum of *olun-* is restricted. This spectrum seems to be wider in OA. For instance, in YM we find the following line:

- (39) *Yeddi gün düğün olundu müdam.* (YM 151)  
seven day wedding be:PASS:PAST continually  
‘The wedding was celebrated seven days continually.’

The phrase *toy<sup>7</sup> olundu* is not used in MA, but it is possible to say *toy edildi* ‘the wedding was celebrated’ or *toy oldu* ‘there was a wedding ceremony’.

<sup>7</sup> The word *toy* is the contemporary equivalent of *düğün* ‘wedding’.

## 2. Reflexive

The reflexive constructions can be divided into two groups: diathetical and non-diathetical.

### 2.1. Diathetical reflexive constructions

#### 2.1.1. Semantics and syntax

The diathetical reflexive construction occurs as a result of deletion of the initial complement. Within this transformation the basic Agent ~ S<sub>syn</sub> relation remains, but at the same time the S<sub>syn</sub> takes the semantic “load” of the deleted complement; e.g.:

- (40) a. *Arzu qızı bəzədi.*  
           Arzu girl:ACC beautify:PAST  
           ‘Arzu beautified the girl’
- (40) b. *Arzu bəzəndi.*  
           Arzu beautify:REF:PAST  
           ‘Arzu beautified herself.’

The double semantic function of the S<sub>syn</sub> is possible in (40b) because here the agent and patient have the same referent. In reflexive transformations like (40a) → (40b) the syntactic valency of the main verb is decreased by one.

The canonical reflexive constructions denote situations where a referent carries out the function of the subject performing action and at the same time the same referent, or more precisely, his / her body or body-part, is the object undergoing this action. Thus one of the distinctive features of the reflexive constructions is the fact that here the S<sub>syn</sub> position is occupied only by the word (or phrase) denoting an animate participant.

Beside the canonical type, there are also two semantic types of the reflexive: autive and benefactive. As distinct from the canonical reflexive, the autive meaning expresses the action of the subject by means of his / her body and not on his / her body; e.g.: *atıl-* ‘to throw oneself’ (< *at-* ‘to throw’). The autive transformations are to some extent like decausative ones of the type *boğ-* ‘to choke (tr.)’ → *boğul-* ‘to choke (intr.)’, *yix-* ‘to pull down’ → *yixil-* ‘to fall down’ (see section 5). However, in autive transformations the position of the initial complement and not the S<sub>syn</sub> is deleted. And secondly, unlike decausatives, the autive verbs denote intentional actions.

The benefactive reflexive denotes the situations in which the subject takes action for his / her own benefit. In these constructions the agent and beneficiary roles of the verb are coreferents.

## 2.1.2. Semantics and morphology

### 2.1.2.1. Canonical reflexive

The canonical reflexive transformations are marked in the morphological structure of the verb by the *-(t)n* morpheme. The morpheme is subject to vowel harmony when it is added to bases ending in a consonant, i.e. it has the *-in*, *-in*, *-un*, *-ün* variants.

In MA the reflexive affix *-n* is added indirectly to the monosyllabic verb *yu-* 'to wash', using the buffer consonant *y*: *yuyun-* 'to wash oneself'. In the OA texts we find the affix *-n* connected directly to the verb: *yundılar-* (DH 66).

It should be noted that in MA the canonical reflexive transformation is not productive. In other words, the number of verbs which have this diathesis is limited to the following simple verbs only: *boya-* 'to paint', *bürü-* 'to cover', *qası-* 'to scratch', *qoru-* 'to defend', *dara-* 'to comb', *yu-* 'to wash', *ört-* 'to cover', *sarı-* 'to wind'. And yet a couple of derivative verbs like *ətirlə-* 'to scent', *xınala-* 'to dye with henna', taking the morpheme *-n*, make canonical reflexive constructions.

However, in OA the canonical reflexive was characteristic for more verbs. Cf.:

- (41) *Oğlan, yüzüği alıb taqındınmı?* (KDQ 101)  
 boy ring:ACC take:GER put on:REFL:PAST/2SG:PART  
 'Young man, did you put on the ring?' (Sümer et al. 1972: 129)
- (42) *Dizcik, qarucıq bağlandı.* (KDQ 112)  
 greave armlet tie:REFL:PAST  
 'He tied on his greaves and his armlets.' (Lewis 1974: 165)
- (43) *Qazan qalqan yapındı ...* (KDQ 126)  
 Qazan shield shut:REFL:PAST  
 'Kazan took up his shield.' (Lewis 1974: 188)
- (44) *Qaçan xurşid ki, məşriqdən göründi,*  
 when sun PART east:ABL see:PASS:PAST  
  
*ulu dağlar qamu nur tac urundi.* (DH 26)  
 great mountain:PL all light crown put:REFL:PAST  
 'When the sun appeared from the East, all the great mountains  
 were crowned by light.'
- (45) *Yar görür özini, çünki güzgüyə baxınur.* (QB 526)  
 lover see:PRES PRN:ACC CONJ mirror:DAT look:REFL:PRES  
 'The lover sees herself because she is looking  
 (lit. looking at herself) in a mirror.'

### 2.1.2.2. Autive forms

The main autive markers in Azerbaijanian are the affixes *-(t)n* / *-(t)l* and their phonetic variants. The rule of their distribution is mostly the same as the above-men-

tioned distribution rule of the passive markers. Cf.: *fırlan-* 'to whirl (intr.)' (< *fırla-* 'to whirl (tr.)'); *atıl-* 'to throw oneself' (< *at-* 'to throw'); *çevril-* 'to turn (intr.)' (< *çevir-* 'to turn (tr.)'); *qoşul-* 'to join (intr.)' (< *qoş-* 'to join (tr.)'); *düzül-* 'to line up (intr.)' (< *düz-* 'to line up (tr.)'); in OA: *qırq incə qız yayıldılar* (KDQ 39) 'the forty slender maidens scattered' (Lewis 1974: 37); *köpək çəkildi* (KDQ 45) 'the dog slunk off' (Lewis 1974: 47); *ol xəlayiq бүкүlmüşdür* (YM 163) 'that people have stooped'. However, there are some verbs ending in a consonant but forming the autive by means of the affix *-(ı)n* instead of the expected *-(ı)l*: *çırp-* 'to flutter (tr.); to beat' > *çırpın-* 'to flutter (intr.); to struggle'; cf.: *çırbın-* (KDQ118); *dart-* 'to stretch, pull' > *dartın-* 'to stretch oneself, to pull oneself'; cf. *tartın-* (QB 367, 384...); *dürt-* 'to plunge (tr.), thrust' > *dürtün-* (in parallel with *dürtül-*) 'to plunge (intr.); *qıs-* 'to press' > *qısın-* (in parallel with *qısıl-*) 'to press oneself close'.

In the OA texts we even find *atın-* (QB 96) 'to throw oneself' and *qoşın-* (QB 261) 'to join'.

In the old period the autive affix *-n* was added directly to the mono-syllabic verb *qo-* 'to put'; e.g.:

- (46) *Bu yandan dəxi bəzırganlar gəlübəni*  
this side:ABL PART merchant:PL come:GER

*Qara Dərvənd ağzına qonmuşlardı.* (KDQ 53)  
Qara Dervend mouth:POSS:DAT put:REFL:PF/3PL:PAST  
'Meanwhile, the merchants had come to the Pass of Kara Dervend,  
in Pasin, and had set up camp [lit. put themselves, V. S.] there.'  
(Sümer et al. 1972: 42)

The verb *qon-* 'to settle; to perch' exists in MA too, but it cannot be considered a morphological reflexive, because there is no basic *qo-* form. Besides, the semantics of *qon-* has changed and become narrow: its first actant can denote not all animated objects but only birds and flying insects.

There is a type of autive verb characterized by collective subjects, i.e. these verbs describe the activity / action of more than one referent. They can express gathering, joining, parting and arrangement. The verbs which express gathering have double forms in MA, with *-n* / *-ıl* and *-(ı)ş* affixes. They are the following verbs: *cəmlən-* / *cəmləş-* 'to assemble, gather together' (< *cəmlə-* 'to sum up, put together'); *cütlən-* / *cütləş-* 'to pair (intr.)' (< *cütlə-* 'to pair (tr.)'); *qoşalan-* / *qoşalaş-* 'to pair (intr.)' (< *qoşala-* 'to pair (tr.)'); *toplan-* / *toplaş-* 'to gather (intr.)' (< *topla-* 'to gather (tr.)'); *yığıl-* / *yığış-* 'to gather (intr.)' (< *yığ-* 'to gather (tr.)'). Cf.:

- (47) a. *Bir dəqiqədə arvad-uşaq*  
a minute:LOC household

*gəlinin başına toplandı.* (Y. V. Çəmənəminli)  
 bride:GEN head:POSS:DAT gather:REFL:PAST  
 'Within a minute the household gathered around the bride.'

