

Werk

Titel: Gagauz right-branching propositions introduced by the element ani

Autor: Menz , Astrid

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2001

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0005 | LOG_0030

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Gagauz right-branching propositions introduced by the element *ani*

Astrid Menz

Menz, Astrid 2001. Gagauz right-branching propositions introduced by the element *ani*. *Turkic Languages* 5, 234-244.

The aim of this article is to describe a set of right-branching dependent clauses based on finite predicates in Gagauz. These clause types have developed, as will be argued, under the influence of Bulgarian and Russian and have displaced the left-branching clauses of the Turkic type. All propositions are introduced by the junctor *ani*, which is used to introduce relative clauses, complement clauses, and clauses of purpose and reason. It is a polyfunctional unit and bears no semantic content. The semantic type of the clause introduced by *ani* thus has to be judged by the type of head it is dependent on and, in the case of clauses of reason or purpose, the mood of the clause's predicate.

Astrid Menz, Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Susam Sokak 16-18, D. 8, 80060 Cihangir, Istanbul, Turkey. E-mail: astmenz@attglobal.net

1. Introduction

Gagauz is a Turkish dialect spoken in several countries in South-East Europe. It is one of the official languages of the Republic of Moldova and is spoken there mainly in *Gagauz Yeri*, an autonomous region in the southern part of Moldova, where approximately two-thirds of the Gagauz live. Another large group of Gagauz is living in the Ukraine. A third significant group lives in Bulgaria, from where the ancestors of the Gagauz now living in Moldova and the Ukraine migrated in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Some small groups are living in Kazakhstan, the Caucasus, Greece and Romania. The total number of Gagauz speakers is about 250,000. Gagauz was established as an official literary language in the former Soviet Union in 1957 and nowadays functions to a certain extent as a written language in the Republic of Moldova.

The ethnogenesis of the Gagauz remains rather unclear. The facts that they are orthodox Christians and that historical sources on them are rare have led to quite different hypotheses. Some scholars claim an Oghuz origin, some a mix of Oghuz and

Kipchak elements. It has even been doubted altogether that the Gagauz are of Turkic origin at all and claimed that they are of Turkified Bulgarian or Greek origin.¹

Linguistically, however, Gagauz clearly belongs to West-Oghuzic and is very close to Turkish. It shows no traces whatsoever of any element that can clearly be linked to the Kipchak language group (see Doerfer 1965 and Mollova 1966).

Due to a long lasting and intensive contact with the socially dominant Slavic languages Bulgarian and Russian, the Gagauz language has developed a set of copied features. This is most obvious on the syntactic level. Among other copied patterns (see Menz 1999) Gagauz has developed a series of right-branching dependent clauses based on finite predicates.

My observations in what follows are mainly based on material from the spoken language. Besides my own material, gathered in the Republic of Moldova especially in the village Tomai in 1995, I have investigated Moškov's texts from Bessarabia published in 1904, and Zajączkowski's material from the late 50s gathered in Bulgaria. To a lesser extent I have used some material from the written language, such as schoolbooks, short stories and the like.²

My description is based on the code-copying model developed by Johanson 1992 and 1993a. Following Johanson's model, I use the term "selective copying" in cases where "one or more selected structural properties of A elements are copied onto B elements" (Johanson 1993a: 202). Globally copied elements, in contrast, are units that are copied as a whole, i.e. their material shape is copied together with their structural properties.

2. Right-branching subordinate clauses in Gagauz

In Turkic languages subordinate clauses are generally constructed on non-finite predicates. These predicates bear converbial, verbal noun, or participial suffixes that function as subordinators. Non-finite subordinate clauses as a rule precede their head.³

In the Gagauz language we find a set of right-branching dependent clauses. These clauses have a finite predicate and are linked to their head by means of various coordinative or subordinative junctors. They thus differ considerably from the genuine Turkic pattern with its left-branching clauses based on non-finite predicates. Moreo-

¹ For a discussion of the various theses regarding the ethnogenesis of the Gagauz people see Özkan (1996: 10-21).

² Sources of examples are indicated by an abbreviation and page number, see Language material. Examples of Cyrillic sources are transliterated.

³ In a variety of Turkic languages, however, finite dependent clauses exist. This is believed to be a contact induced phenomenon. Moreover, in most cases the distribution of such clauses is, compared to their non-finite counterparts, restricted and they cannot be regarded as subordinated, see Johanson (1977: 105-107).

ver, the development of right-branching clauses has led to a significant decrease of clauses of the genuine Turkic type.

