

Werk

Titel: Some remarks on viewpoint operators in Turkmen

Autor: Demir, Sema Aslan

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2017

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0021 | LOG_0013

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Some remarks on viewpoint operators in Turkmen

Sema Aslan Demir

Aslan Demir, Sema 2017. Some remarks on viewpoint operators in Turkmen. *Turkic Languages* 21, 107–114.

In this paper, Turkmen postterminal markers are discussed. Turkmen belongs to the Southwestern branch of Turkic languages and is mostly spoken in Turkmenistan. Although Turkmen is an Oghuz language, it also shares some common areal features with the Northwestern (Kipchak) and Southeastern (Karluk) branches of Turkic languages. This can also be observed in the inventory of Turkmen markers of postterminality, and in some respects this situation can be interpreted as a deviation from the typology of Oghuz languages. The work will first focus on the postterminal marker *-An* (< *-GAn turur*) in competition with the other postterminal marker *-(I)pdlr* (< *-Ip turur*). After this, *-An däldir*, the negative form of *-An*, will be discussed in competition with *-mAndlr*.

Sema Aslan Demir, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Turkic Languages and Literatures, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: semaaslan@hacettepe.edu.tr

0. Introduction

The present work aims to present some interesting features of viewpoint aspect markers in Turkmen. The paper does not include evaluations of all viewpoint aspect markers in Turkmen; instead some observations and questions will be presented about the postterminal markers. Turkmen belongs to the Oghuz branch of Turkic languages and is mostly spoken in Turkmenistan. It has also speakers in Iran, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and some parts of north Caucasus. Although it is an Oghuz language, it also shares some common areal features with the Northwestern (Kipchak) branch and the Southeastern (Karluk) branch of the Turkic languages, which can also be observed in the inventory of Turkmen viewpoint aspect markers, and in some respects this can be interpreted as a deviation from the typology of the Oghuz languages. In this work, Lars Johanson's theory and terminology (1971, 1994 and 2000) will be employed when analyzing data. Examples will be given both in the present Turkmen orthography and in transcription, because some important phonetic features of Turkmen, such as vowel lengths, labial harmony, etc., are not marked by the standard orthography.

Unlike the Slavic languages, the term aspect is here not used for denoting actional contents or situation types; rather, it denotes the viewpoint perspectives, envisaging the events in various ways, in relation to their relevant limits. Viewpoint operators offer different choices for envisaging and presenting events, by opening

perspectives on them. They operate on the actional contents (Johanson 2000: 30–31). There are three main aspectual perspectives that represent different ways of envisaging the event:

The intraterminal perspective: envisaging the event within its limits.

The postterminal perspective: envisaging the event after the transgression of its relevant limit.

The adterminal perspective: envisaging the event at the very attainment of its relevant limit (Johanson 2000: 29).

The viewpoint operators can highlight a point situated within the limits of the event, a point situated after the decisive limit of the event or the decisive limit itself (Johanson 2001: 54)

1. The competition between *-An* and *-Ipdlr*

There are two postterminal markers in the Turkmen aspectual system: *-An* and *-Ipdlr*. It must be stated that while *-Ipdlr* is a widespread postterminal marker in modern Turkmen, *-An* is less commonly used. The morpheme *-An* can be seen in tales, proverbs, and some folkloric narrations, but today *-Ipdlr* is much more common both in daily speech and literature. If we disregard some modal expressions based on *-An*, it seems that the frequency rate of *-An* has been gradually decreasing.

The descriptions of *-An* provided by Baskakov et al. (1970) and Söyegow et al. (2000)—also including findings of earlier works—are the followings:

-An signals that the speaker refers to events, which happened long before, in a way as if they were seen by the speaker. This marker is mostly used in tales and rumors. (Söyegow et al. 2000: 261–262)

-An refers to the past events, which occurred in an uncertain, indefinite past. Although the speaker did not witness the event, he is sure of its realization. (Baskakov et al. 1970: 268)

Let me reformulate the statements implicit in the above descriptions in the following way:

There is an event (E)

E happened in an indefinite past

Speaker did not witness the realization of E

Speaker explains E as if he had seen it

Speaker sure of the realization of E

These statements create some problems. How can a speaker express an unwitnessed event, which happened in an uncertain past, as if he had seen it or was sure of its

realization? In other words, how can a speaker encode a past event which he actually did not see, in a way that is as if he had seen it? See the following examples.

