

Werk

Titel: High-focal intraterminality in Denizil dialects of Turkish

Autor: Bacanlı, Eyüp

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2013

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0017 | LOG_0009

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

High-focal intraterminality in Denizli dialects of Turkish

Eyüp Bacanlı

Bacanlı, Eyüp 2014. High-focal intraterminality in Denizli dialects of Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 17, 5–30.

In this paper I deal with high-focal intraterminal markers in Denizli dialects, which constitute a part of Southwestern Anatolian Turkish dialects. First I give a survey about the phonetic and morpho-syntactic features of the markers. The markers are, first, divided into two main groups: pure aspectuals and preaspectuals; consequently the preaspectuals are classified as nontransformativizer and deictic (limit-oriented) markers with regard to their actional specification. Intraterminal meanings of all markers are examined with respect to focality degrees and aspect-sensitive actional classes. Prosodic equivocality of the preaspectual markers, which has been explored by N. Demir (1993), is revisited. As part of intraterminality, participial forms of certain morphemes and their aspectual meanings are also dealt with. Finally, I elaborate high-focal postterminal functions of *-bduru* and *-boturu* morphemes, which regularly occur in combination with about 30–40 verbs.

Eyüp Bacanlı, TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Ankara Turkey. E-mail: ebacanlı@etu.edu.tr

1. Introduction

The Denizli dialects (DD) of Turkish constitute an important part of Southwestern Anatolian dialects. They are famous for archaic forms (PreTurkic **aṅsırdan* > DD *ansırdan* ‘suddenly’, Old Turkic *nägü* > DD *neyi*, Old Turkic *turgalı käl-* > DD *duralı gäl-*), many examples of the equivalences of so-called rhotacism-zetacism (DD *balatır* ~ *baladız* ‘outgrowth’) and lambdacism-sigmatism (DD *kaykılmak* ~ *keykişmek* ‘to lean back’), the homonymy of the accusative and the dative as in Chuvash,¹ positional allophonic glottal stops (*yaʔmıŝ* [cf. standard Turkish *yatmıŝ* or

1 Brendemoen (1997: 239) states that “... in and around the province of Denizli, the forms of the accusative and dative suffixes are reversed compared with Standard Turkish, being *-(y)A* and *-(y)I* respectively”. Instead of reversion of the suffixes we must speak about homonymy of the two cases: at the end of the utterance or after stops both of the suffixes are pronounced as *-a/-ä*, and within the sentence they phonologically become *-i/-i -u/-ü*. This phonological feature is characteristically positional and is observed in sentences, phrases and even in single words (as in *çapa* ‘hoe’ > *çapıla-* ‘to grub’ > *çapılmek* ‘to grub’), emerging from the quick pronunciation of unaccented syllables. One would pronounce the Turkish sentence *Ova göründü* as *Ovu göründü*, but in spelling the same

yakmış], *da?lı* [cf. standard Turkish *tatlı*], *dı?naz* [cf. standard Turkish *tıkna?z*]), regular voiced consonants in the final position of a syllable (*bagdı* [cf. standard Turkish *baktı*], *dudcek* [cf. standard Turkish *tutacak*]), secondary long vowels which appear as a result of dropping of the consonants *y*, *ğ*, *v*, *r*, *l*, *k*, and *n* (*kö*: [*< köy*], *o:sa* [*< olsa*], *i:san* [*< insan*]), regular palatalizational effect of the consonants /*y/*, /*ç/*, and /*ş/* (*goley* ‘easy’, *doleşdim* ‘I (have) walked around’, *ağec* ‘tree’), monoform suffixes (*-mek* [*< -mAk*], *-ce(k)* [*< -AcAk*], *-e:n/-en* [*< -Aylm*], etc.), and so on. For a general survey of the phonological features of Southwestern Anatolian Turkish dialects, see Korkmaz 1994.

The northern (Sarayköy, Honaz, Bozkurt, Baklan, Akköy, Güney, Çal, Çivril, Bekilli districts) dialects of Denizli diverge from the southern (Tavas, Acipayam, Kale, Serinhisar, Beyağaç, Çameli, Babadağ districts) dialects with the mostly absence of the glottal stop and most of the high-focal intraterminal (+INTRA^{HF}) markers except *-bduru* and *-byörü*. In this respect, they converge with Afyon and Uşak dialects in the north. Southern dialects are essentially an extension of Muğla dialects in the south. The similar isogloss is observed in Aydın (in the west), where neighbouring Bozdoğan and Karacasu dialects converge with Muğla and southern Denizli dialects. The inhabitants of southern Denizli think that they are essentially Yörüks from Muğla. One can hear stories about historical Yörük culture everywhere in south Denizli.

South Denizli and Muğla dialects have great similarities with Central Asian and Southwestern Siberian Turkic languages with regard to the actional and intraterminal markers they possess. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to speak about the Kipchak roots of the people living in the region because of these morphological similarities. For instance, Özışık (2007: 277) notes that the form *-p batır* (*< -p yatır*) is used in Turkmen dialects such as Salır, Göklen, Sakar and Yomut-Günbatar (cf. İ. Demir 2010: 5–6). Despite the distinctive features, the grammatical and lexical characteristics of the dialects are typically Oghuz and the people identify themselves as ‘Yörük’ or ‘Yörük Türkmen’.

The intraterminal markers dealt with in this paper arouse the attention of Turcologists. A thesis (N. Demir 1993) and several papers (N. Demir 1992a; 1992b; 1994a; 1994b; 2000; İ. Demir 2010; Akar 2001; Bacanlı 2007) have been written on the issue. N. Demir’s works are of special importance because he distinguished between aspect and actionality, and demonstrated the role of accentuation in marking this distinction. This paper will not be a repetition of the statements in the aforementioned studies but will contribute to the study of prosodic oppositions, classification of markers, focality oppositions, examination of the markers on the basis of actional classes, and finally, high-focal postterminal (+POST^{HF}) usages of two mark-

phrase the real morphonology appears as *O-va gö-rün-dü* ‘The plain has appeared’. This phonological feature also covers the accusative/dative suffix: compare the pair *evi gittim ~ gittim evä* ‘I went home’ with the pair *evi biliyon ~ biliyon evä* ‘I know the house’.

ers with certain verbs. In this paper, I will follow Johanson's theories on aspect-temporality (1971; 1996; 2000) and N. Demir's approach to the description of these markers. Most of the examples are taken from Korkmaz's (1994) and Tok's (2002) texts from Denizli dialects. The other examples are mine based on my competence in the dialect and the data I collected during my field trips in 2000 and 2008.

2. High-focal intraterminality and aspect-sensitive action types

Internal phase structures of the actions indicated by verb lexemes are important for understanding how they react to viewpoint operators. The basic viewpoint categories suggested by Johanson for Turkic languages are intraterminality and postterminality. Intraterminality is an aspect viewing the action within its (initial and final) limits: *is coming*, *was studying*, *knows*, etc. Postterminality is an aspect viewing the action after the transgression of its (crucial or relevant) limits as in *is occupied*, *has done*, *had worked*, etc. (Johanson 1971; 1996; 2000).

Johanson introduced the notion 'focality'. Focality is a scalar notion reflecting the speaker's psychological interest. "Intra- and postterminals show higher or lower focality degrees depending on the relative narrowness of the range of vision determined by "nunc" [i.e. now EB]" (Johanson 2000: 38). Since the markers to be studied in this paper represent intraterminals of high-focality (+INTRA^{HF}), I will cite Johanson's description: "...+INTRA^{HF} items, focus on the core of "nunc" and events going on there, suggesting a "narrow presentness". They tend to stand for uni-occasional events, i.e., one single occasion of performance, and are particularly suited to convey the impression of internal dynamics, gradual movement towards the finis. These properties are typical of PROG ("progressive") ..." (Johanson 2000: 87).

Actionality types (or actional categories) are very important for understanding the use of high-focal intraterminal markers since high-focal intraterminality is not compatible with all actionality types. The actionality types and the terminology which I will apply in this paper are almost the same as those suggested by Johanson. The first type is nontransformative and nondynamic (static). English verbs *be*, *love*, *know*, *believe*, *wait*, *care for*, *sit* are examples of the first type. +INTRA^{HF} markers are not used with verbs denoting permanent states such as *love*, *know*, or *believe*, but they can be employed with verbs denoting temporary states such as *wait* or *sit*. The second type is nontransformative and dynamic. English verbs *play*, *walk*, *write*, *read* indicate such actions. Semelfactive verbs (such as *knock*, *cough*, *sneeze*, *hit*), which are described as an independent group by Smith (1991: 55–58) and which crosslinguistically do not indicate a crucial limit except the ones that exist in Slavic languages, should be included in the category of nontransformative dynamic verbs. Especially, limit-oriented (deictic) preaspectual +INTRA^{HF} markers, which will be dealt with later in this paper (see 5.2.), explicitly demonstrate that semelfactive verbs in Turkish are not (fini)transformative. +INTRA^{HF} markers are productive with nontransformative dynamic verbs. The third type is constituted by finitransformative verbs such as *come*, *go away*, *grow*, *become*, *arrive*, *recognize*, etc. +INTRA^{HF} mark-

ers in combination with finittransformative verbs indicate gradual progress towards the limit (if the action has obvious preliminaries) or an imminent reading (if the action does not have preliminaries). Initiotransformatives, the fourth group, denote two evolutional phases. For example, the English verb *hide* indicates an initial (transformational) phase as ‘to put out of sight oneself’ and a static (posttransformational) phase as ‘to keep out of sight oneself’. As Johanson states, Turkic languages are relatively rich in initiotransformatives (1999: 173). Turkish verbs *ol-* ‘to become + to be’, *aşık ol-* ‘to fall in love + to be in love’, *uyu-* ‘to fall asleep + be asleep’, *benze-* ‘to come to resemble + to resemble’ are examples of this group. +INTRA^{HF} markers with such combinations generally (but not compulsorily) indicate the second phase (if it does not indicate a permanent state). For more about actional categorization and the realization of combinations with +INTRA markers see Johanson (2000: 58–66, 146–159).

