Werk

Titel: Focus in Turkish and Uyghur. A preliminary report on an ongoing contrastive inves...

Autor: Yakup, Abdurishid

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2016

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0020|LOG_0015

Focus in Turkish and Uyghur.
A preliminary report on an ongoing contrastive investigation

Abdurishid Yakup

Information structure in Turkic languages spoken and written in Central Asia show some specific features compared to Turkish. This article reports preliminary results of a contrastive study of focus in Turkish and Uyghur, which has been carried out as part of a project on the information structure of minority languages in China that has been underway at Minzu University of China since 2013. In principle, it follows the framework suggested by Johanson (2014), however, it also applies results of recent research on information structure to Turkish. The introduction briefly outlines main research on information structure in the Turkic languages, after which follows a description and contrastive analysis of syntagmatic focus, exclusive focus and inclusive focus. The article concludes with brief remarks on some common and divergent features observed in Turkish and some Central Asian languages, specially Uyghur. The analysis is restricted to linguistic facts at sentence level.

Abdurishid Yakup, Turfanforschung, Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Germany; School of Minority Languages and Literatures, Minzu University of China, China. E-Mail: yakup@bbaw.de

This article reports preliminary results of a contrastive study of focus, one of the important information-structural categories in Turkish and Uyghur, which are representative of the southwestern (SW) and the southeastern (SE) branches of the Turkic language family respectively.[1] The term "information structure" covers a number of rather broad notions including focus and background, topic and comment, topic and focus, givenness and new information, presupposed and pragmatically unrecoverable information, etc., and refers to how information is presented, in contrast to information itself; see Chafe (1976), Féry & Krifka (2008), Krifka & Musan (2012),

---

Zimmermann & Féry (2010), Johanson (2014). It can be studied at the level of the phrase, the clause, the text, or the context; see Hasselgard et al. (2002: ix–x).

In recent years a considerable amount of research on the information structure of Turkic languages has been published, though research on information structure actually has a long history in Turkic linguistics; see Johanson (1977), Erguvanlı (1984: 72–117), Kornfilt (1997: 200–207), Johanson (1998: 58–59). Most of the publications dealt with Turkish. Among the results appearing in recent years, those by Göksel & Özsoy (2000) specially deal with focus in Turkish and challenge the generally accepted belief in Turkish linguistics that the immediately pre-verbal position is the focus position in Turkish. They point out that "it is important to note that the immediately preverbal position is only one of the possible positions for f-phrases and wh-expressions", stating that "the area between the constituent that takes focal stress and the position that includes the verb complex is the domain that hosts the elements designating non-recoverable information", namely focus (Göksel & Özsoy 2000: 227). The five articles that appeared in a special issue of *Lingua* in November 2003 mainly deal with important aspects of focus in Turkish; see Donati & Nespor (2003), Göksel & Özsoy (2003), İşsever (2003), Kennelly (2003), Şener & İşsever (2003). The monograph *Turkish. A Comprehensive Grammar* includes rather detailed discussions of focus and topic in Turkish (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 391–403). Johanson (2006) presents interesting analysis of specificity in Turkic from the functional and structural point of view, which is important in analysis of information structure of Turkic. In her new article "Focus in words with truth values" Göksel (2010) discovers interesting facts relating to focus in declarative sentences consisting of a single morphologically complex word (DMWs) and focus in propositions with lexical phrases (DLPs). Johanson (2014), in a lecture specially prepared for the project "Information Structure of Minority languages in China" which has been underway since 2013 in Beijing, suggests a framework for investigating information structure not only in Turkic languages of China but also in other Turkic languages, thereby covering all important aspects of Turkic information structure. In addition, there are some theses and dissertations, e.g. Kılıçaslan (1994) and İşsever (2000), directly dealing with information structure in Turkish. Unfortunately, they are not accessible for most scholars. Publications dealing with information structure of specific Turkic languages other than Turkish are rare. The only such article I know of, Wang & Qadir & Xu (2013), discusses some aspects of prosodic encoding and perception of focus in Uyghur declarative sentences, though the conclusions of the article are debatable. Marcel Erdal's grammar of Old Turkic contains valuable comments on the organization of information in the sentence in Eastern Old Turkic (2004: 422–432). A recently published article by Aydın Özbek, Zang Linshen and Esra Demirtaş presents analysis of the morpho-syntactic character of additives in Asian SOV languages, including Turkish and Uyghur, discussing typological properties that these languages share with regard to the additives, one of the important devices for inclusive focus (Özbek & Zang & Demirtaş 2014). How-

ever, with the exception of Mukhamedova (2011), until now no known publications deal with an inner-Turkic contrastive study of information structure.