- (1) *Bu gün onuň geyimi-gejimi päkize, başy bolsa daralan.* SE. 154
 /Bu gün onuň geymi-gejmi pä:kiðe başı bolθo daralan/
 ‘Today her clothes are clean and (it is observed that) her hair has been combed.’
- (2) *Han kaka, men hiç ýere gitjek däl. Okajak. Onsoňam indi giç, meniň adym bu ýerde okuwçy diýlip ýazylan.* BT. 135
 /Xa:n qa:qa: men hi:ç yere gitjek gä:l, oko:joq. Onsoňom inni gi:ç, meniň a:ðim bu yerde okuwçı diyliþ yaðlan/
 ‘Khan daddy, I will not go anywhere. I will study. Henceforth, it is late, (it is seen that) my name has (already) been written here as a student.’
- (3) *Gapynyň agzynda seki, üstünde haly düşekler ýazylan.* TDG. 262
 /gäpı:nıň aýðınna θeki üθθünne xa:lı düşekler yaðlan/
 ‘(It is seen that) there is a sofa in front of the door; the mattresses, which were made of carpet, have been laid down on it.’

As these examples illustrate, the *-An* marker highlights the postterminal phase of the events, namely, the postterminal situation which results from the transgression of the relevant limit of the event observed. No past phase of the event appears in the range of vision. The event has already disappeared, but some observable traces remain. These traces are adjective-like qualities or descriptive properties, resulting from the transgression of the relevant limit. In examples 1–3, the postterminal verb forms *daralan* <comb-PASS-POST.3SG> ‘be combed’, *ýazylan* <write-PASS-POST.3SG> ‘be written’ and *ýazylan* <lay down-PASS-POST.3SG> ‘be laid down’, encode the property like situation, which result from postterminality, i.e. from the transgression of the relevant limit. The state of the hair, which was combed, the state of the name being written, and the situation of the carpet being laid down are highlighted.

In examples 1–3, which are taken from novels written in standard Turkmen, there are high-focal postterminals, which acquire diagnostic readings. As pointed out by Johanson (2000), more focal anterior items are also inclined to be more diagnostic (Johanson 2000: 108). Let me remind the reader how the term focality is used in Johanson’s theory. Focality is a scalar notion. Intraterminals or postterminals may display higher or lower degrees of focality. High-focal postterminality means that the relevance of the event at the moment of encoding (orientation point) is more important than the event itself. They put high focus on the postterminal state. Their range of vision is narrow, restricted to what is still relevant of the event at the orientation point (Johanson 2000: 38, 108, 110; see also Csató 2000: 30–31). If we reanalyze the examples, we can conclude that

No past phase of the event appears in the range of the speaker's vision. But he can see its results or remaining adjective-like properties, which are valid at the moment of encoding.

The speaker gets information about the postterminal phase of the event usually through visual perception. (In Turkmen *-An* can mark perceptual evidentiality.)

In the examples, the diagnostic readings seem also to be connected with the verb forms, which are passives, such as *daralan* {comb-PASS-POST.3SG}, *yazylan* {write-PASS-POST.3SG} and *yazylan* {lay down-PASS-POST.3SG}

I now revise Söyegow's and Baskakov's descriptions on the basis of the above findings.

There is an event (E)

E happened in an indefinite past (proposed: No past phase of the event appears in the range of vision)

Speaker explains E as if he had seen it (proposed: Speaker describes/reproduces not the event but its concrete results by perceiving them at the moment of encoding)

Speaker is sure of the realization of E. (proposed: Speaker gets information about the postterminal phase of the event usually through visual perception, and this provides a high degree of confidence in the realization of the event.)

In the meantime, especially in folk tales, *-An* also covers less diagnostic and more historic readings, which are more event-oriented (for similar functions of *-GAn* in Noghay see Karakoç 2005: 74). In such uses, the attention is not on the postterminal state of the event, rather on the event itself. In the following example, which is taken from a folk tale, *-An* denotes succeeding event chains historically. It must be stated that it is not usual to see such examples in modern Turkmen literature or colloquial Turkmen.

- (4) *Garyp piriň eliňi daňdyryp, howzuň ýanyna elten. Esgerlerine hem howzuň suwny boşatdyran. Pirden jaýyň açaryny alyp gaplary açan. Şol wagt jaýdan kyrk gyz bilen kyrk ýigit çykyp başlan. Şolar bilen patşanyň ogly bilen gyzy hem çykan.* TM 44
 /Ġarĩ:p pi:riŋ elŋi daŋdĩrĩp xowduŋ ya:nna elten. Eŋgerlerĩnĩ:m xowduŋ suwnu boŋotturon. Pi:rden ja:yĩŋ ačarnĩ alĩp ġapĩlarĩ ačan. Ŗol waġt ja:ydan qĩrq ġĩ:đ wĩlen qĩrq yĩġĩt čĩqĩp baŋla:n. Ŗolor bilen pa:ŝŝa:nĩŋ oylu wĩlen ġĩ:đa:m čĩqan./
 'Garyp bound the hands of the master and took him to the pool. He also made his soldiers drain the water of the pool. He took the house key from the master and opened the door. In that case, forty girls and forty young men began coming out of the building. Both the son and the daughter of the padishah also came out.'