Russian and Bulgarian, the socially dominant contact languages of Gagauz, make use mainly of finite dependent clauses. Thus one can readily assume that Gagauz has selectively copied these patterns from the surrounding Slavic languages. Among the subordinate clauses the right-branching type has almost completely displaced the Turkic type of relative and complement clauses. Adverbial clauses based on converbs are somewhat more stable. Nevertheless there is a set of right-branching adverbial clauses, too.

Junctors used to link the dependent clause to its head are in general made of Turkic material onto which functional properties of their Bulgarian or Russian counterparts are copied. Globally copied elements, that is units copied as a whole, are mainly restricted to the area of mere lexical units. This means that globally copied units are generally not used as clause-introducing elements.⁴

Thus, for example, the interrogative element *(h)angī* in modern Gagauz is also used as a relative pronoun. To indicate agreement with the head noun it bears possessive markers in singular or plural. To express the role of the referent of the head noun within the relative clause, case morphology is used. *(H)angī(sī)* thus functions much like the Russian relative pronoun *kotoryj*. Another example is *ačan*, originally the interrogative “when”, which is now exclusively used as a junctor to introduce temporal clauses and clauses of reason. In what follows I will focus on the various functions of the junctor *ani*.

3. *ani*

As Schönig (1995) has shown, *ani* is a derivation of Old Turkic *qa(:)ni* ‘where’ and corresponds to the Turkish question particle *hani* ‘where, where is’, i.e. it is not a phonetic variant of the question-word *(h)angī* as Pokrovskaja (1964: 141) suggests. *Ani* in Gagauz appears as a clause-introducing element in a variety of attributive, complement and adverbial constructions. Its usage as an interrogative, however, is not as common as in Turkish. All clauses under question are based on finite predicates and regularly follow their head. Some types of these clauses can also precede their heads, see below.

⁴ Gajdarži (1981: 94-96) however cites some examples of the usage of *raz* ‘as’ (< Russian *raz*) and *už* ‘as if’ (< Bulgarian *už*) in clause introducing function. Only one of my informants, whose dominant language was Russian used *raz* once, see Menz (1999: 114).

3.1. Attributive constructions

One function of *ani* is to introduce relative clauses. In Zajaczkowski's material from Bulgaria *ani* is the overall⁵ introducer of relative clauses, regardless of which element in the relative clause the head noun corresponds with. Examples (1)-(3) thus show co-reference between first actant, second actant, and circumstantials and the head noun.

- (1) *Čaarmiš veziri ani saray yapmıstı.* Z 120
 call:PF3SG minister:ACCani palace make:PLUP3SG
 'He called the minister who had built the palace.'

- (2) *Da düşündä görer düvesini,*
 and dream:POSS3.LOCsee:PRS 3SG calf:POSS3.ACC

ani vermiş Allax. M 6
 ani give:PF3SG God
 'And he sees his calf, which God had given (him), in his dream.'

- (3) *Güveyin tarafı kalkar sofradan*
 bridegroom:GENside:POSS3SG stand up:AOR 3SG table:ABL

ani yiyerlerdi. Z 94
 ani eat:R-PST3PL
 'The bridegroom's relatives get up from the table where they have eaten.'

Note that the role of the head noun within the relative construction remains unexpressed, i.e. it is neither expressed explicitly nor by usage of a pro-element in the appropriate case. In other Turkish dialects of Bulgaria the role of the head noun in such right-branching constructions is also not expressed by a pro-element, see Németh (1965: 111).

In the modern language of the Republic of Moldova *ani* is only used to introduce relative clauses that show co-reference between first or second actant, or the possessor of the head noun with the head-noun,⁶ see examples (4)-(5). The restriction to co-reference between head noun and first or second actant of the relative clauses also applies to the usage of *čto* as an introducer of relative clauses in Russian.

⁵ I could observe only a few examples with *ne* as introducing element and these are not very clear, see Menz (1999).

⁶ For relative clauses with co-reference between head-noun and third-actant or circumstantials modern Gagauz uses a relative pronoun based on the question-word *angi* 'which'.

- (4) *Onnar alerlar bizim Moldavyanin o šarabini*
 they buy:PRS.3PL our Moldova:GEN that wine:POSS3.ACC

ani biz ičmeriz. Me 170
 ani we drink:NEG.PRS.1PL
 'They buy the wine of our Moldova that we don't drink.'

