

## Werk

**Titel:** Depictive secondary predicates in Modern Uyghur

**Autor:** Memtimin , Aminem; Nevskaya , Irina

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2012

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0016](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0016) | LOG\_0013

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

# Depictive secondary predicates in Modern Uyghur

Aminem Memtimin & Irina Nevskaya

Memtimin, Aminem & Nevskaya, Irina 2012. Depictive secondary predicates in Modern Uyghur. *Turkic Languages* 16, 80–94.

Depictive predicate constructions are embedded predicative constructions of the types *He came back wounded* or *He eats his meat raw*. *Came back* and *eats* are the primary predicates of these sentences while *wounded* and *raw* are their secondary predicates called ‘depictive’; the former qualifying the subject and the latter, the object. They fulfill a predicative function semantically while being adverbial adjuncts syntactically.

This type of constructions has recently been described for Turkish, Kazakh and some Siberian Turkic languages. This paper is the first look at such predicates in Modern Uyghur. It turns out that there is some overlapping in the strategies used by different Turkic languages for expressing depictives of various semantic types, but there are also some remarkable differences.

Aminem Memtimin, Turkologie, FB 09, Goethe Universität, POB 11 19 32, 60054 Frankfurt a.M., Germany. E-mail: [adil4525@yahoo.com.cn](mailto:adil4525@yahoo.com.cn)

Irina Nevskaya, Institute of Empirical Linguistics, Georg-Voigt-Straße 6, 60235 Frankfurt a.M., Germany. E-mail: [nevskeya@em.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:nevskeya@em.uni-frankfurt.de)

## 1. Introduction

Depictive predicate constructions in various languages have attracted much attention recently. They are embedded predicative constructions of the type: (a) *He came back wounded*, or (b) *He eats his meat raw*, where *wounded* and *raw* are depictive predicates. They contain two semantic predicates—a main one expressed by a verb form, and a secondary one, often expressed by a nominal form or a non-finite verb form. Depictive predicates often refer either to the subject (a) or to the object (b) of the depictive predicate construction, and sometimes to further participants; the participants connected with depictive predicates by predicative relations (*he* in example (a) and *meat* in example (b) above) are their controllers. What makes depictive predicates interesting for study is that they can fulfill a predicative function semantically and at the same time are adverbial adjuncts syntactically. Thus, they concern the domains of both semantics and syntax.

Languages differ in the ways they express secondary depictive predicates. For Turkic, depictive predicates in South Siberian languages (Shor, Tuvan, Altay and Khakas) were described by Nevskaya (2008), in Turkish by Schroeder (2008). Nevskaya and Tazhibaeva (2010) dealt with Kazakh depictives, and some interesting

data about Sakha depictives were presented by Ebata (2010). Depictives in Uyghur, a South Eastern Turkic language, show some differences from South Siberian, Turkish and Kazakh depictives, which makes them worth a separate investigation.

## 2. Properties of the depictive secondary predicate

### 2.1. The depictive secondary predicate versus other adjuncts (manner adverbs and resultatives)

The depictive predicate has some similarities with other adjuncts, which sometimes makes it difficult to distinguish them; however, several criteria and tests have been developed for this purpose. A recent study (Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005) has paid specific attention to distinguishing manner adverbials from depictive secondary predicates. An important feature of depictive predicates is that they are participant-oriented (1), not event-oriented like pure manner adverbials (2):

- (1) *He left the room angry.*
- (2) *He left the room angrily.*<sup>1</sup>

In (1), the depictive *angry* expresses the psychological state of the subject in the time frame of the main predicate *left*, while in (2) *angrily* as a manner adverbial indicates the manner of action expressed by the main verb.

- (1a) *He was angry when he left the room.*
- (2a) *He left the room in an angry manner.*

The depictive construction differs from the adjunct one in being paraphrasable by a bi-clause construction where the element corresponding to the depictive functions as a primary predicate (Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005: 11); see (1a) in contrast to (1b). Sentence (3) is ambiguous, because Uyghur *yəŋi* 1) 'new', or 2) 'recently' can either refer to the object (interpretation a), or to the event (interpretation b); the former is an object oriented depictive while the latter is a temporal adjunct.