- (47) b. *Bu vaxt karvan oğlanlarının hamısı*  
 this time caravan boy:PL:POSS:GEN all:POSS

*bir ocaq başına bir-bir toplaşmışdı.* (Ə. Məmmədخانlı)  
 a fireplace head:POSS:DAT one-one gather:REFL:PF:PAST  
 'At this time all of the caravan boys gathered one by one by a fireplace.'

- (48) a. *Onları ötürmək üçün xeyli adam yığılmışdı.* (İ. Əfəndiyev)  
 they:ACC see off:INF POSP many man gather:REFL:PF:PAST  
 'Many people have gathered to see them off.'

- (48) b. *Nə vaxt ki Tiflisdə oldum,*  
 what time CONJ Tbilisi:LOC be:PAST/1SG

*görüşüb Mirzə Şafigilə yığışarıq.* (Ə. Nicat)  
 see:REC:GER Mirza Shafi:COLL:DAT gather:REFL:AOR/1SG  
 'Always when I'm in Tbilisi, we are meeting and gathering at Mirza Shafi's.'

We have not come across any *-(t)ş* uses of active verbs in the OA texts. Another difference between MA and OA is in the use of some archaic active verbs; e.g.:

- (49) *Yumurlanıb yerindən uru turdı.* (KDQ 38)  
 roll:REFL:GER place:POSS:ABL rise up:PAST  
 'She gathered herself and rose up.' (Lewis 1974: 33)

- (50) *İç Oğuz, Taş Oğuz bəgləri*  
 inner Oghuz outer Oghuz noble:PL:POSS

*söhbətə dərilmişdi.* (KDQ 94)  
 chat:DAT gather:REFL:PF:PAST  
 'The nobles of the Inner Oghuz and Outer Oghuz  
 had assembled to the gathering' (Lewis 1974: 33)

The semantics of the illustrated verbs has changed, and they can be used in MA as passive (*yumurlan-* 'to be rolled, rounded'; *dəril-* 'to be picked, gathered') or decausative (*yumurlan-* 'to get / become rounded') forms only.

### 2.1.2.3. Benefactive reflexive

In comparison to OA, not only the number of reflexive verbs but also the spectrum of reflexive meanings are limited in MA today. The benefactive type of reflexive meanings has no morphological representation in MA, whereas the morphologically

marked benefactive reflexive was wide-spread in Old Turkic languages as well as in OA. Cf.:

- (51) *Bən axirətlik səni qardaş edindim,*  
 I adopted you:ACC brother do:REFL:PAST/1SG  
*Gönüldən yarü həm yoldaş edindim.* (DH 55)  
 heart:ABL friend:CONJ CONJ companion do:REFL:PAST/1SG  
 'I sincerely adopted you as a brother, and as a friend and a companion.'
- (52) *Bağdı gördi kəndünün dəniz qulunu*  
 look:PAST see:PAST own:GEN sea foal:POSS  
*Böz ayğır bunda otlanub turar.* (KDQ 60)  
 gray stallion here:LOC graze:REFL:GER stay:PRES  
 'When he looked about, he saw his own gray stallion grazing at hand.'  
 (Sümer et al. 1972: 56)
- (53) *Könlümün Mənsuri çünkim*  
 heart:POSS/1SG:GEN Mansur:POSS CONJ  
*zülfünü edindi dar ...* (N 64)  
 lovelock:POSS/2SG:ACC do:REFL:PAST gallows  
 'Since the Mansur of my heart made (for himself)  
 your lovelock a gallows ...'
- (54) *Ol nigarın kəndi halın söylənür.* (YM 118)  
 that beautiful girl own state:POSS talk:REFL:PRES  
 'That beautiful girl is talking to herself about her own state.'
- (55) *Hər kim ki içinə*  
 everybody CONJ drink:REFL:SUBJ  
*ləbi camı ilə əyax ...* (QB 598)  
 lip:POSS cup:POSS POSP drinking cup  
 'Everybody who drinks (lit. drinks for himself) from her lip cup ...'

The reflexive morpheme as well as the benefactive reflexive marker are not subject to labial harmony in QB; cf.: *Bir şərbət ağızundan umaram yutınam* (QB 210) 'I hope to swallow (lit. to swallow for myself) a şərbət from your mouth'; *Hüsni-rəngin eşqi çünki dutına könli vətən ...* (QB 591) 'Since love of beauty holds (i.e. considers) the heart as (its) motherland...'

The verbs *deyin-* (< *de-* 'to tell, say'), *söylən-* (< *söylə-* 'to tell') and *dilən-* (< *dilə-* 'to wish') preserve signs of the benefactive reflexive in MA, however, the affix *-(yi)n* now appears rather as a lexical, word-building affix than as a morphological one, because it marks non-regular, non-standard transformations: the verbs *deyin-* and



*söylən-* convey the meanings ‘to mutter, grumble; to complain’ and not just ‘to tell oneself’, and the verb *dilən-* means ‘to beg as a mendicant’ and not just ‘to wish / ask for oneself’.

## 2.2. Non-diathetical reflexive constructions

### 2.2.1. Semantics and syntax

The canonical, autive and benefactive types of reflexive meaning are characteristic for these constructions also. The transformation from the corresponding basic structures to the non-diathetical reflexive constructions does not change the syntactic valency of the main verbs; cf.:

- (40) a. *Arzu qızı bəzədi.*  
 Arzu girl:ACC beautify:PAST  
 ‘Arzu beautified the girl.’

- (40) c. *Arzu özünü bəzədi.*  
 Arzu herself:ACC beautify:PAST  
 ‘Arzu beautified herself.’

In these constructions the reflexive meaning is expressed using reflexive pronouns or nouns that denote body-parts. In OA it was possible to use the personal pronouns instead of reflexive ones; e.g.:

- (56) *Gördünmi mən mana netdim?* (KDQ 86)  
 see:PAST/2SG:PART I I:DAT what do:PAST/1SG  
 ‘Did you see what I did?’ (Sümer et al. 1972: 100);  
 lit. ‘Did you see what I did to me?’

- (57) *Vərqa aydur: Sən sənin işini qıl.* (YM 174)  
 Varqa say:PRES you you:GEN business:POSS:ACC do  
 ‘Varqa says: You do your business (affairs).’

- (58) *Bəndən bəni aldı gözü, zülfündə yitirdüm bəni.* (QB 39)  
 I:ABL I:ACC take:PAST eye:POSS/2SG hair:POSS/2SG:ABL lose:CAUS:PAST/1SG I (mole):ACC  
 lit. ‘Your eye(s) took me from me, I lost myself in your hair’

The limited number of examples shows that such constructions were archaic even for the investigated period. Qazi Burhaneddin, for instance, used (58) just to play upon

the word *bən*, which indicates not only the first person but also means ‘mole’.<sup>8</sup> In other cases he always used reflexive pronouns; e.g.: *yazdı kəndüzini* (QB 73) ‘he wrote himself’; *bənzədürəm öz-özümü* (QB 169) ‘I am resembling myself’, etc. However, it should be noted that constructions with a reflexive use of personal pronouns are found in the following centuries too (see Islamov 1986).

### 2.2.2. Morphology

In MA the non-diathetical reflexive constructions are not marked in the morphological structure of the main verbs. However, in OA the verbs of these constructions took the morpheme *-n* (with its phonetic variants); e.g.:

- (59) *Şoluq dəm belinə qılıc quşandı.* (DH 22)  
 that time waist:POSS:DAT sword gird:REFL:PAST  
 ‘That time (the robber) girded (lit. girded himself) his waist with a sword.’
- (60) *Həqa əgri həqan gözdan*  
 Truth:DAT slantwise look:PART eye:ABL  
  
*yaşınur yüzini dilbər.* (NDL 545)  
 hid:REFL:PRES face:POSS:ACC beloved  
 ‘The beloved is hiding his face from the eye  
 which looks at God with evil intention.’
- (61) *Gizləndi günəş, yüzinə dutındı sitara.* (QB 170)  
 hid:REFL:PAST sun face:POSS:DAT hold:REFL:PAST veil  
 ‘The sun hid itself, veiled its face.’
- (62) *Çü eşqün odına*  
 CONJ love:GEN fire:POSS:DAT  
  
*canum özini ud edinmişdür.* (QB 397)  
 soul:POSS/1SG itself:ACC aloe do:REFL:PF:COP  
 ‘Because my soul has made itself an aloe for the fire of love.’

