

## Werk

**Titel:** Concessive and adversative constructions in Siberian Turkic

**Autor:** Nevskaya, Irina

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2005

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0009](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0009) | LOG\_0039

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

# Concessive and adversative constructions in Siberian Turkic

Irina Nevskaya

Nevskaya, Irina 2005. Concessive and adversative constructions in Siberian Turkic. *Turkic Languages* 9, 234-251.

In this paper, the semantic and structural types of concessive and adversative constructions in Siberian Turkic languages are investigated. In the semantic domain, we distinguish concessive proper and conditional-concessive constructions as well as real and unreal ones, the latter falling into hypothetical and counterfactive constructions. Generalised concessive constructions versus non-generalised ones represent another classificatory criterion. As for their structure, concessive constructions with the conditional form of the dependent predicate in combination with the particle *DA* represent the core of such constructions in all Turkic languages. Additionally, there exist language specific means of expressing concessive and adversative relations: constructions with imperative forms of the predicate in the concessive clause, constructions with various participial forms of the dependent predicate and some contextual means of expressing concession.

Adversative constructions are a more recent means of expressing concessive-adversative relations. In Siberian Turkic, we find only a few adversative conjunctions, most of them are copied structurally or fully from Russian. In addition, a number of modal introductory phrases are on the way to being grammaticalised as adversative conjunctions.

*Irina Nevskaya, Institute of Philology of the Siberian Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, Russia. Email: Nevskaya@em.uni-frankfurt.de*

## 1. Introductory remarks

Concessive and adversative relations alongside causative, consequential, final, resultative and conditional ones express determination of one situation by another and belong to the group of inter-propositional relations. Concession is a relation opposite to cause. A situation which is seen as a cause brings about another situation which is its consequence: *Because he had not done his homework, he got a bad mark*. A concessive situation brings about an anti-consequential situation (or an adversative one) which takes place in spite of the first situation, contrary to our expectations and contrary to a normal, i.e. causal, succession of events: *Although he had not done his homework, he got a good mark*.

	1 <sup>st</sup> situation	2 <sup>nd</sup> situation
<i>Causative-consequential relations:</i>	cause	consequence
<i>Concessive-adversative relations:</i>	concession	anti-consequence

Causative-consequential relations are normally expressed by means of specialised causative (1a) or consequential (1b) constructions. In a causative construction, the causative situation is marked by a causative connecting element (a conjunction, a particle or an adverb in the connector function grammaticalised to different degrees) (1a); in (1b), the consequential situation is marked by a grammaticalised consequential element:

- (1) a. *Because he had not done his homework, he got a bad mark.*  
 b. *He had not done his homework; therefore, he got a bad mark.*

Similarly, we can distinguish concessive (2a) and adversative (2b) constructions:

- (2) a. *Although he had not done his homework, he got a good mark.*  
 b. *He had not done his homework, but he got a good mark.*

Concessive constructions have been recently studied cross-linguistically by Bondarko 1996, Haspelmath & König 1998 and Xrakovskij 2004c; the latter edition is a monograph written by a group of authors. It contains an overview of Turkic concessive constructions (Isxakova, Nasilov & Nevskaya 2004). In this article, we describe concessive and adversative constructions in South Siberian Turkic in more detail. First, we distinguish their semantic types (Section 2). Then, we describe the structural and semantic types of concessive constructions in South Siberian Turkic (Section 3). Most of them are mono-finite, i.e. they are of the synthetic type (Čeremisina, Skribnik 1986) and consist of a matrix clause with the predicate in a finite verb form and of a dependent clause with the predicate in a nonfinite form (e.g. a converb or a participle). These are the most typical means of expressing concessive-adversative relations in Turkic. Concessive constructions with an imperative form of the dependent predicate are a rare exception. Adversative constructions with adversative conjunctions are a more recent means of expressing concessive-adversative relations in Siberian Turkic. They are bi-finite and contain adversative conjunctions, copied (Johanson 1992) from Russian either fully or structurally (Section 4). Ways of expressing concessive-adversative relations at the textual level are described in Section 5.

For illustration, we use the language material found in grammar descriptions (Anonymous 1884, Baskakov 1958, 1966, 1972, 1975, 1985, Čeremisina 1995, Dyrenkova 1941, Isxakov & Pal'mbax 1961, Nevskaya 1993, Radloff 1966, Ubrjatova 1982 etc.) as well as our Shor field data and experimental material collected according to Xrakovskij's questionnaire on concessive constructions (Xrakovskij 2004b).



<i>bol-zo,</i>	<i>üy-in-e</i>	<i>süy-di</i>
be-COND	wife-POSS3-DAT	present-ACC
<i>al-ıp</i>	<i>ber-e</i>	<i>e-d-i.</i>
buy-CONV	give-FUT.PART	be-PAST-3

‘Even if Akchabay had not got his salary, he would have bought a present for his wife.’