- (3) *Bu kiyim-ni yəŋi al-d-im.*  
       this dress-ACC new buy-PST-1SG  
       'I bought this dress recently.' (a)  
       'I bought this dress new.' (b)

This sentence can be paraphrased in two different ways according to its different interpretations:

<sup>1</sup> Example from Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005: 2.

- (3a) *Bu kiyim-ni al-yan-da yeŋi-ti.*  
 this dress-ACC buy-PRFP-LOC new-COP.PST  
 'This dress was new when I bought it.'

- (3b) *Bu kiyim-ni yeqinda al-d-im.*  
 this dress-ACC recently buy-PST-1SG  
 'I bought this dress recently.'

Only in the case of the interpretation (3a) can the sentence be paraphrased as a bi-clause.

The resultative is another type of adjunct that differs from the depictive. Depictive actions or states take place in the same time frame as the action of the main verb, whereas resultatives express the states that are achieved as results of the actions denoted by the main predicates. In (4) – (5), *pak-pakiz* and *qizil* are the results of *cleaning* and *painting* respectively.

- (4) *U öy-ni pak-pakiz qil-ip tazili-wät-t-i.*  
 he house-ACC very.clean make-CONV clean-ACT(AUX)-PST-3SG  
 'He cleaned the house perfectly (literary: very clean).'

- (5) *Män öy jahaz -lir-i-ni qizil sirli-d-im.*  
 I house furniture-PL-POSS3-ACC red paint-PST-1SG  
 'I painted the house furniture red.'

## 2.2. The depictive secondary predicate versus the main predicate of a subordinate clause

The depictive secondary predicate can be differentiated from the main predicate of a subordinate clause with the help of a negation test. In the case of the secondary predicate, the negation on the main verb negates a combination of the actions expressed by the secondary predicate and by the main one, whereas in the case of the main predicate in a subordinate clause, the negation on the main verb only negates the predicate in the main clause.

- (6) *U aččiqla-p ket-ip qal-d-i.*  
 he get.angry-CONV go.away-CONV stay-PST-3SG  
 'He went away angry.'

Thus, (6) is ambiguous and can be understood as a depictive construction or as a construction of a complex sentence with the converb *aččiqla-p* as the predicate of the subordinate clause. In the latter case, it can be understood as (7).

- (7) *U aččiy-i-da ket-ip qal-d-i.*  
 he angry-POSS3-LOC go.away-CONV stay-PST-3SG  
 'He went away out of anger.'

The negation test shows that it is a secondary predicate construction here. See (8), which can be understood as signifying 'he did not go away' or 'he was not angry'; i.e. we can negate both the depictive and the main predicate. In fact, we negate the combination of two actions: 'be angry' and 'go away'. This proves that the depictive shares some modal characteristics (the scope of negation) with the main predicate and does not form a predicative unit of its own.

- (8) *U aččiqlin-ip ket-ip qal-mi-d-i.*  
 he get.angry-CONV go.away-CONV stay-NEG-PST3  
 'He did not go away angry.'  
 = 'He was angry, but he did not go away.'  
 = 'He was not angry when he went away.'

One additional criterion is the intonation: we pause after the converb *aččiqlap* in the function of the predicate of the subordinate clause in the complex sentence construction, see (9):

- (9) *U aččiqpla-p, ket-ip qal-d-i.*  
 he get.angry-CONV go.away-CONV stay-PST-3SG  
 'He got angry and went away.'

### 2.3. The depictive secondary predicate versus a complement of the main predicate

We should distinguish depictives and complements of main predicates. In (10)–(12), *ilyar qil-ip*, *čirayliq qil-ip* and *baxliqliq-i-ya* are complements of the main verb. The *-ip* converb form of the verb *qil-* 'make, do' has been grammaticalized as a status postposition meaning 'as, like'.

