

## Werk

**Titel:** Predicational and sentential positions of interrogative clitics in Turkic

**Autor:** Karakoç, Birsal

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2015

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0019](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0019)|LOG\_0015

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

# Predicational and sentential positions of interrogative clitics in Turkic

**Birsel Karakoç**

Karakoç, Birsel 2015. Predicational and sentential positions of interrogative clitics in Turkic. *Turkic Languages* 19, 85–101.

The present paper surveys predicational and sentential positions of the interrogative particles (Q-clitics) in various modern Turkic languages. In nominal predicates, the following patterns have been found: (1) the medial position, where the Q-clitic precedes the enclitic person-number markers or copular markers; (2) the final position, where the Q-clitic follows the person-number markers or copular markers. Regarding sentential positions, the patterns that have been found are as follows: (1) the interrogative clitic can freely move around the sentence, and attach to the focused constituent; (2) the clitic has a fixed position after the predicate. In each case, the second pattern appears to be typical in Central Asian Turkic languages. It will be shown that in such languages, rather than being marked by the Q-clitic, the focused constituent is just brought to pre-predicative position with accompanying suprasegmental features. A further pattern found in interrogative clauses is characterized by absence of a morphosyntactic element. Interrogation realized without a Q-clitic and just by distinctive interrogative intonation is a contact-induced phenomenon in Turkic.

*Birsel Karakoç, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Box 635, SE-75126 Uppsala, Sweden. E-mail: birsel.karakoc@lingfil.uu.se*

## 1. Introduction

In almost all older and contemporary Turkic languages, the means for signaling a polar question is the use of an interrogative particle (henceforth Q-clitic). Polar questions, which are also called *yes-no* questions, are defined as those questions “to which the expected answer is the equivalent of ‘yes’ or ‘no’” (Dryer 2013: 470). The present paper<sup>1</sup> aims to give a brief overview of predicational and sentential positions of the Q-clitics in various Turkic languages. The same clitics can also be used in

- 1 This paper is a slightly revised version of a talk given at *The 17th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, Université de Rouen (Rouen, France), 3–5 September, 2014. Thanks go to Beste Kamali, who organized the panel “Interrogatives in varieties of Turkic”, and to other participants at the conference. I am especially grateful to Ak Welsapar, Astrid Menz, Aygül Alakbarova, Aynur Abish, Esmat Esmaeili, Kemal Güler, Kenjagul Kalieva and Rizwangul Kurban, who kindly discussed various examples presented in this paper.

echo or tag questions, as well as in non-interrogative contexts, such as in temporal clauses. These kinds of usages are not dealt with in this paper. Other morphological elements that occur with modal functions in interrogative clauses are not discussed either.

The languages investigated belong to the Oghuz (Southwest), Kipchak (Northwest) or Karluk (Southeast) branches of Turkic languages. The situation in older Turkic varieties and in non-standard dialects will not be taken into account. Turkish examples are given in the standard orthography, while examples from other Turkic languages are rendered in a Turcological transcription.

## 2. Morphophonological shapes of the Q-clitic

In East Old Turkic, the Q-clitic *mU* is likely to have had front and back phonological realizations (see Erdal 2004: 349). The cognates have different morphophonological shapes, and are subject to different orthographic conventions in modern languages. The following are a few examples. (1) The Turkish form *mI*, which displays fourfold allomorphy depending on the phonological quality of the preceding word, *mI*, *mi mu*, *mü*, is written separately, e.g. *Kız mı?*, *Çiçek mi?*, *Su mu?*, *Söz mü?*. The Azeri form *-mİ<sup>2</sup>* (*-mİ*, *-mi*, *-mu*, *-mü*), however, attaches to the preceding word. (2) In Noghay, *-MA* has six allomorphs: *-ma*, *-me*, *-ba*, *-be*, *-pa*, *-pe*. It appears as *-ba* after stems ending with /z/, as *-ma* after vowels and voiced consonants (including the nasal ones), and as *-pa* after voiceless consonants, e.g. *Qızba?*, *Köppe?*, *Oquwşıñma?* (3) In Kazakh, the interrogative element *MA* is not formally connected to the preceding word: *ba* occurs after stems ending with /z/ or with nasal consonants, *ma* after stems ending with a vowel or voiced consonant, and *pa* after voiceless consonants, e.g. *Qız ba?*, *Sen be?*, *Bala ma?*, *Däpter me?*, *Kitap pa?*, *Mektep pe?* (4) The cognate *-BI* in Kirghiz appears as *-bİ*, *-bi*, *-bu* or *-bü* after voiced consonants and vowels, and as *-pİ*, *-pi*, *-pu*, *-pü* after voiceless consonants, e.g. *Qızbİ?*, *Atambİ?*, *Köppü?*, *Öydöbü?*, *Açpİ?* (5) In Karachay-Balkar, the bound suffix has four allomorphs, *-mİ*, *-mi*, *-mu*, *-mü*, e.g. *Qızmİ?*, *Menmi?*, *Žoqmı?*, *Köpmü?* (6) The Uyghur interrogative clitic is uniformly *-mu*, e.g. *Qızmu?*, *Mektepmu?*, *Közmü?*, *Däptermü?*

## 3. Predicational positions

The following account mainly looks at the occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates of non-past and past copular clauses. The situation in verbal predicates, except for those based on the past marker *-DI* or the conditional marker *-sA*, is also briefly commented upon, but is not dealt with systematically. Verbal predicates based on past or conditional markers take person-number endings of possessive origin and, as is well known, the interrogative element typically appears after these endings.

- 2 A hyphen before the Q-clitic indicates that, in the standard orthography of the given language, the clitic is treated as a bound morpheme.