Focus was chosen as the *tertium comparationis* in this article not only because among the basic concepts of information structure the notional definition of focus is relatively clear, but also for the following three reasons: (i) it is the starting point of research on the information structure of Turkic, and a systematic investigation of this category in many Turkic languages, including Uyghur, is still lacking; (ii) focus in Turkish is relatively well-investigated, and by applying the most promising research results on focus in Turkish to other Turkic languages, in this case of this case to Uyghur, we can subject these languages to a new type of scrutiny; (iii) focus in Central Asian Turkic languages, including Uyghur, shows many interesting features, especially in contrast to Turkish, and its description in a cross-linguistic perspective will certainly shed light on many important aspects of focus in Turkic languages. Although a contrastive analysis of focus in Turkish and Uyghur is the main goal of the article, facts about some other Turkic languages, e.g. Kazakh, Kirghiz, Salar and Uzbek, will also be discussed. Relevant instances in historical Turkic written languages will also be frequently mentioned, since many crucial aspects of focus in modern Turkic languages can hardly be understood without reference to the facts of historical Turkic languages. I will mostly follow the framework suggested by Johanson (2014), but I also apply results from recent research on information structure in Turkish, especially Göksel & Özsoy (2000, 2003), and İşsever (2003) as well as Göksel & Kerslake (2005: 395–399) and Göksel (2010).

1. Syntagmatic focus

The most widespread and well-accepted approach to establishing the scope of focus is Wh-questions and their answers. The basic idea is that Wh-questions always ask for new information. If focus is defined as the new information in a sentence in the case of narrow focus, then the phrase that replaces the Wh-element is in focus (van der Wal 2014: 108). This is the so-called syntagmatic focus, or the so-called answer focus. In Turkic, interrogative pronouns and the syntagmatic focus are in pre-predicate position (Johanson 1998: 59, Johanson 2014: 7). This can be illustrated with the following examples; the elements in the syntagmatic focus position are underlined.

(1)   Turkish
       Aşçı   yemek pişir-iyor.
       cook   food   cook-INTRA.PRES3
       'The cook cooks food.'

(2)   Kazakh
      Muxtar <u>*xat*</u>   *jaz-dï.*
      Muhtar   letter   write-SPST3
      'Muhtar wrote a letter.'

(3)   Uyghur
      Bala   <u>*tapšuruḳ*</u>   *išlä-vatidu.*
      child   homework   do-FOC.INTRA.PRES3
      'The child is doing homework.'

Sentence (1) answers the question "What did the cook cook?" and the word for food, namely *yemek,* is in the focus position; sentence (2) answers the question "What did Muxtar write?", and the word for letter (*xat*) is in the focus position; sentence (3) is the answer to the question "What is the child doing?", and the word for homework, *tapšuruḳ,* is in the focus position.

In Turkish, focused constituents can be rather freely placed immediately in front of the verb in verbal sentences with more constituents than subject, direct object and verb (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 395).

(4)   Turkish
      Ali-ye   *yemeğ-i*   <u>*anne-m*</u>   *pişir-di.*
      Ali-DAT   food-ACC   mother-POSS1SG   cook-SPST3
      'It was <u>my mother</u> who cooked the food for Ali.'

(5)   *Yemeğ-i*   *anne-m*   <u>*Ali-ye*</u>   *pişir-di.*
      food-ACC   mother-POSS1SG   Ali-DAT   cook-SPST3
      'My mother cooked the food <u>for Ali</u>.'

(6)   *Anne-m*   *Ali-ye*   <u>*yemeğ-i*</u>   *pişir-di.*
      mother-POSS1SG   Ali-DAT   food-ACC   cook-SPST3
      'My mother cooked <u>the food</u> for Ali.'

However, in Uyghur only the focused direct and indirect object and adverbials may occur immediately in front of the predicate verb.

(7)   Uyghur
      Alim   *dost-i-ɣa*   <u>*polo-ni*</u>   *ät-ti.*
      Alim   friend-POSS3-DAT   pilaf-ACC   cook-SPST3
      'Alim cooked <u>the pilaf</u> for his friend.'

(8)   *Alim*   *polo-ni*   <u>*dost-i-ɣa*</u>   *ät-ti.*
      Alim   pilaf-ACC   friend-POSS3-DAT   cook-SPST3
      'Alim cooked the pilaf <u>for his friend</u>.'

(9) *Alim   polo-ni   dost-i-ɣa   hazir   ät-ti.*
    Alim   pilaf-ACC   friend-POSS3-DAT   now   cook-SPST3
    'Alim cooked the polo <u>just now</u> for his friend.'

That is, in Uyghur in sentences with more than three constituents the subject does not occur in immediately preverbal position in the same way that we see in the Turkish sentence in (4). If the subject is the focus of the verbal sentences with both direct and indirect objects, the direct and indirect objects should be moved to postverbal position, and there is a pause between the verb and the postponed constituent.

(10) *<u>Alim</u>   ät-ti,   polo-ni   dost-i-ɣa.*
     Alim   cook-SPST3   pilaf-ACC   friend-POSS3-DAT
     'It was <u>Alim</u> who cooked the pilaf for his friend.'

However, this is the only possible order; placing the indirect object *dostiɣa* before the direct object *poloni* is considered ungrammatical.

    In this connection I would like to discuss some aspects of stress in Uyghur with regard to focus. Some scholars claim that focused constituents bear heavy stress in Turkish wherever they may occur (adapted from Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 397).

(11) Turkish
     Fatma   çicek-ler-i   <u>BUgün</u>   sula-yacak.
     Fatma flower-PL-ACC   today   water-FUT3
     'Fatma will water the plants <u>today</u>.'

