

Werk

Titel: Notes on subject markers and copular forms in Turkish and in some Turkic varietie...

Autor: Karakoç , Birsel

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2009

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0013 | LOG_0035

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Notes on subject markers and copular forms in Turkish and in some Turkic varieties of Iran: A comparative study

Birsel Karakoç

Karakoç, Birsel 2009: Notes on subject markers and copular forms in Turkish and in some Turkic varieties of Iran: A comparative study. *Turkic Languages* 13, 208-224.

This study investigates various typological aspects of subject markers and copular forms in Turkish and in some Turkic varieties spoken in Iran from a comparative point of view. The structural properties of corresponding Persian elements which might be expected to be copied into the systems of Turkic varieties of Iran are investigated as well. The following phenomena in the respective Turkic varieties of Iran have been found: (1) the obligatory use of 3rd person copular forms, (2) the use of 3rd person copular forms in the meaning of 'being existent or present somewhere', (3) the use of markers of existence/presence as copular markers. The paper concludes with a discussion of whether these phenomena might be interpreted as results of contact-induced change or of language-internal development.

Birsel Karakoç, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Box 635, SE-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden. E-mail: birsel.karakoc@lingfil.uu.se.

1. Introduction

This article is concerned with various typological aspects of subject markers and copular forms in Turkish and in several Turkic varieties spoken in Iran from a comparative point of view. In order to be able to assess the properties and their variation, comparisons with some other older and modern Turkic languages will also be made.

I will first describe typological properties of the respective markers in Turkish. As is well known, Turkic languages and dialects of Iran have been in long and intensive interaction with Iranian languages and exhibit language contact phenomena in different linguistic domains (see Johanson & Bulut 2006). With this in mind, I will then describe the structural properties of corresponding constructions in Persian, which might be expected to be copied into the systems of these Turkic varieties. Finally, I will present the phenomena found in the data of Turkic varieties of Iran and consider the question of to what extent these phenomena might be regarded as results of contact-induced change.

2. Subject markers and copular morpheme {-D²T⁴r} with nominal predicates in Turkish

Subject markers link a subject with its predicate. They denote subject agreement indicating the person and the number of the subject. A nominal predicate can be an adjective, a noun phrase (in any grammatical case except the accusative), a personal or demonstrative pronoun (in any case except the accusative), an absolute possessive pronoun, a verbal noun or a participle. Semantically, a wide range of aspects of identification, characterisation or specification can be expressed by linking the subject with the nominal predicate. Subject markers in Turkic languages correspond to the non-past forms of static copular verbs in some other languages, such as ‘to be’ in English or ‘sein’ in German. In Turkish, they are unaccented cliticised morphemes that can possess different allomorphs depending on the phonological quality of the preceding lexeme. See, for example, the markers and the examples¹ in Table 1.

Singular			
1.	{-(y)I ⁴ m}	(Ben) öğretmen-im. (I) teacher-1SG	‘I am a teacher.’
2.	{-sI ⁴ n}	(Sen) öğretmen-sin. (you) teacher-2SG	‘You are a teacher.’
3.	{-Ø}	(O) öğretmen. ((s)he) teacher-Ø	‘(S)he is a teacher.’
Plural			
1.	{-(y)I ⁴ z}	(Biz) öğretmen-iz. (we) teacher-1PL	‘We are teachers.’
2.	{-sI ⁴ nI ⁴ z}	(Siz) öğretmen-siniz. (you) teacher-2PL	‘You are teachers.’
3.	{-Ø}, {-lA ² r}	Onlar öğretmen. they teacher-Ø (Onlar) öğretmen-ler. (they) teacher-3PL	‘They are teachers.’

Table 1. Subject markers with nominal predicates in standard Turkish

As can be seen, there is no subject marker in the 3rd person. *Öğretmen* [teacher-Ø] ‘(s)he is a teacher’ can be a complete finite predication without any predicate marker. As is the case in Semitic and Slavic languages, the absence of the person-number clitic, especially in the 3rd person singular, is a very common typological

¹ Examples from Turkish are given in standard Turkish orthography. Examples from other Turkic varieties and Persian are given in a unified transcription.

characteristic of older and modern Turkic languages. Consider the following examples from the East Old Turkic period:

- Orkhon inscriptions
- (1) *Sü başi inäl karan.*
 army chief-POSS3SG inäl kagan-Ø
 'The commander-in-chief is Inäl Kagan.' (Tekin 1968: 208)
- (2) *Ilim amtī kani?*
 state-POSS1SG now where-Ø
 'Where is my own state now?' (Tekin 1968: 233, 264)
- Karakhanid
- (3) *Tübüm altun.*
 ground-POSS1SG gold-Ø
 'My ground is gold.' (Mansuroğlu 1959: 104)
- (4) *Yazukum üküš.*
 sin-POSS1SG much-Ø
 'My sins are numerous.' (Mansuroğlu 1959: 104)