+INTRA^{HF} markers in Denizli exactly suit these definitions. The markers generally express narrow presentness; on the other hand, a crosslinguistically widespread grammaticalization pattern, i.e. defocalization of +INTRA^{HF} markers, may also be attested in Denizli dialects. Just like the English progressive ‘be V-ing’, they may rarely indicate ‘pluri-occasional events’, ‘extended states’ or ‘extended transformative actions’. However the markers do not have any modal meanings such as ‘intended, desired or probable future’. They do not coincide with such adverbs as *birazdan* ‘soon’, *yarın* ‘tomorrow’, *iki hafta sonra* ‘two weeks later’ or *sāneyä* ‘next year’. On the other hand, all +INTRA^{HF} markers can be used as historical present in narratives. Thus, the high focal present forms of the verb ‘to cry’, *a:lebba(:rı)* [*< ağla-yıpbatır*], *a:lebbatı(rı)* ~ *a:le:batı(rı)* [*< ağla-yıpbatır*] and *a:lebduru*, [*< ağla-yıpdurur*] can be translated as ‘was crying’ instead of ‘is crying’ in narrative discourse.

3. +INTRA^{HF} markers in the dialects of Denizli

Intraterminals of standard Turkish such as *-(A/I)r*, *-lyor* and *-mAktA* are also used in the Denizli region. The suffix *-(A/I)r* as a non-focal intraterminal marker indicates open presentness, potential and pluri-occasional events. The suffix *-lyor* as a low-focal intraterminal may indicate both pluri- and uni-occasional events. It is the most appropriate marker for regular (habitual) events. The suffix *-mAktA* is a relatively high-focal intraterminal since it cannot be used for posterior events or does not have modal meanings. Except for these three intraterminal markers, there are eight more +INTRA^{HF} markers in the southern Denizli region. These are the following: *-bba(:)* (~ *-bba(:rı)*), *-(b)batı(rı)* (~ *-vatı(rı)*), *-bduru*, *-botu(ru)*, *-byörü*, *-bgidär* (~ *-bgidä:* ~ *-bgidäri*), *-bgälir* (~ *-bgäli:* ~ *-bgäliri*), *-bvarır* (~ *-bvarı:*). The marker *-i’verir*, which was dealt with by Demir (1993: 120–123), has not been detected in Denizli. The first two (*-bba:*, *-bbatı/-vatı*) markers have become suffixes. The cliticization process of the others has not been completed because of their preaspectual character and because of their transparency as postverbs in their structure. On the other hand,

all of the markers in question are independent morphemes. In neighbouring Aydın dialects we find contracted forms such as *-pbörü* (< *-p yürür*) (see Korkmaz 1994: 77). All of them are combinations of a postverb [consisting of *-B* converb + auxiliary] and Old Turkic present suffix *-(y)Ur*: *-B barur*, *-B yatur*, *-B oturur*, *-B turur*, *-B yürür*, *-B gidär*, *-B gälir*. The relicts of the old present suffix *-(y)Ur* in the structure of the +INTRA^{HF} markers still indicate present tense, when the old postverbs (*-B dur-*, *-B yürü-*, *-B gid-*, *-B gäl-*, *-B var-*) in the periphrastic markers are used as actionality markers: *gäzib yürü(:)* ‘always walks around’. The marker *-bba(:)*, which is the most grammaticalized aspect marker, and the marker *-bvarı(:)*, which is at the beginning of being grammaticalized as an aspect marker, are cognate morphemes going back to the periphrastic marker *-B barur*. Judging by its rare usage, the latter has begun to be grammaticalized very late in analogy with *-B gidär*. The postverbs were originally used to express metaphorical locative meanings which can be paraphrased as ‘to be located in or at an event’ or ‘to be dwelling in the cursus’. This is a cross-linguistically prevalent pattern to reproduce progressives (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 77; Bybee et al. 1994: 127–133; Squartini 1998: 1–2, 74, 301–302; Bertinetto et al. 2000: 538–541; Johanson 2000: 93–99).

3.1. Classification of +INTRA^{HF} markers

The markers can be classified in groups on the basis of their prosodic, morphological and semantic features. They will be described with respect to their aspectual and preaspectual meanings.

In the first group there are two markers, namely *-bba(:rı)* and *-(b)batı(rı) / -vatu(rı)*. They are pure aspectual morphemes having no actional meaning or prosodic distinction. They have a regular accent on the last syllable as the other aspectual suffixes in Turkish: *alibba:* ‘s/he is taking’, *gidibbaz* ‘we are going’, *oyne:batisın* ‘you are playing’, etc.

In the second group there are six markers, namely *-bduru(:)*, *-botu(ru)*, *-byörü(:)*, *-bgidär*, *-bgälir* and *-bvarır*. They are preaspectual morphemes that synchronically demonstrate aspectual and actionality features and display prosodic oppositions. N. Demir made the first discoveries on the equivocal meanings of some postverbs and present markers with regard to accent on word forms (1992a; 1993: 7–9; 1994a: 86). According to Demir, if the accent in the word form *bakıp duru* is on the first syllable (*bakıp duru*), the periphrastic form indicates actionality, i.e. durativity, (in the sense of ‘keeps looking’), but if the accent is on the converb segment of the lexical verb (*bakıp duru*) then it indicates aspect, i.e. intraterminality (in the sense of ‘is looking’). Although I agree with N. Demir concerning the existence of the prosodic distinctions of *-bduru*, I do not fully agree with him on the interpretation of the opposition marked by the two accents. First of all, the second accent type to which aspectuality is attributed is not on the converb in Denizli dialects, but rather on the last syllable of the whole word forms, i.e. the same as the accent on pure aspectual markers: *bakıbduru* ‘looks, is looking’. This accent corresponds to the accent of

other aspectual and modal markers in Turkish such as *-mXş*, *-DX*, *-Iyor*, *-mAktA*, *-(y)AcAk*, *-mAll*, *-sA*. In the case of Denizli dialects, the second accent type described by Demir would eliminate the morphotactic string and would divide them into two segments, i.e. a converb ‘-B’ and the postverbs ‘*duru*, *yörü*, *gidä*, *gäli*, *varı*’, and consequently this might produce taxis relations, where the *-B* converb has a copredicative function with a following verb such as *Şükür, siz gälib duru:sunuz* (Tok 2002: 343) ‘Thank goodness, having come you stand/are (here)’. On the other hand, I do not claim that N. Demir’s observation about the second accent type is not true. Accentuation of aspect markers can be different in Denizli and in the (Alanya) dialects described by N. Demir. Moreover, in combinations with the Turkish suffix *-Iyor*, which is accented, the accent may appear on the old converb segment to highlight the action indicated by the verb itself: *okuyor* ‘(s)he is reading’. The first accent type (on the first syllable of the lexical verb) is quite rare and does not always indicate actionality but depending on context, also denotes pragmatic connotations, such as interest, being unable to understand or sure about something, anxiety, pleasure, displeasure, appreciation, annoyance, etc. In the course of conversation such pragmatic connotations are understood much better when indicated by suprasegmental elements such as intonation, gesture and mimic. And finally, I think the real distinction between *bakıb duru* ‘(s)he keeps looking’ and *bakıbduru* ‘(s)he looks, is looking’ should be made as “actional” and “preaspectual”, since in the case of the second type of accentuation, actional functions of the *-B dur-* postverb such as homogenization or serialization of the action are maintained (see 5.1.). Similar conclusions may also be drawn concerning *-botu(ru)*, *-byörü*, *-bgidär*, *-bgälir* and *-bvarır*, each of which display the same prosodic oppositions. Note, however, that prosodic distinctions do not break the morphotactic string on deictic preaspectuals (*-bgidär*, *-bgälir* and *-bvarır*), and the accent on the first syllable is applied just to express pragmatic connotations.

3.2. Phonological characterization

The markers have phonological variants in different places and sometimes even in the same village or town. As I have already mentioned, all of the markers go back to ‘a postverb + (y)Ur PRES’ construction and most of them are reduced even considering the cases of their long variants: *-bba:rı* (< *-B barur*), *-boturu* (< *-B oturur*), *-bduru* (< *-B turur*), *-byörü* (< *-B yörür*) and *-bvarı*: (< *-B barur*). However, the *-rX* in the final position caused the emergence of analogous forms and as a result the markers *-bbatır* (< *-B yatur*), *-bgidär* (< *-B gidär*) and *-bgälir* (< *-B gälir*) also have taken an additional narrow vowel as *-(b)batırıl-vatırı*, *-bgidäri* and *-bgäliri* in the third person conjugation.

Dropping the final *r* of the old aorist *-Ur* may have left a trace as a secondary long vowel in some places: *-bbatı:*, *-botu:*, *-bduru:*, *-byörü:*, *-bgidä:*, *-bgäli:* and *-bvarı:*. On the other hand, dropping the *r* has left a regular trace on the variants *-(X)yo:ru* and *-bba:rı*, in which the prolongation is caused by dropping the previous

syllable. The ending *-rX* in *-bba:ri*, *-bbatırı*, *-boturu*, *-bgidäri* and *-bgäliri* is generally used to mark the third person singular. The markers can also be used with other personal suffixes in certain places, e.g. *gälibba(:)rin* ~ *gälibbatırın* ~ *gälibgälirin* ‘I’m coming’. The marker *-bgäliri* may be reduced to *-bgäli:* or *-bgä:ri*.

The converb *-B*, which played a role in the process of the grammaticalization of these old actional and preaspectual forms is included in all markers, except *-(b)batı(rı)* and its cognate *-vatı(rı)*. Among the variants *-bbatı(rı)*, *-batı(rı)* and *-vatı(rı)*, the most widespread form is *-batı(rı)*. The *-rı* at the end is optional. There are also examples with *-(b)batır*.