In each of the given clauses the reflexive meaning is given twice: by the morpheme *-(t)n* and by reflexive pronouns or body-part names. Cf. also: *Sən ... öz-özünü sınan* (QB 113) ‘You try yourself’; *Aşıq ... can oyun özünə sud edinmişdür* (QB 397) ‘The lover has made use of the play with his life’; *Qası qəmzəsi əlindən başını qaşınmazam* (QB 199) ‘lit. I cannot scratch my head because of her eyebrow (and coquetry’; *Belümə müşk saçını, şəha, kəmərlənürəm* (QB 535) ‘O my ruler, I am girdling my waist with your hair’; etc.

<sup>8</sup> That is why the phrase *zulfündən yitirdüm bəni* has the second translation: ‘I lost the mole in your hair’ (i.e. ‘your hair hid the mole in your face from me’).

Languages always try to get rid of pleonasms. In this case the affix *-(t)n* has lost its position, and in MA it is never used in non-diathetical reflexive constructions.

### 3. Reciprocal

In reciprocal transformations the denoted initial situation yields to a new, “symmetrical” one, where two referents are required to perform the same action with respect to each other. The reciprocal constructions are also of diathetical and non-diathetical types.

#### 3.1. Diathetical reciprocal constructions

##### 3.1.1. Semantics and syntax

In diathetical reciprocal constructions the referents, which are simultaneously the subjects and objects of the corresponding action, have two kinds of syntactical representation.

(a) One of the referents is represented by the  $S_{syn}$  and another one by the complement formed with the postposition *ilə* ‘with’. This is the result of the canonical type of reciprocal transformations, where the syntactic valency of the main verb is decreased in rank: the initial complement with a case ending is demoted to the complement position formed with a postposition. Within this transformation the  $S_{syn}$  is not formally changed; however, it (as well as the complement), unlike the basic diathesis, corresponds to two semantic actants; e.g.:

- (63) a. *Ata oğlunu qucaqladı.*  
 father son:POSS:ACC embrace:PAST  
 ‘The father embraced his son.’
- (63) b. *Ata oğlu ilə qucaqlaşdı.*  
 father son:POSS POSP embrace:REC:PAST  
 ‘The father embraced with his son.’

(b) The referents are represented at the syntactic level by one actant ( $S_{syn}$ ) and are expressed as homogenous parts or as a (pro)noun in the plural. The second syntactic actant of this structure is also the complement governed by the postposition *ilə* yet the postposition is added here to the phrase *bir-biri* ‘each other’, which can change according to persons (*bir-birimizlə*, *bir-birinizlə*, *bir-birləri ilə*) and which indicates that the action is directed between the subjects themselves; e.g.:

- (63) c. *Ata və oğul bir-biri ilə qucaqlaşdılar.*  
 father CONJ son each other POSP embrace:REC:PAST/3PL  
 ‘The father and the son embraced’; lit. ‘The father and the son embraced each other.’

In many cases such constructions are used in a grammatically elliptic form where the phrase *bir-biri ilə* is not realized; cf.:

- (63) d. *Ata və oğul qucaqlaşdılar.*  
 father CONJ son embrace:REC:PAST/3PL  
 'The father and the son embraced.'

All of the syntactical structures mentioned have parallels in OA; cf.:

- (64) *Vərqa tayısilə həm qucuşdular.* (YM 175)  
 Varqa uncle:POSS:POSP CONJ embrace:REC:PAST/3PL  
 'And Varqa embraced with his uncle.'
- (65) *İki xurma talı biri biriylə sevişdilər.* (QB 493)  
 two date flower bud each other:POSP love:REC:PAST/3PL  
 'Two handsome youths (lit. flower bud of the date palm) loved each other.'
- (66) *Buluşdu ol iki bədri-minəvvər.* (DH 65)  
 meet:REC:PAST that two full moon:EZ enlightened  
 'Those two handsome youths (lit. enlightened full moon) met.'

The quoted reciprocal constructions are derived on the basis of two-valent verbs. In MA few three-valent verbs have the reciprocal diathesis. As a result of reciprocal transformation these verbs become two-valent ones, because they lose their second syntactic actant (direct object). Other actants change according to the above-mentioned general rule of the reciprocal transformation. Cf.:

- (67) a. *O, Budağa güllə atdı.*  
 he Budaq:DAT bullet throw:PAST  
 'He fired (lit. threw a bullet) at Budaq.'
- (67) b. *O, Budaqla atışdı.*  
 he Budaq:POSP throw:REC:PAST  
 'He exchanged fire (lit. threw at each other) with Budaq.'
- (68) a. *O, dostuna məktub yazdı.*  
 he friend:POSS:DAT letter write:PAST  
 'He wrote a letter to his friend.'
- (68) b. *O, dostu ilə yazışdı.*  
 he friend:POSS POSP write:REC:PAST  
 'He corresponded with his friend.'

The initial direct object is not realized in the derived constructions because the sem structures of the verbs *atış-* and *yazış-* contain the meanings 'bullet' and 'letter', respectively. In such reciprocal clauses the double semantic function is realized not

on the basis of the subject and object but of the subject and addressee of the action. That is why the corresponding constructions are called addressative reciprocals.

In the OA texts the realization of the direct object is possible within addressative reciprocals; e.g.:

- (69) *Söyləşir idi ki, bu sözü bular ...* (YM 179)  
 tell:REC:PRES COP:PAST CONJ this word:ACC they  
 ‘When they were discussing (lit. telling each other) this word ...’

### 3.1.2. Morphology

The reciprocal diathesis is marked in the verb by the morpheme *-ş*. The morpheme is added to bases with a final consonant with a buffer vowel which appears in four variants due to vowel harmony. It is the same in the OA texts; e.g.: *At üzərindən ikisi qarvaşdılar, tartışdılar* (KDQ 109) ‘They grappled while riding their horses, pushing and pulling’ (Sümer et al. 1972: 143); ... *sevişmişlər ol iki mahi-ru* (YM 150) ‘those two moon-faced (ones) have loved each other’; *Anunla cəng edəlim uruşalım* (DH 52); ‘Let us quarrel, fight with him’; *Bərü gəl, döğüşəlim* (KDQ 108) ‘Come and let us fight’ (Sümer et al. 1972: 142); etc. In QB the buffer vowel is not subject to labial harmony; cf.: *görişəyüm* (QB 351); *sorışayum* (QB 352); etc.

The affix *-ş* is directly added to polysyllabic bases with a final vowel; e.g.: *Üç oq, Boz Oq qarşulaşdılar* (< *qarşula-* ‘to meet’) (KDQ 126) ‘The Üch Ok and the Boz Ok met face to face’ (Lewis 1974: 188); *söyləş-* (< *söylə-* ‘to tell’) (DH 71; KDQ 47) ‘to tell each other’. In the investigated texts this morphonological norm is violated only once: *oxşayışum* (< *oxşa-* ‘to be like’) (QB 232).

## 3.2. Non-diathetical reciprocal constructions

### 3.2.1. Semantics and syntax

The non-diathetical reciprocal constructions also denote that a referent exerts an influence on another referent and at the same time is subject to this kind of influence from the second referent. Within these constructions the semantics of mutual activity is conveyed by the phrase *bir-biri* ‘each other’ in the accusative, dative or ablative. The case form depends on the main verb, which demands the same case in basic constructions also. This means that, as distinct from the *bir-biri ilə* forms, the transformations from the corresponding basic non-reciprocal constructions to such structures are not accompanied by changes in the syntactic valency of the main verbs. Cf.

- (70) a. *Səttar təkrar Mahmuda baxdı.*  
 Sattar again Mahmud :DAT look:PAST  
 ‘Sattar looked at Mahmud again.’

- (70) b. *Səttarla Mahmud təkrar bir-birinə baxdılar.*  
 Sattar:POSP Mahmud again each other:DAT look:PAST/3PL  
 ‘Sattar and Mahmud looked again at each other.’

In other words, within transformations like (70a) → (70b) the basic syntactic “S<sub>syn</sub> – complement in a case form – Verb” structure is not changed. This is the principal difference between diathetical and non-diathetical reciprocal constructions.