(12) *Bazı   gün-ler   ön bahçe-de   <u>çocuk-LAR</u>   oynu-yor.*
     some   day-PL   front garden-LOC   child-PL   play-INTRA.PRES3
     'Some days <u>children</u> play in the front garden.'

However, in Uyghur the focused constituents in the same position usually do not take heavy stress but a normal stress. Below are the Uyghur counterparts of the Turkish sentences (11) and (12).

(13) Uyghur
     Patimä   gül-lär-ni   bügün   suɣir-idu.
     Patime   flower-PL-ACC   today   water-INTRA.PRES3
     'Patime will water the plants <u>today</u>.'

(14) *Bäzi   kün-lir-i   ald-i-di-ki   baɣči-da*
     some   day-PL-POSS3   front-POSS3-LOC-REL   garden-LOC
     bali-lar   oyna-ydu.
     children-PL   play-INTRA.PRES3
     'Some days <u>children</u> play in the front garden.'

If some part of the focused constituents bore heavy stress in Uyghur, they would have the readings of trial, discontent, etc.

(15) Uyghur
      NÄgä   *maŋ-diŋiz?*
      where   go-SPST2SG
      'Where are you going?'

      BaZA-ɣa   *maŋ-dim.*
      basar-DAT   go-SPST1SG
      'I am going to the basar.'

This shows that, in focusing, syntagmatic position is crucial in Uyghur but not stress or high pitch.

Vallduví & Engdahl (1996) claim that both syntactic and prosodic strategies are used in Turkish; that is, *in situ* focus is possible in Turkish. Concerning this claim, İşsever states that

> "A closer consideration of the Turkish data reveals that syntactic and prosodic strate-gies are not used for the same task but are motivated by different pragmatic needs. I propose that they are used to mark p-focus [is restricted only to immediately pre-verbal elements and to the verb] and c-focus [can be assigned to any element in the entire pre-verbal area, including the verb itself], respectively." (İşsever 2003: 1033)

He illustrates this point by means of four sentences which answer the questions "When did a servant leave the note on the table?" and "Who left the note on the table before lunch?" Below are the two sentences used by İşsever to illustrate that *in situ* focus is possible in Turkish (the glossing and translation are slightly modified).

(16) Turkish
      a. *Bir hizmetçi* [*F yemek-ten* *önçe]* *masa-nın* *üzer-i-ne*
          a   servant   lunch-ABL   before   table-GEN on-POSS3-DAT
          not-u   *bırak-tı.*
          note-ACC leave-SPST3
          'A servant left the note on the table before lunch.'

      b. [*F Bir hizmetçi]* *yemek-ten* *önçe*   *masa-nın* *üzer-i-ne*
              a   servant   lunch-ABL   before   table-GEN on-POSS3-DAT
          not-u   *bırak-tı.*
          note-ACC leave-SPST3
          'A servant left the note on the table before the lunch.'

In Uyghur this kind of *in situ* focus is not observable; that is, in Uyghur the pre-verbal position is still decisive. Thus only the following sentence is acceptable as the Uyghur counterpart of the sentences in (17).

(17) Uyghur
      Bir   xizmetči   čüšlük   tamak-tin   burun   jozi-niŋ   üst-i-gä
      a   servant   noon   food-ABL   before table-GEN   on-POSS3-DAT
      däptär-ni   koy-up   koy-di.
      note-ACC   put-CONV   POSTV-SPST3
      'A servant put the <u>note</u> on the table before the lunch.'

It is difficult, and perhaps not necessary, to make the same or similar interpretations for Uyghur and some other Turkic languages.

In Turkish a constituent with genitive in existential sentences can be focused by placing stress on it, as seen in (18) (adapted from Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 397). However, in Uyghur this is only possible when another clause follows as a contras-tive element, as seen in (19. Otherwise, the focus is still the constituent occurring immediately in front of *bar* and *yok,* as seen in (20) and (21).

(18) Turkish
      <u>*Ahmet'-in*</u>   *iki*   *araba-sı*   *var.*
      Ahmet-GEN   two   car-POSS3   existing
      '<u>Ahmet</u> has two cars.'

(19) Uyghur
      <u>*Äxmät-niŋ*</u>   *ikki*   *mašini-si*   *bar,*   *lekin*   *här*   *ikki-si*   *buzuk.*
      Ahmet-GEN   two   car-POSS3   existing   but   each   two-POSS3   broken
      '<u>Ahmet</u> has two cars, but both are broken.'

(20) *Äxmät-niŋ*   <u>*ikki   mašini-si*</u>   *bar.*
      Ahmet-GEN   two   car-POSS3   existing
      'Ahmet has <u>two cars</u>.'

(21) *Alim-niŋ*   *Anargül-din*   <u>*bali-si*</u>   *yok.*
      Alim-GEN   Anargül-ABL   child-POSS3   non-existing
      'Alim does not have any <u>child</u> with Anargül.'

This is also true for Kazakh existential sentences.

(22) Kazakh
      Meniŋ   <u>*akša-m*</u>   *bar.*
      I.GEN   money-POSS1SG   existing
      'I have <u>money</u>.'

(23) *Sen-iŋ   ak̦ša-ŋ   jok̦.*
        you-GEN   money-POSS2SG   non-existing
        'You do not have <u>money</u>.'