- (10) *Biz Aynur-ni ilyar qil-ip sayli-d-uq.*  
 we Aynur-ACC pioneer make-CONV elect-PST-1PL  
 'We elected Aynur as a pioneer.'
- (11) *Män uni čirayliq qil-ip yasa-p qoy-d-um.*  
 I she:ACC beautiful make-CONV decorate-CONV put(AUX)-PST-1SG  
 'I made her beautiful.'

- (12) *Aynur-ni sinip başliqliq-i-ya sayli-d-uq.*  
 Aynur-ACC class leadership-POSS-DAT elect-PST-1PL  
 'We elected Aynur as a monitor of the class.'

### 3. Depictive secondary predicates in Modern Uyghur

In Modern Uyghur, depictive secondary predicates are expressed in different ways; they can have subject or object controllers and denote various semantics (physical or mental property of their controllers, individuality and collectivity, just to mention a few).

While depictives often express similar semantics, they can differ in their forms in various languages. Although Modern Uyghur and most other Turkic languages are close relatives, they can express depictive predicates by different language means. Below, we describe the formal types of depictive predicates in Uyghur alongside their semantics.

#### 3.1. Bare adjectives as depictive secondary predicates

Depictive secondary predicates in the form of bare adjectives occur frequently in Uyghur. Some of the examples below are with a subject controller (13)–(15), others with an object controller (16)–(19).

- (13) *U mäst uxla-p qal-d-i.*  
 he drunk sleep-CONV stay(AUX)-PST-3SG  
 'He fell asleep drunk.'
- (14) *U uruş-tin hayat qayt-ip käl-d-i.*  
 he war-ABL alive return-CONV come-PST-3SG  
 'He came back from the war alive.'
- (15) *U yaş ket-ip qal-d-i.*  
 he young go.away-CONV stay.AUX-PST-3SG  
 'He died young.'
- (16) *Ular u-ni tirik köm-iwät-t-i.*  
 they he-ACC alive bury-ACT-PST-3SG  
 'They buried him alive.'
- (17) *Män tamaq-ni issiq yä-y-män.*  
 I food-ACC hot eat-PRS-1SG  
 'I eat the food hot.'

- (18) *Bu kiyim-ni yeñi set-iwal-d-im.*  
 this dress-ACC new buy-ACT-PST-1SG  
 'I bought this dress new.'
- (19) *Män u-niñya täxsi-ni quruq bär-d-im.*  
 I (s) he-DAT plate-ACC empty give-PST-1SG  
 'I gave him the plate empty.'

These depictives express a mental or a physical state of their controllers. Some of the depictives expressed by bare adjectives in Modern Uyghur are rendered by adjectives with the dative case marker in South Siberian Turkic; this is a very prominent feature of depictives there (Nevskaya 2008).

### 3. 2. Compound adjectives as depictives

Compound adjectives also express a mental or physical state of their controllers.

- (20) *U öy-gä quruq qol käl-d-i.*  
 he home-DAT empty hand come-PST-3SG  
 'He came home empty-handed / with nothing in his hands / without success.'
- (21) *U yalañ ayaq qayt-ip käl-d-i.*  
 he naked foot return-CONV come-PST-3SG  
 'He came back barefoot.'

### 3. 3. Abstract nominals in the locative case as depictives

In Uyghur, depictive predicates often appear as nominal phrases headed by grammaticalized nouns like *çay* 'time' or *hal* 'state' in the locative case, as in (22). Adjectives or participles appear as their formal attributes and express the mental or physical state of the controllers of the whole depictive phrase. By adding the possessive suffix after *çay* 'time', one can make the nominal phrase a depictive expressing age; cf. (23).

- (22) *U ayal-i-ni eyir ayaq (hal-da) taşla-p kät-kän.*  
 he wife-POSS3-ACC heavy foot state-LOC throw-conv leave-PRFP  
 'He left his wife pregnant / he left his wife in a pregnant state.'
- (23) *U yaş (çey-i-da) öl-üp kät-t-i.*  
 he young time-POSS3-LOC die-conv go.away-PST-3SG  
 'He died (when he was) young.'