Regarding the position of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates, the following two patterns have been found: (1) the medial position, where the Q-clitic takes an interior position by following a non-verb (noun, adjective, etc.) and preceding the enclitic person-number markers (PN) or the past copular marker (PCOP), e.g. Turkish *Öğretmen mi-sin?* [teacher-Q-2SG] ‘Are you a teacher?’, *Öğretmen mi-ydi-n?* [teacher-Q-PCOP-2SG] ‘Were you a teacher?’, and (2) the final position, where the Q-clitic follows the enclitic person-number markers or the copular markers, e.g. Noghay *Oğutuwşï-siñ-ma?* [teacher-2SG-Q] ‘Are you a teacher?’, *Oğutuwşï edi-ñ-me?* [teacher-PCOP-2SG-Q] ‘Were you a teacher?’, see Table 1.

Pattern 1	Non-verb + Q + PN Non-verb + Q + PCOP + PN
Pattern 2	Non-verb + PN + Q Non-verb + PCOP + PN + Q

Table 1: Positions of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates

In Turkish nominal predicates, the Q-clitic has an interior position. The only exception is found in the third person plural of non-past copular clauses, which has a deviant order; see Table 2.

	Non-past copular clauses	Past copular clauses
1SG	<i>(Ben) öğretmen mi-yim?</i> ‘Am I a teacher?’	<i>(Ben) öğretmen mi-ydi-m?</i> ‘Was I a teacher?’
2SG	<i>(Sen) öğretmen mi-sin?</i> ‘Are you a teacher?’	<i>(Sen) öğretmen mi-ydi-n?</i> ‘Were you a teacher?’
3SG	<i>(O) öğretmen mi?</i> ‘Is (s)he a teacher?’	<i>(O) öğretmen mi-ydi?</i> ‘Was (s)he a teacher?’
1PL	<i>(Biz) öğretmen mi-yiz?</i> ‘Are we teachers?’	<i>(Biz) öğretmen mi-ydi-k?</i> ‘Were we teachers?’
2PL	<i>(Siz) öğretmen mi-siniz?</i> ‘Are you teachers?’	<i>(Siz) öğretmen mi-ydi-niz?</i> ‘Were you teachers?’
3PL	<i>(Onlar) öğretmen-ler mi?</i> ‘Are they teachers?’	<i>(Onlar) öğretmen mi-ydi-ler?</i> ‘Were they teachers?’

Table 2: Occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates in Turkish

An anonymous reviewer of the abstract version of this paper (Karakoç 2014) commented: “‘Are they teachers?’ is not an ‘exception’ at all, as stated in the abstract, if one realizes that +*lar* is a bound suffix whereas the clitical person pronouns are clitics and not suffixes”. The reviewer marks the suffix with +, a sign used for denoting a nominal suffix. This statement is quite problematic, especially with regard to the question whether *-lar* attached to *öğretmen* in the given paradigm is really a bound nominal suffix. First of all, it needs to be pointed out that there are two types of *-lar*

with different intonation patterns. The nominal plural suffix *-lar* is an accented morpheme, e.g. *öğretmenlér*, meaning ‘the teachers’. The person-number marker *-lar*, which denotes third person plural subject agreement, is not accented. As a rule, high tone and stress coincide on the syllable immediately preceding the person-number marker *-lar*, e.g. *Öğretménler* ‘They are teachers’. Compare the different accent patterns and meanings in the following examples. (1) *Gelenler kim? Öğretmenlér mi?* ‘Who are the ones coming (who have come)? Is that the teachers?’. (2) *Onlar ne iş yapıyorlar? Öğretménler mi?* ‘What is their profession? Are they teachers?’. The construction given in the conjugation in Table 2 contains the unaccented person-number marker in *-lar*. Johanson (1981) convincingly argues that there is an old distinction between these two *-lar* forms, which etymologically go back to different origins. He shows that an original enclitic element lies behind the person-number marker *-lar* and may have developed from a more complex structure containing a copular verb *är-* ‘to be’ in the aorist. Consequently, it would not be correct to attempt to explain the deviant order in the third person plural by simply arguing that *-lar* is a bound nominal suffix whereas the person-number markers for other persons are clitics. To sum up, I would like to point out that the position of the Q-clitic in the conjugation of third person plural might be worthy of further investigation.

In Turkish verbal predicates, the Q-clitic also appears in medial position except, as already mentioned, in combinations with past and conditional suffixes, e.g. *Gel-iyor mu-yum?* [come-PRES-Q-1SG], *Bil-ir mi-ydi?* [know-AOR-Q-PCOP3], *Al-acak mı-yız?* [take-PROS-Q-1PL], *Gör-müş mü-sünüz?* [see-PTER-Q-2PL].<sup>3</sup> In third person plurals, the involved morphemes again have a deviant order, e.g. *Gel-iyor-lar mı?* [come-PRES-3PL-Q], *Al-acak-lar mı?* [take-PROS-3PL-Q], *Söyle-miş-ler mi?* [say-PTER-3PL-Q].

In standard Azeri, polar questions are typically marked either by a final positioning of the clitic or just by interrogative intonation without any formal marking (see Table 3).<sup>4</sup> Verbal clauses exhibit the same characteristics, e.g. *Gel-ir-sän?* or *Gel-ir-sän-mi?* [come-PRES-2SG-Q], *Gözlä-yir-ik?* or *Gözlä-yir-ik-mi?* [wait-PRES-1PL-Q], *Yaz-ar-sünüz?* or *Yaz-ar-sünüz-mi?* [write-AOR-2PL-Q], *Yaz-ağak-sünüz?* or *Yaz-ağak-sünüz-mi?* [write-PROS-2PL-Q], etc. Note that placement of the interrogative element before the person-number and copular markers can sometimes be observed in spoken language, e.g. *Müəllim-mi-ydi-m?* [teacher-Q-PCOP-1SG], *Müəllim-mi-ydi-lär?* [teacher-Q-PCOP-3PL], etc.

3 Note that variations can be observed in some Turkish dialects, e.g. *Gel-ir-di-h mi?* ~ *Gel-ir mi-di-h?* or *Vuracağam mı?* ~ *Vuracah mıyam?* (Csató 2000).