## 2.2. Real, hypothetical and counterfactive constructions

In real constructions, both correlated situations are either factive or are seen by the speaker as quite plausible (3a and 3b). The predicate of the matrix clause is typically in the indicative mood. Counterfactive constructions present these situations as unreal, i.e. the speaker knows that the described situations have not taken place (3c). Only conditional-concessive interpretation of the construction is possible. The predicate of the matrix clause is in the conjunctive mood in this case (the future participle of the lexical verb plus the preterit of the auxiliary verb *e-* ‘be’) and the predicate of the concessive clause bears an analytical conditional marker consisting of a perfect participle of the lexical verb and of the conditional form of the auxiliary verb *pol-* ‘be’ in combination with the particle *DA*.

Hypothetical concessive constructions present both situations as problematic, but not really impossible (4). The presupposition is that the speaker considers this possibility.

Altay					
(4)	<i>Poezd</i>	<i>öyinde</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>kel-er</i>	<i>bol-zo,</i>
	train	on.time	PTL	come-PRF.PART	be-COND
	<i>baştaqı</i>	<i>d’uum-ğa</i>	<i>oroyt-ıp</i>	<i>qal-ar</i>	<i>e-d-is.</i>
	opening	session-DAT	be.late-CONV	stay:AUX-FUT.PART	be-PST-1PL

‘Suppose the train arrived/had arrived on time, we would still be/have been late for the opening session.’

In (4), the predicate of the matrix clause is also in the conjunctive mood, but this form has the meaning of supposition here. The analytical conditional form consists of the future participle of the lexical verb and of the conditional form of the auxiliary verb. Only conditional-concessive interpretation of the construction is possible. The time reference is determined only by tense adverbs. The situations expressed in both counterfactive and hypothetical constructions are unreal ones.

## 2.3. Generalised concessive semantics

Following Xrakovskij 2000, we distinguish the following two types of generalised concessive semantics: non-iterative (4) and iterative (5) expressed by means of specialised generalised constructions. Non-iterative generalised constructions are emphatic. They contain indefinite pronouns combined with the concessive particle *DA* as their structural markers: *Shor kem de* ‘no matter who’, *qandıy da* ‘no matter

which', etc. In iterative constructions, the action performed by the same agent takes place many times, or different agents perform the same action.

Altay

- (5) *Qanayda*                    *da*                    *qapšağayla-za-η,*                    *qamčī-la*  
 how                                    PTL                    hurry-COND-2SG                    whip-INST  
*ad-īη-dī*                                    *soq-po!*  
 horse-POSS2-ACC                    hit-NEG

‘(No matter) how much you are in a hurry, do not hit your horse with the whip!’

Shor

- (6) *Parčīn kiži*                    *pil-ze*                    *de,*                    *ayt-paan-ča.*  
 every person know-COND PTL say-NEG-PRS  
 ‘Although everyone knows (that), they do not tell.’

Generalised concessive constructions can be either real or unreal as well as either concessive proper or conditional-concessive. Combining all the semantic criteria, we get the following semantic types of concessive constructions. They are illustrated with Tuvan examples here.

## I. Non-generalised constructions

### I.1. Non-generalised concessive proper constructions

- (7) *Ča's*                    *čap*                    *tur-za*                    *daa,*                    *Petrov*                    *öön-den*  
 rain                    fall:CONV                    stand:AUX-COND                    PTL                    P.                    house-ABL  
*zontik*                    *čoq*                    *ün-üp*                    *kel-gen.*  
 umbrella without go.out-CONV come:AUX-PRF  
 ‘Although it was raining, Petrov left the house without his umbrella.’

### I.2. Non-generalised conditional-concessive constructions

#### I.2.1. Non-generalised real conditional-concessive constructions

- (8) *Ča's*                    *čay-za*                    *daa,*                    *Petrov*                    *öön-den*  
 rain                    fall-COND                    PTL                    P.                    house-ABL  
*zontik*                    *čoq*                    *ün-üp*                    *kel-ir.*  
 umbrella without go.out-CONV come:AUX-AOR/FUT  
 ‘Even if it rains, Petrov (always) leaves the house without his umbrella.’
- (9) *Ča's*                    *čap*                    *kel-ze*                    *daa,*                    *Petrov*                    *öön-den*  
 rain                    fall:CONV                    come-COND                    PTL                    P.                    house-ABL  
*zontik*                    *čoq*                    *ün-üp*                    *kel-ir.*  
 umbrella without go.out-CONV come:AUX-AOR/FUT  
 ‘Even if it is raining, Petrov will leave the house without his umbrella.’