If the grammaticalized noun is omitted, the adjective gets the locative case marker and acts as a depictive (24). The adjective gets the possessive suffix co-referent with

its controller. This structure resembles that of a subordinate clause where the adjective is its main predicate. However, the negation test shows that the adjective phrase does not possess independent modal characteristics, see (25); so, we treat it as a depictive predicate here. The additional criterion is the intonation pattern of the sentence. In the case of the complex sentence the subordinate clause gets its own intonational characteristics – there is, e.g., a pause after the predicate of the dependent clause. This is not the case in (25).

- (24) *Čay-ni qızıy-i-da iç-iwal!*  
 tea-ACC hot-POSS3-LOC drink-ACT(AUX)  
 ‘Drink your tea while it is hot, please!’
- (25) *Čay-ni qızıy-i-da iç-iwal-mi-d-iñ.*  
 tea-ACC hot-POSS3-LOC drink-ACT(AUX)-NG-PST-2SG  
 ‘You did not drink your tea while it was hot.’

We can understand (25) in two ways: ‘You did not drink your tea while it was hot’, or ‘You drank your tea, but it was not hot anymore.’ Thus, the negation on the main verb denies the combination of the two predications: *you drank tea* and *the tea was hot*.

The semantics of (24) is different from that in (26) in that (24) implies a gradual change from one state (here ‘hot’) to another (‘not hot’), whereas (26) implies a contrast. In (24), the adjective is used as an abstract (‘the state of being hot’ from ‘hot’) as in Old Turkic *kičig+im+tä* ‘when I was small, in the state of being small’ from *kičig* ‘small’ (Erdal 2004: 143).

- (26) *Män tamaq-ni qızıq yä-y-män.*  
 I food-ACC hot eat-PRS-1SG  
 ‘I eat the food (only) hot.’

In Modern Uyghur, the *-GAN* participle has to be used with the abstract noun *hal* ‘state’ in order to denote the state of its controller—the subject of the constructions, as shown by (27), while in South Siberian Turkic, the perfect participle can be used as a depictive also alone (Nevskaya 2008). The depictive of this structural type expresses a physical or mental state of its controller which is a result of a previous action.

- (27) *U aččiqla-n-yan hal-da ket-ip qal-d-i.*  
 she get.angry-REFL-PRTC state-LOC go.away-conv stay(ACT)-PST-3SG  
 ‘She went away angry (literally: in an offended state).’



### 3.4. Nominals with the postposition *bilän*

This type of depictives is very rare in Uyghur. It describes the physical or mental state of its controller. Normally, *bilän* has comitative or instrumental functions. In the following examples, (28) contains a depictive predicate, since it describes the appearance of the controller (wearing torn pants). In (29), however, the postposition has comitative functions, while in (30) it expresses instrumental semantics.

- (28) *U yirtiq iştan bilän qayt-ip käl-d-i.*  
 he torn pants with return-CONV come-PST-3SG  
 'He came back with torn pants.'
- (29) *U aki-si bilän bazar-ya kät-t-i.*  
 he old.brother-POSS3 with market-DAT go.away-PST-3SG  
 'He went to the market with his old brother.'
- (30) *Män poyiz bilän käl-d-im.*  
 I train by come-PST-1SG  
 'I came by train.'

### 3.5. Adjectives expressing a grade of quality

In examples (27)–(29), the degree of a quality referred to by an adjective is expressed by a partial reduplication of the adjective, or by other means. The depictive of this structural type expresses a physical or mental state of its controller.

- (31) *U uruş-tin sap-saq qayt-ip käl-d-i.*  
 he war-ABL undamaged / without.injury return-CONV come-PST-3SG  
 'He came back from the war without any injuries (completely undamaged).'
- (32) *Män u-ni koči-da qip-yalıñaç kör-d-üm.*  
 I he-ACC street-LOC totally.naked see-PST-1SG  
 'I saw him on the street totally naked.'
- (33) *U hazir eliş-ip qal-d-i şuğa u*  
 He now be.mad-CONV stay(AUX)-PST-3SG, so he  
*koči-da qip-yalıñaç mañ-i-du.*  
 street-LOC totally naked walk-PRS-3SG  
 'He became mad now, so he walks on the street totally naked.'