In Tok’s corpus, for the first person singular both *-n* and *-ŋ* are attested, but I must state that I have doubts about the second variant since I see the same variant in texts collected in my hometown Nikfer, and I can confidently claim that no such variant exists. The suffix *-ŋ* is used as a reduced form of the suffix of the second person singular *-sXŋ* in the Tavas region. On the other hand, I do not totally deny the possible existence of *-ŋ* suffix for the first person singular in other places.

There is a consensus on the orthography of the pure aspectual markers, but in the case of preaspectuals there is in linguistic studies uncertainty concerning the orthography. The same author may write the same markers both adjacently and separately, and the reason is vague why such a dual orthography is adopted: *Sırile:K gä:ris* ‘we are coming having aligned (them)’ and *gäK-gä:rin* ‘I’m coming’, *ne:diB duruŋ* ‘what are you doing; what do you do?’ and *ne:läBduruŋ* ‘what are you doing; what do you do?’, *yapıB-batan* ‘(the one) which is doing’ and *yapılıbatan* ‘(the one) which is being made’ (cf. Korkmaz 1994: 60, 79, 87, 96, 99, 100); *ötüPduru:* ‘is crowing, is gabbing’, *toplePduru:* ‘is gathering’, *yatıP duru:muş* ‘was evidently lying’, *geçiniP duru:la:* ‘they get by’, *ölüP gidärin* ‘I’m dying/exhausting’, *oluP-gidä:* ‘it’s becoming’ (Tok 2002: respectively 202, 205, 210, 213, 266, 219). However, as it is applied accurately by Demir (1993), it would be better to conventionalize writing (pre)aspectual forms in one word and actional ones as separate words. This is what I will apply in this article.

The last issue to be mentioned about the orthography of the markers concerns the converb *-B* and its regressively assimilated variant *-K*. Some authors (Caferoğlu 1962: 109; Demir 1992b; 1993: 123–135) write it as *-p* and *-k* (as in *-pbatır* and *-ik gelir*) and some (Korkmaz 1994; Tok 2002) as *-P* and *-K* (as in *-Pba:* and *-K gälir*). Voiced stop consonants at the end of a syllable (as *yabdı* < *yaptı*) or at the beginning of the next syllable (as *başga* < *başka*) are a characteristic feature of Southwestern Anatolian dialects. *P* and *K* orthography is preferred to indicate this voicing. I will write the markers with *-b* (and in case of assimilation with *-g*).

3.3. Morphotactic combinations

The Denizli dialects display varieties in person marking. The suffix *-n* is used as the marker of the first person singular (*çalışibba[:rı]n* ~ *çalışıbbatı[:rı]n* ~ *çalışıbdurun* ‘I’m working’), and the suffix *-(X)z* as the marker of the first person plural

(*yebba[:rɪ]z ~ yebbatı[rɪ]z ~ yebduruz ~ yebotu[ru]z* ‘we’re eating’). For the second person singular and plural, both the original long forms *-sXɣ*, *-sXɣz* and the reduced forms *-ɣ*, *-ɣz* can be used. The long forms are, however, used more frequently: *gälibba:sıɣ* ‘you’re coming’, *debbatı:ɣ* ‘you’re saying’, *gölübbasıɣz* ‘you’re laughing’. For the third person singular, generally zero suffix is used. The long variants *-bba(:rɪ)* and *-(b)batı(rɪ)* which are close to the original forms are used much more in the third person singular: *debba: ~ debba:rɪ* ‘(s)he is saying’, *beʔlebbatı ~ beʔlebbatır(tı)* ‘(s)he is waiting’. For the third person plural, \emptyset or *-LA:* are used, e.g. *Çocuʔla: güleşibatı* ‘The children are wrestling’, *Eşkiya:la: gäzibba:la:* ‘Bandits are walking around’.

The +INTRA^{HF} markers may combine with other morphemes such as *idi*, *imiş*, *ise* and *iken* converb: *okubba:(rɪ:)dı* ‘(s)he was reading’, *sö:le(b)batı(rɪ):dı* ‘(s)he was telling’, *ölübgidä:dik* ‘we were (almost) dying’, *çalışı(b)batı(rɪ):mış* ‘(s)he is/was evidently working’, *diñnebotu(ru):muş* ‘(s)he is/was evidently listening’, *keyibyörü:müş* ‘(s)he is/was evidently wearing/wears’, *böyübgäli:mış* ‘(s)he is/was evidently growing’, *uyubduru:sa* ‘if s/he is sleeping’, *dönübbba:(rɪ:)ka* ‘when turning back’, *bilibduru:ka* ‘although (s)he/they was/were aware of’, *varıbvırı:ka* ‘when (s)he was (almost) arriving’, etc.

4. Morphemes of the first group

The markers *-bba(:rɪ)* and *-(b)batı(rɪ)/-vatı(rɪ)* appear as pure aspectual markers. Both of them are extensively used in Denizli dialects but by contrast with Muğla dialects, the marker *-bba(:rɪ)* is used much more frequently than the other. Especially in central places such as Tavas, Kızılcabölük and Nikfer, *-bba(:rɪ)* is unique without competition with *-(b)batı(rɪ)*. I have observed that the *-vatı(rɪ)* variant of *-(b)batı(rɪ)* is regular in the villages Yorga and Horasanlı in Tavas district.

These two markers are used to indicate high-focal intraterminality, “focusing on the core of nunc” and “suggesting narrow presentness” (cf. Johanson 2000: 87). Having this property, they can never be used to indicate future events and they do not have any function in the domain of modality. On the other hand, as I mentioned earlier, there are also rare usages of these markers displaying further grammaticalization and implying defocalization (Johanson 2000: 39). Thus, the markers may also be utilized to express relatively expanded presentness or present perfect situations.

The markers *-bba(:rɪ)* and *-(b)batı(rɪ)* are used almost everywhere as monomorphs, and they do not obey Turkic palatal harmony: *gälibba(:rɪ)* and *gäli(b)batı(rɪ)/gälivati(rɪ)*. However, in only one village, namely Ovacık (in the Tavas district), the suffix *-bba(:rɪ)* has two allomorphs that match Turkish palatal harmony: *-bba(:rɪ)* and *-bbä(:rɪ)*. In Bacanlı 2007 (7–8), I represented *-bbä(:rɪ)* as a distinct morpheme considering the example *çibbäz* from my own data; however, subsequently it became obvious that this suffix has two allomorphs in that village as in *gonuşubbaz* ‘we are talking’ and *çibbäz* ‘we are drinking’.

In high-focal intraterminal usages of the markers, action types are nontransformatives, such as temporary states (*be enough, be aware of*), activities (*go, speak, sing, work*) and semelfactives (*throw, sneeze, hit*); finittransformatives such as accomplishments (*marry, give, come*) and achievements (*arrive, culminate*) and Turkish initiottransformatives (*yat- 'lie down + lie', otur- 'sit down + sit', etc.*). The markers are really incompatible with permanent stative verbs such as *believe, like, etc.* But when they combine with such verbs, the expected meaning is 'to enter into a state': *inanıbbā* '(oh,) s/he is coming to believe/trust', *beğenibba* 'is growing fond of smb/smith'. Examples for +INTRA^{HF} usage:

- (1) *Yörük beyiñ gızı varıdı, gälin edibba:la:*
Yörük squire:GEN daughter:3SG.POSS existing:PAST bride make:BBA:3PL
'Yörük squire had a daughter, they are (now) marrying (her).' (Tok 2002: 455)
- (2) *Säs yetmebba:*
voice be enough:NEG:BBA
'(My) voice is not (being) enough (now) [It's difficult for me to speak now].' (Tok 2002: 293)
- (3) *Nedän ö:lü debbatırın biliyo: muñ?*
Why so say:BATI:1SG know:YOR Q:2SG
'Do you know why I'm saying so?' (Tok 2002: 230)
- (4) *Uykude:dim bän, accıg kafam anormäl çalışıbatı.*
sleep:LOC:COP.PAST:1SG I somewhat head:1SG.POSS anormally work:BATI
'I was (just) asleep (and so now) my head is working anormally.' (Tok 2002: 280)

The markers are also used to indicate low-focal intraterminality, which represents wider presentness and pluri-occasional events:

- (5) *Eşkıya:la: da:da gäzibba:la:mıñ.*
bandit:PL mountain:LOC walk aroun:BBA:3PL:EVID.COP
'Bandits are said to be walking on the mountains (nowadays).' (Tok 2002: 419)
- (6) *Bunna: da oku:ybatır.*
those CONJ study:BATI
'And those children are receiving education.' (Korkmaz 1994: 231)
- (7) *Härkäs añneşi añneşi düyün edibatı, ävlänibatı.*
everybody in agreement wedding make:BATI get married:BATI
'Everybody arranges weddings and gets married in agreement (at present as a convention). (Tok 2002: 256)
- (8) *İnegli olanna: da südsüz galıbatı.*
cow:ADJ be:PART:PL CONJ milk:without stay:BATI
'Even ones who have cows lack milk.' (Tok 2002: 274)

The markers may be used to express present perfect situations for a limited time span:

- (9) “İki üç gündür hizmet edibban” demiş.
 several day:DIR serve:BBA:1SG say:EVID
 ‘(Reportedly) he said: “I’ve been serving for several days”.’ (Tok 2002: 206)

5. Morphemes of the second group

Within this group I will examine six morphemes, *-bduru*, *-botu(ru)*, *-byörü*, *-bgidär*, *-bgälir*, *-bvarır*. All of these markers can be accented in two different ways as I have already mentioned (see 3.1.). I will describe this for each marker under the relevant subtitles.