## I.2.2. Non-generalised unreal conditional-concessive constructions

### I.2.2.1. Non-generalised hypothetical constructions

- (10) *Ča's*            *čap*                    *kel-ir-daa*                    *bol-za,*  
 rain            fall:CONV                    come:AUX-FUT.PART-PTL            be-COND  
*öön-den*        *zontik*                    *čoq*                    *ün-üp*  
 house-ABL    umbrella                    without                    go.out-CONV  
*Petrov*        *kel-ir*                    *iyik.*  
 P.            come:AUX-FUT.PART    PTL  
 'Suppose it were raining, Petrov would still leave the house without his umbrella.'

### I.2.2.2. Non-generalised counterfactual constructions

- (11) *Ča's*            *čap*                    *tur-yan-daa*                    *bol-za,*  
 rain            fall:CONV                    stand:AUX-PRF.PART-PTL            be-COND  
*Petrov*        *öön-den*                    *zontik*                    *čoq*  
 P.            house-ABL                    umbrella                    without  
*ün-üp*        *kel-ir*                    *iyik.*  
 go.out:CONV    come:AUX-FUT            PTL  
 'Even if it had been raining, Petrov would have left the house without his umbrella.'

Or

- (12) *Ča's*            *čap*                    *tur-yan-daa*                    *bol-za,*  
 rain            fall:CONV                    stand:AUX-PRF.PART-PTL            be-COND  
*Petrov*        *öön-den*                    *zontik*                    *čoq*  
 P.            house-ABL                    umbrella                    without  
*ün-üp*        *kel-gey*                    *ertik.*  
 go.out-CONV    come:AUX-OPT            PTL  
 'Even if it had been raining, Petrov would have left the house without his umbrella.'

The subjunctive mood in Tuvan is built with either the future participle or the optative form of the lexical verb plus the modal particle *iyik* or *ertik*. These particles are structural analogues of the auxiliary *edi*: all of them go back to the Old Turkic auxiliary verb *är-* 'be' in the preterit *-D* (*edi*), or in the form of the perfect participle *-DOk* (*ertik*), or in the form of the evidential past *-yOk* (*iyik*).<sup>1</sup>

## II. Generalised concessive constructions

### II.1. Generalised concessive proper constructions

- (13) *Petrov*        *qim-dan-da*            *ayür-za,*                    *qim-daa*            *aŋaa*  
 P.            who-ABL-PTL            ask-COND                    who-PTL            he:DAT

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the Old Turkic formants, see Erdal 2004.

*χarīn ber-ip šīda-vaan.*  
 answer give-CONV be.able-PRF.NEG  
 ‘No matter whom Petrov asked [about it] (Although Petrov asked everyone about it), nobody could give him an answer.’

## II.2. Generalised conditional-concessive constructions

### II.2.1. Generalised real generalised conditional-concessive constructions

- (14) *Petrov qīm-dan-da aytīr-za, qīm-daa aḡaa*  
 P. who-ABL-PTL ask-COND who-PTL he:DAT  
*χarīn ber-ip šīda-vas.*  
 answer give-CONV be.able-AOR/FUT.NEG  
 ‘No matter whom Petrov asks [about it] (Even if Petrov asks everyone about it), nobody will be able to give him an answer.’

### II.2.2. Generalised unreal conditional-concessive constructions

#### II.2.2.1. Generalised hypothetical conditional-concessive constructions

- (15) *Petrov qīm-dan-da aytīr-ar bol-za, qīm-daa*  
 P. who-ABL-PTL ask-FUR.PART be-COND who-PTL  
*aḡaa χarīn ber-ip šīda-vas iyik.*  
 he:DAT answer give-CONV be.able-FUT.PART.NEG PTL  
 ‘Suppose Petrov asked everyone [about it], nobody would still be able to give him an answer.’

#### II.2.2.2. Generalised counterfactual conditional-concessive constructions

- (16) *Petrov qīm-dan-da aytīr-ğan bol-za, qīm-daa*  
 P. who-ABL-PTL ask-PRF.PART be-COND who-PTL  
*aḡaa χarīn ber-ip šīda-vas iyik.*  
 he:DAT answer give-CONV be.able-FUT.PART.NEG PTL  
 ‘No matter whom Petrov had asked [about it] (even if Petrov had asked everyone about it), nobody could have given him an answer.’

## 3. Concessive constructions in Siberian Turkic

### 3.1. Concessive constructions with the conditional form

Concessive constructions with the conditional form of the dependent predicate are the most widespread means to express concessive semantics in Turkic. As we have seen, they can express both concessive proper and conditional-concessive semantics, denote real, hypothetical and unreal situations and render generalised and non-generalised concessive relations. Further we describe some of their structural features. Special attention is paid to the temporal localisation of the correlated situations in such constructions. It is worth noting that in contrast to English, German or Russian



concessive constructions where the anti-consequence can precede the concessive situation, Turkic concessive constructions mirror the temporal correlation of these situations iconically: the concessive situation always precedes the anti-consequence.