2. The relation between degree of focality and source of information

Another question to be discussed in this paper is that of the relationship between the degree of focality and the source of information. It seems that if the basis of the

knowledge about the event or postterminal state of the event is “hearsay” or “reportive”, the postterminal markers are prone to be less focal and more historic. On the other hand, if the basis of the knowledge is perceptive or inferential, the postterminal markers are prone to be more diagnostic and high-focal. The plausibility of this idea needs to be studied further, but a similar tendency can also be observed in the use of the other postterminal marker *-(I)pdIr*. In example 5, the basis of the knowledge is inference, and a diagnostic reading can be obtained. In example 6, the basis of the knowledge is hearsay, and *-(I)pdIr* (the negative form is *-mAndIr*) signals low-focal postterminality in which the events are narrated according to the historical order, like $E1 > E2 > E3 > E4...$

- (5) *Men söýginiň ugrunda şeýle ile göz-gülban bolupdyryn. Emma şeýle ile gülban bolanymy özüm bilmän galypdyryn.* P 413
 /Men öýgü:nüň u:ýrunna şeýle i:le göð-gülba:n bolupdurun. Emma: şeýle i:le gülba:n bolanıma ö:ðüm bilmä:n galıpdırın/
 ‘My love had brought disgrace upon me to, embarrassing me in front of everyone. Yet, I wasn’t even able to comprehend my shame.’
- (6) *Eneleriniň aýtmagyna görä, Japbaklaryň kakasy hem şol agyr ýüke tap getirmän, olary ýaşlykda yetim galdyrypdyr. Dört çagaly dul oturan, girdeji gözünü ýitiren, bar ünsüni iýmite ataran ene çagajyklary açlyk belasyndan goramak üçin gije-gündiz ondan-oňa sümsünipdir, olary wagtly-wagtynda timarlamaga da ýagdaý tapmandyr. Şonuň üçin Japbaklar ata mährini görmän, ene terbiýesini alman, esasan öz peýwagtlaryna ösüpdirler.* J 13
 /eneleriniň aytmaýna görä: japbaqların qa:qaθa:m şol ayır yükö ta:p getirmä:n olorı ya:şlıqda yeti:m ğa:llirıpdır. dö:rt ça:ya:lı dul oturon gi:rdeji göðnü yıtiren ba: ünθünü iýmite ataran ene ça:ýajıqları açlıq bela:θınnan ğo:romoq üçün gi:je-günnüð onnon-onö θümθünüpdür olorı waytlı-waytınna ti:ma:rlama:ya da yayday tapma:nnır sonuň üçün japbaqlar ata mä:hrini görmä:n ene terbiyeθini alma:n eθa:θa:n ö:ð peýwaytlarna ööüpdürlör/
 ‘According to their mother, the father of Japbak could not bear this heavy responsibility and left them as orphans. Their mother, who was widowed with four children, struggled to make a living; day and night she tried to find some food for her children. She could not give much attention to their moral attitude. Without their father’s love and mother’s training, they have grown up on their own.’

3. Competition between *-An däldir* and *-mAndIr*

In Turkmen, the negative form of *-An* is *-An däldir*. The negative form of *-An* was originally *-mAndyr* (*-Andır*: *-mAndIr*) (Çaryýarow 1969: 273) But in the standard language, *-mAndIr* is usually used as the negative form of *-Ipdlr*. In this way, the suppletive negative-positive morpheme pair *-Ipdlr* vs. *-mAndIr* has developed. The generally accepted assumption is that *-An däldir* must have arisen from a need to avoid the ambiguity between the negative forms of *-AndIr* and the negative form of

-IpdIr (Clark 1999: 237). The negated form *-An dälDir* differs from *-mAndIr* in some particular respects. The first difference concerns indirectivity. *-mAndIr* expresses indirectivity in the sense that non-occurrence of the event or absence of the postterminal state is perceived, inferred or heard by the speaker (for indirectivity, see Johanson 2000, 2003). On the other hand, *-An dälDir* removes indirective nuances by coding a higher degree of awareness and consciousness concerning the postterminal phase of the event. (For further details about the semantic values of *-AndIr* and its modal functions, such as presumption, strong assumption etc., see Aslan Demir 2014.) Secondly, unlike *-mAndIr*, what is negated by *-An dälDir* is not the occurrence of the event itself, but a negation of the postterminal state which would occur after the transgression of the relevant limit. The semantic contents of the *-mAndIr* and *-An dälDir* can be formulated as follows: *-mAndIr*: [(event + NEG)] + viewpoint aspect, +IND; *-An dälDir*: [(event + viewpoint aspect)] + NEG, -IND. In examples 7 and 8, no indirective nuance can be perceived. But in example 9, the occurrence of the event is recognized by the speaker with a sudden remembering; i.e. the speaker expresses it in an indirect way referring to a source. This can be translated into English as ‘obviously’, ‘apparently’. Examples 7 and 8 belong to literary language, and 9 comes from colloquial Turkmen.