### 3.6. Nominals with the postpositions *bolup* and *qilip*

The converbs *bol-up* and *qil-ip* are used as postpositions for forming depictive phrases. The development of the postposition *bolup* in South Siberian Turkic is described in Nevskaya 1989. The main arguments for considering *bolup* a postposition

in depictive and some other constructions is its phonological reduction (*bolup* > *bop*), semantic generalization ('being' > 'as', 'like'), loss of its government patterns and of the predicative potential; see *bolup* as the main predicate in an adverbial construction (39) and its discussion in 3.6.1. Similar arguments prove also the grammaticalization of *qilip*.

Nominals governed by the postposition *bolup* serve as depictive predicates with subject controllers, whereas nominals governed by the postposition *qilip* serve as predicates with object controllers. With this distribution, *bolup* and *qilip* in Modern Uyghur have similar functions as English *as*, German *als* and Russian *kak*.

### 3.6.1. Nominals with the postposition *bolup*

Both adjectives and nouns are used with the postposition *bolup*. With nouns, the depictive predicate expresses the status of its controller: to work as a teacher, to come as a director, etc., see (34)–(37). In (37), the main predicate of the depictive predicate *išligän* is the predicate of a subordinated clause.

- (34) *U oqutquči bol-up išli-gän.*  
 he teacher be-CONV work-PRFT  
 'He worked as a teacher.'
- (35) *Šuŋa (biz) ikkiylän başqi-lar-ya malay bolup*  
 thus (we) two:COLL other-PL-DAT servant be-CONV  
*išlä-p yür-i-miz.*  
 work-CONV walk(ACT.AUX)-PRS-1PL  
 'Thus the two of us live as servants for other people.'
- (36) *U ötkän yıl direktor bolup käl-gän.*  
 he last year director be-CONV come-PRFP  
 'Last year he came as director.'
- (37) *U meni oqutquči bol-up išli-gän дәp hörmät qil-i-du.*  
 he I-ACC teacher be-CONV work-PRTC POSTP respect-PRS-3SG  
 'He respects me because of my working as a teacher.'
- (38) *U hoš bop / bol-up čiq-ip kät-t-i.*  
 he happy be-CONV go.out-CONV go.away-PST-3SG  
 'He went out happy.'

Adjectives used in the depictive phrase formed by the postposition *bolup*, denote a physical or mental state of their controllers. If the postposition *bolup* is obligatory with depictive nouns expressing the status of their controllers, adjectives can also be used without the postposition (see section 3.1).

Depictive predicates, in which an adjective is governed by the postposition *bolup* / *bop*, should not be confused with adverbial clauses of reason with the verb *bol-* in the converb form *-(X)p* as their predicate, as in (39), although they have the same structure.

- (39) *U xapa bo-p / bol-up, čiq-ip kät-t-i.*  
 he angry be-CONV go.out-CONV go.away-PST-3SG  
 ‘Being angry, he went out.’, e.g. ‘He went out because of anger.’

The negation test can distinguish them:

- (40) *U xapa bop / bol-up čiq-ip kät-mi-d-i.*  
 he angry be-CONV go.out-CONV go.away-PST-3SG  
 ‘He did not go out angry.’

If (40) were a construction with a depictive predicate expressed by a postpositional phrase with *bolup*, (40) could be understood as (a) *He went out, but he was not angry*, as in (41); (b) *He was angry, but he did not go out*, as in (42). The negation on the main verb would negate the combination of the two actions: *be angry* and *go out*.

- (41) *U xapa bol-mi-d-i.*  
 he angry be-NG-PST-1SG  
 ‘He did not become angry.’
- (42) *U čiq-ip kät-mi-d-i.*  
 he go.out-CONV go.away-NG-PST-1SG  
 ‘He did not go out.’