The absence of the subject marker in the 3rd person is widespread in modern Turkic languages as well, e.g. Kazakh *arıstan tülkiden ülken* [lion fox-ABL big-Ø] 'the lion is bigger than the fox'; Karakalpak *olar oqıwşı* [they student-Ø] 'they are students'; Bashkir *işşı* [employee-Ø] '(s)he is an employee'; New Uyghur *u häkiqätän işčan kız* [really diligent girl-Ø] 'she is really a diligent girl' (Pritsak 1959b: 550); Yakut *kini uču:tal* [(s)he teacher-Ø] '(s)he is a teacher'; Khakas *ol ügretçi* [(s)he teacher-Ø] '(s)he is a teacher'.

In modern Turkish the copular morpheme {-D²I⁴r}, which historically goes back to the present form of the copular verb *tur-* 'to stand, to be' (*tur-ur*), can be used in the 3rd person, e.g. *(o) öğretmendir* [(s)he teacher-COP3]. The free morpheme *turur/durur* found in the older and middle Turkic written varieties became an unaccented enclitic suffix in the subsequent languages and is subject to syllabic harmony. In some modern Turkic varieties, it can also be found in more contracted shapes as {-DI} or {-t}. Khalaj, spoken in Central Iran, is the only Turkic language which does not employ copular forms developed from the lexeme *tur-*. Khalaj has enclitic markers that can be traced back to the old copular verb *är-* 'to be' (Doerfer 1988: 199).

In Turkish, the suffix {-D²I⁴r} has a special meaning, and its use is restricted to certain discourse or text types and depends on pragmatic conditions. It can denote 'confirmation of an assertion', which might be paraphrased in English by 'it is a fact that ...' (cf. Johanson 1971: 294). It should be pointed out that {-D²I⁴r} can also express 'presumptive modality'. Consequently, our example *öğretmendir* can be understood as 'it is a fact that (s)he is a teacher' or 'I assume that (s)he is a teacher'.

This morpheme can fulfil a presumptive function in some other Turkic languages as well; see, e.g., Boeschoten (2006: 374) for Uzbek.

3. Relationships between a subject and a nominal predicate

Relationships between a subject (s) and a nominal predicate linked by means of a subject marker or copular morpheme can be characterised as follows:

(1) A relationship of {s IS x} occurs if identification or characterisation of the person or thing being the subject (s) or first actant of the nominal clause is expressed. In the case of an identification, the nominal predicate refers to an entity, e.g. (*ben*) *öğretmenim* [(I) teacher-1SG] 'I am a teacher'. Characterisation of the first actant or subject is expressed if the predicate consists of an adjective referring to a property, e.g. (*sen*) *güzelsin* [(you) beautiful-2SG] 'you are beautiful'. Such an entity or property denoted by the nominal predicate is marked here as x.

(2) The relationship of {s IS SOMEWHERE} emerges if the nominal predicate consists of a noun phrase in locative case and refers to a location, e.g. *evdeyim* [home-LOC-1SG] 'I am at home'. Such predicates can be termed 'locative predicates' (Hengeveld 1992: 94). As can be seen, subject markers are directly attached to locative predicates. It should be pointed out that, concerning the structuring of information, the subject, which is present or existent somewhere, is usually the 'topic' of this kind of sentences and the locative predicate is the 'comment' (or 'focus'). I mark this relationship as {s^{TOP} IS SOMEWHERE^{COM}}. The term 'topic' refers here to information already established in a discourse unit in which the speaker says 'something about something'. Thus, the topic can serve as an anchoring point for the new information which is called the 'comment' (see e.g. Kotschi 2006: 677). The following examples illustrate the relationship of {s^{TOP} IS SOMEWHERE^{COM}}:

Singular			
1.	{-(y)I ⁴ m}	(Ben) evde-yim. (I) home-LOC-1SG	'I am <u>at home</u> .'
2.	{-sI ⁴ n}	(Sen) evde-sin. (you) home-LOC-2SG	'You are <u>at home</u> .'
3.	{-Ø}	(O) evde. ((s)he) home-LOC-Ø	'(S)he/it is <u>at home</u> .'
Plural			
1.	{-(y)I ⁴ z}	(Biz) evde-yiz. (we) home-LOC-1PL	'We are <u>at home</u> .'
2.	{-sI ⁴ nI ⁴ z}	(Siz) evde-siniz. (you) home-LOC-2PL	'You are <u>at home</u> .'