### 3.2.2. Morphology

In MA the transformations in question are not marked in the morphological structure of the verb by any endings. However, in OA the affix *-(t)ş* marked the verbs of non-diathetical reciprocal constructions, too; e.g.:

- (71) *Məktəb içində bular biri-birin*  
 school inside:POSS:LOC they each other:ACC  
  
*Can içində sevişib qıldı bərin.* (YM 150)  
 soul inside:POSS:LOC love:REC:GER do:PAST sublime  
 ‘At school they truly loved and glorified each other.’
- (72) *Qəməzlər bir-birini qovlaşırlar.* (QB 622)  
 twinkle:PL each other:ACC chase:REC:PRES/3PL  
 ‘The coquettish glances are chasing each other.’
- (73) *Bir-birinə baxışurlar, ey əmu.* (MZ 278)  
 each other:DAT look:REC:PRES/3PL o uncle  
 ‘They are looking at each other, o uncle.’

The same holds for non-diathetical addressative reciprocals; e.g.: *Bir-birinə söz atışdılar* (KDQ 94) ‘They exchanged (harsh) words’ (Lewis 1974: 134); *Bir-birinə ipini sunuşdular* (YM 171) ‘They handed the string to each other’.

In the quoted instances the morpheme *-(t)ş* is pleonastic because the reciprocal meaning is already given by the phrases *bir-birini* and *bir-birinə*.

In QB the non-diathetical reciprocal construction has another and very rare type, which occurs without the *bir-biri* phrase. This type is realized in the following instances:

- (74) *Yüzümi ay yüzinə sürüşəyüm.* (QB 351)  
 face:POSS/1SG:ACC moon face:POSS:DAT rub:REC:SUBJ/1SG  
 ‘Let me rub my face against her moon face  
 (and at the same time be rubbed by her).’
- (75) *Bən ağızımı ağızına anun,*  
 I mouth:POSS/1SG:ACC mouth:POSS:DAT she:GEN

*Qəmzəsini canuma urısayum. (QB 352)*  
 twinkle:POSS:ACC soul:POSS/1SG:DAT touch:REC:SUBJ/1SG  
 'Let me touch my mouth to her mouth (and) her coquettish  
 glance to my soul face (and at the same time be touched by her).'

The affix *-ıŝ /-iŝ* is the only element carrying the reciprocal meaning here. Syntactically, these constructions do not differ from their basic counterparts; cf. (74a) with (74):

- (74) a. *Yüzümi ay yüzinə sürəyüm.*  
 face:POSS/1SG:ACC moon face:POSS:DAT rub: SUBJ/1SG  
 'Let me rub my face against her moon face.'

Since there is no syntactical derivation, sentences like (74), (75) should be considered non-diathetical constructions. Their limited use shows that they were already archaic in the investigated period.

### 3.3. Cooperative verbs

The morpheme *-(ı)ŝ* can be added to one-valent verbs also. In this case, and the case of some intransitive two-valent verbs, the morpheme adds to the bases a cooperative meaning. Such transformations do not change either the syntactic valency of the verb or the correspondence between its syntactic and semantic actants. Cf.:

- (76) a. *Uşaqqlar ağladılar.*  
 child:PL cry:PAST/3PL  
 'The children cried.'
- (76) b. *Uşaqqlar ağlaşdılar.*  
 child:PL cry:COOP:PAST/3PL  
 'The children cried (together).'

In the OA texts the affix *-(ı)ŝ* is used in cooperative meaning not only with intransitive but also with some transitive verbs; e.g.: *Ağ boz atlar binübən yortuşdılar* (< *yort-* 'to gallop (tr.)') (KDQ 103) 'They mounted grey-white horses and galloped away' (Lewis 1974: 149); *Ərənlər düşmənləri avlaşurlar* (< *avla-* 'to hunt') (QB 622) 'Brave men are collectively hunting the enemies'.

Compared with the current period, in OA the affix could be added to more verbs. Such reciprocal and cooperative verbs as *yiləŝ-* (KDQ 93, 97) 'to smell each other'; *bögüriş-* (KDQ 58) 'to lament together'; *yortuş-* (KDQ 93) 'to gallop together'; *aziŝ-* (QB 320) 'to get lost (together)'; *ödəŝ-* (QB 508) 'to pay each other'; *kükrəŝ-* (QB 622) 'to roar together' and so on are not used in MA.

#### 4. Causative

##### 4.1. Semantics and syntax

There are different ways of expressing causal relationship in Turkic languages (see Johanson 1993). Only one of them involves the valency modification of the verb. It is the following type of derivation where the main verb gains an additional semantic actant:

- (77) a. *Şam söndü.*  
candle go-out:PAST  
'The candle went out.'
- (77) b. *Arzu şamı söndürdü.*  
Arzu candle:ACC blow-out:CAUS:PAST  
'Arzu blew the candle out.'

In such cases the derivative construction denotes a new, complex situation consisting of at least two micro-situations, one of which is the initial situation. As these micro-situations are connected with causal relations, the complex situation and the corresponding syntactic structure are called causative.

As a result of the causative derivation both the semantic and the syntactic valency of the main verb are increased by one. Within the derivative structures the new semantic actant always occupies the  $S_{syn}$  position. The initial  $S_{syn}$  is demoted to a complement position. The morphological form of the latter depends as a rule on the basic verb, i.e. it is in the accusative case if the verb is intransitive, and in the dative if the verb is transitive. The same was true in OA; cf.:

- (78) a. *Yer dırəyirdi.*  
earth shake:PRES:PAST  
'The earth was shaking.'
- (78) b. *Ditrədirdi yeri təblin gərvəşi.* (YM 168)  
shake:CAUS:PRES:PAST earth:ACC drum:GEN beat:POSS  
'The drum-beat shook the earth.'
- (79) a. *Zindancı qapuyı açdı.*  
jailer door:ACC open:PAST  
'The jailer opened the door.'
- (79) b. *Xatun ... zindancıya qapuyı açdırdı.* (KDQ 116)  
lady jailer:DAT door:ACC open:CAUS:PAST  
'The lady had the jailer open the door.' (Lewis 1974: 172)

Causation on the basis of three-valent verbs is very limited. When such a possibility is realized, only the facultative (optional) valency of the verb is increased.



Causative constructions have mostly factitive and permissive meanings. The factitive meaning is more characteristic in Azerbaijanian: the realization of the permissive meaning, as a rule, requires special contextual conditions. In the OA texts the frequency of permissive constructions and the number of verbs which may have permissive meaning are greater than in the modern language. Consider the following example from KDQ, where there are three permissive verbs in a brief passage:

- (80) *Xanm baba, qorxuram səgirdərkən Qonur atın sürücdirsən. Savaşdügin vaxtin kəndüni tutdurasan. Ğafillüca gözəl başın kəsdürəsən.* (KDQ 74)  
 'My Khan my father, I am afraid, As you gallop you may let your chestnut horse stumble, As you fight you may let yourself be taken, may let your lovely head be cut off before you know it.' (Lewis 1974: 100).

Today, it is impossible to use the verbs *sürüşdür-* 'to slip / slide' and *kəsdür-* 'to make cut (off)'<sup>9</sup> to denote permissive content.

According to another semantic principle, it is possible to distinguish distant and contact types of causative meaning (Nedjalkov, Sil'nickij 1969). In the terminology of M. Shibatani (1976) they correspond to the directive and manipulative types. The distant (or directive) type signifies such relations between the subject and the state of causation where the effect necessary for the subject of causation is not produced by the subject. The contact type of causation does not imply such a meaning.

As a rule, the causative derivations of intransitive and transitive verb bases correspondingly give the contact and distant meanings; cf.:

- (81) a. *O, maşını boşaltdı.* (< boşal- (intr.) 'to get unloaded')  
 he truck:ACC get unloaded:CAUS:PAST  
 'He unloaded the truck.'  
 (81) b. *O, maşını fəhlələrə boşaltdırdı.* (< boşalt- (tr.) 'to unload')  
 he truck:ACC worker:PL:DAT get unloaded:CAUS:CAUS:PAST  
 'He had the workers unload the truck.'

In some cases the mentioned principle is violated. For instance, the affix *-izdir* in combination with a transitive verb *əm-* 'to suck' expresses contact causation: *əməzdir-* 'to suckle'. Intransitive verbs denoting consciously performed actions can express distant causation, combining a causative indicator: *yüyür-* 'to run' → *yüyürt-* 'to make somebody run'; *oyna-* 'to dance' → *oynat-* 'to make somebody dance'; *sus-* 'to become silent' → *susdur-* 'to make silent', etc.

<sup>9</sup> The current forms of *sürücdür-* and *kəsdür-*, respectively.