- (5) *O affikslerä, ani eni maanali laf kurerlar,*
 that affix:PL.DAT ani new meaning:ADJR word build:PRS.3PL

laf düzüğü affiks deniler. GD7, 64
 word forming affix say:PASS.PRS.3SG
 'The affixes, which form words with new meaning, are called derivational affixes.'

This type of relative clause thus shows the very same pattern as Russian relative clauses introduced by the particle *čto* 'what', using the element *ani* for Russian *čto* or Bulgarian (*g*)*deto*, which, interestingly, is also derived from a question-element 'where' (Bulgarian *k' de*). The usage of non-declining elements to introduce relative clauses is very frequent in colloquial speech in Russian and also Bulgarian, which for centuries has been the main source for copying in Gagauz.

In Moškov's texts from the end of the last century I found some occasional examples showing that this type of relative clause can be prepositive, too. This was, however, absent both in my material and in the various written sources I investigated.

In written language material, however, use of the aforementioned relative pronoun *angi* 'which' is much more frequent than that of the particle *ani*, even if the head corefers with the first or second actant of the relative clause.

Left-branching prepositive clauses of the Turkic type based on participles also exist but are very scarce especially in Moldovian Gagauz (for a detailed description of all types of relative clauses in Gagauz, see Menz 1999: 75-100).

3.2. Complement clauses

The second function of *ani* is to introduce complement clauses of verbs of saying, thinking, perception and the like. These clauses are also postpositive and based on finite predicates, see example (6). These right-branching complement clauses again show the same pattern as their Slavic counterparts introduced in Russian by *čto* and in Bulgarian by *če*, etc.

- (6) *Hepsi sevinärdi ani kolxoza girdik.* Me 192
 everybodybe pleased: R-PST3SG ani kolkhos:DAT enter:PST.1PL
 'Everybody was pleased that we joined the kolkhos.'

In the spoken language *ani* is optional and can be omitted, but as far as I was able to observe these cases are scarce.⁷ Instead of *ani* it is possible to have *ki* in complement clause-introducing position. The usage of *ki* is, however, not very widespread in the spoken language. Gajdarži (1981: 24) states that it is a feature of the language of the older generation. In the written language *ki* seems to be used for stylistic reasons to avoid an increasing frequency of *ani* in one sentence.

At least in the modern written language it is possible to have two or more complement clauses subordinated to one matrix-predicate coordinated mutually by the conjunctive *xem* ‘and’, see example (7).

- (7) *Kızduyardi ani gözleri yaşlan dolardı,*
 girlfeel:R-PST3SG ani eye:PL.POSS3SG tear:WITH fill:R-PST3SG
xem ani darsä taa bir kerä “boba”,
 and ani say:AOR.COND3SG more one time father
o dayanamayağak !...! AD, 6
 she stand:IMPOS.FUT3SG
 ‘The girl felt that her eyes were filling with tears and that
 if she said “father” again, she wouldn’t be able to stand it !...!’

This represents a remarkable difference between right-branching complement-clauses in Gagauz and *ki*-introduced constructions in Turkish or the Turkic languages of Iran influenced by Modern Persian. Furthermore, with the possibility to coordinate two subordinated constructions, these right-branching complement clauses fulfill one of the criteria for hypotaxis listed by Johanson (1977).

Another significant difference from Turkish *ki*-clauses is that Gagauz complement clauses can precede their main clause, as exemplified by (8):

- (8) *Ani biz rusča konuşyoruz bizä yetejek.* Me 212
 ani we Russian speak:PRS.1PL we:DAT suffice:FUT3SG
 ‘That we speak Russian would be sufficient for us.’

This word order together with the fact that a pause can occur between the head and *ani* in the postpositive position shows clearly that *ani* belongs to the complement clause and not to the main clause as *ki* in Turkish.

Non-finite complement clauses based on verbal nouns are very rare in Moldovan Gagauz. I could detect only three examples, one in my own material and two out of about ten books I consulted. Some examples of this type of complement clause can be found in Zajczkowski’s material for Bulgarian Gagauz.

⁷ To a somewhat larger extent *ani* is omitted after *demää* ‘say’.

3.3. Clauses of purpose

A third function of *ani* is to introduce clauses of purpose.⁸ These clauses are based on non-indicative predicates in either the optative mood or the infinitive. The infinitive is used in cases where the first actant of the matrix clause is co-referentially identical with the first actant of the purpose clause (see example 9).

- (9) *Onu alardik da atardik aazimiza*
 that:ACC take:R-PST.1PL and throw:R-PST.1PL mouth:POSS1PL.DAT
ani ölmemää deyni. Me 190
 ani die:NEG.INF deyni
 'We took it and threw it into our mouths in order not to die.'