3.	{-Ø}, {-IA ² r}	Onlar evde. they home-LOC-Ø (Onlar) evde-ler. (they) home-LOC-3PL	'They are <u>at home</u> .'
----	----------------------------	--	-----------------------------

Table 2. Subject markers with locative predicates in Turkish

Subject markers need to be used in combination with the adjective lexeme {var} meaning 'present, existent', if the subject indicates new information and, thus, is the 'comment' of the sentence. The locative predicate accordingly presents the 'topic' of the sentence. I denote this kind of relationship as {S^{COM} IS SOMEWHERE^{TOP}}. As can be seen in the following examples in Table 3, the word order changes as well. The locative predicate being the 'topic' of the sentence is in initial position while the subject being 'comment' follows. This principle of word order may necessitate the use of the lexeme {var}. In nominal clauses, the subject markers may usually be attached to the nominal predicates and not to the subjects. If, however, the subject as 'comment' immediately occupies the position in front of the subject markers, the use of a special element between them becomes syntactically necessary (syntactic constraints). The following examples illustrate the relationship:

Singular		
1.	Evde ben var-ım. home-LOC I present-1SG	' <u>I</u> am at home.'
2.	Evde sen var-sın. home-LOC you present-2SG	' <u>You</u> are at home.'
3.	Evde o var. home-LOC (s)he/it present-Ø	'(S)he/it is at home.'
Plural		
1.	Evde biz var-ız. home-LOC we present-1PL	' <u>We</u> are at home.'
2.	Evde siz var-sınız. home-LOC you present-2PL	' <u>You</u> are at home.'
3.	Evde onlar var-(lar) home-LOC they present-(3PL)	' <u>They</u> are at home.'

Table 3. Subject markers in combination with {var} in Turkish

In the 3rd person, there is the same functional distinction between the {-Ø} (zero-realisation) and the suffix {-D²I⁴r}, e.g.:

- (5) *Okulda öğretmenler var.*
school-LOC teacher-PL present-Ø
'There are teachers in the school.'

- (6) *Okulda öğretmenler vardır.*
 school-LOC teacher-PL present-COP3
 ‘It is a fact that there are teachers in the school.’
 ‘There are probably teachers in the school.’

It should be mentioned here that Turkish has a further, elaborated structure which consists of the verbal lexeme *bulun-* ‘to be located, to be present somewhere’. This structure mostly occurs in formal registers and can indicate certain focal meanings. The verbal lexeme *bulun-* can be used for the relationship both of {S^{TOP} IS SOMEWHERE^{COM}} and of {S^{COM} IS SOMEWHERE^{TOP}}. The order of constituents plays a role in expressing different perspectives concerning the information. Consider the following examples:

- (7) *Evde bulunuyorum.*
 home-LOC to be located-PRES-1SG
 ‘I am (present) at home.’
- (8) *Kitap masada bulunuyor.*
 book table-LOC to be located-PRES-Ø
 ‘The book is (present) on the table.’
- (9) *Masada kitap bulunuyor.*
 table-LOC book to be located-PRES-Ø
 ‘There is a book (books) (present) on the table.’

As regards Turkic varieties spoken in Iran, we observe some variation in the use of the 3rd person copular marker and of the lexeme {var}. Before analysing this variation, I will briefly present corresponding constructions in Persian.

4. Subject markers and copular forms with nominal predicates in Persian

In modern Persian, there are different sets of forms corresponding to the present tense of the static copular verb ‘to be’.² The first set consists of enclitic and unstressed subject markers:

² I would like to thank my colleagues Behrooz Barjasteh Delforoos and Forogh Hashabeiky for discussions about the use of these markers in modern Persian. I am also grateful to Mohammad Reza Ghelichkhani for a discussion about the realisation of the respective categories in Persian and in a Turkic dialect spoken in Hamedan. He denominates this dialect, of which he is a native speaker, *Şahseven Türkî*.

Singular			
1.	-am	(Man) mo'allem-am. (I) teacher-1SG	'I am a teacher.'
2.	-i	(To) mo'allem-i. (you) teacher-2SG	'You are a teacher.'
3.	ast ³	(U:) mo'allem ast. ((s)he) teacher-3SG	'(S)he is a teacher.'
Plural			
1.	-im	(Ma:) mo'allem-im. (we) teacher-1PL	'We are teachers.'
2.	-id	(Šoma:) mo'allem-id. (you) teacher-2PL	'You are teachers.'
3.	-and	(Anha:) mo'allem-and. (they) teacher-3PL	'They are teachers.'

Table 4. Subject markers with nominal predicates in Persian⁴

In modern Persian, the use of an overt agreement marker for the 3rd person is obligatory. In Middle Persian, it was not required. The functional differences between nominal clauses with zero-marker and 3rd person copular marker *ast* in Middle Persian have been described in detail by Josephson (2003). Josephson claims that the nominal clause with zero-copular lost its special meanings and that the copular *ast* then took over in Early New Persian. She notes that the nominal clause without 3rd person copular marker still occurs as a stylistic variant of the clause with *ast* but on a rather modest scale when compared to its wide usage in Middle Persian (2003: 92).⁵

³ In colloquial language, the 3rd person marker *ast* when following a consonant is contracted to *-e*. After a vowel it is represented by *s* (< *st*) (Boyle 1966: 40), e.g. *mo'allem-e* '(s)he is a teacher, *zi:ba:s* '(s)he is beautiful'.