In the case of a causal adjunct clause, the negation on the main verb negates only the main action, as in (43); also note the intonation pattern of this sentence – the pause after the dependent predicate.

- (43) *U xapa bop / bol-up, čiq-ip kät-mi-d-i.*  
 he angry be-CONV go.out-CONV go.away-PST3  
 ‘He did not go out because of anger’, i.e. ‘He was angry, but he did not go out.’

Also possessive adjectives can appear with *bolup* (44). Interestingly, in South Siberian Turkic, such adjectives can be used as depictives alone, without any postposition (Nevskaya 2008), while we find a similar structural type in Kazakh (Nevskaya & Tazhibaeva 2010).

- (44) *U öy-lük oçaq-liq bolup*  
 he family-with (POSS) fireplace-with (POSS) POSTP

*qayt-ip            käl-d-i.*  
 return-CONV    come-PST-1SG  
 'He came back with a family.'

### 3.6.2. Nominals with the postposition *qilip*

The postposition *qilip* is used only with depictives with object controllers. In this respect, it is a counterpart of the postposition *bolup*. However, its use seems to be rather limited in comparison to the use of the postposition *bolup*. Only possessed adjectives appear as depictives with *qilip*. In (45), *qilip* should not be understood as the main predicate of a subordinate clause which governs the possessive nominal *göşlük*, as *etiptu* is the main predicate.

(45) *U    polu-ni    göş-lük    qil-ip    et-iptu.*  
       he    polo-acc    meat-with    POSTP    do-EVID  
       'It turns out that he made the polo-dish with meat.'

### 3.7. The construction with the possessor as the controller of the depictive

Whereas most of the structural types mentioned above were already noted for other Turkic languages (Schroeder 2008, Nevskaya 2008, Nevskaya & Tazhibaeva 2010), this type of depictives is argued to exist in Turkic in this article for the first time. Normally, the constructions of the type *köñli yerim* (46), *qorsiqim ač* (47), *ištini yirtiq* (48) are considered to be possessive constructions as parts of complex sentences where the subject of the subordinate part is an inalienable part of the subject of the main clause, or an object possessed by the subject of the main clause. Here we argue that such constructions can be constructions with depictive predicates since they have the properties of depictive predicates: The negation test shows that such entities do not possess their own modal characteristics, independent of the modal characteristics of the main predicates; they do not bear a separate clausal accent, but are integrated into the intonation scope of the main predicates. They express a physical or mental state of their controllers. For such 'possessed depictives', their controller is the possessor of the entity. Such constructions remind us also of Russian depictives of the type found in (49). Similar depictives are sure to be present also in other Turkic languages, and we will describe them in the future. Their semantics is that of the physical or mental state of the controller.

(46) *U    köñl-i            yerim    qayt-ip            käl-d-i.*  
       he    heart-POSS3    half    return-CONV    come-PST-1SG  
       'He came back upset', literally: 'His heart being half, he came back.'

(47) *Män qorsiq-im            ač            töt    kün    tala-da            yür-d-üm.*  
       I    stomach-POSS1    hungry    four    day    outside-DAT    walk/be-PST-1SG

‘I was outside hungry for four days’,  
literally, ‘My stomach being hungry, I walked outside for four days.’

- (48) *U iştin-i yirtiq qayt-ip käl-d-i.*  
he pants-POSS3 torn return-CONV come-PST3  
‘He came back with torn pants.’

Russian:

- (49) a. *On šjol ruki v brjuki.*  
he go:PST:3SG:masc hand:PL:NOM in trousers:PL:ACC  
‘He went with his hands in the (pockets of his) trousers.’

- b. *Ona stojala ruki v boki.*  
she stand:PST:3SG:fem hand:PL:NOM in hip:PL:ACC  
‘She was standing with her arms on her hips’.

### 3.8. Adverbs as depictives

Only a very limited number of adverbs have a subject valence while most adverbs modify the predicate or the whole proposition. These are the adverbs *alone* and *together* also acting as depictives in languages of other genetic affiliation and language types.