2. Exclusive focus

Another type of focus, called exclusive focus or exhaustive focus, indicates that the focus denotation is the only one that leads to a true proposition (Krifka & Musan 2010: 21). English cleft constructions are considered to trigger this specific meaning.

(24)   It's <u>John</u> and <u>Bill</u> who stole a cookie.

Turkic languages have several devices for coding exclusive focus. In Turkish relative constructions functioning as the subject followed by a nominal predicate are used for exclusive focus (after Johanson 2014: 8).

(25)   Turkish

    a.   *Ali   resm-i   yap-tı.*
          Ali   picture-ACC   make-SPST3
          'Ali made the <u>picture</u>.'

    b.   *Resm-i   yap-an   Ali-ydi.*
          picture-ACC   make-PART   Ali-COP.SPST3
          'It was <u>Ali</u> who made the picture.'

In contrast to (25a), (25b) indicates that Ali is the only person who made the picture. Uyghur has a similar strategy to express exclusive focus, using the same participle of same origin.

(26)   Uyghur

    a.   *Apa-m   išik-ni   ač-ti.*
          mother-POSS1SG door-ACC   open-SPST3
          'My mother opened the <u>door</u>.'

    b.   *Išik-ni   ač-k̦an   apa-m   i-di.*
          door-ACC   open-PART   mother-POSS1SG COP-SPST3
          'It was my <u>mother</u> who opened the door.'

In Uyghur, participles in this construction may take possessive markers, however, in this case, the construction expresses an identity statement rather than exclusivity. Usually, there is a pause between the possessive construction and the following constituent.

(27) *Išik-ni   ač-ķin-i,   apa-m   bol-idu.*
      door-ACC   open-PART-POSS3   mother-POSS1SG   become-INTRA.PRES3
      'The one who opened the door is my <u>mother</u>.'

It should be noted that this way of coding identification focus is not specific to Modern Uyghur. In the Tonyukuk inscription, erected at the beginning of the 8th century and written in so-called Orkhun Turkic, we find almost exactly the same construction. The only difference is that Orkhun Turkic uses the participle in *-mIš* instead of the participle in *-GAn*.

(28) East Old Turkic
      Yaγ-miš-ï   bän   är-tim   Bilgä   Tonyukuk.
      join-PART-POSS3   I   COP-SPST1SG   Bilgä   Tonyukuk
      'The one who has joined (them) was I, Bilgä Tonyukuk.'

It hardly needs saying that the frequent use of *-GAn* with a participial function in Central Asian Turkic languages, including Uyghur, begins with Chaghatay, a Central Asian Turkic written language used from the 13th century to the early 20th century. Below is an example taken from *Risāla-i maʿārif* by Shaybānī Khān (3v10), in which the participle in *-GAn* with the possessive suffix also stands for exclusive focus.

(29) Chaghatay
      Bil-gän-i   Ķurʾān   oķu-γay.
      know-PART-POSS3   Koran   read-OPT3
      'The one who knows should recite from the Koran.'

The other device coding exclusive focus in Turkish is the use of particles before the focused constituent. Turkish shows *ancak, yalnız, sadece, sırf, salt and tek*, all of which mean 'only' and occur before the focused constituent, as seen in (30a). Kazakh also has *tek* with the same distribution and function (30b). Both go back to the East Old Turkic exclusive particle *täk*, while Uyghur uses *päķät* 'only' (30c) copied from Arabic (⇐ Arabic *faķaṭ*).

(30) Turkish
      a. *Ancak öZEL izin-le   gir-il-ebil-iyor-muş.*
          only   special permit-INST   enter-PASS-POSSIB-INTRA.PRES-COP.EV3
          kulis-e.
          backstage-DAT
          'One can only go back stage by special permit.' (Göksel/Kerslake 2005: 398)

b.   Kazakh
     Tek   jas-tar   kel-sïn.
     only   young-PL   come-VOL3
     'Let only young guys come!' (Zhang 2002: 203)

c.   Uyghur
     Bu-ni   päkät   biz   bil-i-miz.
     this-ACC   only   we   know-INTRA.PRES-1PL
     'Only we know this.'

An obvious difference between Turkish, Kazakh and Uyghur is that in Turkish, stress also plays a role in coding exclusive focus. In (30a) the second syllable of *özel* takes heavy stress, while Kazakh and Uyghur mainly rely on the particles, the role of stress not being obvious.

However, the most typical device for coding exclusive focus in Uyghur is the use of the exclusive particle/clitic *-la* (31a). Some other Inner Asian Turkic languages, e.g. Kazakh, Kirghiz, Salar and Yellow Uyghur, also use this device. Kazakh has *aḵ* (31b), and Kirghiz shows *ele* (31c).

(31)   Uyghur
     a.   *Bu   vezipi-ni   siz-<u>la</u>   orunli-yala-y-siz.*
          this   task-ACC   you-EXCL   accomplish-POSSIB-INTRA-PRES2PL
          'Only you can accomplish this task.'

     b.   Kazakh
          Munday   material   Ürümǰi-de   <u>aḵ</u>   bar.
          such   material   Urumchi-LOC   EXCL   existing
          'Such material is only available in Urumchi.' (Zhang 2002: 206)

     c.   Kirghiz
          Bügün a-nï   <u>ele</u>   kör-düm.
          today (s)he-ACC EXCL   see-SPST1SG
          'It was only she whom I saw today. (Hu 1986: 157)

As we see, the constituent with the exclusive particle/clitic also occupies preverbal position. However, it may also appear in other positions, in which case the entire verbal phrase will be reorganized as a relative clause and take possessive markers. Below is the reorganization of (31a).