⁴ The polite forms are as follows: *šoma: mo'allem-id* or *šoma: mo'allem-in* (more polite) instead of 2nd person singular *to mo'allem-i*; *i:ša:n mo'allem-and* or *i:ša:n mo'allem-an* (more polite) instead of 3rd person singular *u: mo'allem ast*; and *šoma: mo'allem-in* instead of 2nd person plural *šoma: mo'allem-id*.

⁵ Zero-marker for 3rd person can occur in some archaic proverbs, for instance: *har ke ba:ma:š biš barfaš bištar* [every who roof-POSS3 more snow-POSS3 more] 'someone whose roof is more, his snow is more' (p.c. with Behrooz Barjasteh Delforozi). It should be pointed out that copular markers in such proverbs are especially omitted for stylistic purposes since proverbs should be short and sound rhythmic. The complete version of this proverb then would be: *har ke ba:ma:š biš ba:šed barfaš bištar ast*.

A further paradigm contains morphologically complex forms which consist of the existential verb *hast* and subject markers: *hastam* 'I am', *hasti* 'you are', *hast* '(s)he is', *hastim* 'we are', *hastid* 'you are', *hastand* 'they are'. These forms are not enclitic.

While the subject markers presented in Table 4 denote a relationship of {S IS X} the complex markers with *hast* especially express the relationship of {S IS SOMEWHERE}, e.g. *barf ast* 'it is snow' vs. *barf hast* 'the snow is there' (cf. Windfuhr 1979: 97). Fleischer (1875: 43-44) remarked that the subject markers denote abstract being while *hast* denotes concrete being 'be-there' (cited in Windfuhr 1979: 98). Although the forms with *hast* originally denote the meaning of presence and existence, they can also link a subject with a nominal predicate indicating the relationship of {S IS X}, e.g. (*man*) *ira:ni hastam* 'I am Persian', (*to*) *ira:ni hasti* 'you are Persian', *šoma: a:lma:ni hastid?* 'are you German?', *man Hasan hastam* 'I am Hasan', etc. Thus, the subject markers and forms with *hast* can be widely interchangeable in some context (cf. Amin-Madani & Lutz 1972: 76-77), e.g. *man mo'alle-m-am / man mo'alle-m hastam* 'I am a teacher', *man xune-am / man xune hastam* 'I am at home', *mo'alle-mha: dar madrese-and / mo'alle-mha: dar madrese hastand* 'the teachers are at the school', *doxtare madrese-ye / doxtare madrese hast* 'the girl is at the school'. The difference between these two sets of paradigms might be that they belong to different registers. Whereas the subject markers are especially used in colloquial language, the complex markers with *hast* mostly occur in written and more formal registers. Furthermore, forms with *hast* can express a certain emphasis within the question-answer patterns, e.g.:

- (10) *To mo'alle-mi?*
'Are you a teacher?'
Bale, hastam.
'Yes, I am.'

Windfuhr (1979: 97-98) cites the following examples and notes that *hast* here has the function of a definite future:

- (11) *Man hastam.*
'I am/will be here.'
- (12) *Bale, xub; to boro, ma: hastim.*
'All right; you go, we will be/stay here.'

In the written language the subject markers cannot be easily attached to the subjects, if the 'locative predicate' (in Persian a prepositional phrase) is in the initial position of the sentence, and the subject is in the final position. Thus, the native speaker I consulted did not consider the following sentence to be well formed:

- (13) *?Dar madrese mo'allema:and.*
'There are teachers at the school.'

With this word order, markers with *hast* would be more adequate:

- (14) *Dar madrese mo'allema: hastand.*
'There are teachers at the school.'

Amin-Madani & Lutz (1972: 77) note the difference between the following sentences in which the order of subjects and locative predicates, and accordingly the predicate markers are different:

- (15) *Bara:daram dar ba:q ast.*
'My brother is in the garden.'

- (16) *Dar xa:ne na:n hast.*
'There is bread at the house.'

In the colloquial language, however, contracted subject markers can be appended to the subjects and express 'existence/presence of someone/something somewhere', e.g. *unja: ye(k) doxtar-e* 'there is a girl there' (Kıral 2001: 66). Thus, the sentence *tu madrese mo'allema:n* 'there are teachers at the school', which is the corresponding colloquial form of sentence (13), is evaluated as an adequate and well-formed sentence.

To sum up, the markers with *hast* can denote the relationship of {S IS X} and thus have taken on some of the functional domains of the enclitic subject markers, while the 'existence/presence of someone/something somewhere' may also be expressed by the enclitic subject markers in the colloquial language.