## 4.2. Morphology

The syntactical causative derivations in MA are marked in the morphological structure of the verb by the affixes *-t* (*-it*, *-it*, *-ut*, *-üt*); *-dır* (*-dir*, *-dur*, *-dür*, *-dar*, *-dər*); *-ır* (*-ir*, *-ur*, *-ür*, *-ar*, *-ər*); *-ız* (*-uz*); *-ızdır* (*-izdir*, *-uzdur*); *-ğuz*; *-kəz*; *-sət*. They also exist in the OA texts, except the forms *-ızdır* (*-izdir*, *-uzdur*) and *-kəz*, instead of which *-zir* / *-zür*, and *-küz*, *-kür* / *-gür* / *-ğur* are used.

Only the affixes *-(i)t* and *-d(i)r* are productive. They realize both contact and distant types of causation. Other, less productive ones express only contact causation.

### 4.2.1. *-t* (*-it*, *-it*, *-ut*, *-üt*)

Actually the consonant of the morpheme is *d* and not *t*. It becomes voiceless at the end of words, according to the general phonetic rule of the Turkic languages, yet it displays its original appearance before all affixes starting with a vowel. Cf.: *ağlat* ‘to make someone cry’ vs. *ağladır* (MA) / *ağladur* (QB 270) ‘he makes cry’; *qanat* ‘to bleed (tr.)’ vs. *qanadım* (MA) / *qanadayım* (QB 313) ‘let me bleed’; *sağalt* ‘to cure’ vs. *sağaldır* (MA) / *sağaldur* (QB 167) ‘he is curing’; *yüyürt* ‘to make someone run’ vs. *yüyürdən* (MA) / *yügürdən* (KDQ 45) ‘who makes run’; etc. In one place in KDQ the morpheme keeps *d* even before a consonant: *Qaraqucın oynaddı Uruz ...* (KDQ 71) ‘Uruz let his black horse prance’ (Sümer et al. 1972: 76).

The morpheme is added to bases with a final vowel or the final *l* and *r* consonants (except monosyllabic stems); cf.: *ağrı* ‘to hurt, cause to ache’; *saralt* ‘to yellow, cause to yellow’; *yaşart* ‘to water, cause to water’; in OA: *Sən əritdün odlara yağım bənüm* (H 25) ‘You melted my ointment in fire’; *Yasadub bir köşki bəzətmışdi ol* (X 8) ‘He had caused (someone) to prepare a palace and to decorate it’; *bərkitdi* (KDQ 43) ‘fastened’; *qarartdı* (KDQ 71; N 295) ‘blackened’; *bəlürdürəm* (QB 301) ‘I am making clear’; *sağaldur* (QB 167) ‘is curing’; *dirilt* (N 254, 276, 286; QB 133, 136, 167...) ‘to bring to life; to revive’; etc.

A few other verbs, namely, *ax*- (which has the *aq*- variant in OA) ‘to flow’; *qırp* ‘to pluck’; *qorx*- (which has the *qorq*- variant in OA) ‘to be frightened’; *hürk*- (the old form: *ürk*-) ‘to be startled’; and in addition, in OA *az*- ‘to go astray; to lose (one’s way)’; *tüt*- ‘to smoke; to fume’ take the morpheme *-t* in the causative too. The morpheme is added to these verbs with a buffer vowel, which in some places in the OA texts does not obey labial harmony; cf.: *tütitməz* (QB 495) ‘it does not smoke’; *ürkitdi* (KDQ 113) ‘he startled’, but *qorqudan*, *ürküdən* (KDQ 45), *qorxudur* (KDQ 57). The form *azıt*- (QB 299, 332) is used in parallel with *azdur*- (QB 444) and *azdır*- (YM 153) ‘to make lose one’s way’. Only the last form is characteristic for MA.

### 4.2.2. *-dır* (*-dir*, *-dur*, *-dür*, *-dar*, *-dər*)

This is another principle causative marker. The morpheme is mainly added to bases ending in consonants. Here are examples from the OA texts: *Sənə ertə bitilər yazdırayım* (< *yaz* ‘to write’), *Həkimə dəxi şərbət düzdürəyim* (< *düz* ‘to prepare’) (DH 81) ‘Let me tomorrow have prescriptions written for you and have the doctor prepare şərbət’; *Güni gəldi, yen-yaqalar dikdürəyim* (< *dik* ‘to stitch’) *səninçün ...*

*Güni gəldi, kafər başın kəsdürəyim* (< kəs- 'to cut') *səninçün* (KDQ 70) 'Its day has come, I shall have sleeves and collar stitched for you ... Their day has come, I shall have them cut off infidel heads for you (Lewis 1974: 92); *Toquzını bir yerinə saydurayım* (< say- 'to count'), *Uruşmadan, dögüşmədən aləmi toldurayım* (< tol- 'to fill') (KDQ) 'I shall make nine of them count as little as one; I shall fill the world with battle and slaughter (Lewis 1974: 103); *Yandurub* (< yan- 'to burn') *eşqin məni xar eylədi* (X 5b) 'Your love burnt and disgraced me'; *Öldürür* (< öl- 'to die') *yetmiş bəhadır, ey əxi* (YM 165) 'He kills seventy valiants, o brother'; *Andururlar* (< an- 'to call to mind') *könlümə Hindustan* (QB 157) 'lit. They recall India to my soul'; etc.

The morpheme is also added to the monosyllabic verb stems ending in vowels; e.g.: *dedür-* (QB 373) 'to cause someone to say'; *yedür-* (A 18; QB 97) / *yedir-* (DH 40; KDQ 60, 73; N 216) 'to feed'. The modern morphonological norm requires double causative affixes for these forms; cf.: *dedirt-*; *yedirt-* (or *yedizdir-*); *yudurt-* (or *yuduzdur-*) 'to cause someone to wash'.

As apparent from the instances above, the morpheme, which is subject to vowel harmony in MA, was mostly used with rounded vowels in the old period. However, there are also counter-examples, where the bases contain a rounded vowel, yet the causative affix has the form *-dır*: *qurdırmışdı* (KDQ 34), *qusdıran* (KDQ 49, 50), *soldıran*, *toldıran* (KDQ 33), etc.

The morpheme has *-dar* (*-dər*) allomorphs, which is common in the Chuvash and Yakut languages. In MA it is used with two verbs only: *dön-* 'to turn (intr.)' and *qon-* 'to settle; to perch'. The affix *-dər* has been petrified in the verbs *əndər-* 'to pour out' and *göndər-* 'to send'. In the OA texts the shapes *döndər-* (A 15; KDQ 37, 40, 112, 118) 'to turn (tr.)', *qondar-* (KDQ 39; QB 87) 'to put / place on' and *göndər-* (YM 183, N 414) are used in parallel with *döndür-* (KDQ 33; QB 315), *qondur-* (KDQ 34, 99; NDL 404) and *göndür-* (YM 176).

In MA the morpheme *-d(ı)r* has no voiceless variants, which were dominant in Old Turkic (see Erdal 1991: 799-831). They are petrified in the verbs *gətir-* 'to bring' and *otur-* 'to sit', the original forms of which we encounter in Ali's Qisse'i Yusif: *gəltür-* (Hacıyev & Vəliyev 1983: 107), from *gəl-* 'to come' and *oltur-* (A 4), from *ol-* 'to be', respectively. Beside these, we have attested only two verbs with the voiceless variants in the OA texts: *əstür-* 'to cause to blow' (< əs- 'to blow') and *yastur-* 'to cause to flatten' (< yas- 'to flatten') (QB 372).

#### 4.2.3. *-ır* (*-ir*, *-ur*, *-ür*, *-ar*, *-ər*)

The morpheme is subject to labial harmony in MA. Yet in OA it was normally used with rounded vowels; e.g.: *artur-* (KDQ 41; YM 199; NDL 37; QB 88, 119...) 'to raise, increase'; *bişür-* (KDQ 46, 99; QB 268, 273...) / *pişür-* (KDQ 99; NDL 160) 'to cook'; *uçur-* (KDQ 38, 73, 119; QB 281, 599) 'to pull / bring down'; *yetür-* (KDQ 53, 56, 60; QB 39, 60...) 'to deliver, cause to reach'; *yitür-* (NDL 549; QB 315319, 624) 'to lose'; etc.