5.1. *-bduru*, *-botu(ru)* and *-byörü* markers

These three markers have been grammaticalized from the verbs *dur-* ‘stand’, *otur-* ‘sit’, and *yörü-* ‘walk’, and are employed in several Turkic languages. Without doubt, the marker *-bduru* is the most extensively used preaspectual marker both in Denizli and in all the Southwestern Anatolian dialects. The similar marker *-botu(ru)* is rarer and is not common in every town and village. For example, it is not used in places (namely Tavas, Nikfer, Ovacık), where *-bba(:rı)* is used without competition by *-(b)batı(rı)*. But it is generally a familiar marker in places where *-(b)batı(rı)* is used dominantly. As far as I know with regard to my own data obtained during my field searches, and considering the explanations and examples in N. Demir’s (1993: 130–132) and in Tok’s theses (2002), it has clear actional meanings which are reminiscent of and replace the form *-bduru*. Considering the contexts, an implication of the lexical meaning ‘to sit’ may be sensed in some predications with *-botu(ru)*. The third marker *-byörü* is a quite rare morpheme although it is commonly used almost everywhere in Southwestern Anatolia. It is the least grammaticalized marker and its use is limited to some verbs. For example, I have seen just one preaspectual example in Tok’s corpus (300 pages) from the southern Denizli region.

In the use of the markers, if the accent is located on the first syllable of the word form, both actional semantics and pragmatic connotations may be observed. Close examination of the examples reveals that actional meaning (in the sense of ‘to keep doing’) is directly interconnected with agency, since the “to keep (on) V-ing” pattern requires a dynamic action (such as *eat, drink, run, come, paint the wall*, etc.) or a temporary state (such as *wait, sit, stand*, etc.) performed by an agent. Regardless of such examples as *It kept raining*, continuative actionality is incompatible with non-agent subjects. Furthermore, pluri-occasional events reflecting low-focal intraterminality (+INTRA^{LF}) and/or nonfocal intraterminality (+INTRA^{NF}) are also incompatible with “to keep doing” pattern. Therefore, in such combinations the first syllable is accentuated for pragmatic purposes. When the first syllable of the lexical verb is accented in combinations with *-b duru*, *-b otu(ru)*, *-b yörü* both actional meanings

and pragmatic connotations may coexist in some predications, while in some others one of them may appear exclusively.

Hereinafter, I will examine which meanings are conveyed by *-bduru*, *-botu(ru)* and *-byörü* in combinations with verbs representing different actional categories. I will also comment on semantic and pragmatic features depending on the accentuation.

5.1.1. *-bduru*, *-botu(ru)*, *-byörü* with (nondynamic and nontransformative) statives

When these markers are used with stative verbs, they indicate temporary or permanent states in the present: *beglebduru* ‘(s)he is waiting (now)’ or ‘(s)he waits (always, usually)’, *geçinibduru:la:* ‘they get along well’, *yaşebduruz* ‘we get by’, *bakıbduru* ‘(s)he cares for (someone)’, *masgıra olubduruz* ‘(we) make ourselves ridiculous’, *durubduru* ‘(s)he is (there)’, *duruboturu* ‘(s)he is (there now), lives (there)’. Permanent states may be associated with lower-focality of intraterminality (as in examples 10, 11, 12, 13) and temporary states with higher-focality of intraterminality (as in 14, 15). Examples:

- (10) *Masgıra olubduru:z.*
make oneself ridiculous:BDURU:1PL
‘We make ourselves ridiculous.’ (Tok 2002: 412)
- (11) *Bi gün biri, bi gün biri beglebduru:la:*
one day one:3SG.POSS one day one:3SG.POSS wait:BDURU:3PL
‘They wait every day alternately.’ (Korkmaz 1994: 230)
- (12) *Dävlät humu bakıbduru.*
state that:ACC care for:BDURU
‘The state cares for him.’ (Tok 2002: 283)
- (13) *Kimi Ärsurum’da kimi Ankarı’da duruboturu.*
some Erzurum:LOC some Ankara:LOC live:BOTURU
‘Some people live (/are) in Erzurum, and some live (/are) in Ankara.’ (Tok 2002: 286)
- (14) *A:be:si de beglebduru:ymuş orla:da.*
elder brother:3SG.POSS CONJ wait:BDURU:EVID.COP there
‘Her elder brother was also waiting for her there.’ (Tok 2002: 211)
- (15) *Yumag yerdä duruboturu.*
ball of string floor:LOC be located:BOTURU
‘Ball of string is (there) on the floor.’ (Tok 2002: 260)

When the first syllable of the intraterminal verbforms is accented, except for example (14), the accent conveys not actionality but only pragmatic connotations such as “surprise, not understand, annoyance, etc.”. In example (14), where the subject is an agent and where the aspect is high-focal intraterminality, the accent on the first syllable of the lexical verb (as in *begleb duruymuş*) indicates actionality in the sense of

'he evidently kept waiting'. But pragmatic connotations may accompany the actional meaning.

5.1.2. With (dynamic and nontransformative) activities and semelfactives

The markers are generally used to indicate high-focal intraterminality but there are also usages of low-focal intraterminality: *Ne:läbduruñ* 'What do you do?', *Okubdurun* 'I'm reading', *Çalışıbdurusunuz* 'You are working', *Yebduru:muş* 'S/he was evidently eating', *Toplebduru* 'S/he is gathering', *Bıçıbduru:z* 'We (generally) reap', *A:lebduru:muş* 'S/he was evidently crying', *Bağırıbduru* 'S/he is shouting', *Dökülübduru* '(Tears) are pouring', *Ö:sürüpduru* 'S/he is coughing', *Tı?ladıbduruz* 'We are knocking', *Kıpırdag atıbduru* 'It is twitching', *Sayıboturu:dum* 'I was counting', *Abdas alıboturu* 'S/he is performing ablution', *Diñneboturu* 'S/he is listening', *Gäzibyörü* 'S/he is walking around', *Are:byörüz* 'We are seeking', *A:ladyörü* 'S/he is making (you) cry', etc. The following examples, except (19) and (20), indicate high-focal intraterminality:

- (16) *Bu gocu garı bu gada: ne ötübduru:?*
that crone thus much why gab:BDURU
'Why is this crone gabbing this much?' (Tok 2002: 202)
- (17) *Gözündän tolu gibi dökülübduru:.*
eye:3SG.POSS:ABL hail like pour from:BDURU
'(Tears) were pouring from her eyes like hail.' (2002: 304)
- (18) *Pıñnar va: akıboturu:.*
stream existing flow:BOTURU
'There is a spring (and) it is flowing.' (Tok 2002: 243)
- (19) *Bizlä: ginä älimizlä: bıçıbduru:z.*
we:PL again hand:1PL.POSS:INST reap:BDURU:1PL
'And yet we still reap with our hands.' (Tok 2002: 222)
- (20) *Kändi gülüp säni ala:dbyörü:.*
himself laugh:CONV you:ACC make cry:BYÖRÜ
'He himself smiles (but) makes you cry.' (Tok 2002: 177)
- (21) *Pusat yüyübduru:muş.*
clothes wash:BDURU:EVID.COP
'She was (evidently) washing the clothes.' (Tok 2002: 323)
- (22) *Abdas alıboturu.*
ablution take:BOTURU
'He is performing ablution.' (Tok 2002: 168)
- (23) *Emniyet dayandı, doleşıbduru.*
police come up:PRET walk around:BDURU
'Policemen came up and they are walking around.' (Tok 2002: 364)
- (24) *(Para) sayıboturu:dum, o du gä:di, ... dedi.*
(money) count:BOTURU:PAST:1SG s/he CONJ come:PRET hiatus say:PRET
'I was counting money, he came and said ...' (Tok 2002: 216)

If the first syllable of the lexical verb is accented in the above sentences, the expected meanings can be summarized as follows: in (16) in the verb phrase *ne ötüb duru* the word *ne* is necessarily accented and blocks the accent on the first syllable of *ötübduru*. If the word *ne* could be omitted, then *ötüb duru* would mean ‘keeps gabbing (annoyingly!)’. In (17) and (18) the verbs indicating nonagency such as *dökül-* ‘to pour’, *ak-* ‘to flow’ can not be accented on the first syllable. It is impossible also in (19) and (20), where a low-focal intraterminal viewpoint is observed. In (21) and (22) above, in phrasal verbs *pusat yü-* ‘to wash the clothes’, *abdas al-* ‘to perform ablution’ the accent can be located on the syllable just before the verb: *Pusat yüyüb duru:muş* ‘(Annoyingly) she evidently kept washing clothes’, *Abdas aliboturu* ‘S/he kept performing ablution’. In (23) both actional and pragmatic meanings are available: *doleşib duru* ‘(interestingly or ominously) they keep walking around’. In (24) the natural interpretation would only be actional meaning, since the subject is the first person singular: *sayıb oturu:dum* ‘I kept counting (the money)’.