4 The word ‘teacher’ corresponds to two different words in Azeri, which are copied from Arabic: *müəllim* ‘a male teacher’, *müəllimä* ‘a female teacher’. Table 3 only shows the conjugation of the masculine form *müəllim*. Tables 3–8 provide the conjugation of the lexeme ‘teacher’ in various languages, just as in Table 2.

As a result of long-term contact with Persian, the Q-clitic, which is characteristic of polar questions in almost all older and modern Turkic languages, has largely vanished in varieties spoken in Iran. Thus, Azeri spoken in Iran relies instead on distinctive, interrogative intonation (see Dehghani 2000: 208, Kırıl 2001: 63). Signaling polar questions just by employing suprasegmental means can be observed in some other contact varieties of Turkic too, such as Chuvash, Salar and Cypriot Turkish.

	Non-past copular clauses	Past copular clauses
1SG	(Män) müällim-äm? (Män) müällim-äm-mi?	(Män) müällim idi-m? (Män) müällim idi-m-mi?
2SG	(Sän) müällim-sän? (Sän) müällim-sän-mi?	(Sän) müällim idi-n? (Sän) müällim idi-n-mi?
3SG	(O) müällim-dir? (O) müällim-dir-mi?	(O) müällim idi? (O) müällim idi-mi?
1PL	(Biz) müällim-ik? (Biz) müällim-ik-mi?	(Biz) müällim idi-k? (Biz) müällim idi-k-mi?
2PL	(Siz) müällim-siniz? (Siz) müällim-siniz-mi?	(Siz) müällim idi-niz? (Siz) müällim idi-niz-mi?
3PL	(Onlar) müällim-dir-lär? (Onlar) müällim-dir-lär-mi?	(Onlar) müällim idi-lär? (Onlar) müällim idi-lär-mi?

Table 3: Occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates in standard Azeri

In Gagauz, variation between medial and final positioning is available, e.g. *Üüredici mi-yim?* [teacher-Q-1SG] or *Üüredici-yim mi?* [teacher-1SG-Q] ‘Am I a teacher?’, *Üüredici mi-ydi-m?* [teacher-Q-PCOP-1SG] or *Üüredici-ydi-m mi?* [teacher-PCOP-1SG-Q] ‘Was I a teacher?’ (Astrid Menz, p. c.). Example (1) illustrates the final occurrence of the clitic. The same variation also occurs in verbal predicates, e.g. *Gör-er-im mi?* [see-AOR-1SG-Q] or *Gör-er mi-yim?* [see-AOR-Q-1SG], *Gör-er-sin mi?* [see-AOR-2SG-Q] or *Gör-er mi-sin?* [see-AOR-Q-2SG], *Gör-er-iz mi?* [see-AOR-1PL-Q] or *Gör-er mi-yiz?* [see-AOR-Q-1PL], *Gör-er-siniz mi?* [see-AOR-2PL-Q] or *Görer mi-ysiniz?* [see-AOR-Q-2PL], while in the third person plural the Q-clitic occupies a final position, e.g. *Gör-er-lär mi?* [see-AOR-3PL-Q] (Özkan 2007: 124). The functional basis of this variation needs to be studied.

- (1) *Sän insan-sın mı osa hayvan-sın mı?* (Menz 1999: 27)  
 you human-being-2SG Q or animal-2SG Q  
 ‘Are you a human-being or an animal?’

In Turkmen, the use of a person-number marker is not necessary when the sentence contains an overt pronominal subject, e.g. *Men Türkmen* [I Turkmen] ‘I am a Turkmen’, *Sen Türkmen* [you Turkmen] ‘You are a Turkmen’, *Sen adam däl* [you human-being not] ‘You are not a human-being’. Thus, due to the lack of a person-

number marker, the interrogative element directly attaches to the predicate noun or adjective, e.g. *Men awçî-mi ya däl-mi?* *Men balıķçı-mi ya çarwa?* ‘Am I a hunter or not? Am I a fisher or a nomad?’ (Welsapar 2010: 15). In past copular clauses, the Q-clitic typically follows the copular marker and personal endings although its internal occurrence can sometimes be observed in spoken language (Table 4). The reason for this variation remains to be investigated. As for verbal predicates, final placement of the Q-clitic is typical:<sup>5</sup> *Bar-ya:r-în-mi?* [go-PRES-1SG-Q] ‘Do I go?’, *Bar-ya:r-lar-mi?* [go-PRES-3PL-Q] ‘Do they go?’, *Bil-yä:r-θiη-mi?* [know-PRES-2SG-Q] ‘Do you know?’, *Yaz-yan-dîr-is-mi?* [write-PART-COP-1PL-Q] ‘Are we maybe writing?’, *Yaz-amok-mu?* [write-NEG.PTER.1SG-Q] ‘Haven’t I written?’, *Yaz-maz-dî-m-mi?* [write-NEG.AOR-PCOP-1SG-Q] ‘Didn’t I used to write?’, *Yaz-ma-yar-dî-k-mi?* [write-NEG-PRES-PCOP-1PL-Q] ‘Weren’t we writing?’, *Ayt-ja-k-dî-k-mi?* [say-PROS-PCOP-1PL-Q] ‘Had we intended to say?’, etc. (Clark 1998: 582–637; Kara 2007: 267).