Only the following causative verbs contained the allomorph *-ar* / *-ər*: *çıxar-* (KDQ 36; N 271; QB 53, 65 ...) 'to take / pull out', from *çix-* 'to go out'; *çökərt-* (QB

304) 'to cause to collapse', in parallel with *çökür-* (KDQ 88, 103), from *çök-* 'to collapse; to kneel down'; *dönər-* (YM 184) 'to turn (tr.)', in parallel with *döndər-* and *döndür-*, from *dön-* 'to turn (intr.)'; *gedər-* / *gidər-* (DH 29; QB 132, 133...) 'to send / drive away; to remove', in parallel with *gedir-* (N 357, 416), from *get-* 'to go'; *qaytar-* (QB 180, 233, 456) 'to return (tr.)', from *qayıt-* 'to return (intr.)'; *qopar-* (KDQ 46, 99; NDL 405; QB 155, 218...) 'to pluck, tear away', from *qop-* 'to tear / come off'.<sup>10</sup>

The mentioned verbs exist in MA too, except those used in parallel forms, i.e. *çökərt-*, *dönər-*, *gedər-*. In MA the causative forms of the verbs *çök-* and *dön-* are *çökdür-* and *döndər-*, respectively. The causative counterpart of the verb *get-* is a suppletive form: *apar-* 'to carry, drive'.

In comparison to the OA texts, the morpheme *-(ı)r* now has a very narrow use spectrum. In MA it is added only to bases ending in *t*, *ç* and *ş* consonants. Yet historically there was no such limitation, and the morpheme *-(ı)r* could be added to more verbs; cf.: *basur-* (QB 570) 'to bury', from *bas-* 'to push'; *bilür-* (QB 236, 270) 'to inform', from *bil-* 'to know'; *çökür-* (KDQ 88, 103) 'to cause to collapse; to make kneel down', from *çök-* 'to collapse; to kneel down'; *dəgür-* (NDL 245; QB 84) 'to bring', from *dəg-* 'to touch; to reach'; *enür-* (A 28) 'to cause to descend', from *en-* 'to descend'; *geyür-* (A 28; KDQ 31, 65; NDL 445; QB 166, 171, 224) 'to dress', from *gey-* 'to put on, wear'; *irür-* (NDL 114; QB 30, 37...) 'to cause to reach', from *ir-* 'to reach'; *sağır-* (KDQ 38) 'to ask / cause someone to milk', from *sağ-* 'to milk'; *sinür-* (QB 219) 'to absorb', from *sin-* 'to subside and be absorbed'; *toyur-* (QB 465; KDQ 35, 38 ...) 'to satiate, satisfy, fill', from *toy-* 'to become filled and satiated'; *yanur-* (YM 181) 'to burn (tr.)', from *yan-* 'to burn (intr.)'.

All these verbs (except *irür-*, the base of which has become archaic) are now used with the morpheme *-d(ı)r*, instead of *-(ı)r*. The bases of almost 40% of the above-mentioned verbs (namely, *bas-*, *bil-*, *gey-* and *sağ-*) are transitive, whereas the morpheme can be added only to one transitive verb in MA: *içir-* 'to give to drink; to get someone drunk', from *iç-* 'to drink'.

The morpheme denotes contact causation. Only within one verb did it have distant causation meaning:

(82) *Dəpə kibi ət yığdım,*  
hill POSP meat heap:PAST/1SG

*göl kibi qımız sağırdım.* (KDQ 38)  
lake POSP koumiss milk:CAUS:PAST/1SG  
'I had meat heaped up like a hill; I had lakefuls of koumiss fermented  
(lit. caused smb. to milk, V.S.).' (Sümer et al. 1972: 16)

<sup>10</sup> There is also a verb *qızar-* (QB 136, 279 ...) 'to turn / grow red, redden', yet it has no causative relationship with its base *qız-* 'to get / grow warmer'.

It should be noted that in the modern spoken language the morpheme *-(t)r* is in many cases expanded with *-t* without any change in meaning; e.g.: *keçirt-* 'to pass (tr.)'; *köçürt-* 'to move, cause to migrate'; *şişirt-* 'to blow up; to inflate'; *çixart-* 'to take out, extract'; *qopart-* 'to tear away; to pluck'; etc. These verbs convey a single causation and not a double one. Such use of the *-(t)+t* combination is not characteristic for the OA texts, where there are few instances of it: *keçirt-* (YM 206), *çökərt-* (QB 304).

#### 4.2.4. *-iz (-iz, -uz)*

In MA the morpheme *-(t)z* can be added to three verbs, namely *dad-* 'to taste', *qalx-* 'to rise, stand up' and *qorx-* 'to be frightened, scared': *dadız-* 'to ask / cause to taste'; *qalxız-* 'to raise'; *qorxuz-* 'to frighten, scare'.

All three of these verbs have morphological variants which are more appropriate for the standard language: *daddır-* / *dadızdır-*; *qaldır-* and *qorxut-*, respectively.

The morpheme was unproductive in OA too, occurring with only one verb in the texts: *əmiz-* 'to suckle' (< *əm-* 'to suck'). We have found it in the Baku manuscript of *Varqa and Gulshah*:

- (83) *Dayələr əmizdi bir yıl onları.* (YMB 1a)  
 nurse:PL suck:CAUS:PAST one year they:ACC  
 'The nurses suckled them one year.'

In the corresponding place of the Istanbul manuscript, upon which the printed edition was based, the verb has the form *əmzürdi* (YM 149).

#### 4.2.5. *-zir / -zür and -ızdır (-izdir, -uzdur)*

The above-mentioned causative verb is also attested in KDQ, but in the shape *əmzir-* (KDQ 33, 82). We have not come across any other verbs with the *-zir / -zür* affixes. They are not used in MA either.

The corresponding form of the verb *əmzir-* in the modern language is *əmizdir-*. Both *-zir* and *-izdir* affixes are originally double causative formants: *-z + ir* and *-iz + dir*. The morpheme *-izdir* has the phonetic variants *-ızdır* and *-uzdur*. They can be added to few bases; e.g.: *dadızdır-* 'to ask / cause someone to taste', from *dad-* 'to taste'; *damızdır-* 'to pour out drop by drop', from *dam-* 'drip'; *doğuzdur-* 'to help to give birth', from *doğ-* 'to give birth'; *doyuzdur-* 'to satiate', from *doy-* 'to be satiated'; *içizdir-* 'to give to drink', from *iç-* 'to drink'; *yatızdır-* 'to put to bed, to lull to sleep', from *yat-* 'to sleep'.

Most of these verbs convey a more or less assistive semantics. The verbs *dam-*, *doy-*, *yat-* are intransitives, while *dad-*, *doğ-*, *iç-* and *əm-* are transitives. Contrary to the general rule, the morpheme adds to transitive bases the contact causation meaning and not the distant one. This can be explained by the fact that all transitive bases taking the morpheme are non-causative verbs.

The morpheme does not exist in the OA texts.

#### 4.2.6. -ğuz / -ğiz

In MA there is only one verb with this affix: *durğuz*- ‘to raise’. Only this verb form occurs also in the OA prosaic and poetical works of the investigated period: *turğiz*- (KDQ 104). However, the forms *durğuz*- and *turğiz*- differ not only phonetically (the *d ~ t, u ~ ı* alternations) but also semantically. The verb *dur*- has three main meanings: (1) ‘to rise, get up’; (2) ‘to stop (intr.)’; and (3) ‘to stand; to be’. In the modern language the verb can only take the affix *-ğuz* when it has the first meaning. The morphological way of realizing causation is not possible for other meanings; they are expressed by suppletive means, cf.: *dur*- ‘to stop (intr.)’ – *saxla*- (or *əylə*-) ‘to stop (tr.)’; *dur*- ‘to stand; to be’ – *qoy*- ‘to put; to leave’.

Yet in KDQ the affix *-ğiz* is added to the verb when the latter has the meaning ‘to stop (intr.)’:

(84) *Həman yayı biləgindən çıxarardı,*  
that bow:ACC wrist:POSS:ABL go out:CAUS:AOR:PAST

*buğanın- sığının boynına atardı,*  
bull:GEN cattle:GEN neck:POSS:DAT throw:AOR:PAST

*çəkib turğızardı.* (KDQ 104)  
pull:GER stop:CAUS:AOR:PAST

‘He used to remove his bow from over his wrist and just throw it around the neck of the male deer or wild cattle, and stop the animal by pulling it.’  
(Sümer et al. 1972: 135)

Beside *durğuz*-, the following four verbs with the affix *-ğuz* are attested in Ibn Muhanna’s Dictionary: *yatğuz*- ‘to put to bed’; *toyğuz*- ‘to satiate’; *oyanğuz*- ‘to wake’; *əmğüz*- ‘suckle’.

Yet as the author himself noted (IM 035), they were rarely used.

#### 4.2.7. -kəz / -küz and -sət

All of these affixes can be added to one and the same verb: *gör*- ‘to see’. There is a chronological distribution with the use of *-kəz* and *-küz*, i.e. *görkəz*- in MA and *görküz*- in OA (IM 0111) ‘to show’.