5.1.3. With finitransformatives

This is the least possible combination. The markers of high focal intraterminality are seldom combined with finitransformative verbs. I am not sure whether *-botu(ru)* can be used with finitransformatives or not. The markers *-bduru* and *-byörü* are very rarely used with them. With such verbs *-bduru* always indicates the serial occurrences of the action pluri-occasionally: *gälibduru* ‘(s)he often comes’, *hastalanıbduru* ‘s/he often gets ill’, etc. These word forms completely correspond to standard Turkish *gelip duruyor* and *hastalanıp duruyor*. The marker *-byörü* can theoretically be used with finitransformatives, and the expected result is the same as in the case of *-bduru*. Thus, the use of *-bduru* and *-byörü* (and perhaps *-boturu*) with finitransformatives make them equivalent of *-p duruyor* in standard Turkish. With some finitransformatives they cannot be used if the subject is not plural. Thus, one may say *ölübdurula*: ‘they die, they are dying’, but not **o ölübduru* ‘he often dies’. This is the main difference between the pure aspectual forms which express one single occasion as in *gälibba*: or *gäli(b)batı* ‘is coming’, *ölübbba*: or *ölü(b)batı* ‘is dying’, etc. I observed in Tok’s corpus combinations such as *gabı:l edıbduru* ‘always approves’, *yollebduru:z* ‘we always send’, *çıkıbduru* ‘(trees in the forest) consistently emerge’, *duyubdurusındur* ‘you maybe (sometimes) hear (his name)’. Examples:

- (25) *Cena:b Allahım gabı:l edıbduru:, yollebduru:z*
 almighty Allah:1SG.POSS approve:BDURU send:BDURU:1PL
beş vakıt namazımızdan.
 five time praying:1PL.POSS:ABL
 ‘Almighty Allah always approves (and) we always send him our five times (daily) prayers.’ (Tok 2002: 220)

- (26) (*Ormanda ağeşlär yerin*) *altından* *çıkıbduru:*.
 (fores:LOC tree:PL ground:GEN) under:3SG.POSS:ABL exit:BDURU
 ‘(The trees in the forest) consistently emerge from the ground.’ (Tok 2002: 260)
- (27) *İsmi* *duyubdurusuñdur* *beliki*.
 name:3SG.POSS:ACC hear:BDURU:2SG:EPIS.COP maybe
 ‘Maybe you (sometimes) hear his name.’ (Tok 2002: 267)

The translation equivalents are available in the case of both types of accents. Then what is the difference between *gabul edib duru* and *gabul edibduru*? The accent on the first syllable indicates glorification, gratitude. In (26) the aspect is low focal intraterminality and the first syllable is accented; the actional meaning is blocked whereas pragmatic connotations may be observed such as admiration, finding it interesting, etc. Although the verb in (27) is low-focal intraterminal, the accent on the first syllable can imply a continuative, serial meaning in an interrogative sense: *duyubdurusuñdur*? ‘Maybe you hear (serially, continuatively)’.

5.1.4. With initiotransformatives

Initiotransformatives are another touchstone to understand the preaspectual character of these morphemes. The markers regularly specify the second phase of the actions denoted by initiotransformative verbs. Thus, they do not only indicate the present tense but also highlight the second (course or static) phase: *görüñbduru* ‘is seen, is on view’ (not ‘being caught sight of’ or ‘coming into appearance’), *bakıbdurusuñuz* ‘you look, are looking’ (not ‘glancing’), *olubduru* ‘is’ (not ‘becoming’), *diñelibdurun* ‘I stand, am standing’ (not ‘standing up’), *uyu:bduru(:)la*: ‘they are asleep’ (not ‘falling asleep’), *benzebduru(:)suñ* ‘you resemble’ (not ‘coming to resemble’), *añnebduruz* ‘we understand’ (not ‘coming to understand’), *yatıboturula*: ‘they’re lying’ (not ‘lying down’), *tasılaboturu* ‘he worries’ (not ‘getting worried’), *keyibyörü* ‘wears, is wearing’ (not ‘putting on’), *minibyörü* ‘rides’ (not ‘mounts’ or ‘is mounting’), etc. The second phase may appear as unioccasional and temporal (as ‘to be standing/lying/sitting’, etc.), may be extended to a broader time span (as ‘to be’, ‘to know’, etc.), or a (frozen) permanent state (as an action of an image or a sculpture): Examples:

- (28) *Cenab Allah onu daş yabmiş. Atıñ üsdünde, çocuğ*
 almighty Allah s/he:ACC stone make:EVID.PAST horse:GEN on child
üzerinde bö:le atıñ yeläsini dutubduru.
 on:3SG.POSS:LOC so horse:GEN mane:3SG.POSS:ACC hold:BDURU
 ‘The Almighty Allah turned her into stone. Mounted on the horse, with her child on her back, she is holding the mane of the horse, like this.’ (Tok 2002: 325)
- (29) *Hö:lü bakıbduru kurd.* (Tok 2002: 338)
 so look:BDURU wolf
 ‘The wolf stares, just like this [The speaker is referring to a wolf image on a banknote].’

- (30) *Düyün olubduru.*
wedding be on:BDURU
'There is a wedding (now).' (Tok 2002: 328)
- (31) *Köro:lu bakıbduru dürbünñ.*
Köroğlu look:BDURU binoculars:INST
'Köroğlu is looking through binoculars.' (Tok 2002: 202)
- (32) *Ba?mışla: Hacı Şa:ban Dayı ocak başında oturubduru.*
look:EVID.PAST:3PL Uncle Hacı Şaban fireplace nearby sit:BDURU
'They glanced and saw that Uncle Hacı Şaban is sitting nearby the fireplace.' (Tok 2002: 190)
- (33) *Bir ayı varımış, yatıbduru:muş.*
a bear existing:EVID.COP lie:BDURU:EVID.COP
'There was obviously a bear and he was (as they saw) lying (there).' (Tok 2002: 210)
- (34) *Horda yatıbotu:dum biri bññä ünnädi.*
there lie:BOTURU:PAST.COP:1SG someone me call:PRET
'I was lying there and someone called me.' (Tok 2002: 218)
- (35) *Ulviye bilibduru.*
Ulviye know:BDURU
'Ulviye knows.' (Tok 2002: 273)
- (36) *Bänim adam asgärä gidiyo: deyä tasalanıboturu:dum*
my man army:DAT go:YOR thinking worry:BOTURU:PAST.COP:1SG
bän, äbäm gälive:di.
I grandma:1SG.POSS show up:PRET
'I was worrying thinking that my man is joining the army (and then) my grandma showed up.' (Tok 2002: 226)

Accenting the first syllable of the lexical verb might lead to different actional meanings and pragmatic connotations in the intraterminal predications. As I stated earlier, while both actional meanings and pragmatic connotations may coexist in some predications, in other ones, one of them may appear exclusively. In (28) and (29) where permanent states are indicated, the accent on the first syllable would indicate pragmatic connotations in the sense of "Very interesting". In (30) the subject is not an agent, but the accent on the first syllable may indicate pluri-occasional occurrence of the action in the sense of 'There are always weddings'. In (31) and (32) the word forms *bakıbduru* and *oturubduru* may express both actional and pragmatic meanings: *bakıbduru* '(still) keeps looking (I wonder why?)', *oturubduru* 'keeps sitting (annoyingly, I wonder why?)'. In (33) and (34) the contexts block the first accent, but if the contexts were available *yatıbduru:muş* would mean 'evidently s/he kept lying (I wonder why, what a laziness!)' and *yatıbduru:dum* 'I kept lying'. In (35) *bilibduru* always expresses a pragmatic connotation in the sense of 'of course s/he knows'. In (36) *tasalanıboturu:dum* would indicate 'I kept worrying, I always used to worry'. In case of the other possible combinations with initiotransformative verbs, the first accent type would indicate both or either of the actional and pragmatic meanings: *olubduru* 'always is/occurs', *görünübduru* 'it is seen (how can

you not notice!)), *diñelib duru* ‘(still) keeps standing (interestingly, annoyingly, I wonder why)’, *uyu:b durula*: ‘they (still) keep sleeping’, *beñzeb duru* ‘s/he resembles (very interestingly)’, *añneb duru* ‘of course s/he understands’, *keyib yörü* ‘keeps wearing, always wears (annoyance, displeasure, what a pity)’, *minib yörü* ‘keeps riding, always rides (pride, annoyance, displeasure)’, etc.

5.2. *-bgidär, -bgälir, -bvarır* markers

The markers of the second subgroup are *-bgälir* (or *-bgäli*: ~ *-bgäliri*), *-bgidär* (or *-bgidä*: ~ *-bgidäri*) and *-bvarır* (or *-bvarı*:). They have been grammaticalized from verbs denoting direction and deixis such as *come, go, arrive*: *-B gälir* (< *B CONV COME:AOR*), *-B gidär* (*B CONV GO:AOR*) and *-B varır* (< *B CONV GO/ARRIVE:AOR*). The verbs such as *come* and *go* are limit-oriented and they indicate a gradual development and progress in time and space. Their cognitive meanings display the basic role within the process of their grammaticalization. Although the most familiar examples of the markers demonstrated in the literature are *gidiK gidär* ‘is going’ and *gäliK gälir* ‘is coming’, the use of the markers is by no means limited to some verbs. They are typically inflected with (both fini- and initio-) transformative verbs. But the use of the markers is not merely limited to some actional classes. Among them the morpheme *-bgälir* comprising a grammaticalized verb denoting the action COME ‘to come’ as a lexical verb, always expresses real (concrete) or metaphoric (abstract) rapprochement, i.e. action directed toward the deictic center. Such morphemes are labeled as venitive or cislocative (Anderson 2004: 209–213; Mithun 2005: 456). On the other hand, the morphemes *-bgidär* and *-bvarır* comprising grammaticalized verbs denoting the action GO, always indicate real (concrete) or metaphoric (abstract) divergence, i.e. action directed away from the deictic center. Such morphemes are called andative or translocative in the same literature. Verbs such as *gäl-* ‘to come’, *yagleş-* ‘to approach, come on’, *gätir-* ‘to bring’, *doğ-* ‘to rise; be born’, *uyan-* ‘to wake up’ which are associated with movement toward the deictic center are inflected with *-bgälir*, where as the verbs such as *git-* ‘to go’, *uzagleş-* ‘to walk away’, *götür-* ‘to take away’, *bat-* ‘to set; sink’, *öl-* ‘to die’, *uyu-* ‘to fall asleep + be asleep’ which indicate a kind of removing are combined with *-bgidär* (and rarely with *-bvarır*): *doğubgäli*: ‘(the sun) is rising; (the baby, puppy) is being born’, *ölubgidä*: ‘is dying’, *batubgidä*: ‘is setting, is sinking’, etc.