(32) *Bu   väzipi-ni   orunli-yala-ydiyin-i   siz-<u>la</u>.*
      this   task-ACC   accomplish:POSSIB-PART-POSS3   you-EXCL
      'The one who can accomplish this task is only you.'

In contrast to (31), (32) strongly excludes other possibilities than the one which takes -*la*.

Etymologically, the Kazakh particle *aḳ* goes back to the East Old Turkic and Middle Turkic particle *OK*, which also codes exclusive focus. Below (33a) is taken from the *Tonyukuk inscription*, and (33b) is from the *Türkische Turfantexte* VI (l. 418), whereas (33c) is from *The Stories of the Prophets* by Al-Rabghūzī' (cited from Boeschoten & O'Kane 2015: 6v6). Of them, the first two represent East Old Turkic, and the third Middle Turkic.

(33)   East Old Turkic

a. *bilgä-si*   *čab-ïsï*   *bän*   *ök*   *är-ti-m.*
counselor-POSS3   aide-de-camp   I   EXCL   COP-SPST-1SG
'It was I who was his counselor and his aide-de-camp.'

b. East Old Turkic

Ol   *kim*   *burhan*   *te-t-ir,*   *nom*   *oḳ*   *ol*
that   who   Buddha   say-CAUS-AOR3   Dharma   EXCL   that
är-ür.
COP-AOR3
'That which is called Buddha, the dharma is nothing else but him.'

c. Middle Turkic

Ol   *zaman* *oḳ*   *kafir*   *bol-dï*   *te-miš-lär.*
that   time   EXCL   infidel become-SPST3   say-PART-3PL
'It is said that Satan became an infidel at that VERY moment.'

Some Chaghatay texts also show the exclusive particle *OK* (Bodrogligeti 2001: 326).

(34) Chaghatay
Sän   *ök*   *sän*   *yarat-γan*   *bu*   *yer*   *kök*   *kün*   *ay.*
you   EXCL   you   create-PART   this   earth   sky   sun   moon
'It is exclusively you who created the earth, the sky, the sun, and the moon.'

In Orkhun Turkic *Ok* and *kök* are also used after the focused predicate (see Tekin 1968: 172). This usage is not detected in texts of later period. It should be noted that Uzbek also has the particle *yoḳ*, which is a development of the Middle Turkic and Chaghatay particle *OK* rather than the East Old Turkic one. However, the Uzbek particle has a clear temporal reading (Bodrogligeti 2003: 1027–1028), even if its exclusive meaning still can be noticed.

In Uyghur the exclusive particle *-la* is also frequently used in combination with *yalɣuz* 'alone' and *päkät* 'only', expressing a focus denotation which is just one among the alternatives that leads to a true assertion.

(35)   Uyghur

    a. *Bu*   *iš-ni*   *yalɣuz*   *Alim-la*   *bil-idu.*
       this   matter-ACC alone   Alim-EXCL   know-INTRA.PRES3
       'It is only Alim who knows this thing.'

    b. *Bu*   *iš-ni*   *päkät*   *dada-m-la*   *bil-idu.*
       that   matter-ACC   only   father-POSS1SG-EXCL   know-INTRA.PRES3
       'Only my father knows that matter'.

However, the use of exclusive particles in combination with exclusive clitics is not unique to Modern Uyghur. At least in Kazakh, exclusive particles are frequently used in combination with exclusive clitics.

(36)   Kazakh

    a. *Bu-nï*   *tek*   *Omar-dïŋ*   *öz-ï-ɣana*   *bïl-edi.*
       this-ACC   only   Omar-GEN   self-POSS3-EXCL   know-INTRA.PRES3
       'It is only Omar himself who knows this.'

    b. *Klas-ta*   *tek*   *ïkï-aḳ*   *oḳïwšï*   *otïr.*
       classroom-LOC only   two-EXCL   student   sit.AOR3
       'Only two students are sitting in the classroom.'

Among the old Turkic languages, in Late East Old Turkic we find the exclusive particle *OK* also being used together with the adjective *yalaŋuz* 'alone', placing *yalaŋuz* before the focused constituent and *OK* after it (the example is from Yakup 2010, Text C l. 259).

(37) *A-ni*   *bil-täči*   *yalŋuz*   *burhan-lar*   *oḳ*   *är-ür-lär.*
    that-ACC know-VN   only   Buddha-PL   EXCL   COP-AOR-PL
    'Those who understand it are exclusively Buddhas.'

If the focused constituent is modified by a numeral, the exclusive particle may occur after the numeral but before the focused element (the example is again from Yakup 2010: 128–129).

(38) Old Uyghur

Yalaŋuz   bir   ök   yok   kuruγ   töz-i   öz-in
alone   one   EXCL   nothing empty   nature-POSS3   self-INSTR
k(ä)ntü   közün-ür.
self   appear-AOR3
'Only and merely one's nature of nothingness and emptiness will be apparent to one-self.'