### 3.1.1. Structural features

Along with the form *-SA* such constructions normally contain concessive particles: *TAGI/TAA/DA*, *CI* or *LA*, etc. However, the conditional construction with the “plain” form *-SA* can also occasionally express concession (6).

Shor

- (17) *Quday-γa ižen-ze-η, poy-uη čanil-ba!*  
 god-DAT trust-COND-2SG self-POSS2SG err-NEG  
 ‘Although you trust in God, do not make mistakes yourself!’

The main clause can contain adversative conjunctions and particles or modal adverbs (Altay: *tünej le, d’ani la* ‘nevertheless, still’). They additionally mark the situation of anti-consequence.

The temporal localisation of the concessive and anti-consequential situations in such constructions depends on many factors: the tense/mood marker of the finite predicate (i.e. whether indicative or non-indicative), the structure of the conditional form itself (whether the conditional marker is added to the lexical verb itself or is added to the auxiliary verb *pol-* while the lexical verb takes a participial form; which participial form the lexical verb gets in the latter case, etc.) and on the presence of certain time adverbs.

### 3.1.2. Temporal localisation as expressed in concessive constructions with the simple conditional form *-SA*

In the concessive constructions with the simple conditional form of the dependent predicate, the temporal localisation of the concessive situation depends on the temporal localisation of the situation expressed by the matrix clause. Thus, the form *-SA* displays a feature here of a typical converb: absence of an independent temporal semantics, i.e. relative tense.

#### 3.1.2.1. Both the concessive situation and that of anti-consequence can be temporally non-localised. These are repeatedly occurring situations.

Tuvan

- (18) *Al-za daa, “al-d-īm” di-ves,*  
 take-COND PTL take-PST-1SG say-NEG.AOR/FUT  
*či-ze daa, “či-d-īm” di-ves.*  
 eat-COND PTL eat-PST-1SG say-NEG.AOR/FUT  
 ‘Although he (always, repeatedly) takes, he does not say that he took; although he (always, repeatedly) eats (something), he does not say that he ate.’

### 3.1.2.2. Both situations are present ones:

Shor

- (19) *Qayizi kiži pil-ze de, ayt-paanča.*  
 which person know-COND PTL say-NEG.PRS  
 ‘Although somebody knows (that), he does not say (it).’

### 3.1.2.3. Both situations refer to the past:

Khakas

- (20) *Uzi-rya sayin-ip, xaraan čap-sa daa,*  
 sleep-INF think-CONV eye close-COND PTL  
*noya da kirbik-ter čara la*  
 why PTL eyelash-PL separately PTL  
*oylas tar-yan-nar.*  
 run spread-PRF-PL  
 ‘Although she tried to close her eyes, she could not (lit.: her eyelashes were separated).’

### 3.1.2.4. Both situations are located in the future:

Tofan

- (21) *Ol gel-se tä, sooda-vas.*  
 he come-COND PTL say-NEG.AOR/FUT  
 ‘Although he comes, he will not say (anything about this).’

## 3.1.3. Temporal localisation as expressed in concessive constructions with analytical conditional forms

### 3.1.3.1. Both situations are located in the future:

Altay

- (22) *Erten ada-m tura-niň üst-in de*  
 tomorrow father-POSS1SG house-GEN roof-POSS3ACC PTL  
*d'aza-r bol-zo, men ogo*  
 repair-FUT.PART be-COND I he:DAT  
*boluš-paz-ım.*  
 help-AOR/FUT.NEG-1SG  
 ‘Although my father repairs the roof tomorrow, I will not help him.’

### 3.1.3.2. Both situations refer to the past:

Altay

- (23) *Men köömöy dö işte-gen bol-zo-m,*  
 I badly PTL work-PRF.PART be-COND-1SG  
*d'e d'aqši işte-p al-ata-m.*  
 but well work-CONV take-IMPF-1SG  
 ‘Although I worked badly, I earned much.’

### 3.1.3.3. The concessive situation is situated in the past, the anti-consequence is situated in the present:

Altay

(24)	<i>Aqčabay</i>	<i>d'uunda-p</i>	<i>bar-ba-ğan</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>bol-zo,</i>
	A.	meet-CONV	go-NEG-PRF.PART	PTL	be-COND
	<i>ol</i>	<i>emdi</i>	<i>kem-di</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>kemdir-beyt.</i>
	he	now	who-ACC	PTL	receive-NEG.PRS

'Although A. has not gone to the meeting, he does not receive anybody now.'

### 3.1.3.4. The concessive situation refers to the past, the anti-consequence to the future:

Altay

(25)	<i>Aqčabaj</i>	<i>d'ed-ip</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>kel-gen</i>	<i>bol-zo,</i>
	A.	reach-CONV	PTL	come-PRF.PART	be-COND
	<i>men</i>	<i>oğo</i>	<i>telefon</i>	<i>soq-poz-ım.</i>	
	I	he:DAT	telefon	beat-NEG.AOR/FUT-1SG	

'Although Akchabay has already returned (home), I will not call him.'