5. Turkic varieties of Iran

In Iran, there are various Oghuz (southwestern) Turkic varieties such as southern Azeri in the northwest, Khorasan Turkic with its dialects, Kashkay and the dialect Aynallu in the south, Sonqor Turkic and Turkmen dialects (see Doerfer 1998). On the other hand, another Turkic language, Khalaj, is spoken in Central Iran between Qum and Araq. Khalaj, which has maintained many archaic linguistic features, is genealogically not related to the Oghuz branch of Turkic. The present study concerning the above-mentioned dialects and languages is based on data from the following sources: Bozkurt (1975), Fázsy (1977), Doerfer (1988), Tulu (1989), Doerfer et al. (1990), Doerfer & Hesche (1998), Kıral (2001), Dolatkah (2006-2007) and Kuribayashi (2008).

6. Phenomena found in Turkic varieties of Iran

6.1. Obligatory use of copular markers at the 3rd person

As already mentioned, Turkish and other older and modern Turkic languages do not usually require subject markers in the 3rd person. The copular morpheme $\{-D^2I^4r\}$ is used in certain discourse types to denote confirmation of an assertion. What can be observed in the data of Kashkay, Khorasan Turkic, Azeri and Khalaj is that these languages make more or less systematic use of the 3rd person markers. All Oghuz varieties use the non-past copular marker in the form of $\{-DI\}$ / $\{-DIr\}$, which derives from *turur*. The non-Oghuz Turkic language Khalaj employs enclitic markers that can be traced back to the copular verb *är-* ‘to be’. Doerfer (1988: 201) points out that the lack of a copular form in Khalaj is rare and might be analysed as an ellipsis. Both $\{-DI\}$ / $\{-DIr\}$ in Oghuz varieties and forms which are historically related to the copular verb *är-* in Khalaj are mainly used as obligatory subject representatives for the 3rd person and do not indicate discourse-type-specific uses. It seems that the functional choice between the ‘zero-marker’ $\{-\emptyset\}$ and ‘copular marker’, a choice relevant in other Turkic languages, has disappeared in the Turkic varieties of Iran. As a consequence, a nominal predicate without any copular marker cannot represent a complete finite predication. Consider the following examples:

- Azeri
- (17) *Mänim adım Häsändi.*
 I-GEN name-POSS1SG Häsän-COP3
 ‘My name is Hasan.’ (Kıral 2001: 140)
- Kashkay
- (18) *Deyar heşna ir kummuca ca:nna:rdi.*
 say-PRES nothing small animal-COP3
 ‘She says, nothing, it is a small animal.’ (Dolatkhah 2006-2007: 54)
- Khalaj
- (19) *Bizüm baluğ e.ydisi ho úlari.*
 we-GEN village landowner-POSS3SG good-COP3
 ‘Our landowner is good.’ (Doerfer 1988: 200)

6.2. Expression of the relationship of $\{S^{COM} \text{ IS SOMEWHERE}^{TOP}\}$

As already discussed, in Turkish, the use of the adjective lexeme $\{var\}$ within a relationship of $\{S \text{ IS SOMEWHERE}\}$ is obligatory if the first actant, the entity present, is the ‘comment’ of the sentence and occurs after the locative predicate, e.g. *masada kitap var* [table-LOC book present] ‘there is (a) book(s) on the table’. This is also a common construction in Turkic varieties of Iran. In addition to this construction, it can be observed in some varieties that the subject markers can be used without hav-

ing been appended to {var} (cf. Doerfer 1988: 203, Kırıl 2001: 66-67 and Kuribayashi 2008) even if the subject represents new information in the sentence and follows the locative predicate. In all of the following examples, the entities referring to the first actant or subject are in the final position of the sentences, following the locative predicates. Thus, they are immediately in front of the copular markers used obligatorily for the 3rd person. The fact that the copular markers are directly attached to the subjects makes these sentences, from the Turkish point of view, awkward:

Bojnurd dialect of Khorasan Turkic

- (20) *Gidiyā, gidiyā, jāḡalā yetişiyyā, jāḡalā ki*
 go-PRES go-PRES3 forest-DAT reach-PRES forest-DAT ki
yetişiyyā, baxiyā, bir daraxtiḡ astında bir daşdı.
 reach-PRES see-PRES one tree-GEN under-POSS3-LOC one stone-COP3
 'He goes and goes and comes to the forest. When he comes to the forest he sees: there is a stone under a tree.' (Fázsy 1977: 130, 134)

Azeri

- (21) *Orda bi(r) ğizdi.*
 there one girl-COP3
 'There is a girl there.' (Kırıl 2001: 66)