Thus the crucial moment for the use of the markers is the speaker’s (or author’s) orientation point. For example, according to the speaker’s orientation point the potentially bidirectional verbs such as *göç-* ‘to move, migrate’, *uç-* ‘to fly’, *yüz-* ‘to swim’, *goş-* ‘to run’, *seyit-* ‘to run rapidly’, *yörü-* ‘to walk’, *gaç-* ‘to flee, escape’, *eme?le-* ‘to crawl’ may be combined with both *-bgälir* and *-bgidär* (and rarely *-bvarır*): *uçubgäli*: ‘is flying (hither)’ and *uçubgidä*: ~ *uçubvarı*: ‘is flying (thither)’. The verbs *gäl-* ‘to come’ and *git-* ‘to go’ are lexicalized with the verb *al-* ‘to take’ in those dialects: *alib gäl-* ‘to bring’, *alib git-* ‘to take to’. Thus, the +INTRA^{HF} aspect of these lexicalized actional phrases is irregular since they comprise ‘to come’ and ‘to

go' verbs within their structures: *alıb gâli*: ~ *alıb gâli* 'is bringing', *alıb gidä*: ~ *alıb gidä* 'is taking (away/to)'. Although there is some possibility to indicate future events in the short variant, the long variants (with *-iri* and *-ri*) regularly indicate narrow presentness.² An example:

- (37) *Gozag alıb gâlin.*
 pine cone to be bringing:1SG
 'I am bringing pine cones.' (Tok 2002: 440)

The markers may be used with all kinds of (fini- or initio-) transformative verbs that can be associated with concrete or abstract divergence and convergence. I should note that most of the transformative actions are associated with divergence and thus are used with *-bgidär*. On the other hand, the markers may also be used with non-transformative (activity and semelfactive) verbs to indicate deictic orientation or only an action on way. Since the markers do not have an actional homogenization function, they cannot be used with non-transformative stative verbs except *yaşa-* 'to live', except with dynamic meaning *yaşebgidäriz* 'we are living on (our life is going on)'. Then, I shall attempt to explain the possible meanings in combinations with different actional classes. Note that most of the predications illustrated below are based on my native competence since in the texts published by Korkmaz (1994) and Tok (2002) the markers are seldom used.

5.2.1. With (dynamic and nontransformative) activities and semelfactives

If the activity verb is a motion verb the markers indicate the direction of the action as in *yörübgidä*: 'is walking (thither)', *gaçıbgidä*: 'is running away', *uçupgidä*: 'is flying (thither)', *goşubvarı*: 'is running (thither)', *yörübgâli*: 'is walking (hither), is coming', *gaçıbgâli*: 'is running, escaping (hither)', *uçubgâli*: 'is flying (hither)', etc. An example:

- (38) *O:rdan "Nazar mı oldu acab" deyä yedıbgâlırımış.*
 there:ABL evil eye Q occur:PRET I wonder thinking lead:BGÄLİR:EVID.COP
 '(As they report) He was leading (the animal) from there (to here) by saying "I wonder if there was an evil eye or not".' (Tok 2002: 244)

If the activity verb is not a motion verb, then the markers indicate high-focal intra-terminal viewpoint of the action, but the whole predication also indicates that the action takes place on a way/route (on board, on a horse, etc.) and implies the speaker's orientation: *kitap oku:bgidä*: 'is reading a book (on the way thither)',

2 This meaning is valid for the hypotactic structure, and for the other tense-aspect meanings paratactic structure is applied: *alı: gâli*: 'brings, will bring', *alı: gidä*: 'takes to, will take to', *aldı gâldi* 'has brought', *aldı gitti* 'has taken to / took to', etc.

börek yebgidä: ‘is eating a patty (on the way thither, while going there)’, *türkü çığırbgäli*: ‘is singing a song (on the way hither, while coming here)’. In the above examples, I have written the lexical verb and postverb as one word. Although the word forms indicate that the actions are taking place on the way (while going or coming), these combinations reflect a transitional stage in the grammaticalization of the markers; the word forms should not be written in two words as for instance *kitap oku:b gidä*: ‘is reading a book and going’ or *türkü çığırib gäli*: ‘is singing a song and coming’. The same conclusions are available also for semelfactive verbs indicating single occurrences: *ö:sürübgäli*: ‘is coughing (while coming)’, *bağıribgidä*: ‘is shouting (while going)’, *tı?ladıbgidä*: ‘is knocking (while going)’, etc.

It is not appropriate to expect these preaspectual markers to be totally devoid of the ‘come’ and ‘go’ meanings, because in the next step they would be pure aspect markers the same as *-bba(:rı)* and *-(b)batı(rı)*.³ Likewise, *-bba(:rı)*, which comes from *-B barur* (CONV + GOES), also must have passed through the same grammaticalization stage. In the next example the marker *-bgidär* indicates high-focal intraterminality by metaphorical means although the corresponding actions (living and destroying) are viewed as low-focal intraterminality in real life:

- (39) *Bir yılanıdım akıbgidärin, ağıdığım yerläri*
 a snake:PAST.COP:1SG slide:BGİDÄR:1SG slide:PART:1SG.POSS place:PL:ACC
yakıbgidärin.
 burn:BGİDÄR:1SG
 ‘I was/am (like) a snake and I slide/am sliding (and going). I burn/am burning (while going) the places where I slide.’ (Tok 2002: 297)

Nontransformative transitive verbs combined with definite objects build transformative actional phrases. In this case *-bgidär* is preferred. When *-bgidär* is used with such an actional phrase, it generally does not imply a translocative meaning but rather an actional specification as in *kitabı oku:bgidä*: ‘is reading through the book (is finishing it)’, *börekleri yebgidä*: ‘is eating the patties up’, etc. On the other hand, these sentences may be used equivocally for subjects that are in progress on the way/route: ‘is reading the book (on the way)’ and ‘is reading through the book (on the way)’.

If one needs to express taxis relations hypotactically in the sense of ‘is shouting and going (or coming)’ then s/he must say *bağırib gidibba(:rı) ~ gibi(b)batı(rı)* and

3 Similar preaspectual forms are observed in other Turkic languages. For example, Kazak *söylesip oturmız*, Kirghiz *süylöşüp oturabız*, Altay *kuuçındajıp oturus* all mean ‘we are speaking (and sitting, while sitting)’ and similarly Kazak *söylesip barajırmız*, Kirghiz *süylöşüp baratabız*, Altay *kuuçındajıp braadırıs* meaning ‘we are speaking (and going, on the way, while going)’. *-p otur/otura* and *-p barajtırı/barata/braadır* in these predications are all preaspectual markers, not independent verbs.

bağırıp gâlibba(:rı) ~ gâli(b)batı(rı) or *bağırı bağırı gidibba(:rı) ~ gidi(b)batı(rı)* and *bağırı bağırı gâlibba(:rı) ~ gâli(b)batı(rı)*, which are equivalents of *bağırarak gidiyor* and *bağırarak geliyor* or *bağıra bağıra gidiyor* and *bağıra bağıra geliyor* in standard Turkish. On the other hand, actional and deictic relevance of the lexical verb, which is in converb form, and its relation with the verb in the basic segment may signal taxis relations. In that case the verb combination indicates two simultaneous actions in the frame of a taxis relation. In (40) the aspect is high-focal intraterminality and in (41) it is non-focal.

- (40) *Bek sallanb gâli:siñ ya?*
 so sightly swing:CONV come:AOR:2SG EXC
 ‘Oh, you are so sightly coming by swinging?’ (Tok 2002: 430)
- (41) *Geç gâlır bizim ilin baharı yazı,*
 late come:AOR our land:GEN spring:3.POSS summer:3.POSS
ötüşüb gâlır turnası gazı.
 chirrup:CONV come:AOR crane:3.POSS goose:3.POSS
 ‘In our land the spring and the summer come late. Cranes and geese come by chirruping.’ (Tok 2002: 171)

5.2.2. With finitransformatives

Finitransformative verbs are the most appropriate to combine with deictic preaspec-tuals. The markers indicate high-focal intraterminality, gradual progress towards limit and uni-occasional events: *bozulubgidä*: ‘is spoiling’, *zenginneşibgidä*: ‘is growing rich’, *hastılabıgidä*: ‘is getting ill’, *guru:bgidä*: ‘is drying’, etc. In such word forms, the speaker may also imply the intensification of the action in the sense of ‘more and more’. The most preferred marker is *-bgidär*, but with some verbs, the speaker may also choose *-bgâlır* for metaphorical reasons. Thus, both a young and an elderly person can say *böyübgidä*: ‘is growing’ for a child, but only an elderly person may say *böyübgâli*: ‘is growing (as I experienced, metaphorically towards me)’. Such metaphorical implications for convergence (and surely for divergence) are also possible for reversive verbs such as *hastılan-* ‘to fall ill’, *eyileş-* ‘to recover’, *fakirleş-* ‘to grow poor’, *zenginleş-* ‘to grow rich’, etc.