We see that the concessive situation can be localised in a different period of time than the situation expressed in the main clause when the conditional form is an analytical one and the lexical verb takes a participial formant determining the temporal localisation of its action.

All the examples in the sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 can also have a conditional-concessive interpretation. All of them are real. The situations can be either factive (consequently the construction gets a concessive proper interpretation) or non-factive (consequently the construction gets a conditional-concessive interpretation).

### 3.1.4. Unreal conditional-concessive constructions

In unreal conditional-concessive constructions i.e. in hypothetical (15) and counterfactual (16) ones, the temporal localisation is neutralised. We need additional contextual markers (like temporal adverbs) to refer the situation to a certain time period.

Altay:

(26)	<i>Poezd</i>	<i>(bügün/keče/ertene)</i>	<i>öyinde</i>
	train	today/yesterday/tomorrow	on.time
	<i>kel-er</i>	<i>bol-zo,</i>	
	come-FUT.PART	be-COND	
	<i>baştapqı</i>	<i>d'uun-ğa</i>	<i>oroyt-ıp</i>
	first	session-DAT	be.late-CONV
	<i>de</i>	<i>qal-ar</i>	<i>e-d-is.</i>
	PTL	stay-FUT.PART	be-PST-1PL

'Suppose that the train had arrived on time (yesterday), we would have been late for the opening session anyway. / Suppose the train arrived on time (today/tomorrow), we would be late for the opening session anyway.'

Altay

(27) *Poezd* (bügün/keče/ertene) öyinde de  
 train (today/yesterday/tomorrow) on.time PTL  
*kel-gen* bol-zo,  
 come-PRF.PART be-COND  
*baştapqı* d'uun-ğa oroyt-ip qal-ar  
 first session-DAT be.late-CONV stay-FUT.PART  
*e-d-is.*  
 be-PST-1PL  
 'Even if the train had arrived on time (yesterday), we would have been late for the opening session. / Even if the train arrived on time (today/tomorrow), we would be late for the opening session.'

### 3.2. Concessive constructions formed by other forms

Such constructions are very diverse and language specific. Most of them are not specialised on expressing concessive relations and render a concessive meaning only in certain contexts. Concessive particles can be contextual markers of such uses.

#### 3.2.1. Concessive constructions with the imperative forms

Imperative forms are found in concessive constructions quite often cross-linguistically: compare Russian *Bud' ja xot' volšebnikom, ja by i togda ne smog by vypolnil' tvoego želanija* 'Even if I were a magician, I would not be able to make your wish come true.' Such constructions always represent a non-factive concessive situation:

Tuvan

(28) *Day* *bedik* *daa* *bol,* *buura-ar,*  
 mountain high PTL be get.ruined-FUT  
*dalay* *terey* *daa* *bol,* *qurya-ar.*  
 sea deep PTL be dry.out-FUT  
 'Even if a mountain is high (lit.: be a mountain high), it gets ruined, even if a sea is deep (lit.: be a sea deep), it dries out.'

Tofan

(29) *Sen* *čor-iy* *tä* *ber,* *men* *ilya-vas-men*  
 you go.away-CONV PTL give:AUX I cry-NEG.FUT-1SG  
 'Even if you go away (lit.: you go away), I will not cry.'

#### 3.2.2. Participles in case forms with postpositions

In Shor, there exists a highly specialised concessive construction with the meaning 'in spite of the situation A (concession), the situation B (anti-consequence) happens'. The dependent predicate is expressed by the participle *-GAn* with the postposition *üstüne* [*üst-ün-e* upper.part-POSS3-DAT]. The construction always renders factive

situations and is more emphatic than the standard construction with the conditional form.

Shor				
(30)	<i>Men</i>	<i>elči</i>	<i>is-qan</i>	<i>üstüne,</i>
	I	ambassador	send-PRF.PART	POSTP
	<i>meenj</i>	<i>kel-er-im-ni</i>	<i>pil-be-d-iñ</i>	<i>či!</i>
	I:GEN	come-FUT.PART-POSS1SG-ACC	know-NEG-PST-2SG	PTL
	'In spite of the fact that I had sent an ambassador, you did not know that I would come?!'			

### 3.3. Contextual means of expressing concessive semantics

A number of constructions with the core meaning of a different type can express concession in certain contexts. These are mostly temporal constructions that may convey different types of causal semantics (cause, condition, purpose or concession) that can be induced by a correlation of the lexical meanings of the verbs in the matrix and the dependent clauses, by some structural markers (like certain verb forms or the presence of certain particles), by a pragmatic reading of a situation alone.