- (50) *Ular bir ömür billä yaşı-yan.*  
they one life together live-PRFP  
‘They lived together their whole life.’

### 3.9. Collective and distributive numerals

Referring to subjects of the main predicate, collective and distributive numerals can be their secondary depictive predicates expressing collectivity or distributivity of their controllers. Distributive numerals are formed in Uyghur by the ablative case marker.

- (51) *Ular ikki-ylän billä čiq-ip kät-t-i.*  
they two-COLL together go.out-CONV go.away-PST-3SG  
‘The two went out together.’
- (52) *Bir-din kir-iŋlar.*  
one-ABL enter-IMP.2PL  
‘Come in one at a time/one by one!’

### 3.10. Converbs as depictives

The converb form  $-(X)p$  can be a depictive predicate if it expresses a physical or mental state of the subject of the main verb and does not have modal and intonational characteristics of its own, necessary to form a separate clause. As depictives they express an action accompanying the main action, often referring to a physical or mental state of the controller. The controller of such depictives is always the subject of the main predicate. Such depictives are described in Nevskaya 2010.

- (53) *U yiyla-p qeş-im-ya käl-d-i.*  
 she cry-CONV beside/side-POSS1-DAT come-PST-3SG  
 'She came to me crying.'

- (54) *U u yär-dä azablin-ip tur-d-i.*  
 he that place-LOC be.upset-CONV stand-PST-3SG  
 'He stayed there feeling upset.'

Such depictives should be distinguished from  $-(X)p$  converbs in the function of manner adjuncts, denoting the manner of the action of the main verb, as in (55)–(56); their semantic connection with the predicate is much stronger than that with the subject, although they do not possess independent modal and intonational characteristics of their own either.

- (55) *U säkrä-p maŋ-d-i.*  
 he limp-CONV walk-PST-3SG  
 'He walked limping.'

- (56) *U u yär-dä ikki put-i-ni ker-ip tur-d-i.*  
 he that place-LOC two foot-POSS3-ACC stretch-CONV stay-PST-3SG  
 'He stayed there stretching out both his legs.'

Converbs as depictives should also be distinguished from converbs as main predicates of subordinate clauses as described in 2.2.

## 4. Conclusion

Turkic languages express the same semantic types of depictive predicates that we find also cross-linguistically (Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005; Schroeder 2004): physical or mental state, social status and roles, integrity, age, state of possession / non-possession (also in the metaphorical sense: that of social status, appearance, physical state, mental state), equality, states as action results, accompanying actions, collectivity/individuality, distribution; sometimes temporary and permanent states are expressed by specialized means (Nevskaya & Tazhibaeva 2010).

Turkic languages also share many strategies in forming depictive secondary predicates, e.g. they use bare adjectives, nominals in the locative case forms, nominals with postpositions, possessive nominals, some adverbs, collective and distributive numerals, fully or partially reduplicated adjectives and converbs as depictives.

The main semantic types of depictive predicates correlate with their formal types. Different states of the semantic subject are expressed by adjectives and nominal phrases, collectivity and distribution by collective and distributive numerals, states as results of previous actions by participles, accompanying actions by converbs, roles and social status by nominal phrases with *bolup*.

Nevertheless, Turkic languages differ in means of expressing depictives in individual languages and branches of Turkic.

A previous research on South Siberian Turkic depictives representing the North-Eastern branch of Turkic (Nevskaya 2008) showed that alongside all-Turkic means of expressing depictives, one of the most striking features here is the use of the dative case with depictives expressed by adjectives. On the one hand, such depictives “compensate” for the lack of abstract nouns expressing the notion ‘state’ that are typical for other branches of Turkic, on the other hand, they allow adjectives to occur with both subject and object depictives. In Siberian languages, which allow the use of bare adjectives both with subject and object depictives, the dative case depictives mark temporary states while bare adjectives seem to express permanent states.