Kashkay

- (22) *Gerer bu rayiḡ a:ltinma bir ḡa:rpuz la:lasidi.*
 see-PRES this stone-GEN under-POSS3-LOC one watermelon bush-POSS3-COP3
 'He sees there is a watermelon bush under this rock.' (Dolatkhah 2006-2007: 43)

In the following examples, the past copular markers with the meaning 'was', 'were' in the 3rd person singular and plural are used without being combined with {var}:

Bojnurd dialect of Khorasan Turkic

- (23) *Gadim zamanda bir jāḡalidi.*
 old time-LOC one forest-PCOP3
 'In the old times there was a forest.' (Fázsy 1977: 165, 169)

Khalaj

- (24) *Bi: ṣā:rčā ākki la:lartilār.*
 a city-LOC two brother-PCOP-3PL
 'There were two brothers in a city.' (Doerfer 1988: 203)

6.3. Uses of {var}

In Turkish, the use of the marker {var} 'existent/present', is, as described above, not necessary in order to denote a relationship of {S^{TOP} IS SOMEWHERE^{COM}}. To express this relationship, subject markers are immediately attached to the locative predicates, e.g. *(ben) evdeyim* [house-LOC-1SG] 'I am at home'. What can be observed in

Turkic varieties of Iran is that the marker {var} can also occur in constructions expressing such a relationship. Consider the following examples with both variants:

Khorasan Turkic

- (25) *Evdäyäm. Evdä ba: 'ram.*
 house-LOC-1SG house-LOC present-1SG
 'I am at home.' (Bozkurt 1975: 182)

Khalaj

- (26) *Hä 'včäm. Hä 'včä va: 'ram.*
 house-LOC-1SG house-LOC present-1SG
 'I am at home.' (Doerfer 1988: 200)

- (27) *I:ra: 'nčam. I:ra: 'nča va: 'ram.*
 Iran-LOC-1SG Iran-LOC present-1SG
 'I am in Iran.' (Doerfer 1989: 110)

Rahmati & Buğday (1998: 10) present the entire paradigm for Azeri: *män varam* 'I am here', *sän varsan* 'you are here', *o var* '(s)he/it is here', *biz (bizlär) varıķ* 'we are here', *siz (sizlär) varsınız (varsız)* 'you are here', *onlar vardırlar* 'they are here'. In his material from the Kabul Avshar dialect spoken in Afghanistan, Bozkurt (1977: 233) gives the following examples provided by native speakers as sentences corresponding to the Persian sentences *dar xa:na hastam* 'I am at home' and *dar i:ra:n hastam* 'I am in Iran'.

Kabul Avshar dialect

- (28) *Evdä varam.*
 house-LOC present-1SG
 'I am at home.'

- (29) *Iranda varam.*
 Iran-LOC present-1SG
 'I am in Iran.'

Doerfer & Hesche & Ravanyar (1990: 23) and Doerfer & Hesche (1998: 21) give examples with the same forms from the Galügäh and Lotfäbäd dialects of Azeri:

Galügäh dialect of Azeri

- (30) *Evdä va 'ram.*
 house-LOC present-1SG
 'I am at home.'

- (31) *Ira:nda va 'ram.*
 Iran-LOC present-1SG
 'I am in Iran.'

- Azeri from Lotfābād
- (32) *Övdä va řam.*
house-LOC present-1SG
'I am at home.'
- (33) *İra řnda varam.*
Iran-LOC present-1SG
'I am in Iran.'

Furthermore, Bozkurt (1977: 236) notes the following sentences which may correspond to the Persian sentence *i:n ha:ne az an daraxt boland tar ast* 'this house is higher than that tree':

- Kabul Avshar dialect
- (34) *Bu ev o daraxtan ucadır.*
this house that tree-ABL high-COP3
- (35) *Bu ev o daraxtan yixaradır.*
this house that tree-ABL high-COP3
- (36) *Bu ev o daraxtan yixari var.*
this house that tree-ABL high present

In the last example, the marker {var} appears to denote a relationship of {S IS X}. Semantically, a characterisation of the first actant, 'this house', is expressed. The use of {var} in this example is very similar to the use of the copular marker {-Dir}. In this context it is important to mention that {var} is an element that also played a role in forming a new type of high-focal present in Abivardi, a Kashkay variety of Shiraz, and the Galūgāh dialect of Azeri. This type of renewal of the high-focal present represents code-copying from Persian; see Doerfer & Hesche & Ravanyar (1990: 28), Csató (2001: 119) and Csató (2005: 281-282) for further information about this construction and Johanson (1992) for the code-copying model.

7. Recapitulation and remaining questions

Table 5 is a comparative overview of the markers and constructions which are used to denote the relationships of {S IS X}, {S^{TOP} IS SOMEWHERE^{COM}} and {S^{COM} IS SOMEWHERE^{TOP}} in Turkish, Persian and Turkic varieties of Iran.