#### 3.3.1. The form *-GAndA*

This form is made up of the perfect participle *-GAn* in the Locative case form. In Siberian Turkic, it is functionally close to gerunds. The prime function of the complex constructions with the dependent predicate in this form is temporal: the dependent situation determines the time of the matrix one. If the content of the matrix situation contradicts our expectations based on the content of the dependent situation, we may have concessive correlation of these situations. The concessive semantics is that of the factive type.

Shor			
(31)	<i>Sen</i>	<i>alıñ</i>	<i>pol-yan-da,</i>
	you:2SG	fool	be-PRF.PART-LOC
	<i>pis-tiñ</i>	<i>tin-ıbis-ti</i>	<i>al-d-iñ</i>
	we-GEN	soul-POSS.1PL-ACC	save-PST-2SG
	'Although you are a fool/Being a fool, (but) you have saved our souls.'		

#### 3.3.2. The form *-ArGA*

The Tuvan form *-ArGA* has also primarily temporal functions, but it can express concession contextually. It is the aorist-future participle in the Dative case form, but it functions as a converb. The concessive situation is always factive. This form can serve as a periphrastic equivalent of the conditional form *-SA* with the particle *DA* in concessive proper constructions. Thus, (13) can be transformed into (32) without any semantic losses.

- (32) *Petrov qim-dan-da aytir-ar-ga, qim-daa aḡaa*  
 P. who-ABL-PTL ask-FUT.PART-LOC who-PTL he:DAT  
*χarīn ber-ip šida-vaan.*  
 answer give-CONV be.able-PREF.NEG  
 ‘No matter whom Petrov asked [about it] (Although/When Petrov asked everyone), nobody could give him an answer.’

### 3.3.3. The converb $-(X)p$

This converb is of the contextual type (Nevskaja 1993), i.e. its semantics is always determined by the lexical or structural factors.

Shor

- (33) *Ol čiiš-ti as či-p, ebire kōp qaraqta-pča.*  
 he meal-ACC little eat-CONV around much look-PRS  
 ‘Although he eats little (eating little), he is looking around a lot.’

### 3.3.4. The negative converb

The negative counterpart of the converb  $-(X)p$  tends to express causal semantics of different types even more often than the positive converb.

Shor

- (34) *Paliq qoştan-maan tabıraq, qaranyı qoştan-d-ı*  
 fish approach-NEG.CONV fast gradually approach-PST-3SG  
 ‘Although the fish did not approach fast (Not approaching fast), it approached gradually.’

## 4. Adversative constructions

Such constructions are bi-finite ones, with adversative conjunctions as their structural markers. Here, two clauses – one representing a concessive situation and another an anti-consequential one – are joined by adversative conjunctions or modal phrases in the process of grammaticalising to become adversative conjunctions. In Siberian Turkic, we find only a few adversative conjunctions of Turkic origin. In some cases we may suppose that their adversative functions are structural copies of the corresponding Russian conjunctions. Siberian Turkic also has some conjunctions copied directly from Russian.

### 4.1. Constructions with Turkic conjunctions

One of the most striking examples of structural copying of adversative functions from Russian is the Altay conjunction *d'e*. This is also an interjection expressing consent: ‘yes!’ and a particle having adversative functions expressing the meaning ‘however’ (among other functions). We suppose that this element has developed the adversative functions following the Russian word *da*, which is also an interjection of consent, an adversative particle (‘however’, ‘nevertheless’) and an adversative

conjunction in Russian. In fact, both in Russian and in Altay, it is often very difficult to draw a line between the particle and the adversative conjunction.

Altay

(35)	<i>Oni</i>	<i>kem</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>d'araš</i>	<i>emes</i>	<i>de-p</i>	<i>ayt-pas,</i>
	he:ACC	who	PTL	handsome	no	say-CONV	say-NEG.FUT
	<i>d'e</i>	<i>onıñ</i>	<i>čiray-ı</i>	<i>kem-ge</i>	<i>de</i>		
	however	he:GEN	face-POSS3SG	who-DAT	PTL		

*d'ara-bayt.*  
be.liked-NEG.PRS  
'(Although) nobody would say that he is not handsome, but nobody likes his face.'

The Shor conjunctions *añtebe* has developed from a postpositional phrase *aañ tebe* [DEM3:GEN towards]. It renders a very specific adversative meaning of compensation 'instead of the situation A (concession), the situation B (anti-consequence) has happened'.

Shor

(36)	<i>Čulat</i>	<i>paž-ın-da</i>	<i>pir</i>	<i>da</i>
	river	upper.reaches-POSS3-LOC	one	PTL
	<i>paliq</i>	<i>tart-pa-d-i-lar,</i>	<i>añtebe</i>	<i>čulat</i>
	fish	catch-NEG-PST-3-PL	instead	river
	<i>pel-tir-i-neñ</i>	<i>küsküş-ter</i>	<i>tart-t-ı-lar.</i>	
	lower.reaches-POSS3-ABL	kind.of.fish-PL	catch-PST-3-PL	

'(Although) they have not caught a single fish in the upper reaches of the river, but they have caught much fish in the lower reaches of the river instead.'