	Non-past copular clauses	Past copular clauses
1SG	<i>Men muýallim-mi?</i>	<i>Men muýallim-dî-m-mi?</i> <i>Men muýallim-mi-dî-m?</i>
2SG	<i>Sen muýallim-mi?</i>	<i>Sen muýallim-dî-η-mi?</i> <i>Sen muýallim-mi-dî-η?</i>
3SG	<i>Ol muýallim-mi?</i>	<i>Ol muýallim-dî-mi?</i> <i>Ol muýallim-mi-dî?</i>
1PL	<i>Biz muýallim-(lar)-mi?</i>	<i>Biz muýallim-(lar)-dî-k-mi?</i> <i>Biz muýallim(lar)-mi-dî-k?</i>
2PL	<i>Siz muýallim-(lar)-mi?</i>	<i>Siz muýallim-(lar)-dî-ηiz-mi?</i> <i>Siz muýallim-(lar)-mi-dî-ηiz?</i>
3PL	<i>Olar muýallim-(lar)-mi?</i>	<i>Olar muýallim-(lar)-dî-mi?</i> <i>Olar muýallim-mi-dî-(lar)?</i>

Table 4: Occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates in Turkmen

In Karachay-Balkar, a Kipchak Turkic language spoken in the Northern Caucasus, the Q-clitic is usually placed before the person-number or copular markers (see Pritsak 1959: 366), e.g.: *Siz xalk-mi-siz?* [you people-Q-2PL] ‘Are you people?’, *Žok-mu edi?* [not existent-Q-PCOP] ‘Wasn’t there?’, *Sen-mi edi-η?* [you-Q-PCOP-2SG] ‘Was it you?’, *Sen tül-mü edi-η?* [you not-Q-PCOP-2SG] ‘Was it not you?’, *Bar-mi-di?* [existent-Q-3SG] ‘Is there?’, *Köz-ler-im kör-me-y-mi edi-le?* [eye-PL-POSS1SG see-NEG-PRES-Q-PCOP-3PL] ‘Didn’t my eyes see?’, *Kel-mez-mi edi-η?* [come-NEG.AOR-Q-PCOP-2SG] ‘Wouldn’t you come?’. There is variation in some verbal predicates, e.g. *Kör-gen-mi edi-η?* [see-PTER-Q-PCOP-2SG] or *Kör-gen edi-η-mi?* [see-PTER-PCOP-

5 It should be noted that modal particles such as *-KA* in Turkmen or *eken* in Noghay, Kazakh and Kirghiz are placed after the Q-clitic. (For the order of the Q-clitic and *eken* in Noghay, see Karakoç 2005: 25–31.)

2SG-Q] ‘Had you seen?’ Referring to Baskakov (1976), Csátó remarks that the final placement of the Q-clitic indicates that “the speaker questions the truth of the proposition: ‘Is it really true that [proposition]?’” In this case, if the clitic precedes the past copula, the verb is questioned (Csátó 2000). This observation needs to be investigated thoroughly in further research.

Noghay, another Kipchak Turkic language in the Northern Caucasus, differs from Karachay-Balkar by final placement of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates; see Table 5. The same is also true for verbal predicates; see example (2). Note that the final *siz* in this example is not the person-number marker but the syntactic subject of the sentence. The person-number marker *siz* is placed prior to the Q-clitic *be*.

	Non-past copular clauses	Past copular clauses
1SG	(Men) <i>oġutuwwŝi-man-ma?</i>	(Men) <i>oġutuwwŝi edi-m-me?</i>
2SG	(Sen) <i>oġutuwwŝi-siŋ-ma?</i>	(Sen) <i>oġutuwwŝi edi-ŋ-me?</i>
3SG	(Ol) <i>oġutuwwŝi-ma?</i>	(Ol) <i>oġutuwwŝi edi-me?</i>
1PL	(Biz) <i>oġutuwwŝi-miz-ma?</i>	(Biz) <i>oġutuwwŝi edi-k-pe?</i>
2PL	(Siz) <i>oġutuwwŝi-siz-ma?</i>	(Siz) <i>oġutuwwŝi edi-ŋiz-be?</i>
3PL	(Olar) <i>oġutuwwŝi-lar-ma?</i>	(Olar) <i>oġutuwwŝi edi-ler-me?</i>

Table 5: Occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates in Noghay

- (2) *Tis awıruw-diŋ ne zat eken-i-n*  
tooth ache-GEN what thing EKEN.COP-POSS3SG-ACC  
*bil-e-siz-be siz?*  
know-PRES-2PL-Q you  
‘Do you know what it is to have toothache?’

In Kazakh as spoken in China, the Q-clitic follows the person-number markers in non-past copular clauses, whereas in past copular clauses it receives an interior position by being placed before the copular marker <sup>y</sup>*edi*. In Kazakh as spoken in Kazakhstan, however, the clitic typically follows the person-number and copular markers; see Table 6. This difference between the varieties is also present in verbal predicates, e.g. *Bar-atın ba ediŋ?* [go-HAB-Q-PCOP-2SG], *Kel-me-ytin be ediŋ?* [come-NEG-HAB-Q-PCOP-2SG], *Bar-ıwŝı ma ediŋ?* [go-HAB-Q-PCOP-2SG], *Kel-me-wŝı me ediŋ?* [come-NEG-HAB-Q-PCOP-2SG], (Kazakh as spoken in China) (Zhang 2004: 372, 376); *Men žaz-a-mın ba?* [I write-PRES-1SG-Q] ‘Do I write?’, *Kel-ežatır-siŋ ba?* [come-FOC.PRES-2SG-Q] ‘Are you coming?’ (Kazakh as spoken in Kazakhstan).



	Non-past copular clauses	Past copular clauses	
		(Kazakh in China)	(Kazakh in Kazakhstan)
1SG	<i>Muƣalim-min be?</i>	<i>Muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı-m?</i>	<i>Muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı-m be?</i>
2SG	<i>Muƣalim-siŋ be?</i>	<i>Muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋ?</i>	<i>Muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋ be?</i>
	<i>Muƣalim-siz be?</i>	<i>Muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋiz?</i>	<i>Muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋiz be?</i>
3SG	<i>Muƣalim be?</i>	<i>Muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı?</i>	<i>Muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı me?</i>
1PL	<i>Muƣalim-biz be?</i>	<i>Muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı-k?</i>	<i>Muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı-k pe?</i>
	<i>Muƣalim-siŋder me?</i>	<i>Muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋder?</i>	<i>Muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋder me?</i>
2PL	<i>Muƣalim-sizder me?</i>	<i>Muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋizder?</i>	<i>Muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı-ŋizder me?</i>
	<i>Olar muƣalim be?</i>	<i>Olar muƣalim be<sup>y</sup>edı?</i>	<i>Olar muƣalim<sup>y</sup>edı me?</i>