A comparative study of Kazakh depictives representing this category in the North-Western branch of Turkic (Nevskaya & Tazhibaeva 2010) showed that the North-Eastern and the North-Western branches of Turkic encode minor semantic types of depictives in similar ways: distributive numerals for distributivity, converbs for accompanying actions, converbs or perfect participles for states as results of preceding actions, possessive nominals for the state of possession (including various metaphorical semantic shifts of the possession semantics). Distinguishing features of depictives in the North-Western branch are as follows: a) Kazakh has an even richer system of encoding depictives than North-Eastern Turkic languages do; b) Kazakh makes use of numerous abstract nouns expressing the notion ‘state’ borrowed from Arabic or Persian: *tür/küy/qal/häl*; c) Kazakh consequently uses the postposition *bolıp* for marking subject controllers, while *qılıp/edip* marks object controllers. In North-Eastern Turkic, only Tuvan uses a similar opposition; here, *polıp* is a marker of subject controllers while *qıldır* appears with object controllers. Kazakh also marks temporary states, but in a different way than South Siberian languages do: the auxiliary noun *kez* ‘interval’ in the locative case governing adjectives describing various states of their semantic subjects expresses temporally limited states.

In Modern Uyghur representing the South-Eastern branch of Turkic, the ways of expressing secondary depictive predicates are basically the same as those in other branches of Turkic, but adjectives in the dative case form found as depictives in Siberian Turkic do not exist in Uyghur; in Uyghur, their task is fulfilled by bare adjectives, similar to Kazakh. Nor does the perfect participle *-GAN* exist as a depictive in Uyghur, unlike South Siberian Turkic and Kazakh. In Modern Uyghur, the use of

bare adjectives to express secondary depictive predicates is the most frequent strategy. Like Kazakh, Uyghur uses abstract nouns with the meaning ‘state’ in the locative case form to express depictive predicates.

In Modern Uyghur, we have found one type of depictives that has not yet been described for Turkic languages—that with the possessor as the depictive controller. This opens perspectives for revising our results also for other Turkic languages.

## References

- Ebata, Fuyuki. 2010. Poster on Yakut presented at the meeting of the International Conference on Turkic linguistics, Szeged 2010.
- Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies 8, 3.) Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & Schultze-Berndt, Eva. 2005. *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: the typology of depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nevskaya, Irina A. 1989. Grammatikalizacija deepričastija na -p ot glagola pol- v šorskom jazyke. In: Čeremisina, M. I. et al. (eds.) *Predloženie v jazykax Sibiri*. Novosibirsk. 113–131.
- Nevskaya, Irina 2010. Converbs as depictive secondary predicates in South Siberian Turkic. In: Boeschoten, H. & Rentzsch, Ju. (eds.) 2009. *Turcology in Mainz*. (Turcologica 80.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 191–200.
- Nevskaya, Irina 2008. Depictive secondary predicates in South Siberian Turkic. In: Schroeder & Hentschel & Boeder (eds.). 275–295.
- Nevskaya, Irina & Tažybaeva, S. 2010. Depictive predicates in Northwest Turkic. In: *Abstracts of the 15th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. August 20–22, 2010. Szeged, Hungary*.
- Schroeder, Christoph 2004. *Depiktive im Sprachvergleich Deutsch-Türkisch. Eine kontrastiv-typologische Analyse*. [Habilitationsschrift, Osnabrück.]
- Schroeder, Christoph & Hentschel, G. & Boeder, W. (eds.) 2008. *Secondary Predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond*. (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16.) Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg.
- Schroeder, Christoph 2008. Adverbial modification and secondary predicates in Turkish: a typological perspective. In: Schroeder & Hentschel & Boeder (eds.) 339–358.

## Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	DAT	dative	PL	plural
ACC	accusative	DISTR	distributive	POSS	possessive
ACT	actionality marker	EVID	evidentiality	POSTP	postposition
AOR	aorist	IMP	imperative	PRS	present
AUX	auxiliary	INST	instrumental	PST	past
COP	copula	LOC	locative	PTCL	participle
CONV	converb	NG	negation	REFL	reflexive