#### 4.2. Adversative conjunctions borrowed from Russian

The conjunction *no* 'but' serves as an example of a conjunction copied from Russian. It is widely used in Shor and in oral varieties of other South Siberian languages (Nevskaja 1999, Nevskaja 2000). Language purists usually proscribe its use in the written varieties of the well-established literary South Siberian Turkic languages like Altay or Khakas, but this is not the case for a young literary language like Shor where we find this conjunction also in published literary works.

Shor

(37)	<i>Sin-ın-a</i>	<i>čet</i>	<i>par-ıp</i>	<i>ebire</i>	<i>kör-d-i,</i>
	trunk-POSS3-DAT	reach	go:AUX-CONV	around	look-PST-3
	<i>no</i>	<i>pir</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>torum</i>	<i>körün-meen-ča.</i>
	but	one	PTL	cone	appear-NEG-PRS

'He has climbed (the tree) and looked around, but no cones are seen.'

## 5. Ways of expressing concessive-adversative relations on the textual level

### 5.1. Adversative constructions with introductory modal phrases

A great diversity of introductory modal phrases with adversative meaning serves as a reservoir for developing adversative conjunctions. Structurally, they are dependent clauses formed according to the concessive patterns with the conditional form *-SA* and the concessive particle *DA*. They act at the textual level as structural elements and usually appear in the beginning of a sentence anaphorically referring to the previous sentence, which represents a concessive situation. They are normally punctuated like dependent clauses, i.e. they are separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma.

Shor

(38)	<i>Tegri</i>	<i>sooqtan</i>	<i>par-tir,</i>	<i>čay-arya</i>	<i>pelen</i>	<i>pol</i>
	sky	get.cold	go:AUX-IND	rain-INF	ready	be
	<i>par-tir.</i>	<i>Endig</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>pol-za,</i>	<i>Alexey</i>	<i>ayradrom-ya</i>
	go:AUX-IND	so	PTL	be-COND	A.	airport-DAT
	<i>par-arya,</i>	<i>te-p,</i>	<i>em-nej</i>	<i>šiq-t-i.</i>		
	go-INF	say-CONV	house-ABL	go.out-PST-3		

‘It got cold, and it was going to rain. However, Alexey left the house in order to go to the airport.’

The modal phrase can also appear without comma, which is evidence that it has been integrated into the intonational structure of the sentence:

Shor

(39)	<i>Služba</i>	<i>aar</i>	<i>iriz-i</i>	<i>čoq</i>	<i>kerek</i>	<i>čilep</i>	<i>pildir-d-i.</i>
	service	hard	joy-POSS3	without	matter	like	appear-PST-3
	<i>Endig</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>pol-za</i>	<i>talaš-čan</i>	<i>ebes</i>	<i>pol-yan!</i>	
	so	PTL	be-COND	retreat-IMP.F.PART	no	be-PRF	

‘My army service appeared to be a hard and joyless matter. However, (but) I could not retreat!’

Finally, appearing in the same complex structure together with the concessive situation and being integrated intonationally, this modal phrase can fulfil the function of an adversative conjunctive element:

Shor

(40)	<i>Ol</i>	<i>čaqsı</i>	<i>kiži</i>	<i>pol-yan</i>	<i>endig</i>
	he	good	person	be-PRF.PART	so
	<i>da</i>	<i>pol-za</i>	<i>už-i</i>		
	PTL	be-COND	end-POSS3		
	<i>paž-i</i>	<i>čoq,</i>	<i>salyın</i>	<i>uškaš</i>	<i>sayış-tıy</i>
	head-POSS3	without	wind	like	thought-WITH



*kiži*                    *pol-γan.*  
 person                be-PRF  
 ‘He was a good man, but a very light-headed and thoughtless one (lit.: without the beginning and the end, with thoughts like the wind).’

## 5.2. Asyndetical constructions

Concessive-adversative relations can be expressed on the textual level by mere juxtaposition of the sentences expressing the concessive and the adversative situations respectively:

Shor  
 (41) *Apšiy*                    *sīraŋay*                    *tün-ma*                    *sal-īp*  
 old.man                    totally                    breath-INST                    put-CONV  
*ertiš-t-i.*  
 drink-PST-3  
*Apšiy-dīŋ*                    *erbekte-rge*                    *aqs-ī*                    *emen*  
 old.man-GEN                    speak-INF                    mouth-POSS3                    nice  
*pol-d-u.*  
 become-PST-3  
*Ayd-arya*                    *söz-ün*                    *tabin-mas*                    *pol-d-u.*  
 say-INF                    word-POSS3ACC                    find-PART.AOR.NEG                    become-PST-3  
 ‘The old man swallowed [the alcohol] in a gulp. He felt like talking (lit.: his mouth became nice to speak). [However,] he could not find what to say (Lit.: words to say).’