The use of *yalŋuz* together with *OK* is absent from the texts of Early East Old Turkic, nor does it occur in Middle Turkic or Chaghatay.

Kazakh, Kirghiz and Uyghur show a further morpheme for coding exclusive focus, namely *-GAna* (it is realized in Uyghur as *-GIna*).

(39)   Kazakh

a.   *J̌as-tar-γana   kel-dį.*
young-PL-EXCL   come-SPST3
'It was only the young people who came.'

b.   Kirghiz
Bul   kitep   kitepkana-da-γana   bar.
this   book   book store-LOC-EXCL   existing
'This book is only available in the bookstore.'

c.   Uyghur
Bu   iš-ni   sän-γina   kil-ala-ysän.
this   matter-ACC   you-EXCL   do-POSSIB-INTRA2SG
'It is only you who can do this thing.'

The exclusive suffix *-GAnA* goes back to the Old Turkic diminutive particle *kïya* (< *-kIñA*), which in a considerable number of cases also functioned as an exclusive focus marker. It is also present in Chaghatay with the same function.

Obviously, Kazakh, Kirghiz and Uyghur show clear divergences from Turkish with regard to coding of the exclusive focus, as Turkish does not have postpositional particles coding focus. It also does not show focus-sensitive clitics and suffixes. Meanwhile, the double coded constructions coding exclusive focus observed in Kazakh and Uyghur also do not exist in Turkish.

3. Inclusive focus

Additive particles like *also* and *too* express the presupposition that the assertion holds for other alternatives (Krifka & Musan 2010: 13). Some scholars call this *also*-focus. I call it here inclusive focus in contrast to exclusive focus.

One of the functions of the Turkish particle *dA* is to mark inclusive focus when attached to the focused constituent (see Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 514; for other

functions of *dA* in Turkish see Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 213–215; Göksel & Özsoy 2003).

(40)   Turkish

    a.   *Emine <u>de</u>   gel-di.*
       Emine also   come-SPST3
       'Emine also came.'

    b.   *Ahmet rakı   <u>da</u>   iç-ebil-ir.*
       Ahmet raki   INCL   drink-POSSIB-AOR3
       'Ahmet can drink raki, too.'

Several Inner Asian Turkic languages, e.g. Kazakh, Salar and Uzbek, also have an additive particle of the same origin, e.g. Kazakh *DA*, Salar *da* and Uzbek *då*. Like Turkish *dA*, those particles are also attached to the focused constituent. Below (41a) is an example from Kazakh, (41b) from Salar (is taken from Ma et al. 1993) and (41c) from Uzbek.

(41)   Kazakh

    a.   *El-dịŋ   bär-ị   ket-tị,   men   <u>de</u>   ket-eyịn.*
       people-GEN   all-POSS3   go-SPST3   I   INCL   go-VOL1SG
       'All people left. Let me go, too.' (Zhang 2003: 131)

    b.   Salar

       Bal-ler-i   ejz-i-negi   aba-si
       child-PL-POSS3   self-POSS3-GEN   father-POSS3
       ama-si-ge   sajliam   vej-ba.
       mother-POSS3-DAT   greeting   give-INTRA.PRES3
       Awla-<u>da</u> bur-i   bur-i-ge   sajliam   vej-ba.
       they-INCL   one-POSS3   one-POSS3-DAT   greeting   give-INTRA.PRES3
       'Children greet their own parents. They also greet each other.'

    c.   Uzbek

       Sịŋl-im-ni   <u>då</u>   čakir-dim.
       younger sister-POSS1SG-ACC   INCL   invite-SPST1SG
       'I also invited my younger sister.'

Usually, the inclusive particle in Turkish (42a, b) and Kazakh (42c) is also attached to the subject and object of the preceding clause.

(42)   Turkish

      a.   *Nurettin   de   yaz-dı,   Emine   de   yaz-dı.*
          Nurettin   INCL   write-SPST3   Emine   INCL   write-SPST3
          'Nurettin wrote, Emine also wrote, too.'

      b.   *Ali Almanca   da   bil-iyor,   İngilizçe   de   biliyor.*
          Ali German   INCL   know-INTRA.PRES3   English   INCL   know-INTRA.PRES3
          'Ali knows German but also English.'

      c.   Kazakh

          Men   onïŋ   äke-sï-nï   de   aya-sï-nï̈
          I   he.GEN father-POSS3-ACC   INCL   elder brother-POSS3-ACC
          da   tanï-ma-y-mï̈n.
          INCL   know-NEG-PRES-1SG
          'I know neither his father nor his elder brother.'

The Uyghur additive clitic *mu* has the same function. Orthographically, Uyghur *mu* is written together with the constituent to which it is attached, and is not accented.

(43)   Uyghur

      a.   *Ätä   siz-mu   ḳayt-i-siz,   biz-mu*
          tomorrow you-INCL   return-INTRA.PRES-2PL   we-INCL
          ḳayt-i-miz.
          return-INTRA.PRES1PL
          'Tomorrow, you will go back. We will go back, too.'

      b.   *Bügün uniŋ   ḳizi-ni-mu   kör-düm.*
          today he.GEN   daughter-ACC-INCL   see-SPST1SG
          'Today I also saw his daughter.'