When the first actant of the main clause differs from that of the subordinated clause, the predicate of the subordinated clause is in the optative, as in example (10).

- (10) *Centralisovani bir gosudarstva upravlyat etsin bizimnän*
 centralized one state govern AUX.OPT3SG we:WITH

ani biz yaşiyalim deyni. Me 106
 ani we live:OPT1PL deyni
 'A centralized state should govern us so that we can live.'

Sporadically the optative mood is used even if the first actants are co-referential. Normally, however, the distinction between co-referential and non-co-referential first actants in purpose clause and matrix clause by means of the different predicator types is quite clear.

According to my observations of the spoken language, in most cases the purpose-clause predicate is immediately followed by the element *deyni*, which corresponds to Turkish *diye*. Whereas most clauses of purpose in my material employ both *ani* and *deyni*, they can optionally omit *deyni* if the predicate is in the optative, like in example (11), see also Gajdarži (1981: 40). Instead of *ani*, *ki* can take the introducing function in purpose clauses. This is especially frequent in the written language, where most of the purpose clauses are introduced by *ki* (see example (12), originally from a literary text). In my spoken language material, however, as can be seen in examples (9)-(11) *ani* is used almost exclusively in this position.

⁸ This is only one possibility to build clauses of purpose. For other possibilities, see Menz (1999: 101-105).

- (11) *Laflar koyulur ani taa interes olsun.* Me 200
 word:PL put:PASS.AOR3SG ani more interestingbe:OPT3SG
 (Foreign) words are put in to make it (the text) more interesting.

In almost all cases the purpose clause follows the matrix clause. I have found only a few examples in literary texts of the purpose clause preceding its matrix clause, which is demonstrated by example (12).

- (12) *Ki bakmamaa aalemin işinā deyni,*
 ki look:NEG.INFpeople:GEN affair:POSS3.DAT deyni

o baalamış kendi gözlerini bir boşçaylan. Gajdarži 1981, 40
 he bind:PF3SG own eye:PL.POSS3.ACC one scarf:WITH
 ‘In order not to look at other people’s affairs,
 he bound his own eyes with a scarf.’

Gajdarži (1981: 40) states that there is no stylistic difference between pre- and post-posed purpose clauses. The possibility of preposing the subordinate clause is again one of Johanson’s 1977 criteria for hypotaxis in the Indo-European sense.

3.4. Clauses of reason

Clauses of reason⁹ show structural similarities with clauses of purpose, but their predicate is always in the indicative mood. They can be introduced by *ani* alone but are in most cases introduced by a combination of an interrogative element and *ani* or *ki*, such as *nečin ani*, *nečin ki*, *onuştan ani ki*. Johanson (1993b: 256) claims that Russian *počemu* ‘why’ and *potomu što* ‘because’ served as a model for the selective copying of the reason-clause introducing function onto the combinations *nečin ki* and *nečin ani* ‘because’. These two most frequently introduce clauses of reason in Gagauz.

Ani itself does not convey causal meaning. It only serves to connect the reason clause with its matrix clause. *Ani* in this function can also be combined with the aforementioned element *deyni* following the predicate. The interpretation of a clause of this type with regard to purpose or reason consequently depends on the mood of the predicate.

In most cases the main clause precedes the clause of reason, so that the order is event – reason as in example (13). Note that in Turkish, for example, the “canonical” order is exactly opposite.

⁹ For all different types of clauses of reason in Gagauz see Menz (1999: 108-118).

- (13) *Bana yok bişey ani korkardılar.* Me 144
 I:DATnot existing something ani fear:R-PST3PL
 ‘Nothing happened to me because they feared me.’
 Turkish: *Korktukları için bana bir şey olmuyordu.*

The order can also be reversed, and thus the clause of reason precedes its main clause, as in example (14). However, examples with this reason – event order are of limited frequency.

- (14) *Ani gagauz yinan yok onnara.*
 ani Gagauz confidence not existing they:DAT
 ‘Because they are Gagauz one has no confidence in them.’

Since *ani* lacks an explicit causal meaning, semantically more explicit units are frequently used to stress the causal meaning. As mentioned above, combinations of a (question) adverb and *ani* or *ki* are the most frequently used among them. With these explicit conjunctions the order of clauses is always event – reason, as in example (15).

- (15) *Komunist sistemi yıkıldı.* Me 212
 communist system:POSS3SG break down:PST3SG
neçin ani internacionalism bitti. Me 212
 because internationalism finish:PST3SG
 ‘The communist system broke down because internationalism was finished.’