## Abbreviations

AOR	Aorist	IND	Indirective
ACC	Accusative	INF	Infinitive
ABL	Ablative	INST	Instrumental
AUX	Auxiliary (element)	LOC	Locative
CONV	Converb	NEG	Negation
COND	Conditional	PART	Participle
DAT	Dative	PL	Plural
DEM	Demonstrative	POSS	Possessive
DIR	Directive	PRF	Perfect
FUT	Future	PST	Past
GEN	Genitive	PRS	Present
IMP	Imperative	PTL	Particle
IMPF	Imperfect	SG	Singular

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues Ajana Ozonova and Bajlak Orzhak, who helped me to collect and to evaluate the Altay and Tuvan material used in this paper.

### Literature

- Anononymous. 1884. *Grammatika altajskogo jazyka, sostavlenaja členami altajskoj missii*. Kazan': Izdatel'stvo Kazanskogo universiteta.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1958. *Altajskij jazyk (vvedenie v izučenie altajskogo jazyka i ego dialektov)*. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1966. *Severnye dialekty altajskogo jazyka. Dialekt černevyx tatar (tyba-kiži)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1972. *Severnye dialekty altajskogo jazyka. Dialekt kumandincev (kumandykiži)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. (ed.). 1975. *Grammatika xakasskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1985. *Dialekt lebedinskix tatar-čalkancev (kuu-kiži)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Bondarko, A. V. (ed.) 1996. *Teorija funkcional'noj grammatiki. Lokativnost'. Bytijnost'. Possessivnost'. Obyslovennost'*. Leningrad: Nauka. Leningradskoe otdelenie.
- Böhtlingk, O. 1851. *Über die Sprache der Jakuten*. Sankt Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademiya nauk.
- Čeremisina, M. I. (ed.). 1995. *Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka. Sintaxis*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Čeremisina, M. I. & Skribnik, E. K. et al. 1986. *Strukturnye tipy sintetičeskix polipredikativnyx konstrukcij v jazykax raznyx sistem*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Dyrenkova, N. D. 1941. *Grammatika šorskogo jazyka*. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Erdal, M. 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Haspelmath, M. & König, E. 1998. Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe. In: Van der Auwera, J. (ed.). *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Isxakov, F. G. & Pal'mbax, A. A. 1961. *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.
- Isxakova, X. F. & Nasilov, D. M. & Nevskaja, I. A. 2004. Chapter 15. Ustupitel'nye konstrukcii v tjurkskix jazykax. In: Xrakovskij, V. S. (ed.). *Tipologija ustupitel'nyx konstrukcij*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. 425–452.
- Johanson, L. 1998. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, L. & Csató, É. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London: Routledge. 30-67.
- Johanson, L. 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main 29, 5.) Stuttgart.
- Nevskaja, I. A. 1993. *Formy deepričastnogo tipa v šorskom jazyke*. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo NGU.
- Nevskaja, I. A. 1998. The revival of literary Shor. *Turkic Languages* 2: 253–270.
- Nevskaya, I. A. 2000. Shor-Russian contact features. In: Gilbers, D. & Nerbonne, J. & Schaeken, J. (eds.) *Languages in contact*. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 28.) Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi. 283–298.
- Radloff, W. 1866. *Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens. I*. Sankt Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademiya nauk.
- Rassadin, V. I. 1978. *Morfologija tofalarskogo jazyka v sravnitel'nom osveščanii*. Moskva: Nauka.

- Ubrjatova, E. I. 1950. *Issledovanija po sintaxisu jakutskogo jazyka. Čast' I. Prostoje predloženie*. Moskva–Leningrad: Nauka.
- Ubrjatova, E. I. 1976. *Issledovanija po sintaxisu jakutskogo jazyka. Čast' II. Složnoe predloženie*. Moskva–Leningrad: Nauka.
- Ubrjatova, E. I. (ed.) 1982. *Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Xrakovskij, V. S. 2000. Opyt analizy universal'nyx ustupitel'nyx konstrukcij. In: Bondarko, A. V. & Šubik, S. A. (eds.) *Problemy funkcional'noj grammatiki. Kategorii morfolologii i sintaxisa v vyskazyvanii*. Sankt Peterburg: Nauka.
- Xrakovskij, V. S. 2004a. Ustupitel'nye konstrukcii: semantika, sintaxis, tipologija. In: Xrakovskij, V. S. (ed.) *Tipologija ustupitel'nyx konstrukcij*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. 9–91.
- Xrakovskij, V. S. 2004b. Anketa dlja opisanija ustupitel'nyx konstrukcij. In: Xrakovskij, V. S. (ed.) *Tipologija ustupitel'nyx konstrukcij*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. 559–591.
- Xrakovskij, V. S. (ed.) 2004c. *Tipologija ustupitel'nyx konstrukcij*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.