Since the use of an overt agreement marker on the 3rd person is obligatory in modern Persian, the obligation for a subject marker on the 3rd person may certainly represent a contact-induced phenomenon in Turkic varieties of Iran.

	{S IS X}	{S IS SOMEWHERE}	
		{S ^{TOP} IS SOMEWHERE ^{COM} }	{S ^{COM} IS SOMEWHERE ^{TOP} }
Turkish	(S) + nominal predicate + subject marker in the 3rd person: 1. zero-marker 2. {-D ² 1 ⁴ r} is not obligatory, used only in certain discourse types	1. (S) + locative predicate + subject marker 2. (S) + locative predicate + <i>bulun-uyor</i> + subject marker	1. locative predicate + S + {var} + subject marker 2. locative predicate + S + <i>bulun-uyor</i> + subject marker
Irano-Turkic	(S) + nominal predicate + subject marker in the 3rd person: 1. an obligatory subject marker 2. {var} can be used	1. (S) + locative predicate + subject marker 2. (S) + locative predicate + {var} + subject marker	1. locative predicate + S + {var} + subject marker 2. locative predicate + S + subject marker
Persian	(S) + nominal predicate + subject marker in the 3rd person: 1. an obligatory subject marker 2. <i>hast</i> can be used	1. (S) + locative predicate + subject marker 2. (S) + locative predicate + <i>hast</i> + subject marker	1. locative predicate + S + <i>hast</i> + subject marker 2. locative predicate + S + contracted subject markers

Table 5: Comparison of markers and constructions in Turkish, Persian and Irano-Turkic

The phenomenon that {var} is used in front of subject markers even if the subject is the topic of the sentence (examples 25-33) needs to be considered from different points of view. Parallel to the more or less equivalent Persian constructions *man xune-am* 'I am at home' and *man xune hastam* 'I am at home', we find the constructions *evdäyäm* 'I am at home' and *evdä varam* 'I am at home' in Irano-Turkic. The use of {var} in this context resembles the use of *hast*. As already noted above, the difference between the two Persian constructions is that the construction with *hast* denotes the localisation of the psychological interest much more as 'being present somewhere'. In almost the same manner, the standard Turkish construction *evde bulunuyorum* 'I am (present) at home' is a focal and more formal variant of *evdeyim* 'I am at home' and has a more restricted use. The Irano-Turkic construction *evdä varam* 'I am at home' seems to be a comparable construction to Turkish *evde bulunuyorum* as well. We may be able to conclude that requirements to renew the markers in order to be able to denote focal meanings or different registers are given both in the Turkic and Persian linguistic systems. The use of {var} in Irano-Turkic

varieties is most likely the result of code-copying (Johanson 1992) of properties of *hast*, but nonetheless represents a process which is certainly in accordance with the developments in Turkic.

The absence of {var} in examples 20-24 is a phenomenon whose possible reasons are not easy to determine. There are two proposed explanations: (1) Copying of structural properties of the Persian subject marker *-e*. As mentioned, subject markers can express 'existence/presence of someone/something somewhere' in the colloquial language. This might have resulted in the patterning that Turkic varieties provide, in some corresponding constructions, showing 3rd person subject markers without {var}. (2) Language-internal reasons are also of course likely. Alongside {var}, Turkish provides a verbal construction with *bulun-* which can indicate focal meanings. The absence of {var} and the sole use of 3rd person markers in Turkic varieties of Iran can also represent a parallel development, i.e. the absence can be caused by the language-internal needs to express certain focal meanings. Dropping the element {var} and using solely the 3rd person subject marker may contribute, as far as I can judge, to localising psychological interest, such as 'there is (was) just now (at that moment) ...'.

The use of {var} as a copular marker within a relationship of {S IS X} may also be interpreted as a result of copying of the functional properties of Persian *hast*. However, it should be pointed out that the lexeme {var}/{bar} played/plays comparable roles in some other older and modern Turkic languages, e.g. Old Uyghur *kärgk sudurta ymä sözlämiš bar* 'in a sūtra it has been also said' (Kara & Zieme 1977: 59), Yakut *bu aan baar* 'this is a door' (Krueger 1962: 119), Karaim *men Karay barmin* 'I am a Karay' (Csató 2000); see also Pritsak (1959a: 360) for the use of *bar* as a copular marker in the dialects of Balkar. Therefore, we need to be cautious with an explanation about the possible reasons of the use of {var} as a copular marker.

Explanations of all these phenomena require solid, comparative research in order to reveal complex form-function relationships across older and modern Turkic languages. It is my hope that my investigation, concerned with the diachronic development and synchronic variation of subject markers and copular forms in Turkic languages from a contrastive perspective, will contribute to a better understanding of such questions.