- (7) *Bu ýüzük siziň barmagyňyza gelişer diýip aldym. Men muny ýöne ýere saýlan dälDirin.* MT 100
 /bu yüdük thiðin barmañiða gelişer diyip allim. men munı yö:nö yere θayla:n nä:llirin/
 ‘I bought this ring with the thought that suits you. I have not chosen it in vain.’
- (8) *Men olardan hiç wagtam gorkan dälDirin.* GRŞ 52
 /men olordon hi:č waytam gorqon nä:llirin./
 ‘I’ve never been scared of them.’
- (9) *Wah, diňläsim gelyän CD-mi ýanyma almandyryn.* CT
 /wax, diñlä:θim gelyä:n CD-mi ya:nıma alma:nnırın/
 ‘Tut-tut. I have obviously forgotten the CD, which I want to listen to.’

4. Conclusion

I have presented some properties of the two Turkmen postterminal markers *-An* and *-IpdIr*. While *-IpdIr* is a widespread postterminal marker in standard Turkmen, *-An* is used in some particular discourse types. In modern Turkmen, both in colloquial and standard, *-IpdIr* is more common.

The marker *-An* highlights the postterminal phase of an event. The speaker often refers to the postterminal phase of the event based on knowledge gained through visual perception. Johanson states that “where the types *-GAn turur* and *-(V)p turur* occur together in one system, the former tends to be pure postterminal, whereas the latter has indirective meanings” (2000: 73). In Turkmen *-An* (< *-GAn turur*) covers

both historical and diagnostic readings. The diagnostic value occurs especially when *-An* is added to passive verb forms.

Another issue discussed in this paper is the competition between *-An däldir* and *-mAndlr*. The negated form *-An däldir* differs from *-mAndlr* in particular respects. The most salient difference concerns indirectivity. *-mAndlr* expresses indirectivity in the sense that the non-occurrence of the event or the absence of the postterminal state is expressed, inferred or heard by the speaker. On the other hand, *-An däldir* removes indirective nuances and encodes a higher degree of awareness and consciousness of the postterminal phase of the event.

References

- Aslan Demir, Sema 2014. *Görünüş kategorisi: Türkmençe örneği*. Ankara: Grafiker.
- Baskakov, Nikolaj Aleksandrovic et al. (eds.) 1970. *Grammatika turkmenskogo jazyka 1. Fonetika i morfologija*. Aşgabat: Ylym.
- Clark, Larry 1998. *Turkmen reference grammar*. (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Csató, Éva Á. 2000. Turkish *-miş* and *imiş* items. Johanson, Lars & Uta, Bo (eds.) *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighboring languages*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 29–43.
- Çaryýarow, Bäşim 1969. *Günorta-günbatar Türki dillerde işlik zamanlary*. Aşgabat: Ylym.
- Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkei-türkischen Aspektsystems*. (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Johanson, Lars 1994. Türkeitürkische Aspektotempora. In: Thieroff, Rolf & Ballweg, Joachim (eds.) *Tense systems in European languages*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 247–266.
- 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.
- Johanson, Lars 2001. On three dimensions of aspectual terminality. In: Bisang, Walter (ed.) *Aspects of typology and universals*. (Studia Typologica 1.) Berlin: Akademie. 53–62.
- Johanson, Lars 2003. Evidentiality in Turkic. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds.) *Studies in evidentiality*. (Typological Studies in Language 54.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 273–290.
- Karakoç, Birsal 2005. *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen*. (Turcologica 58.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Söýegow, Myratgeldi (ed.) 2000. *Türkmen diliniň grammatikasy: Morfologiýa*. Aşgabat: Ruh neşriýaty.

Sources

- AH: www.azathabar.com/a/24351463.html
- BT: *Böwsülen tümlük*. Ak Welsapar. Stockholm: Gün Neşirýaty. 2004.
- GRŞ: *Göres*. Çary Aşyr. Aşgabat: Türkmenistan Neşirýaty. 1986.
- J: *Japbaklar*. Berdi Kerbabaýew. Aşgabat: Türkmen Döwlet Neşirýat Gullugy. 2007.
- MT: *Mülli tahyryň hudaýlygy*. Ak Welsapar. Stockholm: Gün. 2006.
- P: *Perman*. Ata Gowşudow. Aşgabat: Türkmenistan Neşirýaty. 1989.
- CT: Colloquial Turkmen
- SE: *Saýlanan eserler*. Berdi Kerbabaýew. Aşgabat: Magaryf. 1992.

- TDG: *Türkmen diliniň grammatikasy: Morfologiýa*. Aşgabat: Ruh. 2000
- TM: *Türkmen masalları*. Ryoko Asano. Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. 2010.