Table 6: Occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates in Kazakh

The Kirgiz system in nominal predicates is similar to the system of Kazakh as spoken in China; see Table 7. In verbal predicates, the clitic usually takes the last slot, e.g. *Sen šaarya bar-a jata-siŋ-bi?* [you city-DAT go-FOC.PRES-2SG-Q] ‘Are you going to the city?’, *Kel-e jata-m-bi?* [come-FOC.PRES-1SG-Q] ‘Am I coming?’, *Oķu-p jürö-mün-bü?* [read-FOC.PRES-1SG-Q] ‘Am I reading?’, *Kör-ö-süzdör-bü?* [see-PRES-2PL-Q] ‘Are you seeing?’, *Tap-ar-siŋ-bi?* [find-AOR-2SG-Q] ‘Will (can) you find?’, *Kel-iş-e-bi?* [come-3PL-PRES-Q] ‘Are they coming?’, etc.

	Non-past copular clauses	Past copular clauses
1SG	<i>Muƣalim-min-bi?</i>	<i>Muƣalim bele-m?</i>
2SG	<i>Muƣalim-siŋ-bi?</i>	<i>Muƣalim bele-ŋ?</i>
	<i>Muƣalim-siz-bi?</i>	<i>Muƣalim bele-ŋiz?</i>
3SG	<i>Muƣalim-bi?</i>	<i>Muƣalim bele?</i>
1PL	<i>Muƣalim-biz-bi?</i>	<i>Muƣalim bele-k?</i>
	<i>Muƣalim-siŋer-bi?</i>	<i>Muƣalim bele-ŋer?</i>
2PL	<i>Muƣalim-sizder-bi?</i>	<i>Muƣalim bele-ŋizder?</i>
	<i>Alar muƣalim-bi?</i>	<i>Alar muƣalim bele?</i>

Table 7: Occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates in Kirghiz

In Uyghur, in non-past copular clauses, since the person-number marker is usually absent, the clitic *-mu* directly attaches to the nominal predicate. In past copular clauses, it follows the copular form *idi* and fills the last slot in the predicate; see Table 8. It needs to be mentioned that predicate-internal occurrence can be observed in spoken registers, e.g. *Sän oķutķuči-mi-di-ŋ?* [you teacher-Q-PCOP-2SG], *Siz oķutķuči-mi-di-ŋiz?* [you teacher-Q-PCOP-2PL], *U oķutķuči-mi-di?* [(s)he teacher-Q-PCOP], *Silär oķutķuči-mi-di-ŋ-lar?* [you.PL teacher-Q-PCOP-2PL], etc. The nature of this variation in spoken registers needs further study.

	Non-past copular clauses	Past copular clauses
1SG	<i>Män oqutquči-mu?</i>	<i>Män oqutquči idi-m-mu?</i>
2SG	<i>Sän oqutquči-mu?</i> <i>Siz oqutquči-mu?</i>	<i>Sän oqutquči idi-η-mu?</i> <i>Siz oqutquči idi-ηiz-mu?</i>
3SG	<i>U oqutquči-mu?</i>	<i>U oqutquči idi-mu?</i>
1PL	<i>Biz oqutquči-mu?</i>	<i>Biz oqutquči idu-ķ-mu?</i>
2PL	<i>Silär oqutquči-mu?</i>	<i>Silär oqutquči idi-η-lar-mu?</i>
3PL	<i>Ular oqutquči-mu?</i>	<i>Ular oqutquči idi-mu?</i>

Table 8: Occurrence of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates in Uyghur

#### 4. Sentential positions

Concerning syntactic positions of the Q-clitics following patterns have been found:

- Pattern 1      Q follows the focused constituent in a sentence (movement)  
 Pattern 2      Q only occurs after the predicate (fixed position)

Table 9: Sentential positions of the Q-clitic

It is well known that, in Turkish, a sentence such as *Hasan bugün otobüs-le Ankara-dan İstanbul-a git-ti* [Hasan today bus-INST Ankara-ABL İstanbul-DAT go-PAST3] ‘Hasan rode the bus from Ankara to İstanbul today’ can be transformed into a polar question (*Did Hasan ride the bus from Ankara to İstanbul today?*) in a variety of ways depending on the different information structures. As can be seen in the possible polar questions in (3a–f), the sentence constituent that will be the syntactic focus carries the Q-clitic. In other words, the Q-clitic can freely move around the sentence, and each syntactic constituent capable of being the focus can take this element (see Kamali 2015). It needs to be remarked that *mI* itself is not accented, but the last syllable of the word immediately preceding *mI* gets a strong high-pitch accent (see Kamali 2014).

- (3) a. *Hasan mı* [Hasan-FOCUS] *bugün otobüs-le Ankara-dan İstanbul-a git-ti?*  
 b. *Hasan bugün mü* [today-FOCUS] *otobüs-le Ankara-dan İstanbul-a git-ti?*  
 c. *Hasan bugün otobüs-le mi* [by bus-FOCUS] *Ankara-dan İstanbul-a git-ti?*  
 d. *Hasan bugün otobüs-le Ankara-dan mı* [from Ankara-FOCUS] *İstanbul-a git-ti?*  
 e. *Hasan bugün otobüs-le Ankara-dan İstanbul-a mı* [to İstanbul-FOCUS] *git-ti?*  
 f. *Hasan bugün otobüs-le Ankara-dan İstanbul-a git-ti mi?* [polarity in focus]

Both in declarative and interrogative sentences, a focused constituent receiving special emphasis in the form of an extra high pitch range can optionally be brought closer to the predicate, i.e. occupy the pre-predicative position (see Johanson, to appear, Kılıçaslan 2004, Sato 2009, Özge & Bozşahin 2010, Kamali 2014), e.g.:

- (4) a. *Hasan bugün mü* [today-FOCUS] *otobüs-le Ankara-dan İstanbul-a git-ti?*  
 b. *Hasan otobüs-le Ankara-dan İstanbul-a bugün mü* [today-FOCUS] *git-ti?*

The situation is similar in standard Azeri. The clitic can move and attach to the focused constituent. However, as already mentioned, in the Azeri spoken in Iran, which lacks the clitic, the focus of an interrogative utterance is simply highlighted by means of special intonation.