The affix *-sət* exists both in MA and OA. In the OA texts it is a rare form: *görsət*- (N 114; QB 224) ‘to show’. The meaning ‘to show’ was usually expressed by the verb *göstər*- (KDQ 69, 86, 113; QB 64, 94, 331; N 268, 287, 293 ...), which is normal for the modern standard language as well. The forms *görkəz*- and *görsət*- are mostly used in the spoken language.

The forms *görsət*- and *göstər*- are alike. Probably, Kononov (1956: 203) was right in asserting that the affix *-sət* appeared as a result of the metathesis: *görset* < *göster* < *gözter*.

#### 4.2.8. -ğur / -gür / -kür

These affixes, which can be considered phonetic variants of one and the same morpheme, do not exist in MA. They were already archaic in the XIII-XIV centuries. We have found only the following verbs in the investigated texts: *turğur-* (KDQ 118) 'to leave', from *tur-* 'to stand'; *irgür-* (KDQ 73; QB 252; YM 159; MZ 286) 'to cause to reach', from *ir-* 'to reach'; *dirgür-* (KDQ 40, 119) 'to let someone live', from *dir-* (QB 212) 'to live'; *yetkür-* (A 8) 'to make enough', from *yet-* 'to be enough'.

### 5. Decausative

#### 5.1. Semantics and syntax

Transformations like (78a)-(78b) have a syntactically double character. They are characterized as causation from the point of view of (78a). Yet if we take (78b) as a starting point of the transformation, (78b) → (78a) is a decausation process.

Decausation is characterized by one-unit reduction of the syntactic actants, in other words, by a decrease in the syntactic valency of the verb by one. Semantically, it indicates the simplification of the sem structure of the verb, i.e. it is a transformation in a negative sense in that the "cause" component is withdrawn from the verb.

#### 5.2. Morphology

In Azerbaijanian there exist possibilities of marking the decausative transformation in the morphological structure of the verb; e.g.:

- (85) a. *Təbil səsi yeri silkələdi.*  
 drum beat:POSS earth:ACC shake:PAST  
 'The drum-beat shook the earth.'

- (85) b. *Yer silkələndi.*  
 earth shake:DEC:PAST  
 'The earth was shaken.'

The markers of decausation are the affixes *-ıl*, *-il*, *-ul*, *-ül*; *-n*, *-ın*, *-in*, *-un*, *-ün*; *-ş*, *-ış*, *-uş*, *-üş*. The main decausative morphemes are *-(ı)l* and *-(ı)n*, whose allomorphs and distribution rule are the same as the passive ones. Here are some examples of decausative verbs from OA: *yıqıl-* (KDQ 36, 38) 'to be overthrown'; *qırıl-* (KDQ 41) 'to be broken'; *boğul-* (KDQ 60) 'to choke'; *boyan-* (QB 144, 196...) 'to be stained', etc. Again in QB the distribution rule is violated in some places, namely, in *asın-* (QB 253) 'to hang (intr.)' (< *as-* 'to hang (tr.)'); *ayın-* (QB 330) 'to sober up' (< *ay-* 'to sober') and *bayın-* (QB 330) 'to faint' (< *bay-* 'to cause to faint') the affix *-ın* is used instead of the normal *-ıl*.

In MA the affix *-(ı)ş* as a decausative indicator is seen in the following few verbs: *bulaş-* (also attested in OA: KDQ 39; QB 101, 529, 569) 'to become smeared', from *bula-* 'to smear'; *calaş-* 'to be inoculated', from *cala-* 'to inoculate'; *qatış-* 'to mix (intr.)', from *qat-* 'to mix (tr.)'.

*Bulaş-* and *calaş-* are used in parallel with the forms *bulan-* (also found in the OA texts: YM 189) and *calan-*, respectively.

### 5.3. Decausative vs. causatives

The relations between syntactic constructions, formed with non-causative verbs on the one hand, and causative verbs on the other, irrespective of the direction of morphological derivation, are always the same; cf. (78a) and (78b) with (85b) and (85a). The semantic correlations *ditrə* – *ditrət* and *silkələn* – *silkələ* also have the same character despite the fact that their opposite poles are marked. It is irrelevant to the semantics whether the first or second pole is marked. Diachronically, morphological markers can move from one pole to another one without changing the causal relations. For instance, in OA the causal relations ‘to be broken – to break’; ‘to sober up – to sober’ and ‘to faint – to cause to faint’ were morphologically marked in the first, i.e. non-causative pole:

*sin-* (YM 167; QB 314) ‘to be broken’ – *sı-* (KDQ 40, 47; QB 339, 585) ‘to break’  
*ayıl-* (QB 73, 93, 150) ‘to sober up’ – *ay-* (QB 108, 322) ‘to sober’  
*bayıl-* (QB 73, 345, 371) ‘to faint’ – *bay-* (QB 108, 322) ‘to cause to faint’

However, in MA the verbs *sı-*, *ay-*, *bay-* have become archaic, and the mentioned causal relations are marked in the second, i.e. causative pole: *sin-* / *sındır-* ‘to break’; *ayıl-* / *ayılt-* ‘to sober’; *bayıl-* / *bayılt-* ‘to cause to faint’.

Another instance is the relation ‘to be born – to bear’, which is marked in the non-causative pole in MA:

*doğul-* ‘to be born’ – *doğ-* ‘to bear (children)’

In OA the *doğ-* verb meant ‘to be born’, and consequently, the mentioned relation had the morphological marker (*-ur*) in its causative part:

*doğ-* (X 16b; YM 149) /  
*toğ-* (KDQ 49; QB 127) ‘to be born’ – *toğur-* (KDQ 35; NDL 345).

In Azerbaijanian some causal relations are morphologically marked in either pole. They are the following verbal sets:

*dağıl-* ‘to scatter (intr.)’;  
 to fall to pieces’ – *dağıt-* ‘to scatter (tr.)’; to break to pieces’  
*isin-* ‘to grow warm’ – *isit-* ‘to warm’  
*islan-* ‘to get wet’ – *islat-* ‘to wet’  
*ovun-* ‘to be consoled’ – *ovut-* ‘to console’  
*qurtul-* ‘to escape’ – *qurtar-* ‘to save, rescue’  
*tərpən-* ‘to move (intr.)’ – *tərpət-* ‘to move (tr.)’  
*tükən-* ‘to be exhausted’ – *tükət-* ‘to exhaust’



*uzan-* 'to be extended,  
to become lengthened' – *uzat-* 'to extend, to lengthen'.

Compare in the OA texts:

<i>dağıl-</i> (DH 65) /	– <i>dağıt-</i> (N 268, 283, 285...) / <i>tağıt-</i>
<i>tağıl-</i> (KDQ 91,125; NDL 335; QB 635)	(KDQ 44, 69, 92; QB 23, 133 ...)
<i>avın-</i> (DH 62; YM 151) 'to get distracted'	– <i>avit-</i> (YM 186) 'to distract'
<i>oyan-</i> (KDQ 116; N 186, 404, 416; QB 38, 130...)	– <i>oyar-</i> (KDQ 91, 113; N 110; QB 49, 328, 385 ...)
<i>qurtul-</i> (KDQ 56, 117; YM 169, 175) /	– <i>qurtar-</i> (KDQ 35,46; YM 168, 175; N 464; QB 23, 58 ...)
<i>qurtıl-</i> (KDQ 88; QB 64, 69)	
<i>dəprən-</i> (NDL 234; QB 229, 246 ...) /	
<i>dəbrən-</i> (DH 23)	– <i>dəprat-</i> (KDQ 77; QB 25, 42 ...)
<i>tükən-</i> (KDQ 50; N 278, 291, 303; QB 182, 210 ...) / <i>dükən-</i> (KDQ 44, 65, 95; NDL 255; QB 147, 212 ...)	– <i>dükət-</i> (KDQ 99)
<i>uzan-</i> (KDQ 44; QB 60, 107, 135 ...)	– <i>uzat-</i> (YM 186; N 355, 451; QB 73, 84 ...).

The mentioned verbs in MA are simplexes. However, the binary semantic and formal opposition of the counterparts allows us to differentiate formal bases and suffixes; e.g.: *dağıl* / *dağıt*; *qurtıl* / *qurtar*; *tükən* / *tükət*; etc. The differentiated suffixes (-ıl, -n) and (-t, -ar) are just decausative and causative markers, respectively.

The formal bases *dağ-* (or *tağ-*), *isi-*, *isla-*, *qurt-*, *ovu-* (or *avı-*), *oya-*, *təprə-* (or *təprə-* / *dəprə-*), *tükə-* (or *dükə-*) and *uza-* were apparently used as independent verbs in proto-Turkic, yet they are not attested in OA, except the verb *uza-* (YM 159; QB 288) 'to extend'.