In postverbal constructions coding actionality, *mu* is attached to the converb preceding the postverb. In this case the basic meaning of *mu* is somewhat similar to that of the English focus-sensitive particle 'even'.

(44) Uyghur
     U   ḳiz   saŋa   ḳara-p-mu   ḳoy-mi-di.
     that girl   you.DAT   look-CONV-INCL   POSTV-NEG-SPST3
     'That girl did not even care about you.'

These examples illustrate that even very closely related Turkic languages show divergences with regard to the inclusive focus. For instance, as we see, Uzbek has *da* just like Kazakh, Salar and Turkish, while Uyghur has *mu*, which goes back to

East Old Turkic *ymä*; for an analysis of Uyghur *mu* see Yakup (2014). It should be noted that East Old Turkic *ymä* had the shortened variant *mA* already in some Old Uyghur texts (Erdal 2004: 347) and also had the function of a clitic of inclusive focus, having frequently been used together with the exclusive particle *OK* (the below example is taken from Yakup (2010: 228–229).

(45)   Old Uyghur
    Ḳarïmaḳ   *ölmäk* <u>*ymä*</u>   <u>*ök*</u>   *yoḳ,*
    ageing   death also   EXCL non-existing
    ḳarïmaḳ   *ölmäk[ni]ŋ* <u>*ymä*</u>   *alḳïnmaḳ* *yoḳ.*
    ageing   death-GEN   also   destruction no
    'There is no ageing and death, and there is also no destruction of ageing and death.'

Clear interpretation of *ymä ök* is not easy, however, it seems to be that it stands for both inclusive and exclusive functions, expressing the meaning something like 'not only … but also'.

It should be noted that the inclusive particle *ma* still survives in the eastern and southwestern dialects of Modern Uyghur.

In Turkish, *dA* may also be attached to the predicate (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 514). However, the Kazakh, Salar, Uyghur and Uzbek additive particles discussed above do not show this distributional feature.

As an aside, after comparing several very different languages belonging to three different language families, Özbek et al. (2014) claim that SOV word order itself has an independent operation on the morpho-syntactic property of the additives, here the inclusive focus. However, this is hard to justify on the basis of the materials discussed here.

5. Final remarks

The facts discussed in this article are fragmentary, and the analysis is restricted to sentence level. Prosodic, pragmatic, and even some syntactic and semantic factors are almost entirely ignored in the paper. This is far from the standard of empirical contrastive Turkish linguistics would wish for. Below are some conclusions which might be drawn from the analysis conducted so far.

Firstly, Turkic languages spoken and written in Central Asia, including Uyghur, share some properties with Turkish with regard to focus, mainly in relation to the following points:

Just as in Turkish, immediate pre-predicate position is used for interrogative pronouns and the syntagmatic focus in Central Asian Turkic languages:

(i) Like Turkish, modern and historical Central Asian Turkic languages also use relative constructions for exclusive focus, marking identification focus by adding personal markers to the participles in *-GAn* in the relative construction.

(ii) Like Turkish, Central Asian Turkic languages show some adverbials and particles for coding exclusive focus and inclusive focus.

Perhaps these are the properties the languages in the Turkic family generally share.

In contrast to Turkish, Central Asian Turkic languages, including Uyghur, also show clear divergences with regard to several points.

Firstly, although syntagmatic position is crucial in Central Asian Turkic languages, just as in Turkish, in the Central Asian Turkic languages the role of stress or high pitch is limited. Even if stress and pitch play some role, they seem to be of secondary importance.

Secondly, in Turkish, a constituent with a genitive in existential sentences can be focused by placing stress on it. This is however not relevant for Central Asian Turkic languages, especially Uyghur.

Thirdly, Central Asian Turkic languages show a considerable number of clitics and suffixes coding exclusive focus and inclusive focus which do not exist in Turkish.

Fourthly, some Central Asian Turkic languages, especially Kazakh and Uyghur use double coding strategies for exclusive focus. These are also not observable in Turkish.

These are only some preliminary facts and points that I can conclude at the present stage of my research. I hope that detailed descriptions of each language and language variety in the Turkic family of languages and typologically-oriented contrastive studies will make further contributions to the study of Turkic information structure, including focus.

Abbreviations

1	First person
2	Second person
3	Third person
COP	Copula
EXCL	Exclusive focus marker
EV	Evidential
FOC	Focal
INCL	Inclusive focus marker
INTRA.PRES	Intraterminal present
NEG	Negation
PART	Participle
PL	Plural
POSS	Possessive marker
POSSIB	Possibility
REL	Relational suffix
SG	Singular
SPST	Simple past
VOL	Voluntative

References

Bodrogligeti, András J. E. 2001. *A grammar of Chagatay*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

Boeschoten, Hendrik E. & O'Kane, J. (eds.) 2015[2]. *Al-Rabghūzī, The stories of the prophets. Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā': An Eastern Turkish version* 1–2. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Breul, Carsten & Göbbel, Edward 2010. *Comparative and contrastive studies of information structure*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chafe, Wallace 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In: Li, Charles N. (ed.) *Subject and topic*. New York & San Francisco & London: Academic Press. 25–55.