The markers may also highlight the direction of the action with some motion verbs as in *göçübgâli*: ‘is migrating (hither)’, *göçübgidä*: ‘is migrating (thither)’, *çıkıbgâli*: ‘is exiting/coming out (hither)’, *çıkıbgidä*: ‘is exiting/going out’, *yetişibgidä*: ‘is reaching/catching (to them, to you)’ and *yetişibgâli*: ‘is reaching/catching (to us, to me)’. The verb *var-* ‘to arrive’ is generally used with *-bvarır*: *varıbvarı(:)z* ‘we are (almost) arriving, we are about to arrive’. Some finitransformatives intrinsically indicate convergence or divergence. Thus, the verbs *öl-* ‘to die’ and *bat-* ‘to sink; set’ are compulsorily inflected with *-bgidär* whereas the verbs *doğ-* ‘to be born; rise’ and *uyan-* ‘to wake up’ are naturally inflected with *-bgâlır* as in *ölübgidä*: ‘is (in the process of) dying’, *uyanıbgâli*: ‘is (in the process of) waking up’. As N. Demir (1993: 129) states, these combinations indicate imminent future in the sense

of prospective aspect. On the other hand, gradual development of some finittransformative actions may expand to a relatively broader time span as in *yaşlanıbgidäriz* ‘we are getting older’ or *dünyamız ısınıbgidä:miş* ‘(As they report) our earth is (more and more) warming’. Examples with finittransformatives:

- (42) *Gün gidıbgidär.*
sun go away:BGİDÄR
‘The sun is setting.’ (Tok 2002: 165)
- (43) *Dayag yarasından ölübgidärin.*
beating lesion:3.POSS:ABL die:BGİDÄR:1.SG
‘I’m dying [/ am exhausted] because of the lesion from beating.’ (Tok 2002: 266)
- (44) *Dökülübgidä: ortalık.*
spill:BGİDÄR surroundings
‘The surroundings are (all) spilling/being scattered.’ (Tok 2002: 319)

The markers *-bgidär* and *-bgälir* do not always appear as preaspectuals since the verbs *git-* and *gäl-* may be used with their lexical meanings. Such usages concerning taxis relations and expressing the copredicative function of the *-B* converb may be understood from the context, prosody and the relevance of the verb with a deictic preaspectual marker. Thus, the questions coming from familiar people such as *Nerdän gälıbgäli:sıñ* ‘Where are you coming from (now)?’ or *Nere: gıbgıgdä:sıñ* ‘Where are you going to?’ are usually replied to by means of sentences like the following: *Bubamgile yemeg bıñıriveb gälirin* ‘I have cooked some food for my parents, I’m coming’, *Ocak suleb gidärin* ‘I have irrigated (our) plantation, I’m going’ (see Bacanlı 2007: 13–14). Such usages are very similar to those used in standard Turkish *-miş gidiyor* or *-miş geliyor*. An example from Tok (2002: 368):

- (45) *Tası çalıb gidä:lä: hera:lda.*
Bowl:ACC steel:CONV go:AOR:3PL presumably
‘Presumably, having stolen the (golden) bowl, they are going.’

5.2.3. With initiottransformatives

Initiottransformatives are another crucial verb class we can use to illustrate the preaspectual character of the deictic markers. Unlike pure aspectuals which may freely indicate both phases and in contrast to nontransformative preaspectuals which only highlight the second phase, the deictic preaspectual markers highlight only the initial phase as an inchoative phase in progress towards the limit. Again, *-bgidär* is the most preferred marker in combination with initiottransformative verbs, but to indicate real or metaphorical rapprochements *-bgälir* may also be utilized: *olubgidä:* ‘is becoming’, *hasta olubgidä:* ‘is falling ill’, *beñzebgidä:* ‘is coming to resemble’, *üzülübgidä:* ‘is getting bored’, *tasılanıbgidä:* ‘is getting worried’, *uyubgidä:* ‘is falling asleep’, *saklanıbgidä:* ‘is putting himself out of sight’, *diñalıbgäli:* ‘is standing up (towards me)’, *görünübgäli:* ‘is getting seen’, etc.

The deictic meanings of the markers may be relevant with some initiotransformative verbs. For instance, the word form *uyu:bgidä:* normally means ‘is falling asleep’, but it (and according to the orientation point also *uyu:bgäli:*) may also be used when the subject is asleep while sitting in an approaching car.

Examples with initiotransformatives:

- (46) *A:şam namazı olubgidä:*
Evening worship become:BGİDÄR
‘It’s becoming the time of evening worship.’ (Tok 2002: 219)
- (47) *Bän misefirsiz üzülbügidärin.*
I guest:without get bored:BGİDÄR:1SG
‘Without guests I’m getting (more and more) bored.’ (Tok 2002: 246)

6. Participial forms

Some intraterminal markers also have participial forms. In almost every village and town *-(b)batan/-vatan* (very rarely *-batın*) and *-(b)baddık/-vaddık* are used as intraterminal participles without a temporal reference. Thus, although in central places *-bba(:rı)* is used without competition with *-(b)batı(rı)*, but its participial forms are not *-bbaran* or *-bbardık* but rather *-(b)batan* and *-(b)baddık* which, in their turn, reflect a suppletive relationship. *Gäli(b)batan/gälivatan adam* ‘the man, which is/was coming’, *çalış(b)baddı:mız / çalışıvaddı:mız yer* ‘the place, where we are/were working’, etc. These participial forms can indicate higher or lower degree of focality. Here are some examples from the literature: *äväli düyünnä:dä çalib-batan* ‘the one who used to play in weddings’, *şu bakıbbaddı:ñ vatandaş* ‘that citizen whom you’re looking at’, *içibati:mız sula:* ‘the water which we used to drink’, *säni alıbatan, pusad görübatan* ‘the one who is getting married with you and who is buying clothes (for wedding)’, *sorubati:ñız (şey)* ‘(the thing) that you are asking’, *hazır yeyibatınla:* ‘the ones who eat without toil’, *davar güdübatın gız* ‘the girl which is shepherding cattle’, *oynı:batan çocukla:* ‘the children which are playing’, *Bohçu kö: denibatın ye:r* ‘the place which is called Bohçu village’, *Gızlan de:baddı:mız yer* ‘the place which we call Gızlan’, *iliyanı bilibatanna: olu:du* ‘there were people who knew how to play dolly tub’ (Tok 2002: 199, 201, 225, 230, 263, 265, 266, 276, 277, 446). Although the participles *-(b)batan* and *-(b)baddık* are generally used in almost the entire region, one may very rarely come across *-ban* or *-baran* forms too. The source of the first form, however, is not transparent since it may be a reduced form of both *-(b)batan* and *-(b)baran*. In Korkmaz’s texts, there is a relative clause *satılıbban gız* ‘the girl which was being married’ (1994: 65). I have heard in Bahçe village a relative clause such as *gidıbaran motor*, which means ‘the agrimotor which is/was going’, and interestingly in that village *-(b)batı(rı)* is used without competition with *-bba(:rı)*.

Apart from these pure aspectual forms there are also preaspectual participial forms with *-bdur-*, *-bgid-* and *-bgäl-* bases. But their aspectual, actional and taxis values totally depend on the context. Here are some examples expressing intratermi-

nality from Tok's texts: *masilare oturubduranna*: 'the ones who sit around the tables', *yatıbduran neyi* 'what is that lying (there)', *bu gidibgidän gadın* 'that woman who is going (now)' (2002: 202, 242, 372).

7. High-focal postterminal usages of *-bduru* and *-botu(ru)*

With a limited number of verbs the postverbal form *-b dur-* and its aspectual form *-bduru* indicate high-focal postterminality, i.e. stative and resultative. I have mentioned this issue in Bacanlı (2014: 208) and dealt with it in Bacanlı (2010: 122–129). Most of the verbs in combinations with *-b dur-* are object-oriented passives such as *açıl-* 'to be opened', *büzül-* 'to be constricted', *çevril-* 'to be surrounded', *dıkan-* 'to be stuffed', *eğil-* 'to be inclined', *kapan-* 'to be closed', *örtül-* 'to be covered', *seril-* 'to be spread over', *sırılan- ~ dizil-* 'to be aligned', *yaman-* 'to be patched up', *yazıl-* 'to be written', etc. The other verbs are non-passive intransitives such as *yapış-* 'to be adhered', *sark-* 'to dangle', *şiş-* 'to swell', *kalk-* 'to be erected, be raised', *gızar-* 'to blush, be colored up', *garar-* 'to louse; get dark', *yeşer-* 'to turn green', etc. Most of the given verbs may combine with regular stative suffixes in standard Turkish as *aç-ık* 'is open(ed)', *eğ-ik* 'is inclined' *ser-ili* 'is stretched out on', *yay-ılı* 'is spread out' *ger-ili* 'is strained', *ört-ülü* 'is covered', *kalk-ık* 'is erected', *kızar-ık* 'is colored up', etc. Such stative adjectives are examined in Erdal 2000. Thus, in Denizli dialects predications such as *yazılıbduru* 'is written', *şişibduru* 'is swollen', *kapanıbduru* 'is closed' indicate stativity as a type of high-focal postterminality. On the other hand, prosodic equivocality is also observed in this usage. The postterminal meaning is always available when the accent is on the last syllable: *açılıbduru* 'is open(ed)'. But if the accent is on the first syllable then the meaning of the predication may also change to aspecto-actional, namely serialization of the action in present: *açılıb duru* 'is being opened repeatedly, serially'. Needless to say, aforementioned pragmatic connotations may also be attached to this aspecto-actional meaning. On the other hand, accent on the first syllable may also indicate high-focal postterminality with pragmatic connotations. Thus, there is no clear-cut distinction between postterminal and aspecto-actional usages.

+POST^{HF} meaning is available in actional phrases such as *açılıbdurmak* 'to be in the state of having opened', *örtülübdurmak* 'to be in the state of having covered', etc. This function of the postverb *-B Tur-* is not observed only in Denizli dialects. As reported in Bacanlı (2010: 126–128), the same meaning with the same or similar verbs is also attested in Turkmen, Kazakh and Kirghiz. Since this usage is purely aspectual, the actional phrases in Turkic languages are not lexicalized and therefore not mentioned in their dictionaries.