In Turkmen, the interrogative clitic is typically associated with the nominal or verbal predicate of a sentence. Subject or object constituents, like adverbial constituents, do not seem to carry this element. Thus, in contrast to Turkish, the focused constituent is not marked by the Q-clitic, but instead is brought to pre-predicative position with accompanying suprasegmental features; see examples (5–8). Example (8) is taken from a Turkmen novel also available in Turkish translation. It is interesting to observe that the translator changes the position of the Q-clitic in the corresponding Turkish sentence. Thus, the clitic is placed after the direct object *akrabam* ‘my relative’ in the Turkish translation, whereas it is hosted by the predicate *diydim* ‘I said’ in the Turkmen original.

- (5) *Duldegşir goňşu-lar-ıň-a*                      “*biz-e*      *gel-mä-ň,*  
 near neighbor-PL-POSS2SG-DAT      we-DAT      come-NEG-IMP  
*biz-iň*      *gapı-miz-dan*                      *gara-ma-ň!”*  
 we-GEN      door-POSS1PL-ABL      look-NEG-IMP  
*di-yjek-mi?* (Welsapar 2010: 11)  
 say-PROS-Q  
 ‘Will you say to your close neighbors: “Don’t come to us, don’t look into our door!”’
- (6) *Ağla-malī eňre-meli-mi,*      *ähli iş-ler-in-i*                      *taşla-p,*  
 cry-NEC      sob bitterly-NEC-Q all      work-POSS3PL-ACC      abandon-CONV  
*ömür-ler-in-i*      *arza şikayat bilen geçir-meli-mi?* (Welsapar 2010: 50)  
 life-POSS3PL-ACC petition complaint with      spend-NEC-Q  
 ‘Shall they cry and sob bitterly? Shall they abandon all their works and spend their life in petition and complaint?’
- (7) *Biz-e*      *bular-ıň daşkı görnüş-i*                      *gerek,*  
 we-DAT      these-GEN outer appearance-ACC      necessary  
*ğal-an*      *zad-ın-ı*                      *baş-ımız-a*  
 remain-PART      thing-POSS3SG-ACC      head-POSS1PL-DAT  
*yapalı-mı?* (Welsapar 2010: 53)  
 cover-NEC-Q  
 ‘We need their outer appearance, what shall we do with other things? [lit. shall we cover our heads with things remained?]

- (8) "Ġarındaş-ş-īm" diy-di-m-mi? (Welsapar 2002: 270)  
 relative-POSS1SG say-PAST-1SG-Q  
 Turkish translation: 'Akrabam mı dedim?' (Welsapar 2014: 464)  
 'Did I say "my relative"?'

In Karachay-Balkar, the Q-clitic is able to move freely and join different syntactic constituents; see examples (9–12):

- (9) /.../ ne zat-nĩ: mal-nĩ-mĩ, ĵer-ni-mi oýese  
 what thing-ACC goods-ACC-Q land-ACC-Q or  
 ašxĩ kiyim-le-ni-mi koy-ayĩm men saýa? de-di.  
 beautiful cloth-PL-ACC-Q give-OPT1SG I you-DAT say-PAST3  
 '.../ "What shall I give to you? Shall I give goods, land or beautiful cloth" he said.'
- (10) Ne-di bu et-gen-iñ? Adam-la-nĩ ċasaw-larĩ  
 what-COP this do-PART-POSS2SG people-PL-GEN life-POSS3PL  
 bla oyna-r umut-uñ-mu bar-dĩ?  
 with play-PART hope-POSS2SG-Q existent-3SG  
 'What is that you did? Do you intend to play with people's life?'
- (11) Sen anĩ kaydan bil-e-se? Attya-mĩ ayt-xan-dĩ?  
 you this-ACC from where know-PRES-2SG dad-Q say-PTER-3SG  
 'How do you know it? Has dad said it?'
- (12) Aliman bla da alay bol-du.  
 A. with also so become-PAST3  
 Oýese maýa alay-mĩ körün-dü?  
 or I-DAT so-Q appear-PAST3  
 'It also became like that with Aliman. Or, did it maybe appear like that to me?'

The Q-clitic in Noghay is typically hosted by the predicate. The focused constituent, which is not marked by the Q-clitic, occupies the pre-predicative position as a rule. Consider examples (13–15), which are taken from an anthology of Noghay texts with their Turkish translations. When comparing the Noghay originals with their translations, it is interesting to observe yet again that the translator needs to change the position of the Q-clitic in the corresponding Turkish sentences.

- (13) Men-im ata-m Aqmırza-dıñ kôz-i-n  
 I-GEN father-POSS1SG A-GEN eye-POSS3-ACC

*Kırım xan şıyar-γa-ma? de-y-di.*

K. khan take out-PTER-Q say-PRES-3SG

Turkish translation: 'Benim atam Akmirza'nın gözünü Kırım Hanı mı çıkardı? diye sorar.' (Kösoğlu 2002: 34)

'Did Kırım's Khan take out my father Akmirza's eye, he asks.'

- (14) *Endi sen men-nen usta bol-ayak*  
now you I-ABL skilled become-PROS  
*bol-a-siñ-ma?*  
be-PRES-2SG-Q

Turkish translation: 'Şimdi sen benden daha mı usta olacaksın?' (Kösoğlu 2002: 29)

'Do you think that you will be more skilled than me.'

- (15) *Sen balık äkel-gen-siñ-me?*  
you fish bring-PTER-2SG-Q  
*de-y-di xatün-ï.*  
say-PRES-3SG wife-POSS3

Turkish translation: 'Sen balık mı alıp geldin? der hanımı.' (Kösoğlu 2002: 134)

'Did you bring fish, his wife asks.'