Abbreviations

1PL	1st person plural	ABL	Ablative	PCOP	Past copula
1SG	1st person singular	COM	Comment	PL	Plural
2PL	2nd person plural	COP	Copula	POSS	Possessive
2SG	2nd person singular	DAT	Dative	PRES	Present
3PL	3rd person plural	GEN	Genitive	TOP	Topic
3SG	3rd person singular	LOC	Locative	Ø	Zero-marker

Acknowledgements

This study has been carried out within my ongoing research project “The copula in Turkic languages” funded by The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities (Kungl. Vitterhetsakademien). I gratefully acknowledge this support.

References

- Amin-Madani, Sadegh & Lutz, Dorothea 1972. *Persische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik 2006². Uzbek. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) 2006. *The Turkic languages*. London, New York: Routledge. 357-378.
- Boyle, John Andrew 1966. *Grammar of modern Persian*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Bozkurt, M. Fuat 1975. Untersuchungen zum Bojnurd-Dialekt des Chorasantürkischen. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Göttingen, Germany.]
- Bozkurt, M. Fuat 1977. Kabil Avşar ağzı. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten* 1977, 205-261.
- Csató, Éva Ágnes 2000. Some typological features of the viewpoint aspect and tense system in spoken North-Western Karaim. In: Östen Dahl (ed.) 2000. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 671-699.
- Csató, Éva Ágnes 2001. Present in Kashkay. *Turkic Languages* 5, 104-119.
- Csató, Éva Ágnes 2005. On copying in Kashkay. In: Csató, Éva Á. & Isaksson, Bo & Jahani, Carina (eds.) 2005. *Linguistic convergence and areal diffusion: Case studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. London: Routledge Curzon. 271-283.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1988. *Grammatik des Chaladsch*. (Turcologica 4.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1989. Die Kopula im Chaladsch. In: Heissig, Walther & Sagaster, Klaus (eds.) 1989. *Gedanke und Wirkung. Festschrift zum 90. Geburtstag von Nikolaus Poppe*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 106-112.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1998. Turkic languages of Iran. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) 1998. *The Turkic languages*. London, New York: Routledge. 273-282.
- Doerfer, Gerhard & Hesch, Wolfram 1998. *Türkische Folklore-Texte aus Chorasan*. (Turcologica 4.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Doerfer, Gerhard & Hesch, Wolfram & Ravanyar, Jamshid (eds.) 1990. *Oghusica aus Iran*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dolatkhah, Sohrab 2006-2007. Presentation et documentation du folklore Kashkay (Langue turcique du sud de l’Iran). [Unpublished MA thesis, Université Paris, France.]
- Fázsy, Szabolcs 1977. Das Bodschnurdi, ein türkischer Dialekt in Chorasan, Ostpersien. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Zürich, Switzerland.]
- Fleischer, Heinrich Leberecht 1875². *Grammatik der lebenden persischen Sprache. Nach Mirza Mohammed Ibrahim’s Grammar of the Persian language*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Hengeveld, Kees 1992. *Non-verbal predication. Theory, typology, diachrony*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Turcica Upsalien-sia I.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

- Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, 29: 5.) Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Johanson, Lars & Bulut, Christiane (eds.) 2006. *Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects*. (Turcologica 62.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Josephson, Judith 2003. Nominal sentences and copula in Middle and Early New Persian. In: Paul, Ludwig (ed.) 2003. *Persian origins-Early Judaeo-Persian and the emergence of New Persian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 79-94.
- Kara, Georg & Zieme, Peter 1977. *Die uigurischen Übersetzungen des Guruyogas „Tiefer Weg“ von Sa-skya Pañçāta und der Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*. (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients. Berliner Turfantexte 8.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Kıral, Filiz 2001. *Das gesprochene Aserbaidshanisch von Iran. Eine Studie zu den syntaktischen Einflüssen des Persischen*. (Turcologica 43.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kotschi, Thomas 2006. Information structure in spoken discourse. In: Brown, Keith (ed.) 2006. *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 511-518.
- Krueger, John R. 1962. *Yakut manual*. (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 21.) Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Kuribayashi, Yuu 2008. Syntactic copying in Kashkay. [Talk given at the Turcological Seminar, Uppsala University on 2008-10-15.]
- Mansuroğlu, Mecduť 1959. Das Karakhanidische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 57-112.
- Pritsak, Omeljan 1959a. Das Karatschaische und Balkarische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 340-368.
- Pritsak, Omeljan 1959b. Das Neuuigurische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 525-563.
- Rahmati, Nehmat & Buğday, Korkut 1998. *Aserbaidshanisch Lehrbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Tekin, Talāt 1968. *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 69.) Blomington: Indiana University.
- Tulu, Sultan 1989. *Chorasantürkische Materialien aus Kalāt bei Esfarāyen*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- Windfuhr, Gernot L. 1979. *Persian grammar. History and state of its study*. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton Publishers.