Donati, Caterina & Nespor, Marina 2003. From focus to syntax. *Lingua* 113, 1119–1142.

Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Boston: Brill.

Erguvanlı, Eser Emine 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley & Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.

Féry, Caroline & Krifka, Manfred 2008. Information structure. Notional distinctions, way of expression. In: van Sterkenberg, Piet (ed.) *Unity and diversity of languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 123–136.

Göksel, Aslı 2010. Focus in words with truth values. *Iberia. An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2: 1, 89–112.

Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia 2005. *Turkish. A comprehensive grammar*. London and New York: Routledge.

Göksel, Aslı & Özsoy, A. Sumru 2000. Is there a focus position in Turkish? In: Göksel, Aslı & Kerlake, Celia (eds.) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 219–228.

Göksel, Aslı & Özsoy, Sumru 2003. *dA*: a focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* 113, 1143–1167.

Göksel, Aslı & Özsoy, Sumru (eds.) 2003. *Lingua* 113. Special issue: Focus in Turkish.

Hasselgard, Hilde & Johansson, Stig & Behrens, Bergljot & Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine (eds.) 2002. *Information structure in a cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

İşsever, Selçuk 2000. *Türkçede bilgi yapısı* [Information structure in Turkish]. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Ankara: Ankara University.

İşsever, Selçuk 2003. Information structure in Turkish: The word order. Prosody interface. *Lingua* 113, 1025–1053.

Johanson, Lars 1977. Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Suppl.* 3: 2, 1186–1203.

Johanson, Lars 1998. Structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Ágnes (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 30–66.

Johanson, Lars 2006. Two approaches to specificity. In: Kulikov, Leonid & Malchukov, Andrej & de Swart, Peter (eds.) *Case, valency and transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 225–247.

Johanson, Lars 2014. Principles for studying information structure in Turkic languages of China. Lecture given at Minzu University of China, October 2014.

Kennelly, Sarah D. 1997. The presentational focus position of nonspecific objects in Turkish. In: Imer, Kamile & Uzun, N. Engin (eds.) *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Ankara: Ankara University Press. 25–36.

Kennelly, Sarah D. 2003. The implication of quantification for the role of focus in discourse structure. *Lingua* 113, 1055–1088.

Kılıçaslan, Yılmaz 1994. *Information packaging in Turkish*. Unpublished MSc dissertation, University of Edinburgh.

Kılıçaslan, Yılmaz 2004. Syntax of information structure in Turkish. *Linguistics* 42, 717–765.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 1997. *Turkish*. London: Routledge.

Krifka, Manfred & Musan, Renate (eds.) 2012. *The expression of information structure*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Krifka, Manfred & Musan, Renate 2012. Information structure: Overview and linguistic issues. In: Krifka & Musan (eds.) 2012: 1–43.

Ma, Quanlin & Ma, Wanxiang & Ma, Zhicheng 1993. Salar language materials. *Sino-Platonic Papers* 43, December 1993 (www.sino-platonic.org).

Mukhamedova, Raikhangul 2011. From participle to particle: Kazakh *degen* in comparison with its functional equivalents in Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 15, 259–274.

Özbek, Aydın & Zang, LinShen & Demirtaş, Esra 2014. Morpho-syntactic character of additives: A descriptive approach to additives in Asian SOV languages. *Dil ve Edebıyat Dergisi/Journal of Linguistics and Literature* 11–1, 1–15.

Şener, Serkan & İşsever, Selçuk 2003. The interaction of negation with focus: *ne...ne...*phrases in Turkish. *Lingua* 113, 1089–1117.

Tekin, Talat 1968. *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Vallduví, Enric & Engdahl, Elisabet 1996. The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics* 34, 459–519.

van der Wal, Jenneke 2014. Tests for focus. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* (Frühjahr 2014), 105–134.

Wang Bei 王蓓 & Qadir, Tursun 吐尔逊·卡得 & Yi, Xu 许毅 2013. Weiwueryu chenshuju-zhong jiaodian de yunlu shixian ji ganzhi 维吾尔语陈述句中焦点的韵律实现及感知 [Prosodic ecoding and perception of focus in Uyghur]. 声学学报 [Acta Acustica] 38:1, 92–98.

Yakup, Abdurishid 2010. *Prajñāpāramitā literature in Old Uyghur*. (Berliner Turfantexte 28.) Turnhout: Brepols.

Yakup, Abdurishid 2014. Two different *mu* in Modern Uyghur. In: Demir, Nurettin & Kara-koç, Birsel & Menz, Astrid (eds.) *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift*. (Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları) Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi. 461–467.

Yakup, Abdurishid 2014a. Information structure in Inner Asian Turkic languages. Talk given at *Türk Dilbiliminde Tanımlama ve Belgeleme. Genç Araştırmacılar ve Lisans Üstü Öğrenciler İçin Yaz Okulu* 2, 18–24 Ağustos 2014.

Zhang, Dingjing 张定京 2002. *Xiandai Hasakeyu xuci* 现代哈萨克语虚词 [Particles in Modern Kazakh]. Beijing: Minzu Press.

Zimmermann, Malte & Féry, Caroline (eds.) 2010. *Information structure: Theoretical, typological, and experimental perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.