In Kirghiz polar questions, the predicate is the constituent in a sentence which typically hosts the Q-clitic; see examples (16–18).

- (16) *Sen bugün mektep-ke bar-a-siñ-bi?*  
you today school-DAT go-PRES-2SG-Q  
'Are you going to school today?'

- (17) *Al eki žıl-dan kiyin Amerika-γa ket-e-bi?*  
(s)he two year-ABL after America-DAT go-PRES-Q  
'Is he going to America in two years?'

- (18) *Kečki tamak-ti segiz-de iç-e-siñ-bi?*  
dinner-ACC eight-LOC drink-PRES-2SG-Q  
'Do you have dinner at 8 o'clock?'

The Kazakh clitic *MA* also has a fixed position after the predicate. The focused constituent usually occupies the pre-predicative position, as well as being highlighted with high pitch accent. Compare the Kazakh examples given in (19a–f) with the corresponding Turkish examples in (3a–f).

- (19) a. *Bügün aptoboz-ben Ankara-dan Istanbul-ğa Asan* [Asan-FOCUS] *ket-ti me?*  
 b. *Asan aptoboz-ben Ankara-dan Istanbul-ğa bugün* [today-FOCUS] *ket-ti me?*  
 c. *Asan bugün Ankara-dan Istanbul-ğa aptoboz-ben* [by bus-FOCUS] *ket-ti me?*  
 d. *Asan bugün aptoboz-ben Istanbul-ğa Ankara-dan* [from Ankara-FOCUS] *ket-ti me?*  
 e. *Asan bugün aptoboz-ben Ankara-dan Istanbul-ğa* [to Istanbul-FOCUS] *ket-ti me?*  
 f. *Asan bugün aptoboz-ben Ankara-dan Istanbul-ğa ket-ti me?* [polarity in focus]

In Uyghur, the interrogative element *-mu* takes sentence-final position and the constituent that is asked about can move to the pre-predicative position while receiving special intonation. Compare the Uyghur examples in (20a–f) with the corresponding Turkish examples in (3a–f) and the Kazakh examples in (19a–f). Yakup (2013: 464) remarks: “The reason for prohibiting *mu* in non-final position in Uyghur is not very clear. Perhaps prevention from confusing with the homophonic emphatic or intensifying clitic *mu* that usually denotes ‘too, also, as well’ etc. might be one of the main reasons, since the emphatic clitic *mu* occurs after every position other than the sentence-final position.” Consider the example in (21), which possesses these two *mu* forms. The first *mu* following *bügün* ‘today’ means ‘too, also, as well’ whereas the second *-mu* after the predicate *kätti* is a Q-clitic.

- (20) a. *Bügün aptubuz bilän Äñkä-rä-din Istanbul-ğa Häsän* [Häsän-FOCUS] *kät-ti-mu?*  
 b. *Häsän aptubuz bilän Äñkä-rä-din Istanbul-ğa bugün* [today-FOCUS] *kät-ti-mu?*  
 c. *Häsän bugün Äñkä-rä-din Istanbul-ğa aptubuz bilän* [by bus-FOCUS] *kät-ti-mu?*  
 d. *Häsän bugün aptubuz bilän Istanbul-ğa Äñkä-rä-din* [from Ankara-FOCUS] *kät-ti-mu?*  
 e. *Häsän bugün aptubuz bilän Äñkä-rä-din Istanbul-ğa* [to Istanbul-FOCUS] *kät-ti-mu?*  
 f. *Häsän bugün aptubuz bilän Äñkä-rä-din Istanbul-ğa kät-ti-mu?* [polarity in focus]
- (21) *Häsän bugün mu aptubuz bilän kät-ti-mu?*  
 H. today too bus with go-PAST3-Q  
 ‘Did Häsän ride by bus today too?’

Table 10 summarizes the results concerning the sentential positions of the Q-clitics in the languages investigated so far.

	Free movement	Fixed position after the predicate	Zero marker; intonation
Turkish	x		
Standard Azeri	x		x
Azeri spoken in Iran			x
Turkmen		x	
Karachay-Balkar	x		
Noghay		x	
Kirghiz		x	
Kazakh		x	
Uyghur		x	

Table 10: Sentential positions of the Q-clitics

### 5. Summary, prospects and questions for further research

As we have seen, the situation in the modern Turkic languages discussed so far is complex. It is not easy to identify any clear-cut distribution of the patterns in terms of genealogical or geographical relations of the languages, even if we can conclude some general tendencies. (1) Turkish has a special status within the Oghuz Turkic branch since both the internal positioning in predicates and the free syntactic movement are typical for the Q-clitic in this language. (2) As for the other Oghuz languages, the position of this element is shaky in Gagauz, whereas it mainly occupies a final slot in Standard Azeri. (3) The characteristics of the Q-element in Karachay-Balkar, a Kipchak Turkic language spoken in Northern Caucasus, are by and large similar to those in Turkish. On the contrary, Turkmen, an Oghuz language spoken in Central Asia, is largely similar to Central Asian Kipchak languages in terms of the properties of this element. (4) In the given languages, the internal positioning of the Q-clitic within predicates and its combinability with different sentence constituents (syntactic movement) seem to a certain extent to be related to one another, whereas there is a correspondence between the final positioning in predicates and the syntactically fixed predicative position. (5) Loss of a morphosyntactic element and signaling polar questions by means of special interrogative intonation are contact-induced phenomena in some Turkic languages, such as Oghuz varieties spoken in Iran.

Many questions could not be pursued further in the present paper, the main aim of which was to give an overview of the current situation. In order to gain a more complete and detailed picture, the following issues should be thoroughly considered in further research.

The other modern Turkic languages that could not be analyzed here, especially those of the Siberian branch, also need to be studied. The paper has only discussed the situation in standard dialects of the various languages, but consideration of non-standard dialects also seems to be crucial.

To answer some of the questions it will be necessary to adopt a diachronic perspective by providing an analysis of historical development.