Some of the above-mentioned decausative verbs can take a causative affix: *isindir-*, *ovundur-*, *oyandır-* (also attested in the OA texts: N 258) and *uzandır-*. The verbs *isindir-* and *isit-*, *ovundur-* and *ovut-*, *oyandır-* and *oyat-* are synonyms, but *uzandır-* and *uzat-* have different meanings. The verb *uzandır-* 'to help to lay down' is the causative of the verb *uzan-* in the autive meaning (i.e. 'to lie, stretch oneself') and not in the decausative one. It expresses the assistive type of causative meaning, while the verb *uzat-* has the factitive semantics.

In Azerbaijanian a causative affix can be added not only to the incorporated decausative marker. There are some instances where the combination of the decausative and causative markers takes place despite the fact that the verbal bases exist as independent words. In these cases the affixes having opposite functions neutralize each other, and as a result the meaning of the base is not changed; e.g.:

*zəhərləndir-* (< *zəhərlən-* 'to be poisoned') 'to poison' = *zəhərlə-* 'to poison',  
*calaşdır-* (< *calaş-* 'to be inoculated') 'to inoculate' = *cala-* 'to inoculate'

However, in some instances the combination of the affixes appears as a word-building element; cf.:

*süründür-* (< *sürün-* ‘to drag (intr.)’) ‘to procrastinate’, yet *sürü-* ‘to drag (tr.)’.

In the above-mentioned cases the decausative marker is always *-n* or *-ş* and never *-(t)l*. However, in OA we found an exception: *yorult-* (KDQ 75, 114) ‘to weary, tire’ (< *yorul-* ‘to be tired’ < *yor-* ‘to weary, tire’).

## 6. Conclusion

In general, the passive, reflexive, reciprocal, causative and decausative meanings and forms are almost the same in Modern and Old Azerbaijani. However, the present investigation shows that there are also differences in the use of the categories in question.

The reflexive, reciprocal-cooperative, permissive causative forms and the adversative type of passives are characteristic for more verbs in OA, in comparison to the contemporary period. On the other hand, the modal-assessment semantics of passive found in MA is not present in the old texts.

The agentive complement in passive constructions is not common in Azerbaijani; when it does occur, MA uses the postposition *tərəfindən* ‘by’ to mark it, yet the same complement is formed with the ablative affix in OA. From the syntactical point of view, the modern language is unlike OA also in that it avoids the direct object in addressative reciprocal constructions and does not use the personal pronouns to express the reflexive meaning.

Both in MA and OA the passive, active and decausative transformations are marked in the morphological structure of the verb by the morpheme *-(t)l* and its allomorph *-(t)n*. In the current language some active verbs are also formed with the affix *-(t)ş*, which is not encountered in the old texts.

The canonical reflexive marker is the affix *-(t)n*. In addition, in OA the affix also marks the main verbs of the benefactive reflexive and non-diathetical reflexive constructions, which have no morphological marker in MA.

The morpheme *-(t)ş* indicates all reciprocals in OA, yet it marks only diathetical reciprocals in the current language.

In MA the causative derivation is marked in the verb by the affixes *-(t)t*, *-d(t)r*, *-(t)r*, *-(t)z*, *-ğuz*, *-sət*, *-(t)zd(t)r* and *-kəz*. With the exception of the latter two, they also exist in the OA texts. Other causative affixes existing in the old texts—*-zir* / *-zür*, *-küz*, *-kür* / *-gür* / *-ğur*—have disappeared in the modern language, and the affix *-(t)r*, which was used with many verbs in OA, has become unproductive.

All affixes mentioned are subject to vowel harmony both in MA and OA. Yet labial harmony is not strong in the old texts, especially in QB, where the passive, reflexive and reciprocal morphemes are used only with unrounded vowels, whereas most of the causative affixes appear with rounded ones.

### Acknowledgments

The final version of this article was written while I was at the Mainz University with a scholarship from the Union of the German Academies of Sciences and Humanities in 1999-2000. I would like to express my gratitude to the Union for this opportunity.

### Abbreviations / sources

A = *Ali. Qisse'i Yusif*. [MS in the Institute of Manuscripts in Baku: B – 3422. The facsimile of the MS in: *Keçmişimizdən gələn səslər* 1. Bakı: Elm, 1983]  
 DH = *Dastani- Əhməd Hərami*. Bakı: Gənclik, 1978.  
 H = İzzəddin Həsənoğlu. In: *XIII-XVI əsrlər Azərbaycan şe'ri* 3. Bakı: Elm, 1984, 24-25.  
 IM = Melioranskij, P. 1900 (ed.) *Arab-filolog o tureckom jazyke*. Sankt-Peterburg.  
 KDQ = *Kitab-ı Dədə Qorqud*. Bakı: Yazıçı, 1988.  
 MZ = *Mustafa Zərir. Yusif və Züleyxa*. Bakı: Elm, 1991.  
 N = *Nəsimi. Seçilmiş əsərləri*. Bakı: Azərbaycan Dövlət Nəşriyyatı, 1973.  
 NDL = Qəhrəmanov, C. 1970. *Nəsimi "Divan"ının leksikası*. Bakı: Elm.  
 QB = *Qazi Bürhanəddin. Divan*. Bakı: Azərnəşr, 1988.  
 SF = *Suli Fəqih. Yusif və Züleyxa*. Bakı: Maarif, 1991.  
 X = *Xətai. Yusif və Züleyxa*. [MS in the Institute of Manuscripts in Baku: M – 185/2438.]  
 YM = *Yusif Məddah. Vərqa və Gülşah*. In: *XIII-XVI əsrlər Azərbaycan şe'ri* 3. Bakı: Elm, 1984. 148-207.  
 YMB = *Yusif Məddah. Vərqa və Gülşah*. [MS in the Institute of Manuscripts in Baku: B – 4228/5853.]

### References

- Ali, Ahmed (transl.) 1988. *Al-Qur'an*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Axutina, T. V. 1989. *Poroždenie reči: Nevrolingvističeskij analiz sintaksisa*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- Burriel, Kathleen R. F. 1972. *The quatrains of Nesimî fourteenth-century Turkic Hurufî: with annotated translations of the Turkic and Persian quatrains from the Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa MS*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican 1984. *Kutadgu Bilig grameri: Fiil*. (Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları 33.) Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon* 1-2. (Turcologica 7.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ergin, Muharrem 1952. Kadı Burhaneddin divanı üzerinde bir gramer denemesi. *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 4, 287-327.
- Ergin, Muharrem 1962. *Türk dil bilgisi*. (İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi yayınları 785.) İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction* 1. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hacıyev, T. & Vəliyev, K. 1983. *Azərbaycan dili tarixi*. Bakı: Maarif.
- İslamov, Musa 1986. *Türk dillərində əvəzliliklər: Azərbaycan dilinin dialekt materialı əsasında*. Bakı: Elm.
- Johanson, Lars 1993. Typen türkischer Kausalsatzverbindungen. *Journal of Turkology* 2, 213-267.

- Kononov, A. N. 1956. *Grammatika sovremennogo tureckogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Lewis, Geoffrey (transl.) 1974. *The book of Dede Korkut*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Lyons, John 1968. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malchukov, Andrej L. 1993. Adversative constructions in Even in relation to passive and permissive. In: Comrie, B. (ed.) *Causatives and transitivity*. (Studies in language companion 23.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 369-384.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. & Sil'nickij, G. G. 1969. Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. In: Xolodovič, A. A. (ed.) *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij (morfologičeskij kauzativ)*. Leningrad: Nauka. 20-50.
- Palmer, E. H. (transl.) 1949. *The Koran (Qur'an)*. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Pickthall, Marmaduke (transl.) 1952. *The meaning of the glorious koran*. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD.
- Shibatani, M. 1976. The grammar of causative constructions: a conspectus. In: Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions*. (Syntax and Semantics 6.) New York: Academic Press. 1-40.
- Sümer et al. (transl.) 1972 = Sümer, F. & Uysal, A. E. & Walker W. S. *The book of Dede Korkut: a Turkish epic*. Austin, London: University of Texas Press.
- Xolodovič, A. A. 1979. *Problemy grammatičeskoj teorii*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Xrakovskij, V. S. 1974. Passivnye konstrukcii. In: Xolodovič, A. A. (ed.) *Tipologija passivnyx konstrukcij: Diatezy i zalogi*. Leningrad: Nauka. 5-45.
- Ščerbak, A. M. 1981. *Očerki po sravnitel'noj morfologii tjurkskix jazykov (glagol)*. Leningrad: Nauka.