4. Conclusion

As has been shown, *ani* is a polyfunctional grammatical item, which introduces different types of subordinated clauses. The semantic type of the clause must generally be judged from the surroundings, i.e. whether the clause is subordinated to a nominal or verbal unit, etc. Only in cases of purpose clauses is there a syntactical difference between a subordinated and a main clause marked by the usage of a non-indicative predicate and the optional usage of *deyni*.

Ki can replace *ani* in most of its functions, with the exception of introducing relative clauses. The polyfunctionality and usage of *ani* resembles in certain aspects that of *ki* in the various Turkic languages influenced by Persian, including Turkish. There is, however, in my opinion, a significant difference between Gagauz on one hand and the Iran-Turkic languages and Turkish on the other hand. The difference lies in the aforementioned possibilities of preposing the *ani*-introduced clauses and of coordinating them with each other. Gagauz thus shows evidence of subordination in the Indo-European sense. In Turkish, for example, *ki*-introduced clauses do not fulfill any of the criteria for hypotaxis in the Indo-European sense described by Johanson (1977) and thus are qualitatively not comparable to left-branching genuine

Turkic subordinated clauses. Gagauz right-branching clauses do fulfill at least some of these criteria.

One special usage of *ani* not found in Turkic languages that employ *ki* as a clause-introducing element is as an adverbial meaning *instead of ...ing*. This clause type is always prepositive and its predicate is always modal, either in the optative mood or future tense. The Turkish equivalent of this adverbial clause type uses the prospective participle *-(y)EcEK* + possessive + dative.

(16) *Ani yatağam sizi götüreğem.* (My material, not published)
 ani lie:FUT.1SG you:ACC bring: FUT.1SG
 'Instead of sleeping, I can take you (there).'

(17) *Ani keseğäm, brakarim daa içindä.* M 87
 ani cut: FUT.1SG leave:AOR.1SG forest PP.POSS3SG.LOC
 'Instead of killing her, I'd rather leave her in the forest.'

As for word order within the subordinated *ani*-introduced clauses, there seems at least to be a tendency to place the predicate in the final position, which is opposite to the SVO word order in main clauses.

References

- Doerfer, Gerhard 1965. Zur „kiptschakischen“ Schicht im Gagausischen. *Central Asiatic Journal* 10, 21-127.
- Gajdarži, Gavril A. 1981. *Gagauzskij sintaksis: Pridatočnye predloženiya sojznogo podčinenija*. Kišinev: Štinica.
- Johanson, Lars 1977. Some remarks on Turkic 'hypotaxis'. *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher* 47/1975, 104-118.
- Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main 29, 5.) Frankfurt: Steiner
- Johanson, Lars 1993a. Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In: Extra, Guus & Verhoeven, Ludo (eds.) 1993. *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide. 197-221.
- Johanson, Lars 1993b. Typen kausaler Satzverbindungen im Türkischen. *Journal of Turkology* 1, 213-267.
- Menz, Astrid 1999. *Gagausische Syntax: Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. (Turcologica 41.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mollova, Mefküre 1966. Quelques réflexions sur la grammaire de la langue Gagavuze de L. A. Prokovskaja. *Linguistique balkanique* 11/1, 139-144.
- Németh, Julius 1965. *Die Türken von Vidin: Sprache, Folklore und Religion*. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 19.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Özkan, Nevzat 1996. *Gagavuz Türkçesi grameri: Giriş – ses bilgisi – şekil bilgisi – cümle – sözlük – metin örnekleri*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 657; Gramer Bilim ve Uygulama Yayınları 18.) Ankara : TDK 1996.
- Pokrovskaja, Ljudmila A. 1964. *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka: Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.

Schönig, Claus 1995. **qa:ño* und Konsorten. In: Erdal, Marcel & Tezcan, Semih (eds.) *Beläk Bitig: Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag.* (Turcologica 23) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Language material

AD = *Ana dili: Literatura okumakları xem grammatika: 6-ğı klass için.* Kişinev, 1991

GD7 = *Gagauz dili: Üürenmāk kiyadı: edingı klass için.* Kişinev, 1988

M = Moškov, V. A. 1904: *Narėčija bessarabskix gagauzov* (= Radloff, W.: Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme, X. Theil) St. Peterburg.

Me = Menz 1999.

Z = Zajączkowski, Włodzimierz 1966: *Język i folklor Gagauzów z Bułgarii.* Kraków.