The main focus of the paper is positions of the Q-clitic in nominal predicates (past and non-past copular clauses). To obtain a more complete picture, morphosyntactic patterns in verbal predicates, i.e. in combination with different verbal suffixes, need to be surveyed separately.

The nature of interrogative intonation in languages where the Q-clitic has a fixed position after the predicate needs to be scrutinized.

Below, I point out some questions for further research:

How can we explain different behaviors of the Q-clitic (i.e. syntactically free versus fixed, final placement) in modern languages? What are the historical reasons for them? To what extent might language-contact or areal characteristics have played a role?

To what extent can the variation within a system be explained by a dichotomy of spoken or written registers?

An anonymous reviewer of the abstract version of this paper (Karakoç 2014) commented: “The reason for the Noghay and Turkmen order is, of course, analogy from inflectional person marking as in *gel-di-n mi?*”. Is this really the only explanation? Can the final positioning be explained simply by analogy? To what extent does analogy play a role in the development of particular patterns?

What do we know about the role of prosody in the development of different patterns, e.g. *gelecek miyim* versus *gelece:m mi* in spoken Turkish?

How is the functional opposition to be understood when medial and final positioning in predication occur side by side within one system?

Consideration of the scope of clausal operators is crucial for the typology of Turkic languages. What aspects are important to consider regarding the scope properties of the respective elements (Csató 2000)?

What parameters might be important to apply in order to clearly distinguish between varying scope properties, echo-questions and contexts of irony and surprise, for instance Turkish *anlamıyorum mu sanıyorsun?*, *yaparım mı demek istiyorsun?*, etc.

## Abbreviations

1	First person	FOC.PRES	Focal present
2	Second person	GEN	Genitive
3	Third person	IMP	Imperative
ABL	Ablative	NEC	Necessitative
ACC	Accusative	NEG	Negation
AOR	Aorist	OPT	Optative
CONV	Converb	PART	Participle
COP	Copula	PAST	Past tense
DAT	Dative	PCOP	Past copula
FOCUS	Focus	PL	Plural



POSS	Possessive	Q	Interrogative clitic
PRES	Present	SG	Singular
PROS	Prospective	PN	Person-number marker
PTER	Postterminal		

## References

- Baskakov, N. A. (ed.) 1976. *Grammatika karaçajevo-balkarskogo jazyka. Fonetika, morfolo-gija, sintaksis*. Nal'čik: Kabarty-Malkar Kitab Basma.
- Clark, Larry 1998. *Turkmen reference grammar*. (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Csató, Éva Á. 2000. Some syntactic variation in Turkish dialects. In: Özsoy, Sumru & Tay-lan, Eser E. (eds.) *Türkçe'nin ağızları: Çalıştay bildirileri*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversi-tesi. 81–85.
- Dehghani, Yavar 2000. *A grammar of Iranian Azari*. München: Lincom Europe.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013. Polar Questions. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.) *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolu-tionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/116>, Accessed on 2015-07-03.)
- Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 8: Uralic & Central Asian Studies 3.) Boston: Brill.
- Johanson, Lars. 1981. *Pluralsuffixe im Südwesttürkischen*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, 1981: 9. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Johanson, Lars (to appear) Principles for studying information structure in Turkic languages of China.
- Kamali, Beste 2014. Beyond morphosyntax: Interrogative intonation and its role in morpho-syntax in Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 18, 189–206.
- Kamali, Beste 2015. Information structure in Turkish yes/no questions. In: Zeyrek, Deniz & Sağın Şimşek, Çiğdem & Ataş, Ufuk & Rehbein, Jochen (eds.) *Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics*. (Turcologica 103.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 27–39.
- Kara, Mehmet 2007. Türkmen Türkçesi. In: Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican (ed.) *Türk lehçeleri grameri*. Ankara: Akçağ. 231–290.
- Karakoç, Birsel 2005. *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen*. (Turcologica 58.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Karakoç, Birsel 2014. Morphosyntax of copular markers and interrogative particles in Turkic. In: *Abstracts of The 17th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, September 3–5, 2014, Rouen, France. 176.
- Kılıçaslan, Yılmaz 2004. Syntax of information structure in Turkish. *Linguistics* 42, 717–765.
- Kıral, Filiz 2001. *Das gesprochene Aserbaidshanisch von Iran. Eine Studie zu den syntaktischen Einflüssen des Persischen*. (Turcologica 43.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) (2002) *Başlangıcından günümüze kadar Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi 21: Nogay edebiyatı*. Ankara. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Menz, Astrid 1999. *Gagausische Syntax: Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. (Turcologica 41.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Özge, Umut & Bozşahin, Cem 2010. Intonation in the grammar of Turkish. *Lingua* 120, 132–175.

- Özkan, Nevzat 2007. Gagavuz Türkçesi. In: Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican (ed.) *Türk lehçeleri grameri*. Ankara: Akçağ. 81–170.
- Pritsak, Omeljan 1959. Das Karatschaische und Balkarische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis. 340–368.
- Sato, Kumiko 2009. The relation between prosody and focus in yes/no question in Turkish. In: Ay, Sıla & Aydın, Özgür & Ergenç, İclal & Gökmen, Seda & İşsever, S. & Peçenek, D. (eds.) *Essays on Turkish linguistics*. (Turcologica 79.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 23–29.
- Welsapar, Ak 2002. *Kepjebaş. Roman*. Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty.
- Welsapar, Ak 2010. *Aýpi hakynda rowayat: Gysga roman*. Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty.
- Welsapar, Ak 2014. *Kobra*. (Turkish translation of the Turkmen novel *Kepjebaş* by Mazlum Beyhan). Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty.
- Yakup, Abdurishid 2013. Two different *mu* in Modern Uyghur. In: Demir, Nurettin & Karakoç, Birsal & Menz, Astrid (eds.) *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift*. Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications. 461–467.
- Zhang, Dingjing 2004. *Xiàndài hāsàkè yǔ shíyòng yǔfǎ* ['A practical grammar of Modern Kazakh']. Beijing: Chinese Minzu University Press.