- (48) *Bänim pe:nirim ma: islamboturu.*
 my cheese:1SG.POSS exist be soaked:BOTURU
 'I have cheese, it's soaked (it steeps).' (Korkmaz 1994: 72)

- (49) *Gä:miş, köpeglä: dakılıboturu:muş.*
 come:EVID dog:PL be tied:BOTURU:EVID.COP
 'He came (and saw that) the dogs were (evidently) tied.' (Tok 2002: 245)
- (50) *Kıl çadır bälädiyänin orda gurulubduru.*
 haircloth tent municipality:GEN there be situated:BDURU
 'A haircloth tent is situated nearby the municipality.' (Tok 2002: 251)
- (51) *Bi ağeç hö:lü dikilibduru: bir ağeç şö:lü dikilibduru.*
 a tree so be planted:BDURU a tree so be planted:BDURU
 'A tree is planted like this and another tree is planted like this.' (Tok 2002: 272)
- (52) *Bi seped böbär asılıbduru.*
 a basket pepper be hung:BDURU
 'A basket of pepper hangs (here).' (Tok 2002: 328)
- (53) *Burdu du bi mekan dutulubduru:muş.*
 here CONJ a residence be occupied:BDURU:EVID.COP
 '(As they report) here also a residence was occupied.' (Tok 2002: 334)
- (54) *Ävlä:miz kärpişdän. Dört dänä a:ʔlı üslü,*
 house:PL:1PL.POSS mud brick:ABL four piece two-piece
üçü de bö:le yazılıboturu.
 three CONJ so be spread:BOTURU
 'Our houses are made of mud brick. Four of them are (constructed) in two-piece and three are outspread.' (Tok 2002: 383)
- (55) *Oreyi ö:lä çävrilibduru.*
 that place so be surrounded:BDURU
 'That place is surrounded like this.' (Tok 2002: 409)
- (56) *Här şe: sarılıbduru ayının (yüzünä).*
 everything be wrapped bear:GEN face:3SG.POSS:DAT
 'The face of the bear was wrapped with everything.' (Tok 2002: 357)

High-focal postterminal markers do not appear only as stative, but with some finitransformative verbs they also denote a resultative meaning. The following examples demonstrate the combination of the markers with metaphorically finitransformatives derived from initiotransformatives such as *ol-* 'to become + be > (metaphorically) 'to be prepared', *yat-* 'to lie down + lie > (metaphorically) 'to be laid' and with real finitransformatives such as *buluş-* 'to meet, come together' and *gon-* 'to be put on, to settle'; they can only be interpreted as resultative:

- (57) *Yata:η oluboturu, soğuʔlugdu yatoturu.*
 mattress:2SG.POSS be prepared:BOTURU terrace:LOC be laid on:BOTURU
 'Your mattress is prepared (/is situated) and laid on the terrace.' (Korkmaz 1994: 72)
- (58) *Bagmışımış orda buluşubduru:lar, gonusma yapıyo:lar.*
 look at:EVID:EVID.COP there meet:BDURU:3PL speech make:YOR:3PL
 'He looked at (and saw that) they have met there and are making a speech.' (Tok 2002: 349)

- (59) *Da: yurgu da gonubduru.*
 yonder yurgu stone CONJ be put on:BDURU
 ‘The yurgu stone⁴ is put (/is situated) over yonder.’ (Tok 2002: 403)

The following sentence is found in Tok’s corpus (2002: 403) *Bağla guruyıboturula:* (vineyard:PL fade:BOTURU:3PL). It is very difficult to interpret this sentence unerringly. It might be interpreted as postterminal (in the sense of ‘the vineyards have faded’) since the verb is finitransformative. However, an intraterminal interpretation (as ‘the vineyards are fading’) is also possible since the subject is plural (see 5.1.3).

Interestingly, I have found a word form in *-lyor* where a +POST^{HF} (stative) meaning is observed with a finitransformative verb: *Daşla: va: bö:le sırlanıyo: dedeniñ mezeri içindä* (Tok 2002: 406) ‘There are stones (and they) are aligned so in the tomb of the saint’. This usage of *-lyor* may be a result of analogy with *-bduru* and *-boturu*, which indicate intraterminality but with some verbs (as *sıralan-* or *dizil-* ‘be alined’) denote postterminality.

Another word form where a semi-lexicalization is observed is *dolubduru* and *dolubotu(ru)* ‘full of, a lot of’. The verb *tol-* / *dol-* ‘to be filled’ is a finitransformative, and in most of the Turkic languages there is a word such as *tolu ~ dolu* which means ‘full, full of, a lot of, there are too many’. Thus, *dolubduru* and *dolubotu(ru)* are regional variants of *tolu ~ dolu*. An example: *Çuvalla: un dolubduru* (Tok 2002: 363) ‘Sacks are full with flour’.

Conclusions

In Denizli dialects there are eleven intraterminal markers, three of which also exist in standard Turkish. Eight regional morphemes stand out by virtue of their high-focal intraterminal features. These regional markers are divided into two groups among themselves as (pure) aspectuals and preaspectuals. The preaspectual markers may appear as more or less aspectual, demonstrate deictic features and, with regard to prosodic distinctions, may indicate different semantic meanings and pragmatic connotations. All markers are actually used in most of the places although one or two of them are practically absent in certain places. Dialects in Denizli have a relatively complex and colorful inventory of intraterminal markers reflecting focality oppositions, prosodic distinctions, dependence on aspect-sensitive actional categories, and deictic and contextual circumstances. Finally, the markers *-bduru* and *-boturu*, which denote preaspectual meanings, may in certain cases express postterminal meanings such as stative and resultative.

4 *Yurgu stone* is a tool made of stone that was used like a cylinder to press the stuff made of clay on the roof.

References

- Akar, Ali 2001. Muğla ve yöresi ağızlarında şimdiki zaman biçimleri. *M.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Bahar 2001, 1–10.
- Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2004. *Auxiliary verb constructions in Altay-Sayan Turkic* (Turcologica 51.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Bacanlı, Eyüp 2007. Aspekt, kılınış ve taksis çerçevesinde Tavas ağızlarındaki şimdiki zaman işaretleyicilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Erdem* 16/48, 1–19.
- Bacanlı, Eyüp 2014. *Kılınış kategorisi ve Altaycada kılınış belirleyicisi olarak art fiiller*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Bacanlı, Eyüp 2010. *-(X)p tur-(dur-)* art fiilinin durağanlaştırma işlevi. *Turkish Studies* 5/4, 119–132.
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Ebert, Karen H. & de Groot, Casper 2000. The progressive in Europe. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 517–558.
- Brendemoen, Bernt. 1997. Turkish dialects. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 236–241.
- Bybee, Joan L. & Dahl, Östen 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13/1, 51–103.
- Bybee, Joan L. & Perkins, Revere & Pagliuca, William 1994. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Caferoğlu, Ahmet 1962. Muğla ağızı. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı—Belleten* 1962, 107–130.
- Demir, İmdat 2010. Güney-Batı Anadolu ağızlarındaki şimdiki zaman işaretleyicisi *{-(P)Batı(ru)}* ve çağdaş Türk lehçeleriyle karşılaştırılması. *Uluslararası Türk Dilinin ve Edebiyatının Yayılma Alanları Bilgi Şöleni (7–9 Ekim 2010)*. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi & Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Demir, Nurettin 1992a. Zur Verwendung der Hilfsverbverbindung *-ip dur-* in einem anatolischen Dialekt. In: Bethlenfalvy, Géza et al. (eds.) *Altaic religious beliefs and practices. Proceedings of The 33rd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*. Budapest, June 24–29 1990. Budapest. 89–95.
- Demir, Nurettin 1992b. Güneybatı Anadolu ağızlarında kullanılan şimdiki zaman eki *-ik gelir*. *Uluslar arası Türk Dili Kongresi–1992*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. 43–56.
- Demir, Nurettin 1993. *Postverbien im Türkeitürkischen: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung eines südanatolischen Dorfdialekts*. [Turcologica 17.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Demir, Nurettin 1994a. Birleşik fiiller ve vurgu: *-iver-* şeklinin görevlerini tespit etme vurgunun rolü. *TDAY Belleten* 1994, 83–94.
- Demir, Nurettin 1994b. Angaben zum Präsens im *Derleme Sözlüğü*. *Journal of Turcology* 1, 203–212.
- Demir, Nurettin 2000. *Derleme Sözlüğü*'nde şimdiki zamanla ilgili veriler. *İlmi Araştırmalar* 10, 19–27.
- Erdal, Marcel 2000. *Açık and kapalı: the Turkish resultative deverbal adjective*. *Turkic Languages* 4, 22–30.
- Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen: Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*. [Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1.] Uppsala: Almqvist-Wiksell.
- Johanson, Lars 1996. Terminality operators and their hierarchical status. In: Devriendt, Betty & Goossens, Lois & van der Auwera, Johan (eds.) *Complex structures: A functionalist*

perspective (Functional Grammar Series 17.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 229–258.

- Johanson, Lars 1999. Typological notes on aspect and actionality in Kipchak Turkic. In: Abraham, Werner & Kulikov, Leonid (eds.) *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 185–206.
- Johanson, Lars 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 27–187.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep 1994². *Güney-Batı Anadolu ağızları—ses bilgisi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Mithun, Marianne 2005. Beyond the core: typological variation in the identification of participants. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 71, 445–472.
- Özışık, Sevi 2007. Muğla İli ağızlarının Türkmen Türkçesi ağızlarıyla karşılaştırılması. [PhD Dissertation] İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Squartini, Mario 1998. *Verbal periphrases in Romance. Aspect, actionality and grammaticalization*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tok, Turgut 2002. *Denizli İli Güney ve Güneybatı bölgesi ağızları*. [PhD Dissertation] Denizli: Pamukkale University.

Abbreviations

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|--------------------|-------|------------------|
| ABL | ablative | BOTURU | high-focal | INTRA | intraterminality |
| ACL | accusative | | intraterminal | LOC | locative |
| ADJ | adjective | BYÖRÜ | high-focal | NEG | negation |
| AOR | aorist | | intraterminal | PART | participle |
| BATI | high-focal | CONJ | conjunctive | PAST | past |
| | intraterminal | CONV | converb | PL | plural |
| BBA | high-focal | COP | copula | POSS | possessive |
| | intraterminal | DAT | dative | POST | postterminal |
| BDURU | high-focal | DIR | copula in temporal | PRES | present |
| | intraterminal | | expression | PRET | preterit |
| BGÄLİR | high-focal | EPIS | epistemic | Q | question |
| | intraterminal | EVID | evidential | SG | singular |
| BGİDÂR | high-focal | EXC | exclamation | YOR | low-focal |
| | intraterminal | GEN | genitive | | intraterminal |
| | | INST | instrumental | | |